

**WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING  
AGENDA**

**Wednesday, January 7, 2015 9:30 am – 3:30pm**

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

<b>Council Members Present</b>	
Brian Sheldon, Shellfish Aquaculture	Mark Plackett, Citizen
Casey Dennehy, Recreation	Michal Rechner, DNR
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
Marc Horton, Ports	Rod Fleck, N. Pacific MRC
Mark Cedergreen, Recreational Fishing	Sally Toteff, Dept. of Ecology
	Steve Sewell, Dept. of Commerce

<b>Council Members Absent</b>	
Alla Weinstein, Energy Industry	Rich Osborne, Science
Charles Costanzo, Shipping	
JT Austin, Governor's Office	

<b>Liaisons Present</b>	
Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe	

<b>Others Present</b>	
Al Carter, Ocean Gold Seafoods	Kelsey Gianou, Ecology
Bridget Trosin, WA Sea Grant	Kevin Decker, WA SeaGrant
Dru Garson, Greater Grays Harbor	Key McMurry, PCMRC
Doug Fricke, Coalition of Coastal Fisheries	Libby Whiting, DNR
Garett Brennan, Context Partners	Michael Cornmen, Westport Seafood
Gus Gates, Surfrider Foundation	Mike Nordin, PCMRC, PCD
Guy Glenn, Port of Ilwaco	Molly Bogeberg, TNC
Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology (WCMAC Staff)	Tami Pokorny, NPC MRC
Jessi Doerpinghaus, WDFW	Tom Echols, Coalition of Coastal Fisheries
Joe Shumacker, Quinault Nation	Wil Kristin, Context Partners
Kara Cardinal, TNC	Dana Golden, Cascadia Consulting, Note-taker
Katie Wrubel, Makah Office of Marine Affairs	Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions, Facilitator
Katrina Lassiter, DNR	

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

Garrett Dalan welcomed everyone to the meeting. Everyone introduced themselves, including attendees on the phone. Seventeen people were present with four attending via phone.

The WCMAC reviewed the October 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting summary. Three changes were made:

- Under “Marine Protected Reserves”, add Cedergreen to Mark under bullet number 2.
- On page 3, Penny intended that the coastal program’s enforceable policies are limited to Ecology.
- Katie Krueger: Change fishing “habits” to fishing “habitats”
- ! **The October meeting summary was approved with all three corrections. Page numbers will be added to future summaries.**

## 2. Presentation on Other New Uses

Kelsey Gianou of Ecology was hired last summer to help with the writing and research of the plan. She presented a high level summary of her research on four of five potential new uses. The goal of the presentation was to provide information, present future trends and factors in Washington, and collect additional resources for research. WCMAC members discussed their questions, concerns, and ideas in breakout groups after the presentation.

### I. Marine Product Extraction (formerly bio extraction)

- Medicines and drugs, nutritional supplements

#### Clarifying Questions:

- Does aquaculture belong in the marine spatial plan if it would be upland aquaculture?
  - Kelsey Gianou: That is a good point. Some aquaculture to supply organisms for this use could occur in the area of the MSP. Upland aquaculture is a relevant alternative to wild harvest activities for marine product extraction supply.
- Doug Kess: In the California example, did they change from wild harvest to aquaculture due to regulations? Generally if you have a private company harvesting, their motive won’t be sustainable.
  - Kelsey Gianou: I’m not sure what the motivation was for the switch from wild harvest to aquaculture for the California example.
- Dave Flaherty: The biomedical community has totally stopped doing bioprospecting, they are focusing on synthesis. We need to think about permitting and organizing to determine who owns genetic material, and who should get the benefit from it.
- The Pacific Northwest National Lab is looking at the feasibility of extracting uranium from seawater. It won’t happen in the near future, but is a potential type of new use or extraction.

- Rod Fleck: It would be helpful if you could explain the resource ownership issues. Would it be owned by the state or the feds?
  - Kelsey Gianou: According to my current information, it would be dealt with by a harvest permit, just like fishing.

## II. Offshore Aquaculture

- Any new aquaculture outside of coastal estuaries.

### Clarifying Questions:

- How big are the long lines?
  - Kelsey Gianou: The Catalina Sea Ranch in California has 40 long lines that cover 100 acres in about 120 feet water depth, and is estimated to produce 2.5 million pounds of mussels.
- Is there an assumption of natural feeding?
  - Kelsey Gianou: I didn't come across anything about natural feeding for finfish operations.
- Brian: There continues to be interest in doing net pens inside the estuary which would be a new use.
- Dale Beasley: Are all of these things going to be permitted in the sanctuary, or excluded?
  - Kelsey Gianou: The sanctuary has its own process for review and authorization; they set a high bar for commercial operations.
- Casey Dennehy: Is the aquaculture using genetically modified organisms? I'm concerned about escapement.
  - Kelsey Gianou: I don't know; I will do some research.

## III. Dredge Disposal in New Locations

- This is a current use which is being considered a potential expanded use.

### Clarifying Questions:

- Michele Culver: Would re-opening an existing site count as a new use?
  - Kelsey Gianou: It's definitely a new use for completely new sites; I'm not sure how currently unused existing sites would work.

## IV. Mining Gas Hydrates

### Clarifying Questions:

- Penny Dalton: I am confused about the difference between mining and dredge disposal.
  - Kelsey Gianou: They are very similar because they use similar equipment. Dredge disposal is the need to dispose of dredge material driven by navigation dredging. Mining is extracting specific sand, mineral, or material for a particular use.
- Brian Sheldon: You should consider in your analysis that creating bird habitat isn't always a good thing. They devour salmon smolt.
- Michele Culver: Are you planning on looking at other mining of materials or elements?
  - Jennifer Hennessey: We haven't heard of any potential new uses other than the ones we've noted.
- Doug Kess: Have you looked at seafloor mining? It's going forward in Hawaii with new technologies.
  - Kelsey Gianou: It probably doesn't apply to Washington because of conditions. I can look further to see if it's something we should include.
- Dale Beasley: I don't think that gas hydrates will be an issue. There is a potential for banning oil and gas drilling in the entire state, and this doesn't seem very feasible.

### 3. Small Group Exercise

#### Small Group Exercise

The WCMAC divided into four small groups. Participants on the phone will do this exercise via phone at a later date. Four facilitators rotated between groups to discuss potential conflicts, compatibilities and benefits, and additional data and information that would be useful for each potential new use.

#### I. Marine Product Extraction

##### Potential Conflicts:

- Space Use
  - Trespassing on private property (shellfish beds)
  - Infrastructure would conflict with existing uses.
  - Cumulative impacts on all uses.
- Environmental
  - Extraction could harm ESA listed species, other native or unique species, and critical habitat of species such as groundfish.
  - Escapement from aquaculture could harm native species and ecosystems.
  - "Gold rush feel" attracts poachers and can cause rapid harm.
  - Unsustainable use of the resources.
  - Unintended environmental, ecosystem, and foodchain impacts from removing part of the ecosystem.

### **Compatibilities/Benefits:**

- Social
  - Public health
- Economic
  - Taxes and fees for extracting public resources.
  - Net increase of jobs and financial benefits.
  - Large revenue potential: High dollar to extraction ratio
  - Sustainable harvest limits would be necessary to achieve benefits.
- Environmental
  - Mitigation for ocean acidification
  - Natural fertilizer

### **Additional Data/Information:**

- Planning/Permitting
  - Who owns the resource?
    - How would it be managed?
    - Who permits the resource?
    - What are conditions for permitting seawater extraction?
    - How would you permit prospecting?
    - How do you ensure local benefits of discoveries?
  - How would Washington determine sustainable harvest limits?
  - What is the likelihood in Washington waters?
- Economics
  - What is the net gain of jobs from other examples?
- Environmental
  - Are there impacts to seawater intakes for upland aquaculture?
- Other
  - What is the existing research on this topic? Need to understand existing research, specifically Sea Grant's biotech research and Professor Carlos Duarte's research.

## **II. Offshore Aquaculture**

### **Conflicts:**

- Potential conflict with all existing marine uses: fishing, shellfish, crabbing, shipping, recreation, general navigation, dredging and dredge disposal
- Space Use:
  - Where would it be?
  - Would it be in the sanctuary?

- To what extent might the activity be permitted?
- Environmental:
  - Disruption of natural ecosystems
  - Escapement
  - Genetic drift of farmed species, impacts on genetic diversity of native species
  - Anti-fouling: effects of introducing pharmaceuticals to nature,
  - Spread of diseases, sea lice and parasites,
  - Pollution,
  - Water quality, hypoxia
  - Current flow changes,
  - Aquaculture structures act as food aggregating devices
  - Changes in food chain dynamics
    - Competition between native and farmed species for necessary ecosystem services
- Other
  - Economic impacts on existing markets
    - Competition with existing fishing industries
  - Efficiency in the food chain of raising vs. harvesting various species
  - Government support of one type over another, or government subsidies that skew the cost/benefit analysis
  - Human health considerations of consuming the products (GMO, pesticides)

### **Compatibilities/Benefits**

- Environmental
  - Reduce pressure on wild species
  - Water quality improvement
  - Remove carbon from the natural system, reduce ocean acidification impacts
  - Support organic fertilizer supply chain
  - Small geographic footprint
- Economic
  - New economic activity and new jobs (if sustainable)
    - Economic benefit is tied to species and culture method: there is an opportunity
  - Controllable, constant, and predictable product production
- Social
  - Increased food production

### **Additional data/information**

- Technology
  - Is the infrastructure able to withstand winter coastal or offshore storms?
  - How could derelict gear impact the operation?

- What happens to existing aquaculture infrastructure?
- Social/Economic
  - What are the impacts to tribal resources?
  - How would it benefit or impact local economies?
    - How might local communities be included in the investment?
    - What is the economic profile of investors?
    - Are there any local community-based operations?
  - Where is the money going?
  - Is there a market for the products?
  - Who is interested in pursuing aquaculture in Washington?
- Planning/Permitting
  - Are terminal fisheries included?
  - How do you control permitting?
  - What products are being discussed?
- Other
  - How are Washington's fish imports included in the "80%" projection?

### III. Dredge Disposal in New Locations

#### Potential Conflicts:

- Environmental
  - Habitat impacts
    - Monitoring habitat before and after disposal
    - Crab communities
    - Nearshore ecological impacts
  - Contaminants
    - Release for contaminants
  - Change in wave amplification
  - Restricts flow of smaller channels
  - Change in flow dynamics: erosion vs. accretion
- Planning/Permitting
  - Need to identify sediment type from dredging before disposal
- Space Use
  - Intense fishing off southern Washington may conflict with disposal
  - Path of transport may conflict with other existing uses
- Economic
  - Collecting data and monitoring costs

#### Compatibilities/Benefits

- Economics

- Benefit to the navigation industry: jobs, navigation safety, ability to move freight, economic benefit for shipping
- Environmental
  - Beach nourishment
- Social
  - Consider disposal as protection (such as Highway 105 and Wash Away Beach)
  - Valuable material can have a high degree of impact for multiple purposes
  - Change in wave amplification for recreation
- Other
  - Consider existing disposal sites over new ones
  - Enhanced dumping methods should be considered

### **Data/Information Needs**

- Planning/Permitting
  - Estuarine aquaculture should be included in this definition.
  - Make a plan for future dredge disposal needs and map it out instead of a case by case basis
  - Create and understand long term (20-50 year) projections
  - Evaluate of bays, offshore, and upland disposal sites when considering all options
    - Understand cost/benefits of each location
    - Understand larger impacts than cost for each location
  - New disposal alternatives need to be evaluated and have a measurable contribution.
  - Evaluate the dredging process along with the disposal site
  - Develop a database to inform private and federal dredging
  - Introduce consistent monitoring to understand the cause and effect of dredge disposal
- Environmental
  - Understand impact to crab and other benthic organisms: crab population study
  - Nearshore sediment transport study
  - What is the cumulative impact of disposal with other impacts? (including climate change)
  - Understand contaminants in dredge material
  - Understand waves and circulation

## **IV. Mining**

### **Potential Conflicts**

- Space Use
  - Aerial military uses
  - Would it be allowable in the sanctuary? In estuaries?

- To what extent would it be permitted?
- Environmental
  - Impact on ecosystem and habitat
  - Impact on shellfish
  - Change current flow in the estuaries
  - Cumulative impacts to ecosystem: This use could exacerbate existing concerns
  - Contamination or pollution
  - Rockfish essential fish habitat
  - Water quality
  - Fish aggregation
  - Create bird habitat
- Economic
  - Displace economic benefits
  - Effects to industry

### **Compatibilities/Benefits**

- Environmental
  - Prevent or reduce erosion
  - Nourish beaches
  - Protect estuaries
- Economic
  - Potential economic opportunities

### **Data/Information Needs**

- Investigate methane leaks
- Social
  - What would be the impacts to waves and therefore wave users?
  - What are the safety concerns and how might they be mitigated?
- Planning/Permitting
  - Where would this happen in Washington's waters?
  - What types of mining would be allowed?
- Technology
  - What is the mining method?
  - How deep are useful materials?
  - How is this related to beach mining?
  - Where do the mine tailings go?
- Economic
  - Is this economically feasible?
  - What is the demand for materials available in Washington?
- Environmental

- Impacts on turtles and other species of concern

### **Comments and Questions**

- 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.

### **4. Use analysis**

Jennifer Hennessey noted that at the next meeting the WCMAC will discuss the draft assessment matrix. This discussion will include how data is categorized in the data viewer, and how existing uses should be treated when compared with potential new uses. That information will be used to create plan scenarios. After that, we will determine if our recommendations are compatible with existing authorities.

Michele Culver: We were able to get agreement with NOAA to release the commercial albacore data. We will be using that data in the analysis that we do. We are still working to determine what level of specificity we can display the data publicly.

### **5. Updates**

#### **Marine Spatial Planning Outreach to Fishing interests**

Garrett Dalan discussed the request for outreach to fishing interests for the Marine Spatial Plan. The Steering Committee discussed it, and concluded that SeaGrant would have the capacity to do outreach to fishing interests with MSP money as part of their current contract. This outreach is not limited to fishing interests. WCMAC members are welcome to recommend particular groups or avenues for outreach by contacting Kevin from SeaGrant.

### **Comments and Questions**

- Brian Sheldon: General outreach is important, but I don't want it to replace going to fishing communities and getting information on species and where they are fished to put into the data viewer.
- Michele Culver: We do have log books. For fisheries where we don't have logbooks, we've done interviews and sat down with charts. We also have data that we are using in from fishery independent surveys that informs the ecologically important areas. All of that information will be shared as we go through our analysis. If there are people that think their information isn't displayed in the portal, they can contact us.
- Garrett Dalan: Kevin can use the existing fishing data and vet it as he does outreach.

## 6. Review of Attendance Expectations

The vacancy in the energy seat has been filled, and the economic development seat is now empty. The WCMAC reviewed overall attendance which remained high in 2014.

- Brian Sheldon: It's worth visiting at the beginning of the year, to see if people who haven't been attending still have interest.
- Garrett Dalan: I am willing to inquire on the WCMAC's behalf to see if people plan to participate in the future, or if there's a way their participation could be increased outside of the meetings.
  - The WCMAC agreed that this is a good idea.
- Casey Dennehy: I'm not sure if she's been involved in other ways, but we haven't had our appointment from the Governor's office here.
- Miles Batchelder: We are all busy, and the fact that the Governor's appointee isn't here factors into my decision about whether I should come to meetings.

## 7. WACD Resolution to Expand WCMAC membership

The WCMAC reviewed a resolution to add two new seats to the WCMAC for the Conservation Commission and the Washington Conservation Districts. WCMAC has not been asked to make a recommendation on the topic.

### Comments and Questions

- RD Grunbaum: Why do they feel that they need two seats?
- Mike Nordin: The Association wants to have a seat, and the conservation districts are separate volunteer organizations. They provide a local hub to what's going on the ground.
- Michele Culver: How is having a county conservation district representative on the WCMAC different than having a county MRC representative?

- Brian Sheldon: Conservation districts cover a broad area from uplands to shellfish beds. They bring in voluntary participation by landowners.
- Rod Fleck: Why isn't the liaison position being considered first? Do these groups have long standing participation with WCMAC?
  - Mike Nordin: The Commission was one of the groups that supported the original WCMAC legislation, and Conservation District employees have been coming to the meetings.
- An agenda item was requested for the next meeting to discuss the possibility of making a recommendation to the legislature or offering a liaison position.

## 8. Work Plan

Jennifer Hennessey went over the current workplan.

- A tentative meeting was added on September 23<sup>rd</sup>. WCMAC members should let her know if that doesn't work.
- There will be a work session around ecological important areas and a conversation like today on renewable energy at the next meeting.
- There will be more details presented on the use analysis process.
- There will be an update on ecological indicators.

## Comments and Questions

- The forage fish report will be provided to DNR and posted on the website next week.
- Brian Sheldon: I would like to get a status update on the economic analysis before June 30<sup>th</sup>.
- Dale Beasley: I don't see anywhere in the workplan where we are considering how to protect and preserve existing and sustainable uses. I keep bringing this up because we have a unique situation. The marine sanctuary and tribal areas cover 70% of the coast, so that leaves us with only a small amount of area to discuss.
  - This is part of the use analysis process, where we categorize uses as low, medium, and high. The state agencies will take first crack at categorizing low medium and high, and then present it to the WCMAC for review.
- Sally Toteff: There's a concern that what comes out of this spatial plan is going to allow things to happen. The MSP defines certain things that can be allowed, and a proposal has to come in and it has to go through a long process of permits and environmental assessment. In the future, it might be helpful to speak to an example and talk about if there is a proposal for a new use, what the process would be.
- Dave Fluharty: It's a big deal to recognize and document what existing uses are in this plan. That is our job.
- Ray Toste: We need to think about how to communicate to the Federal government. They think we have endless space.

## **9. Technical Committee**

1. Visual assessment – The Technical Committee recommends using the same model as Oregon used. Susan will resend this discussion guide.
2. Renewable energy information needs – Staff is working on a written overview of permitting requirements to present in a written format. Staff will also try to organize a presentation(s) on the known impacts of renewable energy to human uses

## **10. Data Viewer**

Libby Whiting provided an update on the data viewer along with a complete list of all current layers. Layers in yellow are not currently working. The server is approaching capacity, so it may be necessary to verify that all layers add significant value.

### **Comments and Questions**

- Dale Beasley: Could we increase the server size?
  - Libby Whiting: It would technically be possible. We have 133 layers which is more than any other MSP.
- Brian Sheldon: What about the missing invasive species?
  - We are re-evaluating what to do with invasive species. Originally we included mud snails because it was the only one available.

## **11. Governor's Budget Request**

The WCMAC's request for \$925,000 was put in the Governor's budget.

## **12. MRAC Update**

The MRAC requested \$3 million which was included in the Governor's budget. All meeting notes are on the MRAC website.

## **13. Project Updates**

Katrina Lassiter presented project updates. All projects highlighted in red have updates since the October meeting.

## **14. Selection of Chair/Vice-Chair**

No new nominations were made for Chair or Vice-Chair. Garrett Dalan and Doug Kess agreed to continue.

- ! The WCMAC agreed to re-elect Garrett Dalan and Doug Kess as Chair and Vice Chair for 2015.
- Brian Sheldon: Thank you for all of the work and effort you have put in to the Council.

### **Agenda topics for Upcoming Meetings**

- Conservation District and Conservation Commission liaison discussion
- Discuss what protect and preserve entails for the use analysis
- Get an update from the economic assessment
- Garrett Dalan will report back from attendance conversations
- Potential discussion about coal by rail. Someone from the Spills program will present, probably at the April meeting. Sally passed out a fact sheet on the spills program.

### **Public Comment:**

- Key McMurray: I think you should consider naval military use as another potential new use. There could be bombing sites, cables, and sonar activities. Also, the data viewer should be a living resource. Isn't more data going to be added over time? There should be enough server space for future additions.
- Mike Nordin: Next week on January 13<sup>th</sup> the Grays Harbor Conservation District is having long term planning meeting at 2:00pm. Also, the MRC Science Conference is Saturday May 16<sup>th</sup>. It's a celebration of the year, and lunch and dinner are provided. Everyone is invited to both events.
- Libby Whiting: We have started a section on the Marine Spatial Plan Website with frequently asked questions. It is located in the news blog section of the website.
- Randy Kline: Washington State Parks is in the process of considering a rule change to allow wind powered vehicles on our beaches. It would allow them year round rather than through a special events permit for a specific time. Randy will send out a press release to the WCMAC about this process.

**Upcoming Meetings**

- February 25, 2015
- April 22, 2015
- June 24, 2015

Meetings will be held in Aberdeen unless otherwise noted

**Attachment:** Statement from the Coalition of Coastal Fisheries, distributed at the meeting.