

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

Summary

Wednesday, September 28, 2016 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:

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/advisorycouncil.html>

Council Members Present	
Penny Dalton, Sea Grant	Mark Plackett, Citizen
Brian Sheldon, Shellfish Aquaculture	Michal Rechner, DNR
Casey Dennehy, Recreation	Corey Niles, WDFW
Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing	Randy Lewis, Ports
David Fluharty, Educational Institution	R.D. Grunbaum, Conservation
Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC	Rich Osborne, Science
Joshua Berger, Dept. of Commerce	Rod Fleck, N. Pacific MRC
Julie Horowitz, Governor's Office	Jessica Helsley, WCSSP
Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing	Jeff Ward, Coastal Energy
Tiffany Turner, Economic Development	Doug Kess, Pacific MRC

Council Members Absent ¹	
Alla Weinstein, Energy Industry	Sally Toteff, Dept. of Ecology
Carol Ervest, Wahkiakum MRC	Charles Costanzo, Shipping

Others Present (as noted on the sign-in sheet)	
Kevin Zerbe, Cascadia Consulting, Note-taker	George Galasso, NOAA
Jennifer Hennessey, Ecology (WCMAC Staff)	Kevin Decker, WA Sea Grant
Katrina Lassiter, DNR	Gus Gates, Surfrider
Shelly Wilkins, State Senate staff	Jessi Doerpinghaus, WDFW
Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions, Facilitator	Mike Nordin, Citizen
Richard Lovely, Citizen	John Foster, Quinault Tribe

1. Welcome and Introductions, Agenda Review

- Garrett Dalan kicked off the meeting, reminding members to be polite and respectful to each other. He also encouraged members to offer only productive feedback. Members of the public were invited to provide comments (no public comments were made at this time). All attendees introduced themselves and were allowed to provide updates.
- Garrett Dalan informed the group that Mark Cedergreen resigned from the board, and that Corey Niles will be representing WDFW in place of Michele Culver.

¹ State Parks and Recreational Fishing seats are currently vacant.

Member Updates

- Jennifer Hennessey discussed the hiring of a new research/writing person who is starting 10/3/16. This person will take on writing sections of the MSP.
- Casey Dennehy discussed the Clean Water Classic Pro-Am happening 10/20 through 10/22, as well as the MRC Summit taking place in Long Beach.
- Doug Kess stated that Pacific County just finalized its Shoreline Master Program (SMP).
- Penny Dalton mentioned the Bellingham Bay Fisher Poets event taking place 10/1 and 10/2.
- Julie Horowitz mentioned the next meeting of the WA Shellfish Initiative will be taking place 10/3 in Aberdeen and to contact her for information.
- Larry Thevik mentioned the final EIS for the oil terminal at Grays Harbor will be released at the end of the week (9/30). He also noted that the Supreme Court will be hearing a case dealing with ORMA which could have far-reaching implications.
- Dave Fluharty discussed the new Dept. of Interior offshore wind strategy and that it does not mention WA State (more focused on the East Coast).
 - Randy Lewis added that the reason could be that the technology for floating structures needed for West Coast offshore wind has yet to be developed.
- Jessica Helsley informed the group that the Chehalis Basin Dam draft EIS will be open for comment soon.
- Mark Plackett discussed a project in which he is involved focusing on workforce development in WA's coastal towns.

Microfinance Presentation

Lisa Smith, of Enterprise for Equity, was unable to attend the meeting so Rod Fleck gave a brief overview of her presentation on microfinance support for coastal communities. Rod informed the group that the Rural Coastal Microenterprise Initiative has been successful so far. The project area includes Northern Grays Harbor up to Clallam with the intent of going coast-wide with the securing of more funding. In general, the project offers microfinancing options to support a broad range of entrepreneurial efforts along the WA coast. A summary of the project was made available to WCMAC members.

Agenda Review and Adoption of June Meeting Summary

Susan Gulick reviewed the agenda.

Susan Gulick initiated the vote to adopt the June meeting summary, and stated no comments or corrections were received. All WCMAC members approved the June meeting summary.

- ! The June Meeting Summary was adopted.

2. Other Potential MSP Recommendations

Jennifer Hennessey presented agency-created draft recommendations that are thought to fill in gaps left by the current list of recommendations. Six draft recommendations were outlined, and a discussion guide was included in the meeting packet. Each was open for discussion amongst WCMAC members.

Discussion and Comments

- Joshua Berger asked if it is sufficient to indicate that we will finalize indicators in the future as opposed to completing them and including them in the plan. Jennifer stated it is better to have them be ongoing than finishing them in next 6 months, because of the amount of work that would entail.

- Rod Fleck asked about time factors for the indicators and research agenda, and suggested that a review should be done every two years and that a specific agency be given that responsibility.
- Brian Sheldon commented that there seems to be no plan to address economic indicators in the research agenda. Jennifer clarified that economic indicators are included in the term “ecosystem indicators”. Brian recommended an individual action item focused on economic indicators or more specific mention of them be added.
- Dave Fluharty stated that established management priorities are needed before choosing indicators and that WCMAC needs to develop spatial explicit social and economic info
- Casey Dennehy suggested making sure the group reviewing the research agenda be as inclusive as possible. Jennifer agreed but the specific process used to get input and develop the research agenda could depend on what funding is available.
- Doug Kess asked if there is dedicated funding to maintain the data and mapping tool. Jennifer said the data sets pulled into the mapping tool are gathered from web services that get updated and automatically update the map, which requires no additional funding.
 - Mike Rechner also informed the group that the DNR viewer tool will be maintained.
- Penny Dalton agreed with Dave’s suggestion on spatially explicit detail and added that more specificity around research priorities is needed for researchers applying for funds.
 - Mike Rechner agreed more detail would be great, but not sure if it’s a WCMAC MSP responsibility. Jennifer added that specific priorities would be identified as part of the research agenda process, but not within the plan.
- Dale Beasley commented that there is no place for coastal stakeholders or MRC involvement in this document. He would like to see coastal stakeholder involvement in all areas. Jennifer responded that several recommendations mention involvement of WCMAC, so the intent is that coastal stakeholders will be involved.
- Jeff Ward asked why every eight years was chosen for a full review, and recommended shortening it to four years. Jennifer said it was modeled after the cycle for MSP updates.
 - Dave Fluharty suggested that WCMAC develop “triggers” that will initiate a full review. Jennifer said WCMAC could help with monitoring for such “triggers,” but still important have a minimum timeframe for a full review.
- Rich Osborne commented that WCMAC needs to be more explicitly listed in each section.
- Dale Beasley requested that WCMAC being explicitly listed in the second paragraph of the indicators recommendation (instead of “and others”).

3. Draft Recommendations Recommended by Technical Committee

Susan Gulick stated that the goal for this agenda item is to go over the cumulative impacts and data needs as a group. She reviewed each one, and they were also detailed in a discussion guide included in the meeting packet.

Discussion and Comments

- Dale Beasley commented that there are two styles of cumulative impacts that should be clarified: New use and cumulative impacts to existing uses. Susan suggested saying “...potential for cumulative harm to existing uses”.
- Dave Fluharty commented that this is generally applied to environmental impacts, but Dale refers to social/economic impacts. Susan responded that addressing socio-economic impacts was the intent and asked for ideas on how to re-word to make that more clear.

- Garrett Dalan believed the wording was clear and describes who is doing what and how to address cumulative impact concerns. Julie Horowitz agreed, but suggested adding “ecological, economic, and social/cultural” to the language.
- RD Grunbaum commented that “new use” is too limiting, and the sentence should read “new or expanded use.”
- Rod Fleck said it was important to cite which definition of cumulative impacts is being used and reference that in the language.
- Larry Thevik commented that projects will not happen in a vacuum, and any language around cumulative impacts needs to consider how some projects may exacerbate the impacts of other projects. This could potentially lead to tipping points. He also commented that WCMAC should ensure everyone defines cumulative the same way. There are also non-human caused and indirect impacts to consider.
- Brian Sheldon agreed with RD on “expanded uses” and suggested creating a definition guide for the whole document.
- Garrett said the RCW that is referenced is pretty strong, and already addresses the language issues being brought up by WCMAC.
- Susan said she will rewrite the cumulative impacts section based on this feedback and bring it back next meeting.
- Regarding data needs, Brian Sheldon commented on the difference between data and information and that data is either available or not, so no need to include language like “if possible...”
 - Garrett said that without “if possible”, permitting could be stalled for proponent unnecessarily. Jessica Helsley recommended replacing “if possible” with “when it exists.”
- Garrett initiated a vote to approve the recommendation regarding data needs with agreed upon language changes: *WCMAC recommends that project applicants be required to use up-to-date data that is adequate to evaluate the project and its potential effects. If new data gathering is required, it should be done at the applicants’ expense. When it exists, data should include multiple years and multiple seasons within those years.*
 - ! No opposed, the recommendation was approved.
- This recommendation will be added to the list of draft policy recommendations that was previously approved by WCMAC.
- Susan will bring a revised recommendation regarding cumulative impacts to next meeting, and encouraged members to participate in the Technical Committee if they want to wordsmith.

4. WCMAC Spatial Recommendations

Jennifer Hennessey gave a presentation on potential components for the draft spatial recommendations and reviewed the discussion guide in the meeting packet. She detailed the draft criteria for Important, Sensitive and Unique areas (ISUs) and a list of potential, proposed ISUs. She then reviewed the use analysis process and past WCMAC work done within Marxan workshops. She reiterated that the maps Marxan creates are just an analysis, and not a recommendation. Specific details on potential spatial recommendations are included in the discussion guide.

Discussion and Comments

- Brian Sheldon suggested that shellfish beds should be included as ISUs.
- Garrett Dalan asked if there will be a recommendation for federal water. Jennifer said that these are specific to state waters with no counterpart for federal waters and is representative of the limits of WCMAC’s authority over federal waters.
- Dave Fluharty commented that the maps do not show transmission corridor lines going from offshore to onshore – and that will important as they may cross areas of high use.

- Larry Thevik suggested that WCMAC not be silent about its expectations for federal behavior outside of state waters. Jennifer reminded the group the information and recommendations in MSP will help the state convey its interests in federal waters and establish the ability to review federal projects in federal waters (though a Geographic Locator Description).
- Dale Beasley requested the unique nature of the WA coast be described in the MSP, and to ensure that people understand fishing in WA is much more vulnerable than any other state in the nation.
- Brian Sheldon suggested that shellfish beds be rated higher in the Marxan analysis since they are a protected area. He also worried that shutting off all activity in estuaries is a bit of a reach and WCMAC is ignoring an opportunity to get data.
- Corey Niles clarified that the shellfish penalty does not refer to shellfish beds. Brian commented that that represents a data gap.
- Larry wondered if WCMAC can capture the issue of entanglement in its maps and list those areas as ISUs. He also noted that decision-makers should be able to identify all the layers that are included in the maps. He asked that the MSP clearly lay out the findings on federal waters so that those can be taken into account when projects are proposed in federal waters.
- Mark asked if there has been any analysis of landing sites—locations where off-shore uses would bring their products/energy/etc. to shore?
- Mark also suggested that WCMAC be more realistic about what happens in the estuaries and need to determine what the group wants to protect/preserve. Garrett stated that estuaries are not off-limits in the analysis – the analysis includes them in the same category as highest use areas. He stated WCMAC could recommend that data gathering and analysis be performed in estuaries, but it is likely that they will have such a high count that doing such work might be a poor use of resources until an actual project requires that level of analysis in the estuaries.
- Dale asked how ISU-designation affects potential new use and how ISUs were selected. Jennifer responded that they were selected by Agencies based on their knowledge and expertise.
 - Dale suggested adding dredge disposal sites and soft bottom areas to ISUs. Doug Kess added that additional sea floor mapping might be needed to find where soft bottom areas are. Corey Niles reported that 90% of WA coast is soft bottom, so therefore it might be difficult to categorize all of it as ISU.
- Mike Rechner reminded the group that red areas on the map are not really protection, but areas where it will be difficult to get a permitted project.
- Penny Dalton wondered if Marxan can view ISUs in 3D since not all project affect the entire water column. Mike responded that the MSP is not going to that level of detail.
- Jennifer is hoping to revise spatial recommendations based on the feedback and have a deeper discussion in the November meeting.
- Garrett suggested a potential recommendation could focus on what analysis should happen when a proposal comes forward to address how to do a spatial analysis once a proposal is made. Mike added that the spatial analysis is really just to set the context, so the project specific analysis is “where the rubber meets the road.”
- Dave commented that WCMAC can state the standards with which they want federal project remain consistent.
- Randy Lewis suggested the data used to create the spatial analysis is helpful and should be reviewed by agencies doing the review/permitting.
- Dale informed the group of a recent study on stomach content of salmon smolt show a large amount is juvenile rockfish and that soft bottoms provide spawning ground for rockfish, which justifies them being an

ISU. Jennifer reminded the group that NOAA could push WCMAC to identify areas where they prefer a new use to go, if the spatial recommendations exclude other areas from development.

- Larry commented that WCMAC's statutory direction uses the term "high value areas", and value layers were used in other MSPs. He suggested WCMAC include a recommendation of areas that proponents should consider avoiding.
- Doug Kess said it might be helpful to look at a map that is just fishing impacts.
- Next steps: The spatial recommendations will be revised for more discussion and possible approval at the November meeting.

5. WCMAC Funding Recommendations

Garret Dalan presented his letter to the Governor (hard copy included in the meeting packet). The letter is in reference to the 2017-19 Biennial Budget Request from WCMAC.

Discussion and Comments

- Dave Fluharty asked if WCMAC is missing an opportunity to say we have important unanswered questions that need funding.
- Joshua noted that it is a bad year to ask for more money, but we could enhance our request by noting how these funds could leverage some additional funding.
- Brian Sheldon wondered if WCMAC will be looking for money to beef up economic analysis. Katrina Lassiter stated that some of the biennium's budget included additional economic work and the FAQ created by Cascade Economics, but no other specific projects have been identified or proposed by WCMAC that would help further enhance economic understanding of the situation on the coast.
- There was some discussion on what WCMAC does after the MSP comes out. It was mentioned by several members that there is no sunset to WCMAC. The Steering Committee will need to look at the agenda for next several meetings, and have that exact conversation within the next few meetings around what WCMAC wants to be doing outside of MSP.
- Julie Horowitz informed the group that it is not recommended to ask for more than the baseline amount in their budget request.
- Garret initiated a vote for approval of letter in concept, but exact form of letter will be finalized later and will include language about leveraging funds.
 - ! No opposition. The letter was approved in concept.

6. Updates

Susan Gulick reported that the Technical Committee reviewed the adopted policy recommendations, made list of unresolved issues (included in meeting packet).

Discussion and Comments

- Brian Sheldon discussed the resurgence of net penning in Puget Sound and the need to include estuaries in the recommendation to prohibit nonnative finfish aquaculture. Julie Horowitz agreed it is important to have a discussion of aquaculture, but framing it as prohibited is an issue in that it presupposes where the conversation would go. Penny Dalton suggested removing "nonnative" and just leave it as "finfish".
- Garrett Dalan said a future meeting will include a discussion to support funding of vessel traffic risk assessment for the coast. Larry Thevik reiterated that vessel traffic includes more than just oil ships.
- Garrett informed the group that the MRAC conversation is happening on Sept. 30th and is open to the public.

- Jennifer Hennessey discussed the ocean acidification sentinel site conference, and asked WCMAC to be aware that early conversations are happening. She also alerted the group to the updated draft work plan (in the meeting packet).
- Larry asked when WCMAC will see portions of the MSP. Jennifer responded that draft chapters will be made available soon but translating the recommendations into a management framework will take more time. A preliminary plan is expected sometime this winter.
 - Rich Osborne suggested to keep the outline with the document when sending out chapters.

7. Public Comment

- Mike Nordin informed WCMAC that the Pacific Conservation District Facebook page is up and running. He also suggested that there should be link on WCMAC page to show who is on the council, and to upload the current meeting agenda.

Summary of Decisions

- ! June Meeting Summary was adopted.
- ! The data needs section of the Technical Committee Proposed Recommendations document was approved.
- ! The budget letter to the Governor was approved in concept.

All meeting materials may be found here:

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/advisorycouncil.html>

Upcoming Meetings

- November 9, 2016
- February 15, 2017 (tentative)
- May 10, 2017 (tentative)

Meetings will be held in Aberdeen unless otherwise noted