

# WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

## AGENDA

**Wednesday, December 9, 2015 9:30 am – 3:30 pm**

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.

<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b> (Action items are marked with "!")	<b>Objective</b> (Information, Discussion, Action?)	<b>Presenter(s)</b>
<b>9:30</b>	<b>Welcome &amp; Introductions, Agenda Review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome by Chair Garrett Dalan</li> <li>• Introductions, including coastal updates</li> <li>• Review agenda</li> <li>! Adopt summary of September meeting</li> <li>• Public Comment</li> </ul>	<b>Information</b> <i>Reference Materials:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Agenda</i></li> <li>• <i>Draft Meeting Summary</i></li> </ul>	Garrett Dalan Susan Gulick
<b>10:15</b>	<b>Reflections on MSP</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rhode Island Conference</li> <li>• WA progress</li> </ul>	<b>Information, Discussion</b>	Penny Dalton, WA Sea Grant
<b>10:30</b>	<b>Update on Use Analysis</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft sector and roll-up maps</li> <li>• Discuss next steps</li> </ul>	<b>Information, Discussion</b> <i>Reference Materials:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Discussion Guide</i></li> </ul>	Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology
<b>11:30</b>	<b>Viewshed Analysis</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview</li> <li>• Discussion with WCMAC</li> </ul>	<b>Information, Discussion</b>	Rich Osborne, University of WA
<b>12:00</b>	<b>Lunch Break</b>		

12:30	<b>Burrowing Shrimp in Willapa Bay</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Briefing by Kim Patten of WSU on the background, status, and future options for addressing burrowing shrimp in Willapa Bay</li> <li>Discussion with WCMAC</li> </ul>	<b>Information, Discussion</b>	Kim Patten, WSU
1:30	<b>Draft WCMAC Recommendations</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overview of Process</li> <li>Review Draft Problem Statements</li> <li>Develop draft recommendations to address each problem statement</li> </ul>	<b>Discussion</b> <i>Reference Materials:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Discussion Guide</i></li> <li><i>Draft Problem Statements</i></li> <li><i>Menu of Options</i></li> </ul>	Facilitated Discussion Susan Gulick, Facilitator
3:00	<b>Updates</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic Assessment</li> <li>Work Plan</li> <li>MRAC (Ocean Acidification Panel)</li> <li>Nominations</li> </ul>	<b>Information</b> <i>Reference Materials:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Updated Work Plan</i></li> <li><i>Overview of Nominations Process</i></li> </ul>	Staff/WCMAC Members
3:15	<b>Upcoming Meetings</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agenda Topics for Next Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oil Transport/Spills</li> </ul> </li> <li>Reminder of Dates and Times for Future Meetings</li> </ul>	<b>Information</b>	Susan Gulick
3:20	<b>Public Comment</b>	<b>Information</b>	Public/Observers
3:30	<b>Adjourn</b>		Garrett Dalan

### Upcoming Meetings

- February 10, 2016
- April 20, 2016
- June 15, 2016

*Meetings will be held in Aberdeen unless otherwise noted*

# WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

## Draft Summary

Wednesday, Sept 23, 2015 9:30 am – 3:30pm

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

<b>Council Members Present</b>	
Carol Ervest, Wahkiakum MRC	Michele Culver, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Casey Dennehy, Recreation	Miles Batchelder, WA Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership
David Fluharty, Educational Institution	Penny Dalton, WA Sea Grant
Doug Kess, Pacific MRC	
Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC	Ray Toste, Commercial Fishing
Jeff Ward, Coastal Energy	RD Grunbaum, Conservation
Mark Cedergreen, Recreational Fishing	Rich Osborne, Science
Mark Plackett, Citizen	Rod Fleck, N. Pacific MRC
Michal Rechner, DNR	Sally Toteff, Dept. of Ecology

<b>Council Members Absent</b>	
Alla Weinstein, Energy Industry	Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing
Brian Sheldon, Shellfish Aquaculture	Julie Horowitz, Governor's Office
Charles Costanzo, Shipping	Stephen Sewell, Department of Commerce
Randy Kline, WA State Parks	

<b>Liaisons Present</b>	
None	

<b>Others Present (as noted on the sign-in sheet)</b>	
Marie Novak, Cascadia Consulting, Note-taker	Jessi Doerpinghaus, WDFW
Corey Niles, WDFW	Katie Wrubel, Makah Tribe
Gus Gates, Surfrider Foundation	Katrina Lassiter, DNR
Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology (WCMAC Staff)	Kevin Decker, Washington Sea Grant
Kelsey Gianou, Ecology	Libby Whiting, DNR
Frank Gordon, Grays Harbor Commissioner	Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions, Facilitator
Christine Parsons, WA State Parks	Larry Thevik, WDCFA
Charles Menza, NOAA	Molly Bogeberg, The Nature Conservancy
Jeff Leirness, NOAA	

### 1. Welcome & Introductions, Agenda Review

Garrett Dalan welcomed everyone to the meeting. All attendees introduced themselves, and were invited to provide updates.

- Casey Dennehy mentioned several upcoming events, including the Clean Water Classic surf competition Sept 25-27 in Westport, WA, the Coastal MRC Summit Oct. 15-17 in La Push, WA, and a Nov. 17 forum at Grays Harbor College on shoreline master planning.
- Sally Toteff encouraged people to comment on two draft EIS on proposals at Port of Grays Harbor through Oct. 29<sup>th</sup>. Hearings are scheduled for Oct. 1<sup>st</sup> at Satsop Development Park, Oct. 8<sup>th</sup> at D&R facility in Aberdeen.
- Ray Toste announced this will be his last WCMAC meeting and hopes Larry Thevik can replace him.
- Mark Cedergreen clarified that recreational and commercial fishing interests on the coast oppose Sport Priority Bill due to its negative impacts to coastal community economies.
- Dave Fluharty shared that he, Jennifer Hennessey, Penny Dalton, Kelsey Gianou, and Katrina Lassiter will be at the University of Rhode Island for an international symposium on marine spatial planning.
- Carol Ervest shared that Wahkiakum MRC received \$850,000 from WCRI for restoration and a fish processing unit.
- RD Grunbaum encouraged everyone to read the Friends of Grays Harbor's Economic Impact Statement on the impacts of crude oil transport on the Grays Harbor economy, available for download at [fogh.org](http://fogh.org).

### Adoption of June Meeting Summary

- Sally Toteff recommended that the section on her presentation in the June meeting notes be amended as follows:
  - The first bullet on page 5 (under Sally Toteff's name) should be revised to say: "SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act): Allows communities and states a review step before making permit decisions about proposals. SEPA is a disclosure process. It is usually carried out at the local level. For a project that involves an EIS, SEPA is where you can ask questions and provide input on what should be studied."
  - The next bullet should be revised to say: "Water Quality Certification: State law is based on the federal Clean Water Act. The water quality certification identifies if a project will meet water quality standards."
- ! The summary was adopted as amended.

### 2. Update on Use Analysis – Jennifer Hennessey

Jennifer Hennessey gave a presentation on the Use Analysis process, which can be found on the WCMAC webpage: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/documents.html>.

- Agency planning staff have had meetings with different sectors to discuss perceived conflicts; GIS work is now underway. The final product will be maps with information on where conflicts might occur between existing and new uses.
- The intention is to have an online map tool where users can select different layers or a single hexagon and see information about all existing uses and intensity. Metadata will describe where data came from and collection process.
- WDFW will hold a separate meeting on fisheries maps this fall (date TBD) and agencies will meet with Tribes in October to provide an update on the process.

### Questions and Comments

- Several people voiced concerns about the need to differentiate between where there are no conflicts and where there are no data available to determine if there are conflicts. A possible solution would be to include a category for "zero uses" and another category for "no data available."

- Mark Plackett wants to ensure it is easy for people to provide useful, ongoing data so maps are as current and accurate as possible. Jennifer clarified that Kelsey is doing outreach as she builds the MSP, summarizing the studies we've done but also seeking information from other sources. They also rely on this group to make them aware of useful information.

### 3. Existing Policies and Authorities for the MSP – Michele Culver

Michele Culver from WDFW gave a presentation on the existing policies and authorities for the MSP and the five new uses considered. The matrix that describes permitting and authorizing authorities was included in the packet for today.

#### *Questions and Comments*

- Dave Fluharty asked about permitting authority for other things like mining, dredging, commercial and recreational fishing, and would like to see them noted in the handout. Michele clarified that authorities noted relate to proposed new uses under the MSP, which per the statute does not include fishing. Garrett Dalan asked if department has authority to change the fishing map and could an area be totally closed off to a certain use? Michele clarified that it would be in department's authority for state waters; beyond state waters there are a mix of authorities. Depending on which fishery and what it would be closed to, WDFW would have to coordinate with Pacific Fishery Management Council. Fishing is under their authority and guidelines are specified in the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as well as departmental mission to provide for recreational and commercial fishing opportunity. In looking at new uses addressed in MSP, marine reserves and areas closed to fishing are not included. Garrett requested an additional information sheet with a reference to the Magnuson-Stevens Act to make clear that fishing is within WDFW authority. Michele explained that it has been clarified in several documents available online, and descriptions of WDFW and Magnuson-Stevens Act authority are included upfront in the plan itself.
- Penny Dalton asked if they have separate authority for marine mammals and birds. Michele clarified that they do not have ESA authority; she did not include any federal fishing or wildlife protection authorities. It could be useful to also do a similar matrix describing federal authorities.
- Katie Wrubel mentioned Katie Kruger's work for the Quileute Tribe on a legal framework for local, state, and federal authorities related to ocean management. This could be used to fill in existing gaps and describe the overlay of roles.
- Michele recommended that if WCMAC wanted specific requirements for a permit or activity, it should be a recommendation in the MSP for the legislature to consider putting in a statute so that WDFW authority could absorb it more easily.
- Jennifer stated that it could be useful to list other agencies' authorities and develop recommendations to those agencies to ensure the correct steps are taken when a project is permitted.
- Rich Osborne raised the issue that some activities are within federal authority. Jennifer clarified that we cannot create new authorities within the plan for federal waters. If we can make the case that an activity will affect a coastal use or resource of the state, nesting the plan into our state's coastal program will provide mechanism to review and influence these types of federal activities. We may want to look at the Ocean Resources Management Act as this is an existing enforceable policy of the state's coastal program. Michele responded that it would be helpful if WCMAC members could identify a specific recommendation so we can determine our best path to accomplish what the group would like to see as recommendations or requirements for applicants.

- Sally Toteff suggested having a workshop before bringing to WCMAC for discussion and work through recommendations, problems to be solved, levels of authorities, gaps, opportunities to fill gaps, and other ways to address gaps if not through MSP.
- The group will also need to decide if all members can participate in discussions for members that are participants. Would they have to abstain if making recommendations to their agencies?
- Rod Fleck suggested that when making a new legal requirement, we provide some basis from another government, as many of these ideas have been stopped by courts and legislatures.

#### 4. Technical Committee Update

Susan Gulick moved this agenda item up. The Technical Committee has gone through key issues raised at prior WCMAC meetings by topic (including economic, technology and infrastructure, and ecological issues) and is now looking at specific new uses. They have completed all except marine renewable resources, which will be covered in the October meeting. The full WCMAC will have the opportunity to refine and eliminate recommendations. The current draft of recommendations was sent to the group last week.

##### *Questions and Comments*

- Rod Fleck asked how they would like to receive comments and the process for refining the list of potential recommendations. This issue needs to be discussed more. Susan encouraged participation on Technical Committee, and/or sending written comments to Susan

#### 5. Marine Mammal and Seabird Modeling – Charlie Menza and Jeff Leirness

Charlie Menza and Jeff Leirness of NOAA National Center for Coastal and Ocean Science (NCCOS) gave a presentation on the methods and results of the marine mammal and seabird modeling project, which can be found on the WCMAC webpage: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/documents.html>

- NOAA developed maps of marine mammals and seabirds showing relative abundance of important species as a tool to be used to make more informed decisions about where human activity should be in the ocean. Maps were created using observational data, using interpolation and extrapolation to fill in observational gaps. They also did a gap analysis; there are two reports available online. They welcome feedback on the maps.
- It's important that managers do not assume the model describes ecological relationships; the model finds correlation, not necessarily causation around habitat characteristics. This should be a screening tool and then studied further with on-the-ground observation.
- The seabird report is complete and can be found at [NCOSS website](#).
- The marine mammals report is still will be completed by February.

##### *Questions and Comments:*

- Rod Fleck requested they include a caveat around correlation vs. causation to discourage agencies from using maps like this to drive regulation.
- Rich Osborne asked if they had satellite tracking data, and they do not. USGS has done some tracking; they might eventually compare tracking data sets with predictive models as another way to validate them. Monitoring program data sets did not include estuary data.
- Dave Fluharty asked if there is conflict between shipping and high abundance areas of animals since we are trying to understand interrelationships. Jeff answered that there are vulnerability assessments, for example mid-Atlantic assessment of wind farms and sea birds, but none in WA that he is aware of.
- Larry Thevik expressed concern that estuaries were left out since they are right next to the study area and agencies might make conclusions about abundance that aren't necessarily true. He recommended

acknowledging the limitations of the study scope by clearly indicating on maps that those areas do not have any developed predictions, perhaps by changing to colors or graphics on the maps

## 6. Ecological Indicators – Kelly Andrews

Kelly Andrews of NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center presented on ecological indicators for Washington's outer coastal waters, which can be found on the WCMAC webpage: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/documents.html>

- Indicators allow us to measure the health of an ecosystem. Legislation mandates assessment of trends in these indicators.
- Indicator components include ecological interactions, human activity, and environmental drivers. In the conceptual model, they developed a framework for six habitat types, evaluated portfolio of indicators against 17 criteria from scientific literature, then quantified status and trends spatially and temporally.
- Kelly went through several indicators as examples (kelp coverage, copepods, ocean surface temperature, razor clam landings, etc.). There are 150 indicators in the report.
- Next steps will be to identify which indicators are most relevant to the MSP and what needs to be done to decide if an activity is having an effect on these indicators.

### *Questions and Comments*

- Jeff Ward asked if the process allows for new species and indicators to be included. Kelly responded that it's an iterative process flexible to new developments.
- Penny asked if indicators that vary widely are not good indicators. Kelly responded that it depends on what we care about. Some highly variable indicators might still be important, but there may be other indicators that are better for that species/ecosystem characteristic.
- Doug Kess wanted to ensure that the group keeps up on what is changing and how it relates to the MSP process, especially related to climate change.
- Gus Gates suggested using significant wave height as a better predictor of kelp forest health, since buoy data is available.
- Ray Toste cautioned against thinking of indicator variability as a problem; it might just be cyclical.

## 7. Updates

### State Budget/WCMAC Funding

- Katrina Lassiter gave status update on projects done in the last biennium and what's planned for the coming biennium. The MSP Projects Status Report was included in meeting packet. Links are included in the electronic version to the final reports from each project. There were no questions about any projects on the list.
- Libby Whiting has been working on a progress reporting tool, included in packet, and would like input. The goal is to have a simple way of looking at how projects connect to goals and objectives.
- Katrina is working with Rich Osborne to get a contract underway for the ONRC to conduct a visual resource assessment. The ONRC will do a visual resource modeling project rather than a large scale assessment.

### Economic Assessment

- Cascade Economics will produce a FAQ document to address WCMAC's lingering questions from the last report. WCMAC will have an opportunity to review the questions.

### Wok Plan

- Jennifer Hennessey went through Work Plan. WCMAC will meet at the Port of Grays Harbor Commission Chambers through June 2016.
- Based on Technical Committee's work, we made a few changes to the Use Analysis to provide more time to discuss general and spatial recommendations over the next few meetings.
- We are planning a future briefing on the burrowing shrimp issue based on expert availability (Kim Patten and Brett Dumbauld).

#### MRAC (Ocean Acidification Panel)

- Garrett mentioned that next meeting is scheduled for November. Please provide feedback or questions for him to ask when he sends out the agenda. Also please visit [UW Ocean Acidification Center website](#) for new information.
- Doug Kess invited everyone to the MRC Summit on Oct. 15-17.

#### 8. Agenda items for next meeting

Susan reviewed the current December agenda items:

- Update on Use Analysis
- Viewshed analysis update
- Technical Committee draft recommendations
- Update on MSP outreach

WCMAC did not have additional items for agenda topics. RD Grunbaum asked about process for nominating new members. Jennifer clarified process for leaving group, including informing Governor's office, which must be done online at: <http://www.governor.wa.gov/boards-commissions/resources/appointees/resign-board-or-commission>.

Anyone can recommend someone to fill a vacancy. The simplest way would be to fill out the online recommendation form at: <http://www.governor.wa.gov/boards-commissions/board-and-commissions/recommend-applicant-0> This link is also included in the WCMAC bylaws.

You can also communicate with Julie or Keith Swenson in the Governor's Boards and Commissions Office.

#### 9. Public Comment

Larry Thevik recognized Ray Toste's contributions to the WCMAC. He commented that marine spatial planning process is a message process and we need to convey that Washington is unique. It has the shortest coast on the West Coast that is already fully utilized, any new use would be an exemption of an existing use. We have established tribal sovereignty and marine sanctuaries, so we need to understand and effectively communicate our unique circumstances. He also asked that we consider and include export and import of crude oil in Grays Harbor as a new use. WCMAC should have a more expansive interpretation of the five new uses or add a specific new use, "transportation and storage of crude oil." Transporting tar sands oil through Grays Harbor could cause irreparable harm and should be discussed as part of marine spatial planning uses. If that cannot be accomplished, then let's at least recognize what that activity may bring to bear when we're looking at marine spaces.

All thanked Ray Toste for his service.

Meeting adjourned at 2:33 pm.

#### Summary of Decisions:

- ! The June Meeting Summary was approved as amended.

### Upcoming Meetings

- December 9, 2015
- February 10, 2016
- April 20, 2016
- June 15, 2016

*Meetings will be held in Aberdeen unless otherwise noted*

DRAFT

**Discussion Guide: Use Analysis Process Update**  
**December 9, 2015**

**Purpose:**

The Use Analysis is a process:

- To summarize geographic data on current uses: 1) patterns/intensity and 2) total number of uses occurring in a given area.
- To assess the potential spatial interaction between existing and new potential uses.
- To inform the development of spatial recommendations (e.g. protection of existing uses and sensitive resources) and consultation and communication with project proponents.

**Background:**

The Marine Spatial Planning law requires a plan to include maps of: “appropriate locations with high potential for renewable energy production with minimal potential for conflicts with other existing uses or sensitive environments” RCW 43.372.040(6)(c)

At the October 22, 2014 meeting WCMAC agreed to participate in the Use Analysis Process. WCMAC has an important role in advising on the criteria for the process and recommended actions for the outputs of the Use Analysis.

Creating a Marine Spatial Plan requires compiling and evaluating spatial, or mapped, data including existing uses and potential new uses. The state has outlined its approach to this process called a “Use Analysis”. The Use Analysis involves the following main activities:

- Assessing and compiling data on existing uses and ecological information in two ways:
  - Intensity of uses – how frequently an area is used
  - Number of uses – how many uses occur in an area, regardless of how often
- Using spatial analysis tools to compare existing use data to renewable energy data
- Developing spatial recommendations

**Completed:**

- Sector input on spatial data for the use analysis.
- Updated data and maps for the analysis, including refining intensity and footprint of data (e.g. definitions for high, medium and low intensity use).
- Fisheries maps workshop (Nov. 9, 2015)
- Most GIS work to produce sector-based maps and aggregate (all-sectors) maps for:
  - Intensity of uses
  - Number of uses
- Overview on process for tribes (Dec. 4, 2015)

**Where we are now:**

- Presenting most of the completed GIS maps.
- Examining options for renewable energy data comparison:
  - GIS overlays (simple)
  - Other tools: Marxan and Invest (more complex)

**Next steps:**

- Finalize sector and combined intensity and footprint maps.
- Compare existing use data to renewable energy data.
- Discuss and develop spatial recommendations.

**Discussion Guide**  
*Developing Recommendations for the Marine Spatial Plan*  
December 9, 2015

This discussion guide will review the process WCMAC will use to develop consensus recommendations for the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP).

**1. Introduction**

The Technical Committee has spent the past few meetings developing draft problem statements and recommendations for the Marine Spatial Plan. The Technical Committee has not been discussing the relative merits of the draft recommendations; they have been developing a menu of options for consideration by the full WCMAC. WCMAC may choose some or all of the options, may merge or rewrite options, or may create new options to address the problem. This will be lengthy process, with lots of strong feelings and many interests to consider and balance.

Before WCMAC jumps into this discussion, it is important to review the guidance in statute and in the bylaws for how WCMAC uses a consensus-based process to make recommendations.

**2. Consensus-Based Approach**

WCMAC will use a consensus-based approach to making recommendations, as required by WCMAC's enabling statute (Chapter 43.143 RCW—see excerpt in Appendix A). WCMAC's bylaws provide additional detail on consensus in section VI (see excerpt in Appendix A). The key language states:

The Council shall normally operate by consensus pursuant to RCW 43.143.050.

- a) Definition of Consensus: Consensus is a group process where the input of everyone is carefully considered and an outcome is crafted that best meets the needs of the group as a whole. The root of consensus is the word consent, which means to give permission to. When members consent to a decision, they are giving permission to the group to go ahead with the decision. Some members may disagree with all or part of the decision, but based on listening to everyone else's input, all members agree to let the decision go forward because the decision is the best one the entire group can achieve at the current time.
  
- b) Levels of Consensus:
  - i. I can say an unqualified "yes"!
  - ii. I can accept the decision.
  - iii. I can live with the decision.
  - iv. I do not fully agree with the decision, however, I will not block it and will support it.

It is important to recognize that consensus does not mean an individual likes or agrees with every recommendation. Rather, consensus represents the best package of recommendations that meet the needs of the group. Individuals may not like all the details of a consensus-based recommendations, but support the final package because it is the best on the entire group can achieve at the current time.

In order to achieve consensus, we will not be voting on individual recommendations. We will note the outstanding concerns with draft recommendations and work diligently to find language that will work for everyone. However, in

the end we will spend time looking at the full package of draft recommendations. If consensus is successful, individuals who don't particularly like some recommendations will find others that they strongly support. The goal is that the package as a whole will be one that everyone on WCMAC can support with one of the four levels of consensus in the bylaws.

### **3. Evaluating Options**

As mentioned earlier, the Technical Committee has developed a list of options to address each problem statement. These options have not been vetted for feasibility. A key consideration for WCMAC in selecting final recommendations will be to decide if an option is feasible and realistic; if not, WCMAC should work to develop more feasible options to address the problem.

Many of the draft recommendations refer generally to "permitting agencies" who are not specifically identified. If WCMAC supports the concepts of a draft recommendation, staff will do additional research to identify the permitting agencies and determine whether they have the authority to carry out the recommendation. WCMAC may want to reword recommendations based on this research.

Another consideration in evaluating options is whether the recommendations are consistent with existing laws and regulation. According to chapter 43.372 RCW, the MSP cannot add to or take away from state and local agencies' authorities. The MSP is also prohibited from interfering with existing permitted activities.

**RCW 43.372.060**

**Authority limited.**

No authority is created under this chapter to affect in any way any project, use, or activity in the state's marine waters existing prior to or during the development and review of the marine management plan. No authority is created under this chapter to supersede the current authority of any state agency or local government.

This means that WCMAC's MSP recommendations need to be consistent with current laws and regulations. However, WCMAC may develop separate (non-MSP) recommendations to the Governor and Legislature that recommend changes to existing laws. We will distinguish between these two types of recommendations as we review the draft MSP recommendations developed by the Technical Committee.

### **Questions for WCMAC**

1. Are there questions about the definition of consensus? Are there questions about the process we will use to reach consensus?
2. Are there questions about evaluating options?
3. Are WCMAC members clear on the difference between MSP recommendations and other recommendations?

# *Appendix A: Consensus Process*

## *Key Excerpts of Statute and Bylaws*

### **1. Statute**

#### **RCW 43.143.050 (6)**

The Washington coastal marine advisory council ***shall utilize a consensus approach to decision making***. The council may put a decision to a vote among councilmembers, in the event that consensus cannot be reached. The council must include in its bylaws guidelines describing how consensus works and when a lack of consensus among councilmembers will trigger a vote.

#### **RCW 43.143.060 (1) (f)**

The duties of the WMCAC are to...

Provide recommendations to the governor, the legislature, and state and local agencies on specific coastal waters resource management issues, including:

- i) Annual recommendations regarding coastal marine spatial planning expenditures and projects, including uses of the marine resources stewardship trust account created in RCW [43.372.070](#);
- ii) Principles and standards required for emerging new coastal uses;
- iii) Data gaps and opportunities for scientific research addressing coastal waters resource management issues;
- iv) Implementation of Washington's ocean action plan 2006;
- v) Development and implementation of coast-wide goals and strategies, including marine spatial planning; and
- vi) A coastal perspective regarding cross-boundary coastal issues.

#### **RCW 43.143.060 (2)**

In making recommendations under this section, the Washington coastal marine advisory council shall consider:

- a) The principles and policies articulated in Washington's ocean action plan; and
- b) The protection and preservation of existing sustainable uses for current and future generations, including economic stakeholders reliant on marine waters to stabilize the vitality of the coastal economy.

*Note: the full text of the statutes are appended to the WCMAC bylaws.*

## 2. **Bylaws**

### VI. **Advice and Recommendations**

A. Because the Council is charged with providing recommendations to the Governor, the legislature, and state and local agencies on specific coastal waters resource management issues, it is important that there is a clear and effective process for determining the content of those recommendations, as well as on other Council business. Proposed recommendations shall be provided in writing using an established template that includes background information on the issue and rationale for the recommendation. The Steering Committee will develop a work plan and meeting schedule that allow the Council to provide timely and relevant advice and recommendations to the Governor, legislature, and state and local agencies. The work plan will be adopted by the Council.

B. In making recommendations, the Council shall consider:

- a) The principles and policies articulated in *Washington's Ocean Action Plan* [RCW43.143.060].
- b) The protection and preservation of existing sustainable uses for current and future generations, including economic stakeholders reliant on marine waters to stabilize the vitality of the coastal economy. [RCW 43.143.060]
- c) The charge or other direction from the Governor
- d) Existing state laws and regulations.

C. The Council shall normally operate by consensus pursuant to RCW 43.143.050.

- c) Definition of Consensus: Consensus is a group process where the input of everyone is carefully considered and an outcome is crafted that best meets the needs of the group as a whole. The root of consensus is the word consent, which means to give permission to. When members consent to a decision, they are giving permission to the group to go ahead with the decision. Some members may disagree with all or part of the decision, but based on listening to everyone else's input, all members agree to let the decision go forward because the decision is the best one the entire group can achieve at the current time.
- d) Levels of Consensus:
  - i. I can say an unqualified "yes"!
  - ii. I can accept the decision.
  - iii. I can live with the decision.
  - iv. I do not fully agree with the decision, however, I will not block it and will support it.

D. The Council will attempt to reach consensus with thorough, substantive discussion of the issue, including the presentation of differing perspectives and consideration of various options.

E. Decision-Making

- a) When the Council is making formal recommendations consistent with RCW

43.143.060 or taking other formal actions a formal decision-making process will be used:

- i. The Chair or the neutral convener will state the proposed recommendation.
  - ii. The note-taker will read back the proposed recommendation.
  - iii. The Chair or the neutral convener will ask Council members to indicate (by a show of hands and/or thumbs up/down/middle) whether they are in consensus (in full agreement; not in full agreement, but can “live with” the position of the Council; or cannot live with the position).
  - iv. If consensus has not been reached, efforts will be made to address outstanding concerns.
  - v. After substantive efforts have been unsuccessful in reaching consensus, the Chair or neutral convener may call for a vote, following the same procedures in steps i-ii above. The Chair or neutral convener will ask “Who supports this recommendation” and count the hands, followed by “Who opposes this recommendation”, and count the hands. The vote, including the roll call, will be recorded in the meeting summary.
  - vi. If a majority of the Council can live with the recommendation, that position will be reported as the position of the Council. However, in summarizing the decision, the minority concerns will also be captured.
  - vii. All recommendations will be recorded in the meeting summary and added to a formal list of Council recommendations, maintained by the Steering Committee and provided at every Council meeting. As provided in RCW 43.143.060 , these recorded recommendations will be transmitted, as appropriate, to the Governor, Legislature and other agencies in a timely manner.
- b) Informal decisions that do not result in a formal Council recommendation or constitute a formal action may be made informally and are not required to follow the steps in sub-section a.

F. The Council will not revisit topics upon which it has already held a discussion and made a decision unless there is new information that warrants a new discussion, and the Steering Committee agrees to add it to the agenda.

# Potential MSP Recommendations: Options for WCMAC Consideration

Developed by the WCMAC Technical Committee Members<sup>1</sup>  
11/10/15 Technical Committee Meeting

## A. Issues Related to All Potential New Uses

### 1. Economic Issues

#### 1.1. Evaluation of Economic Impacts Prior to Permitting

New uses will have acute and cumulative impacts on the local economy. Local governments, citizens, and businesses would like a clear understanding of the potential positive and negative impacts of new uses prior to the use being permitted.

##### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Local Economic Development Councils should assess the potential impacts of new uses on existing issues.
- b) For any new use, applicants should provide a spatially comparative economic analyses (what is lost vs. what is gained). Applicants should evaluate the public benefit of making that change and what mitigations would offset these impacts.
- c) Permitting agencies<sup>2</sup> should deny permits that show net negative economic impacts.
- d) Applicants should prepare a social impact assessment in addition to the economic analysis.
- e) Permitting agencies should require that the footprint of new construction and resulting restrictions on existing uses are identified in the application process and considered within the economic impact analysis.

#### 1.2. Long-Term Economic Feasibility

There is concern that a new use will be installed, will consequently displace or impact existing uses, then turn out to be unsustainable, and leave irreversible economic impacts. The local community wants assurance that new uses will be economically feasible over the long-term before they are permitted.

##### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

---

<sup>1</sup> Technical Committee Members did not discuss the relative merits of these options. Options were not pre-screened for popularity, feasibility, or any other criteria.

<sup>2</sup> "Permitting agencies" throughout this document refer to applicable federal, tribal, state or local agencies. It should be noted that permitting agencies are limited in their authorities by enabling statutes and other laws.

- a) Regulatory agencies should include a permit condition requiring the applicant to remove infrastructure once a project is non-operational or no longer economically feasible. Applicants should include a detailed description of how the infrastructure will be removed.
- b) Applicants should pay for an economic analysis by an objective entity selected by the permitting agency. The analysis should address the long-term sustainability of costs, revenues, and infrastructure maintenance and replacement. The analysis should address the full life-cycle of the new use, and should assess the economic costs to tax-payers, existing users, and the applicant.
- c) For new energy uses, regulatory agencies should require proof of a power purchase agreement as a condition of a permit.

### **1.3. Local Economic Benefits**

If new uses are permitted, it is desirable that the local community receive economic benefits, and that not all economic benefits are directed out of the local area.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Regulatory agencies should include a permit condition that deference be given to local goods and services if they can provided for comparable cost and quality.

## **2. Infrastructure and Technology**

### **2.1. Navigation Safety**

New ocean<sup>3</sup> infrastructure and the associated navigational restrictions may pose an increased risk to the navigational safety of all vessel types and sizes due to:

- increased or changing traffic patterns,
- mooring cables or other structural impediments,
- debris,
- navigational aids,
- lighting, and
- changes to wave behaviors or currents.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require a vessel traffic risk assessment or a risk-based modelling analysis to evaluate the items above as part of the permitting process.

### **2.2. Dredge Disposal and Wave Amplification**

Dredge disposal can create mounding which can cause wave amplification. This presents safety problems for fishing and general navigation.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants for dredge disposal prepare a risk assessment for wave amplification, and should enforce existing federal and state safety guidelines.
- b) Permitting agencies should prohibit Mound Induced Wave Amplification over 10% from baseline conditions at approved dredge disposal sites that can pass peer review of qualified

---

<sup>3</sup> The terms "ocean" and "off-shore" throughout this document include estuaries

experts outside the USACE by utilizing a number of prominent world class accepted wave models and if necessary field verification to resolve differences in the wave model results<sup>4</sup>.

- c) Ecology should develop a mounding grid guideline that clearly states what the trigger point of the 10% mound induced wave amplification is for each depth that passes peer review of national experts in mound induced wave amplification

### **2.3. Cultural or Historic Resources**

Any new use that disturbs the seafloor, including dredge disposal and mining, could harm or bury cultural or historic resources on the ocean floor, including shipwrecks.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants whose projects will impact the ocean floor to prepare a dual-beam sonar archeological assessment.

### **2.4. Coastal Erosion and Sea-level Rise**

Coastal erosion and sea-level rise could both affect the ongoing feasibility of new and existing uses. Disposal of dredge material could help mitigate coastal erosion impacts.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Dredge disposal sites should be sited in areas where they contribute in a measurable way to mitigate coastal erosion problems.
- b) [WHO?] should regularly monitor erosion and seawater rise on the Washington coast.
- c) Permitting agencies should assess the effects of projected coastal erosion, future sea-level rise, and other climate change impacts to determine the long-term suitability of a proposed new use.

### **2.5. Viewsheds/Aesthetic Impacts**

New ocean infrastructure may significantly reduce the quality of views and coastal aesthetics.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants to develop conceptual site drawings of all visual impacts as part of environmental review.
- b) Permitting agencies and applicants should make every effort to keep the infrastructure out of view from shore when possible.

### **2.6. Durability of Structures**

Harsh coastal conditions on the Washington Coast, including storms and tsunamis, may harm or destroy infrastructure that is not adequately designed or installed to withstand extreme weather or other natural events.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants to prepare a survivability assessment of all structures.

---

<sup>4</sup> Permitting agencies should recognize that the USACE STWave model underestimates 15 foot, 15 second period waves by 2 meters of wave amplification and is not a valid wave model to insure safety.

- b) Permitting agencies should require applicants to be liable for damages and provide bonding and proof of insurance for damages caused from inadequate infrastructure.

**Note/Question: The concept of bonding and liability for damages has been discussed for various issues. Staff will research the best language to address this. Suggestions from WCMAC members are welcome!**

- c) Permitting agencies should prohibit high risk infrastructure in Tsunami inundation or subduction zones.

### **2.7. Obsolete, Abandoned or Destroyed Structures**

If a structure becomes obsolete, is destroyed, or is abandoned, there are concerns about:

- the ongoing impacts of leaving unmaintained structures in place,
- the impacts of the removal process,
- associated debris, and
- footprint scars.

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants to provide decommissioning plans for the removal of all infrastructure when it reaches the end of its life span. Decommissioning plans must include realistic financing to ensure there are adequate funds do carry out the decommissioning at the appropriate time. Decommissioning plans should be approved prior to permitting.

### **2.8. Derelict Gear**

Derelict gear may get caught on permanent structures such as moorings, foundations, etc., resulting in ghost fishing, interference with existing fishing operations, or other impacts.

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require a monitoring and assessment program for derelict gear as part of the permit.
- b) Identifiable fishing gear should be returned to the owner or replaced.
- c) Permitting agencies should require applicants to be liable for loss of income and loss of gear due to impacts from new offshore infrastructure. Permitting agencies should require applicants to be liable for damages and provide bonding and proof of insurance for damages. Compensation should be provided in a timely manner.

### **2.9. Shore-based Infrastructure**

Off-shore uses are sometimes supported by on-shore infrastructure. It is important to understand and assess the positive and negative impacts of this infrastructure over time in order to fully understand the potential effects on local coastal communities.

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require an assessment of the impacts and added burden to the existing infrastructure and ensure the applicant mitigates these impacts.

## **3. Ecological Issues**

### **3.1. Habitat and Migration Routes**

New uses could degrade sensitive and important habitat to valuable or listed species. New uses could also alter or impair existing migration routes.

**Note/Question: We need to define “valuable species”**

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants to demonstrate that the new use will not significantly impact the habitat of valuable or listed species throughout their life cycle.
- b) Permitting agencies should require applicants to establish where known or potential wildlife migration corridors for valuable or listed species exist prior to opening an area to leasing.

### **3.2. Pollution**

New uses could degrade water quality (chemicals, petroleum products, nutrients, oxygen, temperature, acidification, etc.) and impact recreation, tourism, and other uses.

**Note/Question: Should this be broadened to include pollution other than water quality degradation?**

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants to prepare plans for pollution prevention and response.
- b) Permitting agencies should require applicants to be liable for damages and provide bonding and proof of insurance for damages from spills or chemical releases related to the new use, including servicing or otherwise supporting the new use.
- c) Permitting agencies should prohibit vessels greater than 130 feet from anchoring, even temporarily, in Washington coastal zone except if necessary to prevent grounding as a result of mechanical failure of major vessel systems like steering, engine, broke propeller shafting, etc.
- d) Permitting agencies should require applicants to prepare an evaluation of best available technologies that compares the proposed technology with other technology options.

### **3.3. Changes to Physical Processes**

Changes in physical processes, including current flow, sediment processes, coastal erosion and accretion, electromagnetic field, acoustics and wave amplification, can impact existing uses in various ways including:

- Direct and indirect impacts to species and their food sources,
- Eroding estuary bottom conditions so as to impact current flow direction or to erode shellfish beds directly,
- Causing sand spits to move and bury species, and
- Causing changes in oxygen levels.

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants, prior to permitting,<sup>5</sup> to prepare an assessment of the potential impacts from changes to physical processes, including current flow, sediment processes, underwater acoustics, and wave amplification.

---

<sup>5</sup> The requirement for assessments to be done PRIOR TO PERMITTING may need to be clarified throughout this document.

- b) Permitting agencies should require applicants to monitor flows and to have a plan for minimizing and mitigating impacts, including compensatory mitigation.
- c) Permitting agencies should require applicants to be liable for damages and provide bonding and proof of insurance for damages caused by changes in physical processes that result in loss of species or habitat, including compensatory mitigation.

**Note/Question: The concept of bonding and liability for damages has been discussed for various issues. Staff will research the best language to address this. Suggestions from WMCAC members are welcome!**

- d) Permitting agencies should require applicants to survey sediments in areas where sediments may be at risk to provide a baseline of sediment composition, and to develop a sediment monitoring program.

### 3.4. Unintended Consequences

New uses could affect ecosystems in unanticipated ways, including impacts to the food chain, physical processes, and access to existing resources. Limited information may be available to predict or evaluate potential impacts, resulting in unintended and unanticipated consequences.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants to identify possible unintended consequences, and develop plans to prevent those consequences. The plans should identify how applicants will develop mitigation measures for unanticipated impacts. In addition, monitoring should be required so that unintended consequences can be identified, and adaptive management applied as new information is revealed.

**Note/Question: Should the concept of bonding and liability for damages be added to this?**

### 3.5. Invasive Species

New uses could inadvertently introduce invasive species, organisms, etc. that could affect native populations and/or existing aquaculture. New uses could also contribute to the spread of existing invasive species.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants to evaluate the risk of the introduction and/or expansion of invasive species and develop a plan to prevent the introduction or expansion of invasive species. Applicants should also be required to prepare a pollution prevention and control plan that address how invasive species will be contained if they are inadvertently introduced or allowed to spread.
- b) Permitting agencies should require applicants prepare an evaluation of ballast water and should enforce ballast water requirements to ensure it does not introduce invasive species.

## B. Additional Issues Related to Specific New Uses

### 1. Offshore Aquaculture

#### 1.1. Offshore Aquaculture Infrastructure

The infrastructure and activities from offshore aquaculture could result in entanglement or other harm to species, particularly to predators such as pinnipeds, cetaceans, and sharks. The

infrastructure could also provide habitat and food sources for marine species, possibly attracting fish and other species away from marine habitats.

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants for offshore aquaculture to prepare plans to minimize entanglement and to deter or avoid impacts to predators such as pinnipeds, cetaceans, and sharks.

**Note: there is not a draft recommendation to address the problem of attracting species away from marine habitats.**

**1.2. Escapement and Disease from Offshore Aquaculture**

Offshore aquaculture may introduce new species and diseases into the environment, potentially harming existing populations and ecosystems.

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants for offshore aquaculture to prepare escapement prevention and response plans.
- b) Permitting agencies should require applicants for offshore aquaculture to prepare disease prevention and response plans, including the introduction of pharmaceuticals for pest control and disease prevention.
- c) Permitting agencies should require applicants for offshore aquaculture to prepare nutrient pollution prevention and response plans
- d) Permitting agencies should not permit offshore aquaculture species that have a significant risk of introducing disease or illness into the area.

**2. Marine Renewable Energy**

**C. Additional Issues Related to Protecting and Preserving Existing Uses**

**1.1. Stakeholder Involvement**

Stakeholders are concerned that new uses could irrevocably change their communities. Stakeholders would like to have input into the decision-making process, including input to applicants as they develop proposals and applications, and input to permitting agencies as they review applications, develop permit conditions, and make final decisions.

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants to work collaboratively with fishing and aquaculture interests to identify and mitigate potential impacts.
- b) Permitting agencies should require applicants to provide stakeholders detailed information and timely notice on project developments. The notice should be posted to websites and other locations that are familiar to stakeholders, and not be limited to state or federal registers.
- c) Applicants should initiate both formal and informal processes to involve stakeholders in pre-application decisions, so applicants can hear and respond to the concerns of stakeholders.

**NEEDS FURTHER DISCUSSION**

NOTE: We need a separate recommendation that discusses timely notice and input from governments, including tribes.

### 1.2. Impacts to Existing Fisheries and Aquaculture

New uses could degrade or alter existing fisheries and aquaculture through:

- Displacement of fishing grounds;
- Changes to current flows, altering the food chain, bottom conditions, estuary functions, etc.
- Changes to the behavior of species which will stress other populations, including the food chain.
- Water quality degradation (chemicals, petroleum products, nutrients, oxygen, temperature, acidification, etc.)
- Disposal of dredge or mining deposits which covers or disturbs species habitat and/or damages fishing gear.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) Permitting agencies should require applicants to prepare site-specific impact assessments addressing these concerns prior to permitting, including any potential change to the use or geographic area.
- b) Permitting agencies should prohibit new fixed uses or mining from coastal marine waters except in small discrete areas specifically designated as “high intensity use areas” that shall not exceed a total 1.14 square miles of Washington’s coastal marine water not including existing port facilities in the total square mileage.
- c) Local Shoreline Master Programs should be considered in permitting decisions and in the Coastal Zone Management Program, in a timely manner.

### 1.3. Impacts to Fishing Space

There is concern that new uses will preempt existing fishing space, resulting in smaller fishing areas. Smaller fishing areas lead to overcrowded and dangerous fishing activities, loss of fishing income, and additional social, cultural, and economic losses to local communities.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) NEED TO DEVELOP

### 1.4. Net Loss to Fishing

There is concern that new uses could result in a net loss to fishing. Fishing interests would like assurance that fishing will be protected and no net loss will occur.

#### *Options for WCMAC Consideration*

- a) NEED TO DEVELOP

### 1.5. Impacts to Recreation

New uses could degrade recreational opportunities and access by:

- Negatively impacting public safety
- Limiting beach access

- Altering bathymetric features that influence wave action which could potentially:
  - Increase wave hazards
  - Reduce wave quality in surf location
- Diminishing the recreational experience due to:
  - Viewshed degradation
  - Negatively impacting ecological resources valued by recreational users (wildlife viewing, etc)
- Reducing water quality and thus the ability to safely access the water

*Options for WCMAC Consideration*

a) NEED TO DEVELOP

DRAFT

## **Discussion Guide**

### ***Nominations for WCMAC Leadership***

December 9, 2015

This discussion guide provides background on how WCMAC selects persons for leadership positions within WCMAC.

#### **1. Chair and Vice Chair**

**WCMAC's enabling statute** contains this language regarding election of a chair:

*The chair of the Washington coastal marine advisory council must be nominated and elected by a majority of councilmembers. The term of the chair is one year, and the position is eligible for reelection (RCW 43.143.050 (4))*

**WCMAC's bylaws** state:

*The Council shall nominate and elect a Chair and Vice Chair from its membership. Nominees for these positions should commit to providing sufficient time to fulfill assigned duties. The term of the Chair is one year and the position is eligible for reelection. The Council is encouraged to elect new leadership after a Chair or Vice Chair has served two consecutive terms. The Council shall consider geographically diverse representation in selecting these two positions. (IV. B. a)*

#### **Current Officers:**

Chair Garrett Dalan, Vice-Chair Doug Kess

#### **Next Steps**

Nominations will be accepted for WCMAC Chair and Vice Chair until Dec. 31, 2015. WCMAC members may re-nominate the current officers or nominate new leadership.

#### **2. Steering Committee**

**WCMAC's bylaws** state:

*The Steering Committee will be comprised of the Chair of the Council, Vice-Chair of the Council, the Governor's representative, and two members-at-large. The members at large will be nominated by the Steering Committee and confirmed by the Council. In nominating the member at large, the Steering Committee will consider balancing geographic and interest group representation on the Steering Committee. (III. A. i. a))*

#### **Current Steering Committee Members:**

Garrett and Doug (chair and vice-chair), Julie Horowitz (Governor's Rep) and at-large members Mike Rechner and Rod Fleck.

#### **Next Steps**

In early 2017, the Chair, Vice-Chair, and Governor's representative will nominate the two at-large Steering Committee members. If you would like to serve on the Steering Committee or would like to recommend a WCMAC member for the Steering Committee please let Jen, Susan or Julie know.

### **3. Technical Committee**

#### **WCMAC's bylaws state:**

*The Council will appoint 2-3 co-leads for the Technical Committee. The leads will commit to ongoing participation in Technical Committee meetings and will work with neutral convener and staff in preparing agendas for Technical Committee meetings.*

*At least one Steering Committee member should participate in Technical Committee meetings if possible. (III. A. ii. d-e))*

#### **Current Technical Committee Co-Leads:**

Brian Sheldon and Rich Osborne

#### **Next Steps**

In early 2017, WCMAC will confirm the Technical Committee leads. If you would like to serve as a Technical Committee lead, or would like to recommend a WCMAC member as a Technical Committee lead, please let Jen or Susan know.

December 9, 2015

**Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council  
Draft Work Plan: Meetings through June 2016**

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.

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Information</b>	<b>Advice/Action</b>
December 9, 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use Analysis Process – revised maps and comparison maps, recommendations and alternatives</li><li>• Viewshed analysis update</li><li>• General MSP recommendations (Technical Committee)</li><li>• MSP Outreach overview and update</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use Analysis – develop recommendations &amp; alternatives</li><li>• Discuss problem statements and potential general recommendations</li><li>• Input on MSP outreach</li></ul>
February 10, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use Analysis – comparison maps and recommendations (continued)</li><li>• General MSP recommendations (Technical Committee)</li><li>• MSP outreach update</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Develop general MSP recommendations (continued)</li><li>• Develop spatial MSP recommendations</li><li>• Input on MSP outreach</li></ul>
April 20, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• General and spatial recommendations (continued)</li><li>• Update on draft MSP release</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• MSP – finalize WCMAC recommendations</li></ul>
June 15, 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• TBD.</li><li>• Update on draft MSP release</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If needed, additional time to finalize WCMAC recommendations</li><li>• TBD</li></ul>

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.

# 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><b>1. <u>Recommend funding the required elements in the marine spatial planning law</u></b></p> <p>The following MSP elements are remaining gaps that are required by law:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing the Ecosystem Assessment and Indicators</li> <li>• Supporting the planning process (e.g. outreach, technical tools, plan development)</li> <li>• Identifying Important Ecological Areas - sensitive/unique species or biological communities.</li> </ul> <p>Funding for these essential activities will reduce the remainder of funds available for data gaps and other important analyses.</p> <p><b>2. <u>Identify and recommend funding high priority information needs</u></b></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"> <li>• Sector analyses</li> <li>• Coastal economic analysis</li> <li>• Seabirds and marine mammals</li> <li>• Habitat: seafloor maps</li> </ul> <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><b>Funding Recommendation</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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"> <li>a. The continued operation of the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (\$225,000).</li> <li>b. The completion of the Marine Spatial Plan: (\$700,000)                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Incorporate MSP project information updates and data limitations into the draft plan and mapping tool.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Complete projects underway before June 2015, but which may require additional analysis or work.</li> <li>iii. Conduct additional outreach, public engagement, and scientific review in the planning and mapping process</li> <li>iv. Coordinate and consult on the plan with governments.</li> <li>v. Revise and finalize the plan, including research and writing.</li> </ul> <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.
4/22/15	The February Meeting Summary was approved as amended.
6/24/15	The April Meeting Summary was approved as amended.
9/23/15	The June Meeting Summary was approved as amended.