

## **Ocean Shore Management Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan Steering Committee Meeting Comments: Round One, 4/02**

OPRD staff completed the first steering committee meeting on April 24, 2002 in Coos Bay. Following the April 24 meeting, staff completed seven public meetings, with six in coastal cities and one in the Portland area. The steering committee and public meetings followed similar agendas, which included staff presentation of an overview of the planning scope, topics, process, schedule, and expected studies. Staff through note taking on the flip chart collected the committee's comments.

For review purposes, the comments have been arranged by topic and have been summarized and paraphrased. Since this round of meetings is informal the comments were not recorded by tape or court reporter and are not verbatim. No transcripts are available of this meeting. Committee members will be reviewing the comments summary and will advise staff on any omissions or errors to be corrected.

OPRD will be holding a follow up steering committee meeting for members who could not make the April 24<sup>th</sup> meeting. The follow up meeting will be scheduled for early July. Comments from that meeting will be added to this summary upon completion of the July meeting.

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 were 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 of the meetings. The upcoming planning analysis is needed to be able to answer many of those comments. Other questions or comments are well outside of the scope of this beach planning effort and may not be answerable by OPRD. Staff will try to direct commentors on those topics to other sources or forums.

### **Jurisdiction**

- ❑ Provide the committee and the public with explanations of the statutes (Beach Bill) and state rules regarding management of Oregon's beaches, and how those mandates may direct the planning process. Also provide language on Goals 17 and 18.
- ❑ Certain jurisdictional issues should be addressed in the plan and determine which agencies have what authority.
- ❑ Consider where the jurisdictional line should be. There is a process for revisiting the line location, but has not been used in 20 years. Recent attempts were not completed.
- ❑ The public is not aware of the difference between the two jurisdictional lines for permitting, and are especially confused about any area in between the two.
- ❑ Need to complete a topography map with the jurisdictional boundaries shown.

- ❑ Be aware of DLCD actions regarding permitting jurisdiction and county zoning. Need to show the areas where development occurred after 1977. DLCD is looking at defining the area to be zones that allowed development after 1977. some counties may already have this information. This kind of mapping is not going to be done by DLCD. They feel it is a county responsibility. Some felt the mapping should be done as a part of this plan. Was stated that is would be a costly project to take on.

### **Geographic Scope**

- ❑ Estuaries are where a lot of the beach management issues occur. Needs to be included.
- ❑ There are also private property concerns that need to be included.
- ❑ Consider including off shore and inter-tidal areas.
- ❑ Consider extending the plan to Highway 101 or even to the crest of the coast range.

### **General Plan Preparation**

- ❑ Provide the committee with the plan budget and the direction given by the Commission.
- ❑ Clarify when formal Issue Scoping will occur.
- ❑ What OPRD is trying to do is huge. Focus needs to be fine-tuned for the plan to be do-able.
- ❑ The plan(s) should have an identifiable set of goals and objectives with measurable outcomes.
- ❑ Issues should be taken at your first and second rounds of meetings as well as at the third round. Commentors may not come to subsequent meetings.
- ❑ Add public safety to the list of topics. (Related to earthquakes, tsunami and big waves.)
- ❑ Conflicts will vary from beach to beach, so solutions should not be blanket solutions.
- ❑ Consider what constitutes “going to the beach”. Could include many people who never set foot on the sandy beaches.
- ❑ Concerned that the efforts of the steering committee will be ignored by OPRD. Even though the committee is advisory only, the department should seriously consider their comments.
- ❑ The plan(s) could identify future work and potential changes in rules/regulations that need to be done. The plan(s) could target priorities for future actions.
- ❑ Need someone from the invasive species section of the Dept. of Agriculture on the committee. (Will invite them to our technical committee, where most of the government staff experts are included.)
- ❑ Consider incorporating a field trip with each round of steering committee meetings. Visit problem spots near the towns where the meetings will be held.
- ❑ Consider creating a subcommittee or two, as needed to do more work on certain topics.
- ❑ Consider having at least some of the steering committee meetings after the public meetings for that round, so that the committee can hear what was said.
- ❑ May want to have at least one steering committee meeting held inland.
- ❑ May want to have a larger beach tour to allow a comprehensive look at the issues on the ground.

### **Public Involvement: General**

- ❑ OPRD should hold public meetings in other non-coastal cities, such as two in the Willamette Valley and one in Bend. Also consider Reedsport. Also Roseburg.

### **Recreational Use**

- ❑ OPRD needs to understand what the recreation trends are for the future. What new uses might be coming up. Kite boarding is emerging now, for example.
- ❑ Focus on individual recreation use groups.
- ❑ Knowing the relative intensity of different recreational uses is important to the plan.
- ❑ OPRD should look at recreational use outside the window of the on-the-beach survey that was done. Should include off season analysis of whale watching, fishing, etc.

### **General Natural Resource Management**

- ❑ Include information on beach dynamics and sand movement. Sand sources and sinks need to be understood.
- ❑ The Rocky Shores Plan should be folded into this planning effort and not be a separate document.
- ❑ The plan should also address off shore marine reserves issues and take the large scale ecosystem approach.
- ❑ Take a littoral cell approach to collecting and analyzing the data. No two cells are alike.
- ❑ Consider impacts from the plan proposals on natural resources and biological processes.
- ❑ Take the long term view and look at where we want our beaches to be in 100 years.
- ❑ Address man-made erosion resulting from species management.
- ❑ Include sea level rise information.
- ❑ Take a landscape scale approach to analysis and recommendations, at least to include state park lands. Ideally go to watershed units.
- ❑ Look at the larger protected species situation, not just the plovers.
- ❑ Gorse is a huge problem on the coast. It also has changed the coastal landscape. What about this issue? It's a huge threat. Are there effective removal techniques? What about seed suppression? Gorse management experiments need to be compiled and studied to see what works.
- ❑ An Invasive Species Council is forming. OPRD should monitor their recommendations and coordinate with them on related plan issues.
- ❑ Another resource issue to address is non-point pollution and its effect on water quality in the ocean and estuaries. The pollution crosses the beach via creeks and seeps.
- ❑ Map areas of deposition and erosion.
- ❑ Add "research" to the list of topics and uses.
- ❑ Add "noxious weeds" to the list of management issues.

### **Permitting**

- ❑ For enforcing permitting, how well are the zone lines known, on the ground and conceptually? (There are survey markers for the zone line at certain points. Coordinates are mandated for the zone line, although OPRD staff do not survey for

the line. Maps are available. Otherwise there is a lot of confusion about what the line means.)

### **Social and Economic Impacts**

- ❑ Determine what people are willing to pay to get onto the beaches. Consider the impacts of day use or parking fees on the publics' desire to visit the beaches. Look at local, state and federal fees.
- ❑ For future surveys, the steering committee should review and comment on the questions to be asked.
- ❑ What kind of economic information will be collected from the recreation surveys? (Some general tourism questions in SCORP. Watch for the report announcement. Will also look at other tourism information.)
- ❑ Those completing your impacts study should be familiar with Oregon's coast and coastal economy. Include that in your selection criteria.
- ❑ Motorized vehicle use contributes to the economical viability of the coast.
- ❑ Need to figure in the economic value of Highway 101 to the beaches and beach use. Some areas of the beach are not very accessible from 101.
- ❑ Add off-season recreational use estimates to peak season use for economic analysis.
- ❑ Committee wants to review the draft RFP and prospective consultants.
- ❑ Economic information is one of the most difficult types of information to accurately collect.
- ❑ Address the economics of recreational use.

### **Supervision and Enforcement**

- ❑ Will you revisit any of the "use" rules? For example the rules related to dogs on the beaches. (Andy clarified what the rules currently are.)

### **Snowy Plover Conservation**

- ❑ Keep an eye on the court decisions coming up regarding the snowy plover and USFWS. If the critical habitat designation is struck down in court, can the HCP go ahead? (Yes. An HCP does not have to follow the critical habitat or recovery plans, but only uses this kind of information as a guideline for options for the plan. Critical habitat designations apply to federal lands only. The species would still be listed and the state would still have a liability associated with a "takings.")
- ❑ Look at the entire ecosystem and trends over time and across seasons. The larger climate and food supply issues can be overlooked in a short term review. The larger context for salmon was not studied until later.
- ❑ Chart the up's and down's for the plover and look for trends and ideas on what is causing changes, that can be controlled. Some things, such as the weather cannot be managed.
- ❑ Any aggressive predator control effort is hard to achieve, especially in regard to crows and ravens.
- ❑ Do some of the inland population migrate to the beaches? (Not in Oregon.)
- ❑ How do we get a handle on the effectiveness of various approaches? Seems that habitat recovery is key to success. When do we all decide to stop recovery due to a lack of success? (Monitoring here and in California provides some idea of what is effective and what are the major impacts. Habitat is very key. If an HCP is

- implemented the management would likely continue for the agreed upon life of the plan or longer. Delisting could be announced by USFWS if management meets certain recovery goals. This would be a success. Whether to decide to end management due to a decline in the species is a good question.)
- ❑ Try to help solve the problem of “sharing the beach”. Include the various interests.
  - ❑ Correction to the presentation: The range is from Mazatlan to Washington, not Baja to Washington.
  - ❑ It is good to look at the breeding plover counts as they reflect impacts from the weather. They reveal there is no certain trend, but impacts are generally random. (Those counts don’t go back very far, unfortunately.)
  - ❑ In some areas the plover have habituated well to people on the beaches.
  - ❑ The USDA reports that only 2% of plover losses were caused by direct impacts, along the entire west coast. Much larger percentage was due to other impacts such as predators or weather.
  - ❑ With no documented evidence of ATV’s running over nests in Oregon, don’t mention it as if it does occur here.
  - ❑ In sorting out areas for human use and plover protection, there should be a balance.
  - ❑ Beach grass management seems to be a key to recovering the plover. What is happening nationwide in regard to habitat management for open sand?
  - ❑ European beach grass is a problem because it’s growth habit allows the capture of sand and builds the dunes up high. American dune grass does not capture sand in the same manner, but allows it to blow over, keeping the dune low.
  - ❑ Ocean over-washing can open up the sandy areas.
  - ❑ Stabilization has also created lots of dunal wetlands and related habitat. Plover habitat restoration can involve a loss of wetlands due to being infilled manually or indirectly by blowing sand that had been released by manual efforts.
  - ❑ Losing some wetland may not be all bad, but permitting for impacting wetlands is needed.
  - ❑ Deflation plains are not enjoyable and encroach on the open sand and dunes. Hate to see the loss of the open sand landscape and the spread of deflation plains.
  - ❑ Loss of beach grass at New River could cause the river to be filled in.
  - ❑ The lesson from the Oregon Department of Forestry’s experience with doing an HCP for the Elliot Forest and the Tillamook Forest is that OPRD should not buy into a final HCP unless it looks like it will work for both sides.
  - ❑ Is the state’s involvement in an HCP voluntary? Doesn’t the Recovery Plan objectives create a situation in which OPRD has little choice but to complete an HCP to avoid enforcement liability? Are criteria in the Recovery Plan really only “guidelines”? The term “voluntary” is misleading. (There is an incentive for any HCP manager in that certain management assurances can be sought.)
  - ❑ Without an HCP, if plovers are impacted, there is no protection from potential USFWS enforcement of some kind.
  - ❑ Those who are wary may agree in concept that the HCP could be a good thing to do, but are concerned about what the specifics would end up be. The devil is in the details.
  - ❑ The collaboration with USFWS over the HCP will be like a union negotiation, need to see if each side gets what they need.
  - ❑ However, it seems that OPRD is entering into the discussion in the right spirit.

- ❑ Plover management results need to be compiled and studied to see what works and what does not. Many of the current “studies” are actually just anecdotal observations made without the benefit of controls.
- ❑ Can build experiments into the HCP and see what works. This is called “adaptive management”.

### **Plan(s) Implementation**

- ❑ How would the plan(s) inform OPRD about future acquisition priorities for the coast? In regard to larger habitat enhancement and even marine reserves?

### **General Comments**

- ❑ Arnold Ryland wants to join the Western Snowy Plover Working Group.
- ❑ Would like to see more public input on the annual beach restriction decisions prior to the decisions being made.