

**Ocean Governance, Coastal Zone Management and Resource Coordination:
Multiple Perspectives Panel
Northwest Regional Meeting
Seattle, Washington
June 12-14, 2002**

Please note: Ms. Nan Evans the former Manager of the Ocean-Coastal Resource Management Program at the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development has moved onto another position. She originally appeared before the Commission at its June 2002 meeting in Seattle. As a follow-up to that presentation, the Commission posed several questions to Ms. Evans. The answers to those questions were provided to the Commission by Robert J. Bailey, the current Manager of the Ocean-Coastal Resource Management Program.

1. Your reference to the need for an Ocean Resources Management Act has been suggested often. Can you offer suggestions on the specific elements and activities that would be included in such an act?

- a.) Policy guidance (e.g. national policies and objectives for ocean resource use, conservation, protection;
- b.) Programmatic /Governance structure for meeting the policies and objectives (e.g. lead agency or oversight body, advisory councils, role of various agencies and states, regional mechanisms, etc); and
- c.) Process directives (deadlines of various sorts, procedural mechanisms at national and regional levels, etc).

Specifically, we believe that

- region-scale governance mechanisms are necessary to account for the great differences among major ocean/coastal regions of the US, and that these should be related to Large Marine Ecosystems;
- states should be principal participants on behalf of management of activities and resources within “coastal ocean” regions; and
- scientific research and monitoring must be geared to supporting region-scale governance mechanisms.

2. What is your opinion of an organic Federal statute that would provide overarching guidance to Federal agencies to help develop and guide a national ocean policy?

We welcome that step...not unlike the Forest Service’s organic act.

3. What are the key principles (e.g., precautionary approach, ecosystem management, sustainable development, biodiversity) that should be used to guide activities impacting marine waters and should there be a hierarchy among these principles? Should the precautionary approach be given paramount attention over

economic considerations when evaluating the appropriateness of new activities of which the impacts on marine ecosystems and resources are uncertain, and, if so, why?

The “precautionary approach” is desirable but should be expressed differently: the key principle in Oregon's ocean program is the “To conserve marine resources and ecological functions for the purpose of providing long-term ecological, economic, and social value and benefits to future generations.”

That cannot be achieved without being “precautionary,” but it is more explicit.

I have attached a copy of our statewide planning goal for ocean resources. You will note that virtually all of the big-scale principles, above, are either explicitly or implicitly included. These are necessary to create the ethic of long-term sustainable use. Otherwise, we are on a one-way track to ocean destruction.

4. What are the strengths and weakness of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) and is it a viable model that can be expanded to help implement a national ocean policy for all Federal waters?

The CZMA is strong because it accounts for the highly detailed nuances and situations at the state and local level, and provides a mechanism for applying federal policy in a locally-acceptable manner. The CZMA is weak because it includes so many state programs that do not require a lot of conservation or stewardship accountability from states and local governments. There are no specific management targets or standards. There is no systematic approach to protections on a broad regional or ecosystem basis. Ocean protection/conservation **MUST** account for the ocean as it exists... long time scales, broad geography, complex processes, and a certain level of un-knowableness.