SUMMARY

Friday, September 8, 2017 -- 10:00-11:30am (Pacific)

ACTION ITEMS

• Dates and location for 2017 Annual Meeting set, RSVP and travel request form open for RPB members.

• Meagan Flier (RPB Tribe Co-lead) will connect with Maren Farnum (CA State Lands Comm.) for tribal coordination in the San Diego area.

• John Hansen will send out the updated Washington Sub-Regional Agreement to the SRPT members soon.

• Note: Udall Foundation will be handling all travel arrangements in support of Tribal travel to the December meeting in Long Beach.

• Additional input on sub-regional approaches within the RPB is encouraged.

UPCOMING

• September 15th, 2017: Oregon-Northern California sub-regional tribal meeting in Coos Bay, OR.

• November, 2017: Tentative Washington sub-regional in-person meeting.

• December 5 – 7th, 2017: RPB & WCOP 2017 Annual Meeting in Long Beach, California.
CALL SUMMARY

2017 Annual Meeting

- John Hansen (RPB Coord.) confirmed the logistics for the December RPB meeting. The planning committee has been meeting for the last few months. Contact John if you are interested in helping with meeting planning.
  - **Location:** Queen Mary, Long Beach CA
  - **Dates:** December 5th – 7th
    - Tuesday Dec 5: Public RPB Meeting
    - Wednesday Dec 6: RPB & WCOP Exec. Session (Closed)
    - Thursday Dec 7: Additional meetings (Tribal Caucus, Data Portal, Sub-regions, Science Assessments, etc. TBD)
      - 5-6 meeting rooms set aside (Hold 20-50 people) for additional meetings. We can potentially add more rooms if needed.
  - **Lodging:** 2 options
    - On-site: Queen Mary ($139)
    - 0.8 miles from site: Marriott Residence Inn Long Beach Downtown ($173)
  - **Airports:** Long Beach (8 miles), LAX (22 miles), Orange Co. (30 miles)

- Briannon Fraley (Tolowa Dee-ni’ Nation), Meagan Flier (RPB Tribe Co-lead), and John Hansen (RPB Coord.) discussed having an informal tribal caucus meeting Monday night (December 4th) prior to the three-day meeting. And then possibly another Tribal Caucus meeting on December 7th, enabling space for further discussions and debriefing. Meagan is asking for input from Tribal Caucus members on this.
  - John clarified that the closed “Executive Sessions” meeting scheduled for Wednesday Dec 6 is for any representatives of entities involved with the RPB or WCOP. The meeting is only closed to the public.

- Registration & Travel Info will be sent out next week

Sub-Regional Planning Team Updates

Oregon & Northern CA: Sept 15th Tribal Meeting – Coos Bay, OR

- John Hansen (RPB Coord.) updated on the upcoming Oregon-Northern California sub-regional meeting of tribal representatives, including meeting objectives:
- Clearly define opportunity for sub-regional engagement within the West Coast RPB
- Identify priority issues for Tribes off the Oregon and Northern Californian coast and potential sub-regional planning outcomes
- Develop Tribal “Vision Statement” for sub-regional planning, including benefit of tribal participation
- Identify 3-5 tasks that will facilitate sub-regional process with tribal, state and federal partners over the next 6 months

• Tribes planning to attend: Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, Coquille Indian Tribe, Elk Valley Rancheria, Tolowa Dee-ni’ Nation, Trinidad Rancheria, Yurok Tribe

WA Coast Sub-regional Planning Team Update

• John Hansen (RPB Coord.) mentioned the sub-regional agreement (version 3) is still being drafted due to a late flurry of edits. The Washington sub-regional group also has an undersea cable planning exercise / questionnaire out, aimed at an end of September deadline.
• A potential for an in-person November meeting of this sub-regional team was brought up during the last sub-regional group call; staff mentioned that because some won’t be attending the December meeting (Long Beach) a local meeting may be preferable.
  o Becky Smyth (NOAA) asked what the anticipated outcome of the meeting would be. John clarified that it would be to discuss the undersea cable questionnaire, but that if the group did not have anything ready by November, then the meeting will get pushed back. John also mentioned there is Udall Foundation funding to assist Tribes in attending.

Southern California Sub-regional Update

• Maren Farnum (CA State Lands Comm.) gave an update on San Diego’s efforts to meet with stakeholders and Tribes: “We are half way through our one-on-one stakeholder engagement meetings, and anticipate 60 more meetings. The one-on-one meetings were very helpful and informative to understand different perspectives about the ocean space and what things are important.
• One thing that comes up again and again is the issue of beach erosion and the struggle to find adequate sources of sediment. The stakeholder engagement meetings are taking longer than anticipated, so we are pushing back our larger public and community workshops to winter. Therefore, our summary assessment report of everything we learn from our stakeholder and public workshops will come out in early spring (February/March). Our website is still very introductory, but available (sdoceanplanning.org). In addition, we have also begun talks with the CA Ocean Science Trust to figure out how we can set up a good robust
process for scientific review of the data layers we are creating, and for combining those layers for our mapping exercise.”

- Meagan Flier (RPB Tribe Co-lead) offered help in connecting / reaching out to the southern California Tribes.
- Patty Snow (OR Dept. of Land Conservation & Development) asked if they are thinking this effort will ultimately be a sub-regional plan.
  - Maren Farnum (CA State Lands Comm.): “While we are working with federal partners (Navy, NOAA, etc.) we are focusing our efforts on where we (the Port of San Diego) have jurisdictions within state waters. This is a pilot of the State Lands Commission. If this bears out in a way that is beneficial to everyone, we would be interested in setting up additional planning partnerships.”

---

**West Coast Tribal Caucus: Udall Foundation Funding**

- John Hansen (RPB Coord.) and Meagan Flier (RPB Tribal Co-lead) gave a summary of Udall Foundation Funding for tribal travel to RPB-related meetings. John clarified that Udall will be handling all travel arrangements for the December meeting on behalf of tribal staff (to avoid double booking).
- Don Champman (NOC GCC – Tribal Liason) clarified that the Udall Foundation can support one full tribal caucus meeting and three sub-regional meetings between now and Dec 31st; Don also discussed a September 21st meeting in Providence, Rhode Island for briefings on the Ocean Health Index folks dealing with sovereign Tribes. “The Ocean Health Index historically did not know tribal priorities or perspectives; this September meeting is an opportunity to amend that.”

---

**West Coast Ocean Data Portal Update**

- Allison Bailey (Data Portal / SoundGIS) gave an update that the Data Portal is waiting to finalize a contract for her to provide more technical assistance and support. The Data Portal is very interested to see how they can engage with the various sub-regional groups, so they can understand what data needs are and how the portal can help.

---

**West Coast RPB: Monthly Member Discussion Topic: Sub-regions**

- John Hansen (RPB Coord.) introduced the topic (sub-regions) and the five proposed group questions that were distributed to members prior to the call:
  - What should the scale of sub-regions be? Or, how many sub-regions should we have?
  - How will your entity determine whether to actively participate in a proposed sub-regional effort (e.g. interest in the area, interested in the potential issues, capacity, etc.)?
Is there a limit to the number of sub-regions the RPB can effectively support (staffing and/or member participation)? How should RPB members active in multiple sub-regions determine their approach (e.g. first come first serve, develop criteria to participate, etc.)?

What should a “sub-regional plan” look like?

What role should non-governmental stakeholders play in sub-regional efforts?

Irina Irvine (US National Park Service) pointed out how it is difficult for her to spread thinly across several different sub-regions. If she were to engage in other sub-regions other than the Washington one, she would need to engage at a lower energy level.

John Hansen (RPB Coord.): I know a lot of folks have been giving that a thought – especially on the federal side where people cover a broad region. We are on track for 3-5 sub-regions. Is that too many?

Irina Irvine: If there is a way to do a bit of lumping (versus having more sub-regions), maybe that would help.

Mike Huber (Navy) pointed out that the Navy has variable representation across different regions, but they have alternative representatives to help ease the burden of participating.

Katie Wrubel (Makah Tribe): “What are the planning issues that need to be tackled at the sub-regional scale that warrant effort? Are there planning issues for the entire West Coast region that is more substance at the full RPB level? Are there smaller topics for the sub-regions?”

Becky Smyth (NOAA): We are raising issues, but aren’t coming to a resolution on this now, possibly in December at our Annual Meeting. Is that correct?

John Hansen (RPB Coord.): Yes

Becky Smyth (NOAA): 5 sub-regions going at the same time would stress all federal agencies. Maybe California would have to support multiple sub-regions. Where, as a planning body do we want to put our resources and do it well? Will we eventually cover all of the West Coast with sub-regional plans or are we OK with some gaps? There needs to be clear goals for every sub-region.

Kevin Werner (NOAA): “I am still struggling with what the goal and purpose is of this group and the sub-regional groups. I would think we want to be very clear and focus our conversation on what our goals are for these sub-regions.”

Jennifer Hennessey (WA Dept. of Ecology): “To a certain degree, these things have been organic based on existing efforts. There are needs we have identified for the State of WA in terms of early notification, coordination, and the process. We look at the plans that came out of the Northeast, and a lot of those were around commitments to maintain core datasets and notify each other early. The reason we are engaged is that we have a plan, we want to see it used, we want to build upon it.”

Becky Smyth (NOAA): “It is the region that needs to drive the sub-regions. What is the reason that is driving the three governments to be together at that sub-regional table?”

Meagan Flier (RPB Tribe Co-lead) made several points:
o “1) Jennifer, I would agree that it might be jumping the gun to lay out what the sub-regional goals may be, there is a possibility they may be different by area. It is one of the things we are going to try and identify for the upcoming September meeting for Oregon and Northern California.

o 2) The east coast has 3 RPBs; do any federal reps know how you counterparts on the East coast manage being present on various regional teams?”

  ➤ Mike Huber (Navy): “On the east coast, we have multiple Navy regions, so it was easy for us to have different representatives.”
  ➤ Becky Smyth (NOAA): “The federal government roughly organizes around the number of states, versus the geographic area covered. So we have a bit fewer reps on the West Coast.”
  ➤ Patty Snow (OR Dept. of Land Conservation & Development): “Because we have so few federal reps on the West Coast, we may need to limit how many sub-regional plans we have going at the same time. Maybe two or one at a time.”
  ➤ Kevin Werner (NOAA): “My reaction would be to maybe pick one sub-region instead of trying to do multiple at once.”
  ➤ Mike Huber (Navy): “Sometime it is not our call. San Diego wasn’t spawned by the RPB, and sometimes groups are going to get together on their own – so we need to retain some of the flexibility.”

     • John Hansen (RPB Coord.): Just a reminder that the RPB has no role or authority over others to stop or start a State or Tribe to do planning. If there is a role sub-regionally for the RPB that can be helpful, how do we engage and be realistic about what the RPB can support and what products will look like?”

• Group ran out of time while still discussing this topic, but discussed possibly including it as a discussion topic for the next call, in addition to another.

END CALL

Next Call: Friday October 6th -- 10 – 11:30 am PST