

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

Draft Summary

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

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

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

Council Members Absent	
Charles Costanzo, Shipping	

Liaisons Present	
None	

Others Present (as noted on the sign-in sheet)	
Bridget Trosin, WA Sea Grant	Kelsey Gianou, Ecology
Corey Niles, WDFW	Larry Thevik, WDCFA
David Dicks, Tatoosh Law Group	Libby Whiting, DNR
George Galasso, NOAA	Mikaela Freeman, citizen
Gus Gates, Surfrider Foundation	Michael Taylor, Cascade Economics
Kara Cardinal, TNC	Molly Bogeberg, TNC
Katrina Lassiter, DNR	Ray Brown, citizen
Kevin Decker, WSG	Rick Lovely, citizen
Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology (WCMAC Staff)	Jessi Doerpinghaus, WDFW
Kay Treacle is with the Harder Foundation	Craig Zora, citizen
Dana Golden, Cascadia Consulting, Note-taker	Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions, Facilitator

Welcome & Introductions, Agenda Review

- Garrett Dalan welcomed everyone to the meeting. All attendees introduced themselves, and were invited to provide a coastal update.

Coastal Updates:

- The North Pacific MRC helps to support the coast-wide cleanup that is happening this weekend.
- In the North Coast, there will be a River and Ocean Film Festival following the beach cleanup.
- Surfrider will be hosting a free barbeque for volunteers at Hobuck Beach and La Push.
- The MRC Summit will be held on October 15th and October 16th in La Push. Talk to Casey Dennehy for more information.
- Many WCMAC members are working hard on the Pacific County Shoreline Master Program.
- The Department of Ecology issued a new permit to the Willapa-Grays Harbor Oyster Growers Association for controlling burrowing shrimp with a pesticide, imidacloprid.
- The Department of Ecology has an open comment period on a new geographic response plan in the Chehalis River. It will be open until May 8th.
- The state is experiencing the worst drought in 64 years.
- The Ocean salmon season has been set; it's virtually identical to last year.
- The port in Cathlamet has been looking into dredging.
- SeaGrant has a new website and is requesting feedback.
- There is a new book on ocean governance, "Protected Area Governance and Management" that is a great resource for the Council. It is available as a free download; David Fluharty will send a link.
- Washington State Parks went through a rule change to allow wind powered vehicles on some beaches. They will be allowed at the end of May.
- Julie Horowitz is now the Governor's representative at WCMAC meetings. Her focus is shellfish, but she will be working with her colleagues to make sure that issues that come up in other areas are communicated well.
- There is a meeting tonight at the Oakville Events Center on oil trains.
- Thank you to Kevin from Sea Grant for doing a great job on outreach.
- There is a new app called Ocean Shores, Something Fun that has upcoming events and activities.
- Ship worms should be added to the list of potential new uses. They can be farmed and they also have biomedical benefits.
- Ray Toste will be returning to Washington DC to speak about commercial fishing with the legislature.

Agenda and Meeting Summary:

- Susan Gulick went over the agenda. The only change to the agenda was that the discussion of liaisons from the Washington Conservation Commission and the Washington Association of Conservation Districts has been postponed. This will be on a future WCAMC agenda if desired by these organizations.
- The following changes were made to the February Meeting Summary in the packet:
 - Michael Cornman's name was misspelled.
 - On Page 6 there was a note about what someone thought Alla said in a previous meeting. The sentence was removed to avoid confusion.
 - On Page 7, the bullet points about SeaGrant Updates and Ecosystem Indicators bullets should be moved to the left as separate bullets not sub-bullets.
 - At the top it should say "summary" not "agenda".
- ! The February Meeting Summary was approved as amended.

Public Comment:

- Ray Brown: I wanted to speak to this committee because you report directly to the Governor. The Elwha River Dam removal and restoration project was 350 million dollars wasted. And that doesn't include the additional money being spent on silt removal. There were 400,500 acre feet of fresh clean water behind the dam. Desalinization is an energy intensive way of making fresh water; it would cost billions of dollars to desalinate all of that water leaving a huge carbon footprint. Desalinization is not the answer; we just need to get freshwater where it needs to go. We need water storage and water transport programs. California is sitting on high speed rail money, there's money that could be used. I don't want to see us fighting water storage programs and removing them like the Elwha dam. It was a huge mistake. We share our other resources with other places, why not water? It would generate revenue.

MSP Overview & Use Analysis – Jen Hennessey

- Jennifer Hennessey reviewed the MSP Outline and Process, as well as an Overview of the Use Analysis Process. Both handouts were included in the packet. The intent of the handout was to outline the process and contents of the plan to make it more clear how the pieces will start to fit together.
- Jennifer Hennessey went over the documents, particularly the section with Key WCMAC Tasks/Input.

Comments and Questions

- Jeff Ward: In Section 3 on Spatial Analyses, it isn't clear what you do when there is an overlap between a proposed new use and an existing use.
 - Jennifer Hennessey: Recommendations about how to handle use conflicts will be in section 4. It will include conversation at WCMAC about how to handle conflicts.
 - Jeff: It still seems like there's a piece missing between 3 and 4 regarding how you address conflicts between uses.
- RD Grunbaum: The information from this process would be invaluable to the SMP updates. Is it possible to delay SMP updates so that cities and counties can take a look at that information?
 - Jennifer Hennessey: Unfortunately SMPs are a grant funded program, and funding from the state process to support those processes will run out. We are working to help people involved with local SMPs understand where the available data is from MSP that might be helpful in their SMP updates. SMPs can also incorporate information at a later time such as through an amendment to their SMP.
 - Rod Fleck: The process won't stop when the funding runs out.
- Doug Kess: Data on sea level rise would be helpful in local SMPs. Can it be added to the data viewer as it becomes available?
- Mark Plackett: Can the data on climate change be made available to the Shoreline Master Program?
- Penny Dalton: Where do coastal hazards fit in?
 - Jennifer Hennessey: The Ecology of the Pacific Coast section will address physical hazards and the Socio-economic section will address human vulnerabilities.
- Rich Osborne: We need an adaptive management strategy. A lot of the conflicts will play a big role in that.
 - Jennifer Hennessey: This is included in Part 4 and frameworks for creating an adaptive management strategy exist in other plans that we can learn from.

- Mark Plackett: The City of Ocean Shores is already starting to use the mapping tool. Our work is already starting to pay off.
- Dale Beasley: I don't see anything to address the needs of the coastal communities.
 - Jennifer Hennessey: I think part 2 is all about identifying and documenting the existing uses. For each existing use, there will be sub sections. This outline is abbreviated.
- Brian Sheldon: Is the economic section required? It doesn't have an asterisk.
 - Susan Gulick: The asterisks in the outline represent the required elements for the MSP from RCW 43.372.040.
- Mark Cedergreen: Is it clear how the goal to "protect and preserve existing uses" will be addressed and analyzed as part of the Use Analysis? It seems like it is actually focused on how we can somehow make ocean energy happen. The process is supposed to be bottom up but it feels top down.
- Ray Toste: It does feel top down. Coastal fishing could be wiped out immediately. 80% of coastal tax revenue comes directly from the industry.
- Susan Gulick: The use analysis process will be where the level of conflict between existing uses and potential new uses will be analyzed. That is where this group will put together recommendations for how to address those new uses. Developing these recommendations will be an important "bottom up" process.
- Garret Dalan: Section 4.3 is where recommendations will be included. WCMAC could have its own standing recommendations as an appendix if there are some that do not make it into the plan.
 - Dale Beasley: I would prefer that all of the recommendations are in the body not in the appendix.
- Rod Fleck: It would be helpful if you sent out a chapter outline for one of the uses under Section 2 so that people can see what a complete chapter outline will look like.
- Michele Culver: The first step will be to see overlays in the use analysis of where fisheries take place now and to see how areas overlap. This plan doesn't have regulatory power but it can recommend actions to protect and preserve existing uses that will guide regulatory decisions in the future.
- Dale Beasley: I want to understand how high, medium, and low use will be applied to fisheries.
 - Jennifer Hennessey: We have data on the viewer that shows intensity of use from log books, outreach, and data. Fish and Wildlife is having conversations with each industry about what the level of conflict would be in these areas. The same conversations are happening with other sectors. We will bring the approach back in June with questions on how we should compile the information.
- Alla Weinstein: We have a huge marine sanctuary, and the information on treaties needs to go into more depth. Tribes have a lot of rights, and that should be considered as part of the plan. The plan is not just about conservation. It's also about how do we benefit from what we have. Economic development drives the coast but sometimes preservation is taking over benefits. There are areas that could be developed and improved.
 - Ray Toste: I agree. It would be nice to go back to DC not only as a preservationist but to have a blessing from a group like this to say this is what we've come up with together.
- Rod Fleck: Will you include a thorough bibliography of research?
 - Jennifer Hennessey: Yes.
- Rich Osborne: I want to speak to the comments about the lack of confidence in government and the process being bottom up. We keep being told that this is just recommendations and not a

regulatory plan. But we need the strong support from the state agencies and policy makers so that BOEM and others will pay attention to our recommendations.

- Jennifer Hennessey: The reason you hear that is so that people have clear expectations. That can be dissatisfying. There are many mechanisms we can use to use this information. Our intention is that this plan will make us stronger.
- Sally Toteff: Within the outline on section 4-4.5, it would help to add a framework for tribal and federal communication and engagement to show the clear intention for engagement.
- Mark Plackett: I understand the depth of fishing concerns, and I understand that we can be trumped by BOEM and tribes. But if this isn't a bottom up process, then how do we change it so that it is? We're going through a process that gives people an opportunity to look at information that they haven't had until now. I'm here because I think this process is bottom up and I'm willing to invest the time.
- Susan Gulick: I think some of the frustration is that most of what we've been doing so far is gathering information. Now as a group we can begin starting to provide ideas, solutions, and recommendations for each other's concerns.

Coastal Economic Assessment

Mike Taylor of Cascade Economics presented an update on the Coastal Economic Assessment. The team is currently working on data collection, focus group meetings, modeling, and analysis. The presentation is attached to this summary. If any WCMAC members have specific studies or information that you want to make sure Cascade Economics has seen, feel free to contact Mike Taylor.

The Next Steps are:

- Draft report due May 13, 2015
- Review by WCMAC/Address Comments
- Presentation at the June WCMAC Meeting or a standalone workshop
- Final Report due by June 30, 2015

Questions and Comments:

- Brian Sheldon: Have you seen the 2013 Earth Economics study?
 - Mike Taylor: Yes, we have that.
- Mark Plackett: Is the expenditure pattern and spending pattern the same thing?
 - Mike Taylor: The expenditure pattern is how a business's costs break down. Spending patterns are where and how visitors and tourists spend their money.
- RD Grunbaum: I saw the Willapa section for shellfish and aquaculture. Have you separated that out for Gray's Harbor?
 - Mike Taylor: We have not separated that out specifically.
- Brian Sheldon: I am frustrated that we are combining counties. The product should be delivered by county.
 - Mike Taylor: We will be doing the economic profile by county including how they are structured for the different industries. The economic model is a coast-wide model. We had a discussion about this at the October WCMAC Meeting. If we did individual counties, they are small in population and industry. The resolution of the model wouldn't capture it well enough, and the Science Panel recommended that the model be coast-wide. We will still

do a post processing discussion to discuss where specific impacts are likely to occur on a county level. There are no other models with the same credibility. We know there is a lot of interest in county level results.

- Steve Sewell: Did you include the analysis of shipping data in the economic profile?
 - Mike Taylor: We don't have a detailed analysis but we're looking at expenditure patterns for ports and shipping. That is because it's not going to have a major impact role in new uses. Shipping will be one of the sectors for the impact analysis.
 - Steve Sewell: New uses could have a major impact on shipping.
- Mark Cedergreen: For fishing, are you looking beyond the owner operator at the employees and how the money filters through?
 - Mike Taylor: Yes. We focus on vessel operators because they have a good handle on their expenditure. It includes the number of crew, wage levels, etc.
- Mark Cedergreen: When industry starts to shrink, you get down to a point of losing infrastructure. Is that being considered?
 - Mike Taylor: That is part of the risk and vulnerability analysis. We have to look at the rest of the information before we can get to it. There is a threshold with an industry that if it gets too small, it can be decimated. That will be addressed in the report.
- Rich Osborne: I saw that forest industry is in the industry profiles. Will timber lands be included at all in the ecosystem services?
 - Mike Taylor: Yes they are included in the ecosystem services discussion.
- Doug Kess: Do you have any data now or forthcoming that could bolster Ray's trip to DC?
 - Mike Taylor: I would be hesitant to provide information without having it vetted by the rest of the committee.
 - Ray Toste: I will probably go in September, so I could use it then.
- Ray Toste: Did you do any analysis of truckers. The money goes 3.5 to one after processing and distribution.
 - Mike Taylor: We've done that on the processor side. We visited with three different processors and they discussed their expenditures which include shipping and transportation.
 - Michele Culver: Have you spoken with any at-sea processing companies?
 - Mike Taylor: I am not sure, I will check.
- Michele Culver: When you say that you met separately with groundfish fisheries, there are other fisheries as well. Want to make sure that those don't get discounted. It would be good to include La Push and Neah Bay. I can provide contacts for those.
 - Mike Taylor: We are aware of other fisheries.
- Michele Culver: For recreational fishing, make sure you consider non-fishing recreation such as seabird and whale watching.
- Mike Taylor: That is captured in the recreation and tourism section.
- Dale Beasley: We always say that we don't have a way of discussing impacts. We do have some information about different energy devices.
 - Mike Taylor: Because we would have to speculate about those new uses we would have a hard time speculating their expenditure patterns. What we can do (without a specific plan in mind) we can say if a plant were in place it might have a positive, negative, or no impact on an industry.

- Mike Taylor: After the report is done, there is a tool/model which the responsible agency could use to do their own economic analysis. They could ask the proponent for specific information.
- Alla Weinstein: In your analysis of the future uses, you could do an example analysis of a certain project. If some of the industries are shrinking, the new uses will pick up and be able to use infrastructure. You should consider which industries are in decline and what excess capacity could be utilized by new industries.
 - Mike Taylor: We can look at this in the qualitative part of the report.
- Brian Sheldon: As you're going through this you're probably finding information that is unavailable. Will you include that in the report as gaps? One of the things that is going on in recreational vs commercial fishing debate is the general public's lack of access to fish. Is there a way to account or that?
 - Mike Taylor: We are looking at markets and market channels, where the product flows. We can look further at the access question.
- Ray Toste: I can get you information on the National Grocery Association. I have to leave, but anything that Larry has to say is good with me and my organization. I would really like to look at the possibility of having an alternate to fill in for me at meetings.

Marine and Rail Oil Transport Study

- Sally Toteff introduced the presentation. She thanked the Council for inviting Ecology to provide information on the oil transport study. Washington has a number of existing refineries. Oil has been coming into Washington, and we've seen things happening around the country. As our leaders recognize that we have oil being transported in new ways, they are looking at how to pass laws and fund programs to reduce impacts.
- Washington currently is one of the best states in terms of oil spill prevention, response, and preparedness. There are new risks involved with trains that are coming through Washington. The legislature and governor funded a study led by the Department of Ecology to analyze risk and recommend next steps. Oil spill prevention, response, preparedness – the best state in terms of capacity
- David Byers, Response Manager for the Department of Ecology Spills Program presented on the changing energy picture and the recommendations that came out of the study. A copy of the preliminary findings and recommendations was included in the meeting packet.

Comments and Questions

- RD Grunbaum: First responder fire fighters told me that they will assess from ½ mile or greater away whether to respond or not.
 - David Byers: That is true; there is nothing you can do in terms of water or foam.
- RD Grunbaum: I don't think the booming technology is successful. You said you can collect oil at 4 knots, but most technologies fail at 1 knot. Usually around 15% of oil can be recovered.
 - David Byers: 15% is the average nationally, but in Washington we do about 40%.
- Rod Fleck: I participated in a worst case scenario exercise. It was very informative and helpful.
 - David Byers: We make continuous advancement in our area of contingency plans. We get great participation, and it is totally worth the investment.
- Mark Plackett: Do they vent the cars? Are they pre-placing cleanup equipment on rail car shipments yet?

- David Byers: The cars drain from the bottom but under a certain pressure they will vent. There is no pre-placed equipment. However every train has an empty car between the engine and the first car which would be a great place to put equipment. We don't have the ability to regulate that currently.
- Brian Sheldon: It sounds like the best we're going to get is 40% recovery, leaving a bunch of oil that can go into my shellfish bed. It's a given to me that once it hits the environment, it's gone. We know we'll have a spill, so it's just a matter of when. I can't rely on recovery; I'm more concerned about how I'm protected legally from oil companies. Oil company attorneys always drag it out forever, and no one gets paid back. Why can't Washington just say no, we don't want Washington's coast line turned into oil export terminals?
 - David Byers: The premise for our study was that congress has control, and the state doesn't. We don't believe we have the authority to stop the trains. We didn't focus our time in the study on that question.
- RD Grunbaum: You could say no to new terminals because it's a development and a new risk.
 - Rod Fleck: It's not that simple, you have to be really careful about how you do that.
 - Paula: The Environmental Impact Statement process is underway for Westport and Imperium for expansions in Crude by Rail. The EIS process is triggered with a permit application; it is prepared as a disclosure document and evaluates alternative measures. The information is for permiters, and there is always an option to deny the permit.
- Casey Dennehy: When are the marine risk assessment studies for Gray's Harbor and Willapa Bay expected to be completed?
 - The studies are predicated on a bill passing and also adequate funding to complete the study. If those things happen, they would begin July 1st 2016.

Ecologically Important Areas Analysis (Part 2)

Corey Niles and John Pierce from WDFW presented an update on the Ecologically Important Areas Analysis.

The team showed preliminary maps with aggregated data layers. The data layers are aggregated by hexagons. They can be viewed by hot spots or based on the highest ranking of any of the layers.

Next Steps:

- Preliminary draft report due June 1st
- Final report to DNR at the June 30th
- Additional information from NOAA will be available in July
- The June report will likely be revised once new information is available; the revised final report will be completed by the end of August. There will be opportunity for review and comment on the proposed revisions.
- Clarifying Questions
 - Brian Sheldon: It's interesting to see that we were looking at the density of populations and then the estuaries are all red.
 - Michele Culver: We gave the estuaries the highest score, which we proposed at the last meeting. We don't have enough data on estuaries, but we know that they are important.

- Brian Sheldon: I understand the reasoning, but it would be nice if we had more data. That should be identified in the data gaps.
- Rich Osborne: You don't actually have data for every point, right?
 - John Pierce: Correct, it's modeled off of the data we do have.
- Will there be an effort to show a feeding or foraging area for seabird colonies?
 - John Pierce: We are still getting additional seabird information. Other special habitats will be included in the final model.
- Dale Beasley: When you used the fish information, did you look at how the logbook data correlates with the trawl data?
 - John Pierce: No we haven't done that.
 - Michele Culver: For the Use Analysis, we'll be looking at each fishery with log book data. Those will be separate layers that you can compare to the trawl data.
- Brian Sheldon: Why does the renewable energy layer show Willapa Bay as suitable? It is not suitable for a new use, it is shellfish beds.
 - John Pierce: My understanding is the renewable energy layers produced were looking only at requirements for different types of renewable energy technologies, like resource potential, distance to port, and water depth. This data was not intended to address the human or environmental conflicts that would be considered later on in the planning process.
 - Michele Culver: The next piece will be the human use analysis. That will be mapped just like we are mapping it for fish and wildlife. Remember that these maps are not intended to be an impact assessment; they are an early planning tool.
- Mark Plackett: With the hexagonal model are you putting all the data in the hexagon so that every hexagon has all of the information?
 - John Pierce: Yes, every hexagon retains all of the layers.
- Rich Osborne: Can you map where the actual data is, so that it's possible to see how much the model is doing and how much is data?
 - John Pierce: There is definitely uncertainty. The maps have uncertainty information associated with every hexagon. We are still working on how to manage and record uncertainty. We did do a comparison of the model to raw data, and the models did pretty well.
- Corey Niles: The report will have 1 or 2 pages of information for each data layer.

Updates

- The work plan was updated to include a September 23rd Meeting
 - The June meeting will include a discussion of the ecological and social indicators work
 - We are planning meeting dates for beyond September. There will likely be a meeting in early December.
- Technical Committee Update/Data Viewer
 - The Technical Committee is now meeting regularly on the 2nd Wednesday of every month from 2:30-4:30.
 - The Technical Committee met on March 10th. The meeting summary is in the folder. The Technical Committee is working on weeding out old data that is no longer relevant. The data list was also reorganized by current and future uses.

- Mark Plackett: The data viewer is one of our better selling tools. It's very valuable to be able to hand it to someone.
- MRAC (Ocean Acidification Panel)
 - Garrett Dalan has sent out several of their newsletters. There are no other updates; they are waiting to hear if they receive funding.
- MSP Projects Status Report
 - There are a lot of updates because draft products are starting to come in. The updates are in the packet.

Upcoming Meetings

- Agenda Topics for Next Meeting
 - Casey Dennehy: We would like to present on the recreational use survey.
 - Jennifer Hennessey: There is a possibility of having a stand alone workshop on the economic analysis work. Would people be interested in doing that?
 - Penny Dalton: Melissa may be ready to present on the social indicators.
 - RD Grunbaum: I have an economic study on the impacts of oil spills on the 9 tribal fisheries that I could share.
- Garrett Dalan: There are two correspondences that will go out with the minutes.

Public Comment

- Larry Thevik: I was not comforted or confident in the ability of the state to respond to oil spills. I would like you to understand the scope of the projects for Southwest Washington. The oil from the Vancouver and Grays Harbor terminals will equal over half of all the oil moved in nation in 2014. The marine spatial planning process needs to identify and understand the risks, and take a policy position. This is a new use not an expansion of new uses. Fish and Wildlife said that Gray's Harbor is very vulnerable to an oil spill. The Department of Ecology must acknowledge the limited effectiveness of cleanup in the fast moving waters of Grays Harbor, Willapa Bay, and the Columbia River. Damage would be irreparable. Booming of oil is not effective. Oil haulers themselves say they can recover at .7 knots to 1 knot. Last year, Grays Harbor exceeded 3.5 knots 120 times. Booming would only work in a slack tide on a calm day. Tanker owners said in the event of an at sea spill they are very fortunate to recover 10-15%. I lost a season to the Valdez oil spill. No matter how high the paper is stacked, oil spill response is not up to the task. I am asking this body to be skeptical of the study. I ask that as a body that is charged with trying to identify uses for our marine spatial planning spaces, when the draft EIS comes out this body should engage and have some response. I know there's been a reluctance to consider proposed terminals as not being new uses, but I suggest to you that they are. There's something you can do about it. As for wind energy, each project has to be evaluated individually. The measure of whether or not an alternative use is suitable is not where it would have less conflict. The utility should have to be proven.
- Ray Brown: I don't think anyone is saying that crude by rail doesn't have some risk. I believe these risks can be mitigated. Tankers full of gasoline and propane travel up and down roads all the time. Shipments by truck are 6 times more dangerous than rail. Why the sudden focus on crude by rail? Oil is a very valuable commodity in our country and we should support safe transport.
- Gus Gates: I'm from the Surfrider foundation, and want to thank you for all of your efforts. I know it's a slog and it's not easy. I read the entire 500 page document on the oil transportation study hoping that there would be an emphasis on what we are doing to protect coastal communities. We

need to protect existing jobs and the quality of life. There will be major changes on the horizon if some of these things happen and I've yet to hear what will be done to protect coastal communities. In honor of Earth Day I encourage you all to get involved in the EIS process and contact your legislators.

- Kay Treakle: The ecosystem here is very important to us, and we are appreciative of the work that you're doing. There is a bridge between oil transport issues, the oil terminal, and the MSP study. I think the economic study covering the whole coast is missing the question of what would be the economic impact of oil spills on the coast. I would argue that it should be an addendum to the analysis.

Summary of Decisions:

- ! The February Meeting Summary was approved as amended.

Upcoming Meetings

- June 24, 2015 – Montesano High School
- September 23, 2015

Meetings will be held in Aberdeen unless otherwise noted