

Ocean Shore Management Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan Public Involvement Summary: Round One, April/May 2002

OPRD staff completed public meetings in seven cities, and one steering committee meeting, in April and May 2002. The meetings included staff presentation of an overview of the planning scope, topics, process, schedule, and expected studies. Staff collected general comments through notes taken on flip charts.

For review purposes, we have arranged the comments by meeting date/place and by topic. They have been summarized and paraphrased, and are not verbatim. Since the first round of public meetings was informal, the comments were not recorded on tape or by court reporter. As a result, there are no available transcripts of these meetings. Anyone reviewing the summary of comments may contact OPRD staff and alert them to any omissions or clarifications they notice.

The following comments should not be taken as OPRD-approved objectives at this point in the planning process. OPRD will consider these comments and others through 2002, and will begin to identify key planning issues through its Issue Scoping sessions in January/February 2003. Also, many of the comments are provided in the form of questions of OPRD. In some cases, if the answer was known and was provided by OPRD staff at the meeting, it is shown following the question in parentheses. For some of the questions OPRD had no answers at the time. The upcoming planning analysis is needed to be able to answer those questions. Other questions/comments are well outside of the scope of this planning effort and may not be answerable by OPRD. Staff will try to direct commentors on those topics to other sources and forums for answers.

OPRD has no formal comment deadline for the planning process at this time. The public is invited to provide comments through this summer, through the website email address, or may phone or mail to the contacts listed on the web site.

http://www.prd.state.or.us/osmp_hcp.php

April 30, 2002 Gold Beach Public Meeting

Jurisdiction

- Is all of the beach owned by OPRD? (Generally, only the wet sand area away from State Parks, and the beaches adjacent to State Parks are owned by the State. However, OPRD has authority to manage an easement from the high tide line to the vegetation line or zone line for beach permitting, resource management and recreational use.)

Recreation Use

- ❑ Some are concerned about ATV's being allowed on the beaches, especially at South Jetty. Others support ATV recreation on the beaches and using vehicles to get to clamming and fishing areas.
- ❑ Concerned about misbehavior on the part of some ATV riders, such as shooting birds.

Beach Access

- ❑ Residents are concerned about being shut off from using the beaches, and that access restrictions could be extensive enough to negatively affect the tourism economy on the south coast.
- ❑ Between Euchre Creek and Humbug Mountain there are very few public beach accesses. This is also true between Euchre Creek and Ophir. Five to nine mile stretches without access. Most are private accesses or access is limited by topography. Private access roads in that area are now being gated to the public. There is a need to provide public access in that area. One opportunity may be at the old quarry site near Humbug.
- ❑ The gate at Frankport is now locked. Who owns that? (Privately owned but in the process of being purchased by OPRD.)
- ❑ Beach access at Otter Point needs to be improved for safety.
Post danger signs at access points to narrow beaches and changes in tide line.

Permitting: Removing Natural Materials

- ❑ What kind of impacts are happening to the environment due to sea urchin collection? Loss of urchins could affect the amount of sand that is available from the cliffs. Are there any studies? Are chitons also being negatively affected?

General Natural Resource Management

- ❑ Why are there so few shells on the beaches any more? Hunter Creek area seems to have few shells. (The availability of shells is related to the amount and productivity of adjacent shallow water habitats. More shells near these habitats.)

Supervision and Enforcement

- ❑ The key to good recreational use and management is a happy medium and sharing the beach. Recreationalists should not abuse the privilege of having beaches open to public use. It's those who misbehave who cause problems for everyone else. The problems increase as more and more people use the beaches. Eventually the only solution is good supervision and enforcement.

Snowy Plover Conservation

- ❑ Why are you planning to include Curry County in the HCP when there are so few birds in the county? (The HCP would apply to the entire Oregon coast so that OPRD can obtain certain long term management assurances and relief from potential USFWS enforcement if the plover move into any section of beach.)
- ❑ Focus recovery and habitat restoration on beaches where they are few people.

- ❑ Support protecting the coast for birds and all wildlife.
- ❑ Have studies been done on the nesting success rate? (The monitors complete annual reports on nesting success.)
- ❑ Do exclosures help survival? (They help to some extent in deterring predators from taking eggs. The annual reports also talk about how the exclosures had worked that year, any particular problems or innovations in design etc..)
- ❑ Once beach grass is removed does it come back? (Generally yes. Managing for open sand is an on-going task.)
- ❑ How does reducing areas of beach and open sand affect the plover? (They instinctually use that kind of habitat for nesting. Their survival rate is not good in vegetated areas as predators can hide and ambush them. Their nesting success is tied to having sufficient areas of open sand.)
- ❑ Is a permit needed from OPRD to remove beach grass or to push sand into the sea? (Yes – if on the ocean shore.)
- ❑ Who does studies on snowy plover survival? (Monitors and researchers in Oregon, California, and on the northeast coast concerning related piping plovers, have completed inventories and assessments of plover success and impacts on them. In Oregon, staff from the Oregon Natural Heritage Program are hired to do the monitoring and exclosures. The USFWS, USFS, BLM, ODFW and in a minor way, OPRD, pay for their work.)

General OPRD-related Comments

- ❑ What is OPRD going to do with the recent Cape Sebastian purchase? (Provide trail connections, beach access and primitive camping.)
- ❑ How does OPRD fund development and operations? (Generally the lottery and grants for acquisition, development and rehabilitation. User fees and RV fees for operations.)
- ❑ What is OPRD looking at doing with fees? (Will be considering whether to extend day use fees to more parks. The issue will be before our May Commission meeting for consideration of going to rulemaking.)
- ❑ Private campgrounds have a hard time competing with OPRD campgrounds and other public parks. Private parks cannot raise their fees when public park fees are so low.

May 1, 2002 Coos Bay Public Meeting

Jurisdictions

- ❑ Who is in charge of the estuaries and rivers? (Division of State Lands.)

Public Involvement: Steering Committee

- ❑ Who are the specific steering committee members? (We will post that list on the web site.)
- ❑ John Griffith should be the Coos County representative.

Recreational Use

- ❑ Allow recreational placer mining on the beach by permit. It would be an economic benefit and should cost about \$10. Allow miners to use vehicles for access and to haul equipment.
- ❑ Pumps and mining is not aesthetically pleasing for most visitors.
- ❑ Allow vehicular access to Whiskey Run, especially for disabled.
- ❑ Some concern that the recreational use survey will be used in a misleading way. They know that some respondents have lied or have chosen not to respond.
- ❑ The beach survey did not address off-season use. Off-season use needs to be addressed as well.

Beach Access

- ❑ USFS has cut off access to beach for vehicles at Siltcoos, resulting in vehicular access being concentrated at another location. This has caused congestion in the vicinity of the open access. Restrictions and driving on the beach at Siltcoos has offended some users who had spent time working on snowy plover restoration project. These persons say they will no longer help with those projects.
- ❑ There are several other beach accesses that the federal agencies have closed or restricted, such as near Tahkenitch.
- ❑ It's too inconvenient to have to go to OPRD for a special permit for vehicular use on the beaches that are closed to vehicles, for the elderly and disabled.

Permitting; Natural Products Collection

- ❑ Make it easier for the public to collect driftwood for firewood.
- ❑ Need to create a permit that will protect firewood collectors who are hauling driftwood via the highway from violations imposed by state patrol.

Supervision and Enforcement

- ❑ Need more enforcement of state laws on the beaches such as speed limits. Not enforced on the North Spit.
- ❑ The public is confused about where different rules apply.
- ❑ Prohibit dogs entirely from some beaches and allow them on others, to provide options for different preferences.

Snowy Plover Conservation

- ❑ 90% of snowy plover decline is due to European beach grass and predators.
- ❑ Have ODFW help with predator control.
- ❑ Create a research project in which about 5 miles of remote beach has beach grass removed and controlled and predators are controlled. In two years count the birds and see how well it worked. Should be perfect conditions and recovery goals should be met for Oregon in this area.
- ❑ If Oregon and Washington are halfway to making the recovery number of plovers, why do we need more beach closures? Appears that closures are happening for other reasons and the birds are being used as an excuse by the government.

- ❑ OPRD needs to establish clear and specific goals for the conservation plan, in regard to de-listing and beach restrictions.
- ❑ Can OPRD disagree with the USFWS in its plan? (OPRD's completion of a Habitat Conservation Plan is voluntary. The USFWS Recovery Plan is essentially a set of guidelines about how to recover the species. OPRD and USFWS can agree on variations and alternatives that will still likely recover the species.)
- ❑ Provide more basic information on the plover to the public.
- ❑ Concern that the public's interests are not going to be adequately represented in the conservation plan, and that OPRD has it's own agenda that staff are not explaining to them. (Currently OPRD has no proposals, recommendations or plans. We will be considering options through the planning process and sharing them with the public for comment and potential revision.)
- ❑ Agencies with nests on their lands should pay for the monitoring, not OPRD. (OPRD pays very little of the cost because it was only one park with nesting plover.)

General Comments

- ❑ Coos County residents are not the problem on the beaches; the government is the problem with unreasonable restrictions.
- ❑ The local economy relies heavily on tourism and cannot sustain a downturn from lowered visitation that could result from beach restrictions.
- ❑ The state and federal government is seen as the enemy. We should all be working together.
- ❑ Figure out an efficient way to clean up the plastic trash that washes onto the beach every day.

May 2, 2003 Florence Public Meeting

Public Involvement: General

- ❑ Would like to see OPRD identify the major recreational user groups and involve them.
- ❑ The user groups need to come to the public meetings.
- ❑ Would like to see some of the meetings in the Willamette Valley. Most of the beach visitors come from there.
- ❑ Why is there only a meeting in Portland and not Eugene?

Public Involvement: Steering Committee

- ❑ Add SOLV as an environmental advocate

Beach Access

- ❑ OPRD has said it wants a beach access every three miles. This is a mistake. Needs to be fitted to the land.
- ❑ Don't like the day use only parking restrictions for horse trailers, interferes with moonlight rides.

Beach Permitting

- ❑ Find a less arbitrary manner for dealing with very specific situations. Find ways to be more flexible. Hard and fast rules are often arbitrary. Have a permitting board that participates in permit decisions.
- ❑ Riprap is needed to protect homes and roads. What is being done to allow this protection, especially at Spencer Creek where the highway bridge is in jeopardy.
- ❑ OPRD has been very responsive in providing permits in emergency situations.

Snowy Plover Conservation

- ❑ Sees an effort by USFS to destroy the dunes. Dune leveling is filling inter-dunal wetlands and killing native plants. Enhancement plans need to address protecting wetlands and related native plants. USFS is not doing this. Since OPRD issues permits to USFS for dune leveling, OPRD should direct applicants to use methods that don't spread beach grass via the ocean and that protect native plants and wetlands. DLCDC seems to be the only agency concerned about this.
- ❑ Single-minded focus on plover recovery is not a balance. Habitat uses should not "trump" human uses. Balancing providing access and protecting resources is incompatible. Difficult to see that the plan will be balanced when so much of the presentation is about the plover.
- ❑ How can the HCP be voluntary when the Endangered Species Act is not? (The HCP is an option to the usual actions for protecting species.)
- ❑ Is the state's voluntary participation in the HCP going to be supportive of human uses? (OPRD is looking for ways to provide for human uses in the HCP. That is the other half of the balance.)
- ❑ The beach restrictions at Baker Beach seem to be working. See very few violations. Now it's mostly a predator problem. Have seen crows and ravens at the nests hanging around. Nest failures are mostly due to crows and ravens. Consider putting up comment boxes or restriction areas for public to provide observations of what is happening with the birds.
- ❑ Seagulls are a real problem for the nests. Do exclosures help? (Bird predators are harder to exclude, but the exclosures seem to help.)
- ❑ In the 1970's 20% of the plovers were using Baker Beach. Find some suitable sections of beach and totally close them to public access and emphasize plover recovery there. They seem to like dredge spoil areas. There are lots of opportunities if done right.
- ❑ Predator control is a single-minded and single species approach. It pits plover protection against the well-being of other species. It will affect the larger environment negatively. This is another kind of imbalance.
- ❑ OPRD needs to assess whether management efforts are working or not. Compare various approaches and use what works best. Systematic evaluations need to be done over time and through the seasons.
- ❑ Most of the "studies" on the effectiveness of plover management are anecdotal and were not controlled studies.
- ❑ Why are the sanderlings successful and the snowy plover are not? (Different behavior and instincts.)

- ❑ The “restrictions” equipment (ropes and fencing) is left on the beaches as litter each year, and cause safety problems for horses. Collect it after nesting.
- ❑ Using snares for predator control would be unacceptable.
- ❑ Emphasize the reasons why OPRD wants to do an HCP up front in the presentation.

General Comments

- ❑ The Coastal Commission could help with information and review the draft report.
- ❑ Florence’s economy relies on tourism and beach visitors.
- ❑ There are already fees to go to state parks. There will now be more restrictions. There is no end to the mounting costs and restrictions.

May 6, 2002 Newport Public Meeting

Jurisdiction

- ❑ Who has jurisdiction of rocky intertidal areas? (Up to 16 foot contour is OPRD.)
- ❑ What is the date when the ocean shore line was done? (In 1969 the statutory vegetation line was described.)
- ❑ Does OPRD have ownership and management authority of the entire sand beach? (Explained the jurisdiction and ownership limits.)
- ❑ How much of the ocean shore is privately owned?

OPRD’s Role

- ❑ Emphasize the resource protection aspect of your mission over recreation provision.

Recreation Use

- ❑ Horses are sometimes seen as a conflict with other users. Are kites a safety problem around horses?

Public Involvement: Steering Committee

- ❑ Who is on the committee from coastal conservation groups? (OSCC)

Recreational Use

- ❑ Don’t allow vehicular use on more beaches than are currently allowed, and consider reducing the number of beaches where they are allowed.

Permitting

- ❑ OPRD should not subsidize the cost of permitting. Fees should cover all costs.

General Natural Resource Management

- ❑ Appreciate the beach for its intrinsic nature-natural setting and solitude.
- ❑ High priority to protect sensitive wildlife, including all shorebirds, from human disturbance during critical times of the year.
- ❑ Some of Oregon’s beaches could or should be considered to be wilderness settings and should be managed as such, with limited access and high levels of resource protection.

Snowy Plover Conservation

- ❑ Why is the plan only addressing snowy plover and not other species?
- ❑ Is the plan not including inter-tidal areas and habitats?
- ❑ Does the use of the term “balance” mean a 50/50 split between habitat and human use? Species protection may need to be of greater concern than human use. We should protect pristine beaches. (No, the balance would need to fit each place and situation.)

OPRD-related Comments

- ❑ Is your process covered by the land use goals for the beaches, and does it comply with State Agency Coordination requirements?
- ❑ New parks should be purchased and created as opposed to expanding facilities in existing parks.
- ❑ Public parks and lands should be buffered by low density zoning.
- ❑ State parks should be havens from development and not compete with private RV parks. Should not include concessions.
- ❑ Oppose the day use fee.
- ❑ OPRD’s parks should play a strong role in supporting the objectives of the Salmon Plan and maintaining biodiversity.

May 7, 2002 Tillamook Public Meeting

Jurisdiction

- ❑ Is there a way of knowing who owns out to the water without going to the deeds? (That is the only accurate approach. No current data base in place.)
- ❑ If OPRD only has recreation authority, can someone build a seawall to the water? (OPRD also has riprap and construction permitting authority up to the vegetation line or zone line, whichever is inland, and would regulate the construction of things such as seawalls in that area only.)
- ❑ In unincorporated areas, can the counties go before the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission and ask for more restrictive measures, such as camping restrictions? (Yes) Are the adopted restrictions then state rules? (Yes)

Geographic Scope

- ❑ Will upland park activities be considered in the plan(s) since use of these areas may impact use of the ocean shores, the beach? (We will look at neighboring uses to the beach and accesses to the beach. Outside of that the remainder will be reviewed in a general contextual way.)
- ❑ Will there be any consideration of bay areas? (Not directly, they are in other agency jurisdictions, but will be considered as context.)

Public Involvement

- ❑ Are there ways that the Coast Watch volunteers can assist with the plan? (We want to talk with Philip Johnson about how we can collect observations from members.)

Recreational Use

- ❑ What disciplines are involved in putting together the SCORP survey? Will it provide information on tourism dollars? (SCORP does ask some tourism-related questions. Watch for the upcoming reports.)
- ❑ One more type of use to consider should be no use at all.
- ❑ There are conflicts between vehicular users and non-vehicular users. It's sometimes hard for drivers to tell when they are entering a beach that is closed to vehicles. Should use prominent natural features for the boundary markers, not signs. Signs are too easily stolen or vandalized. The area of Sand Lake and the Boy Scout Camp is a good example.
- ❑ Some feel there should only be vehicular use on the beaches by special permit.

General Natural Resource Management

- ❑ Are you considering having some beaches completely closed to people? It would be a good idea to have some beaches preserved only for wildlife to use.
- ❑ Are you going to be looking at management of natural and cultural resources as well as recreation? (yes)
- ❑ On low tides people are swarming over inter-tidal areas and trampling them. Is there anything in this plan that would address these areas? (The Rocky Shores Plan already addresses these areas. Our plan(s) will acknowledge the direction from that plan for those areas.)
- ❑ Are you seeking out scientific information on crabs and other species that come onto the beach? (yes, we will be)
- ❑ Are crabs and clams killed by vehicles driving over the sand?
- ❑ Traffic in some areas is a problem for many wildlife on the beach.

Permitting

- ❑ Is a permit required for collecting driftwood? I thought you could not take firewood off of the beach. (No permit is required for small amounts for personal use. A landowner collecting driftwood on his dry sand property does not require a permit for that activity, but would need a permit to drive on a closed beach to get the wood off. Otherwise the general public is not allowed permits for commercial collection of driftwood from the publicly-owned, or from someone else's dry sand beach.)
- ❑ Have observed that people do not get permits for various regulated activities on the beach. (Our enforcement and supervision ability is limited by the few staff we have for that purpose, and some violations cannot be discovered.)

Snowy Plover Conservation

- ❑ Have you seen any snowy plovers at Bayocean Spit? (historically yes)
- ❑ Would you be creating new plover habitat as a part of your plan implementation? (potentially yes)
- ❑ Bayocean spit would need to be closed to human use if designated for plover protection.
- ❑ Is there predator control beyond using exclosures? (Yes, harassment and trapping can be used)

- ❑ Will the plan include restrictions? (Potentially in some places. We don't know what or where at this time. Restrictions will be selected through the process and reviewed in the draft plan(s).)
- ❑ Can restrictions be for smaller areas versus larger areas? (We will be working with biological consultants to help us to answer those questions and others like them)
- ❑ In Washington, Ledbetter State Park beaches are closed to all public access to protect plovers. Need to see more of that in Oregon.
- ❑ We should thank the plovers for the protection of the beaches. Without them open sand beaches could disappear.
- ❑ If you end up with all 250 birds in Washington, would USFWS de-list them? (Not sure, as they are looking for more of a regional distribution than that.)
- ❑ How does the HCP work, if there are currently no plovers on the spit at Bayocean? (It outlines actions to be taken for certain places if birds begin to nest. Don't know what or where now.)

Supervision and Enforcement

- ❑ Include consideration of evacuation of the beaches in the event of a tsunami. Should be an off shore detection system, warning system and some areas might need to be permanently closed due to excessive danger from potential tsunami.

May 8, 2002 Seaside Public Meeting

Recreational Use

- ❑ Don't allow more vehicular use on the beaches. Possibly restrict more of it in some areas.
- ❑ Horseback riding options need to be protected.
- ❑ Equestrians need to pick up their horses' droppings.

Snowy Plover Conservation

- ❑ Are crows included in predator management? (yes)
- ❑ Crows can get around any enclosure.
- ❑ Ok to limit access on those beaches where it is needed to protect habitat.
- ❑ Will this plan be a prelude to more restrictions? Once restrictions begin, they multiply. Will the cities have to do plans?

General OPRD-related Comments

- ❑ Don't expand existing parks, and increase the capacity of those parks. Create new parks.
- ❑ OPRD should emphasize its role as a natural resource manager over recreational use

May 16, 2002 Portland Public Meeting

Jurisdictions

- ❑ There are several agencies with overlapping jurisdictions on the ocean shore. There is a lot of confusion on the part of the public and the agencies about who has what kind of authorities regarding the beaches. OPRD needs to better coordinate with them, make them known to the public, and educate the agencies about how to improve their

understanding of laws and rules related to the ocean shore. The objective is to provide better “customer service” to the public.

Geographic Scope

- ❑ Why not include the non-sandy portions of the shore in the plan? (The Rocky Shores Plan covered the rocky inter-tidal portions of the shore. OPRD’s shore plan will acknowledge the Rocky Shores Plan in regard to those areas. OPRD will also acknowledge any inventories and plans already completed by other jurisdictions for the estuaries at the beaches, which are outside of OPRD’s jurisdiction.)

OPRD’s Role

- ❑ OPRD should not compete with the private sector in providing entertainment-oriented recreation. Rather OPRD should be concentrating on providing the natural settings that are becoming more and more scarce, and which provide visitors with a sense of solitude and connection with the natural environment.
- ❑ OPRD should be targeting key lands on the ocean shore for acquisition to preclude development.
- ❑ OPRD’s dual missions of protecting resources, and providing for recreation and education are compatible in that the majority of recreationists are on the beach to enjoy the same natural setting that wildlife needs.

Public Involvement: Steering Committee

- ❑ Majority of recreationists on the coastal beaches are there for solitude, and are on foot. Concerned about lack of representation of this user group on the steering committee.
- ❑ Concerned that OPRD is giving motorized access and recreation too much weight by placing a representative for this group on the steering committee. Motorized use has more of an impact than other recreation activities.
- ❑ Would like to see committee representatives for birding, Native Plant Society and research scientists.

Public Involvement: General

- ❑ What can the public do to help OPRD get through the plan and have good recommendations? (Help OPRD to identify what the key issues are, provide any knowledge you have about the beaches or use of them, review the draft comments and draft plans and provide comments on them, identify gaps in the information and proposed solutions.)

Recreational Use

- ❑ Vehicles provide most of the conflicts that are often assumed to be happening because of other activities such as camping on the beach. Beach camping would not be a problem if it were allowed as non-vehicular, because less equipment and supplies could be brought in and much less garbage would be left.
- ❑ Support the coast trail, and camping on the beach without vehicular access.

Beach Access

- ❑ Concerned that traditional accesses are being lost such as closed street ends, ad hoc trails and private roads.
- ❑ What is the best and most complete method for identifying all of the historical or traditional accesses and then determining where access points need to be for the future? Not sure that the DLCD Coastal Access data base is complete. Make sure it is “ground-truthed”.
- ❑ Key point is to maintain the appropriate “balance” between resource protection and providing for access.
- ❑ Oregon Shore Conservation Coalition was a beach access advocate prior to being a larger resource advocate. The group is interested in seeing beach accesses “preserved” for future use. Exceptions may be specific restrictions for specific resource protection reasons, and not just limited to the protection of snowy plover.

Permitting: Beach Structures and Riprap

- ❑ Riprap is both a visual and an environmental intrusion and threat. OPRD’s objective should be to allow as little as possible, given the law.
- ❑ Resolve dispute about the definition of where it is allowed.
- ❑ Permitting fees should cover the full cost of administering review of the impacts, both short and long term.

Permitting: Natural Products Collection

- ❑ Driftwood is needed to control beach erosion. Removal can upset the natural balance of beach sand retention. Commercial or large scale driftwood collection should not be allowed. It seems that some illegal collecting by truck is currently occurring. (The dry sand is often owned by private citizens, and the driftwood on that land is their property and can be legally collected by them and even sold. These landowners can obtain permits from OPRD to drive their pickup truck down the beach to their property to collect and haul their wood.)
- ❑ Establish strict limits on the amounts that can be taken for personal use.

Supervision and Rule Enforcement

- ❑ More enforcement staff are needed on the beaches.
- ❑ There needs to be some clarification of what the rules are and where they apply.
- ❑ It’s hard for volunteers to effectively deal with members of the public who are misbehaving, because they have no authority.

Snowy Plover Conservation

- ❑ What are the consequences of not having an HCP? (Potential federal enforcement due to a “taking” of snowy plover without the protection of a “takings permit”. The HCP provides certain assurances to OPRD of how activities can occur on the beaches without liability for a taking.)
- ❑ If the snowy plover recovery goal (USFWS) is met would management measures for the beaches be allowed to change and would the population be considered to be stable? We may just end up with a much larger habitat to protect over the long run.

(USFWS representative said that plover conservation measures implemented during the HCP may become part of the routine management of the beaches for the long run. OPRD staff said that we don't know what those measures will end up to be or where they would be implemented at this time. Proposals for management actions will be offered in the draft plan for comment.)

- ❑ Primary concern regarding the HCP is ensuring that public access to the beaches is continued.
- ❑ What are the current law suits about? Will the suits halt the HCP? (Coos County is suing USFWS regarding their critical habitat designation for snowy plover, saying the economic impacts study was not complete. The suit will not halt the HCP as the critical habitat designations are not mandatory for OPRD completion of the HCP. Habitat protection and enhancement objectives for the HCP happen independently of the official critical habitat designation status.)
- ❑ Balancing human use with plover recovery could be a very tough thing to achieve in some locations.
- ❑ Do snowy plovers prefer the naturally created open sand habitats or the “restored” or man-made open sand areas? (They have been using both.)

Plan(s) Implementation

- ❑ Once the plan(s) are approved by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission will there is a legislative approval process? (Some issues may potentially involve some party attempting to change statutes or rules to achieve desired or recommended solutions to key issues. Also, some of the recommended actions will involve OPRD requests for budget approval by the legislature, through the normal biennial budget approval process. Other than that the legislature would have no automatic approval role for the plan(s).)