

# WASHINGTON FORUM ON Marine Spatial Planning



October 20, 2009 – Aberdeen, WA  
Bishop Center for the Performing Arts, Grays Harbor College  
9:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Co sponsored by:



# Acknowledgements: Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

Special thanks to the Forum steering committee members, event co-sponsors, speakers, and others who made this event possible:

## Steering Committee

### Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee Members (and interest represented)

Bob Burkle (Scientific)  
Birdie Davenport (State)  
Eric Delvin (Conservation & Environmental)  
Kathy Greer (Recreational)  
Arthur D. "RD" Grunbaum, (Local Citizens)  
Don Harders (Aquaculture)  
Robin Leraas (Economic)  
Harv Lillegard (Business)  
Lorena Marchant (Educational)  
Don Samuelson (Commercial Fishing)  
Joe Schumacker (Tribal)  
Ray Toste (Commercial Fishing)

## Community Volunteers

Holly and Mark Plackett, Ocean Shores, WA

## Staff

Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor County  
Brie Van Cleve, WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

## Co-Sponsoring Organizations

Friends of Grays Harbor  
Grays Harbor County  
Grays Harbor College  
Port of Grays Harbor  
Quinault Indian Nation  
Surfrider Foundation  
The Nature Conservancy  
WA Dept. of Natural Resources  
WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife  
WA Dungeness Crab Fishermen's Association  
Westport Charterboat Association

## Speakers

Please see Appendix B for a Participants List with speakers noted.

## Facilitation and Note Taking

Margen Carlson (facilitator) and Jenna Norman, WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife  
David Fulton, The Nature Conservancy  
Gabriela Goldfarb, Consultant (report author)

*For information about this event please contact:*

**Eric Delvin**, Community Conservation Coordinator  
The Nature Conservancy of Washington  
120 East Union Ave Suite 214  
Olympia, WA 98501  
(360) 280-2460  
edelvin@tnc.org

**Jena Carter**, Regional Marine Director  
The Nature Conservancy – Western Division  
821 SE 14th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97214  
(503) 802-8114  
jcarter@tnc.org

# Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Background</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Session 1: Welcome and Introductions</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Session 2: What is Marine Spatial Planning?</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>Session 3: MSP Examples and Decision-Support Tools</b> ..	<b>9</b>
<b>Session 4: Existing MSP Components in WA</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Session 5: Local Perspectives</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Session 6: Participant Input and Perspectives</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Session 7: Summary and Next Steps</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix A: Group Discussions</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix B: Forum Participant List</b> .....	<b>28</b>



## Executive Summary



On October 20, 2009 the Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee hosted the Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning. The event was held at Grays Harbor College in Aberdeen, Washington and attracted more than 80 attendees representing the general public, sport and commercial fishing, shellfish farming, recreation, tourism, higher education, and local, state, tribal and federal governments.

After a welcome from Grays Harbor County Commissioner Al Carter and Grays Harbor College President Ed Brewster, attendees heard a number of presentations about marine spatial planning. Joe Schumacher of the Quinault Indian Nation and Jena Carter of The Nature Conservancy each delivered presentations explaining what marine spatial planning is and what is driving the marine spatial planning dialogue at the national, regional, and state levels.

Three speakers then described decision-support tools that can contribute information and spatial data to support marine spatial planning in Washington. Maurice Hill of the federal Minerals Management Service presented information on the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre now being developed. Jo Smith of The Nature Conservancy discussed her

organization's Pacific Northwest Marine Ecoregional Assessment. Kathy Taylor of the Washington Department of Ecology reviewed the features and uses of the Washington Coastal Atlas. Jennifer Hennessey of the Washington Department of Ecology concluded the general presentations with an examination of the statutes, frameworks, and regulations already in place in Washington that could support marine spatial planning.

The remainder of the Forum provided a platform for local perspectives to be expressed and discussed. Attendees first heard short presentations from leaders of different stakeholder groups who were asked to address the question: "What challenges and opportunities exist from your perspective for marine spatial planning?" The speakers were:

- Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County
- Brian Blake, Washington State House of Representatives
- Maurice Hill, Minerals Management Service
- Brie VanCleve, WA Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Rick Lovely, Grays Harbor Public Utility District
- Ray Toste, Washington Dungeness Crab Fishermen's

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

Association

- Marco Pinchot, Taylor Shellfish Farms
- Dick Sheldon, Northern Oyster Company
- Mark Cedergreen, Westport Charterboat Association
- LeRoy Tipton, Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce
- Gary Nelson, Port of Grays Harbor
- Jody Kennedy, Surfrider Foundation
- Lorena Marchant, Grays Harbor College

After these presentations audience members formed three groups for a discussion of the same question. Common themes arose both in the leaders' presentations and the group discussions. These included:

- **Engaging broad participation.** All attendees agreed it is vitally important to reach beyond those who typically participate in policy discussions to make sure that all interests are represented at the table, including the general public.
- **Ensuring a locally-driven process.** Many participants felt planning initiatives in state and federal waters were inevitable and that vigorous participation by community members would be critical to ensuring such processes address locally relevant issues and are locally driven.
- **Prioritizing traditional users.** Many attendees expressed concerns that marine spatial planning could be used as a mechanism to displace fishermen and shellfish farmers, and that any process must place a higher priority on protecting those uses than accommodating new uses like renewable ocean energy.
- **Using the marine resources committees (MRCs) as a principal conduit of information.** Most people agreed MRCs, especially the Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee, are well positioned to engage, educate, and inform the public about marine spatial planning, and to represent their perspectives and priorities.
- **Securing financial resources.** There was general agreement on the need for adequate funding for data gathering and decision support tools, outreach, the planning process, and plan implementation.
- **Obtaining good quality data and maps.** Another point of universal agreement was that good quality information

is essential to an effective planning process. Participants called for ground-truthing existing and new data and maps, increasing socioeconomic and natural resource information, and ensuring good access to information resources.

- **Improving resource agency coordination and collaboration.** Participants noted the large number of agencies, authorities, and programs at all levels of government that would have to put aside turf issues, pool resources, and develop mechanisms for successful coordination and collaboration in order to develop and implement an effective plan.
- **Building upon existing authorities and programs.** Speakers and audience members acknowledged the need to coordinate and integrate a marine spatial planning process with the many existing authorities, programs, and plans that already address ocean uses.
- **Questioning the appropriateness of renewable ocean energy.** Many participants expressed unease towards renewable ocean energy (wind, wave, tidal) as a threat to traditional uses of the ocean (fishing, shellfish farming, recreation) and marine life.

Al Carter, Grays Harbor County Commissioner and Jacques White of The Nature Conservancy concluded the Forum by highlighting many of these points in a final session and thanking the attendees for their time and valuable input.

## Background



In March, 2009 Grays Harbor County established the Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee (Grays Harbor MRC)<sup>1</sup> with a vision to:

- Educate and promote citizen involvement in coastal marine issues;
- Close gaps in scientific data about local marine resources;
- Implement practical projects to benefit local marine resources and coastal communities;
- Guide state and federal public policies that affect local marine resources;
- Identify community priorities for marine resources;
- Ensure public safety for coastal citizens; and
- Promote sustainable coastal communities through use of marine resources.

The Washington State Legislature authorized and provided funding for the establishment of outer coast marine resources committees (MRCs) in 2008 legislation in order to support counties in using sound science to address the needs of the

local marine ecosystem.<sup>2</sup> The MRCs are charged with carrying out projects and recommending measures to enhance stewardship, restoration, and protection of marine resources. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's Coastal MRC Program coordinates and provides funding to support MRCs in coastal counties.<sup>3</sup>

As one of its first actions, the Grays Harbor MRC voted to convene the October 20, 2009 Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning.<sup>4</sup> More than 80 attendees representing the general public, sport and commercial fishing, shellfish farming, recreation, tourism, higher education, and local, state, tribal and federal governments participated in the day-long session. (See Appendix B for a list of all participants).

This report summarizes the presentations and discussions which took place at the Forum. After each set of speakers concluded, they fielded questions from the audience; those exchanges are also included. The PowerPoint slides that accompanied many of the presentations can be accessed via the internet at the Grays Harbor MRC website.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See [http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub\\_svcs/MRC/index.html](http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/MRC/index.html)

<sup>2</sup> See Revised Code of Washington 36.125.020 at <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=36.125.020>.

<sup>3</sup> See <http://wdfw.wa.gov/about/volunteer/mrc/>.

<sup>4</sup> The Forum was co-sponsored by The Nature Conservancy with generous financial support from the David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

<sup>5</sup> See [http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub\\_svcs/MRC/index.html](http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/MRC/index.html) and click on "Information Links."

## Session 1: Welcome and Introductions



Al Carter, Grays Harbor County Commissioner opened the meeting by welcoming participants and explaining that the Grays Harbor MRC is the first to be established on Washington’s ocean coast, and that it is taking a ground-up approach to engaging the community on ocean issues. To plan for the next 50-100 years requires an organic approach that should support locally-driven projects, such as gear removal, stream restoration, and other restoration efforts. There needs to be an evaluation of whether new uses such as wave or tidal energy are desirable, and if so, where is appropriate to site such projects. He observed there are many competing interests on the ocean coast, and those interests need to work together to ensure ocean resources are healthy and available for use. He further noted all of the uses represented in the audience – shellfish farmers, sport and commercial fishermen, gear retailers, the public utility district, and many others – are interconnected with the interests of others who are not in attendance at this Forum. He called upon today’s meeting participants to “bring a friend” and persuade nontraditional partners to participant in future meetings on marine spatial planning

Grays Harbor College President Ed Brewster also welcomed attendees to the College and acknowledged the elected officials in the audience: County Commissioners Al Carter and Terry Willis, and Washington House of Representative District 19 members Brian Blake and Dean Takko. Mr. Brewster described Grays Harbor College as a “commons” for the community, a place for discourse and disagreements to be aired, where people should come together for discussion and decide how to move forward. The college is deeply involved in coastal, water, and other natural resources management issues in its academic programs, including a model watershed, a lake, and a fish hatchery all on campus. Key college staff include Lorena Marchant, who will be involved in any marine spatial planning efforts, Janel Spaulding, who is involved in the Chehalis watershed initiative, and art teacher Eric Sandbren who is organizing a series of events on the region’s wetlands.

Forum facilitator Margen Carlson of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife acknowledged the steering committee members who helped organize the Forum. (See list at inside cover of this report.)

## Session 2: What is Marine Spatial Planning?



Jena Carter, The Nature Conservancy. Ms. Carter opened by noting her organization's long history of work in marine waters, including the development of marine ecoregional assessments. She said this Forum is the fourth workshop on marine spatial planning The Nature Conservancy has sponsored or co-sponsored in the last 12 weeks; the others were held on the East Coast, California, Oregon, and another Washington event in Seattle. This summer, The Nature Conservancy also published a paper on best practices for marine spatial planning<sup>6</sup> Ms. Carter expressed her appreciation for the strong interest in the topic as shown by the many people in attendance at this Forum.

Ms. Carter highlighted the UNESCO Initiative on Marine Spatial Planning as a significant source of information about marine spatial planning. On its website, the Initiative offers descriptions of marine spatial planning efforts around the world, a paper on what constitutes "good" practices, a step-by-step handbook explaining ten steps of marine spatial planning, and a definition of marine spatial planning.<sup>7</sup>

Ms. Carter stated a principal motivation for marine spatial planning is to develop a comprehensive vision for future marine uses. Humans depend on coasts and oceans for food, recreation, transport, and a variety of ecosystem services. Renewable energy, offshore oil and gas exploitation, aquaculture, commercial fishing, recreational use, and shipping all need ocean spaces. These activities occur alongside whales, sea turtles, sea birds, fish, and the habitats they too need for survival.

She examined a few of the components of the UNESCO definition of marine spatial planning as follows:

- **Planning** – Planning is focused on the future. It is visionary in that it identifies where or how existing and future marine uses should occur. It is a process that involves robust citizen participation and helps a community prepare for change, rather than react to it.
- **Spatial and temporal distribution of human activities** – This means looking at ocean uses in four dimensions - on

<sup>6</sup> Available at [http://www.nature.org/initiatives/marine/files/msp\\_best\\_practices.pdf](http://www.nature.org/initiatives/marine/files/msp_best_practices.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> See <http://www.unesco-ioc-marinesp.be/>.

the ocean surface, in the water column, on the sea bed and over time.

- **Analyzing** – This entails pulling together existing data and conducting research to address gaps in knowledge about, for example, socio-economic uses and marine habitats and species. It is essential to put this information into a spatial format at the appropriate scale. Often research exists in small scales (localized) but for some spatial planning there will be a need for data at the statewide or even regional scales.
- **Objectives** – Marine spatial planning is a way to integrate ecological, economic, and social objectives. The specific objectives are typically determined through a political process.

**The UNESCO Initiative on Marine Spatial Planning definition:**

Marine spatial planning is a public process of analyzing and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities in marine areas to achieve ecological, economic and social objectives that have been specified through a political process.

Ms. Carter made the point that marine spatial planning is not necessarily analogous to ocean zoning. Marine space has long been zoned for individual human uses (e.g. geographically-based fishery closures, shipping lanes, oil and gas leases, etc.). While zoning can be a tool to implement spatial planning, other tools and solutions can be employed. Oregon, for example, expressed in its Territorial Sea Plan a priority on living renewable ocean resources and vets all ocean proposals against that priority.

She then highlighted several aspects of the State of Rhode Island's evolving Ocean Special Area Management Plan (Ocean SAMP) process. With offshore wind energy proposals as a major driver, in August 2008, Rhode Island launched a two-year planning process to site offshore renewable energy development. The effort is being underwritten by the wind energy company selected by the state as the project developer. A particularly innovative feature of the Ocean SAMP is that the state entered into a memorandum of understanding with the federal government to allow the state plan to apply 40 nautical miles offshore

instead of stopping at the state 3 nautical mile boundary.

Ms. Carter described and showed slides of some of the technical aspects of the Ocean SAMP process, including the creation of gridded maps and overlays that identify exclusion zones (e.g. navigation lanes and precautionary areas, disposal sites, military areas, marine protected areas, airport buffer zones, cable areas, etc.), geological features like terminal moraines that make construction difficult, wind resources, shore visual analysis, and more. Out of all these overlays, the Ocean SAMP identified preliminary options for siting wind energy facilities, and set priorities for researching living marine resources (e.g., marine mammals and turtles, avian and bat species, fish and fish habitat, endangered species), other resources (e.g., water and air quality, historical and cultural) and socioeconomic uses (e.g., recreational, fixed gear, and other fishing effort via cooperative interviews with fishermen, aquaculture, recreational boating, conservation). After use and resource zone maps are completed, the Ocean SAMP will move to develop objectives, boundaries, and chapters for each use, then adopt a plan at the state level and incorporate it into the state's federally approved coastal management plan.<sup>8</sup>

There are a number of other marine spatial planning initiatives around the country that are of interest. The State of Oregon is also developing a policy and plan for siting ocean renewable energy in response to wave energy proposals off its coastline. The State of Massachusetts chose to do comprehensive mapping for multiple uses. The West Coast Governors' Agreement (a joint initiative of the Governors of Washington, Oregon, and California) is also contemplating marine spatial planning; a workshop held two weeks ago in Seattle launched a process to identify priority sites for renewable ocean energy all along the West Coast. At the national level, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration head Jane Lubchenco said marine spatial planning is one of her top priorities. On June 12th President Obama issued a memorandum to federal agencies to develop recommendations for a national ocean policy and a framework for carrying out coastal and marine spatial planning; the latter set of recommendations will be issued in mid-December, 2009.

Ms. Carter closed by noting that each state will have to decide what marine spatial planning means in its state

<sup>8</sup> Information is available at <http://seagrant.gso.uri.edu/oceansamp/>.

waters. The federal government will decide in federal waters, but there is an opportunity to partner and carry out integrated planning that transcends state, federal, and even local jurisdictional boundaries. How that might happen is still an emerging story.

**Joe Schumacker, Quinault Indian Nation.** Mr. Schumacker, the Quinault Nation's marine resources scientist, gave a presentation titled "Marine Spatial Planning and You." He noted Grays Harbor County's significant connections to ocean resources. He identified the main impetus for today's Forum as the Presidential proclamation and the anticipated guidance on marine spatial planning that will be issued in mid-December by the President's ocean policy task force. Mr. Schumacker reported he will be speaking about marine spatial planning later in the week with the White House Council on Environmental Quality, which oversees the ocean policy task force and that he testified about ocean policy generally before the task force the previous month in San Francisco.

Mr. Schumacker described marine spatial planning as a process for:

- Siting offshore energy developments,
- Informing ecosystem based management,
- Establishing conservation set-asides, and
- Planning for future marine uses.

He focused on the initial steps needed to launch marine spatial planning initiatives, starting with forums like today's that gather the people of the coast and get the word out that this type of initiative is coming and that it will potentially affect how the ocean is governed. Early funding is essential to compile existing data and support public participation and input; in Grays Harbor, just about everybody should be interested.

As the Rhode Island example showed, mapping is an important initial exercise. Geographic information system (GIS) technology allows the layering of key information including uses, species, habitats, and seasonality. Some maps will be created with existing data, and later modified with new input and data. An example of mapping, as illustrated

by the slides, is the California Ocean Uses Atlas, which is collecting geospatial information on nearly 30 different human uses of the ocean off the state of California. Part of the information was gathered in a series of four workshops conducted throughout the state. The atlas data provide baseline information regarding the location and extent to which the ocean environment is used for non-consumptive, industrial, military, and fishing uses.<sup>9</sup>

After mapping comes planning - the "real meat" of the process. The planning effort will result in recommendations for the purposes noted above (e.g., siting offshore energy developments, informing ecosystem based management, establishing conservation set-asides, and planning for future marine uses). Planning sets the stage for potential regulatory action by appropriate agencies to enact those recommendations.

Mr. Schumacker identified the Pacific Northwest Marine Ecoregional Assessment prepared by The Nature Conservancy as another example of marine spatial planning-related activities. This work illustrates that some nongovernmental organizations are better equipped than government to undertake mapping, and these organizations are key players as marine spatial planning progresses. Mr. Schumacker noted it is important for NGOs and communities to work collaboratively to vet data and maps.

Mr. Schumacker offered as a cautionary tale the effort by the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary to map and zone intertidal marine areas. The tribes participated in all steps until a final technical panel meeting; the tribes were not invited to that meeting, and the Sanctuary produced a map that proposed no-take areas on tribal lands, leading to a deep rift between tribes and the Sanctuary that took many years to heal. The mistake set that particular process back but ultimately led to the creation of the Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC) that now advises the Sanctuary. The IPC works hard to prevent similar situations from reoccurring in the future.

He noted that a 2008 Tribal/State Ocean Ecosystem Initiative Briefing document is currently being updated to reflect high resolution mapping, habitat characterization, and identification of species distribution as high priorities. Tribes support ecosystem based management so long as it is

<sup>9</sup> See [http://mpa.gov/science\\_analysis/atlas.html](http://mpa.gov/science_analysis/atlas.html)

better defined with clear paths specified to achieve it. Mr. Schumacker encouraged workshop attendees to demand transparency and to actively participate in any marine spatial planning process that emerges.

**Questions and Answers.** Mr. Schumacker was asked: If a nongovernmental organization is doing mapping, what do you do about actual or perceived bias? He responded that the key is participation. Once maps are made, they can take on life of their own. All interested parties need to be at table. The extensive list of participants in Rhode Island is a good example. Ms. Carter responded that nongovernmental organizations may not be the source of information, just the integrator. That is the case with respect to The Nature Conservancy's ecoregional assessments that stitch together data from many different sources. Ms. Carter was asked: How long did the Rhode Island process take? She replied that it is still underway, with only Phase I completed. The second phase is scheduled to conclude in August 2010.

## Session 3: MSP Examples and Decision-Support Tools



In this session speakers highlighted tools that can contribute information and spatial data to support marine spatial planning in Washington. Maurice Hill of the federal Minerals Management Service presented information about the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre. Jo Smith of The Nature Conservancy described her organization's Ecoregional Assessments. Kathy Taylor of the Washington Department of Ecology discussed the Washington Coastal Atlas.

**Maurice Hill, Minerals Management Service.** Mr. Hill explained that he was making the presentation about the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre on behalf of MMS' Christine Taylor, who couldn't attend due to her work for the Presidential task force on marine spatial planning; she and Brian Smith of the NOAA Coastal Services Center are leading development of the Cadastre. Mr. Hill's presentation covered four points: an overview of the Cadastre, the partnerships involved in its development, information about the data and viewers, and the case studies currently being developed.

Mandated by the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre is a marine information system that provides a data framework for decision making on the Outer

Continental Shelf and state waters. The vision for the Cadastre is a tool that provides authoritative data needed to support ocean planning and management in an easily accessible format so that end users can visualize and access data for their specific needs.

Development of the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre was propelled by the need to site renewable ocean energy projects. However, it will be relevant to all ocean planning issues and an important tool for achieving coordinated data and decision making, updating boundaries, incorporating new data, and reducing costs to states and other organizations. As the Cadastre is built, governmental and nongovernmental entities such as the Washington Department of Ecology can also work with MMS to incorporate appropriate data.

Mr. Hill explained that in the terrestrial context a cadastre is a survey of land ownership. The marine cadastre is different; it does not show ownership per se, but rather jurisdictions and uses of marine and coastal waters. He illustrated his points with slides of maps of the Channel Islands with overlays highlighting various data themes, such as marine infrastructure and navigation. Significant data gaps exist in a

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

number of themes including geology and seafloor, marine habitat and biodiversity, and human uses (fishing, military, etc.).

At present, the NOAA Coastal Services Center regularly harvests data from agencies – the authoritative sources – and provides access to the data and map-making capabilities via the Marine Boundary Working Group’s portal, which is accessible at <http://www.csc.noaa.gov/mmc>. The “case studies” currently being developed include:

- Mapping applications to support MMS’ energy planning, regulations, and permit review;
- Mapping hydrokinetic projects and critical habitat data for NOAA Fisheries Habitat Conservation Division; and
- Working with the State of California to provide web map services for state ocean planning and wave energy studies.

Federal initiatives on the West Coast that are focal points for the Cadastre include geospatial tools and services provided by the West Coast Regional Office of the NOAA Coastal Services Center, the NOAA Marine Protected Area Center’s work to develop a framework for a national system of marine protected areas, the California Ocean Uses Atlas Project, the activities of the National Marine Sanctuaries, and NOAA Fisheries’ Essential Fish Habitat Mapper, Fisheries GIS Portal, and Hydrokinetic Mapping Project.

Mr. Hill summarized by saying the Cadastre is issue driven, gaining momentum through case studies and partnerships, and scalable and transferrable. The Cadastre’s products and support include:

- Authoritative marine boundary and supporting data
- Stand-alone and customizable data viewers
- Templates for developing map viewers
- Support on a case-by-case basis

**Questions and Answers.** Mr. Hill was asked if the constituent data layers and shape files would be available to download; he responded he thought it was necessary to use the viewer. Joe Schumacker commented that in the Pacific Northwest it was essential to take into account tribal jurisdiction and work collaboratively with the tribes; Mr. Hill responded that he would follow up with Mr. Schumacker. A final questioner raised the concern that information

collected by different parties is in different formats, and asked how the data is being integrated. Mr. Hill acknowledged it is a major challenge to incorporate data from varying sources, and MMS is starting to fund studies to address that issue.

**Jo Smith, The Nature Conservancy.** Ms. Smith discussed The Nature Conservancy’s Pacific Northwest Marine Ecoregional Assessment: what it is, how it can be used, and examples of its use. The Assessments identify ecologically significant areas that, if protected, represent regional biodiversity and frame a regional-scale context for conservation efforts. Those efforts can encompass a wide range of strategies such as incentives for private landowners, promoting the adoption of best management practices, ecosystem restoration projects, and conservation easements. TNC’s Ecoregional Assessments are not regulatory, prescriptive, or perfect.

The Assessment’s strongest attributes are that they result from rigorous quantitative analysis and offer a way to present physical and biological features and other information in a spatially explicit way; they also provide consistency across a region, build credibility among partners, and illuminate future data needs. Assessments incorporate extensive expert review, and are the most comprehensive and current efforts to set conservation priorities at a regional scale.

These assessments also have weaknesses. The scale is often coarse and local sites of importance may be difficult to identify. Assessments depend on available data that suffer from significant gaps, verification methods are inadequate, and assumptions regarding goals may be somewhat arbitrary. Integration between freshwater, terrestrial, and marine areas is imperfect. However, no one has ever tried to create this kind of tool before, and Assessments are expected to be revised and improved over time.

Several TNC Assessments have been done along the West Coast from Alaska to Baja California. Collaborators on the Washington the Assessment include The Nature Conservancy, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington Department of Natural Resources, and many other partners.

Ms. Smith’s slides summarized the elements of the Ecoregional Assessment approach, including: identifying targets; setting conservation goals for species, habitats, and communities;

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

compiling data; assessing threats and limiting factors; and modeling via a software program called Marxan. Data come from a wide array of state, federal, and academic institutions, and are organized using the Minerals Management Service “grid system” of 1 mile square blocks in state waters and 3 mile square blocks in federal waters. Currently, the Pacific Northwest Marine Ecoregional Assessment has progressed through a number of the planning phases and is now conducting preliminary runs of the data using Marxan. The data and results will continue to be peer reviewed by the data sources and stakeholders.

**Questions and Answers.** A participant asked whether The Nature Conservancy’s development of the Ecoregional Assessments was an insinuation that managers are not managing the resources properly. Ms. Smith responded it was not her intent to insinuate that managers are not managing their resources properly; Assessments are a tool to help them do their jobs.

**Kathy Taylor, Washington Department of Ecology.** Ms. Taylor began with a series of slides explaining the Atlas’s development in coordination with multiple state, tribal, federal, and nongovernmental agencies in Washington and elsewhere, and described its purpose “to make relevant information easily available for use in coastal and shoreline resource planning and management.” This is a very broad purpose that is compatible with marine spatial planning. The primary audiences for the Atlas are local governments implementing the Washington coastal zone management program and state agencies that regulate or manage activities on the shorelines and tidelands of Washington. Other important audiences are tribal and federal government agencies, nongovernmental organizations, real estate professionals, and private citizens.

The Atlas’ geographic extent includes the marine shoreline of Washington’s outer coast, the shoreline and waters of Puget Sound, the estuarine portion of the Columbia River, and upland information for all counties with marine or estuarine shorelines. The available data include:

- **Biological/Habitat Features** – Wetlands, Historic Estuary Maps, Pocket Estuaries, Dunegrass, Surfgrass, Kelp, Eelgrass, Salt Marsh, Low Marsh
- **Physical Features** – Drift Cells, Slope Stability, Water Bodies (100k), Water Courses (100k)

- **Regulated Features** – Commercial Shellfish, Flood Zone, Drinking Water Wells, Category Water (5, 4C, 4B, 4A, 2, 1)
- **Modifications** – Piers and Docks, Shore Modification
- **Jurisdictional Delineations** - Watershed (WRIA) Boundaries, Sub Basins, Counties, Cities, Township/Range/Section
- **Transportation Features** – Major Roads, Streets, Railroads
- **Background Imagery** – USGS Topo Maps, Aerial Imagery, Hillshade, Nautical Charts
- **Satellite Imagery** – Land Use/Land Cover 1991, 1996, 2001
- **Other Imagery** – Oblique shoreline photos 1976-77, 1992-’97, 2000-02, 2006

Ms. Taylor then paged through a series of slides demonstrating the Atlas’ features, noting in particular the ability to display information relating to changes in forest cover and impervious surfaces using NOAA’s coastal change analysis program data, and the usefulness of the oblique aerial photos of the shoreline. More layers of data can easily be added when they become available, such as data layers from the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre and from an initiative to incorporate public access and user survey information. Other current priorities are redesigning the Atlas to be more information rich and less cartographic centered, increasing cooperative efforts with other state agencies, and improving interoperability with other coastal atlases on the West Coast through the International Coastal Atlas Network. The Washington Coastal Atlas is available at [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sma/atlas\\_home.html](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sma/atlas_home.html).

**Questions and answers.** A participant asked who takes photos. Ms. Taylor responded that a contract photographer takes them every 5-6 years, depending on funding. Another participant asked how the Department of Ecology defined “coastal” for purposes of the Atlas (i.e., how far inland). Ms. Taylor responded that the Atlas includes information for the entirety of coastal counties.

## Session 4: Existing MSP Components in WA



In this session, Jennifer Hennessey of the Washington Department of Ecology examined the statutes, frameworks, and regulations already in place in Washington that could be applied towards marine spatial planning. Ms. Hennessey explained her role working on ocean policy issues for the Department of Ecology and coordinating the State Ocean Caucus, an interagency team of state agencies. She acknowledged her presentation would not be an exhaustive survey of every Washington law or regulation that may be relevant to marine spatial planning, but would highlight: 1) key coastal management authorities applied in the context of single projects; 2) laws and regulations used to conduct area-based or multi-use management for coastal areas and resources; and 3) some considerations for any future marine spatial planning efforts.

She began by stating that planning for the use of marine resources is not new. State regulations already apply to managing these resources, although they might not work perfectly. It is important to draw lessons from these experiences and build on what already exists.

Ms. Hennessey noted the criticism that there are too many

managers of marine resources. The Pew Oceans Commission and U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy issued reports recognizing that fragmented, sector-by-sector approaches to managing our ocean and coast have hindered efforts to address problems and promote sustainable ocean ecosystems.<sup>10</sup> The Washington Ocean Action Plan recognizes a need for moving toward an ecosystem-based approach to managing ocean and coastal resources with the following recommended actions: 1) assess the health and trends of the ocean ecosystem, develop key indicators and performance measures, and evaluate progress toward ecosystem health and 2) develop tools for managing impacts to coastal and ocean resources through a collaborative process.<sup>11</sup> At the same time, there are continuing mandates to administer existing authorities.

Ms. Hennessey defined two terms used in her presentation: area-based management and multi-use planning. She defined area based management as decision making for a discrete location and typically for single uses, although a smaller site may be the focus of multiple uses. Multi-use planning refers to planning for multiple uses in a larger geographic area.

<sup>10</sup> See [http://www.pewtrusts.org/our\\_work\\_detail.aspx?id=130](http://www.pewtrusts.org/our_work_detail.aspx?id=130) and <http://oceancommission.gov/>.

<sup>11</sup> See <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/>.

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

Beyond state authorities and frameworks, many others would play an important role in a marine spatial planning process. There are federally-managed areas such as the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, National Parks, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Refuges. In Puget Sound, there is the Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve. These areas all have discrete management plans that are important to consider when thinking about aligning decision-making and looking at how the whole ecosystem is functioning. The many tribes in the state also co-manage marine resources and any planning process requires tribal participation and government-to-government consultation.

A question is how best to align various state, federal, local and tribal authorities to achieve overall goals. Key state agencies and the authorities they administer related to managing coastal resources include:

- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
  - o Co-managed fisheries (state, tribes, federal)
  - o Species and associated habitat management
- Washington Departments of Natural Resources (DNR) & Washington State Parks
  - o Land management
- Washington Department of Ecology
  - o Shoreline Management
  - o Water Quality
  - o State Coastal Program and federal projects

Other key players to keep in mind include the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC), which has authority in both state and federal waters to issue harvest restrictions for managed species. In federal waters, the Council may implement provisions to close areas, protect essential fish habitat, and monitor species.

As an example of the complex regulatory regime facing spatial planning, Ms. Hennessey offered an example of how a single project can trigger requirements for approvals from numerous agencies, such as:

- Hydraulic project approval by WDFW
- Aquatic land lease by DNR
- Shoreline permits from local governments or Department of Ecology
- Water quality permits from Department of Ecology
- State Environmental Policy Act implementation by the lead agency
- Other applicable permits such as health, safety, etc.

The table to the left summarizes the information presented in Ms. Hennessey's slides highlighting the principal mechanisms used by state agencies and the Pacific Fishery Management Council (a federally-designated entity) to carry out area-based management of activities in ocean waters and the adjacent shoreline.

Ms. Hennessey explained the primary relevant multi-use planning frameworks in Washington State are the state Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA) and the Shoreline Master Programs. The table below describes the key features of these frameworks.

## Area-Based Management in Marine Waters

Washington Dept. of  
Fish and Wildlife

### State waters

#### Sets:

- Harvest restrictions
- Species and habitat protection measures (e.g., gear type prohibitions, specific measures for nearshore rockfish, groundfish and halibut, salmon, forage fish, and sharks)

### Federal waters

#### Administers:

- Harvest restrictions for Dungeness crab
- Management measures for all species not managed by PFMC (e.g., pollock, spot prawns, chum salmon, sockeye salmon).

Pacific Fishery  
Management Council

### State and federal waters

#### Designates:

- Rockfish Conservation Area
- Essential Fish Habitat area closures
- Prohibitions on krill harvest and dredge gear
- Protected species measures (e.g., sea turtles, seabirds, marine mammals).

#### Is developing:

- Ecosystem Fishery Management Plan.

Washington State Parks

- Manages the Seashore Conservation Areas (which includes recreation management plans for ocean beaches)

Washington Dept. of  
Natural Resources

- Manages all state owned aquatic lands to encourage direct public use and access, foster water-dependent uses, ensure environmental protection, and utilize renewable resources.
- Designates Aquatic Reserves that seek to protect water-dependent uses and protect the environment as primary goals while balancing multiple other uses to maximize overall public benefits.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> See <http://www.dnr.wa.gov/AboutDNR/Divisions/ARD/Pages/home.aspx>

## Multi-use Planning Frameworks in Marine Waters

### Washington Dept. of Natural Resources

- Conducts bay-wide planning to inform the decision making of all entities managing a given location (e.g., Mystery Bay planning effort).
- Is developing an Aquatic Lands Habitat Conservation Plan to meet federal Endangered Species Act requirements.

### Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA)

- Sets broad policies and specific permitting criteria for uses other than fishing and recreation.
- Guides development of local Shoreline Master Programs.
- Supposed to apply to “all federal, state or local permits or approvals for activities that will adversely impact renewable marine resources and existing coastal and ocean uses.”
- ORMA and other state laws making up the federally-approved Washington coastal zone management program are the basis for evaluating consistency of federal activities with state policies.

### Shoreline Master Programs

- In practice, Shoreline Management regulations and federal consistency determinations are the main implementation mechanisms for ORMA.
- Developed in partnership between state and local governments.<sup>13</sup>
- Part of the state’s federally-approved coastal zone management program.
- For ocean counties, must address ocean management criteria that apply out to 3 miles and encourage a regional perspective.

Ms. Hennessey noted that the state’s coastal zone management program already has the authority to develop special area management plans (SAMPs). Rhode Island is using the SAMP authority to develop their ocean plan. In 1986, Washington used this tool to develop the Grays Harbor Estuary Management Program,<sup>14</sup> which has been subsequently incorporated into local, state, and federal decision-making. Washington would need additional resources, but not authorities, to develop a SAMP for the ocean. The Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) is another possible planning framework; Massachusetts is using its state environmental policy act for its ocean plan development and implementation.

Ms. Hennessey closed with considerations for marine spatial planning going forward. They include the need to acknowledge existing authorities and frameworks, identify gaps, and incorporate processes already under way like habitat conservation plans under the Endangered Species Act. Data availability is another key consideration, including the following questions: Are data available for a comprehensive planning process? If not, what is needed? What is the capacity to manage and share data effectively? Ms. Hennessey also indicated the importance of clearly articulating goals and objectives at the outset and determining how to measure progress towards those goals. Finally, she stated the need to allocate adequate financial resources for marine spatial planning. For example, data costs have easily constituted 50%

<sup>13</sup> See <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/SMA/index.html>.

<sup>14</sup> See [http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub\\_svcs/EstuaryPlan.htm](http://www.co.grays-harbor.wa.us/info/pub_svcs/EstuaryPlan.htm).

of the budget for these types of initiatives. However, funding is also needed to conduct effective planning processes and implementation of the plan.

**Questions and answers.** A participant commented that the Navy has been doing research along coast and asked whether there was any thought of using that information, particularly for mapping. Ms. Hennessey responded that the Governor sent a letter to the Navy and NOAA to get mapping information released. NOAA was able to release its info, but the Navy declined to further release classified information and also indicated that their classified information may not be useful anyway. Another participant noted all the different state and federal agencies and their areas of responsibility, and asked whether it was possible to coordinate all of them in a coastal team to work together at the local level. Ms. Hennessey replied that the State Ocean Caucus currently coordinates across the state agencies and would be a good place continue coordinating.

## Session 5: Local Perspectives



Leaders of different government, tribal, and stakeholder groups expressed their perspectives on the challenges and opportunities that exist for marine spatial planning.

**Terry Willis, Grays Harbor County.** Ms. Willis described her experience of involvement in two other processes similar to marine spatial planning: watershed planning for the Chehalis basin, and planning for a flood authority for the basin. The flood authority takes in the whole basin and all its activities, as does the Chehalis Basin Partnership management plan. The thought of doing a complementary process for the marine environment is exciting. Earlier, Commissioner Al Carter said everybody must be invited to participate and be in the room. This is important. Previous efforts have been derailed by not getting the right representation. A good process will result in a document that protects all activities – shipping lanes, special fishing areas, recreation, wildlife habitat, and all other aspects of concern. Ms. Willis expressed her view that a group coming together around marine spatial planning will provide a missing link to other processes started in the county. She observed there were lots of familiar faces in the room, lots of talent and education, and encouraged attendees to move forward. The need for financing is always an issue, but

she urged the audience not to let it become a deterrent. She closed by promising to remain engaged in the next steps. *Due to a scheduling conflict Ms. Willis was unable to stay for a question and answer session after her presentation.*

**Brian Blake, Washington State House of Representatives.** Mr. Blake explained that his legislative district stretches from Aberdeen to the mouth of the Columbia River, and east to Longview/Kelso. He views marine spatial planning as a huge opportunity. Planning for uses in the ocean can reduce problems associated with siting those uses. Good quality maps of the ocean floor are needed and could be developed for relatively little money. A significant challenge is the perception among many people that marine spatial planning is window dressing for imposing “no-go” zones for the public, creating marine protected areas that exclude people. Promoting dialogue is very important. Mr. Blake questioned the wisdom of NOAA proposing a no-fishing zone in Puget Sound just as efforts to launch a marine spatial planning process on the ocean coast are starting. He closed by underscoring the importance of people participating in a marine spatial planning effort to make it as good as it can be.

**Questions and Answers.** An audience member expressed concern that marine spatial planning is a first step in cordoning off the ocean for special interest uses, like ocean ranching and windmills offshore. Mr. Blake answered that he was never supportive of ocean ranching. There are interests that want to do things that will displace existing users, but he believes vibrant commercial and sport fishing industries shouldn't be pushed aside for these potential future opportunities.

**Maurice Hill, Minerals Management Service.** Mr. Hill explained he works as the agency's West Coast program coordinator for offshore renewable energy (wind, current, wave), and that MMS has jurisdiction only on the outer continental shelf (OCS) while sharing authority for regulating wave and tidal current energy with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). MMS issues leases, FERC issues licenses. The federal Energy Policy Act of 2005 also gave MMS responsibility to lead development of the Multipurpose Marine Cadastre for use as planning tool for siting renewable energy projects. The agency also co-chairs the West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health (WCGA) Renewable Energy Action Coordination Team which is developing a coastal siting report for renewable energy on the West Coast. A recent workshop in Seattle focused on the coastal siting report and other WCGA action teams are also interested in pursuing marine spatial planning. A key challenge in moving forward is funding. The upcoming Presidential Ocean Policy Task Force report on marine spatial planning and its implementation may be an avenue to Congressional funding.

**Brie Van Cleve, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.** Ms. Van Cleve focused on Marine Resource Committees (MRCs) as a model for local engagement on cross-cutting marine issues. The challenge is how such locally focused groups can productively engage in big processes like marine spatial planning, and how that work can reflect both national and local concerns. Ms. Van Cleve commended Grays Harbor MRC for convening this event and noted that because marine spatial planning is new to everyone there is a tremendous opportunity for MRCs to broker conversations on this topic. The collection of accurate biological, bathymetric, and ocean use data is paramount and must engage local entities in order to ensure accuracy and a supported process. MRCs provide a unique, broadly representative, and readily accessible forum to identify local data gaps, discuss collection

strategies, and verify results. The challenge to management agencies of engaging the spectrum of resource users could be alleviated in part by working systematically with the local MRC to engage MRC members themselves and the broader community. MRCs provide a means for outreach and give communities a channel for providing feedback. Ms. Van Cleve closed with her hope that MRC members today come away with a good understanding of marine spatial planning, and that agencies will look at MRCs as an excellent mechanism for engaging stakeholders.

**Rick Lovely, Grays Harbor Public Utility District.** Mr. Lovely explained the public utility district (PUD) is interested in marine spatial planning because of renewable energy possibilities. The PUD partnered with consultants from Electric Power Research Institute, Golder & Associates, the Bonneville Power Administration, Department of Ecology and WDNR to assess the feasibility of tidal energy and in-stream energy conversion projects. Sites need to be evaluated for both power potential and environmental considerations. The PUD has completed Phase I of evaluating the opportunity for tidal energy, and initial studies indicate there is some potential. The PUD is now into Phase II, which is to get FERC permits to look closely at the environmental impacts. The machines need to go where maximum flow is, but that's also where ships and fish go. Mr. Lovely expressed reservations about wave and wind energy, citing serious technical difficulties in tying into onshore transmission facilities.

**Ray Toste, Washington Dungeness Crab Fishermen's Association.** Mr. Toste introduced himself as the general manager of the Association based in Westport. He noted his counterpart Dale Beasley from the Columbia River Crab Fisherman's Association was also in attendance. Mr. Toste provided examples of the management measures (e.g., sex, size, and season harvest criteria, buoy cameras, limited entry) that WDFW and industry together have implemented to make the crab fishery the successful in Washington. Overcapitalization is not the doing of industry or WDFW; crab populations are cyclical. The industry and WDFW are working collaboratively to get relief for the fishery, help industry take up less space in the ocean, and put together funding for gear retrieval. He asserted he was misquoted in the past saying that wave and wind energy doesn't work. What he said was that it works in Europe where electricity prices are extremely high, and to take up ocean space for that

use here – where prices are low - is ludicrous. Therefore, at this point, the Association is opposed to wave and wind energy. He reminded the audience Washington is the largest employer of fishing people in the nation, and Westport is consistently ranked a top port. He closed by commending the tribes, legislature, elected officials, and all the participants for gathering for this event.

**Marco Pinchot, Taylor Shellfish Farms.** Mr. Pinchot expressed his appreciation for including a shellfish farmer among the speakers. He noted shellfish farming is WA's oldest industry with exports dating to the 1800s, long before logs. He made the argument that the legislature, at the turn of the last century, engaged in marine spatial planning when it sold tidelands for the purpose of farming shellfish. In other states farmers do not own their tidelands. Ownership is the basis for a sustainable industry in Washington. In Puget Sound, pollution and population growth have eroded growing lands. Shellfish farmers have no control over what happens in the upland. Marine spatial planning could be an opportunity to find more protection from these pollution-generating upland activities that affect shellfish farming because oysters are so intolerant of environmental degradation. In Puget Sound the conflicts arise when upland farms are converted to housing, leading to conflict with remaining upland farms and shellfish farmers.

**Dick Sheldon, Northern Oyster Company.** Mr. Sheldon spoke in response to Mr. Lovely's comments, noting that shellfish farmers will be adversely affected if currents are changed by tidal or any other types of ocean energy projects, and will be opposed to development in Willapa Bay.

**Mark Cedergreen, Westport Charterboat Association.** Mr. Cedergreen introduced himself as the Executive Director of the Westport Charterboat Association, a member of the Pacific Fishery Management Council since 2002, and resident of Westport since 1956. He is presenting a recreational fishing perspective on marine spatial planning for the coast; someone else would have to comment on behalf of estuary fishing. "Marine" to the recreational fishing industry includes: recreational salt water fisheries for salmon, groundfish, halibut, and albacore tuna, whale watching trips in the spring, and associated navigational, ecological, and safety issues. "Spatial" implies the geography in which the recreational fishing industry works, in four dimensions

(surface, water column, sea floor, and season). The geographical extent includes: from the beach out to over sixty miles offshore, from the Queets River in the north to the mouth of the Columbia River in the south, near the surface for salmon and tuna, and on the sea bottom for groundfish and halibut. Recreational fishing occurs in the entire water column across 4,000 square miles of ocean. Recreational fisheries are governed primarily by WDFW in co-management with the coastal tribes, the Pacific Fishery Management Council, and the U.S. Coast Guard. Ocean recreational fishing developed as a result of available fishing opportunities, watercraft technology, and public demand for recreation and food. They were not planned by government but were developed by private enterprise subject to government regulation. The word "planning" is neutral. Poor planning often results in major disruptions of fisheries and economic losses. Good planning can minimize these problems and enhance the economic and social success of private enterprise. The challenges of marine spatial planning from a recreational fishing perspective include:

- Maintaining current fishing grounds from being rendered unavailable or unusable for fishing.
- Defending recreational fishing as a "best use" of our current area. Not necessarily the only use, but a best use. Proper planning can facilitate cohesive multiple uses.
- Protecting our area from uses that are harmful to sustainable fisheries (both explicitly and through the "law of unintended consequences").
- Countering attempts to circumvent the Pacific Fishery Management Council and/or state and tribal fishery management entities by non-fishery management entities.

The opportunities of marine spatial planning from a recreational perspective include:

- Creating & maintaining a "seat at the table" for recreational fishing in the planning process.
- Working with other current ocean users to develop consensus on best use.
- Working with potential new ocean spatial users to find mutually acceptable solutions for best use/least conflict projects and activities.

Like the tribes and commercial fisheries, the recreational fishing industry believes it has a historical and cultural right in the fishing grounds off Washington state. Given a seat at the table, recreational fishery representatives will be responsible participants in the process of planning for future uses in addition to maintaining the viability and prosperity of historical ones. Mr. Cedergreen closed by saying he hoped all the players will be at the table; when you leave someone out, it causes problems.

**LeRoy Tipton, Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce.**

Mr. Tipton spoke about the travel industry in Grays Harbor County, saying tourism in Washington state accounts for \$150 billion in spending annually, with \$270 million of that spent in Grays Harbor County. The County's total taxable retail sales exceed \$800 million, and about 30% of that can be attributed to travelers. Travelers only spend 20% of their tourism dollars on accommodations; 80% of their spending goes to other things: food, beverage, transportation, and general retail sales. That spending translates to 5,000 jobs in Grays Harbor (compared to 150,000 tourism-related jobs statewide) and \$84 million in wages. From a tourism perspective, the goal must be to retain the beauty that attracts tourists. Everything that happens in the County affects the tourist industry. It is necessary to ensure that tourism is protected as the Grays Harbor region plans for new uses.

**Gary Nelson, Port of Grays Harbor.** Mr. Nelson commented that preserving access to and use of marine resources off the coast is the port's priority because it protects a way of life. As part of municipal government, the port is responsible for economic development. The Port has two functions that are of greatest interest in the marine spatial planning context. One is its role in providing important access to ocean resources for the local economy and serving as the operator of the boat basin (the largest landing south of Dutch Harbor, Alaska). The other role is ensuring safe ingress and egress to the ocean resources. From a transportation standpoint international trade has the biggest financial impact. Grays Harbor is the only deepwater port north of San Francisco that has a four-lane highway and good connections. Grays Harbor has a unique opportunity to continue to be an important trading partner with the rest of the West Coast and the Pacific Rim.

Coordination and communication among all the entities is key, but it is hard to do efficiently. An event like this one helps ensure we do this work efficiently using scarce resources. A plan is like a budget, a snapshot in time. The ocean is a very diverse, dynamic resource; we need to get a good understanding of the resource before we can plan, but by the time we do it will change again. The port has had 50 to 60 vessel calls in past years; that number is likely to go up to 100 before too long. Planning is not for a static event; it is for a context that is always changing.

**Jody Kennedy, Surfrider Foundation.** Ms. Kennedy described Surfrider Foundation as a grassroots nonprofit dedicated to the stewardship and enjoyment of ocean and coastal resources. The organization's members are predominantly surfers and swimmers, but also some fishermen. No one has a good handle on the economic value of these forms of recreation, but recreators make up a good proportion of local tourism, contributing perhaps 30% of Westport jobs and 20% of users. Recreators share the ocean resource with cargo ships, navy training facilities, fishing, and other users. Now alternative ocean energy may be a future use. That increases the need to share, and planning is a good way to make such sharing happen. One challenge is a lack of data about where recreational users go. Surfrider is sponsoring a project to collect this kind of data on non-extractive recreational uses in Oregon, and hopes to initiate a similar project in Washington. Because ocean energy hasn't happened in Washington yet, recreators and others have an opportunity to get involved early and shape the goals, objectives, and process of marine spatial planning. Surfrider encourages everyone to get involved.

**Lorena Marchant, Grays Harbor College.** Ms. Marchant expressed the college's appreciation for the opportunity to be involved. She urged participants to keep in mind that many people won't know what marine spatial planning is, so it will be very important to inform and educate the public. This can be an exciting process, but it will require significant financial resources.

## Session 6: Participant Input and Perspectives



In this session participants formed three groups to discuss the same question addressed by speakers in the “Local Perspectives” session: “What challenges and opportunities exist from your perspective for marine spatial planning?” One group also focused on the questions “What do you think about coordinating data layers to create a holistic picture of the ocean?” and “How can your community contribute to marine spatial planning in Washington?” After their group discussions concluded and the participants met again in plenary session, a representative from each group reported a major point of agreement or dissension or theme from their discussion. The highlights are presented below, and detailed notes of group discussion points are provided in Appendix A.

**Group 1.** This group gravitated to two main planks: 1) the essential need for local input, despite the difficulty of getting the general public to understand marine spatial planning and getting them involved; and 2) local needs must have priority, and there has to be mitigation of impacts to locals if new uses emerge.

**Group 2.** This group focused on the challenges of marine spatial planning. Cost was a major concern, with fears that it will be expensive to make the plan and then implement the strategies that come out of a plan. Like group 1, there was concern about fostering a ground up, not top down process, with all the stakeholders at the table. It is particularly hard to engage, for example, recreational fishermen who are often out fishing. Goals and a shared vision must be developed from the bottom up, but it is tricky to educate and energize the general public about the concept of marine spatial planning.

**Group 3.** This group’s main topic of discussion was the idea that the Marine Resources Committee could serve as a great conduit for information, “ears on the ground” bringing in information from, for example, fishermen, and also getting information out to the community.

## Session 7: Summary and Next Steps



In this session Al Carter, Grays Harbor County Commissioner, and Jacques White of The Nature Conservancy provided a summary of the major points from the day's discussions and possible next steps for the Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee.

**Jacques White, The Nature Conservancy.** Mr. White commented that he had listened closely to the day's discussions while keeping in mind the Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee's goal of sustainably managing the area's marine resources. He noted concerns expressed earlier in the day that marine spatial planning may be a "Trojan horse" for a top down process that tries to tell local people what to do. He cited three factors motivating the growing nationwide interest in marine spatial planning:

- Rampant development that is harming coasts.
- The dire condition of some coastal fisheries (e.g., Massachusetts cod crash, salmon closures on the West Coast, West Coast rockfish).
- Mounting pressures to site offshore industrial uses on the East Coast.

Mr. White then shared a series of thoughts related to how the Grays Harbor MRC might move its agenda forward. He underscored the need for the MRC to engage a wide array of people in a planning process. Such broad participation can help ensure that local citizens have a strong voice in shaping their future. The MRC should communicate to people in many venues (e.g., schools, community groups) about what the MRC is doing to try to get out ahead of ocean problems. The MRC can lead in focusing and prioritizing the most important issues, then craft planning exercises around those concerns.

Another fundamental issue is that everyone needs to work with the same set of facts. The cost of these planning exercises can be high, so the MRC needs to seek out partners among nongovernmental organizations, public agencies, and others to help fund a planning effort. However, the MRC, not the agencies or nongovernmental organizations, needs to drive the development of solutions.

Mr. White cited a pressing need to address the problem of fragmented responsibilities among many agencies for resource management in the ocean environment. The Governor's initiative to reorganize natural resource management is not likely to resolve this issue in the near future. If Grays Harbor

MRC comes up with a clear agenda, and articulates its priorities to the state and federal agencies, such guidance will be welcomed by those public agencies. If the MRC oversees a careful analysis of facts and achieves agreement on a joint set of goals (e.g., a sustainable fishing community, jobs, economic development) and approaches government, the MRC will likely have greater success in getting support to advance its strategies and goals. The MRC should examine the decision support tools described earlier in the day to see which will be useful to its efforts. Mr. White closed by saying that it was impressive that 85 people attended the Forum, and that everyone expressed that they learned something. He expressed his hope that they learned about something they can use in their work.

**Al Carter, Grays Harbor County Commissioner.** Mr. Carter closed the day by commenting on the importance of what the participants did at the event. He believes spatial planning is coming, and the community has the option to grab the bus and drive it, or somebody else will drive it. He expressed the belief that getting better data will help everyone. Mr. Carter concluded by extending his appreciation to everyone for their participation, and expressed his wish to see 150 people at the next event, encouraging everyone to bring a friend next time.

# Appendix A: Group Discussions

## OVERVIEW

Forum attendees split into three groups to discuss the same question addressed by speakers in the “Local Perspectives” session: “What challenges and opportunities exist from your perspective for marine spatial planning?” One group also focused on the questions “What do you think about coordinating data layers to create a holistic picture of the ocean?” and “How can your community contribute to marine spatial planning in Washington?” After their group discussions concluded and the participants met again in plenary session, a representative from each group reported a major point of agreement or dissension or theme from their discussion (see Session 6 above).

The discussion points of each group are presented below, organized by main theme. When recorded, the notes indicate that the speaker represents a particular stakeholder group’s perspective.

## GROUP 1 DISCUSSION POINTS

### Boating Safety

- (Elected official) The fishing aspect of it is important. What about safe transit of small fishing boats from port to fishing areas? As part of the maintenance of the mouth of the Columbia, the Army Corps is forced to explore the least expensive disposal options, such as end of jetty disposal. This creates wave energy/dynamic problems that endanger small boats. We must be sure not to create hazards for the recreational and commercial boating community.
- (Fisherman) I agree we must look at and understand boating/fisherman safety.
- (Conservation) Would marine spatial planning offer an opportunity to zone certain areas of the ocean to protect safety of commercial and recreational boaters?

### Data Issues

- Current uses necessitate additional data.
- (State, Conservation) Marine spatial planning is an opportunity to involve locals in these kinds of discussions and about how to interpret and apply the data. [e.g., the TNC Ecoregional Assessment] The ocean uses are especially important, since this is a big hole right now.
- We need to ensure the information is used appropriately and that it is up-to-date.

### Stakeholder Engagement

- The theme of public involvement in the process is really important, but a big challenge. How do we know that we’re involving all the right parties so that we avoid some of the issues Joe Schumacker spoke about: people coming in late in the process and being frustrated with, or advocating against the recommendations?
- (Conservation) The challenge is getting literally everybody involved in the process. It is really tough to get people involved!
- (Conservation) The hard part of ecosystem-based management and marine spatial planning is setting goals, identifying what we want to accomplish. Everyone must be involved from the beginning and work together to ensure all the uses and concerns are represented.

### The Nature Conservancy’s Ecoregional Assessment

- An example of the difficulty of public involvement is that the [Nature Conservancy’s] ecoregional assessment is happening along the coast, and I hadn’t even heard about it. I’m concerned with attempts to maintain biodiversity without the public being involved.
- People are developing measures to evaluate biodiversity, but I’m concerned it’s being done without local input (esp. fishing community). TNC is going out and doing this, and even though they say it’s just a mapping effort, that’s how exclusion from ocean uses and areas begins.
- Seems like this administration is unusually influenced by environmental groups.

### Environmental versus User Group Tension

- You hit the nail on the head by asking, “What is biodiversity? What is ecosystem-based management?” There is a certain amount of mistrust between fishermen, fishery managers and environmental groups. The environmental groups are absolutely running things, and it results in chipping away at user groups like fishers and crabbers.
- (Fisherman) I think the key is to get locals involved.
- I think this is an opportunity because, while there is a long-standing distrust among many of these groups, many of the uses are not incompatible: a well-managed fishery is good for biodiversity and biodiversity is good for a well-managed fishery.

### Renewable Ocean Energy

- (Shellfish farmer) All the discussions in the past about natural resource use have ended up with the natural resource users losing out. And now, with ocean energy, it has the potential to absolutely wipe us out. When you start talking about this with the natural resource use community, it comes across that you want the natural resource users to give up their livelihoods and go on welfare so that people in Portland can have heat and electricity.
- (Elected official) You’ve got all this carbon going into the air and causing ocean acidification and affecting things like shellfish industry. It seems like ocean energy uses represent an additional threat to oceans and ocean uses. I think we need to exhaust terrestrial energy.
- Wind and wave energy should be forced to prove they’re beneficial before we allow them.
- (Fisherman) If people want to talk about putting in more wind and wave energy off the coast, fine. Then take out some of the dams on the Columbia River. I’d be willing to trade some ocean energy generation for taking out some of the dams to get our salmon back.
- (State) Opportunity: there needs to be some sort of goal related to existing uses and maintaining those uses into the future.
- (Shellfish farmer) Chamber of Commerce rep talked about Port of Grays Harbor being in the top 13 ports in the nation. We’ve still got something good here, and we need to fight to save it. We need to identify what we want to save, and save it. Identify it scientifically, not politically or anything else.

- We need to learn from past efforts. George’s Bank in New England really messed up their situation with their fishery management
- (Conservation) A challenge is not repeating the mistakes of the past. We need the folks who were involved to record those.
- The reciprocal is that we have an opportunity to learn from those things. We should have a “lessons learned” from past efforts to plan on the coast.
- (State) We need to look at existing laws/regulations. Some of them may not be as effective as they could be, but we should see what we can do with things that are already on the books.

## GROUP 2 DISCUSSION POINTS

### Marine Spatial Planning Generally

- Marine spatial planning seems like an expensive, top down planning process with no specific issues.
- Grays Harbor Estuary Management Plan – this plan needs to be reviewed and incorporated as marine spatial planning moves forward.

### Goals

- Key is to focus on Grays Harbor issues. It will be a hard sell to local citizens if the goal isn’t focused on specific problem solving.
- Need to identify goals for marine spatial planning at a local level.
- Grays Harbor County lacks a long term comprehensive vision.
- Local issue in the future is commercial fisheries.
- Coastal hazards are an important concern.

### Stakeholder Involvement

- Stakeholders need to have clear positions.
- Recreational fishermen represent a large number of users who don’t have a cohesive organization; it is difficult to represent the entire group at a stakeholder meeting.
- Ensure all interests are represented.

### Data Challenges

- There is a data gap for biological data for commercially important bait fish.
- We have vague information on issues such as good fishing areas.
- What tools do we need to carry out data gathering?

### Fishery management challenges.

- The Department of Fish and Wildlife's interests are conservation and tight regulations to ensure a viable stock of fish to have a sustainable fish industry and strong economy.

### Renewable ocean energy.

- Energy development could adversely affect the crab fisheries (privatizing public areas)

### Marine protected areas.

- Marine protected areas offer protection from sportfishing, but there is a need for protected areas for long-lived species.
- There is a need to educate people on marine protected areas and refuges; what they do and how they can enhance species.

## GROUP 3 DISCUSSION POINTS

### Coordinating Data Layers

- (Utility) Technology provides a wonderful opportunity to collaborate - having seen this with the Golder Associates' integrated decision support system. All the issues need to be overlaid so you know where the impacts are occurring.
- (Public citizen) Phil Osborne from Golder Associates says it's important to make it web-based for public digestion – a user module, so Dale Beasley can import human use data about the area he fishes. That allows the data to be fully vetted.
- (Elected official) Why wouldn't you want as much information as possible? There would need to be gatekeepers to insure that one person's perceptions correspond with reality.
- (Conservation) I see problems with coordinating the data. People don't look at the metadata and don't know where it comes from. We can certainly list all of the data layers, but

how does it get integrated.

- (Elected official) You see numerous agencies doing their own thing and trying to answer their own questions. It's frustrating they don't work together more.
- (Public citizen) It would be helpful to have an inventory of the data that's out there.
- (GIS) I'd like to see open-source. A lot of the systems are viewers that are user friendly so people can turn it on and look, but you need a portal so people can input and retrieve the data.
- (Utility) One of my biggest frustrations is that we all have different systems. So we punch through sewer lines because we didn't have the right layer. We need to get to a common base. Open-source. We have to understand the static picture first and then move to the dynamic. We don't even understand the static yet.
- (Conservation) At The Nature Conservancy we know there are gaps in our ecoregional assessment layers, like the absence of migrating whale data. We also need to think about how to coordinate efforts to map the ocean floor at the same resolution.
- (Utility) You can have the best data in the world, but if it is hoarded then it doesn't do anybody any good. Knowledge becomes powerful when it's there for everyone to use in common platform/format.
- (Public citizen) I think a data inventory is the first step.

### Marine Resource Committee (MRC) Role

- (Public citizen) MRCs can help with spatial planning. As the plan is developed, the MRCs can be a conduit for gathering and coordinating the data. They are a source of "People Power."
- (Conservation) I see MRCs as a two-way channel. They are local enough that they can gather information from the communities but they can also help through public forums to help the public understand this complex regulatory planning process.
- (Public citizen) If someone has a concern there has to be somebody they can call to say "this isn't right." The MRC can communicate to the State Ocean Caucus or other Ocean Policy Committee.
- (Fisherman) I'd like to see MRC members sit in on these

Ocean Caucus meetings. I'd like it to be more clear that communication and input goes from the bottom-up as well as from the top-down. Consistency and continuity.

- (Conservation) MRCs can work in the way that watershed planning groups like the Chehalis Basin have worked. It's a good example.
- (College) I think the group all agrees on the point that MRCs should be the conduit and communicator for involving local perspectives in MSP.

**Other Stakeholder Engagement.**

- (Conservation) Surfrider can contribute by doing outreach to our members, interest group, recreational users to help them understand what marine spatial planning is and what it isn't so that they'll be more open to contributing in the process.

## Appendix B: Forum Participant List

### Liz Anderson

Community & Government Relations Director  
Grays Harbor Public Utility District  
2720 Sumner Ave.  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 538-6232  
landerson@ghpud.org

### Dale Beasley

Columbia River Crab Fisherman's Association  
PO Box 461  
Ilwaco, WA 98624  
(360) 642-3942  
crabby@willapabay.org

### Keven Bennett

GIS Services Specialist  
Olympic Natural Resources Center  
University of Washington  
14600 SE 176th M-4  
Renton, WA 98058  
(425) 277-6631  
k2ebennett@comcast.net

### Steve Berggren

Chehalis Basin Fisheries Task Force  
Chehalis Basin Partnership, Marine Resources  
P.O. Box 1342  
Westport, WA 98595  
(260) 268-2546  
kingfishslick@hotmail.com

### Brian Blake (Speaker)

Representative – 19th District  
Washington State House of Representatives  
P.O. Box 40600  
305 John L. O'Brien Bldg.  
Olympia, WA 98504-0600  
(360) 786-7870  
blake.brian@leg.wa.gov

### April Boe

Chehalis Basin Knotweed Project Manager  
The Nature Conservancy  
120 Union Ave. SE, Suite 215  
Olympia, WA 98501  
(360) 280-3217  
aboe@tnc.org

### Les Bolton

Executive Director  
Grays Harbor Historical Seaport  
P.O. Box 2019  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 581-1488  
les@historicalseaport.org

### Edward J. Brewster (Speaker)

President  
Grays Harbor College  
1620 Edward P. Smith Drive  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 532-9020  
brewster@ghc.edu

### Bob Burkle

**Board Member – Scientific Interests**  
**Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
48 Devonshire Road  
Montesano, WA 98563  
(360) 249-1217  
Bob.Burkle@dfw.wa.gov

### C. John Campbell

CCA  
7121 Lillooet Loop  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 532-2905  
c.john.campbell@comcast.net

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

### **Laurel Carver**

Conservation Practitioner I  
The Nature Conservancy  
120 East Union Ave, Suite 215  
Olympia, WA 98501  
(207) 798-1369  
lcarver@tnc.org

### **Al Carter (Speaker)**

County Commissioner – District #3  
Grays Harbor County  
100 W Broadway, Suite 1  
Montesano, WA 98563  
(800) 230-1638  
ACarter@co.grays-harbor.wa.us

### **Jena Carter (Speaker)**

Regional Marine Director – Western Division  
The Nature Conservancy  
821 SE 14th Ave.  
Portland, OR 97214  
(503) 802-8114  
jcarter@tnc.org

### **Mark Cedergreen (Speaker)**

Westport Charterboat Association  
P.O. Box 654  
Westport, WA 98595  
(360) 268-0445  
mcedergreen@olynet.com

### **Laura Chartier**

Marine Conservation Planner  
The Nature Conservancy - Alaska  
715 L. Street  
Anchorage, AK 99501  
(907) 276-3133 Ext. 118  
lchartier@tnc.org

### **Ken Connell**

Coastal Oceanographer  
Golder Associates, Inc.  
18300 NE Union Hill Rd., Suite 200  
Redmond, WA 985052  
(425) 883-0777  
kconnell@golder.com

### **Cyrilla Cook**

Aquatic Policy Analyst  
Washington State Department of Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 47027  
Olympia, WA 98504-7027  
(360) 902-1080  
cyrilla.cook@dnr.wa.gov

### **Michele Culver**

Region 6 Director  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
48 Devonshire Road  
Montesano, W 98563  
(360) 249-1211  
Michele.Culver@dfw.wa.gov

### **Garrett Dalan**

#### **Staff Lead**

#### **Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**

Environmental Health Specialist  
Grays Harbor County  
100 W. Broadway, Suite 31  
Montesano, WA 98563  
(360) 249-4413  
gdalan@co.grays-harbor.wa.us

### **Birdie Davenport**

#### **Board Member – State Interests**

#### **Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**

Natural Area Manager  
Washington State Department of Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 280  
Castle Rock, WA 98611  
(360) 596-5144  
roberta.davenport@dnr.wa.gov

### **Aimee David**

Ocean Conservation Policy  
Monterey Bay Aquarium  
886 Cannery Row  
Monterey, CA 93940-1023  
(831) 647-6870  
adavid@mbayaq.org

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

### **Eric Delvin**

#### **Board Member – Conservation & Environment Interests Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**

Community Conservation Coordinator  
The Nature Conservancy  
120 East Union Ave Suite 214  
Olympia, WA 98501  
(360) 280-2460  
edelvin@tnc.org

### **Doug Fricke**

President  
Washington Trollers Association  
P.O. Box 2402  
Westport, WA 98595  
(360) 580-3027  
dfricke@techline.com

### **David Fulton**

Marine Renewable Energy Intern  
The Nature Conservancy  
821 SE 14th Ave.  
Portland, OR 97214  
(503) 802-8167  
dfulton@tnc.org

### **Ginger Gamblin**

President  
Grayland Neighbors Association  
P.O. Box 509  
Grayland, WA 98547  
(360) 267-0333  
vgamblin@comcast.net

### **Catherine Goldman**

P.O. Box 7  
Grayland, WA 98547  
(360) 589-0565  
cathgold@comcast.net

### **Eric Goldman**

GNA  
P.O. Box 7  
Grayland, WA 98547  
lawgold@comcast.net

### **Caroline Gibson**

Marine Program Manager  
Northwest Straits Commission  
10441 Bayview-Edison Rd.  
Mount Vernon, WA 98273  
(360) 428-1057  
Gibson@nwstraits.org

### **Tom Good**

Research Fishery Biologist  
NW Fisheries Science Center  
NOAA  
2725 Montlake Blvd. E  
Seattle, WA 98112-2013  
(206) 860-3469  
tom.good@noaa.gov

### **Wesley Gray**

Engineering Manager  
Grays Harbor Public Utility District  
P.O. Box 480  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 538-6353  
wgray@ghpud.org

### **Kathy Greer**

#### **Board Member – Recreational Interests Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**

Surfrider Foundation  
P.O. Box 2293  
Westport, WA 98506  
(360) 581-7060  
kgreer@surfrider.org

### **Arthur (R.D.) Grunbaum**

#### **Board Member – Local Citizen Interests Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**

Friends of Grays Harbor  
P.O. Box 1512  
Westport, WA 98595  
(360) 648-2476  
rd@fogh.org

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

### **Dan Guy**

Branch Chief, Southwest WA Habitat Branch  
NOAA Fisheries  
510 Desmond Drive  
Lacey, WA 98503  
(360) 534-9342  
dan.guy@noaa.gov

### **Don Harders**

**Board Member – Aquaculture Interests  
Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**  
Lone Tree Oyster Company  
209 Burrows Rd.  
Hoquiam, WA 98550  
(360) 593-0814  
dcharders@gmail.com

### **Jennifer Hennessey (Speaker)**

Ocean Policy Associate  
Washington State Department of Ecology  
P.O. Box 47600  
Olympia, WA 98504  
(360) 407-6595  
jenh461@ecy.wa.gov

### **Maurice Hill (Speaker)**

Renewable Energy Program Coordinator  
Pacific OCS Region  
Minerals Management Service  
770 Paseo Camarillo  
Camarillo, CA 93010  
(805) 389-7815  
maurice.hill@mms.gov

### **Kirt Hughes**

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
48 Devonshire Rd.  
Montesano, WA 98563  
(360) 249-1204  
Kirt.Hughes@dfw.wa.gov

### **Nick Jeremiah**

Fish Biologist  
NOAA Fisheries  
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 103  
Lacey, WA 98503  
360-753-9090  
nick.jeremiah@noaa.gov

### **Mike Johnson**

District Manager/WRIA #24 LE Coordinator  
Pacific Conservation District  
P.O. Box 336  
South Bend, WA 98577  
(360) 875-9424  
paccon@willapabay.org

### **Bruce Jones**

SSHIAP Section Manager  
Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission  
6730 Martin Way E  
Olympia, WA 98516  
(360) 528-4369  
bjones@nwifc.org

### **Jody Kennedy (Speaker)**

Washington Policy Coordinator  
Surfrider Foundation  
5815 McKinley Place N  
Seattle, WA 98103  
(206) 940-6509  
jkennedy@surfrider.org

### **Tom Kollasch**

Willapa Program Director  
The Nature Conservancy  
750 Commercial Street  
Astoria, OR 97103  
(503) 325-3896, Ext. 302  
tkollasch@tnc.org

### **Gayle Kreitman**

Fish Biologist  
NOAA Fisheries  
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 103  
Lacey, WA 98503  
gayle.kreitman@noaa.gov

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

### Harv Lillegard

**Board Member – Business Interests**

**Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**

702 Cherry Road  
Montesano, WA 98563  
(360) 580-0362  
montebuilder@olynet.com

### Rick Lovely (Speaker)

General Manager  
Grays Harbor Public Utility District  
2720 Sumner Ave.  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 532-4220  
rlvely@ghpud.org

### Deanna Lynch

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
510 Desmond Drive SE, Suite 102  
Lacey, WA 98503  
(360) 753-9545  
deanna\_lynch@fws.gov

### Brian Lynn

Coastal/Shorebirds Section Manager  
Washington State Department of Ecology  
P.O. Box 47600  
Olympia, WA 98504  
(360) 407-6224  
brian.lynn@ecy.wa.gov

### Lorena Marchant (Speaker)

**Board Member – Educational Interests**

**Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**

Coastal Resources Learning Center  
Grays Harbor College  
1620 Edward P. Smith Drive  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 538-4179  
lmarchant@ghc.edu

### Arnie Martin

Grays Harbor Audubon Society  
631 Chenault Ave.  
Hoquiam, WA 98550-1822  
(360) 612-0437  
Arnold6.martin@comcast.net

### Lee McCoy

Biological Science Technician  
Agricultural Research Service  
U.S. Department of Agriculture  
2111 SE Marine Science Drive  
Newport, OR 97365  
(541) 867-5021  
lee.mccoy@oregonstate.edu

### Key McMurry

Stream and Wildlife Biologist  
Key Environmental Solutions  
550 Mill Creek Road  
Raymond, WA 98577  
(360) 942-3184  
key@keyenvironmentalsolutions.com

### Kyle Murphy

Aquatic Reserves Program Manager  
Washington State Department of Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 47027  
Olympia, WA 98504-7027  
(360) 902-1073  
kyle.murphy@dnr.wa.gov

### Gary Nelson (Speaker)

Executive Director  
Port of Grays Harbor  
P.O. Box 660  
111 S. Wooding Street  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 533-9530  
gnelson@portgrays.org

### Josh Niles

NRT  
Pacific Conservation District  
P.O. Box 336  
South Bend, WA 98586  
(360) 875-9424

### Mike Nordin

Project Manager  
Pacific Conservation District  
P.O. Box 336  
South Bend, WA 98586  
(360) 875-9424  
plutroll@willapabay.org

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

### **Jenna Norman**

Coastal Marine Resources Program  
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
600 Capitol Way N  
Olympia, WA 98501-1091  
(360) 902-2658  
Jenna.Norman@dfw.wa.gov

### **Phil Osborne**

Senior Consultant, Coastal Geoscience  
Golder Associates, Inc.  
18300 NE Union Hill Road, Suite 200  
Redmond, WA 98052  
(425) 883-0777  
posborne@golder.com

### **Osa Odum**

GIS Specialist, Outer Coast  
Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission  
6730 Martin Way E  
Olympia, WA 98516  
(360) 528-4371  
oodum@nwifc.org

### **Marco Pinchot (Speaker)**

Education and Outreach Director  
Taylor Shellfish Farms  
130 SE Lynch Road  
Shelton, WA 98584  
(360) 426-6178  
marcop@taylorshellfish.com

### **Mark Plackett**

Executive Director  
Mark Plackett Enterprises  
P.O. Box 231  
Ocean Shores, WA 98569  
(360) 289-0490  
markplackett@yahoo.com

### **Margo Posten**

Research & Administration Specialist  
Multi-Species Development Holdings  
707 Pennsylvania Ave.  
Bremerton, WA 98337  
(360) 689-5786  
margo@msdh-llc.com

### **Erin Prahler**

Simpson Tacher & Bartlett Public Service Fellow  
Center for Ocean Solutions  
99 Pacific St. Suite. 155A  
Monterey, CA 93940  
(831) 333-2077  
EPrahler@stanford.edu

### **Michal Rechner**

Aquatic Reserves Policy Supervisor  
Washington Department of Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 47027  
Olympia, WA 98504-7027  
(360) 902-1075  
michal.rechner@dnr.wa.gov

### **Bill Robinson**

State Government Relations Director  
The Nature Conservancy  
120 E Union Ave.  
Olympia, WA 98501  
(360) 352-2476  
brobinson@tnc.org

### **Carl Schroeder**

Policy Analyst  
House Democratic Caucus  
Washington House of Representatives  
P.O. Box 40600  
Olympia, WA 98504  
(360) 786-7206  
schroeder.carl@leg.wa.gov

### **Joe Schumacker (Speaker)**

**Board Member – Tribal Interests**  
**Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**  
Fisheries Manager  
Quinault Indian Nation  
P.O. Box 189  
Taholah, WA 98587  
(360) 276-8211  
jschumacker@quinault.org

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

### **Dick Sheldon (Speaker)**

Owner/Spokesperson  
Northern Oyster Company  
P.O. Box 365  
Ocean Park, WA 98640  
(360) 665-4886

### **Robert Shelton**

Chairman  
Westport Planning Commission  
P.O. Box 2518  
Westport, WA 98595  
(360) 268-5105  
fisherman1947@yahoo.com

### **Doug Smith**

Assistant General Manager  
Grays Harbor Public Utility District  
2720 Sumner Ave.  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 538-6508  
dsmith@ghpud.org

### **Joanna (Jo) Smith (Speaker)**

Applied Marine Scientist  
The Nature Conservancy  
1917 1st Ave.  
Seattle, WA 98101  
(206) 434-4345  
joanna\_smith@tnc.org

### **Janel Spaulding**

Watershed Facilitator  
Chehalis Basin Partnership  
Grays Harbor College  
1620 Edward P. Smith Drive  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 538-4212  
jspauldi@ghc.edu

### **Michael Spencer**

Pacific County Marine Resources Committee  
(Exploratory)  
935 Fower Street  
Raymond, WA 98577  
(360) 942-3240  
michaeljspenc57@hotmail.com

### **Dean Takko**

Representative – 19th District  
Washington State House of Representatives  
3319 Columbia Heights Road  
Longview, WA 98632  
(360) 786-7806  
Takko.Dean@leg.wa.gov

### **Kathy Taylor (Speaker)**

Senior Marine Ecologist  
Washington State Department of Ecology  
P.O. Box 47600  
Olympia, WA 98504  
(360) 407-7125  
ktay461@ecy.wa.gov

### **Zoanne Thomas**

SW WA Rivers District Manager  
Aquatics Resources Division  
Washington Department of Natural Resources  
P.O. Box 280  
Castle Rock, WA 98611  
(360) 767-7005  
zoanne.thomas@dnr.wa.gov

### **Sam Thompson**

Staff Counsel  
Senate Committee Services  
P.O. Box 40466  
Olympia, WA 98504  
(360) 786-7413  
thompson.sam@leg.wa.gov

### **LeRoy Tipton (Speaker)**

President and COO  
Grays Harbor Chamber of Commerce  
506 Duffy Street  
Aberdeen, WA 98520  
(360) 532-1924  
chamber@graysharbor.org

## Washington Forum on Marine Spatial Planning

### **Ray Toste (Speaker)**

**Board Member – Commercial Fishing Interests**

**Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**

Washington Dungeness Crab Fishermen's Association

P.O. Box 299

Grayland, WA 98547

(360) 268-1515

rtoste@aol.com

### **Brie Van Cleve (Speaker)**

**Staff Lead**

**Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee**

Nearshore and Ocean Policy Analyst

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

600 Capitol Way N

Olympia, WA 98501-1091

(360) 902-2750

vanclfbv@dfw.wa.gov

### **Ron Warren**

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

48 Devonshire Road

Montesano, WA 98563

(360) 249-1201

Ron.Warren@dfw.wa.gov

### **Miranda Wecker**

Marine Program Director

Olympic Natural Resources Center

University of Washington

P.O. Box 160

Naselle, WA 98638

(360) 484-7128

mwecker@wwest.net

### **Jacques White (Speaker)**

Marine Conservation Director

The Nature Conservancy - WA

1917 1st Ave

Seattle, WA 98101

(206) 434-4345

jwhite@tnc.org

### **Gary Wilburn**

Policy Staff Director

Washington Senate Democratic Caucus

P.O. Box 40464

Olympia, WA 98504-0464

(360) 786-7453

wilburn.gary@leg.wa.gov

### **Terry Willis (Speaker)**

County Commissioner – District #1

Grays Harbor County

100 W Broadway, Suite 1

Montesano, WA 98563

(800) 230-1638

TWillis@co.grays-harbor.wa.us

### **Nancy Wright**

Marine Geographer

Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary

NOAA

115 E. Railroad Ave., Suite 301

Port Angeles, WA 98362

(360) 457-6622, Ext. 18

nancy.wright@noaa.gov

WASHINGTON FORUM ON  
**Marine Spatial Planning**

**October 20, 2009 – Aberdeen, WA**  
**Bishop Center for the Performing Arts, Grays Harbor College**

**9:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.**

**Co sponsored by:**

