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Scoping Comment input
- Members ranked top 10 priorities
- Matrix created
- Rough Analysis
  - total rank value assigned
  - number of members
Scoping Comment input

- Secondary Analysis
  - where were mixed votes (do vs. don’t)
  - where were natural breaks
  - strength of ranking
Process

Scoping Comment input

- Tertiary Analysis
  - review of comments
  - identification of problematic input
  - assignment of green, yellow and red
Results

Assignment of rank

• Green
  – high ranking value
  – high number of members ranking
  – comments reflect a consensus
  – high public interest
Assignment of rank

• Red
  – low or no ranking value
  – low or no number of members ranking
  – lower public interest
Results

Assignment of rank

• Yellow
  – median ranking value
  – difference of member opinion
  – mixed or medium public interest
Assumptions by staff

– Move forward to assess green items
– Red items are low importance to AC
– Yellow items require more AC input
Meeting Exercise

• “Quick check” by members
• Prioritization of discussion order
• Quick overview on items
• Member discussion
  – new green / red items
  – need more information (workshop)
Moving Forward

Staff assessment

• “First take” exercise completed
• Run AC recommendations through developed criteria
• Staff identify items to undertake
• AC responds / participates
Moving forward

Threshold question:

• Does the ONMS have the institutional responsibility and/or authority to address this issue?
Moving forward

Criteria 1 – Site Benefits

• Does this have positive site benefits to natural resources/ecosystem, cultural resources, habitat protection, protection of biodiversity, or resolving user conflicts?
Criteria 2 – Urgency

• Is the issue/problem adversely impacting resources, persistent, getting worse with time/deteriorating, increasing in frequency, wide spatial extent, non-reversible.
Criteria 3 – Feasibility

• Do we have the necessary people resources/skills, money/funding, infrastructure, and technical capability.
Moving forward

Criteria 4 – Level of Effort

• What is the level of effort required to address an issue? How much time and how many people will be required to accomplish this task?
Criteria 5 – Agency Best Fit

• Who is the best agency or group to address an issue? Is MBNMS the only entity who can cover this issue or are we duplicating effort?
Meeting tasks

Q&A on Process

AC discussion on yellow items