

# WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING Final Meeting Summary

October 22, 2014 - 9:30 am – 3:30pm

Council Members Present	
Brian Sheldon, Shellfish Aquaculture	Michele Culver, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Casey Dennehy, Recreation	Penny Dalton, WA SeaGrant
Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing	Randy Kline, WA State Parks
Doug Kess, Pacific MRC	Ray Toste, Commercial Fishing
Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC	RD Grunbaum, Conservation
Marc Horton, Ports	Rich Osborne, Science
Mark Cedergreen, Recreational Fishing	Rod Fleck, N. Pacific MRC
Mark Plackett, Citizen	Sally Toteff, Dept. of Ecology
Michal Rechner, DNR	

Council Members Absent	
Alla Weinstein, Energy Industry	JT Austin, Governor's Office
Carol Ervest, Wahkiakum MRC	Miles Batchelder, WA Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership
Charles Costanzo, Shipping	Steve Sewall, Dept. of Commerce
David Fluharty, Educational Institution	Jeff Ward, Coastal Energy

Liaisons Present	
Katie Krueger, Quileute Tribe	

Others Present	
Bridget Trosin, WA Sea Grant	Larry Thevik, WOCFA
Doug Fricke, Coalition of Coastal Fisheries	Laura Wilson, Makah Office of Marine Affairs/ TNC
Greg Mueller, citizen	Libby Whiting, DNR
Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology (WCMAC Staff)	Mike Nordin, PCMRC, PCD
Katie Wrubel, Makah Office of Marine Affairs	Molly Bogeberg, TNC
Katrina Lassiter, DNR	Shannon Davies, The Research Group, LLC
Kelsey Gianou, Ecology	Stefan Moedritzer, Cascadia Consulting, Note-taker
Kevin Decker, WA SeaGrant	Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions, Facilitator
Key McMurry, PCMRC	Simon Geerlofs, PNNL

## 1. Welcome and Agenda Review

Garrett welcomed the Council to the meeting and reviewed the agenda. There was a quorum of 13 council members present. All Council members introduced themselves. The Council reviewed the meeting summaries from 7-19 and 9-18.

- Mislabeling of the tribal liaisons was corrected.
- Alla Weinstein was not present at the council 9/18 meeting, Sally Toteff was present at the 9-18 meeting.
- ! **The 7-19 and 9-18 meeting summaries approved, with attendance changes made.**

## 2. Update on Data Viewer/ Status of Data List

Libby Whiting presented on the current data being utilized in the data viewer, and the data that still needs to be analyzed and incorporated.

### Questions and Comments:

- Brian Sheldon: I'd like to see more data with fish and shellfish land ownership. GIBS maps are available with spatial data for oyster beds and more shellfish land ownership.
  - Mark Plackett: Dynamic data is available from flyovers.
- Mark Cedergreen: I would like it to be noted that all of the data is from existing systems except for the energy data, which is a potential use, not an existing one.
  - Libby Whiting: In the viewer, the current title is energy suitability to reflect that idea.
- Dale Beasley: The terminology in the viewer is not public/user friendly; the terms should be less technical (e.g. benthic, pelagic, meters vs. feet).
  - Libby Whiting: The descriptions are continually edited. When the data is updated it comes with default language and we work to make it more usable.
- Dale Beasley: I would like to see albacore and troll salmon data added. Also, the latitude and longitude pointer doesn't work well.
  - Libby Whiting: These data sets were added this morning, but the data is very low resolution (40 sq. mile data level). There was a search feature added for specific latitudes and longitudes, as well as finder for specific cities, townships, counties, and ranges.
- Dale Beasley: What are the WDFW lines on the viewer? These lines have economic impacts, would like to see them explained better and backed up with more data.
  - Michele Culver: These are the lines we use for reporting catch areas within fisheries. There is also a link on the viewer to view the regulations online.
- Dale Beasley: What are commercial fishing lease blocks in the viewer?
  - Michele Culver: The map was generated by USGS in 2008. These are what they are proposing for lease blocks.
    - Dale: I would like these to come out of the viewer.
- Brian Sheldon: I would like to see more data on invasive species, right now there is only one type (mud snails).
  - Rich Osborne: It would be great if these existed, but right now invasive species spatial data is collected on a very small scale and is largely anecdotal.
- Brian Sheldon: I would like to see the technical committee look at invasive species data.
  - Susan: Invasive species data will be discussed further at a technical committee meeting.
    - Brian: We could also include the science team.

Michele Culver presented on the spatial fishery data that is available for use in the MSP including what can be publicly disclosed and what is exempt. The presentation is available on the WCMAC SharePoint site.

### Questions and Comments:

- Mark Plackett: If the state legislature needs information on a renewable project, would they have enough authority to trigger analysis, or does it have to be a federal agency?

- Michele Culver: That is one of the things that would be put into the plan, what levels of analysis we would want and who we would like to pay for it.
- Katie Krueger: Do these data include the impact from Oregon fishers that come up into these zones?
  - Michele Culver: Yes that is included.
- Dale: What are 5 new uses in the MSP and where might they be addressed?
  - Michele: Renewable energy, aquaculture, dredge disposal, bioextraction (for pharmaceuticals or cosmetic purposes), and mining are five potential new uses from WCMAC workshops.
- Rich Osborne: We [the state] don't have the current authority to comment on any of those 5 new uses in federal waters, correct?
  - Jennifer Hennessey: No, under the coastal zone management act, the state current can apply to evaluate a proposal in federal waters. We can ask, but we have to build a case of what those coastal effects are and ask NOAA individually for permission every time a proposal comes through. The benefit of a plan is being able to have that case made ahead of time and automatically requiring federal agencies to notify the state when a project is proposed in that area and the state being approved to review according to the enforceable policies in the state's approved coastal program.
  - Michele Culver: The other component of benefit of the plan is that we can specify what we want in terms of standards so all proposals would be aware of that upfront.
- Rich Osborne: How will you assess the impacts of fisheries (salmon in particular) without quantitative data?
  - Michele Culver: we don't have catch data with latitude and longitude, but we have a good idea of the overall picture. We have enough data to still look at the impacts (for groundfish there are 200-300 spots which were enough to draw a boundary, and the overall catch amounts are there) so we are already 90-95% of the way there without the in depth technical data.
- Penny Dalton: Ecology's coastal program only includes authorities under Ecology, correct? Are WDFW's authorities (i.e. laws/regulations) included in Washington's coastal program?
  - Jennifer: WDFW's authorities are not part of Washington's coastal program. The plan allows us to use the existing enforceable policies in our state's coastal program (e.g. Clean Water Act and Shoreline Management Act).
- Brian Sheldon: We need to get the fisheries mapped. Why are tribal fisheries not being spatially mapped out?
  - Katie Krueger: The Quileute Tribe intends to provide catch data for the economic analysis, but can't speak for other tribes.
- Susan Gulick: This conversation can be continued at the next Technical Committee Meeting.

### 3. Use Analysis Process Overview

Jennifer Hennessey reviewed the Use Analysis Process. The process includes assessing use data, performing use analysis to identify alternatives and recommendations, and analyzing potential new use data. The presentation is available on the WCMAC SharePoint site.

Questions and Comments:

- Brian Sheldon: Will the MSP boundary expand when we receive additional fishing data?
  - Jennifer: We have not cut off any of the data in the data viewer. This is the boundary we identified through the scoping process and is the one that we think will best address the things we need to cover in our application to NOAA, which requires consideration of criteria such as areas where we expect potential new uses to be proposed, areas that are ecologically significant, places that have ocean resources and uses connected to Washington's coastal zone, etc.
- Rod: We have repeatedly said we are not doing a zoning code with the MSP, but there may be an application for an activity that would generate a permit process. Do you see a more detailed explanation in your proposed matrix?
  - Jennifer: That is correct; the MSP is not a zoning code. Permitting processes will occur on a case by case basis.
- Sally: Will we compile potential solutions from the WCMAC as part of the recommendation process?
  - Susan Gulick: First we will identify the issues, then develop potential options to resolve the issues, and finally recommendations.
- Rod Fleck: Why are the Columbia River and the Strait not included?
  - Jennifer: There are different policies that apply to those water bodies.
- Dale Beasley: There is a strong chance that new uses will conflict with existing uses. We can minimize conflict by developing recommendations and standards, and we should invite some other individuals outside the WCMAC group.
- ! **WCMAC agreed to the recommended use analysis process without revision.**

#### 4. Marine Protected Reserves

Dale Beasley presented on Marine Protected Reserves. He requested a series of workshops to address fishing issues. The presentation is available on the WCMAC SharePoint site.

#### Questions and Comments:

- Rod Fleck: I agree that the MSP won't be a fixed time frame. The MSP is not a regulatory document or zoning code, which should be repeated throughout the final document.
- Mark Cedergreen: I agree that the people in the fishing industry are affected more than anyone else in the process. Treaty fishermen have every right to fish off our coasts. Tribes are on the same side as the fishermen in terms of ocean use.
- Ray: I went to Washington DC at Senator Cantwell's request as part of a 25-person group testifying to the US Senate. The big question was why aren't young people getting into fishing? One of the biggest fears is marine spatial planning, and the combined challenge of sanctuaries, tribal obligations, protected mammal predation, global warming, ocean acidification, USCG regulations, permit fees and transfers, disputes to sport fishing, and sport non-compliance.
- Michal Rechner: Nobody is opposed to seeking greater input from the fishing industry, but we don't want to create an expectation that we are going to pull people together from outside the council to solve the same issues we are trying to solve within the WCMAC.

#### 5. Public Comments

- Larry Thevik: A fear of displacement covers any conversation with ocean groups, there are plenty of groups that think there is a lot of space to go around, when in reality there is not. I endorse

Dale's concerns, but not establishing fishing preserves. Washington is unique in that it has a short coast with a marine sanctuary and other sovereigns controlling a lot of ocean spaces. I support Michele and Ecology in creating a unique plan to address these issues.

- Key McMurry: Great to hear that there is a potential in the CMSP for us to make the case for going out to the federal CZMA boundary line, I'm glad it got discussed. I agree that the fishermen will be impacted most by the plan.
- Doug Fricke: We need to bring in the fishermen to these coastal workshops to get it right. They have qualitative knowledge about the fisheries that can fill in holes in the spatial data. I have filed economic reports for Grays Harbor for 30 years, and now the Port has released a report that is excellent and might be helpful to us. However, they didn't go to the next step on the commercial side, which they did do in Bristol Bay (the executive summary of this report is recommended reading). We should go to the next level and include the economic contributions: trucking, distributions, and restaurants. Let's make sure we get credit for this work nationwide.

## 6. Economic Analysis Scope of Work

Mike Taylor presented his Economic Analysis Scope of Work on behalf of Cascade Economics. The presentation is available on the WCMAC SharePoint site.

### Questions and Comments:

- Mark Cedergreen: Recreational fishing should be included, it accounts for a lot of revenue. You could change commercial fishing to "fishing industry" to cover commercial, recreational, and tribal.
  - Mike Taylor: We will see what we can do to include that.
- Katie Krueger: What are you classifying as a catastrophic event? Also, BOEM has written all of these lines that really just are a snapshot of the current situation, fishing habitats will change with changing climate.
  - Mike: We aren't equipped to address climate change in the study; the intent is to look at immediate events (more tsunami-like).
- Rod Fleck: Will the analysis take into account direct and indirect values and impacts and put a dollar amount on them?
  - Mike: This risk assessment will not cover that, this is qualitative rather than quantitative. For example, do they have alternatives, are there other ways to bridge a short period of loss. Further up in the assessment, they will be incorporated.

Mike Taylor discussed the Economic Impact Modeling tool to evaluate the direct impacts and their community effects. There will be a coast-wide model which is broken down by counties as well as a state-wide model.

- Garrett: If you run the coast through the model, will you still get more accurate county numbers than running the counties individually?
  - Mike: Yes, there is an element of post-processing that attributes certain economic factors to counties to divide the final numbers up on the county level. The Science Panel has agreed that these will be more accurate.
- The WCMAC discussed marine and rail oil transportation and potential economic impacts. Garrett Dalan noted that while it's a very important topic, the economic analysis isn't scoped to run impact

scenarios for a variety of environmental impacts. He proposed discussing oil spills and coal at a later meeting.

- Bridget provided an update on the economic analysis from the Science Panel. They were given the scope on October 15<sup>th</sup>, and provided the consultants with feedback. More formal written comments will be provided to the Science panel and WCMAC

## 7. Presentation: Ecological Effects of Marine Renewable Energy

Simon Geerlofs of the Pacific Northwest National Labs presented on the Ecological Effects of Marine Renewable Energy. The presentation is available on the WCMAC SharePoint site.

### Questions and Comments:

- Dale Beasley: What happens if one of the devices has an internal short and releases electricity in the water?
  - Simon: The electricity that can come off of the cables or devices is minimal. I don't have a lot of information about this.
- Katie Krueger: All research was done on vertebrates, are invertebrates being examined as well?
  - Simon: Oregon State is researching benthic issues with invertebrates. We typically examine species with strong regulatory guidelines. Most projects are driven by regulations from BOEM and NOAA.
  - Jennifer: There were a series of workshops on the ecological effects of tidal energy as well as wave energy discussing risks that were most concerning to scientists.
- Mark Plackett: Would you say you are figuring out what we can do, not so much what we should do?
  - Simon: From the environmental angle, the question is can we do it sustainably, and from the energy policy side it is different.
- Public comment: By putting man-made structures in the water, those structures will attract growth which will attract bait fish and predators. There are studies in Germany and the UK documenting seals and sea lion increases. We have ESA salmon runs feeding directly into these which will be a problem.

## 8. Updates

- Work Plan
  - Jen Hennessey updated the work plan with the use analysis process.
  - The ecologically important areas analysis timing has been shifted.
- Science Panel Update
  - Bridget Trosin provided an update and written summary from the Science Advisory Panel meeting on September 16.
  - Subcommittees have been assigned to each scientific review request based on individual areas of expertise.
  - The Science Panel comments will be publicly available on the MSP website. Rich will also have access to their documents and can share information.
- Technical Committee Update
  - There is a written document in the folder with updates. Contact Rich Osborne or Brian Sheldon with questions

- MRAC Update
  - MRAC requested legislative appropriations to keep the group running, plus \$3.5 million related to ocean acidification efforts.

## 9. Announcements

- Casey Dennehy announced the new survey response counts for recreation uses.
- Suggestions for future WCMAC meeting agendas:
  - Mark Cedergreen: We should follow up on Dale's request for additional working groups.
  - Sally Toteff: Ecology could send someone to give a presentation on the marine rail and oil transportation study.
  - Brian Sheldon: We should address the lack of attendance.

## 10. Public Comment

- Key McMurry: I agree with the comments about attendance. The governor's liaison has missed three or four meetings.
- Larry Thevik: The argument that the crude oil by rail project is nothing new is false. There is a difference between a tank holding water, and one holding nuclear waste and one holding 16 million gallons of crude oil. Shipping crude oil into Grays Harbor is definitely a new use. I would request that the Council define this as a new use. Also, when you list your goals you should acknowledge up front that there may be no "appropriate" renewable energy locations.

### Upcoming Meetings

- January 7, 2015
- February 25, 2015
- April 22, 2015
- June 24, 2015

*Meetings will be held in Aberdeen unless otherwise noted*