

## ***Coastal and Nearshore Oregon: Using and Protecting Our Natural Resources***

### **Background**

During the LWVOR's state convention in 2009, members made a recommendation to restudy the current position on Coastal Natural Resources with particular emphasis on Marine Reserves and Energy from the Ocean. The study was to be an expansion of the existing position based on a 1990 study *Energy, Ecology, Economics: Oregon Offshore Development Issues* that focused on offshore mining. The new study report, ***Coastal and Nearshore Oregon: Using and Protecting Our Natural Resources***, was published in July 2012.

### **Achieving Consensus**

Reaching consensus is much like taking a temperature – does the discussion of the consensus questions indicate strong, moderate, or little support for the any of the proposed answers. What the League is seeking is strong agreement on the issues so that a member agreement committee can establish statements from which Leagues can take action and give testimony .

While members do not take a vote on the answers, they do need to determine if there are little or no objections and a general feeling of agreement with their proposed answers. The role of the discussion leader and the recorder are crucial. The recorder needs to accurately capture the discussion, and the leader summarizes the points agreed on to be recorded. Discussion leaders need to encourage all members to contribute to the conversation.

The discussion group is not writing the final wording for the position, but rather, giving the consensus, or the agreement of the group, on the various questions posed. Think of the word “significant” in assessing member agreement. The state LWVOR member agreement committee will look at all answers and create a position statement that summarizes the significant agreement of all the members. The goal of this process is a credible position statement that the League can use for advocacy and visibility for many years.

Please note: Unit report sheets should be turned in to each local league so that one unified consensus report is sent to the state league office. Either the local board or a special committee can review and agree on the final report from each league. In addition, if your league has units, please copy those report forms and also send them with the league's consensus report. They are important for the archival record of the study.

## **Due Date**

The report sheets and consensus are **due January 15, 2013**.

### **Outline of the Report:**

**Oregon's Coastline/Coastal Zone pages 1**  
**Coastal Regulations pages 2-6**  
**Characteristics of the Coastal Environment**  
    **Estuaries page 6**  
    **Columbia River plume page 8**

**Natural features page 8**  
**The people and the economy p 10**  
**Working waterfronts page 11**  
**Mapping page 12**  
**Natural Resource Topics**  
**Fisheries page 13**  
**Marine Reserves page 15**  
**Ocean Energy page 19**  
**Invasive or introduced species page 25**  
**Forestry page 27**  
**Dredging page 28**  
**Chromite mining page 31**  
**Ocean acidification page 32**  
**Non Point Source Pollution, water quality page 32**  
**Trash page 34**  
**Ocean noise pollution page 35**  
**Climate change page 35**  
**Public involvement page 38**  
**Conclusion p 38**  
**References p 38**

**Recommended timing for sections**

	<u>1 hour session</u>	<u>1 1/2 hour session</u>	<u>2 hours session</u>
Question 1	20 minutes	30 minutes	40 minutes
Question 2 -	20 minutes	30 minutes	40 minutes
Question 3 -	10 minutes	15 minutes	15 minutes
Question 4-	5 minutes	10 minutes	15 minutes
Question 5-	5 minutes	10 minutes	10 minutes

**Consensus questions**

**1. Marine Reserves:** (see fisheries and marine reserves study pages pp 13-19)  
The State of Oregon has established two pilot (test) marine reserves. For these sites, baseline data has been collected and restrictions are in place. Three other sites have been approved, however, no restriction can be imposed until baseline data has been collected.

**Do you support the development of marine reserves and/or marine protected areas?**

If not, why not?

If so, what factors (scientific, cultural, fisheries, tourism and other economic considerations, endangered and threatened species, types of habitats such as sandy bottoms, kelp forests, rocky reefs) should be considered in:

Identifying locations (number, distance between, individual sites or a system of reserves)

Determining size

Developing management goals

Length of operation (for a trial period, long term, on-going or until identified objective is reached)

Should public and/or private funding be provided? How (State General Fund, dedicated state funding, Federal such as grants or tax credits, private, public grants, etc.)?

For management

For enforcement

Compensation for lost income

For Research

**2. Ocean Energy:** (see study pages 19-24)

The LWVUS supports the movement toward renewable energy development. The ocean has been identified as a potential resource for energy.

**Do you support research and test deployment of wave energy devices on the Oregon Coast?**

If not, why not?

If so, should Oregon provide financial assistance for the research and development? What type of support (State General Fund, dedicated state funds, federal, public grants, etc.)?

**Do you support commercial deployment?**

If not, why not?

If so, what criteria should be considered for each of these subject areas before commercial development occurs?

Environmental impacts

Effects on fisheries

Effects on recreational activities and scenic values

Economic impacts (jobs, tax revenue etc)

Role of local communities and statewide concerns

Other

**3. The Coastal Management Zone (CMZ):** (see study pages 2-6, 8, 27, 32-34)

The CMZ has specific mandates for limiting pollution in streams and discharges to the ocean. These mandates require additional controls beyond statewide requirements for coastal forestry, septic systems, development, endangered species habitat (salmon migration), etc.

**In addressing these mandates how should the following issues be considered?**

Uniformity in the CMZ among local, county, and state regulations

Funding for monitoring, restoration, enforcement, invasive species control

Impact on local economies and municipalities (costs, effect on development, etc.)

**4. Estuaries:** (see study pages 6-8, 25, 35)

Estuaries are natural transitions between salt and fresh water. They provide habitat, flood protection, recreational opportunities, nurseries for many species, etc. However, over time, these natural features have been altered by human development and are endangered due to rising sea level and climate change. As sea levels rise, estuaries may move inland.

**What, if any, measures do you support to preserve and restore these natural features while maintaining economic viability?** (Designating additional reserves, stream side protection, planting, removal of invasives, scientific research, restoration)

**How should these activities be funded?** (State General Fund, dedicated state funding, federal, private, public grants, etc.)

**5. Mining and Dredging:** (see study pages 28-32)

Mining (for minerals, gravel, etc.) and dredging activities (installation of boat basins and docks, maintenance of navigation channels, etc.) disturb streambeds and alter habitat. These activities provide for continued and new economic development. Analyses and permitting are required under the CWA, ESA, etc. The League has positions in support of these state and federal requirements.

**What do you see as the major issues to be addressed related to these activities?**  
Please provide examples.

:

**OTHER COMMENTS**