

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

Draft Summary

Wednesday, September 27, 2017 9:30 am – 3:30pm

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

All meeting materials and presentations can be found on the [WCMAC Website](#)

Council Members Present	
Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC	Carol Ervest, Wahiakum MRC
Rich Osborne, Science	Randy Lewis, Ports
Jessica Helsley, WCSSP	Michal Rechner, DNR
Casey Dennehy, Recreation	Corey Niles, WDFW
Doug Kess, Pacific MRC	Rod Fleck, N Pacific MRC
Mike Cassinelli, Recreational Fishing	RD Grunbaum, Conservation
Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing	Mark Plackett, Citizen
Penny Dalton, Sea Grant	Brian Sheldon, Shellfish Aquaculture (via phone)
David Fluharty, Educational Institution	Tiffany Turner, Econ. Development (via phone)

Council Members Absent	
Sally Toteff, Dept. of Ecology	Joshua Berger, Dept. of Commerce
Charles Costanzo, Shipping	Jeff Ward, Coastal Energy
J. T. Austin, Governor's Office	Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing
Alla Weinstein, Energy	

Liaisons Present	

Others Present (as noted on the sign-in sheet)	
Katrina Lassiter, DNR	Jessi Doerpinghaus, WDFW
Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology (WCMAC Staff)	Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions, Facilitator
Mike Passmore, Wahkiakum Co.	Kevin Decker, WA Sea Grant
Gus Gates, Surfrider	Claire Dawson, The Nature Conservancy
Sara Brostrom, Ecology	Allison Bailey, Sound GIS
Katie Wrubel, Makah Tribe	Crystal Dingler, Mayor of Ocean Shores
Patricia Iolavera, Navy Region NW	Bobbak Talebi, Ecology
Lili Bastian, Ecology	Emily Wright, Cascadia Consulting, Note-taker
Molly Bogeberg, The Nature Conservancy	David Cottrell, Grayland Drainage District
Amanda Murphy, The Ruckelshaus Center	Phyllis Schulman, The Ruckelshaus Center

Welcome and Introductions

WCMAC members introduced themselves and offered the following updates:

Updates

- Garrett introduced a new note-taker, Emily Wright, to WCMAC.
- Mike Cassinelli introduced himself as a new member representing recreational fishing and reported on fish hatchery activities.
- Larry Thevik announced the Dungeness Crab Act (DCA) was passed by Congress, giving Washington and other North Pacific states permanent authority to manage the Dungeness Crab fishery in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). Larry requested that WCMAC continue discussing the impact of DCA on Washington state.
- Penny Dalton announced that WA Sea Grant is still supported with federal funding.
- Dave Fluharty announced a new electronic database of literature and resources on coastal management, especially marine spatial planning, accessible at openchannels.org.
- Susan noted a change to the WCMAC agenda by providing more time for coastal updates from the MRCs and agencies, as well as other WCMAC members. She requested that WCMAC members notify the steering committee in advance of specific issues that will require more in-depth discussion so they can create a designated time slot on future agendas and comply with public notice requirements.

May Meeting Summary

- Susan noted that the summary will be revised with the new website URL.
<https://www.ezview.wa.gov/?alias=1962&pageid=37058>
 - Larry requested a change to his recorded statement on page 3, bullet 7.
 - Carol Ervest clarified that Mike Backman's public comment (page 4, bullet 7) did not suggest that WCMAC have a commercial finfish aquaculture representative. She requested the record be changed to clarify that he expressed concerns around commercial finfish aquaculture and frustration that WCMAC did not have a NOAA representative.
- ! The May Meeting Summary was adopted with the above changes.

Coastal MRC Updates

- Rod Fleck shared the **North Pacific MRC** activities around the sportfish halibut fishery, including promoting a traditional allocation rather than a statewide pool. He noted the challenges of understanding state and federal processes, impacts on Tribal communities, WDFW juggling many different demands, and economic impacts. Rich Osborne announced the RFP release for projects and noted a new simplified 2-page pre-proposal to streamline the process and encourage more community-based projects. He also noted that they are supporting the MRC Summit coming up in November.
- Doug Kess reflected on the 10-year history of the **Pacific County MRC**, their support for continuing coordinated advocacy through the MRC Summit, and their advocacy efforts for a new buoy in the Columbia River. He expressed support for the Coastal Resilience Panel at WCMAC to support local efforts and coastwide coordination.
- Carol shared the current restoration projects in the **Wahkiakum MRC** and their upcoming funding requests and pending proposals. She noted that their shoreline management plan is still under development and expressed support for the MRC Summit.
- Garrett presented the placemats supported by **Grays Harbor MRC** that summarize their lost crab pot removal project that is wrapping up, noting that additional placemats are available for outreach. He noted that Casey, Molly, and himself are organizing the Annual MRC Summit (Nov. 2-4 in Cathlamet) and invited WCMAC and others to the public sessions on November 3rd and 4th. Larry suggested that the informational placemats describe in more detail the tendency for biodegradable escapement devices to break down earlier than desired and the steps being taken to

remedy that problem. RD Grunbaum reported on an informative presentation by the Coastal Interpretive Center and encouraged WCMAC to visit their location in Ocean Shores.

Agency Update on Atlantic Salmon Net Pen Escape

Michal Rechner provided an overview of the recent catastrophic incident involving a net pen with Atlantic salmon operated by Cooke Aquaculture, as well as the steps DNR and other state agencies have taken in response. He referred WCMAC members to the incident webpage for more information, daily updates, and maps of where the landings have been. The incident webpage is: <https://www.dnr.wa.gov/atlanticsalmon> and the webpage with map of landings is: http://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/salmon/atlantic_catch_map.php. He reported that all infrastructural debris has been removed, according to Cooke Aquaculture, and that over 200,000 escaped salmon have been caught so far, with approximately 104,000 still unaccounted for. DNR is working with Cooke Aquaculture to inspect their other existing arrays.

Discussion and questions

- Rod asked if DNR has assessed their stomach content. Michal confirmed and reported that assessments thus far have shown either no content in escapee stomachs or no new content other than the Cooke Aquaculture feed.
- RD asked whether the escaped salmon are tagged. Michal explained they identified by an otolith marker (on the each fish's ear bone) from the Cooke hatchery. The Cooke salmon otoliths have been found as far north as Canada.
- RD asked when the pens were authorized. Michal estimated the late 1970s to early 1980s, but there had been a series of ownership changes over the years. He noted he could retrieve specific records if desired.
- Mark Plackett asked what exactly happened to cause the incident. Michal reported that the structure had failed, but DNR is still investigating what caused the failure and anticipates completing their review by late November to early December. He referred WCMAC to a video of the pen taken on the day of the incident, available on the incident webpage.
- Jess asked whether there is a regular cycle of investigating facilities, and if not, whether WCMAC and other groups could support new requirements for inspection on a regular basis. Michal explained that leases do not include a routine inspection, but the language within leases gives the State authority to conduct an inspection at any time. However, he expressed that the State does not have the expertise to for conducting marine engineering inspections and they would have to contract that work out, which is expensive. He invited suggestions on how to address the issue of inspections.
- Doug asked about the ecological and economic damage from the incident. Michal expressed that DNR is working on estimating the damages, but noted the difficulty involved due to the broad range of impacts, from excess feed in the water to economic losses. He noted that the tribes are keeping the salmon they catch to potentially pursue retribution for damages. Corey Niles reported that WDFW experts are in the process of using data being collected to estimate the ecological damages.
- Rod asked why these operations are not required to have a gillnet or other boat nearby net pens for rapid response in case of such incidents, noting that the non-tribal response was slower than the tribal response. Michal explained that an escape response and management plan is required under one of the permits required for net pen operations, but that a plan is not required for the lease. He expressed that there could be an opportunity to require it in the future. Corey added that ESA considerations contributed to the delay in approving non-tribal vessels to assist in the response.
- Susan recommended postponing the remaining net pen discussion and coastal updates until later in the agenda, in order to have the full time for the Coastal Resilience Panel Discussion prior to the lunch break.

Panel Discussion of Coastal Hazards and Coastal Resilience

Bobbak Talebi described the panel as an effort to share local, state and federal initiatives to address existing and future impacts from coastal hazards. He introduced the panel members and emphasized the importance of partnerships with these and other organizations. Panel members then gave their presentations, available on the WCMAC webpage.

Mayor Crystal Dingler (City of Ocean Shores) presented on the city's CoastWise Resilience Collaboration. She expressed that resilience is especially difficult on the coast due to limited economic resources and underscored the importance of support from WCMAC and other entities. She provided an overview of Ocean Shores' failing North Jetty and severe coastal erosion that has caused economic losses around residential and Port resources. She provided a timeline of key efforts from the 1990s through today to address this problem, including research on beach profiles, installation of fortifying geotubes/geobags and sand fencing, with support from the Army Corps of Engineers, Sea Grant, and other partners. She also gave an overview of the series of high wind and surf events that have undermined these efforts, such as the key failure in December 2014. Mayor Crystal described the recently developed Coastal Hazards Organizational Resilience Team (COHORT), which is unfunded to date. She requested support from WCMAC to facilitate coastwide coordination of resilience efforts, raise awareness around coastal resilience, and act as mediator and advocate for coastal communities among State agencies to prioritize coastal resilience within the State and secure line-item funding to support their efforts.

David Cottrell (Grayland Drainage District #1 and member of Willapa Erosion Control Alliance Now (WECAN)) presented on coastal erosion facing North Cove and Willapa Bay, noting that the phenomenon is different from what has been observed elsewhere and what the models predict. He gave an overview of the historic changes to the shoreline, mainly the breach of the barrier spit and dune that makes land, infrastructure, and other resources vulnerable to significant flooding during storm surges. He shared the efforts that are being taken to mitigate the risk: anchoring driftwood, re-contouring the erosion scarp, constructing a berm, and planting native vegetation. He emphasized the importance of collaboration to solve this problem and recognized several partners: the Shoalwater Bay Tribe, homeowners, Grayland Drainage District, Department of Transportation, and Port of Willapa. He summarized the key barriers they are now facing: 1) reframing the narrative around shoreline management away from inevitable relocation toward hope and defense; 2) changing shoreline management regulations to better fit local contexts; 3) securing funding to support these efforts, which is especially difficult due to slower timeframes that agencies operate on.

Amanda Murphy and Phyllis Schulman (The Ruckelshaus Center) presented on the coastal resilience assessment project they recently completed upon the request of state and local entities, asking four key questions in a systems approach: 1) what is resilience? 2) do coastal managers perceive the Washington as resilient? 3) what efforts are currently being taken to support coastal resilience? 4) what is needed? They completed individual and group interviews and workshops over about three weeks, engaging over 100 participants from the North Pacific MRC, Grays Harbor College, WSU Extension Cranberry Center, various agencies, and the Shoalwater Bay Tribe. They specifically reached out to the 5 coastal tribes and engaged them in the manner that was best for them.

Phyllis reviewed their findings: 1) Many activities are being undertaken to support resilience, but there is widespread lack of capacity and coordination for implementing and securing funding for these efforts. 2) A common lack of infrastructural redundancy indicates a need for prioritizing life safety issues to increase resilience. 3) There are various communication challenges, including limited understanding of issues that coastal communities face, an undesirable narrative surrounding coastal issues, and limited communication with lack of broadband and cellular coverage. 4) Coastal tribes are perceived as leaders in resilience planning and preparedness and could provide lessons for others, but they need more funding support.

Phyllis shared the recommendations in their report: 1) Establish a coastwide resilience initiative to coordinate efforts. 2) Provide more financial and organizational support for local efforts. 3) Enhance well-being and consider new approaches to economic development. 4) Embed resilience planning into broader community planning. 5) Raise awareness about coastal resilience statewide. 6) Increase capacity for emergency preparedness, planning, and recovery efforts at both state and local scales. 7) Improve and invest in life safety and resiliency infrastructure. 8) Improve opportunities for collaboration and

partnerships through technical assistance and context-specific strategies. 9) Make federal regulations more flexible to support approaches more suitable for local conditions. 10) Learn from tribal experiences.

Lastly, Phyllis suggested several ways that WCMAC could support these efforts: 1) Build attention and political will around coastal resilience needs, beginning with how WCMAC might incorporate this more into its work. 2) Identify funding for coastal resilience. 3) Act as a convening body to support coordination. 4) Elevate the message of coastal resilience within the Governor's office. 5) Help address place-based needs in data and resources.

Discussion and questions

- Mark Plackett asked about the type of berm that would be built near Willapa Bay. David explained it would be a dynamic debris berm using driftwood that has built up along the bank, designed with WDFW for local conditions.
- Mark Plackett asked whether The Ruckelshaus Center has identified funding sources. Amanda explained that some sources and funding model examples were identified by interviewees, but a list was not compiled. Phyllis highlighted their recommendation to have NOAA and Sea Grant convene a group to be more creative about funding, aside from existing grants and government sources. Bobbak said Ecology has found that not many funding programs support the types of projects needed on the coast for pre-disaster efforts, except for TNC's Washington Coastal Restoration Initiative or Floodplains by Design.
- Rod Fleck asked about dredging in Ocean Shores and suggested conducting an infrastructure assessment of roads, jetty, and other places to provide a more comprehensive basis for support. Mayor Dingler said the jetty is serving its purpose for navigation. Randy Lewis explained that since the jetties' design and purpose for navigation is defined by federal law, the Corps is limited by those parameters and cannot make structural changes to the design for other purposes. In other words, the Corps' ability to take coastal resilience and protection into account when making repairs is limited. Economic issues pose another challenge in the system for maintenance planning; currently, the conditions must be very poor before maintenance becomes economically feasible.
- Penny Dalton expressed appreciation for The Ruckelshaus Center's report, especially its findings that State legislators are interested in coastal resilience and the concrete evidence of community needs. She supported WCMAC's involvement to find creative solutions to connect this high-level interest with local needs.
- Larry commented on the condition of the north jetty in Ocean Shores and expressed concern that there is a missing connection between the jetty's condition and the accreted lands. He urged the Port to petition the Corps to accelerate the timeline on rebuilding the jetty, partly in recognition of how navigation projects have exacerbated the problem, and to re-examine the Corps' authority regarding the accreted land.
- Mike Cassinelli expressed concern about the US Army Corps of Engineers and management issues on the coast being split between two districts (north coast in Seattle and south coast in Portland). He emphasized the importance of collaboration and financial support for coastal communities and asked why his office, as the Mayor of Ilwaco, and the office of the Mayor of Long Beach were not involved in The Ruckelshaus Center's report. Amanda clarified that all mayors were invited to the workshops and acknowledged the challenge of having involvement of all stakeholders given the limited timeframe. Phyllis explained that their goal was to identify common themes and key differences, rather than representing every community along the coast. Bobbak acknowledged another time limitation posed by their interest in completing the report before the end of the legislative session.
- Doug Kess emphasized the political nature of problem and the importance of State support, and remarked that Surfrider Foundation and The Nature Conservancy have been the primary funders of coastal resilience efforts. He expressed support for The Ruckelshaus Center report's recommendation to develop innovative funding sources.
- Casey Dennehy expressed support for WCMAC's involvement in supporting coastal resilience and suggested WCMAC could ~~assist-provide advice for their~~ develop~~ment~~ing a comprehensive plan for coastal resilience, similar to the MSP process, including strategies that could be addressed through legislative action.
- Randy Lewis asked whether The Ruckelshaus Center or Bobbak has identified case studies of other communities that have successfully addressed coastal resilience issues, and commented that the State appears to be

disconnected from the Corps and local needs. Bobbak acknowledged the challenge in making historical records accessible to local communities. He explained that the State is trying to stay connected to local communities and the Corps, but that those relationships could be bolstered by groups like WCMAC. Mayor Dingler noted that there are plenty of examples of coastal resilience, such as from the 100 Resilient Cities project, and emphasized the importance of continuity within communities to facilitate efforts. Jen suggested the Lower Columbia Solutions Group as an example of an alternative model of funding for resilience projects. Bobbak suggested the possible need of combining several models to fully address the suite of issues addressed on the Washington coast. Phyllis highlighted their recommendations to create opportunities and platforms for communication and coordination, interdisciplinary technical services advisory teams to help communities address their challenges, and a biennial "roadshow" to bring agencies to the coast.

- Patricia Iolavera (Navy Region NW) expressed appreciation for The Ruckelshaus Center report and underscored its finding that a lot of efforts are currently happening, including those at the federal level, and that existing policies, such as the Growth Management Act, could become platforms for supporting coastal resilience.
- Larry suggested that Ocean Shores utilize language from the south jetty rebuild project to help inform the north jetty planning, and consider limiting development so it does not further increase risk. Mayor Dingler clarified that Ocean Shores has a moratorium on further building in areas at risk of shoreline erosion.
- Rod Fleck suggested that WCMAC discuss at the December meeting what resilience means for the council, referencing work done during the timber wars to address local needs. He asked whether the Governor's office supported WCMAC addressing coastal resilience and whether sending a letter would be helpful to request additional guidance on priorities.
- Mark Plackett commented that the solution to Ocean Shores' erosion problem is both political as well as economic. He explained the historic accretion of over a mile of land in Ocean Shores since 1964, mostly due to the construction of the North Jetty, to highlight the importance of acknowledging the limited ability to predict how the shoreline will change in the future when addressing coastal resilience.

Public Comment #1

- No public comments were given.

MSP Update

Jen gave an update on the status of the draft MSP, which was provided in a handout in the meeting materials. Since the May meeting, their interagency team has incorporated public comments, made content and copy edits to the document, developed a programmatic EIS, and worked with NOAA to finalize language in the plan. The final draft plan and draft EIS is anticipated to be released the second week of October followed by a public comment period of 60 days. They intend to widely announce the release and Jen requested that WCMAC help distribute the announcement. They intend to hold a meeting in each MRC to gather comments.

Discussion and questions

- Garrett suggested that the MRC summit might align with the MSP public comment period. He requested that Jen's team structure the public meetings with sufficient time for public engagement and questions.
- Mark asked what a programmatic EIS entails. Jen explained that it estimates the impacts of adopting the actions in the plan, rather than the impacts of constructing and operating a specific project.
- Rich asked whether there was a timeline for legislature submission. Jen clarified that submission is not required, but they will inform coastal legislators about the plan.
- Larry requested an extension of the public comment period to 90 days to allow for more engagement among crab fishers. Susan asked whether Larry felt the additional 30 days, from mid-December to mid-January, would increase the number of comments. Larry explained that the beginning of the season in early December is very important for

the fleet. Garrett suggested that Jen's team consider scheduling meetings in the relevant communities as early as possible, before the crab season begins.

Report on WCMAC Member Interviews

Susan reviewed the summary of key points from WCMAC member interviews, provided in meeting materials, which included perspectives on operational processes, additional topics for WCMAC agendas, and other comments. She invited comments or questions regarding the summary.

Discussion and questions

- Mike Cassinelli asked whether the previous recreational fishing representative was interviewed and Susan confirmed that he was not, but two commercial fishing representatives had been interviewed.
- Garrett suggested that the WCMAC site have a simpler domain name and to create a redirect link to the WCMAC site from the Governor's webpage.

2018 WCMAC Work Plan

Susan reviewed the draft WCMAC work plan for the next year, provided in the meeting materials. She clarified that the "WCMAC Focus" column refers to three different types of WCMAC engagement: 1) sharing of information among WCMAC members; 2) informal advice to the Governor's office through notes and comments from WCMAC meetings, which does not require a vote or consensus; 3) formal advice to the Governor in the form of a letter or other format, which does require a consensus vote.

Susan then asked WCMAC members to review the list of other unranked topics of interest and consider whether they should be added to the core work plan. Susan recommended considering what WCMAC could contribute to the issue, rather than selecting topics based on importance (i.e., there may be some very important issues that aren't suitable for WCMAC involvement).

Discussion and questions

- Mike Cassinelli identified watershed protection as a topic that did not appear on the list, particularly regarding negative impacts from logging practices. Susan asked for clarification on whether upland processes were under WCMAC's purview. Garrett identified a distinction between impacts on drinking water supply versus on marine waters. Rod Fleck suggested this seemed outside the purview of WCMAC's traditional focus and that reviewing the Northwest Forest Practices Act could help local communities identify opportunities for using those rules to address the watershed issues of concern.
- Mark Plackett suggested prioritizing economic development as integral to coastal resilience. He suggested that WCMAC bring in stakeholders that have not yet been involved and pursue alternative funding sources to support local communities to carry out these projects. He also suggested that WCMAC receive updates on invasive species management and shellfish aquaculture management in the future.
- Rod Fleck commented that WCMAC has strived to work on economic development for a long time but has not fully addressed it. He suggested that WCMAC could use more support and direction from the Governor's office. Susan suggested narrowing WCMAC's economic development focus to a more specific topic, such as on coastal resilience, to make it more achievable.
- Jen reported that the WCMAC interviews and draft work plan were given to the Governor's office and received with enthusiasm. She supported Susan's recommendation to frame the economic development topic to be more concrete and therefore more attainable. Rod identified the lack of specific targets for economic development as another reason why WCMAC has not been able to fully address it.

- Rich Osborne commented that forest and fishery practices both impact coastal conditions and need to be addressed together. He recommended bringing together the forestry, fisheries, and tourism sectors to support economic development.
- Mike Cassinelli questioned WCMAC's role in economic development given the work of the EDCs and other organizations. Mark Plackett clarified that although the EDCs are bringing jobs to the coast, they do not focus on coastal resilience.
- Dave Fluharty requested that WCMAC continue discussing and supporting earthquake and tsunami preparedness efforts as an important part of coastal resilience.
- Randy Lewis recommended that WCMAC consider how to support capacity building in coastal communities in response to The Ruckelshaus Center report finding. Penny suggested incorporating capacity building into the coastal resilience focus area, at least in the near term.

Susan synthesized general agreement around coastal resilience as part of the 2018 WCMAC work plan. She gauged WCMAC interest in creating a work group to review the outcomes of The Ruckelshaus Center report, refine the list of specific tasks, and bring this information back to the full group for discussion.

- Mark requested that the work group consider how WCMAC could address economic development as one component of coastal resilience.
- Dave Fluharty suggested that the work group also consider how WCMAC could support efforts to reframe the narrative around coastal resilience.

Susan asked WCMAC to suggest key people to recruit for the work group.

- Rich recommended that the work group consider using a different format for meeting other than conference calls, as they have been ineffective for these types of discussions in the past. Garrett suggested video conferencing as an alternative format and expressed the challenge of having geographical representation. Doug announced that Grays Harbor College has a new video conference system that might be useful. Tiffany recommended using a type of video conferencing that gives each person their own screenshot instead of having most of the people in a single room with only 1-2 people in a different location. Garrett said he could arrange for that type of video conference, but noted its potential limitations of dropped calls and technology issues.
- Randy recommended asking Bobbak about people from outside WCMAC to consider inviting to join the work group.
- Susan recommended first identifying the type of work group members desired before exploring the video conferencing option.
- Garrett asked how many people would be involved in the work group. Rich said that the technical group he was a part of had 15 members, a few of whom often dominated the calls. He expressed support for video conferencing. Susan recommended focusing on who should be involved rather than how many.
- Jessica recommended first defining what coastal resilience meant for WCMAC. Susan clarified that is the intention of the work group—to look at the issues and develop a conceptual proposal for WCMAC to discuss.
- Rod volunteered to be on the work group as long as the work group develops a plan to lead WCMAC to define resilience.
- Penny recommended having someone from Sea Grant and The Ruckelshaus Center sit on the work group.
- Garrett, Mark Plackett, Casey Dennehy, Tiffany, and Randy also volunteered.
- Casey recommended reaching out to Tribal stakeholders as well.
- None of the work group volunteers expressed technological limitations to video conferencing.
- Mark Plackett suggested creating an electronic platform for WCMAC to provide input. Susan explained she intended to disseminate a discussion guide with background information to all WCMAC members to review in advance and provide feedback via email, which will inform the work group discussion.

- Larry asked whether the work group will still be open to all WCMAC members. Susan confirmed and clarified that the only difference is that the work group volunteers will be asked to do more review in-between the calls and that she would use the schedules of work group members to determine when to have meetings.

Susan confirmed the three additional topics that were added to the core work plan list: watershed protection, tsunami/disaster preparedness, and building local capacity. She flagged shellfish aquaculture and invasive species management as topics that WCMAC would receive updates on. The other core topics in the work plan would remain as currently written. She asked for any additional thoughts on the work plan, keeping in mind that it is a fluid document that can be revised throughout the year.

- Dave Fluharty asked whether ecosystem indicators also included socioeconomic indicators, which Jen confirmed.

WCMAC Member Appointment Process

Jen relayed information from the Governor's office regarding the appointment process. The Governor's office would like all WCMAC members, except Mike Cassinelli, who would like to continue serving to reapply online. This allows to the Governor's office to ensure they have up-to-date contact information, answers to the legal questions, and contact information for groups, such as the MRC chair or coordinator for MRC representatives. She will distribute the link to the online application to the WCMAC list via email. The Governor's office hopes to complete the re-appointment process within the next month. Current members can continue participating per usual, even though appointments are slated to end on October 7th. Jen reminded WCMAC that the re-appointments will be staggered in 2-year, 3-year, and 4-year terms. Rich asked whether members can request for a specific appointment term. Jen confirmed that option, but in absence of requests, the Governor's office will determine the terms using information from the WCMAC member interviews.

Public Comment #2

- Allison Bailey (Sound GIS) congratulated WCMAC on nearly completing the MSP and expressed support for the data products WCMAC has developed, but expressed concern about the data availability. She noted that the data catalog on the MSP site has not been functional. She noted that the mapping tool is a good idea, but does not appear to correspond to the spatial information in the MSP document. She also said the draft MSP has a list of data sources, but these do not seem to correlate to the sources available on the server for download. She encourages WCMAC to make the data more accessible, especially given that The Ruckelshaus Center report identified a need for data availability among coastal communities. She recommends considering the West Coast Data Portal as a model, which has been both a data source as well as a networking platform, and has successfully integrated with other data catalogs. Jen clarified that DNR is updating their web-based data system, which is why the online data catalog has been temporarily down.
- Gus Gates (Surfrider) commended the Department of Ecology for its decision to deny the water quality permit for the coal terminal (Millennium).
- Molly Bogeberg (The Nature Conservancy) announced that TNC is helping develop downscaled sea level rise projections, expected to be completed in 2018 or 2019, that hopefully will inform shoreline master plan updates and could inform WCMAC planning for coastal resilience. Garrett mentioned Molly would likely be involved in the work group.

Other Agency Updates

Jen announced:

- The Department of Ecology's decision to deny the permit for Millennium Bulk Terminals to construct and operate a coal export terminal near Longview.
- BOEM issued a Request for Information to revise their 5 year oil and gas strategic plan for offshore leasing. This is the first stage in the federal government's process to draft a new strategic plan. The Washington Departments of

Ecology, Natural Resources, and Fish and Wildlife sent a joint letter to the Bureau of Ocean Management and Energy (BOEM, Department of Interior) in opposition to oil and gas leasing and drilling off the Washington coast. Governor Inslee sent a similar letter, joined by the Governors of Oregon and California.

- Ecology's Spills Program received funding for conducting a vessel traffic risk assessment for Grays Harbor and they are currently defining what that process will entail.

Discussion and questions

- Dave Fluharty expressed support for the decision about the coal export terminal, but expressed concern about the impacts that decision will have on increased train volumes in other areas of the state.

Other Coastal Updates

Garrett provided an MRAC update. He announced the 2017 addendum to the Blue Ribbon Panel report, which is open for feedback through the middle of October. There is not a meeting planned yet to discuss the addendum.

Susan invited WCMAC to provide additional updates or comments on the net pen incident.

- Larry expressed concern about the net pen incident and the potential competition posed by the Atlantic salmon in Pacific waters with impacts on local fisheries. He highlighted how the tribal and agency response to the incident conflicts with proponents' message that escapes cause no contamination or competition for resources. He urged WCMAC to challenge these claims and assess the potential threats posed by these types of spills.
- Jess announced that the Department of Ecology is working on a net pen science and guidance project and will hold a public meeting about the topic at the Port of Grays Harbor Commissioners Chambers on October 24th from 10am-2pm. Jess commended Surfrider and the Coastal Partnership for raising awareness and gathering support for the Washington coast communities.
- Larry commended the Port of Grays Harbor for not supporting crude oil terminal, but expressed concern about potential future proposals for oil shipping. He distributed a news article on the decision: <http://www.northcoastnews.com/news/port-to-city-oil-shipment-plans-off-the-table/>
- Mark announced that new clamming dates have been identified and that Ocean Gold is currently hiring. He also gave a brief background on the pending project to establish a major portal for shipping potash from Canada and expressed disappointment with how the Port handled the open house. RD provided more information about the potash proposal and informed WCMAC that his organization will be doing research on the project and holding community presentations over the next few months. He requested help from WCMAC to find information about the project. Randy clarified that the potash proposal should be available online and clarified that the Port of Grays Harbor did not initiate the project, but rather was approached by an outside entity.
- Rich announced the third edition of the Pacific Northwest Harmful Algal Bloom (HAB) Bulletin and that new data being acquired through collaboration with NOAA and the Makah Tribe will soon be displayed online at nanoos.org and used to develop a 5-day forecast of HAB toxins. Rich also announced a record low of resident salmon-eating killer whales, believed to be attributable to 2014-2015 conditions, as well as high stress hormones levels and stillborn rates in southern resident whales, which is thought to be linked to less food. This year has also seen a record high in meat-eating killer whales and humpbacks in inland waters. Larry asked Rich whether in-ocean sampling will be expanded. Rich described efforts to secure funding for expanding sampling. Dave Fluharty clarified that the killer whales are eating less Chinook salmon.

Discussion of Proposed Meeting Dates

Susan solicited feedback about the proposed meeting dates for upcoming WCMAC meetings, especially the next one on Friday, December 15th, and key agenda topics for the next meeting and future meetings.

- WCMAC members generally expressed support for the meeting dates.
- Garrett asked whether WCMAC could get an update from the state on the comments received on the draft MSP before the public comment period is closed (e.g. at the December WCMAC meeting). Jen confirmed the state could provide an update and summary on comments received, but would not be able to discuss the response to comments.
- There were no other comments on agenda topics.

Summary of Decisions

- ! The May Meeting Summary was adopted with the changes noted above.
- ! Create work group to draft proposed WCMAC plan for discussing coastal resilience.

Upcoming Meetings

- FRIDAY, December 15, 2017
- Wednesday, March 28, 2018
- Wednesday, June 13, 2018
- Wednesday, September 26, 2018
- Wednesday, December 12, 2018

Meetings will be held in Aberdeen unless otherwise noted

WCMAC Coastal Resilience Work Plan

December 15, 2017

DISCUSSION GUIDE

Background

WCMAC created a Coastal Resilience Work Group at its last meeting and asked that they prepare discussion topics on coastal resilience for the December WCMAC meeting. Specific instructions were:

- 1) Review and propose various definitions of “resilience” for WCMAC, particularly in terms of WCMAC’s role.
 - Discuss how economic development fits into this definition.
 - Discuss how WCMAC could support efforts to reframe the narrative around coastal resilience.
- 2) Review the recommendations from the Ruckelshaus Report (WA State Coast Resilience Assessment)
 - Determine where WCMAC has a role in implementing these recommendations.
 - Prioritize recommendations for WCMAC support.

1. Definitions of Resilience

The Work Group discussed how the term “coastal resilience” is used to mean a variety of things, ranging from recovery from a disaster, such as an earthquake or tsunami; adapting to ongoing ecological changes, such as coastal erosion and sea-level rise; or general sustainability of coastal communities and local economies. The Work Group agreed that the following concepts should be included in a definition of coastal resilience¹:

- Planning and preparation for significant changes to ecological, economic, social and cultural conditions;
- Adaptation in response to these changes; and
- Recovery from negative changes.

The Work Group also discussed whether economic stress alone should be considered part of coastal resilience, or should it be limited to the economic impacts of planning for/adapting to/recovering from coastal hazards. There was general agreement that the economic issues facing the coast are greater than those related to “coastal hazards”. However, Work Group members also understood that if the definition is too broad it will cover everything within WCMAC’s purview and does not help narrow and focus the work plan. Work Group members discussed that there may be a need for two definitions: a broad definition that encompasses broad economic challenges on the coast, and a second the defines what WCMAC’s focus should be in the coming biennium. The broader definition can be used to discuss the needs and priorities of the coast and a more narrow definition could be used to guide WCMAC’s action plan. As long as there is an understanding of the broader economic components of coastal resilience, the Work Group agreed that WCMAC’s focus could be more narrowly focused on coastal hazards.

Questions for WCMAC

1. *What should WCMAC focus on with regard to coastal resilience?*
2. *Is there a need to support a broader definition for discussing coastal needs, but focusing on a sub-set of the broader definition when discussing WCMAC’s potential role and actions?*

¹ A list of definitions used by others is included as Appendix A to this discussion guide.

2. Review of the Recommendations from the WA State Coast Resilience Assessment (Ruckelshaus Report)

The Work Group reviewed these recommendations² and selected those where:

- A) WCMAC has a potential role in implementing these recommendations, or
- B) WCMAC should support/advocate for as top priority actions for the state.

A. WCMAC has a potential role in implementing these recommendations

The Work Group discussed that the primary action WCMAC can take is to be a convening entity, and focused on selecting recommendations where WCMAC could convene discussions and play an effective role in moving the recommendations forward. The Work Group identified three recommendations as priorities for WCMAC action (i.e. where WCMAC can play an active role in helping carry out the recommendation):

1. Funding Issues

- The Work Group selected this recommendation from the Ruckelshaus report as the top priority:
 - ✓ **Recommendation 9.1:** *Convene a coastal resilience funding task force. The task force could include tribal, federal, and state representatives, nonprofits, businesses, and philanthropic entities to explore creative options and partnerships for funding and coordinating investments.*
- Secondary priorities that relate to the funding task force include:
 - ✓ **Recommendation 2.1:** *Through State funding, provide at least \$50,000 each in additional funding to coastal tribes, Marine Resource Committees, and Conservation Districts to stimulate additional locally driven resilience efforts. As part of the funding mechanism, provide parameters and guidance so that the funding is utilized for resilience-related projects.*
 - ✓ **Recommendation 8.2:** *Prioritize the development and implementation of funding mechanisms and plans to rebuild or retrofit coastal schools or buildings near schools as multiuse earthquake ready facilities that include tsunami evacuation safe havens.*
- The Work Group envisions convening a workshop—potentially as part of, or in place of, a regular WCMAC meeting—to discuss funding options to address coastal resilience.

2. Science and Policy Workshop

- In addition, the Work Group supported efforts to implement this recommendation:
 - ✓ **Recommendation 9.3:** *Increase interdisciplinary and cross-sector collaboration and utilize existing efforts to share information about the work communities and researchers are undertaking.*
 - Ecology has an opportunity to apply for a competitive grant that could fund a science/policy workshop. The first day would be focused on the science/risks of coastal hazards and the second day would be a policy discussion of the steps needed to address the various hazards. The output of the workshop could include a state of the knowledge report and a work plan of next steps for the coastal region.
 - The grant proposal is due in January. The Work Group encouraged Ecology to apply and supported the idea.

3. Regulatory Barriers

- The Work Group also discussed this recommendation:

² The full list of recommendations from the Ruckelshaus Report is included as Appendix B to this discussion guide.

- ✓ **Recommendation 10.1:** *Explore opportunities to increase flexibility of regulatory approaches and support voluntary and collaborative efforts.*
 - WCMAC could help identify outdated policies and practices that inhibit useful activities. (For example, if you issue a bid for a dune restoration, you are almost prohibited from accepting volunteer labor or donations.) This could potentially be done through an online survey or email questionnaire.

Questions for WMCAC

1. *Do you agree with the Work Group’s recommendations of priority recommendations for WCMAC actions?*
2. *Are there other recommendations from the Ruckelshaus report that you think WCMAC should consider for WCMAC’s Work Plan?*

B. WCMAC should advocate for/recommend financing or otherwise support the following recommendations:

- The Work Group also identified recommendations from the Ruckelshaus report which should be prioritized for immediate action—even if WCMAC does not have a direct role in moving the action forward. These would be recommendations where WCMAC could advocate for funding and implementation, perhaps through letters to the Governor, legislators or others, testimony at legislative hearings, or other forms of advocacy. The WORK Group identified the following recommendations from the Ruckelshaus report as priorities for WCMAC advocacy. (Note that these are in addition to the funding recommendations noted above, which should also be priorities for WCMAC advocacy).
 - ✓ **Recommendation 8.1:** *Expedite efforts to get coast-wide broadband, improved cell phone coverage, and satellite communications for emergency response. Convene the relevant public and private entities, including those who are currently working on this issue, to identify strategies and solutions to barriers.*
 - ✓ **Recommendation 8.2:** *Prioritize the development and implementation of funding mechanisms and plans to rebuild or retrofit coastal schools or buildings near schools as multiuse earthquake ready facilities that include tsunami evacuation safe havens.*
 - ✓ **Recommendation 8.3:** *Expedite the development of priorities and actions to address coastal erosion, and identify funding options and support existing collaborative efforts.*
- The Work Group also agreed that this recommendation should be a priority for WCMAC advocacy.
 - ✓ **Recommendation 1.1:** *Create an integrated coast-wide effort to strengthen coastal resilience that is staffed by Washington Sea Grant, Washington State University Extension, Washington State Department of Ecology, and Washington State Emergency Management Division.*

Questions for WMCAC

1. *Do you agree with the Work Group’s recommendations of priority recommendations for WCMAC advocacy?*
2. *Are there other recommendations from the Ruckelshaus report that you think WCMAC should consider for WCMAC advocacy?*

Appendix A

Sample Definitions of “Resilience”

- Resilience is a community’s ability to thrive in the present, adapt to hazard challenges, and transform as necessary to meet future threats and opportunities. (*Ecology*)
- Community resilience refers to the ability to adapt to changing conditions and withstand and rapidly recover from disruption due to emergencies. (*Presidential Policy Directive/PPD-8: National Preparedness*)
- Resilient coastal communities plan for and take deliberate action to reduce risks from coastal hazards, accelerate recovery from disaster events, and adapt to changing conditions. (*NOAA Office of Coastal Management website*)
- Resilience is the ability to adapt to changing conditions and withstand—and rapidly recover from—disruption due to emergencies. (*NOAA, National Ocean Service “Resilience” website*)
- Resilience is the capacity of a(n) (eco)system to persist or maintain function in the face of exogenous disturbances. That is, the capacity of an ecosystem to tolerate disturbance without collapsing into a different state that is controlled by a different set of processes. (*NMFS “Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Policy” (NMFS Policy Directive 01-120, May 23, 2016)*)
- The resilience of a community is inextricably linked to its wellbeing as well as its natural environment. It is important to consider the intersection of economic prosperity, community, health, ecology, infrastructure, and governance when considering how to improve community resilience. (*Source unknown*)

Appendix B

Recommendations from the Washington State Coast Resilience Assessment

As you review these, please consider:

- i. *Is there a role for WCMAC to play in implementing this recommendation? Consider the role and specific tasks that WCMAC could realistically complete.*
- ii. *If you were offering advice on which of these recommendations should be priorities for the state, which would you choose? Please limit your selections to 3-5 “Key leveraging actions”.*

1. Establish A Coast-Wide Resilience Initiative to Enhance and Integrate Efforts

- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Create an integrated coast-wide effort to strengthen coastal resilience that is staffed by Washington Sea Grant, Washington State University Extension, Washington State Department of Ecology, and Washington State Emergency Management Division.*

2. Support and Enhance Local Efforts to Strengthen Resilience

- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Through State funding, provide at least \$50,000 each in additional funding to coastal tribes, Marine Resource Committees, and Conservation Districts to stimulate additional locally driven resilience efforts. As part of the funding mechanism, provide parameters and guidance so that the funding is utilized for resilience-related projects.*

3. Enhance Well-Being and Consider New Approaches to Economic Development

- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Consider integrating approaches to economic development that are based on regenerative planning and development and informed by local cultural, social, ecological and political dynamics.*
- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Undertake community food security assessments and develop food and health-related action plans and initiatives to address food security and access needs.*
- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Convene a diverse group of interests to focus on insurance issues facing coastal property owners and to develop recommendations.*

4. Support Improved Understanding and Application of Resilience for Planning, Policy, And Strategy Development

- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Invest in activities that deepen understanding of resilience and create practical tools that allow for a consistent application of resilience principles.*

5. Develop an Advocacy Strategy for The Coast

- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Develop narratives and design a campaign through video, print, social, and professional media outlets that communicate the compelling stories of coastal communities.*

6. Increase Support for And Learn from Coastal Tribes’ Resilience Efforts

- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Identify what is needed to support the implementation of relocation efforts, climate action plans, and hazard mitigation plans, and prioritize meeting those needs.*

7. Increase Capacity for Emergency Preparedness, Planning, And Recovery Efforts

- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Increase funding for State and Local Emergency Management and increase state focus on coastal preparedness, mitigation, recovery, and resilience.*
- **Key Leveraging Action:** *Utilize the work of Clallam County Emergency Management as a model for emergency preparedness planning for coastal counties and provide support for the enhancement and implementation of plans.*

8. Improve and Invest in The Life Safety, Reliability, And Redundancy of Critical *Infrastructure*

- **Key Leveraging Action:** Expedite efforts to get coast-wide broadband, improved cell phone coverage, and satellite communications for emergency response. Convene the relevant public and private entities, including those who are currently working on this issue, to identify strategies and solutions to barriers.
- **Key Leveraging Action:** Prioritize the development and implementation of funding mechanisms and plans to rebuild or retrofit coastal schools or buildings near schools as multiuse earthquake ready facilities that include tsunami evacuation safe havens.
- **Key Leveraging Action:** Expedite the development of priorities and actions to address coastal erosion, and identify funding options and support existing collaborative efforts.

9. Increase Opportunities for Collaboration, Coordination, and Partnerships

- **Key Leveraging Action:** Convene a coastal resilience funding task force. The task force could include tribal, federal, and state representatives, nonprofits, businesses, and philanthropic entities to explore creative options and partnerships for funding and coordinating investments.
- **Key Leveraging Action:** Secure adequate funding for technical experts and programs to gather and analyze data. Develop multi-disciplinary technical assistance “advisory teams” that can be configured based on need to work directly with communities on specific issues.
- **Key Leveraging Action:** Increase interdisciplinary and cross-sector collaboration and utilize existing efforts to share information about the work communities and researchers are undertaking.

10. Advance Coastal Protection and Restoration

- **Key Leveraging Action:** Explore opportunities to increase flexibility of regulatory approaches and support voluntary and collaborative efforts.

Draft WCMAC Workplan

10/5/17

	Topic	Purpose	WCMAC Focus	Timeframe	Tasks	Information Needs	Working Group (Y/N)	Notes/Status Updates
A.	Coastal Resilience	To update WCMAC on efforts to address coastal resilience and identify areas where WCMAC may want to provide informal or formal advice on the issue.	Information Sharing; Possible informal advice	9/17-12/17	1. Develop Panel Discussion for Sept. WCMAC Meeting (<i>WCMAC Staff</i>) 2. WCMAC Discussion on next steps (<i>WCMAC Meeting</i>)	1. Informational Briefing 2. Reports from current efforts	TBD	*Panel Discussion will occur at Sept. WCMAC meeting.
B.	Ecosystem Indicators	To provide feedback to the state on refining the list of ecosystem indicators.	Informal Advice	6/18-12/18	1. Compile existing lists of indicators, summary of methods, and proposed process for refining indicators (<i>WCMAC staff</i>) 2. WCMAC briefing and discussion (<i>WCMAC Meeting</i>)	1. List of current potential indicators 2. Summary of methods used to identify current list 3. Informational briefing on developing scientifically robust indicators	TBD	*Need to consult with NOAA (NWFSC)
C.	Science and Research Agenda	To provide feedback to the state on the development of a science and research agenda, including data gaps and WCMAC's priorities.	Informal Advice	1/18-6/18	1. Compile Data Gaps (<i>WCMAC Staff</i>) 2. WCMAC Discussion on Initial List of Gaps and Priorities (<i>WCMAC Meeting</i>)	1. List of data gaps (initial list from MSP) 2. Summary of existing, current science needs documents for WA Coast (e.g. OCNMS, PEMO)	TBD	
D.	Monitor Implementation of MSP	To keep WCMAC informed of MSP implementation efforts	Information Sharing	Ongoing	1. Summarize status of MSP implementation tasks (WCMAC staff) 2. Develop panel on regulatory roles for Dec. meeting? (<i>WCMAC staff</i>)	1. Informational Briefing on Status of MSP Implementation	No	*Include briefing on how the plan gets used, particularly regarding new applications *Review plans that are inconsistent with MSP
E.	Annual Work Plan	To develop an annual workplan to guide planning for WCMAC meetings and activities.	Operations/Admin	12/17	1. Compile topics and outcomes (<i>Steering Committee</i>) 2. Develop draft annual workplan (<i>Steering Committee</i>) 3. Discuss and adopt work plan (<i>WCMAC Meeting</i>)	1. Input from WCMAC members and Gov's office on topics and priorities	No	* Initial draft work plan discussed at September meeting with final work plan addressed at Dec. meeting.
F.	WCMAC Meeting Agendas and Operations	To fulfill Steering Committee responsibilities as listed in the by-laws	Operations/Admin	Ongoing	1. Set WCMAC Agendas for each meeting 2. Conduct officer elections every 2 years		No	
G.	WCMAC Operations/By-laws Clarifications	To clarify WCMAC operations regarding consensus and majority voting, and process and implications for recusals	Operations/Admin	3/18	1. Identify options and/or recommend changes to the by-laws (<i>Steering Committee</i>) 2. Adopt revised by-laws (<i>WCMAC</i>)		No	*It may be possible to address these issues without revising the bylaws

Other Topics of Interest/Future Consideration

Notes/Comments

1	Cosatal Erosion	
2	Vessel Traffic/Navigational Safety/Transport of hazardous substances	
3	Shipping overview	
4	Oil terminals	
5	Ocean Acidification	Joint meeting with MRAC, or presentation from MRAC plus other entities (eg. WA Ocean Acidification Research Center, Governor's office, etc.)
6	Ocean conditions (e.g. temperature, ocean acidification, etc.)	Could be combined with Ocean Acidification
7	Sea-level rise (included with coastal resiliency?)	
8	Commercial Net Pen Aquaculture	
9	Offshore Aquaculture	
10	Shellfish Aquaculture Management issues (e.g. invasive species, burrowing shrimp, etc.)	Will provide ongoing updates to WCMAC as appropriate
11	Invasive Species Management	Will provide ongoing updates to WCMAC as appropriate
12	Changing Fishing Fleets and Alternative Fishing Methods	
13	Briefing from WDFW on recreation and commercial fishing allocation	
14	Coastal Energy	
15	Economic Development: How to coastal communities adapt to changing economy?	

WCMAC Election of Chair and Vice Chair

1. Here's what the bylaws say:

Chair and Vice Chair:

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.

(Section IV. B. a))

Steering Committee:

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.

(Section III. A. i.)

2. Here's our proposed process:

- Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair are due by January 15. You may self-nominate or nominate someone else. Staff will check with all nominees to ensure that they are willing to serve if elected.
- Staff will send out the list of nominees who are willing to serve prior to the March meeting.
- WCMAC will elect the Chair and Vice-Chair at the March meeting.
- The new Chair and Vice Chair will work with JT Austin of the Governor's office to identify two recommended at-large members of the Steering Committee, taking into account balancing geographic and interest group representation.
- WCMAC members will confirm the Steering Committee recommendations via e-mail so that the new Steering Committee may begin functioning shortly after the March meeting.