

## Results of Pre-meeting Survey on the Pacific Marine Estuarine Partnership

Forty three of the meeting participants were asked to participate in an anonymous, on-line survey before the meeting, to help in preparation for the meeting. (Two participants who were invited late, did not get a chance to respond).

Of the 43 people invited to participate, 35 people responded, answering some or all of the 10 questions.

The survey began with this short introduction:

Thank you for participating in this short (10 question) online survey. It is an effort to gain some initial input from those of you who will be attending the May 25-26th meeting to further develop the Pacific Marine Estuarine Fish Habitat Partnership. We will use responses to this survey as a starting point for discussion regarding the purpose, usefulness, breadth and scope of this new partnership. Please take a few minutes to answer the following multiple choice questions. It should only take about 10 minutes to complete this survey.

**The question results are below:**

**1. Where do you work and what type of organization do you work for?  
(select all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
California	37.1%	13
Oregon	42.9%	15
Washington	31.4%	11
Alaska	28.6%	10
Federal	34.3%	12
State	20.0%	7
NGO	22.9%	8
Local	2.9%	1
Commercial / Industry	2.9%	1
Other (please specify)	25.7%	9
<i>answered question</i>		<b>35</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>0</b>

Number	Other (please specify)
1	Indian Tribe
2	Tribal Commission
3	Also work nationally and periodically internationally serving as staff to the National Fish Habitat Board for the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (fishwildlife.org) and serve on NFHAP Science Committee. I also serve on several NFHAP FHP Steering Committees as they mature from infancy. Also work on related initiatives EPA Healthy Watershed, USGS Water Smart initiatives on behalf of AFWA
4	Regional
5	Interstate Commission
6	Pacific Fishery Management Council
7	A National Fish Habitat Partnership
8	Sport fishing trade organization
9	Indian Tribe

**2. Does your current position / area of expertise involve any of the following?  
(select all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Managing on-the-ground projects	48.6%	17
Fund-raising for habitat conservation	34.3%	12
Coordinating closely with other partnership efforts	74.3%	26
Managing cooperative or partnership groups	51.4%	18
Developing strategic plans for habitat conservation	60.0%	21
Habitat assessment	51.4%	18
Project monitoring	45.7%	16
Public information / outreach about conservation measures	62.9%	22
Climate Change Assessment	34.3%	12
Fisheries Management	48.6%	17
	<i>answered question</i>	<b>35</b>
	<i>skipped question</i>	<b>0</b>

**3. Are you currently involved in partnerships that cover a broad geographic area, i.e. large region, state-wide, or multistate? If so, how well do the partnerships you are currently involved with address the habitat conservation needs in your area?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
I am not currently involved in partnerships that cover a broad geographic area	11.4%	4
Very well, all or most of the habitat conservation needs are met	8.6%	3
Pretty well, a majority of the habitat conservation needs are met	25.7%	9
Not very well, only some of the habitat conservation needs are met	42.9%	15
Poorly, most of the habitat conservation needs are NOT met	2.9%	1
Don't know / not applicable	8.6%	3
	<i>answered question</i>	<b>35</b>
	<i>skipped question</i>	<b>0</b>

**4. What are the habitat conservation needs that existing partnerships are NOT meeting?  
(select all that apply)**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Finding and leveraging funding	51.6%	16
Research or scientific support	48.4%	15
Setting priorities	58.1%	18
Soliciting and selecting effective projects	19.4%	6
Implementing projects	19.4%	6
Coordinating with other partnerships	41.9%	13
Coordinating within partnership	6.5%	2
Assessing habitat condition	41.9%	13
Monitoring habitat projects	51.6%	16
Building policy level support	71.0%	22
Getting public engagement and support	51.6%	16
Other (please specify)		9
	<i>answered question</i>	<b>31</b>
	<i>skipped question</i>	<b>4</b>

5. Which of the following answers best describes your current understanding of NFHAP Fish Habitat Partnerships? (Please see [www.FishHabitat.org](http://www.FishHabitat.org) to familiarize yourself with the Action Plan, existing guidelines for Fish Habitat Partnerships and take into account when responding)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Good, I know about and understand Fish Habitat Partnerships	34.3%	12
Fair, I know something about them, but still have questions	54.3%	19
Poor, I know little about and / or don't understand the FHP concept	11.4%	4
<i>answered question</i>		<b>35</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>0</b>

6. Are you familiar with the Pacific Coast Joint Venture which has set regional priorities for waterfowl habitat conservation and accomplished millions of dollars of on-the-ground work towards those priorities?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	37.1%	13
No	31.4%	11
Somewhat	31.4%	11
<i>answered question</i>		<b>35</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>0</b>

Number	Other (please specify)
1	Non USFWS funding for partnership administration/staffing/coordination.
2	Climate change information
3	Varies by state and "partnership"
4	This would be even more effective re number 5 below if we could determine if folks understand what the voluntary objectives of NFHAP are page 5 and how it differs from other conservation partnerships and why this was formed even though we already have 1000+ watershed conservation efforts spending billions of dollars Thanks for asking next question to do that :- ) I keep a list of the most commonly asked questions and will soon circulate in advance for everyone.
5	Authoritative, regulatory, enforcement.
6	assuring enforcement of existing laws -- making sure there is a level playing field for those who want to do the right thing but that are a disadvantage to those who don't
7	They meet some of all of these, but resources are limited
8	Comment on Question #3: We qualified our response to read: "Pretty well. Some of the habitat conservation needs are met."
9	What I see as the two greatest needs are: 1) A committed strategy to protect the best 2) A requirement that restoration funding follow a general template: a) the determination of limiting factors b) prioritization of limiting factors c) funding and implementation of projects d) efficacy monitoring.

7. What initial thoughts do you have on the 3 highest priority habitat needs?

Answer Options	Response Count
	22
<i>answered question</i>	<b>22</b>
<i>skipped question</i>	<b>13</b>

Number	Response Text
1	1. Assessing the vulnerability of relevant habitats (and species/ecosystems) to climate change; 2. Identifying and implementing climate change adaptation measures; 3. Building public support for/generating sufficient funding for those measures.

2	Better information to link nearshore and estuary habitats to fish populations/fishery production Protection from invasives Protection/restoration of highly productive habitats (e.g., SAV, kelp, tidal wetlands) from coastal development Enhance habitats for resiliency in face of climate change
3	Assessment of critical resources; prioritizing critical needs; developing an action plan to address the previous two items
4	Increased protection of key fish habitats. Identification and assessment of highest value fish habitats at watershed scale. Current high resolution geospatial natural resource data for the area of concern.
5	Estuary conservation is the highest priority habitat need with little coordinated action going on there within the PNW. Nearshore ocean conservation ranks a close second to estuaries. Low elevation, coastal river valleys and/or aquatic systems are also in need to considerable attention.
6	How do we define our 3 highest priority habitat needs? That needs to come first.
7	Question too general. What habitats? Where?
8	Science supporting existing condition of habitats coast-wide. Ameliorating (e.g., via restoration or protection) loss of estuarine wetland habitat area from dikes and levees. Ameliorating bulkheading of shorelines.
9	Identification of key habitat areas for a subset of fish. Protecting those areas. Understanding where those areas will move to given climate change induced shifts in habitat and fish distribution.
10	priority habitats for what? estuarine and marine,,,, ? priority of NFHAP implementation is develop Fish Habitat Partnerships that perform voluntary protection, restoration and enhancement conservation actions relating ecological flow/water levels, connectivity and water quality. Each conservation action should be science driven with the ability to to establish baseline metrics that enable us to determine our ability to assess effectiveness of habitat conservation (protection, restoration and enhancement) outcomes. We are treating causes not the symptoms. This FHP under NFHAP and cannot pursue regulatory actions using NFHAP money but compliments regulatory efforts. Also it should be noted current funds cannot be used for land and water purchase or lease. However the enabling legislation will allow for purchase/lease of land and water.
11	1) Focus on estuaries and nearshore areas (place less priority on freshwater since we have strong Watershed Council efforts focused on those already) 2) Focus on fish species that need estuaries and spend much of life cycle in nearshore areas (it seems like significant funds are already spent on salmon recovery)
12	1. Adapting our management based on ocean acidification and sea level rise. What should we do differently? 2. Understanding dead zones. Can we do something to avoid these or help adaptatively manage these. 3. Capturing the public's support. How do we pick one or more species that resonate with the public and garners their support for habitat improvements and management?
13	floodplain protection protection of adequate buffers to allow "migration" of marsh habitat protection of intact habitats that connect or link up with other intact habitats
14	PMEP should steer clear of freshwater salmon habitat and focus on marine/estuarine habitat. It should also focus on issues that lend themselves to cooperative solutions via a partnership. Examples might be marine debris, marine invasive species, and estuarine habitat protection/restoration.
15	1. Assessing the best potential locations for improving habitat. 2. Determining where NAFHAP partnerships can cooperatively address watersheds. 3. Finding additional funding for habitat assessments.
16	a) From our perspective at Oregon's national estuarine research reserve, intergovernmental partnership agreements with federal, state and tribal partners (e.g., NOAA, native tribes, neighboring NERRS in California and Washington) are functioning effectively. Broad regional partnerships (e.g., Coastal America Foundation, Restore America's Estuaries (RAE), Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP), Integrated Ocean Observing System (IOOS) and its northwest affiliate, the Networked Association of Northwest Ocean Observing Stations (NANOOS), the NERRS System-wide Monitoring Plan) are variously addressing habitat monitoring, assessment and restoration.  The limiting factor for accomplishing estuarine habitat restoration does not appear to be ineffective partnerships or lack of partnerships but instead lack of capacity (\$\$) to accomplish restoration work (including monitoring and assessments), effective policy level support, and public engagement.  b) Capacity to monitor, assess and evaluate; e.g., what are the implications for tide flat habitats and communities of the decline and potential extirpation of mud shrimp ( <i>Upogebia pugettensis</i> ), infestations of new aquatic invasive species (e.g., <i>Didemnum vexillum</i> , <i>Sphaeroma quoyanum</i> , <i>Assiminea parasitologica</i> ); assessment and control of existing AIS in estuaries.the decline and potential extirpation of mud shrimp ( <i>Upogebia pugettensis</i> ) in Oregon estuaries--what are the implications for tide flat habitats and communities?

	E.g., South Slough has accomplished significant habitat restoration for some species of fish, but 90 percent of the estuarine habitat of Coos Bay is still lost to dredging, diking and filling. Important research has come out of SSNERR about habitat use of coho salmon in estuaries but little if any research has been done on the habitat needs of starry flounder, also an estuarine-dependent species. Efforts to restore native Olympia oysters are just beginning...little is known about their habitat requirements, or why remnant populations continue to exist in some estuaries but not in others.  c) Info on the associations of various estuary wetlands species and habitats
17	See # 4
18	Seagrass conservation, tidal wetland and associated shallow water habitat conservation, and invasives species control. Water quality improvement should likely be on the list as well, but I am less experienced with these issues, so didn't place as 3 highest priorities.
19	1) We need more on-the-ground/in-the-water scientific data gathering. 2) We need more on-the-ground/in-the-water monitoring. 3) We need, in addition to a robust state habitat protection policy/mechanism (marine reserves) that is both systemic and sufficiently redundant to adequately protect different habitat types, a regional and nation-wide policy/mechanism that unites the states' individual and often unrelated habitat protection policies/mechanisms.
20	Think global act local, together we can make a difference Water quality and quantity for fisheries is a high priority Habitat needs include effective public outreach. Public opinion drives public policy.
21	Centralized management of habitat data coast wide and at smaller scales Prioritization of habitat restoration projects Better education and outreach to public to engage their interests, actions, and funding
22	1. assessment/mapping 2. spatial planning 3. monitoring

**8. Have you participated in The Nature Conservancy's Ecoregional Assessment meetings to provide habitat information or input?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	34.3%	12
No	65.7%	23
<i>answered question</i>		<b>35</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>0</b>

**9. Do you have any initial input on the geographic scope of the partnership?**

Answer Options	Yes	No	Don't know	Response Count
Boundaries should be set by ecoregional boundaries (e.g., CA Current)	24	1	6	31
Boundaries should be set depending on what priority habitats or strategic focus areas are defined and where they are located	23	2	5	30
Boundaries should be set depending on logistical considerations for efficiency of work	10	9	8	27
Boundaries should be set to minimize number of different partnership groups	4	15	9	28
Boundaries should be set depending on common interests	14	6	8	28
Please provide your initial input on the geographic scope of the partnership:				17
<i>answered question</i>				<b>32</b>
<i>skipped question</i>				<b>3</b>

Number	Please provide your initial input on the geographic scope of the partnership:
1	The threat of climate change necessitates more collaboration across all levels (governments, NGOs, academic institutions, private interests) as well as more attention to "ecosystem function" relative to specific habitats and species. This should include greater emphasis on the interface between terrestrial/freshwater, coastal/estuarine, and marine systems.

2	Start small. Expand as new opportunities and needs arise. Conduct more effective outreach to all stakeholders in adjacent areas before including them. Specifically, I do not think you will have adequate representation from Alaska at the workshop in order to make an informed and inclusive decision to include some or all of the Alaska coast in the partnership. A Southeast Alaska FHP is in its formative stages and is much better positioned to address local estuarine and nearshore marine fish habitat issues. FHPs are bottom up efforts that work best when they develop in response to local conservation needs. That having been said, it will be essential for all coastal Alaska FHPs to work closely with the Pacific FHP, regardless of its ultimate geographic scope.
3	My initial feeling is that the California Current offers plenty of critical habitat conservation needs for the Partnership and it has strong ecoregional cohesion but I understand the interest of some to include the BC/Alaska coast as well. I think a parallel partnership for AK may more effective than having a single large effort but it depends on how large of a partnership can be supported under a single entity.
4	Boundaries should be set on how we can best achieve improved habitat conservation in coastal marine SE AK, WA, OR, and CA.
5	I don't feel comfortable making a recommendation on this without a better understanding of the issues involved.
6	I think the boundaries should be set in a manner that best advances the partnership's purpose and meets needs that have presumably already been identified. I note on the agenda that 'geographic scope' is listed before conversations on program purpose and needs. I think it should follow these topics.
7	Umbrella and subregional Boundaries should be designed to maximize filling habitat conservation gaps in the most cost effective and strategic manner and allow for bottom up prioritization integrated with larger landscape considerations.
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The draft federal Ocean Policy Task Force interim reports highlight regional collaboration around Large Marine Ecosystems, such as the California Current.</li> <li>- The West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health was established around the CC LME.</li> <li>- Managing according to LMEs helps meet the goals of Ecosystem Based Management (EBM)</li> </ul>
9	Scope needs to be manageable from a biological and financial perspective. Smaller more focused partnerships usually work the best.
10	CA, OR, WA coast and estuarine areas (same influence by CA current)
11	The geographic scope should correspond to the type of issues we choose to address and should reflect some ecological linkages. DOI's North Pacific Landscape Conservation Cooperative runs from northern California to Southeast Alaska, and there may be some efficiencies and synergies to be gained from overlapping with that geographic scope.
12	It makes sense to include CA, OR, ID, WA, and SE Alaska. British Columbia is an option. Non-SE Alaska should not be included because it is a distinctly different eco-region, plus there are other NFHAP partnerships already up there.
13	<p>The scope should:</p> <p>a) recognize tidal flow as a principal driver of estuarine and nearshore ecology and an essential element of the scope, and emphasize the importance of the nearshore-estuarine connection;</p> <p>b) recognize the implications of increased ocean acidity for nearshore habitats, communities and species hypoxic or dead zones, and movements of species in and out of estuaries, and include mechanisms to adapt the scope as needed to respond to new information about ocean acidity and its implications for estuaries, and</p> <p>c) acknowledge the importance of estuaries as essential human habitat. (The narrow coastal fringe that makes up 17 percent of the nation's shoreland area, excluding Alaska, is home to more than half of its population. In 2003, approximately 153 million people (53 percent of the nation's population) lived in 673 coastal counties, an increase of 33 million people since 1980 (Crosset et al., 2004). Roughly one-half of the nation's gross domestic product (\$4.5 trillion in 2000) is generated in those counties and in adjacent ocean waters (U.S. Oceans Report, 2004).</p> <p>Regardless of the geographic breadth of the scope of the partnership, it should emphasize importance of the region of the California Current between Cape Arago and Cape Mendocino as a primary focus for study of climate change effects affecting estuarine habitats and nearshore ecological communities.</p>
14	We may want to also look at need, i.e. some of the region may already have funding to address habitat needs, while other priority areas may have none. Some areas may already have high functioning partnerships and other may have none, etc..
15	Geographic scope should consider the demonstrated need of region(s), habitat priorities, regions' ability to maximize partnership efficiencies, and logistical considerations.

16	See above: We should look beyond interest groups/stakeholders and political spatial divisions and base the scope of partnerships on the actual habitat protection and assessment needs by ecoregion.
17	Geographic scope should be functional and based on the objectives of the partnership

**10. Please indicate your preference for the name of this partnership.**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Pacific Marine and Estuarine Fish Habitat Partnership	32.3%	10
Pacific Marine and Estuarine Partnership	19.4%	6
Pacific Marine and Coastal Partnership	9.7%	3
Pacific Coast Fish Habitat Partnership	38.7%	12
Other (please specify)		9
<i>answered question</i>		<b>31</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>4</b>

Number	Other (please specify)
1	Not sure
2	I need to more fully understand the objectives of this partnership before recommending a name.
3	I struggle with whether to call it Pacific Marine and Estuarine versus Coast because there are several FHPs on the west coast that theoretically include estuarine and marine, especially CA Fish Passage, N.A. Pacific Salmon Candidate FHP, Mat Su Salmon FHP, SW AK Salmon FHP, Kenai FHP, Salmon in the City candidate FHP, and others that are about to seek candidate status.. Whatever title is ultimately selected should help make sure we don't forget to include estuarine and the more difficult marine habitats ... for shellfish and finfish...
4	Pacific Coast Aquatic Habitat Partnership
5	PMEP. It rolls off the tongue and is descriptive.
6	Let's discuss!
7	I like the first one as a second choice!
8	Because we have many anadromous fish in the Pacific Northwest, it may be that some more inland waterbodies will need some degree of consideration, expanding the scope beyond strict application to marine and estuarine waters to include the upper portions of coastal watersheds where anadromous fish spawn.
9	Pacific Marine and Estuarine Habitat Partnership (seems a little too fish-centric; fish are only one, albeit important, group of important organisms that make up an ecosystem)