

**WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING
DRAFT SUMMARY**

Wednesday, April 23, 2014 10:00am – 3:00pm

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

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

Other Attendees <i>(includes those who signed in; legibility of handwriting may affect accuracy)</i>	
Al Carter, Ocean Gold Seafoods	Key McMurry, Key Environmental Solutions
Allison Bailey, Sound GIS	Larrie Giese, Westport Charterboat Association
Andy Mitby, Willapa Gillnetters	Larry Thevik, WDCFA
Bruce Ogren, WDCA and WBREG	Libby Whiting, DNR
Bridget Trosin, Washington Sea Grant (on the phone)	Michael Cornman, Westport Seafood
Cur Gavigan, Senate Center SVS	Mikaela Freeman, UW SMEA Grad student
Eric Delvin, TNC	Rich Osborne, UW ONRC
George Hart, Navy Region NW	Rick Lovely, Ex WCMAC Com.
Guy Glenn, Port of Ilwaco	Ross Barkhurst, Waterfowl
Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology (WCMAC Staff)	Sherry McNamara, Senate Ways and Means
<u>Jamie Lance</u> Gray, Commercial Fishing	Steve <u>Grity</u> Gray, Bell Buoy Crab Co.
Joe Schumacker, Quinault Indian Nation	Steve Westrick, Westport Charterboat Association
Katie Kruger, Quileute	Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions, Facilitator
Katie Wrubel, TNC	Dana Golden, Cascadia Consulting, Notetaker

1. Welcome & Introductions, Agenda Review

Chair Garrett Dalan welcomed everyone and WCMAC Members introduced themselves. Garrett reviewed the agenda. He brought up each of the topics and concerns raised at the end of the last meeting, and how they would be addressed in this agenda.

- Dale Beasley requested to include a short discussion about liaisons in this meeting.
- Jennifer [HennessyHennessey](#) provided an update on tribal liaison invitations. Joe Schumaker is observing for the Quinault Tribe and Katie Kruger is observing for the Quileute Tribe. The McCaw Tribe will let the WCMAC know about a liaison soon.
- ! The WCMAC approved the summary of the January meeting with the [recommendations changes](#) in the version distributed in the meeting packet. There were no objections.

2. MSP Status

Jennifer [HennessyHennessey](#) provided an update on the MSP planning process. The scope of the MSP is to address the location of potential new marine uses. The 5 goals or objectives are to protect existing uses, protect cultural uses/resources, preserve the environment, integrate decision making, and provide new economic opportunities. The boundary is from Cape Flattery to Cape Disappointment up to normal high water. It is a non-regulatory plan, existing authorities will implement the plan. The sector analysis and ecosystem assessment are currently underway. The goal is to have a draft plan completed by next spring.

Comments and Questions

- Brian Sheldon: How were the boundaries defined?
 - The statute for the Marine Spatial Plan defines the boundaries.
- Jeff Ward: I suggest you include the future trends analysis and call Part 3 the implementation plan like it is in the RCW.
- Rich Osborne: The climate change piece should be at the end with an explanation of how it modifies the current conditions.
- Dale Beasley: There isn't enough about the impacts that the plan might have to people on the coast or threats such as coastal erosion or oil spill pollution. People are the most important part.
- Brian Sheldon: I would like to see a "lessons learned" section that includes past regulatory decisions. Future aquaculture should be added under "future uses".
- Penny Dalton: How do coastal hazards fit in? You could broaden the climate change section.
-

Jennifer [HennessyHennessey](#) then reviewed the recommended approach to MSP Development which includes a proposal for Ecology to bring on temporary staff to assist with writing MSP.

Comments and Questions

- What are the alternatives?
 - Jennifer [HennessyHennessey](#): Ecology could hire a consultant but this would need to go through union review and an RFP process which would take an additional 4 months.

- Dave Flaherty: We might be underestimating the amount of effort it will take to accomplish this. There will need to be a lot of support to include all the technical information and work across agencies.
- Doug [HessKess](#): How would this person interact with the WCMAC?
 - Jennifer [HennessyHennessey](#): They could come to meetings or interact with smaller groups.
- Dave Flaherty: We haven't been explicit about what the "background" means, and how potential new uses will be evaluated. It's really important that we understand what we can expect in terms of the nature of the analysis.
 - Jennifer [HennessyHennessey](#): We will start and continue those conversations soon.
- Rod Fleck: It would help the writer if we have a workshop to determine definitions for the words we're using (i.e. sustainable) before they begin writing.
- Susan Gulick: There seem to be no objections to hiring someone to work on writing the MSP. The WCMAC would like them to interact and work with this group, and have the ability to integrate a lot of existing information.
- ! The WCMAC affirmed the recommended approach to MSP Development with no objections.

3. MSP Draft Actions List

Jennifer [HennessyHennessey](#) presented a MSP Draft Actions List which will generate more specificity under the goals and objectives and identify the specific information and analyses that will go into the plan. Comments were solicited and incorporated into the current list. The Nature Conservancy has been having conversations with the MRC's and generating further ideas. There is a document compiled with comments from the three northern MRCs.

Comments and Questions

- Several WCMAC members spoke in support of waiting to approve the Draft Actions List until there was time for the Nature Conservancy's interviews to be incorporated.
- Rod Fleck: The WCMAC needs to come into the July meeting expecting to make a decision on the MSP Actions list.
- Rich Osborne: It would be helpful to come to a common understanding of some of the key terms in the Draft Actions List.
- Rod Fleck: Kara (from TNC) may be able to provide an initial list of words that would be helpful to define.
- ! The WCMAC felt that additional revisions to the MSP Actions List are needed and agreed to a process for adopting a final version by the July meeting. This revision process will involve:
 1. Staff will review and incorporate the MRC document.
 2. A revised action list will be sent out by Memorial Day.
 3. WCMAC can provide additional comments during the month of June, with a potential workshop or conference call.
 4. WCMAC will take action on a final action list at the July meeting.

4. Presentation: Proposed Process to Identify Ecological Areas WDFW

Michelle Culver presented the proposed process to identify ecologically important areas. WDFW will work with federal agencies, tribes, and the science panel on use of available data to develop an initial map of ecologically important areas. There will be a half day work session with the WCMAC to review

the initial map with an opportunity to provide feedback. There will then be an overlay of the map with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory energy siting maps, and a second WCMAC work session.

Comments and Questions:

- Rich Osborne: It would be useful to use the marine data mapper during the workshops and to display WDFW's work.
- Dale Beasley: How will you determine ecologically important species?
 - Michelle Culver: All available data will be assembled. We will have presence and absence data. We won't be able to track species movement.
- Dale Beasley: We should set up a baseline so that if there are future impacts we have something to reference.
 - Michelle Culver: WDFW is not proposing to assess impacts to these species; we are proposing to determine where the sensitive areas are. That type of additional assessment could be recommendations in the plan itself. The goal is to support decision making of the MSP.
- Rod Fleck: I didn't see anything about areas of historic ecological importance that may no longer be of importance. These are areas that have potential for recovery and could have value again.
- Penny Dalton: I recommend that you separate science and policy issues and discuss them separately.
- Dale Beasley: I'm glad you included fish in "protect and preserve existing uses."
- Brian Sheldon: I'm concerned that we are paying for information that should be paid for by the proponent for project proposal.
 - Michelle Culver: The plan will note data gaps and identify additional information that is needed to make project decisions. This information would be required by the proponent of a project before they receive a permit.
- Doug [HessKess](#): There will be a need for adaptive management and updating of the MSP. As we identify gaps we can make recommendations to the legislature to fund gaps.

5. Updates

- **Science Panel**
 - At the January WCMAC meeting, Bridget Trosin of Washington Sea Grant provided an update for scoping the top priorities for engaging scientists. The near term priorities identified were an economic analysis project and ecological areas. Several WCMAC members expressed interested in interacting and communicating with the Science Panel. WCMAC members are welcome to recommend additional researchers that they would like included on the science panel.
- **Webinar on Mapping tool**
 - Libby Whiting provided an update on the Mapping tool. There was a webinar last Monday about how to use tool.
 - Libby Whiting: We are constantly looking at ways to improve the tool and the data. There are 98 data sets in the mapping application, and we encourage you help us identify additional data or gaps.
 - Doug [HessKess](#): I was really impressed with the usability of it.
 - Mark Plackett: Is there a way we can grade the data sets in the tool?

- Libby Whiting: It's up to the WCMAC to debate what data should be included, and what types of notes should go along with each data set.

6. Lunch Break

7. MSP Budget Update

Katrina Lassiter reviewed the status of projects and funding. Everything on the briefing sheet has been discussed robustly by the Technical Committee. All current projects will be completed by June 30, 2015. No WCMAC decisions were necessary.

Comments and Questions:

- Brian Sheldon: If we want meaningful information that we can use with the economic analysis it's going to be a lot more money. I would like to see the group to bump that up into \$750,000.
- Doug [HessKess](#): A really important part of the economic analysis is sophisticated analysis of the multipliers and an understanding of the work of the marine economies on the Coast. I'm disturbed that Oregon spent about \$700,000 and did collect new information. I support the move up to \$750,000.
 - Katrina Lassiter: Oregon's RFP was \$250,000
- Rich Osborne: The sector analyses and recreational use studies include parts of a comprehensive economic study.
- Mark Plackett: It would be good to see the scope of what we asked for and the cost for each part.
- Michal Rechner: The amount spent for the economic analysis will be driven by the consultants selected to do the work and the cost of their proposed scope of work. We can change this to \$750,000, but keep in mind the costs are estimates and not caps.
- Garrett Dalan: The WCMAC could recommend that we would not like anything added to the list until the coastal economic RFP is out, addressed, and awarded to make the budget for the economic analysis the priority.
 - Michal Rechner: New projects might get added to the list. There are other things under this account like the MRAC.

8. WCMAC Operating Procedure for Formal Recommendations

The WCMAC reviewed the Operating Procedure for Formal WCMAC Recommendations. The Operating Procedure was developed by the Steering Committee. The Operating Procedure includes a form for a "Proposed Policy or Action-based Recommendation." Anyone can fill out the form and submit it to the WCMAC facilitator or Chair. The Steering Committee will review submittals and decide whether to schedule them for WCMAC discussion.

Comments and Questions

- Brian Sheldon: I would like the Steering Committee to provide the WCMAC with a list and brief description of any recommendations that they decide not to schedule for WCMAC discussion (4a of the Operating Procedure). They could include a brief description of why it was not appropriate for discussion.
- Dale Beasley: I would like to see a timeline of how the budget process works.
 - JT Austin: Budget scenarios start to be looked at as early as September, so the earlier budget requests are made the better.

- Brian Sheldon: We should have a list of gaps from funded projects. Who is reading those reports and identifying gaps? That would be helpful for developing a budget.
- Doug [HessKess](#): If anyone has further changes or concerns, talk to the Steering Committee so the adoption at the next meeting is smooth and not just a formality.

The Operating Procedure for formal recommendations was tabled until the July Meeting.

9. Technical Committee Report

Rich Osborne provided an update from the Technical Committee. There has been very good attendance at the meetings.

- Update on the Coastal Economic Assessment
 - The Technical Committee is working on an RFP. There are four general areas:
 1. Economic profile and trends of the Washington coast
 2. Analysis of fisheries and shellfish aquaculture for each port
 3. Economic profile and trends of tribal communities
 4. Recommendations for a standard and repeatable methodology for data gathering
- Michelle Culver: There are several fishery studies that have been done through the federal process. DNR and Ecology should cross check what's already been done and not duplicate efforts in the economic analysis.
- If WCMAC members have comments on the economic analysis, they should email them to Jennifer, Susan, Brian, or Rich. The next Technical Committee Meeting will be in early May. The RFP will likely be released before the July 7th Meeting.

10. WCMAC Work Plan

Jennifer [Hennessey](#) presented the Draft WCMAC Work plan, which WCMAC will be asked to adopt at the July meeting. WCMAC work sessions will added in March and January to address specific topics. The formal recommendation form (presented earlier in the meeting) will help to identify further Work Plan needs. If members have further Work Plan input, they can talk to steering committee members.

- Dale Beasley: As part of the Work Plan, I would like WCMAC to have time to review the sector and economic analyses to see what we get out of them.

11. WCMAC Communication Guidelines

The WCMAC reviewed the Communication Guidelines, which were developed by the Steering Committee and do not require formal adoption. WCMAC members can send comments or suggestions to a member of the Steering Committee. Jennifer Hennessey noted that a SharePoint site will be available soon to share common documents.

12. Upcoming Meetings

- **Agenda topics for the next meeting:**
 - Dale Beasley: The WCMAC should recommend an MOU with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) to have a moratorium on new energy permits until we have a final MSP and our coastal Shoreline Master Plan (SMP) is updated and the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) is approved.

- Rod Fleck: This should be a formal written recommendation. Dale could talk to Ecology or the Governor's office about how to word this recommendation.
 - Casey Dennehy: I would like to see a list of projects that have been completed. We need that before we provide further recommendations on funding.
 - Brian Sheldon: I would like to see a presentation on alternative energy with case studies of alternative energy applicable to the coast.
 - Jeff Ward: I am presenting at the Pacific Coast MRC on May 17th. I would be happy to present at a WCMAC meeting or bring someone from the National Lab.
 - Michelle Culver: There's also a report by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory on the state website that shows the suitability for different types of alternative energy on the coast.
- **Dates and times for future meetings:**
 - The next WCMAC Meeting is July 9th. Proposed future dates are listed below:
 - October 22, 2014
 - February 25, 2015
 - April 22, 2015
 - June 24, 2015
 - In addition to the four regular WCMAC meetings, staff is suggesting two additional Work Sessions:
 - March 25th, 2015 – WCMAC Work Session to review energy alternatives and provide feedback. (Note: Jennifer [HennessyHennessey](#) will check to see if this meeting can be held earlier in March.)
 - January 7, 2015 – WCMAC Work Session to review an initial Ecologically Important Areas Map and provide feedback.
 - The WCMAC discussed whether they would prefer to start meetings earlier or end them later if more time is needed in future agendas. The WCMAC was split on this question. The Steering Committee will take this under advisement for future agendas.
- **Garrett Dalan's closing comments:**
 - WCMAC members should send comments on the Draft Actions List to Jennifer [HennessyHennessey](#).
 - We need to circle back to Dale's request for a liaison. The Steering Committee will take this under advisement the recommendation to have this on the July meeting agenda.
 - Dale Beasley: If someone at the table recommends an agenda item, it shouldn't have to go through a formal process.
 - Doug [HessKess](#): I want to provide some background on Rick Lovely. He was the former head of the PUD in Grey's Harbor and did an extensive amount of analysis on alternative energy.

13. Public Comment

- Representative from the Westport Charter Association: I want to thank Dale and RD Grunbaum for their comments. There are already many uses of our coastal areas, and I'm concerned about proposals for additional uses. We need to think long and hard about what those new uses are. There's a long history of fishing and crabbing. There are already a lot of

obstacles- ESA listed salmon, predators, and regulations, so I'm asking you to think long and hard about what you're doing to make sure we don't lose our livelihood.

- Steve Westrick, President of the Westport Charter Association provided a public comment. The submitted public comment is included in Appendix 2.
- Key McMurry: Thank you for including and trying to incorporate The Nature Conservancy's work. I also think you need to have longer meetings and more meetings to accomplish this work.
- Jim Long: I'm a lifelong resident and commercial fisherman. Thank you for what you're doing. Adding additional uses will create significant adverse impacts for our communities. We've already lost fishing grounds – 50% of our crab fleet fishing is restricted to 9% of the Coast. If we get rid of local fishing jobs, fishermen will have to move up to Alaska. We need to take care of the coast, and not overrun it.
- Mike Corman from Westport Seafood: We have 200 licensed crab fishermen with a vessel value of over 50 million dollars. Westport is one of the top 10 landing sites in the U.S.; please consider that as you move forward.
- Steve Gray owner of the [Bellway-Bell Buoy](#) Crab Company: I have fished for 50 years, and you're making a decision of what my job is going to be. We only have 13 miles available in the Southern Sector. Marine Spatial Planning could take a big bite out of it. The most important things are people and jobs. In the town where we live our cannery uses over half the water so if you do something that impacts that, the water system in that town will shut down. Whatever you do, do it right, stay with people, stay with the jobs that are there and make sure you get enough money to study it.
- Larry [LeevickThevik](#), Vice President of Washington Dungeness Crab Fisherman's Association: There is fear with the language within the MSP that you will set aside and identify areas for alternative energy. Within the MSP legislation, there should be a place for the new users to justify their use, before we need to beg and borrow to stay where we've been. We should let the installation in Coos Bay Oregon determine if there is value in this idea. I don't believe we should step on other people's toes. You should advise the legislature that there may not be an appropriate place for renewable energy in the ocean.
- Ross Barker from South bend: To make sure we incorporate all the interests of people on the shore, MRCs shouldn't be a filter or surrogate for public support. Previous WCMAC meetings have been dominated by non-state agencies, and it's hard to tell who's in charge. It's only natural for industry lobbyists to fight for their interests; we need to be careful about how much of a public resource we give away. I'm concerned about the waterfowl which never meet escapement goals. We need to keep these species in mind and bring them back to harvestable levels.
- Tim Stearns from Washington Department of Commerce provided a public comment. The submitted public comment is included in Appendix 2.
- Rick Lovely: I've been in the electrical industry for 35 years. When I was manager for the PUD we looked at several types of wave energy and tidal energy. The Tacoma Narrows looked to be the best location, but when we actually did the study, it would double the oxygen depletion problem in the lower Puget Sound already has an oxygen depletion problem. It wasn't worth the time or the expenditure.
- Sally Toteff, Department of Ecology: There are currently proposals to expand facilities to bring in crude oil. We are at the beginning of a scoping process for an Environmental Assessment. Public comment is open between now and May 27th.

- Dale Beasley: I would like to thank everyone for their patience, and for all of the people who came today to share with this group.
- Ray: As we get to the issue of ocean energy, we need to be careful and make sure fishermen aren't harmed. I will be phasing out my position on the WCMAC, and would like to stay on as an alternate. It's been a pleasure working with all of you.

14. Adjourn

|

Appendix 1. Public Comment Submitted by the Westport Charterboat Association.

April 23rd, 2014

Westport Charterboat Association position paper concerning Marine Spatial Planning

My name is Steve Westrick, president of the WCBA, I represent a group of Charter Fishing businesses that are based in Westport Washington.

On the face of things the Charter business may seem like just a fun and simple business enterprise. Well it can be fun and rewarding but when you drill right down to it, it's anything but simple. Like any business large or small there's definitely blood sweat and tears involved to make your personal enterprise successful.

For this statement alone we seriously object to any marine spatial planning actions that threaten to reduce our available ocean areas that have traditionally been accessible for our coastal fisheries.

Our Charter vessel businesses for the most part are family owned and operated small enterprises. We fish Albacore Tuna, various rockfish species, Halibut, Ling Cod and of course Salmon. You may think that this is a lot different fish species to be able to catch, well, it's by necessity, no vessel business can rely on one species alone to support their income, we've had to diversify over the years to stay in business by perusing many fish species and not just salmon like the days of old. Our range of operation on any given day is up to 40 miles and up to 100 miles when tuna are included.

A loss of any fishing grounds is lost opportunity and it is vitally important for us to get that message out. Unless there are substantial royalties planned to mitigate for loss of grounds and opportunity in our traditional use areas, we whole heartedly object to rule making that move us away from those areas. Also, in the regulated world we live in there already exist certain areas that are restricted to fishing at certain times for particular reasons. Anymore competition for available space on an already fully utilized geography is simply not desirable. Remember, loss of grounds is lost opportunity, and lost opportunity is lost income for our coastal businesses and community as a whole. Thank You

Appendix 2. Public Comment Submitted by Tim Stearns

To: Washington Marine Coastal Advisory Council

From: Tim Stearns, State Energy Office – Washington Department of Commerce

Comments for April 24, 2014 meeting in Grays Harbor

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please note that I have no responsibility for Marine Spatial Planning. My work entails working to understand and advance clean energy technologies by ensuring alignment of policy, incentives and regulation to advance the state's energy priorities:

- Maintain competitive energy prices.
- Foster a clean energy economy and jobs.
- Meet obligations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Marine Spatial Planning is a significant opportunity for the coastal region to understand your current situation and to chart a desirable future. I urge you to seize the opportunity to identify what is important to the coast environmentally, economically and socially. I urge you to establish a vision for the future you want and plot a course to get there. Ecology has taught us that all things are connected so you must work to ensure they are managed using a systems approach across local, state, federal and tribal responsibilities. To be successful in a world of finite resources (time, money, talent) we must set priorities, we should have a road map and we should be able to gauge and measure progress. We know that conditions, opportunities, economics...change so this plan will need to evolve and be kept up to date.

- 1) **Marine energy is a long way from being commercial.** It is still largely in the R & D with a modest number of pilots in operation around the globe.
 - a. We are beginning to see some commercial demonstrations. By and large all are very site specific custom installations and in the U.S. done under the FERC pilot programs.
 - b. At this point there are no commercial wave and tidal technologies that I know of – cost-competitive with commercial wind or natural gas or have a settled design or a clearly established permitting and construction configuration.
 - c. Many countries are collaborating on developing the technologies and environmental frameworks. <http://energy.gov/eere/water/water-power-program>
 - d. Economic analysis on technologies at this stage is very speculative because the technologies are new, all installations are custom, permitting is still being established, and grid connection is on a case by case basis.
 - e. Key caveat – governments don't control what developers want to apply for when. Governments process applications according to governing laws. Can influence and analyze.
- 2) **Energy and climate are worldwide challenges.**
 - a. Ocean renewable wind, wave, tidal are attractive options for many situations:
 - b. Island nations like Ireland and Scotland
 - c. Areas served by diesel – Alaska and Hawaii
 - d. Other high cost places or dependent on coal or nuclear – Japan, England.
 - e. Those dependent on imported oil, gas or coal – much of Europe.
- 3) **Greenhouse gas producing energy need to be replaced by a combination of policies, investment, new technologies...:**
 - a. Efficiency – building codes, appliances, devices
 - b. Retrofit and rethink other uses
 - c. Planning – for transit, less carbon intensive materials

- d. Cleaner vehicles, fuels, transit
- e. Cleaner generation – wind, wave, tidal, solar
- f. Cleaner fossil fuel generation
- g. Other – materials, nuclear, central solar, garbage

There is no one size fits all set of solutions – thus many need to be explored. The options vary dramatically by location, geography, infrastructure, markets, economies...

4) Vital to identify important areas and needs currently used – economic/environmental/social:

- a. Life histories of species – fish, food species, the whole food web
- b. Ecological services and habitats –
 - i. salmon spawn in rivers,
 - ii. clean water is filtered through forests
 - iii. air is filtered via plants
 - iv. biomass is part of a group of food webs
- c. economic & social
 - i. landscapes
 - ii. cities
 - iii. views

Humans are part of the area. We need to understand their needs and impacts. We need to identify ways to fulfill their needs economically and environmentally compatible.

- d. Three great examples of rating schemes:

Protected Areas – Northwest Power Planning Council – identified fish habitats:

- i. off-limits – anadromous fish and sensitive habitats
 - ii. where mitigation could offset losses
 - iii. where development was unlikely to cause damage
- <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/protectedareas/home/>

King County Stormwater Management uses a 3 tier classification of land by erosion potential to guide development, retain ecological function, address mitigation, to protect and improve water quality, and protect public health and safety (avoid mudslides and other landscape disruptions.)

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/waterandland/stormwater/documents/surface-water-design-manual.aspx>

Klickitat County did a countywide programmatic EIS to look at energy development. The result was county wide baseline information, identification of key habitat areas and identification of what type of energy development would be acceptable in what locations. This EIS has guided wind development, saved time and minimized conflicts.

<http://www.klickitatcounty.org/planning/default.asp?fCategoryIdSelected=948111261>

5) Marine Spatial Planning creates a framework to make decisions based on understanding, interrelationships and data.

- a. Will need to be maintained over time.
- b. Needs to be used.
- c. Can inform local/state/federal/tribal decisions.
- d. Use common indicators, planning tools, goals.

6) Improve the coordination of decision making based on data and shared analysis across local/state/federal/tribal decisions:

- a. Needs to be developed.
- b. Perhaps formalized.
- c. Prioritize investments
- d. Decisions happening now – roads, water, sewer, timber harvest, docks, jetties, oil and coal ports.
- e. Should try to advance social, economic and environmental goals through each of these decisions.
- f. Likely will need to broaden funding to achieve these goals - investment by all parties trying to achieve common goals.
- g. Can speed up permitting and ensure everyone does their part. This way those seeking permits know what the goals and measures are so they can be accountable and ensure others are accountable.

7) Know where you are going – easier to help:

- a. Having a common vision that is kept up to date.
- b. Prioritized – never unlimited money.
- c. Options based on assets – economic /social/environmental.
- d. Investments based on future goals.

8) Marine Spatial planning is a huge opportunity to:

- a. Identify what it is important.
- b. Goals for the future.
- c. Guide decisions: what activities can be allowed where?
- d. Tools to measure progress and problems to guide investments.

Tim Stearns
Senior Energy Policy Specialist
Washington State Energy Office
Office of Economic Development and Competitiveness
Department of Commerce
2001 Sixth Avenue, Suite 2600
Seattle, Washington 98121
206-256-6121 phone
206- 256-6158 fax
tim.stearns@commerce.wa.gov
tim (dot) stearns (at) commerce (dot) wa (dot) gov



Department of Commerce
Innovation is in our nature.

Our Mission: Grow and improve jobs in Washington State