

2017

# Informing Oregon's Marine Protected Area (MPA) Baseline Past and Present Tribal Uses of Marine Resources

Sabra Marie TallChief Comet  
*Portland State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/mem\\_gradprojects](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/mem_gradprojects)

 Part of the Environmental Health and Protection Commons, Environmental Monitoring Commons, and the Water Resource Management Commons

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

## Recommended Citation

Comet, Sabra Marie TallChief, "Informing Oregon's Marine Protected Area (MPA) Baseline Past and Present Tribal Uses of Marine Resources" (2017). *Environmental Science and Management Professional Master's Project Reports*. 27.  
[https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/mem\\_gradprojects/27](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/mem_gradprojects/27)  
<https://doi.org/10.15760/mem.9>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Environmental Science and Management Professional Master's Project Reports by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

Informing Oregon's Marine Protected Area (MPA) Baseline  
Past and Present Tribal Uses of Marine Resources

by

Sabra Marie TallChief Comet

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Master of Environmental Management

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Max Nielsen-Pincus

Dr. Elise Granek

Dr. Thomas Swearingen

Portland State University

2017

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements:	6
Abstract:	7
Chapter 1: Project Introduction	8
Overview	8
Study Area	9
Research Questions	12
Why is this important?	12
Chapter Summaries	13
References:	15
Chapter 2: Tribal Member Interview Narratives of Coastal Species Use	17
Abstract	17
Introduction	18
Methods	26
Participants	26
Interviews	27
Confidentiality	29
Results/Discussion	30
TRIBAL MEMBER FAMILIARITY WITH MR/MPA OUTREACH	30
TRIBAL MEMBER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MARINE RESERVES	31
COSTAL & MARINE SPECIES USE BY TRIBAL MEMBERS	32
COASTAL & MARINE POPULATION/HABITAT CHANGE	37
Changes in habitats/species	37
Regulations/Impetus for Change	39
Fisheries/collapse	41
TRIBAL MEMBER EXPERIENCES WITH ENFORCEMENT OF “TAKE” REGULATIONS	43
Oregon Fish and Wildlife Outreach and Legal Limitations	43
Conclusion	45
References	48
Chapter 3: Spatial Distribution of Tribal Marine and Coastal Species on the Oregon Coast	50
Abstract	50
Introduction	51
Methods	59
Study Area	59
PGIS Approach	59

Confidentiality .....	62
Results.....	62
TRIBAL USE AND MR/MPA OVERLAP.....	66
Cape Falcon .....	67
Cascade Head.....	70
Otter Rock.....	72
Cape Perpetua .....	74
HOTSPOTS OF TRIBAL USE OF MARINE AND COASTAL SPECIES .....	78
Species-specific hotspots .....	79
Culturally Important Species .....	80
Coquille Indian Tribe .....	85
Siletz Indian Tribe.....	87
CTCLUSI.....	91
OVERLAP BETWEEN TRIBAL USE AND NON-MR/MPA.....	94
Discussion.....	95
References.....	98
Chapter 4: Techniques for natural resource practitioners to productively engage with tribes .....	101
Abstract.....	101
Introduction.....	102
Step 1: Deciding whether to engage a tribe .....	105
Step 2: Timing of Outreach.....	107
Step 3: Before Contact .....	108
Cultural Sensitivity During Tribal Engagement .....	109
Conclusion .....	111
References.....	112
APPENDIX A .....	115
APPENDIX B .....	125
APPENDIX C .....	127
APPENDIX D .....	131
APPENDIX E .....	143
APPENDIX F.....	146
APPENDIX G .....	164

# Table of Figures

## Chapter 2

Fig. 2.1: Oregon marine reserves .....	23
Fig. 2.2: Species saturation by interview .....	36

## Chapter 3

Fig. 3.1: Oregon marine reserves .....	57
Fig. 3.2: Tribal resource use .....	67
Fig. 3.3: Cape Falcon.....	69
Fig. 3.4: Cascade Head.....	71
Fig. 3.5: Otter Rock .....	73
Fig. 3.6: Cape Perpetua.....	75
Fig. 3.7: Redfish Rocks.....	77
Fig. 3.8: All tribal marine/coastal species use.....	79
Fig. 3.9: Rockfish density.....	81
Fig. 3.10: Clam density.....	82
Fig. 3.11: Seaweed/algae density.....	83
Fig. 3.12: Perch density.....	84
Fig. 3.13: Coquille tribe species use bar chart.....	86
Fig. 3.14: Coquille tribe all species density.....	87
Fig. 3.15: Siletz tribe species use bar chart.....	88
Fig. 3.16: Siletz tribe locator map.....	89
Fig. 3.17: Siletz tribe detailed maps.....	90
Fig. 3.18: CTCLUSI tribe species use bar chart.....	91
Fig. 3.19: CTCLUSI tribe locator map.....	92
Fig. 3.20: CTCLUSI tribe detailed maps.....	93

## Chapter 4

Fig. 4.1: Infographic.....	104
----------------------------	-----

## Appendix F

Fig. 1A: Lamprey use.....	146
Fig. 2A: Salmon use.....	147
Fig. 3A: Starry Flounder use.....	148

Fig. 4A: Bass use.....	149
Fig. 5A: Flatfish use.....	150
Fig. 6A: Smelt & herring use.....	151
Fig. 7A: Greenling use.....	152
Fig. 8A: Sturgeon use.....	153
Fig. 9A: Common crab use.....	154
Fig. 10A: Other crab use.....	155
Fig. 11A: Olivella use.....	155
Fig. 12A: Mussel use.....	156
Fig. 13A: Large mollusk.....	157
Fig. 14A: Echinoderm use.....	158
Fig. 15A: Beach shrimp.....	159
Fig. 16A: Shrimp use.....	160
Fig. 17A: Barnacle use.....	161
Fig. 18A: Oyster use.....	162
Fig. 19A: Seagrass use.....	163

## Table of Tables

### **Chapter 1**

Table 1.1: Legislation for creation/implementation of Oregon MR/MPAs .....	10
--	----

### **Chapter 2**

Table 2.1: Frequency of species groups.....	36
---	----

### **Chapter 3**

Table 3.1: Geographic region of ancestral bands/tribes of interview participants .....	66
--	----

### **Chapter 4**

Table 4.1: Categories of tribes .....	115
---------------------------------------	-----

### **Appendix B**

Table 1A: Regional and alternate species names .....	126-127
--	---------

### **Appendix C**

Table 2A: Frequency of species use.....	128-132
---	---------

## Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank the following, without whom this project would not have been possible: my committee, Dr. Max Nielsen Pincus (Portland State University), Dr. Elise Granek (Portland State University), and Dr. Tommy Swearingen (Oregon Fish and Wildlife Department); Oregon Sea Grant for funding the project; the staff and members of the participating tribes; Samantha Hamlin, Barbara Moreland, and Cody Evers (Portland State University) for re-training in GIS; both graduate labs, my MEM cohort, and all the others who have given input since this project's infancy.

## **Abstract:**

Oregon implemented a series of marine reserves from 2012 through the beginning of 2016 that will be evaluated in 2023. As part of that evaluation, several studies are focusing on the impact of the reserves on coastal communities. This project focused on tribal members with ancestral territory on the Oregon coast. Tribal members from three tribes, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, the Coquille Indian Tribe, and the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians were interviewed for this project. The interviews centered around two themes: 1) past and present use of marine and coastal species, and 2) experiences and opinions about the implementation and policies of Oregon's marine reserves. A mapping exercise in which tribal members marked where they gathered species was performed concurrently with the interviews. Shared patterns in the interview narratives around changes in plant/animal populations, habitats, and land uses are the focus on Chapter 2. Spatial information from the mapping exercise is the focus of Chapter 3. Chapter 4 briefly introduces techniques for efficiently engaging with tribes on resource management projects, using this project as the example application for the techniques. Over 150 species were reported by 28 participants in 23 interviews, and the areas marked during the mapping exercise covered over 12,000 square kilometers. Several trends were corroborated across interviews, including the timing of two smelt populations, and the crash and slow recovery of the Starry Flounder. There was traditional/subsistence use reported in areas overlapping four of the five marine reserves in Oregon, although some of the activity had stopped well before the implementation of the reserves. The majority of participants were in favor of the existence of marine reserves, but had a variety of suggestions for changes to the implementation and policy.

This document contains culturally sensitive indigenous knowledge that is not available for full public access. If you wish access to the full article please contact the primary author at [ttallcomet@gmail.com](mailto:ttallcomet@gmail.com) to discuss appropriate usage of the data.