

# Involving Citizens in Marine Spatial Planning

---

A case study of Oregon's Territorial Sea Plan  
amendment process for renewable energy  
development

**Angela San Filippo**

**6/14/2013**

All of Oregon's coastal communities are challenged by seasonal economic activity, aging demographics, and rising cost of living. These factors as well as increasing pressure on marine resources, a shift in federal and state policy towards marine spatial planning, and renewable energy standards have led to Oregon's decision to amend its Territorial Sea Plan for renewable energy. Citizen involvement was a key element in this process. With a diverse group of stakeholders including industry, state, local and federal government, recreationalists, fishermen, tourists, and conservation groups and the presence of the public trust, involving citizens in coastal and marine planning is especially challenging. Through an analysis of hundreds of public comments and 13 semi structured interviews with stakeholders that participated in the planning and development process this research seeks to understand and learn from Oregon's citizen involvement process. As a result of this qualitative approach this research established key themes that shed light on the successes, challenges, and limitations of Oregon's citizen involvement process. This research study provides recommendations that can be implemented as part of Oregon's continuing process to amend its Territorial Sea Plan and plan for new and diverse uses while continuing to involve Oregon's diverse ocean users and citizens.

# Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction .....	3
1.1 Research Questions .....	4
2.0 Literature Review .....	5
2.1 Planning Methods .....	5
2.2 Citizen Involvement .....	6
3.0 Context.....	8
3.1 Federal Policies .....	8
3.2 Oregon Policies .....	9
4.0 Methods.....	14
4.1 Textual analysis of public comments .....	14
4.2 Semi Structured Interviews.....	14
5.0 Findings .....	16
5.1 Challenges .....	16
5.2 Successes.....	19
5.3 Limitations.....	21
6.0 Analysis and Recommendations .....	26
6.1 Refining Advisory Boards .....	26
6.2 Continuing the process .....	28
6.3 Further Research.....	30
7.0 References .....	31

# 1.0 Introduction

---

Oregon's coastal communities are diverse, ranging from ocean beach towns with weekend and summer tourist activities to bustling ports on the edge of estuaries. Along Oregon's coast there are hundreds of public access sites that provide important ecological, economic, and social links between the ocean and coastal watersheds (Oregon Coast Visitor's Association, 2013). Oregon's diverse shorelines, estuaries, and nearshore marine habitats provide many tourism and recreation opportunities and important wildlife habitat. Moving seaward offshore opportunities begin to move towards commercial and recreational fisheries, shipping, and other industrial uses (Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development n.d.). Despite the diversity of Oregon's coastal areas and the variety of ocean uses, all of Oregon's coastal communities are challenged by seasonal economic activity, aging demographics, and a rising cost of living (Swedeen, Batker, Radtke, Boumans, & Willer, 2008).

The nature of the public trust ensures that all citizens have a stake in the management of ocean and coastal resources (Bassett, 2006). As competition for ocean resources continues to expand, with renewable energy, aquaculture, fishing, recreation, tourism, and conservation of ecosystem services and functions the subject of increasing controversy in Oregon and nationally it has become even more important for coastal states to engage in inclusive and effective marine spatial planning processes. There is growing research and policy interest in marine spatial planning, stakeholder participation, and renewable energy technology; however real on-the ground planning and management that effectively balances competing interests, sustains resources and protects important ecological values has been difficult to achieve (Beck, Kachmar, K.K, & others, 2009).

The Oregon Department of Energy (DOE) and Oregon State University (OSU) have identified Oregon's territorial sea as an ideal location for wave energy conversion (State of Oregon). According to a 2011 study by the Electric Policy Research Institute Oregon has enough total annual available wave energy in the inner continental shelf alone to power 28 million homes. In a time of many economic, climate, and energy development uncertainties, this study as well as federal and state policies that increase renewable energy standards and encourage marine spatial planning principles put Oregon at the forefront of planning and development. As Oregon works towards identifying areas that are suitable for offshore renewable energy development Oregon is not only under pressure from the local economy but also in the national spotlight (Tuerck, Head, & Bachman, 2011). These challenges, projections, and policy changes have begun to open the eyes of Oregon's coastal communities to where new opportunities might exist. Through analyzing and collecting data on existing uses and marine habitats Oregon chose to update their existing Territorial Sea Plan to develop mandatory policies that will apply to state and federal agency approvals for the location and operation of offshore renewable energy facilities in the Oregon Territorial Sea (Kitzhaber, 2012).

# 1.1 Research Questions

Oregon's renewable energy amendment process is used as a case study to better understand citizen involvement strategies as applied in a marine spatial planning process and how public and stakeholder input was incorporated into the planning and development process.

This research study aims to understand some of the challenges, successes, and limitations that Oregon encountered in its comprehensive planning and citizen involvement efforts to plan for renewable energy development in Oregon's territorial sea. The following three research questions were used to guide this research study:

1. What were the primary challenges faced by Oregon's stakeholder advisory boards when amending the Territorial Sea Plan for renewable energy development?
2. What stakeholder involvement strategies and actions have proven the most effective in addressing those challenges?
3. What successes and limitations resulted from the planning and development process of the Renewable energy amendment?

# 2.0 Literature Review

---

In order to fully understand the successes and challenges of Oregon's citizen involvement process it is necessary to understand what constitutes effective citizen involvement and comprehensive planning. The following is a review of literature with the purpose of offering a better understanding of comprehensive versus specific planning projects and citizen involvement strategies.

## 2.1 Planning Methods

There are two distinctly different methods of planning, comprehensive planning and project by project planning. Examples of these two types of planning are present in land use planning; with comprehensive city, county or regional plans and specific area (e.g. neighborhood plan) or specific use plans (e.g. transportation plan) that are not comprehensive in nature (Berke, Godschalk, Kaiser, & Rodriguez, 2006). These different types of planning are also present in federal land management agencies with Strategic Environmental Impact Assessments also called Regional Environmental Assessments that plan comprehensively for an entire defined area versus Environmental Impact Assessments that are completed on a project by project basis. Strategic Environmental Impact Assessments are a diagnostic tool to integrate environmental, social, and economic considerations into the formulation of policies, development programs, and plans (Dalal-Clayton and Sadler 2005).

Comprehensive planning is a process that determines community goals and aspirations through community involvement. The outcome is a comprehensive plan that provides a framework for public policy typically for a large geographic area, a broad range of topics, and covering a long-term time frame (Berke, Godschalk, Kaiser, & Rodriguez, 2006). Comprehensive plans are likely to be continuous processes and are less likely to provide specific written outputs. In comprehensive plans the focus of citizen involvement and consultation is more diffuse, and usually takes place in the early stages of policy or plan formation. Since comprehensive plans are more likely to be continuous and large scale it is usually impractical and not cost effective to involve a full range of stakeholders, instead often select focal groups of stakeholder representatives are incorporated into the process to provide input on a continual basis (Dalal-Clayton & Sadler, 2005). Most planning agencies and governments are required at a minimum to provide some type of public review or public comment period as part of the planning process.

Some of the major differences between these two types of planning are that comprehensive planning has a higher level of application to decision making, a broader range of alternatives that are open to consideration, and greater opportunity to achieve environmental objectives. However, in comprehensive planning there is greater uncertainty about the effects of the policy or plan as compared to a project with concrete action. In comprehensive planning a broader range of environmental consequences must be considered, and there is a wider set of linkages and tradeoffs with economic and

social issues (Dalal-Clayton & Sadler, 2005). Table 1 shows the primary differences between comprehensive and project by project planning and was adopted and modified from DAC Guidelines and Reference Series comparison of Strategic Environmental Assessments with Environmental Impact Assessment (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2006).

**Table 1: Comparison of Comprehensive and Project Specific Plans**

<b>Comprehensive plans</b>	<b>Project specific plans</b>
Broad and long term strategic perspective	Specific and short term projects
Begins at an early stage in strategic planning	Begins at early stage once parameters are set
Considers a broad range of alternatives	Considers limited range of alternatives
Conducted independently of any specific project proponent	Usually prepared or funded by the project proponent
Focus on policy, plan, and program implications	Focus on obtaining project permission
Multi-stage iterative process	Well-defined, linear process with clear beginning and end
Emphasis on meeting balanced environmental, social, and economic objectives in policies, plans, and programs	Emphasis on mitigating environmental and social impacts of a specific project
Inherently incorporates consideration of cumulative impacts	Limited review of cumulative impacts

Marine spatial planning is a relatively new form of comprehensive planning. Coastal management programs and plans have been around since the 1970s but many of these state run coastal programs have focused mainly on coastal land use issues or specific ocean resources without a comprehensive approach to ocean resources and uses (Godschalk, 1992). In recent years there has been a policy shift towards focusing on comprehensive ocean plans or marine spatial planning. With this policy shift as well as increased interest in new and varied development uses several coastal states sought to update or create comprehensive ocean management plans that incorporate marine spatial planning principles (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). With Oregon’s latest Territorial Sea Plan amendment for renewable energy development, Oregon along with Rhode Island and Massachusetts are among the first coastal states to incorporate marine spatial planning principles into coastal and marine planning programs.

## 2.2 Citizen Involvement

Traditional decision making is characterized by elected or appointed officials representing constituents and exercising authority by making decisions for the public good. The citizen desire to have a meaningful part in the process is a contemporary phenomenon and planners, government officials, and policy makers are still working out the best ways to involve the public (Senecah, 2004). Presently, in most planning projects or programs collaboration with landowners and other stakeholders is considered a

necessary portion of the planning and development process. In federal agency projects that go through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process public reviews are mandated. Before NEPA was implemented in 1970 the public had little access to formal decision making processes nor did they expect it. With the implementation of NEPA and the growing distrust in government most governing systems developed formal and more diverse opportunities for citizen involvement including such mechanisms and tools as planning boards, task forces, commissions, and advisory boards (Kinsella, 2004).

Simply incorporating citizen involvement into a process does not mean that better or more informed decisions will be made or that input will be incorporated into those decisions. Effective and meaningful citizen involvement is not easy and it takes a substantial amount of time and effort. Effective citizen involvement can support good environmental decision making, build a community's ability to engage in other issues, support a solid civic base, result in building community experience and relationships, and can play a role in discouraging bad projects (Senecah, 2004).

There are many different citizen involvement theories, both practical and purely theoretical, but there are few clear measures of effectiveness with regard to meaningful participation. This is especially difficult because projects and programs come in all shapes and sizes and the stakeholders and interested public changes based on the project. In recent years there has been a push for citizen involvement processes to emphasize dialogic, social, and two way communication processes (Innes & Booher, 2010). These more participatory processes have moved away from the more traditional review and comment period and public hearings towards two-way communication and deliberative processes. Two of the primary features in these processes are sustained, regular interaction and the ability to jointly define problems and evaluate solutions (Hamilton, 2004).

As a part of the shift to more contemporary citizen involvement processes there is a call for them to be an integral part of any planning program and not a separate feature. Most research suggests that in order to be effective citizen involvement should be implemented and engaged in as early as possible, programs should cultivate social norms that emphasize everyone engaging in public and stakeholder involvement, engagement and communication with the public and stakeholders should be ever present and continuous, and the communication should be connected to building long-term relationships (Innes & Booher, 2010; Hamilton, 2004; Margerum, 2011; Wondolleck & Yaffee, 2000).

Comprehensive and project by project planning go hand in hand. While each have their strengths and weaknesses when implemented as a complement to each other they can result in well-rounded policies and program. Comprehensive planning can provide the framework to guide strategic and specific project by project plans. In conjunction with effective citizen involvement strategies comprehensive planning can facilitate the creation of a broad community or region wide vision that is put into action through implementing smaller projects that serve the overall vision, goals, and objectives of the community.

## 3.0 Context

---

This research aims to provide insight and perspective into how citizen involvement was initiated and used in the comprehensive planning effort undertaken by Oregon to incorporate offshore renewable energy development into Oregon's Territorial Sea Plan. Oregon went through a five year planning and development process to identify areas suitable for offshore renewable energy development that included citizen involvement efforts including stakeholder advisory boards and public meetings and workshops

To provide context and reasoning for Oregon's renewable energy amendment process the following is an overview of relevant policies, guidelines, management programs, and plans that guided Oregon's renewable energy amendment process. This section begins at the federal level and continues through Oregon statewide planning goals and policies and concludes with an in depth look at Oregon's coastal and marine management program including, the coastal and marine legal framework, planning in the territorial sea, and Oregon's most recent effort to amend the Territorial Sea Plan for renewable energy development.

### 3.1 Federal Policies

The National Ocean Policy Act and the Federal Energy Policy Act of 2005 provide the federal framework that guided Oregon's effort to amend the Territorial Sea Plan for renewable energy development.

#### 3.1.1 National Ocean Policy Act

The first United States coastal management programs were guided by the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972 and focused primarily on the management of land use issues leaving coastal water issues largely unaddressed (Cicin-Sain & Knecht, 1998). In 2010 the National Ocean Policy Act was implemented to overcome some of the criticisms of the CZMA. The National Ocean Policy Act is the United States' first national ocean policy, provides strengthened governance structure to provide sustained high-level and coordinated attention to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes issues, and includes a targeted implementation strategy that identifies and prioritizes nine categories of action that the United States should pursue. One of the nine categories of action is a framework for effective coastal and marine spatial planning (Obama, 2010).

Marine spatial planning offers a new, comprehensive, and integrated approach to managing uses and activities at a regional level. The goals of marine spatial planning are to decrease user conflict, improve planning and regulatory efficiencies, decrease associated costs and delays, engage affected communities and stakeholders, and preserve critical ecosystem functions and services. Marine spatial planning is a tool developed to improve collaboration among all coastal and ocean interests and to better inform and



guide decision-making that affects economic, environmental, security, social, and cultural interests (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration).

### **3.1.2 Federal Renewable Energy policy**

The Federal Energy Policy Act of 2005 was passed as an attempt to combat growing energy problems and changed United States energy policy by providing tax incentives and loan guarantees for energy production of various types (United States Department of Energy, 2010). The act authorizes subsidies for wind and other alternative energy producers and adds ocean energy sources including wave and tidal power for the first time as separately identified, renewable technologies. This act also requires the Department of Energy to study and report on existing natural energy resources including wind, solar, waves, and tides (United States Government, 2005). Most states have either renewable energy standards (mandatory) or goals (voluntary). These are policies that are designed to increase generation of electricity from renewable resources. These policies either require or encourage electricity producers within a given jurisdiction to supply a certain minimum share of their electricity from designated renewable energy resources (United States Department of Energy, 2010).

## **3.2 Oregon Policies**

Oregon's statewide planning goals, renewable energy policy, and coastal and marine planning efforts provide more specific guidelines and planning strategies that influenced Oregon's amendment process.

### **3.2.1 Oregon Statewide Planning Goals**

Since 1973 Oregon has maintained a strong statewide planning program whose foundation is a set of 19 statewide planning goals. Local governments as well as special districts and state agencies must comply with Oregon's statewide goals. Each goal is an expression of Oregon's policies as they relate to specific resources or processes (State of Oregon). Two of these goals, Goal 1: Citizen Involvement and Goal 19: Ocean Resources, apply directly to this research study.

#### **Citizen involvement**

Goal number one calls for "the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process." All agencies and special purpose districts must coordinate their planning efforts with local governing bodies and make use of existing citizen involvement programs. Citizen involvement programs are required to incorporate six components; widespread citizen involvement, effective two-way communication, citizen influence, technical information available in an understandable form, feedback mechanisms assuring the public response from policy makers, and financial support that insures funding for citizen involvement processes (State of Oregon).

## **Ocean resources**

Goal number 19 calls for all actions by local, state, and federal agencies that are likely to affect ocean resources and uses provide for conservation of marine resources and ecological functions for the purpose of providing long-term ecological, economic, and social value and benefits to future generations. Goal 19 also expressly states that higher priority be given to the protection of renewable marine resources than to the development of non-renewable ocean resources (State of Oregon). For the purposes of amending the Territorial Sea Plan for renewable energy development the state put renewable energy resources in the same category as non-renewable resources.

### **3.2.2 Oregon Renewable Energy Policy**

Despite the incorporation of renewable energy technology into federal energy policy much of the actual regulations and enforcement is left up to individual states (United States Department of Energy, 2010). Originally enacted in 2007, Oregon's Senate Bill 838, the Oregon Renewable Portfolio Standard, requires Oregon utilities to deliver a percentage of their electricity from renewable resources by 2025. For Oregon's largest utility boards the standard started at 5 percent in 2011, increases to 15 percent in 2015, 20 percent in 2020, and 25 percent by 2025 (State of Oregon).

### **3.2.3 Oregon Coastal and Marine Planning**

Like all coastal areas Oregon's coastal and marine environments represent a variety of uses and stakeholder groups. The following overview of Oregon's coastal and marine legal framework, coastal management program, history of planning in the territorial sea, and the renewable energy amendment process will help to understand how Oregon has incorporated state and federal policies into practice.

#### **Oregon Coastal and Marine Legal Framework**

Oregon's shorelines and coastal waters have a complicated and interconnected legal framework. The stakeholders and jurisdictions play an integral part in coastal and marine planning processes. Working from the bottom upward the legal framework starts with the general public, private landowners, state and local jurisdictions, and finally federal jurisdictions.

The public's right to coastal shorelines and waters is encompassed in the public trust doctrine. The public trust doctrine states that coastal and ocean waters and the lands beneath them are not subject to private ownership. Instead these waters are held in trust for the public under a common law doctrine (Kalo, Hildreth and Christie 2007). Oregon House Bill 1601 (The Beach Bill) defines Oregon public trust simply as scenic and recreation uses of Oregon's seashore and ocean beaches and extends public access to the vegetation line regardless of property rights (Bassett 2006).

Oregon's coast has seven coastal counties, 32 local governments, and a host of state and federal agencies that implement policies and work to achieve the goals of the statewide land use and coastal management programs. Each Oregon city and county is required to develop a comprehensive plan that utilizes planning, zoning, and other regulations to provide for growth, essential public services, and

protection of key coastal resources (Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development n.d.). State agencies including, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Department of State Lands, and Department of Forestry assist local governments, enforce regulations, and carry out programs and state laws that protect coastal resources.

Federal agencies also contribute to managing Oregon's coastal resources. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Office of Ocean and Coastal Management provide funding and technical expertise. The United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and United States Fish and Wildlife Service manage vital coastal resources that include National Wildlife Refuges, productive forests, and the Oregon Dunes Recreational Area. The United States Army Corps of Engineers maintains vital navigation facilities and permitting processes for private and public entities (Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development n.d.).

Oregon's coastal management program has the challenge of enlisting all of these partners as well as community organizations and the public to design and achieve common goals and visions for the Oregon coast and ocean areas.

## **Oregon Coastal and Marine Management**

Oregon's strong judicial support has enabled the state to take a proactive approach to their coastal and marine management program. Oregon's first coastal management program laid the foundation for the coastal goals and policies that were integrated into the statewide land use planning program in 1975 (Bailey 1997). In an effort to address the ocean side of coastal management the Oregon Oceans Management Act was passed in 1977. This act ultimately led to the creation of what is today designated as the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), the lead agency for ocean planning. The Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC) was established by the 1991 legislature as a permanent mechanism to coordinate an interagency and multi-organizational approach to ocean planning, policy development, and management (Hout, 1990).

The Ocean Resource Management Plan was not confined to just state waters and its policy recommendations for marine habitat were meant to apply to the continental margin of Oregon, not just state waters. The legislature recognized the importance of these policies but also necessity for a more detailed plan and policies aimed at Oregon's Territorial Sea where the state does have jurisdiction (State of Oregon).

## **Oregon's Territorial Sea Plan**

Oregon's territorial sea extends from the mean high water seaward three miles and includes the airspace above and the seabed below and is the sovereign territory of the state (State of Oregon n.d.). The Ocean Policy Advisory Council completed Oregon's first Territorial Sea Plan (TSP) in 1994. The initial plan contained detailed requirements for state and federal agencies to analyze effects of their activities on ocean resources and established a strategy for protection of Oregon's rocky shores (Bailey, 1997). Since its inception Oregon's TSP has been updated and amended as necessary. The TSP was amended in 2000 to address submarine telecommunication cables on the seafloor and in 2001 to add a chapter that

describes Oregon's overall management goals and policies (Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, 2013). Most recently Oregon has incorporated an additional chapter for renewable energy development.

## **The Renewable Energy Amendment to the Territorial Sea Plan**

The Territorial Sea Plan Part Five: Uses of the Territorial Sea for the Development of Renewable Energy Facilities or Other Related Structures, Equipment or Facilities includes various policies, implementation and evaluation standards, coordination processes, development requirements for renewable energy projects, and spatially explicit information that will be used to direct renewable energy development to specific areas (Department of Land Conservation and Development, 2013). The purpose of this additional section is to provide guidelines for the siting of wave energy and other forms of marine renewable energy to areas that pose the least conflict with existing ocean uses and natural resources (Kitzhaber 2012).

In 2008 Governor Kulongoski signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). As part of this MOU, the State of Oregon agreed to prepare a comprehensive planning document for siting offshore renewable energy facilities and FERC would take this into consideration when issuing permits and licenses. As of January 2013 the Renewable Energy Amendment has been adopted by DLCD. The amendment identifies four Renewable Energy Suitability Study Areas where initial development of renewable energy will be encouraged (Kitzhaber 2012). The amendment provides guidelines for developers and standards for protecting ecological and fishing resources, other existing uses, and coastal views. The amendment also provides guidelines for review of applications and permitting procedures. Developers can seek approval for projects in other areas off Oregon's coast but they will have to meet more stringent standards (Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, 2013).

The planning process for the Renewable Energy Amendment began with OPAC establishing part one; review and permitting guidelines and starting the recommendations for part two. Part two which defines spatially specific development areas was more contentious and made a more diverse advisory body necessary. This led to the creation of the Territorial Sea Plan Advisory Committee (TSPAC). According to the Citizen's Guide to the Territorial Sea Plan OPAC was to turn over their recommendation to the Territorial Sea Plan Advisory Committee who would review and add to OPAC's recommendation (Kitzhaber, 2012).

The following is a description of each of these advisory bodies and the citizen involvement strategies that were used throughout the amendment process.

### **Ocean Policy Advisory Council**

The Ocean Policy Advisory Council is a legislatively appointed body with voting and non-voting members that represent state agencies, ocean user groups, local coastal governments, and citizen representatives, see Table 2. Members serve four year terms; however members are eligible for reappointment. The Ocean Policy Advisory Council acts as the main policy advisory council to the Governor's office (Oregon Legislative Assembly, 2012).

**Table 2: OPAC Membership Composition**

<b>Voting members</b>	
The Governor or the Governor's designee	Department of State Lands
Department of Environmental Quality	Department of Parks and Recreation
Department of Fish and Wildlife	Department of Agriculture
Department of Geology and Mineral Industries	Oregon State University, Sea Grant
Department of Land and Conservation	Coast wide organization for small ports and local government
<b>Nonvoting members</b>	
Member of the governing body of Coos, Curry, Douglas or Lane County	Member of the governing body of Clatsop, Lincoln, or Tillamook County
Elected official from a coastal city bordering the territorial sea	Coastal non-fishing recreation interests of surfing, diving, kayaking, or windsurfing
Commercial ocean fisheries of the North Coast (Newport and north)	Commercial ocean fisheries of the South Coast (south of Newport)
Charter, sport, or recreation fisheries of the North Coast	Charter, sport, or recreation fisheries of the South Coast
Ports marine navigation or transportation	Oregon Indian tribes
Coastal conservation or environmental organization	Statewide conservation or environmental organization
Two representatives of the public, one is a resident of a county bordering the territorial sea	

**The Territorial Sea Plan Advisory Committee**

The Territorial Sea Plan Advisory Committee includes many of the same stakeholder groups and in some cases the very same individuals as OPAC with the addition of a renewable energy industry representative and a public utility representative. Unlike OPAC all TSPAC members have a vote. The members of TSPAC further divided into subcommittees to address each of the following areas raised by OPAC; Fishery Resources, Recreational Resources, Visual/Aesthetic Resources, TSP Part 5 Language, Energy, and Ecological Resources (State of Oregon, 2013).

**Citizen Involvement**

The Ocean Policy Advisory Committee and TSPAC are the primary mechanisms to involve stakeholders in ocean planning. It is the responsibility of the members of each of these advisory bodies to communicate with their constituents and speak on behalf of the groups collective interests. In addition advisory board meetings and functions public meetings were held throughout the planning process. Public comments were accepted in writing and online and all previously submitted comments were available to be read online.

The first round of public meetings took place during the spring of 2011. The first round of public outreach constituted seven public meetings held at various locations from the Southern Oregon coast to Astoria at the mouth of the Columbia River, with one meeting held in Salem. Round two of public meetings took place during the winter of 2012. Round two consisted of eight coastal public meetings and two inland meetings one in Portland and one in Eugene (State of Oregon, 2013).

## 4.0 Methods

---

This research study used a qualitative approach focusing on textual analysis of public comments and semi-structured interviews with stakeholder participants.

### 4.1 Textual analysis of public comments

The textual analysis included all public comments that were submitted verbally, in writing, or online at public hearings, stakeholder meetings, and planning workshops. All of these comments are publicly available online.

Public comments were specifically analyzed for topics relating to the planning and development process and how comments were incorporated into the planning and development process of the renewable energy amendment. The textual analysis will be used to represent the collective public opinion of the planning process.

There were a total of 327 public comments either received online, verbally, or in written form. Of these 167 were unique organizations or individuals. Many of the individuals and organizations that participated in public meetings or submitted comments online had multiple comments over multiple meetings. There were a total of 62 organizations or companies represented in the public comments; these included private companies, conservation groups, local governments, fishing associations, and Ports. About half of public participants identified solely as public citizens these included self-proclaimed commercial and recreational fisher people, non-consumptive users (surfers, kayakers, tourists), and coastal residents.

The vast majority of comments were received verbally at public meetings. Only a handful of people submitted comments online and they were mostly inquiries with little substantive content. There were about twenty written comments submitted at public meetings. These were mostly from organizations and local governments and were generally accompanied by verbal comments that stated much of the same content. Some of the written comments were mostly background information about the organization or submissions of data that they wanted to be incorporated into the planning process.

### 4.2 Semi Structured Interviews

Key people that worked on Oregon's renewable energy amendment were identified through review of policies and documents and textual analysis of public comments. By speaking to staff within these departments the snowball method was used to identify additional interviewees. Individuals, staff members, and stakeholder representatives were invited to participate in one-on-one interviews

conducted over the phone or in person. Informed consent was requested verbally during initial email contact and again in the interview process. Each interview took approximately one hour.

Every effort was made to interview at least one representative from each stakeholder group identified through background research on the composition of OPAC and TSPAC. Interview participants consisted of two conservation group representatives, one non-governmental organization representative, two fishing group representatives, one public utility representative, and five state staff members from four different state agencies, one public citizen, and one renewable energy industry representative. Of these interviewees six were members of OPAC and five were members of TSPAC. Limited effort was put into interviewing members of the public because the general public perceptions were able to be inferred from the hundreds of public comments that were submitted. All thirteen interviewees had extensive participation throughout the renewable energy amendment process with most participating on TSPAC or OPAC for both part one (establishing review and permitting processes) and part two (determining spatially specific areas) of the amendment process.

Planning staff and stakeholder representatives were asked about their role in the planning and development process, what specific parts of the stakeholder participation process they thought worked well and what parts they thought could use improvement. Interviewees were asked if they were aware of their opinions and recommendations being incorporated into the planning and decision making process and if so how that was accomplished. Interviewees were also asked if they had specific suggestions on how to improve stakeholder as well as citizen involvement.

Extensive notes were taken during all interviews. Interview notes were analyzed for key themes and trends relating specifically to challenges they encountered, successes, and limitations of the resulting plan, and recommendations for future planning efforts and potential modifications to the stakeholder and citizen involvement processes.

# 5.0 Findings

---

Overall interviewees and the general public were supportive of renewable energy development. Support for renewable energy was most commonly related to improving the coastal economy and the broad understanding that Oregon needs to pursue alternative energy sources to meet energy demands. Although there was a common thread of support the means to achieve increased renewable energy production were not agreed upon. The most common divergences in public comments and interviewee opinions were over whether the process should take a more cautious approach or push forward more insistently.

Through extensive organization and coding of interview notes and public comments the results were split into three key themes: challenges, successes, and limitations. Challenges are defined as external factors. Successes and limitations are results from the process or the plan itself.

## 5.1 Challenges

The key challenges identified relate to the overall setting that this process took place in and general challenges that relate to public engagement and planning strategies.

### 5.1.1 Setting

The challenges related to the setting on the Oregon coast include timing of the amendment process, the complicated web of jurisdictions and regulations, and the fact that there is no ocean space that is not already identified as being important for an existing use. Many ocean users and interviewees had just participated in the marine reserve planning process. Both members of TSPAC and OPAC said they, as well as the citizens of the Oregon coast, were feeling fatigued from countless meetings. Several interviewees said some of the public was also frustrated because they were not comfortable with the outcomes of the marine reserve process. This frustration led to some ocean users and stakeholders being very cautious and wary of participating in the renewable energy amendment process.

The complicated web of jurisdictions in the territorial sea was reiterated by every interviewee. As described by one state employee authority is duplicated in various areas with at least five different state agencies having jurisdiction over various resources and regulations. In order to plan effectively in Oregon's territorial sea the complexities and inner workings of each of these agencies must be understood and according to state staff that is hard even for them to overcome. According to several interviewees the complicated web of jurisdictions also means there is the chance that Oregon may be taken out as a player in offshore renewable energy development. According to these interviewees if Oregon does not find a way to work with industry and establish an adequate number of development areas that meet industry criteria FERC has the ability to come in and issue permits outside of the



territorial sea in federally managed waters. According to several TSPAC members this would negate the whole renewable energy amendment process and Oregon will have missed the opportunity to bring business, employment, and money to Oregon's coastal communities.

Several interviewees brought up the regulatory environment as being a challenge for the renewable energy industry. A TSPAC and an OPAC member both talked about how the current regulatory system built up around non-renewable energy industries that are inherently dangerous and includes a lot of money and corruption. One interviewee stated that:

“Renewables are coming of age during a time of dangerous bullies and are being forced into a regulatory environment that wasn't designed for them.”

The challenge is that renewable energy is an up and coming technology, the impacts of which are not fully understood but they have been lumped into a regulatory environment that was built around the non-renewable energy industry that has had dramatic and lasting impacts. Based on public comments and interviews the existing regulatory structure was primarily identified as a challenge by renewable energy industry and public utility representatives.

According to one TSPAC member there isn't one square inch of the territorial sea that someone doesn't say is a priority for fishing or other existing uses. According to several interviewees many groups including conservation groups and fishing associations expressed support for renewable energy but when it came down to defining specific areas they were not able to reach a consensus. Every interviewee said there is no clear open space in the ocean and this led to the challenge of people perceiving this to mean there is no room for new uses. This was especially challenging because renewable energy is of lower state priority than living marine renewable resources.

## 5.1.2 Process

The challenges relating to the process include citizen involvement and the conceptual nature of the process.

### **Citizen involvement**

All interviewees expressed the challenge of certain groups and communities being more organized and cohesive than others. One example of this was given by a TSPAC member in regard to different regions of the fishing community. According to this interviewee the Reedsport fishermen were not as organized and did not participate as much as some of the other fishing groups, this did not necessarily mean that they didn't have opinions or recommendations that would have benefited the process.

Interviewees representing state agencies with experience in different public engagement techniques said there is no ideal way to gain input and there are pros and cons of every method that could have been used. According to one OPAC member:

“It doesn’t matter what methods you choose and how long you run the process from a staff perspective there will still be people that would say they want to be more involved and not everyone is going to be 100 percent satisfied with the outcome.”

With respect to public meetings, the primary public engagement method used, OPAC and TSPAC members identified the primary challenge as not being able to choose or if people will show up.

“Sometimes there is strong and diverse attendance and other times there are one or two radical voices that dominate the conversation or a group of retirees that does not represent the diversity of people living and working on in the area.”

From an agency perspective public and stakeholder involvement are challenging because the process takes much longer and can be “laborious and time consuming” because staff and advisory boards have to circle back and circle back throughout the process (geographically as well as conceptually). As described by an OPAC member:

“If someone shows up at the 19<sup>th</sup> of 20 meetings and says they haven’t heard about the process we have to get them up to speed, it is difficult and frustrating to everyone involved, but it has to happen.”

## **Conceptual process**

All interviewees and many of the public comments expressed the challenge of the conceptual nature of the amendment process. Many interviewees and members of the public expressed concern about the newness of wave energy technology and the lack of information about environmental impacts and overall effects of development because the technology is still being developed. According to one OPAC member being on the forefront of technology, as well as one of the first states to embark on siting offshore renewable energy development areas, and the perceived negative impact of development made planning and engaging citizens very challenging. All interviewees talked about the lack of available information about the wave energy industry and six interviewees expressed concern about the lack of other programs to learn from.

The comprehensive aspect of the amendment process was an added challenge that added to the conceptual nature of the process. According to all interviewees planning processes such as this one that are long term and involve numerous stakeholders wear people out and there is a breaking point for both staff and for the public. According to one interviewee the challenge is having enough process while not reaching that breaking point.

The majority of interviewees said the conceptual nature of the planning process made it difficult for stakeholders as well as citizens to fully understand and participate in the process. According to several interviewees throughout the process staff and the members of TSPAC and OPAC all had difficulty laying out the reasoning for developing this plan during this time, this made it very difficult for members of the public and stakeholder participants to fully understand and engage in the process.

## 5.2 Successes

The key successes identified in interviews and public comments relate to the process and outputs of the plan itself.

### 5.2.1 Process

The successes relating to the process are further broken down into citizen involvement, advisory boards, and MarineMap.

#### Citizen involvement

All interviewees expressed the success that came from incorporating a more diverse group of stakeholders. According to all interviewees state staff became more proactive about incorporating the renewable energy industry. During the planning process Oregon Wave Energy Trust (OWET) was tasked with identifying sites that were of interest to the renewable energy industry and a renewable energy industry representative was included on TSPAC. According to all OPAC and TSPAC members having the wave energy industry present to supply information and knowledge to the public as well as to the advisory boards was helpful in putting a face to some of the technology and getting real information about the potential benefits and consequences of development. All interviewees identified the incorporation of renewable energy industry information and their input into siting areas as crucial to the success of the planning effort.

All interviewees said that the public had ample opportunities to provide input, opinions, and recommendations. According to one interviewee:

“OPAC and TSPAC both collected tons of public input and they conducted, participated, and presented at numerous public meetings and workshops up and down the coast as well as in the Willamette Valley and Portland.”

Every interviewee said that there were plenty of opportunities for people to be involved and there were a lot of different options on how to participate including attending meetings and workshops, submitting comments at meetings, in writing, and online, and submitting and interacting with MarineMap. Public comments reiterated what interviewees were saying by recognizing the many opportunities to be involved in the process and coming back to commend the OPAC and TSPAC groups on the incorporation of public input. Two specific examples came up in several interviews and many of the public comments.

The first example was the use of a non-consumptive user survey that was implemented by the non-profit group Surfrider. The non-consumptive user survey was distributed by Surfrider to coastal as well as inland Oregonians to identify areas where they surf, kayak, dive, and take part in other activities that are considered to be non-consumptive. This survey was not at first incorporated into the process but after many public comments and a general outcry from stakeholders and the public the survey was incorporated into the process and used to identify high use recreation areas.

Secondly a viewshed analysis was completed by state agencies and was incorporated into the process after numerous public comments were received asking the advisory boards to take aesthetics and viewpoint issues into consideration. A viewshed is an area that is visible from a specific location. The viewshed analysis for this project prioritized viewpoints from state parks, recreation areas, and other high use public areas.

## **Advisory Boards**

According to all interviewees the agencies and staff that were facilitating and participating in the process were legitimately committed and dedicated. Interviewees also agreed that OPAC and TSPAC members as a collective were knowledgeable and the majority were directly connected to the stakeholder groups they were representing.

All interviewees said that both advisory boards had good group dynamics and participants weren't shy about speaking their minds. Many interviews said that significant relationships were built and as a result the advisory groups were able to approach challenging issues, and while they were never in total agreement everyone was able to lay their issues and opinions on the table. According to one TSPAC member:

“There was mutual respect, a feeling of community, and an atmosphere of collaboration rather than contention.”

All interviewees identified the incorporation of a renewable energy representative into TSPAC as strengthening the process. Several members of TSPAC went as far as to say that the addition of a renewable energy representative made their efforts more effective and successful.

## **MarineMap**

According to all interviewees MarineMap was a useful and effective tool to represent complex information and was extremely valuable as a presentation, data collection, and exploratory tool. According to the majority of interviewees MarineMap strengthened the ability of stakeholders and the public to form comments and opinions and led participants to be able to really visualize the data. One interviewee identified providing access and tutorials on MarineMap during public meetings as being particularly helpful to answer questions from the public.

All interviewees identified the importance and helpfulness of having MarineMap for their own use. The majority of interviewees said MarineMap was instrumental in informing planners and staff about inconsistencies and gaps in the data. MarineMap also gave planners the ability to break data into different layers and represent complex data in a much more accessible way.

## **5.2.2 Outputs**

The successful outputs of the plan and the process itself include data collection, the permitting and review process, definition of spatially specific areas, and forging of relationships.

The Viewshed and non-consumptive use analysis and fishing ground data that was generated during the process were all identified as being particularly helpful for stakeholders. Fishing ground data was inferred and prioritized by using fishing log book information and anecdotal information from fishermen. All interviewees identified the information that they had access to and generated in the planning and development process as moving in the right direction and well beyond what had been available in the past. Several TSPAC members said that Oregon is in better shape in terms of the amount of data and their ability to analyze that data than at any another point in its history. All interviewees also verbalized how helpful this data and analyses will be to future planning and research. Several interviewees said that the planning staff and stakeholders came out of this process with a much better understanding of Goal 19 and a stronger ability to fulfill its goals and intentions.

The majority of TSPAC members said that the permitting and review process was a very positive output of the plan. The additional review and permitting process was identified as a success because each individual project will have to be evaluated and permitted on its own to determine compliance with the plan. This ensures there will not be a massive rush of development. Judging by interviewee and public comments the permitting and review process was particularly important to conservation, ecological, and fishing representatives.

The majority of interviewees said the nature of this project allowed non-governmental organizations, conservation groups, and fishing associations to be on the same team. According to a member of TSPAC there are few instances when fishing and ecological uses come together in agreement and this process forged relationships between these two stakeholder groups as well as others that were not present before. One member of TSPAC said this process enabled diverse stakeholders to interact and get involved with each other in different, interesting, and beneficial ways that wouldn't have otherwise happened.

All interviewees felt that identifying a handful of areas in a contentious and highly utilized environment was a success. Several interviewees also expressed their support of the final plan having a cap on the build out so that the plan will have to be revisited if build out reaches a certain extent of the territorial sea.

## **5.3 Limitations**

The key limitations relate to the process and the outputs of the plan.

### **5.3.1 Process**

The limitations relating to the process are described by the following subcategories: background, citizen involvement, advisory boards, and MarineMap.

## Background

The following are general limitations of the process; these include stakeholder inclusivity and political agendas that rushed the process. Several interviewees raised the issue that the process had the appearance of being inclusive when in fact in the end it did not play out that way. According to one TSPAC member state agencies and TSPAC members went through a lot of trouble to create subcommittees on individual resources and added resource representatives to TSPAC that were not included on OPAC to create a more inclusive process. In the end there were meetings behind closed doors with just select members and it really made other TSPAC members question how much their opinions and recommendations were being valued. According to two other TSPAC member this was really unfortunate because there was so much good process and public involvement up to that point and then having a closed door meeting without everyone present kind of negates all the good. One of these TSPAC members stated:

“It is more than frustrating, it is infuriating, we put so much time into it, so proud of it, and we get everyone involved, treat them as though they matter, and then ignore them, you have all this process and then it gets ignored.”

Another issue that came up in the majority of the interviews was that towards the end of the process the governor’s office stepped in and told the advisory boards that they needed a final recommendation before the next legislative session. This resulted in the process getting rushed through right at the end. Both of these limitations could probably have been mitigated through having more transparency and communication about the political agenda as well as the reasoning behind conducting meetings with individual groups.

## Citizen involvement

According to four interviewees at public meetings information was often shared in a way that seemed to confuse or intimidate the public. Several interviewees said that when conveying information to the public there was a lack of connection between the planning and review of project proposals. This seemed to lead the public into assuming that siting in the plan was an automatic green light for projects. According to one interviewee the review and permitting process was all laid out in part one of the Renewable Energy Amendment but nobody really went into it or read it and it wasn’t made real to the public.

Several interviewees also said that while it was helpful to have the wave energy industry share information and be a part of the process they weren’t sure industry representatives were the right people to convey that information to the public. According to another interviewee in some cases the renewable energy industry supplying information seemed to cause the public discomfort because there was the perception that the renewable energy industry was not an objective source of information.

Another limitation of the citizen involvement process that came up again and again in interviews was a gap in time between when planning efforts were narrowed down to specific sites and when the information was presented to the public. According to one interviewee the gap in time was upwards of a year, which resulted in the public having a substantial amount to catch up on once they had the chance

to provide their comments. According to this same interviewee the specific draft areas really kind of missed the boat on public participation and the public only had a chance to comment on them if they were a registered user of MarineMap.

According to all interviewees there was a lot of data collection that was needed for this process and establishing the priority fishing grounds was one subset of data that was particularly hard to collect. According to all interviewees and many of the public comments fishermen hold information on fishing grounds close to their chest and getting them to share their data on animal behavior and spatial representation of fishing grounds was a huge challenge. According to one TSPAC member fishing groups worked with Ecotrust to put together a data layer and even though it is very difficult to get people to talk about their fishing spots they were able to put together fishing resource data. According to the majority of interviewees this information was not only the hardest to come by but also the information that may have the most gaps because of the concentration of information around ports, the lack of information from fishermen who fish further offshore or in more remote areas, and the difficulty in mapping such a dynamic resource that includes animal behavior and spatial integration patterns.

Lastly almost every interviewee brought up the fact that the OWET information and siting information was brought in late in the siting process. Oregon Wave Energy Trust information was important because without it the stakeholders would have no idea if the renewable energy development would be feasible for industry in the areas they were identifying. Oregon Wave Energy Trust was able to provide a perspective that the advisory board did not have before and according to interviewees this was due to a delay in the information as OWET got their data and information together but also because there was push back from OPAC that incorporating industry input was not their responsibility. According to one TSPAC member OPAC saw their responsibility solely to Goal 19 and as renewable energy was not included in Goal 19 as a beneficial use this was not OPAC's responsibility.

## **Advisory Boards**

According to all OPAC and TSPAC members in the beginning of the process the advisory boards got off on the wrong foot when thinking about the selection process. They were thinking about areas that were important for fishing and other existing uses and where not to develop rather than where they should develop and which sites would be feasible for renewable energy development. All interviewees said the group moved quickly down this path and wasn't considering industry needs. According to TSPAC members when industry input did come into play late in the process there was this mentality amongst OPAC members that the sites they had come up with should exist because they already started down that road not because they were the best areas or made sense. It became very obvious to most participants that they were going to have sites that would protect existing uses but they weren't going to be any interest to the industry for development.

According to several interviewees the composition of OPAC is weighted towards the fishing industry. The composition of OPAC also includes city council representatives and in all areas city council positions are on a voluntary basis and according to one interviewee it can be hard to get people to run. Two members of OPAC are public at large representatives and it is these members' responsibility to represent the opinions of the general population of the entire state of Oregon. According to OPAC

members this position has a huge challenge in obtaining meaningful feedback. There was also concern from the majority of interviewees about filling vacant positions. According to one interviewee having vacant positions can significantly change the voting outcome.

According to interviewees the four year OPAC terms are a challenge because on one hand you have OPAC members that have been on the advisory board for greater than four years and new blood would potentially benefit the group but there is also the issue of who would be on OPAC if it weren't the existing members. According to all interviewees there are only so many people with the expertise, ability, and willingness to effectively participate and represent the necessary stakeholder groups.

The majority of interviewees brought up the fact that the success of the process was dependent on the advisory boards being dedicated, knowledgeable, and engaged with their constituents. Each interviewee expressed concern that advisory board members had varying levels of understanding about the planning process, dedication, and engagement and communication with their constituents. All TSPAC interviewees said that the effectiveness of the advisory groups depends on the knowledge and dedication of the members of advisory boards. According to the majority of interviewees some of the stakeholders were less participatory with their constituents and some seemed to be more or less representing their own interests and opinions rather than that of the constituents they were chosen to represent. According to all interviewees there are some members of both TSPAC and OPAC that took the process very seriously and others that were more lax.

According to one OPAC member other OPAC members wanted staff to reach out more to the public and staff had to remind OPAC members that they are supposed to correspond to their constituents, it was unclear to this interviewee if all members made as much of an effort as staff would expect. There is also the challenge of OPAC members who were in a position when they were appointed but no longer serve in that capacity. For example one interviewee said that one OPAC member was a city commissioner when they were appointed but no longer holds that position and it is currently unknown how in touch they are with the community and their constituents.

According to the majority of TSPAC and OPAC members having two advisory boards had various challenges. The main challenge that was identified was the ability to understand the roles of each advisory group and the authority of each group in issuing recommendations to DLCD. According to TSPAC members OPAC tended to think they had more authority because they are legislatively appointed, when in fact OPAC and TSPAC are separate but equal advisory bodies. Several interviewees said that the advisory bodies as a collective were not super sharp about what was already in the Territorial Sea Plan and the stakeholders sitting on TSPAC and OPAC had varying degrees of comfort with the planning process.

One key limitation in having two advisory groups was miscommunication between the two advisory boards. All TSPAC members interviewed said that when OPAC turned the process over to TSPAC they told TSPAC that they would take their recommendations, however there was nothing in the statute that says they have to; it was just defined by OPAC's word. After this interaction TSPAC put in a lot of work and expanded on areas, collected data, and provided OPAC with final recommendations and OPAC



wound up making their own recommendation that was significantly different than TSPAC's recommendation.

## **MarineMap**

MarineMap was the primary method for staff and advisory board members to share and receive information with the public. According to every interviewee MarineMap had a steep learning curve and the general public and some of the stakeholders encountered challenges related to getting online, navigating the website, knowing what to do with the information once they were able to access it, and having the right technology requirements to use MarineMap. In many cases interviewees said in order to use MarineMap effectively you had to know how to use it and know where to specifically look for information. MarineMap was used to convey a lot of the information and planning staff tried to provide paper maps for those without access to MarineMap but it is difficult, if not impossible, to provide paper maps that convey the amount of complex information and the level of detail that MarineMap provided.

### **5.3.2 Outputs**

The first output limitation identified by several interviewees was a concern that the plan had too much regulatory structure in place for the renewable energy industry to want or be able to deal with. Most interviewees were not sure if this would be the case and they said they would just have to wait and see if the amount of regulatory structure would repeal industry.

Attributable to the fact that there are no pending permits or project proposals on the table all interviewees said they concluded the process with the uncertainty of whether or not the renewable energy industry would be interested in the areas they had identified. Two interviewees thought that the small part of the territorial sea they identified as appropriate for renewable energy development was a limitation. These interviewees were both concerned that the area they came up with was so small that the renewable energy industry wouldn't be interested at all.

# 6.0 Analysis and Recommendations

---

Based on the interviews and analysis of public comments the citizen involvement strategies seemed to be effective. There was general agreement that plenty of public comment opportunities were available and these opportunities were diverse enough to gain a diverse group of participants. Through analysis of public comments and examples from interviews it was apparent that input from the public was incorporated into the process.

The areas where there is room for improvement and recommendations would be particularly useful were in the advisory boards and in outlining steps for moving forward. Most of the recommendations that came out of interviews and the identified challenges and limitations related to the advisory boards could be mitigated through refining advisory boards and establishing a plan for moving forward.

This section is divided into two areas: refining advisory boards and continuing the process. These two subjects are analyzed further and recommendations are provided based on interviews, public comments, and background research.

## 6.1 Refining Advisory Boards

All interviewees expressed concerns about the advisory boards. Many of these concerns relate to advisory board logistics including composition, term limits, filling vacant positions, and confusion and communication challenges of having two advisory boards. Other concerns that were identified by interviewees were the advisory board members' varying degrees of knowledge and comfort with the planning process, regulations, their responsibilities, authority, and expectations, and their connection and engagement with the constituents they are supposed to represent.

Informed engagement and transparency and openness are two of the seven essential principles for meaningful stakeholder involvement processes as described by the Udall Foundation. According to the Udall Foundation these principles are necessary for stakeholder participation to have a positive impact on the process. Participants need to be educated and informed about the subjects that will be discussed and about the goals and elements of the planning process. Differences in the levels of knowledge and familiarity with ocean issues among planning staff, stakeholder representatives, and the public will be a challenge in most, if not all, planning processes. Therefore, developing a shared understanding at the beginning of the process that includes the issues that need to be addressed and the information that is available is a key element of successful stakeholder involvement (United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution Udall Foundation, 2011).

Since OPAC has been in operation in varying degrees with varying effectiveness and with many of the same members it will be difficult if not impossible to effectively change OPAC in its current form. It is

because of these factors that I recommend OPAC go through a rebranding effort. Currently OPAC has operating procedures and guidelines but does not necessary follow them all and TSPAC does not have guidelines, therefore it is not much of a surprise that there was confusion over the process, authority, and operating procedures. I recommend rebranding the advisory boards to include a permanent board with state and federal agencies and a non-permanent boards that are implemented on an as needed basis. These advisory boards would include the stakeholder advisory groups that are necessary for particular projects and plans. The second, non-permanent group members would be defined by the needs of the specific project or plan they are working on. The permanent group would do the preplanning and research and with the help of public outreach will identify the necessary members for the second group. Necessary members of the permanent advisory board could also be incorporated into the project specific advisory boards.

In order to create shared understanding clear operating guidelines and procedures are necessary for each advisory group. Operating guidelines include such elements as member composition, level of authority, voting rights and quorums, term limits, guidelines and procedures for citizen involvement, and expectations of members. Even though OPAC has guidelines many of these are not effectively being implemented, this is primarily apparent in the members exceeding term limits and perpetual presence of vacant positions. Stakeholder advisory boards are a good strategy for decentralizing processes and obtaining stakeholder opinions but only if the advisory boards have accountability, clear expectations, and a standard level of knowledge and understanding.

Many of the recommendations that were offered by interviewees included preplanning and research that includes best practices and case study research. Preplanning and research would be conducted by the permanent advisory board and funneled into tutorials and education that would kick off each specific project or plan. The tutorials or other education sessions would cover the planning process, purpose and vision for the project, expectations, operating guidelines, how their input will be incorporated into the planning process, and development of the group charter. Some of this information may be supplied by technical experts and the process should be guided by a facilitator.

A group charter should be developed each time an advisory board is implemented, when new members join the board, or when a new project is started. The group charter will include specifics on the board's accountability to themselves and their constituents, the team's direction or vision, objectives, expectations of each other, and other relevant information. Investing time to develop a group charter will reduce the confusion about the group's objectives and through the team process will encourage understanding and buy-in from the entire group. The group charter should be available publicly.

Providing clear expectations and education to stakeholders will help to ensure that stakeholders all have a similar understanding and background information and might also help to reduce the amount of miscommunication about the process. This will also help stakeholders to clearly understand how their recommendations will be incorporated and the amount of weight their recommendations will be given in the decision making process. This will not only benefit stakeholders but will benefit the process by ensuring planning agencies, state staff, and stakeholders are on the same page and will help keep the process on track with pre-established guidelines and expectations. If the process does need to be

adapted then planning agencies, state staff and stakeholders will have to be transparent and open about the changes because everyone has the same knowledge and understanding about the guidelines and expectations.

Education, tutorials, and development of a group charter may help to mitigate some of the things that happened during the process that advisory members expressed being frustrated with or were not comfortable with. These include select subcommittee group meetings that happened without the other subcommittees present and the significant gap in time that occurred between when specific areas were drafted and when the public was able to provide comments on them. If planning agencies, advisory members, and state staff agreed on guidelines, expectations, and laid the process out clearly and publicly in the beginning of the process these types of changes would be more difficult to implement. If changes need to be made all participants would need to be a part of the decision to make the change or at least know about it ahead of time. This would probably help to quell the level of stakeholder frustration and comfort with the process.

Education, tutorials, preplanning and research, as well as development of group charters will help to ensure clear understanding, project buy-in, and education about the process. This will help stakeholders to provide a clear and universal message to the public which may help mitigate the limitation about how information was presented to the public. The idea is that if stakeholders have a better understanding of the process, guidelines, and purpose of the project they will be able to communicate messages more clearly to the public.

## 6.2 Continuing the process

Public comments identified the challenge of the timing in relation to the newness of technology. Stakeholders reiterated this same sentiment with comments about the lack of information in relation to wave energy technology and the challenge of the conceptual nature of the planning process. Despite these challenges all interviewees said the amount of data and analysis that was created during the process put Oregon in a position to better understand and achieve the goals and intentions of Goal 19 and the information will be of use to future planning efforts.

The nature of the Territorial Sea Plan being adaptive and amended as necessary ensures that there will be future amendments and marine spatial planning efforts in Oregon (Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, 2013). In addition, there is increasing interest in Oregon's territorial seas for other development purposes and therefore it is important for Oregon to continue to collect data and add to their knowledge base. Many interviewees and the general public expressed concern about gaps in information related to fishing, ecological, recreation, and impacts of wave energy technology. State agencies and stakeholders had to contend with these information gaps while they were planning for renewable energy development. Several interviewees said that as a result of the Renewable Energy Amendment process Oregon is in a better place in terms of the amount of information they have and the depth of their understanding of existing uses and stakeholder and public interests in the ocean environment. Unfortunately, this information is dynamic and in order to be

effective and useful to planning efforts the information needs to be kept up to date. Therefore, this is the time to embrace the knowledge they have and continue to collect information and keep themselves in a position of knowledge and understanding.

There are several strategies that would be helpful for Oregon to maintain and expand their level of knowledge and understanding for future planning and development projects; these include evaluation strategies, implementation of a data network, and establishing a research agenda.

I recommend the implementation of an evaluation process for renewable energy projects similar to Oregon's marine reserve evaluation process. The marine reserves that have been implemented serve as reference areas to conduct ongoing research on marine reserve condition and effectiveness of natural and human-induced stressors. The information and data collected from monitoring is to be used to support adaptive management of marine reserves and general nearshore management (State of Oregon, 2013). A similar type of monitoring and evaluation plan collecting baseline information and data relating to the social, economic, and ecological effects of renewable energy development could be implemented as wave energy projects are approved and implemented on the Oregon coast. Implementing monitoring projects can also create the opportunity to forge partnerships among researchers, fishing associations, and charters who have the necessary equipment and local knowledge that would benefit evaluation and monitoring strategies and goals.

Another method of data collection was recommended in 2011 after an Oregon Coastal and Marine Data Network Workshop. The workshop recommended a formal network similar to a network recommended by the Oregon Nearshore Research Task Force in 2010. This program would ensure that data and information from a variety of sources be widely available and that the program be sufficiently flexible to account for the constant addition of new data and scientific information, the evolving needs among potential users, and the continuing advances in data technologies. In Oregon there are many entities currently working on data and information products that are useful to coastal and marine spatial planning efforts. However, according to researchers access to these products is informal and uncoordinated outside of specific projects and integration efforts. The establishment of a formal network would improve the availability and consistency of information (Oregon State University Institute for Natural Resources, 2011). Most of the stakeholders that work on planning projects and plans are not necessarily planners or technical experts and would benefit from having one central location to access existing information.

Thirdly a research agenda could be established. Rhode Island has also recently engaged in a marine spatial planning effort and incorporated a Research Agenda as part of their Rhode Island Special Area Management Plan (SAMP). The purpose of the Research Agenda is to identify data gaps and short and long-term research priorities that can be used to prioritize funding. As described in Rhode Island's SAMP the Research Agenda will allow the Coastal Resources Management Council to (Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council):

- Continue to learn about Rhode Island's offshore natural resources and human activities;
- Better understand the potential effects of future development and other human impacts; and

- Increase Rhode Island’s understanding of the potential impacts of global climate change.

These three methods will be most effective when implemented together. The evaluation process is a data collection tool, the data network as a way to access and add information in a central location that is available to Oregon’s diverse stakeholders and jurisdictions, and the research agenda as a way to prioritize research and data collection projects. All three data and research strategies would benefit from having an advisory group that includes scientists, partner federal and state agencies, environmental organizations, and ocean user groups. This advisory group would be the first non-permanent advisory board to be created as recommended in the previous section. This group would help to create partnerships, establish evaluation mechanisms, and identify data gaps, short- and long-term research priorities, potential partners, and potential funding sources for the research agenda. Incorporating stakeholders into the evaluation and creation of the research agenda brings citizen involvement full circle with stakeholders defining projects and evaluating solutions.

As the renewable energy industry begins to develop areas in Oregon’s territorial sea baseline information relating to impacts on existing uses and marine habitat as well as public perception information will help to quell some of the concerns about the lack of information and will aid future marine spatial planning efforts. The establishment of a data collection and evaluation plan that includes a formal network of data collection and information sharing also has the potential to create partnerships and cooperation with diverse ocean users and increase stakeholder and citizen involvement.

Research related to citizen and stakeholder involvement strategies emphasizes dialogic, social, and two-way communication processes that are continuous and focus on long-term relationship building (Innes & Booher, 2010). Involving stakeholders and the public in data collection and evaluation mechanisms that are on the forefront of marine spatial planning projects will help to forge long-term relationships and has the potential to engage the public and stakeholders in a participatory approach that is focused on two way communication and sharing of information. Forging long-term relationships and bringing the public and stakeholders into the beginning of the data collection and research process can help to establish trust and can create more public understanding of planning processes.

## 6.3 Further Research

In order to more fully understand citizen involvement in marine spatial planning it would be beneficial to compare Oregon’s process to other coastal state efforts at marine spatial planning principles. Other states to look into include Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Many state agency staff and stakeholders mentioned Rhode Island’s Research agenda and advisory board process as having a strong participatory planning approach; therefore it would be beneficial to explore their process in greater detail.

In 2012 the State of Washington authorized funds to begin a marine spatial planning process off of Washington’s coast. It would be interesting to look into a case study as it is being implemented and would offer the opportunity to be more involved in the process. Washington would be an interesting comparative case study because of the similar topography, ocean users, and culture of the two states.

## 7.0 References

---

- Bailey, R. J. (1997). The Oregon Ocean Resources Management Program: a State-level Ocean Management Initiative. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 205-224.
- Bassett, J. (2006, April 2). *Choices that created the Oregon mystique: governor Tome McCall's foresight and accomplishments*. Retrieved December 4, 2012, from <http://www.govoregon.org/beachbilltext.html>
- Beck, F. M., Kachmar, M. J., K.K, & and others. (2009). *Best Practices for Marine Spatial Planning: Workshop report*. Arlington: The Nature Conservancy.
- Berke, P. R., Godschalk, D. R., Kaiser, E. J., & Rodriguez, D. A. (2006). *Urban Land Use Planning: Fifth Edition*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Cicin-Sain, B., & Knecht, R. (1998). *Integrated Coastal and Ocean Management: Concepts and Practices*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.
- Council on Environmental Quality. (n.d.). *The White House*. Retrieved from National Ocean Policy Implementation Plan: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ceq/initiatives/oceans>
- Dalal-Clayton, B., & Sadler, B. (2005). *Strategic Environmental Assessment: A Sourcebook and Reference Guide to International Experience*. Sterling: Earthscan.
- Department of Land Conservation and Development. (2010). *Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines*. Salem: State of Oregon. Retrieved December 5, 2012, from <http://www.oregon.gov/lcd/pages/goals.aspx>
- Department of Land Conservation and Development. (2013). *Part Five: Use of the Territorial Sea for the Development of Renewable Energy Facilities or Other Related Structure, Equipment or Facilities*. Salem: State of Oregon.
- Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs. (2009). *Massachusetts Ocean Management Plan Volume 1: Management and Administration*. Boston: The Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
- Godschalk, D. R. (1992). Implementing Coastal Zone Management: 1972-1990. *Coastal Management*, 93-116.
- Hamilton, J. D. (2004). Competing and Converging Values of Public Participation: A Case Study of Participant Views in Department of Energy Nuclear Weapons Cleanup. In S. P. Depoe, J. W. Delicath, & M.-F. A. Elsenbeer, *Communication and Public Participation in Environmental Decision Making* (pp. 59-82). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hout, E. (1990). Ocean Policy Development in the State of Oregon. *Coastal Management*, 255-266.

- Innes, J. E., & Booher, D. E. (2010). *Planning with Complexity: An introduction to collaborative rationality for public policy*. London, New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Kalo, J. J., Hildreth, R. G., & Christie, D. R. (2007). *Coastal and Ocean Law Cases and Materials: Third Edition*. St. Paul: Thomson/West.
- Kinsella, W. J. (2004). Public Expertise: A Foundation for Citizen Participation in Energy and Environmental Decisions. In S. P. Depoe, J. W. Delicath, & M.-F. A. Elsenbeer, *Communication and Public Participation in Environmental Decision Making* (pp. 83-95). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kitzhaber, J. A. (2012). *A Citizen's Guide to the Territorial Sea Plan Amendment Process*. Salem: State of Oregon.
- Margerum, R. D. (2011). *Beyond Consensus: Improving Collaborative Planning and Management*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press.
- National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration Coastal Services Center. (2011, January/February). *Coastal Services*. Retrieved May 2, 2013, from Marine Spatial Planning: Rhode Island Puts Its Unique SAMP on Ocean Management: <http://www.csc.noaa.gov/magazine/2011/01/article2.html>
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (n.d.). *Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning*. Retrieved from Ocean Policy Task Force: <http://www.cmsp.noaa.gov/>
- Obama, B. (2010, July 19). *The White House*. Retrieved from Executive Order 13547 -- Stewardship of the Ocean, Our Coasts and the Great Lakes: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/executive-order-stewardship-ocean-our-coasts-and-great-lakes>
- Oregon Coast Visitor's Association. (2013). *Oregon The People's Coast*. Retrieved from <http://visittheoregoncoast.com/>
- Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development. (2013, January). *Oregon Coastal Management Program*. Retrieved from Part Five: Use of the Territorial Sea for the Development of Renewable Energy Facilities or Other Related Structures, Equipment or Facilities: [http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP/Pages/Ocean\\_TSP.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP/Pages/Ocean_TSP.aspx)
- Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development. (n.d.). *Partnerships and Innovation: Oregon Coastal Management Program*. Salem: Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development.
- Oregon Legislative Assembly. (2012). Chapter 196 - Columbia River Gorge; Ocean Resource Planning; Wetlands; Removal and Fill. *196.438 Ocean Policy Advisory Council; members term of office; quorum*. Salem: State of Oregon.



- Oregon State University Institute for Natural Resources. (2011). *The Oregon Coastal and Marine Data Network Workshop: Workshop Summary*. Salem: Institute for Natural Resources.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2006). *Applying Strategic Environmental Assessment: Good practice guidance for development co-operation*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Partidario, M. R., & Clark, R. (2000). Introduction. In M. R. Partidario, & R. Clark, *Perspectives on Strategic Environmental Assessment* (pp. 1-11). Boca Raton, London, New York, Washington D.C.: Lewis Publishers.
- Reder, B. (2011). *Approaches to Coastal Management: a case study of territorial sea planning in Oregon*. Eugene: University of Oregon.
- Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council. (n.d.). *Rhode Island Ocean Special Area Management Plan*. Retrieved from OceanSAMP:  
<http://seagrant.gso.uri.edu/oceansamp/index.html>
- Senecah, S. L. (2004). The Trinity of Voice: The Role of Practical Theory in Planning and Evaluating the Effectiveness of Environmental Participatory Processes. In S. P. Depoe, J. W. Delicath, & M.-F. A. Elsenbeer, *Communication and Public Participation in Environmental Decision Making* (pp. 13-34). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- State of Oregon. (2013, January). *Oregon Ocean Information: A Resource for Planning in the Territorial Sea*. Retrieved from Public Meetings of the Territorial Sea Planning Process:  
<http://www.oregonocean.info/>
- State of Oregon. (n.d.). *Oregon Coastal Management Program*. Retrieved December 5, 2012, from  
[http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP/pages/ocean\\_tsp.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP/pages/ocean_tsp.aspx)
- State of Oregon. (n.d.). *Oregon Coastal Management Program*. Retrieved from Oregon Ocean Resources Management Plan: [http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP/pages/ocean\\_plan.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP/pages/ocean_plan.aspx)
- State of Oregon. (n.d.). *Oregon Department of Energy: Renewable Energy*. Retrieved from A Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) for Oregon:  
[http://www.oregon.gov/ENERGY/RENEW/Pages/RPS\\_home.aspx](http://www.oregon.gov/ENERGY/RENEW/Pages/RPS_home.aspx)
- State of Oregon. (n.d.). *Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development*. Retrieved from Statewide Planning Goals: <http://www.oregon.gov/lcd/pages/goals.aspx>
- Swedeen, P., Batker, D., Radtke, H., Boumans, R., & Willer, C. (2008). *An Ecological Economics Approach to Understanding Oregon's Coastal Economy and Environment*. Tacoma: Earth Economics.
- Tuerck, D. G., Head, M., & Bachman, P. (2011). *Economic Impact of Oregon's Renewable Portfolio Standard*. Portland: The Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University and Cascade Policy Institute.

United States Department of Energy. (2010, May 5). *Federal Energy Management Program*. Retrieved from Energy Policy Act of 2005:  
<http://www1.eere.energy.gov/femp/regulations/epact2005.html>

United States Government. (2005, August 8). Energy Policy Act. *Public Law 109-58*. Washington D.C.: United States Government.

United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution Udall Foundation. (2011). *Principles for Stakeholder Involvement in Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning*. Tucson: United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution Udall Foundation.

Wondolleck, J. M., & Yaffee, S. L. (2000). *Making Collaboration Work: Lessons from Innovation in Natural Resource Management*. Washington D.C. and Covelo: Island Press.