

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, April 22, 2015 9:30 am – 3:30pm

Location: Port of Grays Harbor Commissioners Chambers, 111 S. Wooding St. Aberdeen, WA

9:15 a.m. Coffee and Treats: Breakfast refreshments will be served at 9:15. Please come early to enjoy them. The meeting will start promptly at 9:30 a.m.

Time	Agenda Item (Action items are marked with "I")	Objective (Information, Discussion, Action?)	Presenter(s)
9:30	Welcome & Introductions, Agenda Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome by Chair Garrett Dalan Introductions, including coastal updates Review of agenda Adopt summary of February meeting Public Comment 	Information <i>Reference Materials:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agenda Draft Meeting Summary 	Garrett Dalan Susan Gulick
10:15	MSP Overview & Use Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of MSP Outline and Process: Where we are and where we are going Overview of Use Analysis Process 	Information, Discussion <i>Reference Materials:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion Guide Condensed Plan Outline 	Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology
11:00	Coastal Economic Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation by Cascade Economics 	Information, Discussion	Mike Taylor, Cascade Economics
12:00	Lunch Break		
12:30	Marine and Rail Oil Transport Study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation by Ecology Clarifying Questions Discussion with WCMAC 	Information, Discussion <i>Reference Materials:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fact Sheet 	Dave Byers, Ecology
1:30	Ecologically Important Areas Analysis (Part 2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation by WDFW Clarifying Questions Discussion with WCMAC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WCMAC Feedback Next Steps 	Information, Discussion	Michele Culver, Corey Niles, and John Pierce, WDFW
2:30	Conservation District Liaisons <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss option of supporting WA Association of Conservation Districts Resolution or inviting representatives of the WA State Conservation Commission or WACD to be liaisons to WCMAC 	Discussion <i>Reference Materials:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> WACD Resolution Statements from WACD and WCC 	

2:45	Updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Plan • Technical Committee Update/Data Viewer • MRAC (Ocean Acidification Panel) • MSP Projects Status Report 	Information <i>Reference Materials:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Updated Work Plan</i> • <i>TC Report</i> • <i>Data List</i> • <i>Project Status Report</i> 	Susan Gulick/WCMAC Members
3:15	Upcoming Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda Topics for Next Meeting • Reminder of Dates and Times for Future Meetings 	Information	Susan Gulick
3:20	Public Comment	Information	Public/Observers
3:30	Adjourn		Garrett Dalan

Upcoming Meetings

- June 24, 2015
- September 23, 2015

Meetings will be held in Aberdeen unless otherwise noted

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

AGENDA

Wednesday, February 25th, 2015 9:30 am – 3:30pm

Location: Port of Grays Harbor Commissioners Chambers, 111 S. Wooding St. Aberdeen, WA

Council Members Present	
Casey Dennehy, Recreation	Michal Rechner, DNR (phone)
Carol Everst, Wahkiakum MRC	Michele Culver, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing	Miles Batchelder, WA Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership
David Fluharty, Educational Institution	Penny Dalton, WA SeaGrant
Doug Kess, Pacific MRC	Randy Kline, WA State Parks
Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC	Ray Toste, Commercial Fishing
Jeff Ward, Coastal Energy	RD Grunbaum, Conservation
Julie Horowitz, Governor's Office (phone)	Rich Osborne, Science
Marc Horton, Ports	Rod Fleck, N. Pacific MRC
Mark Cedergreen, Recreational Fishing	Sally Toteff, Dept. of Ecology
Mark Plackett, Citizen	Steve Sewell, Department of Commerce

Council Members Absent	
Alla Weinstein, Energy Industry	Charles Costanzo, Shipping
Brian Sheldon, Shellfish Aquaculture	

Liaisons Present	
Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe	

Others Present	
Bridget Trosin, WA Sea Grant	Kelsey Gianou, Ecology
Corey Niles, WDFW	Libby Whiting, DNR
Faith Eldwood, Pacific County	Michael Gornmen Cornman, Westport Seafood
Gus Gates, Surfrider Foundation	Mike Nordin, PCMRC, PCD
Jennifer Hagen, Quileute Tribe	Rick Lovely
Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology (WCMAC Staff)	Scott Pearson, WDFW
Jessi Doerpinghaus, WDFW	Shannon Davies, TRG
John Pierce, WDFW	Tim Crose, Pacific Co
Katie Wrubel, Makah Office of Marine Affairs	Dana Golden, Cascadia Consulting, Note-taker
Katrina Lassiter, DNR	Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions, Facilitator

1. Welcome and Introductions

Garrett Dalan welcomed everyone to the meeting. He noted that there are now microphones to make it easier for people to hear. Garrett also said that starting this meeting there would be a distinct period for clarifying questions followed by an opportunity for broader discussion.

Announcements:

- Casey Dennehy: There will be a forum of coastal MRC leadership and the Northwest Straits Initiative to talk with state senators and representatives. There will be a focus on ocean acidification and marine debris.
- Doug Kess: Pacific County is in the middle of an SMP update with their science conference coming up May 14th.
- Dale Beasley: The fisherman poets meeting will be held in Astoria this weekend.
- Mark Cedergreen: We have been busy in the Legislature, and North of Falcon Salmon setting season starts next week.
- Penny Dalton: In the throws of proposals for research next year. Sea Grant is working on a pilot program for workforce development. Also the 23rd annual Shellfish Growers Conference in Alderbrook.
- Dave Fluharty: <http://www.openchannels.org> has over 100 webinars that discuss marine spatial planning. It could be a good resource for this group.
- Carol Ervest: We are doing a pinniped count and finishing up with our fish preservation training.
- Sally Toteff: The Department of Ecology responded to an oily water discharge on February 14th. Recovery work from the January floods and landslides is ongoing. The Department of Ecology is working on requirements to reduce the risk of crude oil, trains, and pipelines.
- Michele Culver: A new director at WDFW started on the first of February. The new director is making a point to visit all of the regions. Phil Anderson is still working part time, mostly on salmon and state-tribal issues.
- Randy Kline: There is a proposed Washington Administrative Code Update to allow for the use of wind powered vehicles on beaches.
- RD: There is a bill in the legislature that would allow hunting in state parks.
- Mark Plackett: There are a number of events coming up. Chocolate on the Beach and the Razor Clam Festival at the end of March.
- Rod Fleck: We are working on the completion of the Rainforest Arts Center, with the grand opening on April 14th. There is also a coastal cleanup on April 25th.
- Julie Horowitz: The WCMAC work is important to Governor Inslee. JT Austin has a broad portfolio of things she is working on, so Julie has been asked to be the governor's point person with the WCMAC. She will be engaging actively with the WCMAC, and communicating with the Governor's office regarding areas where she does not have expertise.
- Garrett Dalan: There is a competition for a concept of a sustainable coastal business. There will be a 3-day intensive business development course at the end of July. More information is available at wacoastworks.org.
- The public attendees introduced themselves. Susan Gulick reviewed the Agenda.

2. Adopt summary of January Meeting

! The January Meeting Summary was adopted with no objections.

Public Comment:

- Michael Cornma~~en~~ of Westport Seafood: Thank you for your contribution. I am a business owner, and part of that is recognizing each individual's influence. There are a lot of different things coming our way. This group can think about what's our purpose, why are we really here? One purpose of your council is to share information. Keep in mind that some of the things you make recommendations on will affect my business. Mike passed out RCW 43.143.30 and RCW 43.143.60 and continued his comments:
- For RCW 43.143.30 I'm concerned about the impacts mentioned in (e). Look at the criteria you have been charged with.
- For RCW 43.143.60, look at why you're really here. We have \$4 billion in revenue from commercial fishing, \$1.5 million from recreational fishing. You need to consider the livelihoods of people who live on the coast.

Ecologically Important Areas Analysis

Michele Culver provided an update on WDFW's work on the ecologically important areas project.

The project is part of the legislative mandate for the plan that includes developing ecosystem indicators and identification of ecologically significant/important areas. The update included a proposed methodology and an outline of where they are in the process of identifying and mapping ecologically important areas.

John Pierce and Corey Niles, scientists working on the project, presented their approaches.

Next Steps/Timeline

- Feb 25th EIA Briefing at WCMAC Work Session
- Mid-March State/Tribal EIA Technical meeting
- April 22nd EIA Briefing at WCMAC Work Session
- April 29-May 1 state tribal policy meeting
- June 1 – Draft EIA report for tribal policy and technical review
- June 15 - Comments due to WDFW
- June 30 - Final EIA report and maps due

Clarifying Questions

- Rich Osborne: Is the hexagon grid being used by anyone else? Can you generate a latitude/longitude layer?
 - The same hexagon grid will be used for the recreational use study and the Use Analysis. Yes, a latitude/longitude layer could be developed.
- Mark Plackett: It's really important to keep track of data gaps as you discover them. Are you interfacing with the Shoreline Management Plan?
 - We are working with our shoreline planner to make sure that local governments are aware of the data as they are available, so they can be included in those processes. The timing doesn't always work out for the data to be included.
- There is a gap in the rocky habitat where the trawl data doesn't go.

- This is version one, new information can be incorporated as it is available.
- Jeff Ward: Do you have a working definition of “crucial” habitat”. It sounds close to critical, but it may matter what crucial means.
 - We do not yet have a working definition.
- Would you be concerned about how the public would interpret the overlay of energy suitability and high importance crucial habitat?
 - Yes, there is concern that simplified decisions could be made.
- Casey Dennehy: You should include whale migration routes.
 - This is one of the things that the NOAA team is modeling and mapping, but it won't be available until the end of June. We will do our best to incorporate it.
- Dave Fluharty: I'm hoping that you can incorporate more information on the dynamics of essential fish habitat. Where are the important areas for productivity and connectivity? That will be important for tradeoff decisions.
 - We are conscious of that, and the approach we are using is where animals spend the most time. The map can't draw those links, but to the extent we can we will make those connections in the narrative.
- Doug Kess: In the kelp model, what if there is a new area of very high production or a persisting forest that is dying off. That wouldn't be accurately reflected.
 - In the map even the lowest kelp is of medium importance. More could be done in terms of persistence and annual variation.
- Dale Beasley: I didn't see anything about Dungeness crab in your presentation. Have you identified spawning areas?
 - Fishery data doesn't get at spawning areas and where they settle out. If there are maps of spawning areas we would like to see them. That is a gap but that information is not available that we know of.
- Rod Fleck: You need to be careful about the way that this gets used. You need to make recommendations about what the type of application materials someone in those areas should have up front, rather than zone them out of being considered.
 - Michele Culver: We're not proposing any recommendations out of this project, just proposing information. We will present information to the WCMAC, and the WCMAC will make recommendations.
- Katie Krueger: Is there a schedule or funding for updating this information?
 - There is no funding for future updates identified right now. We are hoping that there will be.
 - Jennifer Hennessey: The plan requires an adaptive management strategy. Once we have a framework in place, it will be easier to update.

Discussion

- Mark Plackett: It seems really important to have the salmon and albacore data included in there.
 - Yes, we are planning to add as much as we can.
- RD Grunbaum: You said that estuaries are high value. Is there any discussion about the interaction of the estuaries and potential for collapse if something happens on the coast?
 - We can't model it or put it in map but it will be included in comments.

- Dave Fluharty: We need to determine seasonality. Are uses consistent, static, and to what extent are they vulnerable or sensitive. We have to get to the point that we are looking at this from an ecosystem perspective.
- Rich Osborne: I want to emphasize what I'm hearing from most people. It's a good methodology given the data you have. Once we have all of the data gaps, then maybe we need another round on BAS science that is not based on data but based on experts, based on knowledge, and based on seasonality. If we go forward with too many holes we'll make some mistakes.
 - Michele Culver: We tried to not be duplicative. We are looking at NOAA's data, NWFSC's integrated ecosystem assessment, and the seafloor mapping exercise. The challenge is how to bring all of this together to get the best possible view of the ecosystem.
- Penny Dalton: Why is the same decision about the estuary importance not being made for the coastal strip?
 - The data shows just the groundfish starting at 50 meters. Most of the nearshore data is on seabirds. There is no groundfish data for the nearshore.
 - Michele: The next step is to overlay the fish and wildlife data.
- Jeff Ward: What you're doing is important. It's a point of departure for other questions like ecological connectivity.
- When you aggregate these maps, you could probably produce a map of which areas are economically valuable.
- Dale Beasley: What about invertebrates?
 - We aren't aware of anything in the nearshore where we could map benthic creatures, but if you have ideas let us know.
- Sally Toteff: This is the best work we've been able to do so far. It's a first step, there are gaps, but we have to get started together. It's been a very productive conversation.
- Mark Plackett: I really appreciate the transparency. It's important to know the rules by which the map is made.
- Jennifer Hennessey: Alongside the development of the plan, we are doing a programmatic SEPA process that will be a more formal mechanism for establishing best available science used in the plan, including documenting the ecosystem processes and context in addition to specific analyses such as the EIA.
- Dave Fluharty: We should think of this as a decision support tool, not a decision making tool.
- Randy Kline: The regulatory context for a document like this is like a government comprehensive plan. It's a policy document not a regulatory document.
 - While it is a policy document, think about how it may play out in a regulatory context
- Ray Toste: With bird migration, the wrong thing in the wrong place would be really disruptive.
- Jeff Ward: We are going to have very detailed maps and a very long plan come out of this. We need to get to key socioeconomic, cultural, and ecological factors that are important to the WCMAC in determining if a potential new use is acceptable. A new use needs to look at whether it would improve, denigrate, or not change each of the three attributes. This is a product that is not one thing; it's a description of how to go forward.

4. Renewable Energy As a Potential New Use

Kelsey Gianou presented her research to date on renewable energy as a potential new use. She is in the middle of an in depth literature review. She invited anyone to send her information or resources that would add to her review.

Questions and Comments:

- Is there potential for solar in the ocean?
 - Not that I'm aware of.
- Is there any reason you couldn't use the energy at the site?
 - Jennifer Hennessey: There are some offshore desalinization plants that are being proposed in mostly arid areas, which would generate and use power on site.
- ~~Alla Weinstein thought that conditions for wind farms might be better here than in Coos Bay.~~ Where would the best place for wind energy be?
 - Jeff: Currently most information comes from wind map models. PNNL is putting out buoys to collect real time information on speed and direction. We're currently working from uncertain predictions.
- Mark Plackett – there's a doctor that put up a turbine in ocean shores – he thought he could pay for his own electricity. It did not work out for him.
- Dale Beasley: Gray's Harbor is currently already meeting its renewable energy standards. Pacific County doesn't have to meet it, and I'm not sure about the other counties. I'm curious what the efficiency of area per kilowatt hour is for these different technologies.
 - Jeff: We don't know that here yet. There's also a difference between the footprint and the exclusion area.

Susan Gulick: In the survey of WCMAC members, people wanted more information on permitting in a written briefing report. That information is in your packet and was emailed do you. It won't be discussed during WCMAC time, but it is a resource as part of this process.

The WCMAC broke into 4 small groups to share perspectives related to renewable energy. They compiled a list of potential conflicts, compatibilities and benefits, and places where more information is needed. *A summary of their input is provided below.*

Marine Renewable Energy Small Group Discussion

Potential Conflicts

- *Space Use*
 - *Potential impact on current uses including commercial and recreational fishing, and shipping*
 - *Exclusion zones impact current uses*
 - *New devices complicate navigation and decrease safety*
- *Environmental*
 - *Unknown consequences on marine resources*
 - *Impacts of a stationary structure introduced in the marine environment are not fully understood*
 - *Unknown wind energy device impacts on birds and bats*
 - *Anchoring causes damage to the substrate*
 - *Potential compounding effects of climate change*

- *Unknown ecosystem impacts*
- *Potential changes in sediment transport and wave action*
- *Economic*
 - *Using government resources on something that is not feasible*
 - *Visual impacts may have effects on tourism and recreation*
 - *Taxes are based on a broader tax range*
 - *Net impacts on jobs*
- *Technology*
 - *Transmission lines need to connect to the grid*
 - *The resource is inconsistent and unreliable*
 - *Devices are subject to catastrophic events*
- *Social*
 - *Potential visual and aesthetic impacts on a culturally important place*
 - *Potential legal complications*

Compatibilities/Benefits

- *Environmental*
 - *Improvement of air quality*
 - *Decreased carbon output*
 - *Aggregation of fish and marine life around devices*
 - *Monitoring and initial studies may help improve data and the understanding of marine resources*
- *Economic*
 - *Increase in local community energy independence and reliance on a local source*
 - *Diversify energy portfolio and decrease Washington's dependence on fossil fuels*
 - *Aggregation of fish around devices provides a potential opportunity for fishing*
 - *Support an efficient use of space if multiple uses are permitted together*
 - *Create multiple new industries with each new use (piggy back industries)*
 - *Support an efficient use of space for aquaculture yield*
 - *May lower the cost of energy per kilowatt*
 - *Opportunity for jobs and economic activities*
- *Social*
 - *Search and rescue operations may improve*
 - *Support sustainable ocean energy*

Data/Information Needs

- *How would the established tax base impact local communities?*
- *What is the process for establishing exclusion zones?*
- *Where does geothermal energy fit into the energy portfolio?*
- *Social*
 - *How are current activities impacted?*

- *What do communities of current wind projects say about their project and the true benefits/compatibilities of the project?*
- *What are the legal ramifications (especially regarding tribal rights)?*
- *Planning/Permitting*
 - *What are the tradeoffs between onshore and offshore wind energy?*
 - *Will marine renewable energy ban fishing from an area?*
- *Technology*
 - *Are some technologies more compatible to other uses (especially fishing)?*
 - *What is the process for removing turbines?*
 - *What is the production efficiency of various devices (area used per KW hour produced)?*
 - *What are maintenance costs of various devices?*
 - *What are the potential sizes and scales of energy projects?*
 - *What infrastructure is needed?*
- *Economic*
 - *If subsidies are removed from the equation, is the new use economically feasible?*
 - *What are the economic impacts to local communities?*
 - *What is the net impact to jobs?*
 - *Do seasonal or temporary jobs replace full time jobs?*
 - *Where is the power going?*
- *Environmental*
 - *What do studies say about the impact on fish and birds?*
 - *What do studies say about the impact on marine habitat?*
 - *Are there better resource locations than Washington's coast?*
 - *How might sediment transport change? What do those changes mean for marine resources?*

Comments and Questions

- *Moving sediment from one location to another can affect beach nourishment (chemically and physically) and impact marine life and recreation.*
- *Oil and gas should be included in this analysis.*
- *Doug Kess: Clearly we can't get answers to all of these questions. I think the point of this is to develop a general set of principles and questions that would need to be addressed for any new use. We want to know the ecological impact, the economic impact, and the general impacts on human welfare. And we want to know how they are going to be assessed and monitored.*
- *Mark Cedergreen: We also want to minimize unintended consequences.*
- *Susan Gulick asked Council members what they thought about the small group work.*
 - *Casey Dennehy: I think it was productive. People who don't speak as often had the chance to speak up.*
 - *Fluharty: It was good to incorporate people from the public. They provided valuable information.*
 - *Cedergreen: It would be nice to have separate spaces for the group discussions.*

- *Sally Toteff: I liked how we had the presentation ahead of the discussions, so that we were all prepped with the same basic information.*
- *RD Grunbaum: It would be nice to have fewer topics with more time for each.*

5. Use analysis

Jennifer Hennessey presented the process for completing the spatial analysis. The use analysis was the first piece. Jennifer presented how the use analysis fits into the MSP, and the next steps. At the next WCMAC meeting, WCMAC will review the draft use matrix and provide recommendations.

Questions and Comments:

- Katie: To what intensity will the geographic analysis be applied?
 - Michele Culver: It will be the same 1 square mile hexagon.
- RD Grunbaum: Is there the ability to say that there are no areas appropriate for a new use?
 - Jennifer Hennessey: There has to be a well-reasoned description of where the conflicts are. You can say no in specific places.
 - Jeff Ward: The challenging part will be the areas that are ranked "medium".
- Katie Krueger: How are the divisions between high, medium, and low defined?
 - They have not yet been determined. We will work to explain and make this distinction transparent.
- Michele Culver: When we look at a conflict it's just the space, not the efficiency of the technology. Every cell is colored the maximum ranking of whatever is inside that area.
- Sometimes aggregate data puts you in a lot of medium territory. We want distinction so we can see where the critical locations are.
- Sally Toteff: The plan will provide a platform of where to start from when projects are proposed.

6. Updates

Attendance

- Garrett Dalan reported on his discussion with WCMAC members who have been missing meetings.
- The Governor has appointed Julie Horowitz to replace JT Austin as the WCMAC liaison from the Governor's office Julie should have greater availability to participate in WCMAC meetings, including the Steering Committee.
- Charlie Costanzo of shipping said that he is engaged in the meeting materials, and if there is anything shipping related that needs his input the WCMAC should let him know. He will make efforts to attend WCMAC meetings when there is something specific to shipping on the agenda. He's also available for questions or discussion outside of the meetings on the topic of shipping.

Workplan

- The updated workplan is included in the packet. The only new item is a proposed September 23rd meeting date.

Data viewer

Libby Whiting reviewed the list of data sets in the data viewer with updated notes. Several of the broken data sets were fixed.

Questions and Comments:

- Dale Beasley: I would rather have it in common units, latitude and longitude, than in minutes.
- Dale Beasley: I would like to be able to tell if the ocean disposal sites are historic or active. Some have been discontinued.
 - With Kelsey's research we are looking at the status of the sites. We may be able to swap some of it out with a more accurate data set.
- Dale Beasley: Why is the participatory mapping data still not the whole area?
 - Once the whole data set is available for Oregon, California, and Hawaii, that information will be available.

MRAC

Garrett Dalan provided an update from the Marine Resources Advisory Council. They have been waiting to see what funding they receive. Garrett will forward the bi-monthly news flyer on ocean acidification to the WCMAC group.

Project Status Report Updates

- Katrina Lassiter provided updates on all of the current projects. Projects with changes are highlighted in the handout provided.
- Dale Beasley: Why is the amount for Cascade Economics \$30,000?
 - Katrina Lassiter: Thanks for pointing that out. It should be around \$300,000. I will change it.

7. Upcoming Meeting Agenda Topics

- Dale: How specifically are we going to work with MSP to protect and preserve existing fisheries?
 - Susan: There is still confusion about how we get from here to the end of the plan. Perhaps we can review that at the next meeting..
- Garrett: There could be value for the different sectors to talk about what each wants from the plan.
 - Rich: I disagree; we should be expressing those concerns all along.
- Doug Kess: We need to develop ecological, social, and cultural criteria that we can apply to any new use. We won't agree on everything but we should start defining what those criteria might be.
- Michele: We will give another update on the EIA moving into Phase 2. It will be a similar work session as today. It will include:
 - Responding to feedback we received today
 - Sea Grant updates
 - Ecosystem indicators
- Update on oil transport

- The social science indicators update would like to consider moving to June – they will have a more complete report then
- Dale: What happened to the request for fishermen meetings?
 - Jen: we heard that request, and Sea Grant is working it. They have not been finalized.
 - Dale: Summer will not work for fishermen. Fishermen need to have a conversation about fishing preserves; it would be helpful to have the discussion included in the MSP work.

Public Comment

- RD: Will the Crude by Rail EIS be released in June? I've heard it's very long. What is the timeframe for public comment?
 - Sally Toteff: The target for public review has been moved to June. There are still more areas to be analyzed. There is a list serve that provides notifications. I can email the WCMAC list serve to notify you when the comment period starts.
 - RD: The Oakville and Rochester Chamber of Commerce is hosting a forum on April 22nd at 6:30 to provide information on the impacts.

Upcoming Meetings

- April 22, 2015
- June 24, 2015
- September 23, 2015

Meetings will be held in Aberdeen unless otherwise noted

Discussion Guide

Overview of the Marine Spatial Planning Process and WCMAC's Opportunities for Input

April 22, 2015

This discussion guide provides an overview of the contents and organization of the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP), an update on the current status of the planning process, and a summary of key tasks for WCMAC in the process.

1. Overview of the Contents of the MSP

A condensed outline of the MSP is attached to this discussion guide. The MSP will include the following sections:

- **Introduction and background.** This section provides background on the purpose, content, and guiding principles for the MSP.
- **Current Conditions and Future Trends.** This section provides a detailed narrative description about current conditions, existing uses, and potential new uses. Each sub-section will include maps and other types of data (e.g. charts, graphs, tables). This section will incorporate information gained from many of the recent projects that were funded by the marine resources stewardship trust account, including the sector analyses, the economic analysis, recreational data, data on forage fish spawning, seabirds and marine mammals, seafloor mapping, oceanographic information, energy suitability and other reports. The focus of this section is to provide information and context for the plan recommendations.
- **Spatial Analyses.** This section will summarize the analyses of the interactions between new uses, existing uses, and the environment. The primary analyses will be the Use Analysis and the Ecologically Important Areas Analysis. Using GIS as a primary tool, these spatial analyses will evaluate:
 - use intensity (mapping the intensity of current uses or presence of ecologically important areas along the coast)
 - level of conflict (mapping areas that could present low-high levels of conflicts with existing uses)
 - level of conflict compared with technical suitability data (identify areas of the coast that are suitable for potential uses)
- **Recommendations.** This section will provide background on the regulatory framework that will guide MSP recommendations. It will also contain plan recommendations, including spatial designations and general policy recommendations to meet the requirements and goals of the plan. Finally, it will present detail on how the plan should be implemented, incorporating an adaptive management strategy that allows the plan to adapt to changing conditions over time.
- **Environmental Assessment/SEPA Requirements.** This section will include the environmental assessment documents required by SEPA. The SEPA documents may be published as a separate report from the plan.
- **Appendices.** Technical reports, statutes, and other relevant documents will be appended to the MSP.

2. Current Status (Where we are now) and Next Steps (Where are we going?)

Projects collecting new data for the plan will largely be completed by June 2015. This information will be incorporated into the current conditions and future trends section.

State agencies are beginning work on the spatial analyses that will shape the plan recommendations. This includes the Ecologically Important Areas Analysis and the Use Analysis. The Use Analysis will analyze the interactions between existing uses, the environment and potential uses. Both of these analyses will rely on GIS.

Concurrently with the completion of the spatial analyses, WCMAC can begin to develop overarching policy recommendations for the MSP (recommendations that are not site-specific). This work will begin at the June meeting.

3. Key WCMAC Tasks/Input

- Learn about new information & provide input (through Fall 2015) – MSP Section 2

As projects providing new information are completed, WCMAC (via WCMAC or Technical Committee meetings) will receive briefings summarizing many of these projects (April-Sept 2015). WCMAC members will be able to identify and provide input on key remaining information gaps that plan recommendations could potentially address.

Staff will continue work to summarize and incorporate information on the current status and future trends for the plan, including information from completed projects. As part of this process, staff will continue to reach out to particular WCMAC members based on their area of expertise, as needed.

- Feedback on Spatial Analyses (February 2015 – Fall 2015) – MSP Section 3

As analyses begin, the agencies will be asking WCMAC for input on the subjective decisions that are needed within the analyses. For example, WCMAC may be asked to weigh in on different approaches for defining conflict. WCMAC will also be briefed on the objective components of the analyses (what the data show).

Individual WCMAC members will be approached to review available spatial data based on their expertise, provide feedback on data quality, and give input on how to assign level of conflict for that use.

- Input on general recommendations (Summer 2015 – Winter 2016) – MSP Section 4.3

The key WCMAC task in the summer and fall of 2015 will be to develop policy recommendations. WCMAC will receive information on existing authorities and options. The initial policy options will be developed based on the input from the small groups on potential new uses that were convened at the January and February 2015 WCMAC meetings. Staff will provide a range of options for WCMAC to consider and will work to craft consensus recommendations.

- Input on spatial recommendations (Winter 2016) – MSP Section 4.3.1

When the spatial analyses are complete (the Use Analysis and the Ecologically Important Areas Analysis), WCMAC will begin working on developing more specific spatial recommendations. For example, WCMAC may decide to recommend that certain uses be considered in some areas and not others. WCMAC may want recommend specific mitigation measures for certain uses in certain areas. There will be a wide range of options for WCMAC to consider.

Questions for WCMAC

- Are the contents and organization of the MSP clear?
- Are there additional questions about where we are in the process and where we are going?
- Is it clear how the goal to “protect and preserve existing uses” will be addressed and analyzed as part of the Use Analysis?

Overview: Marine Spatial Plan Contents¹

April 2015 Draft

1. Introduction

This section provides background on the purpose, requirements, guiding principles, and planning process.

- 1.1. Purpose and need for the Marine Spatial Plan
- 1.2. Marine Waters Management and Planning Act requirements
- 1.3. Plan goals and objectives
- 1.4. Planning process summary
- 1.5. Tribes – treaty rights
- 1.6. Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary

2. Current Conditions and Future Trends

This section provides a detailed narrative description about current conditions, existing uses, and potential new uses. Each sub-section will include maps and other types of data (e.g. charts, graphs, tables) when available.

Each existing use section will include the following information when available:

- Summary of history and current uses
- Maps of high value areas* (when required and available)
- Economic impact of uses
- Related infrastructure
- Future trends

Each potential new or expanded use section will likely include the following information when available:

Summary of History, Current and Emerging Technology, Related Infrastructure, Potential Benefits and Use Compatibilities, Potential Environmental Effects, Potential Human Use Conflicts, Permitting, Resource Potential, Future Trends and Factors

- 2.1. Ecology of the Pacific Coast
- 2.2. Cultural and Historical Resources
- 2.3. Socio-Economic Setting
- 2.4. Commercial and Recreational Fisheries
- 2.5. Aquaculture
- 2.6. Recreation and Tourism
- 2.7. Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure
- 2.8. Military Training
- 2.9. Research activities within the Plan area
- 2.10. Potential New/Expanded Uses
 - 2.10.1. Renewable Energy
 - 2.10.2. Offshore Aquaculture
 - 2.10.3. Dredge Disposal in New Locations
 - 2.10.4. Marine Product Extraction
 - 2.10.5. Mining- Sand and Gravel Mining and Gas Hydrate Mining
- 2.11. Climate Change

¹ This is an evolving document. Specific organization and section details may be revised as the plan progresses.

3. Spatial Analyses

This section will provide a summary on the methods and key outputs of the spatial analyses.

- 3.1. Ecologically Important Areas*
- 3.2. Use Analysis

4. Marine Spatial Plan and Management Framework.*

This section provides background on the regulatory framework, as well as the recommended policies and spatial designations. It also includes an adaptive management strategy to ensure the plan adapts to future changes, new information, etc.

- 4.1. Existing statutes, regulations and policies
- 4.2. Existing state and local authorities, including management plans and procedures, that govern plan implementation*(SMPs, port plans, etc.).
- 4.3. Recommended designations and policies
 - 4.3.1. Maps of different designations/areas (e.g. multi-use, preferred new use areas, avoid, and conserve areas) and descriptions
 - 4.3.2. General policies
 - 4.3.2.1. Recommendations on phasing and scaling
 - 4.3.2.2. Recommendations on data and analysis needs for projects
 - 4.3.2.3. Other recommendations
 - 4.3.3. New use – policies specific to new use
 - 4.3.4. Recommendations for Federal Waters*
- 4.4. Substantially inconsistent existing management plans and recommendations on aligning plans (if needed).*
- 4.5. Framework for coordinating state agency and local government review of proposed renewable energy development uses*
- 4.6. Adaptive Management Strategy*
- 4.7. Ecosystem indicators and recommendations*

5. Environmental Assessment/SEPA Requirements (this may be a separate document)

6. Appendices

The appendices may include technical reports prepared as background for the MSP as well as statutes, guidelines, and other relevant documents.

Note:

**Asterisks denote legally required elements for the MSP [see RCW 43.372.040]*

Final marine & rail oil transportation study

Given the rapid and significant changes in how crude oil moves through Washington (particularly since crude by rail entered the picture three years ago), it is important to look at the impacts this evolving practice has on public health and safety, and the environment.

In April 2014, the Washington State Legislature authorized the Washington Department of Ecology to [study potential risks posed from oil transported by rail and vessel](#), as well as identify ways to mitigate the risks.

Two months later, in an effort take as many actions as possible, Governor Jay Inslee requested [preliminary findings and recommendations](#) by October 1, 2014. The preliminary report was delivered on time and a [draft](#) of the full study was provided to the Governor and Legislature on December 1, 2014.

The final version of the study was delivered March 2, 2015.

Study confirms risks

Key findings show that in 2013 an estimated 11.8 billion to 12.7 billion gallons of oil shipped by railroad through the U.S. That equates to a 42-fold increase in oil transported by rail nationally since 2008.

Washington State increased from zero shipments of oil in 2011 to 0.7 billion gallons in 2013. Today the state receives approximately 19 unit trains a week, each carrying as much as 3 million gallons of Bakken crude, mostly destined to refineries in Washington and California.

If the proposed facilities and refinery expansions to accommodate rail imports are permitted and fully built over the next few years, the weekly unit train number could jump to 137 or more.

It is more important than ever for the state to have adequate resources to continue to address impacts to public health and safety, and environmental protection resulting from the changing energy picture.

Organizational Members and Contributors

Washington Department of Ecology

Washington Military Department, Emergency Management Division

Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission

Washington State Department of Transportation

Tribal governments and commissions

Other federal and state agencies

Other public and private organizations

For more information
ecy.wa.gov

Contact information

Scott Ferguson
360-407-7465
Scott.Ferguson@ecy.wa.gov

ADA accommodation
Ecology, 360-407-7455
Relay Service, 711
TTY, 877-833-6341

Differences between the draft & final studies

Three changes of note resulted from the December 1, 2014 draft study to the March 1, 2015 final report.

Stabilization

The study team added findings on the Bakken crude conditioning/stabilization steps that North Dakota took to reduce the volatility of crude oil before shipping it by rail. This topic is raised often, including at legislative hearings.

A recommendation was changed from the draft study to call on the Northwest Area Committee to sample the oil and characterize the hazards presented to first responders. The committee is asked to communicate the results and potential health/environmental threat(s) to Washington response organizations.

Draft Washington Pilotage Commission recommendation moved to executive summary

At the request of the Office of Financial Management, an existing draft recommendation for the Washington Pilotage Commission and rulemaking was moved into the executive summary because the action is contained in proposed legislation.

Salish Sea Workshop

An appendix was added to capture results from the January 7-8, 2015 Salish Sea Workshop in Bellingham. The workshop reviewed 10 years of waterway studies and connected their assumptions, findings, and recommendations to identify steps to reduce risk within the current energy and transportation environment.

Final study content

The final study includes a list of 43 findings and recommendations. The recommendations are a mix of risk mitigation steps at the federal and state levels addressing rail, marine, facility, emergency and spill response.

The recommendations include direction on improving infrastructure, facility design, industry operational processes and practices, expanding sensitive area protections, emergency and spill response equipment caching, personnel training, and planning improvements.

The study serves as a base document to address risk and the changing transportation energy picture for years to come.

Public Comments

The team gathered comments from the public and other interested parties throughout the study process.

More than 1,000 comments helped shape and inform the report. Comments collected through December 1, 2014, were compiled into a Frequently Heard Comments document that was submitted to the Legislature with the final study and is available [online](#).

April 22, 2015

**Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council
Draft Work Plan: Meetings through September 2015**

The WCMAC work plan is a living document. It will be continually updated and used as a guide for planning WCMAC meetings. WCMAC members are encouraged to identify agenda requests as early as possible.

Governor’s charge to the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council is to focus on providing advice for marine spatial planning process through June 2015, particularly:

- Funding priorities for key data gaps and information.
- Information for and expert team review of draft sector analyses.
- Data quality of existing data (by expert teams).
- Issues and concerns for impacts of proposed activities to aid development of scenarios and draft Environmental Impact Statement and Marine Spatial Plan.

Meeting	Information	Advice/Action
April 22, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Work Session</u>: Ecologically Important Areas Analysis (WDFW) • MSP & Use Analysis Process – present process, products, and timeline • Coast-wide Economic Analysis (consultants) • Marine Oil and Rail Study presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WDFW Ecologically Important Areas analysis
June 24, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on Ecological and Social Indicators (WSG/NWFSC) • Use Analysis Process – describe general approach • Ecological modeling and seafloor mapping results (NCCOS)? • Background on existing authorities and policy options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Analysis – feedback on approach and discuss conflicts • Discuss policy options and concerns
September 23, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Analysis Process – conflict maps • Additional background on existing authorities and policy options 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Analysis - feedback on conflict maps • Discuss potential general recommendations to address concerns

Other information needs to fit in:

- Background on spills program.
- Background on state vs. federal jurisdiction.
- Lessons-learned from other planning processes.

Other topics, issues, or recommendations may be addressed through the process set up by the Council and as time and resources allow.

MSP Active Data (4/14/15)	Data owner	Notes
FUTURE USES		
Energy Suitability/Potential		
Tidal Energy Devices	PNNL and Parametrix	
Wave Energy: Deepwater Energy Devices	PNNL and Parametrix	
Wave Energy: Mid-depth Energy Devices	PNNL and Parametrix	
Wave Energy: Nearshore, M3 Energy Devices	PNNL and Parametrix	
Wave Energy: Nearshore Energy Devices	PNNL and Parametrix	
Wind Energy: Turbines Mounted on Monopiles	PNNL and Parametrix	
Wind Energy: Turbines Mounted on Floating Platforms	PNNL and Parametrix	
Wind Energy: Turbines Mounted on Jacket/Tri Founds	PNNL and Parametrix	
BPA Transmission Assets	Bonneville Power Administration	Broken.
Submarine Cables	NOAA Office of Coast Survey	
Renewable Energy Past Projects	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Underwater Pipelines	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Underwater Transmission Cables	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Dredge Disposal in New Locations		
Ocean Disposal Sites	NOAA OCS or DNR	
***Dredge Disposal Locations	Wa Dept. of Natural Resources	
Ocean Dumping	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Aquaculture in New Locations		
Bathymetry (25m contours)	Oregon State University/TNC	
Ports (add Willapa & Nahcotta)	US Army Corps of Engineers	
Mining or Mineral Extraction (Gas Hydrates)		
Mining and Mineral Extraction	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Bathymetry (25m contours)	Oregon State University/TNC	
Marine Product Extraction		
Benthic Habitat	The Nature Conservancy	
CURRENT USES		
Aquaculture		
Aquaculture Districts	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Commercial Shellfish Growing Areas	Wa Department of Health	
Confirmed Outfall Locations	U.S EPA or DNR	Replace with DNR permitted outfalls
Oyster Reserves	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Oyster Tracts	Wa Dept. of Natural Resources	
Recreational Shellfish Beaches	Wa Department of Health	
Water Quality Monitoring	Wa Department of Health	
***Water Quality Assessment	Wa Dept. of Ecology	
Commercial Intertidal Harvest	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Recreational Intertidal Harvest	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Mariculture	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	

MSP Active Data (4/14/15) Fishing CURRENT USES	Data owner	Notes
Fishing		
Commercial Albacore Fishing	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Commercial Dungeness Fishery	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Commercial Groundfish Fishery (sablefish)	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Commercial Pacific Whiting Fishery	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Commercial Pink Shrimp Fishery	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Commercial Salmon Fishery	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Commercial Sardine Fishery	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Recreational Albacore Fishery	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Recreational Bottomfish and Lingcod Fisheries	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Recreational Halibut Fishery	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Recreational Salmon Fishery	Wa Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	
Seafood Processors	Wa Department of Ecology	
Shipping density: fishing vessels	U.S. Coast Guard	
Commercial Dive Fishing	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Commercial Fishing with Benthic Fixed Gear	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Commercial Fishing with Benthic Mobile Gear	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Commercial Pelagic Fishing	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Kayak Fishing	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Recreational Dive Fishing	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Recreational Fishing From Boats (Benthic Species)	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Recreational Fishing From Boats (Pelagic Species)	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Recreational Fishing From Shore	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Recreational Subsistence Fishing and Harvest	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Military		
***Military Authoritative Areas	U.S. Navy	
Military Practice Areas	Nautical Charts or Navy data	
Shipping density: military vessels	U.S. Coast Guard	
Military Operations	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Shipping		
Shipping Density: US Coast Guard, AIS	***Sanctuary SAIS	
Cargo	Cargo	
Fishing	Fishing	
Military	Misc. Vessels	
Passenger	Passenger	
Pleasure	none	
Tanker	Tankers	
Tug and Tow	Tugs	
All Other	All Vessels	
Area to be Avoided	NOAA, OCNM Sanctuary	
Commercial Waterways (Deep Draft)	Bureau of Transportation Statistics	
Crabber and Towboat Lanes	Washington Sea Grant	
Wrecks	NOAA Office of Coast Survey	
Commercial Shipping	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Cruise Ships	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Motorized Boating	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	

MSP Active Data: Rec & Tourism CURRENT USES	Data owner	Notes
Recreation & Tourism		
***Diving	Point 97/ Surfrider	
***Shore-Based Activities	Point 97/ Surfrider	
***Surface Water Sports	Point 97/ Surfrider	
***Wildlife Viewing & Sightseeing	Point 97/ Surfrider	
***All Recreational Activities	Point 97/ Surfrider	
Public Access	Wa Department of Ecology	
Beach Uses	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Paddling	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Sailing	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
SCUBA/Snorkeling	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Surface Board Sports	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Swimming	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Tide Pooling	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Wildlife Viewing at Sea	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Management Areas		
Coastal National Wildlife Refuges	US DFW	
County Boundaries	Wa Department of Ecology	
Exclusive Economic Zone	NOAA National Ocean Service	
Federal Lease Blocks	Bureau Ocean & Energy Mgmt.	
Groundfish Essential Fish Habitats	NOAA NMFS	
Marine Protected Area (Fish Inventory)	NOAA NMFS	
MSP Study Area	Wa Dept. of Natural Resources	
Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary	National Marine Sanctuaries	
Seashore Conservation Area	Wa Parks Commission	
Shoreline (Physical Boundary)	Wa Dept. Natural Resources	
State Owned Aquatic Land Parcels	Wa Dept. of Natural Resources	
***State Parks Areas	Wa Parks Commission	
Territorial Sea	NOAA National Ocean Service	
Marine Habitat		
Rocky Reefs	The Nature Conservancy	
Marine Mammal Haulouts	WDFW	
Green Sturgeon Critical Habitat	NOAA	
Marbled Murrelet Critical Habitat	US Fish and Wildlife Service	
Sockeye Salmon Critical Habitat (Lake Ozette)	NOAA	
***Dunegrass (Shorezone)	Wa. Dept. of Natural Resources	
***Kelp (Shorezone)	Wa. Dept. of Natural Resources	
***Salt marsh (Shorezone)	Wa. Dept. of Natural Resources	
***Seagrass (Shorezone)	Wa. Dept. of Natural Resources	
Infrastructure		
Beacons	NOAA Office of Coast Survey	
Buoys	NOAA Office of Coast Survey	
Marinas	Wa Department of Ecology	

MSP Active Data (4/14/15) Other Data on Viewer	Data owner	Notes
Marine Life		
Marine Mammal Distributions	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Blue Whale	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Fin Whale	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Humpback Whale	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Northern Right Whale Dolphin	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Sperm Whale	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Small beaked whale	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Dall's Porpoise	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Pacific White-Sided Dolphin	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Short-Beaked Common Dolphin	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
Striped Dolphin	Southwest Fish. Science Center	
***Marine Mammal and Bird Migration Distribution Models	NCCOS	
Physical Oceanography		
Bathymetry	UW Oceanography	
***Chlorophyll (Integrated), all seasons	UW Oceanography	Link to webpage
***Hypoxia Intensity Index, all seasons	UW Oceanography	Link to webpage
***Hypoxia Frequency Index, all seasons	UW Oceanography	Link to webpage
***Bottom Oxygen, mean/min all seasons	UW Oceanography	Link to webpage
***River influence, all seasons	UW Oceanography	Link to webpage
***Surface Salinity, all seasons	UW Oceanography	Link to webpage
***Near Bottom Speed, max/RMS	UW Oceanography	Link to webpage
***Bottom Temperature, mean/min/max all seasons	UW Oceanography	Link to webpage
***Sea Surface Temperature mean/min/max all seasons	UW Oceanography	Link to webpage
Human Uses: Participatory Mapping	NOAA and Bureau of Ocean and	
Industrial Uses		
Marine Debris	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Non-Extractive Uses		
Cultural Uses	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	
Permanent Research Areas	Participatory GIS BOEM/NOAA	

**MSP Projects Status Report
2012-2015**



Mapping projects
Ecosystem assessment projects
Data and technical projects
Stakeholder engagement projects

***Projects updated since the February 2015 meeting**

	<i>Project</i>	<i>Contractor</i>	<i>Project Description</i>	<i>Deliverables</i>	<i>Contract cost</i>	<i>Progress as of April 15, 2015</i>	<i>Status</i>
1	Nearshore multibeam survey	DNR and ECY	High resolution multibeam bathymetric and sediment characterization survey of nearshore subtidal, intertidal, and coastal areas around river mouths to assess sediment stability and natural resource limitations to laying power cables	*Summary report on all new data collected including multibeam backscatter, and LIDAR; *Processed data and data products including maps and images	\$ 386,000.00	Ecology and DNR completed multibeam surveys of the northern outer coast river mouths and surrounding areas (Quillayute and Elwha) and submitted a final report that is available on the project page of the website.	Completed June 2013
2	Intertidal wave runner survey	DNR and ECY	Single beam cross-shore transects (wave runner) of intertidal nearshore areas around river mouths and priority nearshore regions. There will be survey transects set up to get a general sense of the bottom types.	*New nearshore bathymetry and beach topography profiles; *A report on data collection and recommendations for future work; *Provision of existing bathymetry and beach topography data		Ecology and DNR completed nearshore wave runner bathymetry data collection in the tributaries in Wahkiakum County, and they surveyed the mouth of the Columbia with the multibeam and wave runners. They and submitted a final report that is available on the project page of the website.	Completed June 2013
3	Data evaluation and seafloor mapping strategy	NCCOS Biogeography Branch	Scientific and technical assistance to the state to standardize and evaluate spatial data in support of marine spatial planning. Development of a seafloor mapping strategy for Washington's offshore waters.	*Identification and sharing of useful datasets; *A technical report to evaluate no more than 10 key physical and biological datasets based on how the datasets have been used by other marine spatial planners, potential alternatives, and advantages and disadvantages of using the particular dataset to meet state goals. *Geospatial data viewer for existing bathymetric geospatial data layers; *Strategic planning roadmap for prioritization of bathymetric data collection.	\$ 75,000.00	The Biogeography team provided DNR with a final report that evaluated 10 key physical and biological datasets. They also created a geospatial data viewer for bathymetric data and a blueprint for future phases of spatial prioritization.	Completed June 2013
4	Seafloor mapping prioritization and marine mammal and seabird modeling	NCCOS Biogeography Branch	Seafloor mapping and Marine mammal/seabird modeling	*Development of seabird and marine mammal species distribution models; *Evaluation of marine mammal datasets; *Spatial prioritization of outer coast for future seafloor mapping needs	\$ 207,000.00	*From January through March 2015, NCCOS will be conducted a web-based exercise for scientists and coastal managers to identify their seafloor mapping priorities. NCCOS is planning a final workshop for May 14, 2015 to finalize the participatory GIS mapping and discuss the results of the prioritization exercise. *NCCOS will be funding the marine mammal species distribution component of the modeling project. The deliverables of this project will be completed in September 2015.	Will be completed June and September 2015
5	Human use mapping	NOAA	Mapping human uses through the BOEM/NOAA Pacific Regional Ocean Uses Atlas program	*Two participatory human use mapping workshops in April 2013 held in Aberdeen and Pt. Angeles and *Final maps (funded by NOAA)	\$ 6,500.00	Workshops were held in Port Angeles and Aberdeen in April 2013. Data and maps were delivered to DNR during the summer and autumn of 2013.	Completed October 2013
6	Tribal catch mapping	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission	Mapping Tribal Commercial Marine Catch Data	*GIS data layers and shape files of the four Coastal Tribes' tribal commercial catch for the years 1980-2011	\$ 65,000.00	The NWIFC collected, analyzed, and reconciled tribal data. NWIFC staff developed GIS layers by management area, species, gear, catch, month and year.	Completed June 2013
7	Tribal cultural use mapping	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission	Mapping tribal traditional and cultural areas: a) Marine fishing areas, b) Intertidal fishing and gathering locations, c) Culturally significant areas/locations	*GIS data layers and shape files of the four Coastal Tribes' traditional fishing and cultural areas along the outer coast		The NWIFC compiled data on utilized and significant species, including species of finfish, shellfish, plants, birds and mammals. Project staff developed a GIS layer of utilized species and sensitive species sites. Staff from the four coastal tribes were consulted to verify and expand upon these GIS layers.	Completed June 2013

**MSP Projects Status Report
2012-2015**



Mapping projects
Ecosystem assessment projects
Data and technical projects
Stakeholder engagement projects

***Projects updated since the January 2015 meeting**

	Project	Contractor	Project Description	Deliverables	Contract cost	Progress as of April 15, 2015	Status
8	Sanctuary Seafloor Atlas	Oregon State University	Synthesis and stitching together of benthic habitat data from the northern portion of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary	*GIS data layers of benthic habitat data in the northern part of the National Marine Sanctuary and a scalable online Seafloor Atlas	\$ 50,000.00	Since the last update in December 2014, the OSU atlas team has made significant progress toward project objectives. An OCNMS region backscatter mosaic was developed from individual input datasets. A medium resolution bathymetry grid has also been developed and a higher resolution grid is in progress. All available seabed habitat maps have been integrated into a single habitat map dataset and the team is correcting areas of misclassification, complete unclassified areas, and improve the depth of classification. A prototype of the online web site is also in development. Nancy Wright, OCNMS, is advising on habitat mapping tasks and web site design.	Will be completed by June 2015
9	Marine renewable energy suitability study	Pacific Northwest National Laboratories	Develop marine renewable energy suitability data layer that compiles information on energy resource potential (wave, tidal), energy industry needs, various technology types, and suitability factors such as economic, physical, and infrastructure preferences and requirements.	*Suitability data for wave, tidal, and offshore wind devices; conceptual models for energy device suitability; *8 final concept models (4 wave, 2 tidal, 2 offshore wind) with scoring models for each attribute; database, GIS dataset, and maps showing suitability for up to 8 energy device types; *Presentation to WCMAC and each of the MRCs	\$ 100,000.00	PNNL developed suitability models for wave, tidal, and offshore wind energy technologies - these are available on the projects page of the website and the data can be viewed on the mapping application.	Completed June 2013
10	Oceanographic modelling	UW Oceanography	Mapping and modeling of coastal oceanographic conditions and trends	*Spatial data on plankton productivity and bottom oxygen levels (hypoxia); *Seasonal maps of speed over the coast; *Map of bottom bathymetry gridded to 1km; *Presentation of relevant data to WCMAC as needed	\$ 211,000.00	The UW team finalized models using the oceanographic data and formatted the data into GIS layers. These models and data were provided to DNR and the summary report can be found on the projects page of the website.	Completed June 2013
11	Pacific County mapping	UW Olympic Natural Resources Center	Pacific County projects - mapping shellfish growing areas, mapping beneficial use areas, mapping invasive species, mapping shoreline designations, integrating seafloor mapping and shellfish areas	*GIS data on commercial, private, tribal, and public shellfish growing areas; *GIS layers of beneficial use areas; *GIS data of invasive species (spartina, knotweed, japanese eelgrass, burrowing shrimp); *shapefile of shoreline designations; integration of existing seafloor mapping data	\$ 76,000.00	The ONRC digitized the Shoreline Environmental Designation maps from Pacific County; generated a spreadsheet of all relevant datasets currently in our archives and have contacted local collaborators to compile as wide a list of readily available datasets as possible; and are assisted the UW Coastal Study Group in converting their model output into ARC GIS format.	Completed June 2013
12	Student economic baseline project	UW Program on the Environment	Marine economic baseline for the coast - basic update and assessment of current status of coastal marine based economy	*Final report that provides a high level look at the marine based economy of the outer coast; *webinar of the study findings available to the public; *project website with webinar presentation and downloadable copies of reports generated by the project	\$ 150,000.00	The student team completed their project, which included interviewing coastal stakeholders, compiling economic data from the coastal counties, developing a project website, and writing a report with recommendations. The report can be found on the project website at http://wa-working-coast.wix.com/wa-workingcoast .	Completed April 2013
13	Commercial fishing mapping	WDFW	Mapping Commercial Fishing and Fish and Wildlife Resources	*Comprehensive GIS maps of coastal commercial fishing activities	\$260,000.00 *includes year 1 forage fish survey	Data collected and incorporated into the MSP mapping tool.	Completed June 2013
14	Recreational fishing mapping	WDFW	Mapping recreational fishing data	*GIS data layers and maps of fishing locations and areas of importance (for specific trip types) for recreational fisheries		Data collected and incorporated into the MSP mapping tool.	Completed June 2013

**MSP Projects Status Report
2012-2015**



Mapping projects
Ecosystem assessment projects
Data and technical projects
Stakeholder engagement projects

***Projects updated since the February 2015 meeting**

	Project	Contractor	Project Description	Deliverables	Contract cost	Progress as of April 15, 2015	Status
15	Forage fish mapping	WDFW	Mapping forage fish distribution	*GIS map of forage fish distribution based on approximately 500 spawning beach surveys; *2012-2014 Forage fish survey GIS layers; *first year survey report; *final report	\$ 350,000.00	WDFW submitted the forage fish survey and data to DNR in mid-January. It was reviewed by the participating tribes prior to submission. WDFW and the tribes found that smelt eggs are deposited and/or distributed on the outer coast across a broad tide range, unlike Puget Sound where eggs are deposited along a narrow substrate band near the high tide mark. A suite of beach physical characteristics have been correlated to egg abundance and survival. The final report is available on msp.wa.gov at http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/ForageFishReport.pdf .	Completed January 2015
16	Seabird and marine mammal database	WDFW	Create seabird and marine mammal geodatabase	*Seabird colony and haul out geodatabase data layers; *species density GIS layers; *coastal winter bird abundance GIS layers	\$ 74,000.00	WDFW staff obtained, verified, and integrated data into the WDFW seabird catalog from various sources and provided the data to the NOAA Biogeography Team in September. Additionally, staff have delineated marine mammal haul out sites using data from 1998 through 2014 for the Columbia River, outer coast, and Puget Sound. WDFW is using these seabird and mammal data in developing the EIA, and they are in the process of completing the final report for this project.	Will be completed by June 2015
17	Marine mammal aerial surveys	WDFW	Conduct marine mammal aerial surveys	*Pinniped haul out and sea otter concentration areas GIS layers and *final report	\$ 77,000.00	WDFW staff conducted several surveys throughout the coastal area during the summer and fall of 2014. They completed the process of reviewing video and counting digital images, which was time-intensive, and they are error-checking the data to finalize maps for the portal.	Will be completed by June 2015
18	Ecologically important areas	WDFW	Identify Ecologically Important Areas	*Map and analysis of Ecologically Important Areas off the Washington coast	\$ 149,000.00	The WDFW team categorized the data for various fish and wildlife, some of which is more robust and/or at a refined scale than others. From this, they developed a suite of preliminary maps, which they shared with the Tribal Technical Group and the State/Tribal policy level group in early February 2015. They will presented preliminary maps at the February 2015 WCMAC meeting and will provide another project update at the April 2015 WCMAC meeting. Washington Sea Grant is planning a meeting with the Science Panel to prepare a written review of the draft ecologically important areas report.	Will be completed by June 2015
19	Shipping sector analysis	BST Associates	Sector analysis	*Sector analysis report for shipping	\$ 15,000.00	Contractor presented draft findings at July 2014 WCMAC meeting. Project is now completed.	Completed August 2014
20	Recreation/tourism, fishing, renewable energy, and aquaculture sector analysis	Industrial Economics	Sector analyses	*Sector analysis reports for recreation/tourism, fishing (commercial/recreational), marine renewable energy, and aquaculture	\$ 60,000.00	Contractor presented draft findings at July 2014 WCMAC meeting. With the exception of the aquaculture sector report, the project was completed in August 2014. The contract was amended to allow the contractor to conduct interviews with 4-5 additional members of the aquaculture industry, and the aquaculture sector analysis was completed in October 2014.	Completed October 2014
21	Ecosystem indicators: phase I	NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center	Ecosystem indicator and conceptual models; ecosystem indicator workshop	*Ecosystem indicator workshop to result in a broad understanding of ecosystem indicators; *a draft conceptual model; *a process for establishing indicators; *identification of information gaps	\$ 50,000.00	This workshop was held for scientists and managers on May 13th, 2013. The Northwest Fisheries Science Center developed draft conceptual models of the marine waters of the Washington coast, a list of potential ecosystem indicators, and a process for evaluating candidate indicators.	Completed June 2013
22	Ecosystem indicators: phase II	NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC)	Ecosystem Indicators and Modeling	*Conceptual models for Washington coastal and estuarine habitats; *candidate indicators for the coast and estuaries; *maps linking habitat attributes and indicators on the seascape; *presentations to SOC and WCMAC; *report on status and trends of ecological indicators; *PDFs of each model and map	\$ 250,000.00	The scientists at the NWFSC have created new conceptual model graphics (all habitat types to be completed soon), received and incorporated feedback on coastal estuary indicators, and calculated weightings for indicator evaluation criteria. In early April, NWFSC submitted four documents for Science Panel review - an overview of the indicator selection process, the quantification of the status and trends for each indicator, conceptual models for pelagic habitat, and an Excel workbook with the details of the indicator selection process. Washington Sea Grant is planning a final Science Panel review of the ecological indicators project and will be facilitating a presentation from the NWFSC in Grays Harbor tomorrow.	Will be completed by June 2015

**MSP Projects Status Report
2012-2015**



Mapping projects
Ecosystem assessment projects
Data and technical projects
Stakeholder engagement projects

***Projects updated since the February 2015 meeting**

	Project	Contractor	Project Description	Deliverables	Contract cost	Progress as of April 15, 2015	Status
23	Social science indicators	Washington Sea Grant	Social science indicators and conceptual model development	*Document analysis of local human values and activities; *candidate social science indicators and draft conceptual model; *ecosystem assessment outreach materials	\$ 93,000.00	In January, the social indicator team began the indicator evaluation phase for each of the 4 coastal counties. They assessed a comprehensive set of quantitative social indicators from existing data (on aspects such as basic conditions, health, education, infrastructure, safety, government, housing, access to social services, social cohesion, use of natural resources) for each of the counties. The team has presented draft summaries of indicator performance and asked for input at Pacific and Grays Harbor MRC meetings and will do the same at the North Pacific MRC in mid-May.	Will be completed by June 2015
24	Economic analysis	Cascade Economics	Economic analysis of the Washington coast	*Scoping process and *coast-wide economic analysis	\$ 304,616.00	Cascade Economics held focus group meetings with shrimp and groundfish fishers in Illwaco in mid-March, prepared a draft aquaculture section and solicited input from growers and processors, conducted recreation and tourism research on 33 coastal communities, collaborated with Surfrider/Point 97 to obtain their survey data and with Sea Grant on social and cultural information, developed a survey on social and cultural information, and communicated with tribal staff. The Cascade Economics team will present on some of their findings at the April 2015 WCMAC meeting.	Will be completed by June 2015
25	Recreational use study	Surfrider and Point 97	Recreational Use Study	*A baseline characterization of coastal recreation participation rates and trip expenditures and *a spatial baseline of coastal and ocean recreation use patterns on the outer Pacific coast of Washington	\$ 170,000.00	Surfrider presented preliminary findings in March and April to the Sanctuary Advisory Council and Olympic Coast Tourism Bureau. Point 97 completed data analysis on the panel and opt-in spatial and survey data, have produced draft maps, shared maps and data layers with DNR, and are now drafting the report. Surfrider and Point 97 have been coordinating with Sea Grant on future presentations and with the Olympic National Marine Sanctuary on a choice experiment survey.	Will be completed by June 2015
26	MSP mapping tool	DNR	MSP mapping tool - provide a decision support tool to access data. Viewable in a map format and accessible without GIS expertise.	*An interactive map system, accessible through the website to view and manipulate GIS data layers; *subscription to ArcGIS Online to allow for secure users	\$ 130,000.00	The state completed its first wave in the development of the mapping application in June 2013 and is now working on functionality. The State Ocean Caucus is preparing to use the data layers in the mapping tool for a spatial analysis.	Phase I complete, ongoing addition of new content
27	Data catalog	DNR	GIS data catalog for Marine Spatial Planning to provide access to raw datasets and complete metadata for data that are in the mapping tool	*A data catalog for accessing MSP datasets	\$ 150,000.00	The data catalog allows users to access and download the datasets that populate the mapping application. New data becomes available on the data catalog when it is added to the mapping application. The data catalog is available on the Explore page of the website.	Phase I complete. Further development Will be completed by June 2015.
28	MSP website	DNR	Public website for Washington marine spatial planning (with TNC)	*A public website with all relevant information about MSP in Washington - including news, projects, background documents, and upcoming events		The website was launched and demonstrated to the WCMAC in April 2013. Updates and edits to the website content are ongoing. The state has been posting weekly Q&As on the News page as well as upcoming events.	Completed June 2013, ongoing addition of new content
29	Website management and planning support - project position	DNR	Coastal and marine planner position	*Website management; *mapping tool outreach; *planning support	\$ 177,000.00	Position in place since January 2014. Planner has made updates and improvements to the website, conducted contextual research, developed draft outreach materials, and participated in the state planning team. Planner has tracked down datasets to fill data gaps including the crabber tow boat lanes, state and federal boundaries, oceanography data, albacore tuna data, and others.	Will be completed by June 2015

**MSP Projects Status Report
2012-2015**



Mapping projects
Ecosystem assessment projects
Data and technical projects
Stakeholder engagement projects

***Projects updated since the February 2015 meeting**

	Project	Contractor	Project Description	Deliverables	Contract cost	Progress as of April 15, 2015	Status
30	Plan research and development - project position	ECY	Plan research and writing position	*Research for plan development (i.e.. providing socioeconomic use and environmental contextual information) and *draft chapters of the plan	\$ 100,000.00	Position began in mid-June 2014.	Will be completed by June 2015
31	Identification of data standards and gaps	Washington Sea Grant	Facilitation of scientific input from issue based groups to provide technical input on development of data tools	*Identification of area-specific experts; *formation of technical committee to provide scientific feedback; *teaching of a course on MSP that utilizes expertise of UW experts and graduate students to provide feedback on data standards and data gaps	See WA Sea Grant items in yellow	Washington Sea Grant organized a graduate course for the Spring 2013 quarter in which the students looked at existing and new data, and contacted issue area experts to review the data and identify data gaps. Students reported to the state agencies and the WCMAC in June 2013. The report is available on the projects page of the website.	Completed June 2013
32	Scientific input coordination	Washington Sea Grant	Science coordination through a Science Advisory Panel	*2 - 4 Science Advisory Panel meetings per year and *ongoing feedback from the Science Advisory Panel	\$ 60,000.00	On November 25, 2015, Washington Sea Grant convened the science panel via webinar to solicit feedback on WDFW's methods and approach to identifying ecologically important areas off Washington's coast. On January 20, 2015, Sea Grant will hold a second meeting with WDFW to review the ecologically important areas project . Sea Grant also convened the science panel on December 19, 2014 to discuss the approach to developing the social indicators.	Will be completed by June 2015
33	Website and data catalog development and data tool outreach	The Nature Conservancy	Data tool outreach and training to stakeholders and tribes; assistance with website and data catalog development; participation in technical and planning committees	*TNC participation on GIS tool development committees; *design and launch of public website; *integration of data catalog into the website; *outreach on the GIS tool; *data from TNC's Pacific Northwest Coast ecoregional assessment	See Nature Conservancy item in green	TNC worked with DNR, Ecology, and the rest of the State Ocean Caucus on planning tool development, the website, and outreach throughout 2013. TNC and Ecotrust designed and launched the website, and collaborated with the state to help develop the mapping application.	Completed June 2013
34	MRC workshops on goals and objectives	The Surfrider Foundation	Coastal marine resource committees (MRCs) workshops to gather community input on the MSP goals and objectives, with staff support from Surfrider and The Nature Conservancy.	*Summary report that captures input from the public that can inform the MSP goals and objectives setting process, and will be available as a public record.	\$ 19,000.00	The MRCs conducted outreach in April 2013 and Surfrider produced a summary report that is available on the project page of the website.	Completed June 2013
35	MSP 101	Washington Sea Grant	Coordination of MSP short course (MSP 101)	*MSP outreach materials and standard curriculum and *outreach activities on the coast	\$ 125,000.00	In 2013, Washington Sea Grant produced outreach materials and conducted a series of MSP 101 outreach events in coastal communities.	Completed June 2013
36	Goals and objectives workshops	Washington Sea Grant	Coordination and facilitation of work sessions to draft marine spatial planning objectives	*Coordination and planning of a series of three workshops to engage stakeholders in the development of objectives for the MSP process		Washington Sea Grant held three objective setting workshops in the spring of 2013. The final workshop report is available on the projects page of the website.	Completed June 2013
37	General MSP outreach	Washington Sea Grant	Coordination and facilitation of marine spatial planning outreach	*Summary of 2012-2013 outreach activities; *10 public outreach meetings; *10-15 MSP short courses; *outreach materials; *summaries of outreach meetings	\$ 149,000.00	In March 2015, Sea Grant hosted public screenings of Ocean Frontiers 2 in Ilwaco and Aberdeen and a forum with fishermen in Ilwaco. In April, they facilitated a presentation from Surfrider to the Olympic Coast Visitor's Bureau on the recreational use study and from their own staff to the Pacific and Grays Harbor MRCs on the social indicators project. Earlier this week, Sea Grant hosted a general MSP outreach event in Aberdeen. This morning, Sea Grant gave a general MSP presentation to the Ocean Shores and North Beach Chamber of Commerce and tomorrow will be facilitating a presentation from the NWFSC to the Grays Harbor Coalition of Infrastructure and the Citizens for a Clean Harbor. Sea Grant is planning to facilitate additional presentations on the recreational use study and social indicators in May.	Will be completed by June 2015

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL
Technical Committee

Tuesday March 10, 2015
2:00-4:00 pm
Conference Call

SUMMARY

Council Members Present	
Brian Sheldon, Shellfish Aquaculture	Doug Kess, Pacific MRC
Casey Dennehy, Recreation	Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC
Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing	Rich Osborne, Science
Others Present	
Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology (WCMAC Staff)	Jessi Doerpinghaus, WDFW
Katrina Lassiter, WDNR	Corey Niles, WDFW
Katie Krueger, Quileute Nation Liaison	Libby Whiting, WDNR
Keith Ledford, Makah Nation	Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions (Facilitator)

1. Removal of Data from the Data Viewer

- Libby reviewed the Data Discussion Guide. The guide includes the criteria for data inclusion. The criteria are:
 - ✓ Data provide information on marine resources or uses that are required by law
 - ✓ Data provide important contextual information on existing jurisdictions or regulations
 - ✓ Data provide a spatial component needed to show conflicts between current and future uses
 - ✓ Data are complete for where the resource or activity occurs
 - ✓ Data are available in reliable format and are in a final or near-final form
 - ✓ Data provide diversity of information across categories
 - ✓ Data are from the authoritative source and are publically sharable
 - ✓ Data are representative of where the use or resource occurs on average over time
- The State Ocean Caucus (SOC) worked with Libby to identify data that do meet the criteria and should be removed. Libby reviewed this list with the Technical Committee (TC).
- The following list are the data that the TC agreed should be removed:
 - ✓ Marine Supply
 - ✓ Population Demographics
 - ✓ Marine Structures
 - ✓ Point Source Discharge: Dairy
 - ✓ Catch Reporting Areas
 - ✓ Cities
 - ✓ Fishing Management Areas
 - ✓ Natural Resource Conservation Areas
 - ✓ Northwest National Marine Fisheries Services Regions
 - ✓ Pacific Fishery Management Council Region
 - ✓ Estuaries of Concern
 - ✓ Invasive New Zealand Mud Snails
 - ✓ Large Marine Ecosystems
 - ✓ Summer Chlorophyll
 - ✓ Rivers
 - ✓ Upwelling

- The following list are the data that the TC recommended for removal and further discussion:
 - ✓ Commercial Waterways (Deep Draft)
 - ✓ Shoreline Ownership Boundaries
 - ✓ Marbled Murrelet Critical Habitat
 - ✓ Participatory GIS Mapping
- The following list are the data that the TC recommended for improvement:
 - ✓ Military Practice Areas
 - ✓ Ocean Disposal Sites
 - ✓ Energy Suitability: change to “Energy Potential”
 - ✓ Change Commercial Shellfish Growing Areas: change to Commercial Shellfish Health Monitoring Areas
 - ✓ Ports: add Willapa and Nahcotta
 - ✓ Salmon and Steelhead Critical Habitat: show sockeye only
- Rich complimented staff on pulling together a list of data for the TC to review and approved of all recommended removals. He also recommended additional information on a few layers that are now listed for improvements or removal.
- Dale had additional questions, concerns and requests for improvements that the TC did not have time to discuss. He will provide a list of those data to Susan and Libby for consideration at a future TC meeting.
- The TC discussed how to best show commercial aquaculture growing areas. Brian recommends using oyster tracks data along with the aquaculture districts for the plan instead of commercial shellfish growing areas (which really show monitoring sites, not growing areas, and should be renamed if it remains on the viewer). Water quality monitoring sites are shown on another layer so these data are redundant.
- TC members agreed that the data on invasive New Zealand mud snails is not useful, but Brian would like the following invasive species data added: Japanese oyster drills, zosteria spartina, zosteria japonica, and green crab.
- The TC discussed the participatory GIS data. Some members would like it removed. If it remains, it should be clearly noted that this is data gathered from input at workshops. Staff are considering adding a pop-up that will communicate this.
- The TC asked what happens to the data that are removed from the mapping application. Staff explained that some of the data may remain on the data catalog or have links to the contextual information within another part of the website.
- Dale would like the viewer to be very user-friendly to the public.

2. WDFW Stakeholder Outreach Efforts

- Corey reviewed WDFW’s handout summarizing their MSP stakeholder outreach efforts.
- The efforts help ground-truth the fishing maps and identify areas where maps may be improved. WDFW is setting up meetings fishery by fishery (e.g., Dungeness crab, At Sea Whiting, fixed gear sablefish, salmon troll) to get input on the maps and for general outreach on MSP. There will also be a meeting held for fishermen and the general public sometime in April where WDFW will be looking for input on the fishing use maps.
- Corey explained the difference between the Ecologically Important Areas (EIAs) and fishing maps. EIA maps show how the fish uses the ocean; the fishing maps show where the fisheries catch the fish. Sometimes these line up, sometimes they are different because regulations and economic incentives affect where people fish (e.g. a fishing vessels may fish as close to port as possible to reduce costs, preserve the quality of the fish, etc.). WDFW is documenting both the fishery data and the data on fish.

- Dale is concerned that the upcoming meetings with fisherman will not allow for fishermen to collaborate on how to protect and preserve fishing. Sea Grant is still working on the agenda, and there are options to open the agenda to include this.
- Dale also noted that it is important to have meetings in different ports so that all fishermen can collaborate and provide input. Corey explained that in WDFW's experience it has been difficult to get fishery participants to attend general meetings and that fishery sectors can be quite different. The plan to approach fishery sectors individually is meant to maximize attendance and opportunity for input on fishery specific maps. Dale also emphasized that it was important to find meeting times when fishermen will be in port and not out fishing. Corey said WDFW agrees and noted that getting good attendance is often quite challenging.

3. Other Issues with the Data Viewer

- The TC discussed how the analysis of current and potential new uses will help identify potential conflicts between current and new uses. The current effort is to ensure that the best data will be used in the analysis.
- Once those conflicts are identified, the WCMAC will have the opportunity to make recommendations to protect current uses.
- The TC discussed the benefits of noting whether species are present or absent rather than ranking presence as high, medium or low. There is a risk that noting anything as "low" will be interpreted as a good area for a new use, which is not necessarily true. Using presence or absence will deter people from wanting every item to be listed as high, or at least medium.
- The TC discussed how some species will change their migratory patterns due to climate change, including shifts in food supply. All this information will change over time. The data viewer as well as the MSP needs to be updated to adapt to these changes.
- Staff was asked whether bull trout data should be added.
- Dale would like to change energy "suitability" to energy "potential" or something neutral. The data in this layer is from PNNL. Brian does not think the portrayal is accurate.
- The commercial albacore tuna data that is publically available is on the data viewer and is a very coarse resolution; Dale wants commercial albacore tuna and commercial salmon troll fisheries data to be improved and some small fisheries data should be added, such as gillnet fisheries in estuaries.
- The data on Commercial Waterways (Deep Draft) is not spatially significant for the viewer and is redundant to shipping data.
- The Navy provided new data that will replace the military practice area layer. Staff don't know whether Navy will have comments on the plan down the road, and whether they will ask for exclusionary areas.
- Is there a way to show aquatic lease areas?

4. Next Technical Committee Meeting

- Susan will send an inquiry to WCMAC members to find a regular meeting day for Technical Committee calls so that all interested persons can participate. Many members had conflicts with this meeting time.

WCMAC Decisions and Recommendations

This list provides a summary of key recommendations by the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC). The statute requires WCMAC to use a consensus approach to decision making and the Council may put issues to a vote, when it cannot reach consensus [RCW 43.143.050(6)]. Meeting summaries provide details of consensus or majority votes for each recommendation.

WCMAC Policy Recommendations

<i>Date</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
10/23/13	<p>The WCMAC agreed that staff should move forward with the required elements and high priority needs as noted in the staff recommendation:</p> <p>1. <u>Recommend funding the required elements in the marine spatial planning law</u></p> <p>The following MSP elements are remaining gaps that are required by law:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing the Ecosystem Assessment and Indicators • Supporting the planning process (e.g. outreach, technical tools, plan development) • Identifying Important Ecological Areas - sensitive/unique species or biological communities. <p>Funding for these essential activities will reduce the remainder of funds available for data gaps and other important analyses.</p> <p>2. <u>Identify and recommend funding high priority information needs</u></p> <p>Information that is essential to identify and analyze conflicts and compatibilities with resources or existing uses. Staff recommends including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sector analyses • Coastal economic analysis • Seabirds and marine mammals • Habitat: seafloor maps <p>DNR will work with the WCMAC committee to identify desired deliverables/ outcomes for each item funded. The coastal and economic analysis should be given additional funding as necessary to do a thorough economic assessment.</p>
10/23/13	The WCMAC recommended funding the forage fish study by WDFW.
1/29/14	The Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council recommends that a Recreational Use Study be completed and used as appropriate in developing the Marine Spatial Plan.
7/9/14	The MSP Draft Actions list was adopted unanimously.
9/18/14	<p>Funding Recommendation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The WCMAC recommends that the Governor include \$925,000 in the proposed 2016-17 biennial budget to fund the following activities: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The continued operation of the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (\$225,000). b. The completion of the Marine Spatial Plan: (\$700,000) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Incorporate MSP project information updates and data limitations into the draft plan and mapping tool.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Complete projects underway before June 2015, but which may require additional analysis or work. iii. Conduct additional outreach, public engagement, and scientific review in the planning and mapping process iv. Coordinate and consult on the plan with governments. v. Revise and finalize the plan, including research and writing. <p>2. WCMAC recommends that the Chair of the WCMAC transmit the WCMAC recommendation to the Governor and the chairs of the legislative finance committees via letter, including the required budget form. Staff will prepare the budget form to meet the Office of Financial Management's requirements. The Steering Committee will review the budget form prior to final submittal to ensure it matches WCMAC's recommendation.</p>
--	--

WCMAC Operations Decisions

This list provides a summary of key operational recommendations by WCMAC. It does not attempt to capture all operational recommendations. Meeting summaries provide information on the more detailed operational recommendations.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Decision</i>
10/23/13	The four coastal treaty tribes will be invited to serve as liaisons to the WCMAC as sovereign governments.
1/29/14	The Bylaws were adopted
1/29/14	Garrett Dalan was elected Chair, and Doug Kess was elected Vice Chair
1/29/14	Rob Fleck and Michael Rechner were selected as the at large members of the Steering Committee
1/29/14	Rich Osborne and Brian Sheldon were elected co-leads of the Technical Committee
1/29/14	The October Meeting Summary was adopted with amendments.
4/23/14	The January Meeting Summary was adopted with amendments.
4/23/14	The WCMAC affirmed the recommended approach to MSP Development.
4/23/14	The WCMAC agreed to a process for adopting the MSP Actions List at the July meeting.
7/9/14	The April Meeting Summary was adopted as amended.
7/9/14	The Operating Procedure for Formal WCMAC recommendations was approved as amended
7/9/14	WCMAC recommends DNR extend the contract for facilitation services through the end of the biennium and amend it to include potential additional meetings.
10/22/14	The July and Sept. meeting summaries adopted with amendments.
10/22/14	WCMAC agreed to the recommended use analysis process without revision.
1/7/15	The October Meeting Summary was adopted as corrected.
1/7/15	WCMAC agreed to re-elect Garrett Dalan and Doug Kess as Chair and Vice Chair for 2015.
2/25/15	The January Meeting Summary was adopted as corrected.