

## Recap from Day One (May 24<sup>th</sup>) Discussion

**People who were quiet or relatively quiet on day one were asked to provide their thoughts on things to date.**

Comments from these participants:

From the NGO perspective, there is often lack of evidence to support issues they are concerned with. Need good base of data, linked to empirical studies. Interesting opportunity to do on a bioregional scale. Crystallizing specific roles for the group is important.

Focusing more narrowly on marine and intertidal is good; there are a lot of ways to interface with Joint Venture partnerships and watershed councils on estuarine and upland areas. This would be a part of the way to look at overall efforts and link specifically to needs

How to be a unique partnership? We could connect estuarine process with nearshore and offshore processes (California Current processes). How to link up broad goals with smaller scale efforts? Focus on efforts where there is a lot of data, e.g. NERRs/Estuary Programs to link up with larger scale processes.

Good that this will not focus on salmon; Value added-- bring something new to effort. Synergies with Landscape Conservation Cooperatives. Trying to focus on common interests that many not be top issues

Near shore environment is under-served. Efforts needed here. Special need to have focus groups look at nearshore environment.

Going offshore is good. Need a one-stop shopping point person who can tell us what is happening in other partnerships, where state (and others) can go to find out what's happening. It's fish focused but really deals with how the whole ecosystem works.

Likes marine habitat in name. How it would work for Oregon's nearshore environment not clear. Can't restore like estuary or river, can't enhance unless consider artificial reefs. Estuaries though are in need of more partnerships and money for restoration.

Estuaries and nearshore should be focus. Focus on ecosystem health rather than just counting numbers of fish

Marine and estuarine ecosystem focus is good. Partnership part is very important. Build on and support those efforts. Linkages among partnerships across state; tie in with West Coast Governor's Agreement on Ocean Health and other efforts. Build on and support efforts and cross communication; fill this niche.

Consider the perspective on sitting out in the ocean and looking back at shore. Marine reserves in federal jurisdictional waters, and some in CA, WA. How much institutional cross-pollination between agencies. Need truly systematic approach to look at habitat types and species.

What could partnership do? By what means? Lots of groups already doing this. Need next level of communication to reach out to groups. Help communicate to groups already doing work on the ground-- what's already going on in terms of restoration upstream and down and also regarding ecosystem processes from Bay to headwaters.

Partnership to speak for needs and support folks doing work on ground. Could speak to County Commissioners, City Councils; use the multi-partnership folks to support those needing it.

Like draft goals and objectives for building a marine-estuarine partnership; partnership to tie together and leverage existing work.

Puget Sound undergoing a large restoration efforts; but rather than shy away since there are on-going efforts, work at the margins-- at the coast and river interfaces. Similar large scale projects in Lower Columbia and San Francisco Bay.

Compliance and effectiveness monitoring. Projects are not always successful. Want to pursue tried and true measures, but where not tried, due compliance and effectiveness monitoring.

The NOAA restoration center furthers land-based whole-watershed partnership projects. Working with Ecotrust/USFS/BLM/OWEB. Leverage and amplify these partnerships. Existing shared high priority areas and high priority project types.

When the National Fish Habitat Action Plan was drafted in 2005 things were in their infancy. Times and awareness of issues are different today. What other folks did shouldn't have to tie hands of this group.

i.e. an ecosystem focus versus tackling just a subset of ecologically processes. What can we add value to? Recognized fish habitat partnership is different than just being a coalition partner, e.g. for the JVs.. Work would bridge efforts, but need to be separate, e.g. since Fish Habitat Partnerships are named in legislation. PME-FHP is needed since with existing partnerships there may be gaps. What is needed? Estuarine focus. Assessment of existing partnerships. Identify what needs to be done, what gaps are there? This group can fill those gaps. Science, administrative, policy, legal, regulatory/non-regulatory. Regional teleconferences may be necessary since missing people at the table, e.g. CA. Lastly, administratively, the LCC base budget can provide funds for coordination; every partnership has struggles. LCC super administrative entity. Look at definition.

The Wetlands Conservancy hosted a 1.5 day meeting with 40 science people in Oregon. Wanted to update the Oregon Atlas in terms of what was going on; sharing data. This partnership can be the ones to do that -- i.e. can play on-going roles: coordinating to get people together, not denigration of other efforts, leaving time for 'organic' development-- people create their own partnerships

Structure of group determines behavior (Dr. Richard Weber social research) -- now we're lacking structure so we're struggling -- that's normal. Takes time to be a 'performing' group, with functional relationships and trust.