

On March 29th, 2013 the first in a series of three Marine Spatial Planning workshops convened at the Rotary Log Pavilion in Aberdeen, WA. The purpose of the workshop was to develop a draft goal for Washington Coast's Marine Spatial Plan (MSP), develop themes for plan objectives, discuss spatial boundary options for the plan and to improve communication and coordination among the groups involved in the MSP planning process.

Workshop attendees were comprised of government officials and local stakeholders with a vested interest or management authority over Washington's marine resources and waters. They included representatives from local government, state and federal agencies, coastal treaty tribes and the Washington Coast Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC). As future partners in the successful implementation of Washington's MSP, this representative group was invited to provide valuable planning perspectives and expertise in the development of MSP goals and objectives and to begin developing a joint vision for the MSP capable of aligning the plan across jurisdictions.

The workshop was facilitated by Washington Sea Grant's Steve Harbell and Bridget Trosin and Washington Department of Ecology's Jennifer Hennessey. Hennessey provided an overview of the legal mandate, history and timeline of Washington's MSP planning process. Sea Grant staff facilitated stakeholder discussion within and across eight small break-out groups of 5-6 people. Small group discussions captured information from stakeholders regarding important social, economic and ecological resources on Washington's Coast as well as important threats putting these resources at risk. Large group collaborations produced a draft MSP goal and themes to inform the MSP plan objectives to be developed in two future workshops scheduled to take place in Aberdeen on April 26, 2013 and May 3, 2013.

The workshop produced the following draft goal for the MSP:

To ensure a resilient and healthy marine ecosystem on Washington's Coast that supports sustainable economic, social, and cultural opportunities for coastal communities, visitors, and future generations.

The following themes for developing plan objectives were identified:

- Environmental change
- Unbalanced development
- The need for a collective vision, strategy & proactive planning
- Access to and use of resources
- Cultural and traditional values

Workshop facilitators prefaced the workshop's plan boundary consideration with an overview of the requirements necessary to establish Federal Consistency for the MSP in accordance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. Kris Wall and Bill O'Beirne from NOAA's Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management were introduced via phone and identified as the federal agency contacts for information related to Washington's MSP federal consistency determination process. Workshop attendees were introduced to a few possible plan boundary options (using the toe of the continental shelf, using the full 200 miles of the coastal Exclusive Economic Zone, using another, smaller, distance or depth from the coastline) and the relative challenges and benefits associated with federal consistency review under each option were discussed.

Marine spatial planning is a public process to analyze and plan uses of the marine environment and ocean-related human activities to achieve agreed-on ecological, economic and social objectives. The MSP planning workshop series supports the coordinated effort currently underway to solve Washington Coast's shared resource management challenges. The workshop series outcomes

clear draft goal, draft plan objectives and the proposed spatial plan boundary—will be used to engage the broader public in the next phase of Washington’s Marine Spatial Plan development.

Washington Marine Spatial Planning Workshop Discussion Notes

Aberdeen, WA – Rotary Log Pavilion

March 29, 2013

Table of Contents

1. Full Group Discussion Notes
2. Small Group Discussion Notes
 - Group 1 – Pg 11
 - Group 2 – Pg 16
 - Group 3 – Pg 19
 - Group 4 – Pg 24
 - Group 5 – Pg 27
 - Group 6 – Pg 32
 - Group 7 – Pg 38
 - Group 8 – Pg 41

Full Group Discussion Notes

Workshop Facilitators

- Introduction—Brian Lynn, WA Dept. of Ecology
 - Moderator—Steve Harbell, WA Sea Grant
 - Presenter—Jennifer Hennessey, WA Dept. of Ecology
 - Presenter—Katrina Lassiter, WA Dept. of Natural Resources
 - Presenter—Bridget Trosin, WA Sea Grant
 - Presenter—Kris Wall, NOAA-OCRM
1. Lynn – Introduction of facilitators and workshop participants
 - WA's five coastal county Marine Resource Committees and representatives from Federal, State, Local, Tribal governments are all represented at today's workshop.
 2. Harbell – Overview of group discussion working agreement
 - Be respectful of others
 - Keep discussion brief and to the point
 - Don't interrupt others
 - Keep an open mind- listen to the opinion of others
 - Avoid side conversations that distract others
 - Strive for consensus
 3. Hennessey & Lassiter - MSP Public Planning Process Overview
 - Overview of MSP law (hard copy distributed to group)

- Overview of plan funding (purple hard copy distributed to group)
 - What projects will they be completing in 2013?
 - Got approval for spending on project categories (4)
 - Call for project ideas received responses from WCMAC members
 - Project categories include spatial mapping, ecological assessments
 - Compiled proposals, discussed pros/cons w/ major players (defined by law)
 - August- contracts out of the door
 - UW- basic econ assessment of coast
 - Submitted report to legislature- past, present, future
 - ~ 20 projects in process, 7/8 of \$ contracted
 - Now to June- workshops like this
 - MRC involved in additional outreach

- Overview of planning process
 - We are currently in the “pre-planning” phase of a multiyear process.
 - The workshop will facilitate the identification of priorities, interests, individual desires for the MSP
 - The series of three workshops planned between now and June, 2013 are the ground level for drafting the goals and objectives for the MSP.
 - Upon completion of the plan the Department of Ecology must submit the plan to NOAA for federal consistency review and approval.
 - Other jurisdictions will also use the MSP info. Example: SEPA
 - While it will create no new laws it will be an information source for policy recommendations
 - Questions:
 - Are the coastal estuaries included in the plan?
 - The MSP will include estuaries. Establishing the exact coverage/spatial boundary of the plan will be part of the public planning process.
 - What is the timeline to complete the plan?
 - There is no legislated mandate to complete the plan by a certain deadline. It will be a multi-year process (~2yrs) and is heavily dependent on State funding.
 - Will there be a similar process for Puget Sound?
 - This will be up to the legislature. The mandate between now and 2016 is to focus on the coast.
 - Will MSP information be available on a website?
 - Yes. Please visit www.msp.wa.gov . This new website will be live within a few weeks of the workshop. The UW coastal economy project will also have its own website.
 - Will workshop PowerPoints also be the website?
 - Yes, the Dept. of Ecology will post them.
- Comments/Concerns expressed about the workshop process

- The breadth of the workshop's goal loses the detail needed to build a good plan
- We don't want to have our time wasted at "just another workshop"
- Can't read what's on the ppt screen (small writing and the dark section at the bottom of the powerpoint is hard to read and too much light in the room)
- Concern that the broader themes lose too much detail and cannot encapsulate all of the ideas and important notes that were discussed here today. By reporting back to the group the ideas are already so condensed that taking an even more general statement from these ideas doesn't adequately capture this.
- Necessity to condense is needed in order to move forward. Can't go into too much detail in these over-arching goals, compromise is necessary.
- We will move from a reactive mode project by project, to a more active, cohesive proactive planning mode that improves coordination and action. Any discomfort being reflected in this session is about the challenges of moving forward and transitioning into a new paradigm.
- Requests for the powerpoints, UW reports, other agency reports, map (400 fathoms & toe of the slope) and note-taker products/notes be made available online.
- Post group content more visibly as they are discussed

4. Harbell—Group discussions of important coastal resources, threats and vision.

Large Group Discussion of Important Resources

- Group 1
 - Ecological – Healthy marine and terrestrial ecosystems
 - Social – Tribal and traditional natural resource communities, recognition of national significance.
 - Economic - Marine transportation, Tourism, Forestry, Fishing
- Group 2
 - Ecological – Biodiversity, relationship to resources, tourism, recreation
- Group 3
 - Ecological – High diversity and abundance of fish and wildlife, no listed salmon species except Lake Ozette sockeye
 - Social – Direct tie to resources; all ecological resources tie into both social and economic wealth. Small communities. Treaty tribes.
 - Economic – Ecological ties to economic.
- Group 4
 - Ecological – Intact ecosystems, extensive wilderness, shellfish
 - Social/Economic – All year access, tourism based, undeveloped, freedom of navigation.
- Group 5

- Sources of Wealth: Navigation, Great Circle Route, Unique ecology, cultural heritage, marine industry, tribal, access, razor clams, land ownership mix, wilderness/working areas, fish stock sustainability, working waterfronts, access and use for resources and recreation, sustainable communities
- Group 6
 - Ecological – Accessibility, ecologically pristine, species diversity, unique species (glass sponge coral reef), birding.
 - Social – Historical tribal and social connections. Due to accessibility. Tourism
 - Economy – Very heavily linked to coast and self sustaining. Important tourism and recreational destination.
- Group 7
 - Wealth seen from sea side or land side. Wealth needs to keep both navigable waters and still use for commerce.
- Group 8
 - Ecological – remoteness, pristine views
 - Social – Need for multiple views of wealth (from both the POV of a shipping lane and as a bird on land), uses like birding, surfing, fishing
 - Economic – navigable water/commerce

Ecological Most Important:

- Healthy marine and terrestrial ecosystems
- Natural environment with accessibility for user groups

Social Most Important:

- Traditional natural-resource-based communities
- Public access: recreational access and access for resource use
- Long history of relationship to resources (tribal, small communities, diverse)

Economic Most Important:

- Strength of marine based industry (fishing, tourism, marine transportation)
- Traditional uses of marine resources by coastal communities
- Access /Use (consumptive vs. non-consumptive) of resources.

Large Group Discussion of Important Resource Threats

- Group 1
 - Ecological: Climate change, oil spills, development, invasive species
 - Social: Unsustainable resource extraction, curtailment of public access to resources, tribal treaties at risk
 - Economic: Unbalanced economic development (fishing vs. tourism), price of fuel, unbalanced regulation
- Group 2
 - Ecological: Human inputs, oil spills, marine debris, sediment, invasive species
 - Social: Population, demographics
- Group 3 – No common vision

- Social: Conflicting use and win-lose mentality leads to lack of common vision. Adversarial relationships, planning reactively not proactively, losing younger generations, natural disasters, allocation of resources
- Ecological: Heavy industry point-source pollution, climate change & ocean acidification, oil spills, missing data/mismanagement due to data inaccuracies.
- Economic: High efficiency costs of doing business on outer coast, changes in resource abundance.
- Group 4
 - Ecological: Sea level rise, erosion, temperature, development
 - Social: lack of adaption to changing resource use pressures
 - Economic: Port activities are perceived as eco/socio-economic threats
- Group 5
 - Ecological: Jetties impacting beaches and sediments, tourism and infrastructure investment, technology to protect environment
 - Social: Government disconnect, poor planning
 - Economic: Increase in commercial vessels
- Group 6
 - Ecological: Degradation, harmful algal blooms, sea level rise, invasive species, toxics, oil spills, salmon population declines, human population growth, uncontrolled development, marine debris (tsunami), erosion
 - Social: Poor management of resources, overharvesting of resources, general stresses of economic downturn, loss of small town, outside interests vs. local interests
 - Economic: Lots of natural resources, development of coastal area, marine transportation
- Group 7
 - Threat of static processes in permits and infrastructure covers all three.
 - Static infrastructure in dynamic system, not planning for change.
- Group 8
 - All three covered by climate change and development pressure, conflicting uses, poor planning, static processes (infrastructure, permits, plans).

Large Group discussion of most important threats to ecological, social and economic wealth:

Identified Themes:

- Environmental change
 - Ineffective institutional adaptation to environmental and political change.
 - Reactive and competitive response to change.
 - Lack of collective coastal vision and strategy in face of substantial change.
 - Uncertainty/lack of understanding related to interactions on coast.
- Unbalanced development
 - Coast is dealing with growth, more of everything as the greatest threat to the economy – unbalanced economic development

- The need for a collective vision, strategy & proactive planning
 - Lack of good communication between interest groups
 - Lack of integrated marine planning similar to land use planning
 - Exhaustive planning sessions with no progress made
 - Not having voices heard in the process
 - Lack of effective institutional adaptation to environmental change
 - Decentralization leads to ineffective planning. Some comments look at outcome and others the source. No collective planning that joins all of the different agencies. Marine coastal planning isn't integrated as neatly as traditional planning which is usually land-use allocation. We also need to address land use planning and how it should be seeing MSP differently
 - More of the issue is that management is reactive (threat) rather than proactive.
 - Ineffective management is a result of poor communication, lack of involvement, poor planning, inefficient data, lack of transparency, lack of balanced power in decision making
 - Ineffective management and response doesn't cover the issues and isn't the sole threat to coastal change. Planning and management are not threats. They are responses to or the symptoms of threats.
 - Have to get it from here and move it towards someone who can make this happen
 - Many of the threats (population growth/retaining youth in community) can't be addressed directly by the MSP plan
- Access to and use of resources
 - Protecting resources in a way that that does not sustain elevated access/higher use is a threat
- Cultural and traditional values

Vision for the coast:

- Group 1: Opportunities available for future generations. Future generations capable of use/same opportunities we have had. Intergenerational Equity.
- Group 2: Long term thinking about responsible development, balance with respect to ecological integrity. Economic and cultural integrity.
- Group 3: Bumper Sticker = "Our coast, a great place to live from generation to generation". Also, sustainable resource management
- Group 4: Resilience
- Group 5: Strong innovative vibrant communities that can sustainably use resources.
- Group 6: Resources balanced between resource user groups
- Group 7: A well-balanced community that is ecologically (rights of all species to survive and thrive), socio-economically (responsive government, informed/engaged public), and culturally (maintaining the traditions of coastal use) well balanced.
- Group 8: Jurisdictions working together, integrated/unified processes, healthy ecosystem and economy, beach access

5. Trosin—Group development of the WA MSP Goal

- Examples of other MSP plan goals were shared
- The goal should be visionary, broad, brief, consistent with law, consistent with state authorities and treaty obligations
- The goal should be measurable at the objective level.
- Everything should add up to vision you are trying achieve.

Small Group Goals:

- Group 1: *To ensure a resilient marine ecosystem on Washington's Coast that supports economic, social, and cultural opportunities for coastal communities, visitors and future generations.*
- Group 2: *To conserve and restore a resilient coastal and marine ecosystem to support sustainable marine-based economic, cultural, and recreational opportunities and services for current and future generations/in perpetuity*
- Group 3: *To proactively plan for and adaptively manage a healthy marine ecosystem and optimize economic, cultural, and recreational opportunities now and in the future.*
- Group 4: *To maintain a sustainable/resilient marine ecosystem on Washington's Coast to provide marine-based economic, social, cultural opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations.*
- Group 5: *Since the Washington Coast is unique in the world, we will enhance and protect our coastal marine environment in order to provide for the long-term economic, ecological and social benefit for ourselves and our children's children.*
- Group 6:
- Group 7: *To achieve and maintain a marine ecosystem on Washington's coast that provides the necessary goods and services to sustain traditional, cultural, and future uses for residents, visitors, and future generations.*
- Group 8: *To ensure Washington's coastal character through preserving and enhancing a healthy marine ecosystem to provide marine-based social, economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations.*

Large Group Goal Words/Concerns

- Should "maintain" be included? Should status quo really be the goal? But, doesn't "maintain" also imply preservation of native species?
- Should "restore" or "improve" be included for already degraded areas?
- Should the goal include "to plan" or "to manage"? Shouldn't we try for something more?

- Should “resources” be included?
- Should “sustainable” be included?
- Should “resilient” be included?
- Should “unique” be included?
- Should the goal be actionable or measurable?
- Should “cultural” or “traditional” be included?
- Should “enhancement” be included? This word has greater meaning in regard to hatcheries.
- Should “healthy” be included? How do you measure health?
- Should we describe from an outcome perspective rather than descriptive?
- Should we include “ensure” to imply ongoing action?
- Should we include “optimize”? How do you optimize one thing over another?
- Should we emphasize “ecosystem”? Even though it includes people, will this alarm anyone?
- Should “future generations” be included?
- Should “intergenerational” be included? Shouldn’t we honor both our heritage and future generations?
- Should “balanced” be included?
- Should “needs” be included? Everyone has needs.
- Should “tribal treaty rights” be included?
- Should “coastal” be included?
- Should “tourist” be included? Is this a better word than “visitor”?
- Should “research” be included?
- Ecology, socio-economic, and cultural are “three legs of a stool”
- Refining the statements to “Whereas” statements could be useful. We can then include what things we see as problems and how we would envision these goals being met

Large Group Consensus Goal:

To ensure a resilient and healthy marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast that supports sustainable economic, social, and cultural opportunities for coastal communities, visitors, and future generations.

6. Hennessey – Theme selection for developing objectives
 - Each workshop participant was asked to write down two topics based on the themes identified in the earlier group discussion of coastal resources, risks and vision to be developed into MSP plan objectives in the next two MSP workshops.
7. Wall – NOAA’s federal consistency determination of the MSP
 - Federal Consistency is the requirement that Federal actions, in or outside the coastal zone, that affect any land or water use or natural resource of a State’s coastal zone must be consistent with the enforceable policies of State Coastal Management Programs.

- NOAA -OCRM approves state lists of federal license or permit activities subject to federal consistency review
 - To review listed activities outside the state's coastal zone, the state must provide a geographic location description (GLD) of such activities and show that there are reasonably foreseeable coastal effects from the listed activity within the GLD.
 - Different listed activities may have different GLDs.
 - If no GLD is approved by NOAA-OCRM, the state may request NOAA-OCRM approval to review listed activities outside the state's coastal zone on a case-by-case basis as an unlisted activity. (15 C.F.R. § 930.54)
- Obtaining Geographic Location Description (GLD) Approval
 - Proposed GLDs must be geographically specific, apply to specific listed federal license or permit activities, and based on an analysis showing that effects on the state's coastal uses or resources are reasonably foreseeable.
 - Effect analysis does not have to show proof of coastal effects, but must show a reasonable causal connection. The effects analysis cannot be based on conclusory statements.
 - A GLD does not need to delineate the boundary of where effects are reasonably foreseeable and where they are not; it only needs to be show that within the area described that effects are reasonably foreseeable.
- MSP Boundary Suggestions Related to Federal Consistency
 - Consider which federal activities (licenses or permits) are mostly likely to have reasonably foreseeable coastal effects (that you would want to include in a GLD), and where those activities occur
 - Link to existing federal NEPA (EA, EIS) documents/studies and their defined geographic extent (and data availability) – provide causal information
 - Consider bathymetric features, ecologically critical areas (foraging, nursery), offshore migration patterns, etc.
 - Boundary must be defined based on fixed natural features, or lat/long coordinates
 - Consider geographic constraints/limits of certain activities or technologies (e.g. pipeline distances/costs, technology depths)
 - Where won't things be, or won't activities occur – exclude/ignore these areas.
 - Consider geographic extent of available spatial data that will be necessary for effects analysis
 - In general, the further from shore, the more difficult it can be to attest to coastal effects
 - Need to be able to attest to reasonably foreseeable coastal effects on state coastal resources or uses (not effects at the location in federal waters, but effects within the state coastal zone, or on state uses or resources)
 - Demonstration of coastal effects needs to be based on science and data – cannot be conclusory statements

- Effect analysis does not have to show proof of coastal effects, but must show a reasonable causal connection (still a fairly high bar)
- Consider migration patterns, foraging areas, breeding areas, areas of unique species abundance or concentrations
- Don't forget effects to uses as well as resources (e.g. fishing, recreation)

8. Harbell & Hennessey – Group draft boundary discussion

- The state has jurisdiction out to 3 nautical miles
- To push the SMP out to the full 200 miles of the federal EEZ would require demonstrating coastal effects for a very large marine area. It is important to think about whether or not federal agencies would actually be permitting activities beyond a certain distance that would have coastal effects on state.
- Examples of possible boundary lines:
 - Toe of the continental slope (used by Oregon's Territorial Sea Plan)
 - The full 200 miles of the federal EEZ
 - To the depth of 400 fathoms

Large group boundary discussion questions & comments:

- We should consider the potential of future technology (example: deep sea gas hydrates).
- Biggest is the best.
- Need to know more about essential local resource uses and activities.
- What is manageable? Should we go with what is doable and approvable?
- We need to know more about potential federally-permitted uses and impacts. What federal activities are currently being discussed? Dredging disposal, military activity, fishing, ocean renewable energy, mining... the slide from Kris Wall has many activities.
- Once this decision is made it will be very difficult to change. Efforts to make similar changes in Washington have taken 20+ years.
- We need to address N-S boundaries also.
- What effects arguments have been successfully made in the past? How far out have coastal effects been demonstrated?
- How will cross-boundary concerns with Canada and Oregon be addressed?
 - Oregon's plan is using the toe of continental slope, if WA selected this boundary also it would map nicely to their plan.
- This needs to be informed by where federal actions are taking place, such as where does the military operate. Are there current proposals in those waters?
- If a river passes through land into estuary, can you regulate land-based activities with MSP?
- What are the anticipated federal activities in marine waters that we want the MSP to be able to regulate?
- NMFS has CZMA and ESA jurisdiction, how does this impact MSP?
- There are deep canyons in the toe of WA's continental slope.
- What is average distance from shore if 400 fathoms?
- What are the average depths of the other alternatives?

- What is the average depth of trawl activity?
- What depth goes to the extent of renewable energy technology for the foreseeable future?
- What depth has regulatory meaning in terms of fisheries?
- Does marine spatial planning include up-stream effects (e.g., farms, nutrient loading)?
- There's a tradeoff between being effective and manageable.
- We could phase-in federal consistency, start at the inner boundary and extend out later
- How does MSP interact with areas outside the MSP boundaries?
- A lot of resources to consider depends on life cycle of the species and the understanding of how these habitats are utilized.
- Need to know geography

A medium-sized spatial plan (with a boundary at some point between 3-200 miles) was preferred by many groups but most felt more information was needed to decide on whether 400 fathoms was a realistic solution. Strong preferences for federal consistency determination for the full 200 mile EEZ were also held by some. Additional time is reserved for further boundary discussion at the next MSP workshop on April 26, 2013.

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 1

Group 1: Group Members

Bill Whiteaker	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Bridget Trosin	WA Sea Grant
Dale Beasley	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Faith Taylor-Eldred	Pacific County
George Galasso	NOAA-Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
Libby Whiting	WA Dept. of Natural Resources (Small Group Facilitator)
Rich Osborne	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council

Group 1: Small group introductions

Questions: What's in this for me? Why am I here today? What is the biggest challenge in this process? What are the opportunities of this process?

- The biggest challenge is that this is a brand new process.
- Here to improve communication between groups on outer coast.
- Here to keep fishermen fishing and to make sure the ocean resources are available for future generations.
- Here because the process is an opportunity to coordinate governance groups across sectors.

- Here to represent the public interests of SMP in Pacific County and to better understand the MSP process to relay information back to the public.
- Here because getting communities involved in Marine Resource Management is important.

Group 1: Identification of ecological, social and economic wealth

What is it about Washington's coast that makes it unique and special? What does the coast offer that no other place can? What parts of coastal culture do we hope to maintain for future generations?

- What is wealth? Traditional natural resources, low population density, no urban sprawl, fresh water resources.
- Use of marine highway for commerce. Marine transportation. Volume and value of goods.
- Tourism along coastline. We don't have the houses along coastline like Oregon and California. Scenic byway. Recreational fishing not just commercial.
- Fairly healthy marine ecosystem. Want to try to protect this. Pristine estuary. Chesapeake Bay, 100's of millions spent, no restoration.
- Wilderness character of NW coast. Multiple sanctuaries. Tribes. National park unlikely to be developed. 80 miles, coast only 140 miles long. Helps protect water quality.
- Washington coast left alone for so long. Control tourism to maintain wilderness. Recognition through formal designations: Park, Sanctuary, Refuges, Tribal UNA A lot of state processes won't fit. WA unique. Cultural resources like shipwrecks, canoe runs, middens, islands with special meaning to tribes. Tribes have own name for certain places, that is part of what makes area special. Traditional natural resource communities: Timber and fishing. Completely natural resource based. Biodiversity of intertidal highest on west coast. Most important area for seabirds in state. Upwelling drives productive system. Environmental quality: More birds in this area now than 20 years ago. Adjacent terrestrial area to marine systems to maintain ecosystem.

Group 1: Current and future threats to ecological, social and economic wealth

What changes have you observed on the coast? Are these changes negative, positive, neutral? What are threats to the coast's ecological wealth? What are threats to coast's social wealth? What are threats to the coast's economic wealth?

- Ecological Marine:
 - Current and future linked.
 - Climate change
 - oil spills
 - human impacts from development
 - diseased species from salmon farms.
 - Climate refugees,
 - Hypoxia,

- HABs,
- Invasive species,
- Ocean Acidification.

- Ecological Terrestrial:
 - Similar to marine, but with lessened impacts from oil spills.

- Social:
 - Traditional Natural Resource Communities:
 - Unsustainable resource extraction. Communities depend on resource. Overexploitation of resources poses long term threat to community.
 - Curtailment of public access (to resources or navigation).
 - Tribal communities:
 - Unable to exercise treaty rights. To maintain social and economic health, need access to treaty resources. Tribal treaties at risk. Without resource there is no treaty. Can't exercise treaty rights without access to resources.
 - Recognition of National significance:
 - Connected to first two. Not defined separately. Uniqueness of WA state and its resources and peoples.

- Economic: (Threat to economy is a bad economy.)
 - Unsustainable resource extraction
 - Curtailment of public access to resources
 - Tribal treaties at risk
 - Over regulation or unbalanced regulation (remove two for every one implemented)
 - Unbalanced economic development.
 - Marine Transportation:
 - Price of fuel. Passed on to consumer. Last two changes to towing based on fuel costs. People against transporting crude oil through our ports. Need to find a way to accommodate use of oil. Has dramatic impact on price of other resources.
 - Price of resources and materials.
 - Regulation.
 - Negative interactions between traditional natural resource use and tourism.
 - Tension between economic utility and healthy marine ecosystem metrics
 - Price of timber or fish increasing may be good for local economies. Price of fish hasn't been raised in decades.

Describe your ideal vision for the coast. What is a healthy coastal community? What are your hopes for the future? What are the opportunities for the coast? What ecological, economic and social opportunities or resources are enhanced in your vision? What threats are diminished? What does the ideal community need to thrive?

- It is long-term sustainability. Intergenerational equity. Concept of 7 generations. Credited to a tribal perspective. Protecting for grandkids so they can enjoy the same thing you did. Not keeping things static, but making sure future generations can utilize a healthy ocean. Our generation not a particularly good job of being stewards. Let people harvest over longer period of time? Way to get a higher value for resources.
- Intergenerational access. Can see it in his lifetime. Started fishing investment was next to nothing. When he sold out, amount of people who could buy in much smaller. Much more expensive now. Gave licenses to person who purchased. Maintain livelihood. Only so much natural capital. Can't allow everybody in the world to have it. Don't know how to deal with population increase. When you move ahead, heck of a problem when you talk about access. Access not just physical, can mean access to livelihood or experience. In future economics of communities will change.
- Opportunity to encourage next generation.
- Intergenerational equity. So many more people now that need to be employed. One driver is technology. Fishing comes to mind. Factory trawl ship vs. traditional methods. Concentrated into single owners. Dumbing-down technology may make it so more people can work instead of fewer people doing the same job that once employed many.
- Used to open fishery (crab) over longer period. Don't have a coast wide opening anymore. Economics that gets back to how you pass this on from generation to generation.
- We want to keep our traditional communities sustainable. We are not ever going to be static. What else can we do for our areas. We are not in a place to be static. We need to think outside the box. Keep what we have sustainable, but don't say, "no we can't go there".
- Mix uses the most. Create a diverse method of making wealth from resources.
- Ever increasing population is problem will always throw a kink as you go down the road.
- We are in open economic habitat waiting to be exploited.

Group 1: MSP Draft Goal

Example Goal: "To maintain a healthy marine ecosystem on Washington's Coast to provide marine-based economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations" What would you change, what would you keep?

- Add "no ocean energy".
- "communities" vs. "residents". Communities are more attractive than residents. Community more synergistic. Resident might not be invested.
- Not just economic, but social and cultural too
- Opportunity beyond economic. Maintain, accepting present condition. Parts of current ecosystem could be degraded right now. Could areas be improved?
- I heard the word community. I am more into the community aspect of it.
- Maybe "maintain" isn't right word.

- “restore and enhance” component needed instead of/in addition to “maintain”
- Shifting baselines change. Some fisheries are rebuilding, but still much lower than what they were originally. Should we be maintaining present levels, or be rebuilding?
- Restore and enhance. I’m thinking of invasive species. A good example is the removal of spartina. Maintain, restore and enhance in some circumstances.
- We have to completely ignore climate change to restore and enhance. We are going to have to become realistic. I think maintain is the best we can do.
- Specific invasive species can take a lot out of our economy. We are giving up productive crops for non-productive use.
- Maintaining ecosystem would theoretically resolve that.
- Recreational should not be main theme.
- Keep ecosystem first.

Group 1: Draft Small Group Goal

To ensure a resilient marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast that supports economic, social, and cultural opportunities for coastal communities, visitors and future generations.

Group 1: Spatial Boundary Considerations

What you like and what you would like to change about proposed boundaries.

Alternative 1. Follow toe of continental slope.

Alternative 2. Extend boundary to 400 fathoms.

Alternative 3. Full 200 miles of Federal EEZ

- What we like: Precautionary principle, inclusion of the sanctuary, smoother boundary
- What would we change: Possible phase in of expanded boundary area
- Bottom line on sanctuary is 25 nm. Sanctuary boundary approximates toe and cuts across canyons.
- WA has self imposed CZMA limit. We have no federal consistency with Oregon waters. If this limits us in federal consistency, I am opposed. Dumping dredge spoils on fishing grounds. I would say something out around 200 nm. I am in favor of going to the full limit of what the federal government allows the state to do.
- The floating wind farms are coming and we will eventually have the technology to go out that far. We can’t predict what will be developed.
- WA can’t affect OR choices. OR can kill all wildlife, WA can’t do anything about it.
- Federal boundary is 200 nm. In order for State to make recommendations...
- Not talking about today, but about future.
- Have to be able to prove effects outside of waters in order to include their waters into our plan.
- Anything out to 200 nm will have to come into 3 nm territorial state waters.
- We can’t go beyond 3 nm today. Plan for future or try to amend in future. Both difficult.
- Push boundaries in WA a bit. Maybe like OR we can do it in phases. First phase in one part, but keep option to look at future distance. Don’t cut off option.

- Still think we should get maximum Feds will allow. Remember reasonably foreseeable. In 25 years we are going to have a lot more knowledge. If you go off current knowledge, could go off high tide line. In 1980 had trawl with 1000 fathoms of cable. Some impact will put me at 400 fathoms. Could push 850 fathoms in 1980. Why would I want anything less than that.
- Apply precautionary principle.
- Will not accept either alt 1 or alt 2. No compromise. I won't compromise someone's life. This is similar.
- I'm ready to have the battle over 200 nm limit and see where it goes.
- In general terms, working with the state is important to NOAA. Even minimum discussion will include all of sanctuary and I am ok with that. When we did management plan, we got consistency determination from WA, for entire plan, even areas beyond WA jurisdiction. I'm curious about state management of 8 fisheries in federal waters. Fed doesn't manage crab in federal waters. Something state could use as justification as going beyond state waters.
- I have looked at a lot of data. We have no information about what is out past boundary lines. What is out there?
- Fish. I have been out that far to fish.

Group 1: Preferred Small Group Boundary

Federal limit of 200 nm and are ready to have the fight over it today, since it would be so difficult to change later. Possible to start talking about phasing the plan.

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 2

Group 2: Group Members

Casey Dennehy	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Chris Harvey	NOAA-NWFSC
Kara Cardinal	WA Sea Grant Fellow, The Nature Conservancy (Group Facilitator)
Pamela Barrett	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Penny Dalton	WA Sea Grant
Rick Lovely	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Steven Fradkin	U.S. National Park Service
Tim Crose	Pacific County

Group 2: Identification of ecological, social and economic wealth

What is it about Washington's coast that makes it unique and special? What does the coast offer that no other place can? What parts of coastal culture do we hope to maintain for future generations?

- biodiversity in ecosystem, tourism and recreation (national parks and other), tribal and non-tribal or harvest marine organisms, oyster and shellfish production, relatively undeveloped coastline, potential for sustainable coastal development, diversity of healthy natural environments, tribal lands and identity, commercial fishing, geographic isolation, low population, and lack of accessibility
- Summary/consensus:
 - under-developed, low population coastline with unique way of life and relationship to resources (tribal, commercial, recreational)
 - commercial shellfish and fishing
 - diverse, healthy habitats and ecosystems

Group 2: Current and future threats to ecological, social and economic wealth

What changes have you observed on the coast? Are these changes negative, positive, neutral? What are threats to the coast's ecological wealth? What are threats to coast's social wealth? What are threats to the coast's economic wealth?

- unconstrained roads, human impacts (pollution, invasive species), loss of natural uses and economic values, fisheries collapse (from over-harvesting, ecological changes from climate change, oil spills, other industrial accidents), coastal erosion and lack of sedimentation from the Columbia, poor economies and communities not prioritizing protecting the environment, increase in shipping and shipping threats related to coal export (oil spills), development related to human population needs (road building, timber harvest), climate change (range changes and range expansion of species, ocean acidification, hydrological changes), traditional livelihoods going away and demographics shift (young people have to move resulting in aging population and decreasing tax base), higher energy prices hurting coastal industries and decreasing tourism, unconstrained growth and development, unmet need for infrastructure investment (coastal structures, schools, roads), environmental changes (sea level rise, increased storm frequency, marine debris, invasive species, increased storm frequency), over-harvest of natural fisheries populations, challenge to preserve tribal cultures and other traditional culture
- Summary/consensus:
 - Intrinsic/local threats: oil spills, marine debris, pollution, changes in fisheries
 - Extrinsic/global threats: climate change, ocean acidification, sea level rise, changes in fisheries, erosion
 - Population dynamics and demographic shifts

Group 2: Ideal Vision of the Coast

What is a healthy coastal community? What are your hopes for the future? What are the opportunities for the coast? What ecological, economic and social opportunities or resources are enhanced in your vision? What threats are diminished? What does the ideal community need to thrive?

- Sustainable development with long-term thinking and planning, healthy economy with working industries and tourism and recreation, empowered and engaged coastal

communities, land-use that promotes ecological viability and environmental protection, communities have the resources to plan and protect both population and environment, attract green technologies and industries to coastal region, decisions that best protect the ecology while taking into account the economic and practical considerations, sustainable infrastructure (hazard resilient, low-impact development from the start), renewable energy should benefit local communities, eco-tourism that respects existing coastal cultures (tribal and other), enhanced conservation and ecosystem function while allowing for sustainable resource exploitation and economic growth, growing tourism and ecosystem preservation, truly collaborative community decision-making, sustainable and fully eco-labeled fisheries

- Summary consensus:
 - Empowered/interactive communities with local investment
 - Long-term thinking/responsible development
 - Balanced uses with respect to ecological and economic integrity

Group 2: MSP Draft Goal

Example Goal: “To maintain a healthy marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast to provide marine-based economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations” What would you change, what would you keep?

- instead of “maintain” a healthy ecosystem, should we use “preserve and protect”? What about restoration goals? “promote”? “encourage”? “restore”?
- instead of “healthy” ecosystem should we use “resilient” and/or “diverse”
- instead of WA coast, do we consider a larger connected ecosystem, i.e., upland or ocean waters?
- instead of “marine ecosystem”, should we use “marine and coastal ecosystems”?
- instead of “future generations”, should we use “in perpetuity”

Group 2: Small Group Draft Goal

To conserve and restore a resilient marine and coastal and marine ecosystem to support sustainable marine-based economic, cultural, and recreational opportunities and services for current and future generations/in perpetuity

Group 2: Spatial Boundary Considerations

What you like and what you would like to change about proposed boundaries.

Alternative 1. Follow toe of continental slope.

Alternative 2. Extend boundary to 400 fathoms.

Alternative 3. Full 200 miles of Federal EEZ

- What data do we have on fisheries? Shipping routes? Other activities?
- How far out do existing data sets go?
- Lots of data gaps in near-shore waters, maybe this should be a priority?
- Lots of open-ocean processes affect near-shore commercial activities, so maybe as far possible?
- Should we be consistent with OR?

- Conclusion: We need more information

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 3

Group 3: Group Members:

Bonnie DeJoseph	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Joe Shumacker	Quinault
Kara Blake	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Facilitator)
Key McMurry	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Mark Cedergreen	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Michele Culver	WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Randy Lewis	Grays Harbor County

Group 3: Small group introductions

Questions: What's in this for me? Why am I here today? What is the biggest challenge in this process? What are the opportunities of this process?

- Here to protect coastal community, funding
- Here because the process is very important to recreational fishing and communities including West Port where he is from. Here today to be included.
- Biggest challenge is to keep it local (include the state in that statement). Consider worst case to be if federal level imposes regulations.
- Opportunity to fit in w/ others along the coast.
- Here to listen
- Opportunity to bring together information to aid decision making, also challenging to forge diverse
- Here because he works as planner, so he has to be. Interested in process, works w/ many groups, opportunity to join process early.
- Concerned if we don't do it correctly or even if we do, that over-seeing force (federal) will alter, find balance
- Here to contribute to the process that can inform MSP (data, scientific input)
- Challenges- funding, federal involvement
- Opportunity- challenge, has been pretty strong w/ legislature about wanting to be involved, so now we must deliver. Bonnie translation: they have been very vocal to legislature, requesting to be involved in this process. Now that they are they must follow through appropriately.

Group 3: Identification of ecological, social and economic wealth

What is it about Washington's coast that makes it unique and special? What does the coast offer that no other place can? What parts of coastal culture do we hope to maintain for future generations?

- Ecological- unique, diverse, relatively healthy (compared to PS and East Coast), currently no ESA listed species of salmon (except for Lake Ozette Sockeye), both estuaries and marine
- Social-
 - treaty tribes,
 - small communities tied together thru commonalities, all love where we live
 - tourism- important to social networking
 - communities tied directly to Natural Resources
 - stakeholder involvement
- Economic-
 - Tourism
 - Recreational; fishing, wildlife, viewing, surfing, etc.
 - Port
 - Natural Resources
- Social- fairly integrated community w/ common interests/values. Love where they live.
- Economic- sustainable industry, sustainable livelihood (fishing, fairly), tourism, boat building (poor economy affect sales and need)
- Ecological- Natural resources (beauty)
- Social- unique community (both political and social) connection to resources.
- Economic-
 - Aesthetic, more of an attraction
 - Consumable/renewable resources- both ocean or landside
- Ecological- High diversity and abundance of fish and wildlife resources in the intertidal and offshore (many deep sea canyons, coral/sponge communities, and rocky habitat)
- Social/Econ- Presence of coastal treaty tribes who share values with keeping coastal areas natural while supporting sustainability, harvest, community development and economic stability
- Ecological/Economic-remote ports and access points from land keeps beaches more natural with pristine areas and ease for harvesting and catch accounting

Group 3: Current and future threats to ecological, social and economic wealth

What changes have you observed on the coast? Are these changes negative, positive, neutral? What are threats to the coast's ecological wealth? What are threats to coast's social wealth? What are threats to the coast's economic wealth?

- Social/ Economic-
 - Adversarial relationships between competing resource uses; has been bad in past, OK right now, but still in danger of it happening again, which destroys communities
 - Allocation of Resources- Moving fishery up Columbia River threaten peace and tranquility of area we live in.
 - Collaboration to produce win-wins much better than where we were in past.

- Economic-
 - Heavy industry- usually point source problem (dairy farm huge issue, different than single source)
 - Climate Change (eco/econ)
 - Over development (particularly non-point source)- in past problem w/ agriculture
 - Failed ocean energy (eco/econ)- put a lot of materials in the ocean, project fails, who is responsible for clean-up?
- Ecological-loss of natural resources
- Econ- loss of jobs forcing people to leave area; tourism numbers decreasing
- Ecological-
 - Little is known about resources, must manage w/out science/data, which could lead to mismanagement.
 - Increased development and poor planning
- Ecological-Fighting over competing goals instead of seeking compatible ones. Not managing for best outcome for system, but rather for individual interests that “won” (loudest, most political weight, most valued, etc.). Ex. Still arguing farmed vs wild salmon.
 - Win/lose mentality
 - Need balanced approach that fosters cooperation.
- Social- Lack of opportunities with younger generation, loosing connection (see economic challenge). Engaged community that seeks common good.
- Economic-
 - remote location starting to work against us, focus on logistics regionalization on larger areas and consolidation
 - The medium businesses are having problems surviving. We are seeing more “mom & pop” than “big business”- not in between.

Group Discussion:

- Heavy industry- poor planning
- Oil spill
- Climate Change (subsets: OA, sea level rise, water quality)
- Funding
- Regulations
- Natural disasters- potential of tsunami
- Ocean Energy- unknown if good or bad?
- disagrees that farmed vs. wild is still an issue, but rather that they are managed to avoid ESA listing.
- managing to avoid ESA listing but not necessarily managing full system. Managing interests, not the system, and the interests are defined by who wins.
- in reactive mode instead of proactive mode, address what is on the table at the moment. Agree, how we address the combination, rather than individual. Also, agree about the unknowns.

Group 3: Ideal Vision of the Coast

Describe your ideal vision for the coast. What is a healthy coastal community? What are your hopes for the future? What are the opportunities for the coast? What ecological, economic and social opportunities or resources are enhanced in your vision? What threats are diminished? What does the ideal community need to thrive?

Poster Board Notes

- Vision: sustainable resource management
- Healthy coastal community
 - Balanced cooperative effort for common good
 - Informed (regarding local issues) community
 - Engaged community
- Hopes for the future
 - Sustainable economy that protects ecology
 - Generation to generation
 - Engage youth
- Opportunity
 - Light industry
 - Improve tourism
- balanced co-op effort that creates a sustainable economy, social network, and protects the ecosystem. Co-op effort for the common good. Building off of Mark's comments.
- expanding on threat of losing younger generations.
- Ecological-
 - sustainable resource management, at least adequate infrastructure, local communities be informed of current issues (variety of methods)
 - balance between human and "animal" issues (*Bonnie note: this was not discussed further, but from other discussions I gather this is related to the sea lion/salmon controversy...*)
- Social-integrated communities with widespread common interests
- Economic-
 - Primary sustainable industry
 - Supporting industry
 - Sustainable livelihoods (fishing/tourism/farming/boat building)
- Vision: "great place to live and work from generation to generation"
- need "light" industry and tourism
- Everyone working together to protect and preserve,
- Strong coastal voice; continued strong stakeholder involvement,
- strong transparency among stakeholders, communities, state, tribes, and federal agencies
- switch from reactive to proactive
- Continue existing job and bring in new
- Control by state and counties out to the 200 mile limit to match CZMA (federal)

- cranberry, cattle, dairy industries are all examples where the kids are not interested in continuing the family business. Add “our coast” to Mark’s slogan.
- Ex. Ocean Shores, Snowy Owls, increase in tourism; build tourism

Group 3: MSP Draft Goal

Example Goal: “To maintain a healthy marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast to provide marine-based economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations” What would you change, what would you keep?

- Dislike/discussions
 - “Maintain”- dislike because it alludes that the status quo does not need improvement
 - “to provide”- prefer “sustain”
 - sustain is good word b/c like sustainability, which is big word in resources, it means that you can use it without hurting it.
 - “optimize” also an option
 - “marine-based”- excludes too much (ex. oysters); it is not just marine, over used as well
 - “maximize”- not good
 - OK w/ other group’s wording of “for generations to come”
 - realized group goal lacked “coastal”. Do we need to add it? No, it will probably get added later.

Group 3: Small Group Draft Goal

To proactively plan for and adaptively manage a healthy marine ecosystem and optimize economic, cultural, and recreational opportunities now and in the future.

Group 3: Spatial Boundary Considerations

What you like and what you would like to change about proposed boundaries.

Alternative 1. Follow toe of continental slope.

Alternative 2. Extend boundary to 400 fathoms.

Alternative 3. Full 200 miles of Federal EEZ

- would like a modified option 1. Could do a longitudinal line
- her suggestion would be a straight line starting at continental shelf down or diagonal
- her understanding from presentation is that one must have jurisdiction
- know how far federal practical uses go (military activity, etc.)
- on shelf you could see quite a bit of stuff. Like Michele’s idea; pick a point at top and bottom, then justify.
- what is reasonably foreseeable for wind turbines
- their incentive will be to keep as close to shore as possible b/c of costs
- 90% of fishing done before the shelf
- Japan discovered methane hydrates extraction methods
- what about following the slope line?

- you can justify something relatively straight, as far as NEPA documents
- what would be the impact of our activities?
- there would be an impact of the short side (infrastructure). May not be bad, it depends
- the question is how far we want to project the future at this point rather than including language for it to be re-examined?
- 400 fathoms is what drives our fisheries, and much more
- curious, planning process is so complex that she wonders if the cost/benefit analysis justifies going further out?
- will be working w/ feds on that topic next week
- ecological perspective, we know more about this area than others
- seen a lot of discussions, recognizing that activity beyond the 400 fathom
- when we first came up w/ this, I wanted it to be out to 200 (her initial goal), but if we can't justify it. Include statement that says "...as technology advances, revisit the idea"
- what is the justification?
- impacts ecosystem that drives our economy
- show causal connection?
- potentially, a lot of iridium out there
- any activity could displace current ecosystem services
- a freeze on off-shore drilling is a policy not solid regulation; therefore, could it be used as justification?

Group 3: Preferred Small Group Boundary

Option #2: 400 Fathoms

- Contour describing 400 fathoms (need adaptive management)
- Encompasses high species diversity; areas important to our fisheries.
- Significant NEPA analysis for CCE and EEZ through marine fishery council addresses
- We have much more data on this area (reef/slope) than w/in 3 NM.
- Justification, looking forward and the discovery of methane hydrate extraction methods. Leave option to revisit decision as advances in technology, etc.

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 4

Group 4: Group Members

Brit Sojka	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Facilitator)
Caitlin Shishido	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Garrett Dalan	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Kelly Andrews	NOAA-National Marine Fisheries Service
Michael Bruce	Grays Harbor County
Randy Kline	WA State Parks

Group 4: Small group introductions

Questions: What's in this for me? Why am I here today? What is the biggest challenge in this process? What are the opportunities of this process?

Challenges

- Information about MSP to support political decisions made about MSP.
- Getting information out to people about the management roles of agencies in MSP.
- How to make analyses as transparent as possible for public dissemination of information.

Group 4: Identification of ecological, social and economic wealth

What is it about Washington's coast that makes it unique and special? What does the coast offer that no other place can? What parts of coastal culture do we hope to maintain for future generations?

- Overarching theme for the group: "Sustainable access for user groups"
 - What is unique to the Washington Coast?
 - Westport Seafood production
 - Yacht building
 - Land based infrastructure
 - Cold Storage Facilities
 - Economic Efficiency
 - Sail Time, Fuel
 - High productivity area
 - Ecological: Varied Habitats (Nurseries, Nutrients, Productivities), diversity, clean air, fisheries,
 - Economic: Fishing and Port
 - Social: Recreation and get-away potential

Group 4: Current and future threats to ecological, social and economic wealth

What changes have you observed on the coast? Are these changes negative, positive, neutral? What are threats to the coast's ecological wealth? What are threats to coast's social wealth? What are threats to the coast's economic wealth?

- Overarching theme for the Group: "Poor adaptation to changing resource use pressures"
 - Concern: 'Seattle and Olympia make decisions for the coast'
 - Concern: Ocean Energy
 - Concern: Thinking about MSP from the personal vs. professional perspective?
 - Population/Industrial growth spreading to the coast
 - Need to ensure safety for traditional jobs such as fishing, those jobs that would prevent coastal towns from becoming 'tourist towns'

- But areas on the coast already do serve as ‘get-away’ towns and so far that type of culture has not threatened the town’s livelihood
- Reduction in Access
 - Ocean energy project spawned MPAs that has reduced the areas where fisherman can fish.
- What is important and potentially under threat?
 - Recreation accesses and maritime industry
 - Clean air, surf, sanity
 - Economic seafood industry
- Concern: Uncertainty is a big threat, balancing need for more data and better information with how much people are willing to pay for that information; there is also a need for unbiased information;
- Concern: What is going on in the port? What actions are they taking? Big economic/social player. Balancing needs of the port and the well-being of the community
- Ecological: coastal erosion (-), sea level rise (-), rise in temperatures (-), changes in fisheries (overfishing- (-), rebounding populations-(+)), climate change (interactive effects can be both positive and negative), need for consideration of other natural variations (i.e. PDO, ENSO)
- Social: resort developments (will change the culture, both positive and negative), conflicts between users/user groups (-), overuse and exploitation (-), loss of jobs (-)
- Economic: elimination of maritime based industry (-), outsourcing (-), overfishing (lead to collapse of fisheries(-)), poor adaptation to change (-)

Group 4: Ideal Vision of the Coast

Describe your ideal vision for the coast. What is a healthy coastal community? What are your hopes for the future? What are the opportunities for the coast? What ecological, economic and social opportunities or resources are enhanced in your vision? What threats are diminished? What does the ideal community need to thrive?

- Overarching theme for the Group: “Resilient communities invested in transparent coastal management processes and the data acquisition needed to deal with uncertainty”
 - Maintaining an American industry
 - Maintain sustainable access for user groups in the face of change
 - Need for a community that is invested in transparent processes and research acquisition needed to deal with uncertainty

Group 4: MSP Draft Goal

Example Goal: “To maintain a healthy marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast to provide marine-based economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations” What would you change, what would you keep?

Suggestions:

- Include words such as sustainable and resilient

- Use of word ecosystem (is it all encompassing)
- “To maintain (sustainable, healthy, resilient) marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast to provide marine-based economic, recreational (social, cultural, ecological) opportunities for...”
- Is there something better than “visitors”?

Group 4: Small Group Draft Goal

To maintain a sustainable/resilient marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast to provide marine-based economic, social, cultural opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations.

Group 4: Spatial Boundary Considerations

What you like and what you would like to change about proposed boundaries.

Alternative 1. Follow toe of continental slope.

Alternative 2. Extend boundary to 400 fathoms.

Alternative 3. Full 200 miles of Federal EEZ

- Why are we looking to define a boundary? Is it for State management of fisheries? Answer: State connection to federal influence on State resources, allows for State to have some influence on activities.
- Continental shelf line vs. 400 fathoms vs. custom alternative
- Start with what we already have jurisdiction over and extend if necessary
- Consider effects of land-based runoff/pressures- usually extends out toward the continental shelf, this seems like a natural defining line.
- Agreed upon the closest alternative -> toe of the continental shelf

Group 4: Preferred Small Group Boundary

Toe of the continental shelf

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 5

Group 5: Group Members

Barbara Clabots	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Brian Lynn	WA Dept. of Ecology
Britta Timpane-Padgham	US/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Facilitator)
Doug Kess	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Ricardo Rodriguez	U.S. Coast Guard
Rod Fleck	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Tami Pokorny	Jefferson County

Group 5: Identification of ecological, social and economic wealth

What is it about Washington's coast that makes it unique and special? What does the coast offer that no other place can? What parts of coastal culture do we hope to maintain for future generations?

ecological:

- Intact ecosystems
- Extensive wilderness/sanctuaries designated
- Shellfishing (Razor clams)
- Remote beaches
- temperate climate
- fishing (salmon)
- birding
- waves to surf

Social/Economic:

- All year access and use to consumptive and nonconsumptive users
- Tourist destination supporting economy
- Not highly developed
- Mix of tribal/non-tribal cultures
- Mix of ownerships/responsibilities (by land owners and governing agencies)
- Remote populations with access to urban centers
- Historical and continuous use by marine resource dependent communities
- Marine transportation uses
- Freedom of navigation (no manmade structures obstructing vessel traffic)

Want to maintain:

- Sustainable communities uses of natural resources
- Fish stocks
- working waterfronts
- Access to resources to harvest
- Public access to beach

Group 5: Current and future threats to ecological, social and economic wealth

What changes have you observed on the coast? Are these changes negative, positive, neutral? What are threats to the coast's ecological wealth? What are threats to coast's social wealth? What are threats to the coast's economic wealth?

Threats and changes on the coast? Are they +/-?

Ecological

- Jetties impacting beaches sediment supply (neutral)
- Harmful algal blooms (-)
- Ocean acidification/chemical changes (-)
- Increase in marine pollution (-)
- Decrease in commercial stocks (-)
- Challenge of managing stocks (-)
- Sea level rise (-)

- Derelict vessels leaking pollutants (-)

Social

- Having too broad of management goals
- Overharvesting, crowding (-)
- Increase in visitors to the coast (neutral)
- Increased participation by community, NGO, and state on coastal issues (+)
- Lacking data for management
- Reactive management (and not proactive) (-)
- Communication of management decisions has not been transparent (-)
- Unbalanced management decisions which benefit certain groups over others
- Losing younger generations
- Poor planning/piece meal management (-)
- Tourist's preservationist/protectionism/An increase in public opinion that "use=harm" (-)

Economic

- Smaller fishing fleets (-)
- Lack of economic growth in coastal communities (-)
- Increase in investment for tourism by tribes (neutral)
- Growing interest in technologies to protect environment (+)
- Government disconnect in idea of "ownership of coast" (-)
- Expenses incurred to handle derelict vessels (-)
- Increase in commercial vessels (+/-)
- Economic loss from natural disasters (-)
- Unbalanced economic development between sectors (-)
- Coast Guard not being able to patrol every area at every time

Group 5: Ideal Vision of the Coast

Describe your ideal vision for the coast. What is a healthy coastal community? What are your hopes for the future? What are the opportunities for the coast? What ecological, economic and social opportunities or resources are enhanced in your vision? What threats are diminished? What does the ideal community need to thrive?

- More sustainable timber harvesting
- Strong ecosystems
- Clean beaches
- Control residential and commercial development
- All coastal zone users should abide by MSP principles
- Open and transparent public policy about MSP process
- Thoughtful evaluation of new uses
- Diversify economy and balance with current uses
- Prepare for ocean changes and hazards
- Prepare for more vessel traffic and impacts
- Strong vibrant coast with unique communities can access and use natural resources
- Enhance marine commerce activities/Full ports
- Innovative wind/wave/micro energy projects

- Get time/attention/resources for the coast (from government)
- Strong innovative and vibrant communities that can access and use natural resources sustainably
- Maintain cultural and ecological integrity
- Ideally balance all resource groups
- Have jurisdictions work together
- Community that recognizes rights of all species to survive and thrive
- Intergenerational equity
- Intergenerational balance between socio-economic, cultural, and ecological uses and needs (as a tripod)
- Whereas statements
- job opportunities in Forks

Group 5: MSP Draft Goal

Example Goal: “To maintain a healthy marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast to provide marine-based economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations” What would you change, what would you keep?

- ‘maintain’ is insufficient
- don’t focus too much on ecosystem
- missing cultural aspect
- does marine include ‘coastal’?
- What would we keep?
- To conserve marine resources and ecological functions for the purpose of providing long-term economic, ecological, social, benefits for future generations (OREGON)
- Since the WA coast is unique in the world, we will enhance and protect our coastal marine environment in order to provide for long term economic, ecological, and social benefits for ourselves and our children’s children
- To “Restore, maintain, improve, enhance, achieve”...(lack of consensus on word choice)
- To achieve and ensure a resilient and healthy ecosystem (phrase it as an end goal and not action words)
- Focus on native species not invasives
- “Proactively plan for and adaptively manage”
- do we need to specify WA coast?
- To optimize the social, ecological, and economic benefits of the coast for WA residents and visitors
- To optimize economic, recreational, and cultural opportunities for WA coastal communities, visitors
- “provide” instead of sustain or optimize, support, sustain
- BALANCE needs/uses of WA coastline

Group 5: Small Group Draft Goal: *Since the Washington Coast is unique in the world, we will enhance and protect our coastal marine environment in order to provide for the long-term economic, ecological and social benefit for ourselves and our children's children.*

Group 5: Spatial Boundary Considerations

What you like and what you would like to change about proposed boundaries.

Alternative 1. Follow toe of continental slope.

Alternative 2. Extend boundary to 400 fathoms.

Alternative 3. Full 200 miles of Federal EEZ

- No current renewable energy proposals
- Need to look at deep sea corals, whale migrations, where endangered species are
- Where are federal activities going on? Navy, coast guard, mining, oil and gas leasing and pipelines, EPA water quality

Concerns:

- aesthetic impact of activities in the water decrease with distance from shore, so can we just put more details of the plans in the closer areas and put in less energy into the activities further out
- We don't know how easy it is to demonstrate impacts to enforce federal consistency.
- What are other state's processes in doing this? Why did they draw the lines where they did?
- What kinds of activities are going on in open ocean?
- Data gap: what kinds of things have states written into law that they can use as enforceable policy that we might want to use?
- Some interest in going out to 200 m
- Need for more info about potential uses and activities
- What about consistency with Oregon's plans and what happens over time in several decades? What will technology be like in the future and how can we anticipate impacts on coastal communities?
- Can we find out what Canadian interests are and what their current activities are in the water? Can any of their research studies help us?
- ID GIS layers most prone to fluctuation due to changing ocean conditions
- Do we need some more information/research on impacts of tidal/wave energy on fisheries? (most Katie saw was on vertebrates, but invertebrate fisheries are IMP here)

continental slope plan:

- likes: easier to manage, we know more, following natural boundary is easy, would be consistent with Oregon,
- dislikes: not as much power for the state

400 fathom out plan:

- likes: state's increasing power, a smooth boundary is best, includes highest level of species diversity at and past continental slope, NEPA documents on environmental impacts, a lot of NOAA surveys on slope and shelf

- dislikes: lack of information for federal consistency, less ability to influence activities farther out

Group 5: Preferred Small Group Boundary

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 6

Group 6: Group Members

Alicia Bridges	Grays Harbor County
Eric Braun	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jennifer Reitz	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Facilitator)
Katrina Lassiter	WA Dept. of Natural Resources
Mike Nordin	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Miles Batchelder	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council (sub for Mark Swartout)
RD Grunbaum	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Sara Smith	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)

Group 6: Small group introductions

Questions: What’s in this for me? Why am I here today? What is the biggest challenge in this process? What are the opportunities of this process?

- Health and welling being of state of WA, collaboration between state groups important
- Defender of water quality and open ocean beaches, impacts coming to area that we need to understand how these affect ocean beaches; expect: find consensus at this meeting
- has been involved in process from beginning; focus on coastal interest, balance between what coast needs and wants and working with others to come up with good product on MSP, find balance in this (state, feds, coastal interest, stakeholders, etc.)
- New to spatial planning, interested professionally and personal (SS note: Her son is a crab fishermen, she mentioned her interest in representing interests of commercial fishermen multiple times throughout the meeting), interested in regulation of energy systems so it doesn’t interfere with local fishermen and sustainability
- here to represent interests of salmon species; obligation to protect and take care of ecosystems, especially to retain qualities of ecosystems which support fish (especially salmon)
- here to represent corps, concerned about balancing mission from congress to maintain navigation challenges in an environmentally sustainable manner

- interested in coastal sustainability (she was cut off because of time constraints)

Group 6: Identification of ecological, social and economic wealth

What is it about Washington's coast that makes it unique and special? What does the coast offer that no other place can? What parts of coastal culture do we hope to maintain for future generations?

- Group Poster Board Notes:
 - Why is WA unique/special
 - Accessible yet less developed
 - More ecologically pristine
 - Important role in state economy
 - Seafood (salmon, crab, razor clams)
 - Self-sustaining
 - Important to Preserve Sustainability
 - Historical/tribal/social connections to the coast
 - Changes:
 - Population growth
 - Limitations on a resource dependent economy
 - Caused by population growth/ecosystem limits
 - Switch from resource dependent economy to tourist –based economy
 - Caused by limitations on resource based economy
 - Threats
 - Uncontrolled development
 - Global environmental changes
 - Climate change, sea level rise, acidification
 - Communication problems
 - Outside interests impacting local issues
 - Vision
 - Enhances all ecological, economic & social
 - Reduces threats: pollution, invasives, poor management
 - Improve communication coordination
 - Ideal community needs:
 - Self sustainability, balance between interests, healthy/sustainable environment and economy, open-mindedness, stewardship ethic, living wages
- SS note: Some group members commented that this question were too general and struggled to distill their thoughts down into a few phrases.
 - What is it about Washington's coast that makes it unique and special?
 - Small group individual answers: Culture community, perspective of place in world, birding, glass sponge coral reefs (only one of two places in the world that has this), remote, less developed, healthy diverse ecosystems, unspoiled, diversity, accessibility, pristine, mixed use opportunities

- Small group discussion:
 - Some ecological aspect, emphasis on natural conditions
 - Less developed nature is important
 - this goes with accessibility in that there are not many people
 - less developed is linked with healthy ecosystems, so they can really be considered like the same things
- What does the coast offer that no other place can?
 - Small group individual answers: Sustainable economy, razor clams and marine ecosystems, wilderness coastline, tribal culture, access to marine environment, fish, wildlife, recreations, open space, fisheries, fresh air, mountain/forest/beaches, road less coastline
 - Small group discussion:
 - Seafood in general
 - WA coast line is self-sustaining. Communities from mountains to coast line can produce their own food if required. This contrasts with cities, which rely on resources imported from elsewhere. The rest of group agreed on this thought.
- What parts of coastal culture do you hope to maintain for future generations?
 - Small group individual answers: Unique ecological beauty, trial connections and entities that govern these, traditional uses, resource based economy/recreation use, salmon and culture, working waterfront, places to relax, trails, fisheries (recreation and commercial)
 - Small group discussion:
 - Tribal attachment is important to preserve
 - Sustainability of historical social connection in general
 - surprised that so many group members mentioned tribal connection [SS note: Tone was not negative])

Group 6: Current and future threats to ecological, social and economic wealth

What changes have you observed on the coast? Are these changes negative, positive, neutral? What are threats to the coast's ecological wealth? What are threats to coast's social wealth? What are threats to the coast's economic wealth?

- What changes have you observed on the coast?
 - Answers: Shifting economy from resource/harvesting to recreation/tourism, economic downturn, more traffic, localized growth, vacation development, more outside pressures (ecologically, socially, and economically), more marine debris, erosion, decline in harvest for clamming and fishing
 - Small group discussion:
 - Liked focusing on changes vs. threats because changes are something we can change better

- Asked group to suggest two changes they think are the biggest changes
 - Have a lot of outside pressures coming in (more people, etc.) and how we're adapting to it. So far change is negative, but thinks with communication we can protect our values and who we are, but it's something we need to work on.
 - Part of this process (MSP workshop) is to direct changes
 - Prominent changes are growth and it's outside influences; negative impact on resource-dependent economies; we've pushed the limits of what our resources can provide, need to balance need for more with limited resources
 - This is why the economy has shifted towards recreation-based, because we're pushing our harvested resources
 - Two ways to make management decisions: Incentive-based (bottom-up) or regulatory (top-down). Need to do more incentive-based management instead of top-down management
- Are these changes negative, positive, or neutral?
 - Small group discussion: Mostly negative, some positive, depends on perspective (SS note: Pretty mixed answers, discussed under context of change/threat question)
- What are threats to the coast's ecological, social, and economic wealth?
 - Answers: poor management of resources, over harvesting, pollution, not maintaining infrastructure, overwhelming crowds, loss of small towns/natural resources, industrial development, environmental degradations, acid acidification, sea level rise, decline in species, climate change (sea level/temperature rises), increase in human population and development, outside decision-making over local decisions, local communities not adjusting to new management decisions, crude oil by rail, invasive species
 - Small group discussion: (SS note: Of the prompted questions the group seemed to put the most interest/effort into coming up with this list, really was a group decision)
 - Threats from poorly managed development:
 - Includes developmental pressures and associated pollution
 - Added that development is not necessarily bad, but development needs to be managed and controlled
 - Larger global threats: Climate change, ocean acidification
 - Lack of communication
 - External pressures trying to drive internal decisions
 - Strong distinction between outsiders and insiders
 - "Us vs. them" mentality

Group 6: Ideal Vision of the Coast

Describe your ideal vision for the coast. What is a healthy coastal community? What are your hopes for the future? What are the opportunities for the coast? What ecological, economic and social opportunities or resources are enhanced in your vision? What threats are diminished? What does the ideal community need to thrive?

Each participant wrote their answers on note cards. Jenn reviewed individual answers and the group discussed common themes and disagreements among their responses.

- What ecological, economic, and social opportunities or resources are enhanced in your vision? What threats are diminished?
 - What resources are enhanced:
 - Individual answers: Diverse species resources, balance between uses and working together, vibrant, sustainable resource-driven economy, living wages, open minded communities, respect for nature, protected parks, wild areas, public access, balance of tourism and traditional uses, maintain dynamic equilibrium of coast and coastal processes
 - Small group discussion: Balance between ecological, economic, and social needs are balanced and enhanced
 - What threats are diminished?
 - changed question for clarity: What threats that are present now do we need to diminish to get to our ideal enhanced resources state?
 - Individual answers: pollution, invasive species, poor management practices,
 - Small group discussion:
 - Improved and open communication is key
 - Listening is important as well
 - Things can be considered a threat and enhancement depending on how you look at it

Group 6: MSP Draft Goal

Example Goal: “To maintain a healthy marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast to provide marine-based economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations” What would you change, what would you keep?

- Change “marine-based” to “resource-based”
 - change to “marine resource-based”. This may not include ALL resources, it’s not possible to address that
 - Not all group members agreed with this change.
- “Healthy marine ecosystem” depends on a much larger area than just the boundary (example: climate change). Should this be included in MSP?
- Changing “to maintain”: group agreed that use of this phrase was ok with them.
 - Could be “preserve and maintain” or “restore and maintain”, which would be a little more aggressive.

- “To maintain” assumes that it already is a healthy ecosystem. This may not entirely be true. Implies that we’re not striving for enhancement. (SS note: Group spent a lot of time discussing this idea.)
- Group agreed that “to maintain” was ok to use in this goal phrase, but something about restoring should be considered.
 - MSP creates opportunities for restoration, but main purpose is to maintain the current ecosystem state
 - Difficulties defining at what point an ecosystem qualifies as restored.
 - Ultimately, MSP could include something about restoring degraded ecosystems, but the group did not come to a consensus about what the semantics of this could be.
 - Maybe something about MSP creating a tool for restoration
- Wants to have something in place so that the goals and objectives are flexible. Somewhere down the road there may be an issue or question that we haven’t anticipated. We need to be able to accommodate these unexpected difficulties.

Group 6: Small Group Draft Goal

Group 6: Spatial Boundary Considerations

What you like and what you would like to change about proposed boundaries.

Alternative 1. Follow toe of continental slope.

Alternative 2. Extend boundary to 400 fathoms.

Alternative 3. Full 200 miles of Federal EEZ

- Group discussed two maps with different MSP boundaries. One followed the continental slope (has ecological considerations with this area, including up-welling, encompasses federal waters, goes beyond the depth limits of most coastal technologies), the other goes to 400 fathoms offshore (this is much further offshore, includes more fisheries).
 - Small group discussion:
 - Group consensus (except for 2 who abstained from voting; and 1 who recommended extending boundaries out to 200 miles) that the MSP boundaries should be a minimum of 400 fathoms and a maximum of 200 miles.
 - This encompasses more coastal processes which are important to MSP purposes and goals.
 - State fishing extends out to 400 fathoms and should be included in MSP
 - If plan is limited to continental toe boundary this might not encompass future unanticipated uses (such as offshore oil rigs). We need to have plans in place to properly manage these future uses.

- Further boundary would require more work, data, enforcement, management effort.
- Would consider extending boundary out to federal boundary line. Since MSP is just advisory we can plan for as far as we want, but it doesn't necessarily mean we have to manage the entire area all the time. Pointed out that data collection does not have to occur in the entire area, could be pointed to key places.
 - Some group discussion about whether this would be manageable. Group had some disagreeing opinions on this.
 - Federal use outside state boundary (including wave energy infrastructure, etc.) would still include state waters because of the need to run piping, etc. to shore.

Group 6: Preferred Small Group Boundary

A minimum of 400 fathoms and a maximum of 200 miles

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 7

Group 7: Group Members

Crystal Dinger	Grays Harbor County
George Hart	U.S. Navy
Gretchen Glaub	WA Dept of Ecology (Small Group Facilitator)
Jeffrey Ward	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Jessica Randall	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Katie Krueger	Quileute
Mike Rechner	WA Dept. of Natural Resources

Group 7: Small group introductions

Questions: What's in this for me? Why am I here today? What is the biggest challenge in this process? What are the opportunities of this process?

Why is everyone here?

- The city of Ocean Shores is directly influenced by what happens in the ocean since it sits on a peninsula. Also heard concerns from fisheries, roles might be infringed on in this process. *Difficult for the mayor and city planner to attend this meeting but thought it was very important.
- Here to understand the issues for different stakeholders and bring these back to the National lab to help inform future planning/research.
- Quileute tribe directly dependent on the ocean for livelihoods (resort, comm. fisheries, parks). Concern that although the sanctuary and parks prohibit energy

development but recognize that the fish they depend on move so they will be impacted by decisions for surrounding area.

- Connectivity. Navy represented from AK to CA and partnerships with other research agencies to support cooperation and sharing of information.
- Representing DNR/aquatic resource management particularly interested in addressing stakeholder interests to avoid future problems down the line to ensure that all parties concerns are being addressed.

Perceived challenges:

- Integrating all the different parties ideas and interests
- Diversity of perspectives/input will force us to be open minded but could be difficult to remember this since it is easy to come in with preconceived ideas of what these meetings will be result in.

Other:

- Concern about lack of legal information about the jurisdiction of northern coasts particularly in Jefferson county, the tribes, and sanctuary at/around the nearshore/coastal areas pertaining to offshore energy permitting? Marine topo maps US Navy/NOAA assessable to the public/other agencies?

Group 7: Identification of ecological, social and economic wealth

What is it about Washington's coast that makes it unique and special? What does the coast offer that no other place can? What parts of coastal culture do we hope to maintain for future generations?

Ecological: **Remote, protected areas that preserve resources and species diversity**

- Pristine and healthy environment
- Ecosystem services (ie. wetlands, estuaries)
- Biological abundance, greatest marine diversity
- Sanctuary vital

Social: **Preservation of quality of life, both tribal and non-tribal**

- Aesthetic values (proximity to cities but removed from city life)
- Not fully developed coastline creates unique, small communities
- Tradition: both tribal and fishing history needs to be preserved

Economic: **Coastlines support both consumptive (fisheries, shipping, etc.) and non-consumptive (tourism) uses of the ecosystem**

- Tourism & recreation/natural values linked together, unable to support non-consumptive lifestyle without both these two things
- Extraction of resources (fisheries) & tribal rights
- Treaty tribes with property rights with fish in the ocean for local tribes
- Tribal culture brings in economic revenue
- Shipping in Greys Harbor who go to the coast vs. traveling through Puget Sound

Group 7: Current and future threats to ecological, social and economic wealth

What changes have you observed on the coast? Are these changes negative, positive, neutral? What are threats to the coast's ecological wealth? What are threats to coast's social wealth? What are threats to the coast's economic wealth?

Climate change & development pressures

- Tsunami
- Ocean acidification
- Climate change & impacts fishery populations
- Increasing interest in untapped resources (gas, oil, coal)
 - +revenue, -ecological impacts
- More of everything (extraction, people, commerce)
 - +more commerce, shipping, etc. - more use of resources (fisheries, natural resources)
- Changing definition of a threat
- Vulnerable populations (elderly/retirement communities, one-way entrance/exit from town)
- Potential oil spill
- Lack of education, understanding changes/threats
- Inability to make decisions at a national level, respond quickly to change, world cooperation/global change
- Effluence/waste water & non-source point pollution

Group 7: Ideal Vision of the Coast

Describe your ideal vision for the coast. What is a healthy coastal community? What are your hopes for the future? What are the opportunities for the coast? What ecological, economic and social opportunities or resources are enhanced in your vision? What threats are diminished? What does the ideal community need to thrive?

A well-balanced community that is ecologically (rights of all species to survive and thrive), socio-economically (responsive government, informed/engaged public), and culturally (maintaining the traditions of coastal use) well balanced.

- Functioning and protecting the goods and services of the coast
- Responsive government, ecologically aware population and recognition of the rights of all species to survive and thrive
- Preserve a sustainable ecosystem
- Three leg stool: socio-economic, culture, and ecological, if one deteriorates they all fall
- Enhancements: ecological education and involvement
- A coastal environment where sustainable traditional/cultural use can co-exist with each other that provides the goods and services to support healthy communities

Group 7: MSP Draft Goal

Example Goal: “To maintain a healthy marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast to provide marine-based economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations” What would you change, what would you keep?

- Reword to ‘first achieve and then maintain’
- Avoid ‘healthy’ because it isn’t described, what we want is an ecosystem that supports our uses
- Goods and services, defined as anything necessary for appropriate use in order to continue
- Include cultural values/traditions, respectful of traditional uses

LIKE: residents, visitors, future generations + ecosystems

DISLIKE: ‘Healthy’

Group 7: Small Group Draft Goal

To achieve and maintain a marine ecosystem on Washington’s coast that provides the necessary goods and services to sustain traditional, cultural, and future uses for residents, visitors, and future generations.

Group 7: Spatial Boundary Considerations

What you like and what you would like to change about proposed boundaries.

Alternative 1. Follow toe of continental slope.

Alternative 2. Extend boundary to 400 fathoms.

Alternative 3. Full 200 miles of Federal EEZ

Thoughts on the boundary (400 fathoms vs. the continental slope):

- Why go out further than a use would typically occur? How deep is the deepest use that could realistically occur (attaching vs. mining)? No WA land interest to try and control this
- Topography and fisheries questions, don’t have the resources to answer this question
- The larger the land area we are addressing the more information required to
- collect, the more challenges we face with managing it and the longer this process will take
- If the goal is to deal with energy use, go with the topography and the biology (much farther offshore) vs. the inland areas were impacted
- Would be helpful to know where the fisheries are, can’t decide without this information
- Fragile inverts like corals live on the slopes, need to account for this information
- Damage to the infrastructure if we don’t know how some of the creatures will impact them?
- Turbidity flows (canyons), erosion and earthquake damage

Things to understand:

- Sensitive to pulses of energy happening along the transition line?

- Understand all the lifestyles of the commercial fishing species in the area

Group 7: Preferred Small Group Boundary

Toe of the slope, that's where the conflicts would be & further information necessary

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 8

Group 8: Group Members

Chris Clark	Clallam County
Laura Wigand	WA Dept. of Health (Small Group Facilitator)
Mark Horton	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Patricia Iolavera	U.S. Navy
Rosemary Furfey	NOAA-National Marine Fisheries Service
Theresa Julius	Grays Harbor County
Tim Stearns	WA Dept. of Commerce - Energy Office

Group 8: Small group introductions

Questions: What's in this for me? Why am I here today? What is the biggest challenge in this process? What are the opportunities of this process?

- Here as part of their job
- Access, demand for resources, Navy
- MRC member, get involved on the ground floor
- Dept of Commerce, energy, planning, frameworks for good development
- Grays harbor, local gov, needs to have access to reports, know what others are saying as well as more time to talk to each other in small & large settings.

Group 8: Identification of ecological, social and economic wealth

What is it about Washington's coast that makes it unique and special? What does the coast offer that no other place can? What parts of coastal culture do we hope to maintain for future generations?

- Wealth
 - Navigable waters/commerce
 - Ecological soundness/remote setting
 - Fisheries, tourism, et
 - Challenge: view of water from land vs. on the water (what is the approach?)
- Unique & Special
 - fishing: commercial, tribal , sports
 - ecological: estuary, birds
 - tribal
 - paddling, surfing, tourism, beaches, birding
 - healthy thriving species
 - importance of resource harvest (clams)

- unique habitats that need to be protected
- remote, relatively undeveloped, feels like a functioning ecosystem
- wild, rugged, secluded, no development
- seamless transition from upland to coast
- watershed connections
- What does the coast offer no other place can
 - Shipping, ports, shellfish
 - Shift from timber to shipping
 - Tourism, beaches, birding
 - Magic of the coast, rural setting, rainforest, views, scenery, maintain wild places
- What parts of coastal cultures do you hope to maintain for future generations?
 - Fishing culture (shift to whale watching & sport from commercial)
 - Connection to Puget Sound – gateway to outer coast – role of navigation & shipping
 - Transit, training area, defensible border: national security resource
 - Commerce- can't separate Coast from Puget Sound – linked ecologically, commercially

Group 8: Current and future threats to ecological, social and economic wealth

What changes have you observed on the coast? Are these changes negative, positive, neutral? What are threats to the coast's ecological wealth? What are threats to coast's social wealth? What are threats to the coast's economic wealth?

- Threats
 - Conflicting uses
 - Poor planning
 - Stasis: infrastructure, plans, permits, need monitoring mechanisms with ability to change, need to consider dynamic systems with static use
 - Biological implications of ocean acidification, climate change.
- What changes have you observed on the coast?
 - Competing uses, conflicts over use, issue of deflecting use, poor regulations
 - Compounding issues of users
 - Poor planning – need highest & best use
- Ideal vision
 - Contingency plans
 - Proactive planning – have data ready
 - Economic vitality + environmental protection (intrinsic and use)
 - Recovery plans – what it takes to restore
 - Transition tools
 - Thinking, viable & sustainable industries
 - Sustain uses compatible with vision
 - Smart & selective
 - Review & modernization of permitting, united analysis
- What is enhanced in your vision/what threats diminished?
 - Public access to beaches
 - Tsunami readiness
 - Low impact development
 - Internalizing risk/costs to the environment
 - Contingency & insurance system

- Need visionary and concrete
- Coordinate & collaborate
- Streamlined, integrated permitting
- What does the ideal community need to thrive?
 - Preservation of opportunities: harvest shellfish, boating etc. (maintain or expand)

Group 8: Ideal Vision of the Coast

Describe your ideal vision for the coast. What is a healthy coastal community? What are your hopes for the future? What are the opportunities for the coast? What ecological, economic and social opportunities or resources are enhanced in your vision? What threats are diminished? What does the ideal community need to thrive?

- Vision
 - Institutions working together
 - Unified process/integrated
 - Healthy & balanced ecosystem + economy
 - Need for concrete and visionary beach access/preservation

Group 8: MSP Draft Goal

Example Goal: “To maintain a healthy marine ecosystem on Washington’s Coast to provide marine-based economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations”

What would you change, what would you keep?

- Goal Formation
 - Generally like the example
 - Keep: recreation, ecosystem, social, economic
 - Change:
 - add culture/identity
 - add historic sense of place
 - add preserving character
 - change “maintain” to preserve or enhance
 - marine-dependent uses given priority
 - add watershed connection
 - add land-water interface

Group 8: Small Group Draft Goal: To ensure Washington’s coastal character through preserving and enhancing a healthy marine ecosystem to provide marine-based social, economic and recreational opportunities for residents, visitors, and future generations.

Group 8: Spatial Boundary Considerations

What you like and what you would like to change about proposed boundaries.

Alternative 1. Follow toe of continental slope.

Alternative 2. Extend boundary to 400 fathoms.

Alternative 3. Full 200 miles of Federal EEZ

- Alternative 1
 - Covers wave, tidal, transmission lines, mining

- Can gather more info/understand area better/more manageable
 - Tanker transit – not sure of shipping lanes, may need to go further out
- Alternative 2
 - Fishing edge
 - Covers wind energy, wave & tidal energy, mining, lines
 - Challenge: monitoring over time
- Needs
 - Wind maps
 - Navy migration/use of areas
 - Navigation lanes
 - Potential use/activities survey to then draw lines

Group 8: Preferred Small Group Boundary

On April 26th, 2013 the second in a series of three Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) workshops convened at the Rotary Log Pavilion in Aberdeen, WA. Workshop attendees included representatives from local government, state and federal agencies, coastal treaty tribes and the Washington Coast Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC). The purpose of the workshop was to develop draft objectives for Washington Coast's Marine Spatial Plan (MSP). Workshop attendees built upon an overarching plan goal, core planning themes and specific issues of concern identified and prioritized in the first MSP workshop held on March 29, 2013.

The workshop was jointly facilitated by Bridget Trosin and Steve Harbell from Washington Sea Grant. Anne Nelson, on behalf of NOAA, provided a SMART (Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-limited) model training to assist workshop attendees systematically approach the objective-setting process. Sea Grant staff facilitated small group discussions and objective development with seven stakeholder teams of 5-6 people each. The small group objectives were then shared with the full workshop body. Additional opportunity to discuss and provide written comment on the draft objectives was also provided during an open "gallery walk" review process during the second half of the workshop.

The small groups produced the following seven draft objectives for the MSP:

- **Objective 1:** Improve healthy natural resource based economic activity along the WA coast through collaborative management and investment of uses and access to resources for the long term.
- **Objective 2:** To only allow uses that maintain a healthy economy that forever sustains our coastal communities in order to preserve their local identity and heritage.
- **Objective 3:** Sustain diverse traditional uses to ensure continuity of Washington's coastal culture and a high quality of life forever.
- **Objective 4:** Document, monitor, and respond to changes in marine ecosystem functions, goods and services to ensure a healthy and resilient Washington coast for the long-term.
- **Objective 5:** To ensure coastal ecosystems, communities, habitats, species and gene pools are resilient into the future by documenting existing conditions, trends, and prioritizing adaptive management strategies.
- **Objective 6:** Develop a locally driven management structure aligning WA MSP policy that is formally recognized and strategically incorporated, giving priority to the protection of existing sustainable uses.
- **Objective 7:** Enhance sustainable economic opportunities to achieve a resilient economy in coastal communities while maintaining and improving the quality of life for the future.

The workshop planning team is currently reviewing the stakeholder feedback and commentary provided in Workshop 2 to further revise and refine the seven draft goal objectives. Revisions will be shared at the final workshop to be held in Aberdeen on May 3, 2013. The final workshop will also engage stakeholders in a process to identify the appropriate boundaries for Washington's MSP.

Marine spatial planning is a public process to analyze and plan uses of the marine environment and ocean-related human activities to achieve agreed-on ecological, economic and social objectives. The MSP planning workshop series supports the coordinated effort currently underway to solve Washington Coast's shared resource management challenges. The workshop series outcomes—a clear draft goal, draft plan objectives and the proposed spatial plan boundary—will be used to engage the broader public in the next phase of Washington's Marine Spatial Plan development.

Washington Marine Spatial Planning Workshop Discussion Notes

Aberdeen, WA – Rotary Log Pavilion

April 26, 2013

Table of Contents

1. Draft Objectives & Gallery Walk Comments
2. Full Group Discussion Notes
3. Small Group Discussion Notes
 - Group 1 - Pg 9
 - Group 2 - Pg 12
 - Group 3 - Pg 17
 - Group 4 - Pg 25
 - Group 6 - Pg 28
 - Group 7 - Pg 31
 - Group 8 - Pg 40

Draft Goals & Comments

Overarching Goal: “To ensure a resilient and healthy marine ecosystem on Washington’s coast that supports sustainable economic, recreational, and cultural opportunities for coastal communities, visitors and future generations.”

Theme Economic: Access/ Use of Resource

Draft Theme Goal: Protect and preserve resource access and sustainable resource use for coastal communities to ensure economic viability.

Revised Theme Goal: Protect and preserve resources access and sustainable resource use for coastal communities to ensure economic *vibrancy*.

Objective 1: Improve healthy natural resource based economic activity along the WA coast through collaborative management and investment of uses and access to resources for the long term.

- Really like the word collaborative
- These are things we all want so the language is good, but feel the stigias needed may not include access to all areas or increased economic vibrancy. Collaborative is a sticky wicket (good luck).
- This is pretty good but collaborative management and investment of uses needs to be tightened up. Maybe in place of “and investment of” put “that “fosters”
- I like it.

- I would eliminate “investment of uses and access to resources” after collaborative management end in “for the long term”
- Poetic- well done.
- Natural Resource based- good job.
- Long term is dependent on short and medium term investments and making choices.
- Is there a baseline? What does healthy mean?
- Investment ‘in’ uses instead ‘of’ uses
- What does investment of uses mean?
- Question about what investment means
- Good job but not sure of what investment of uses means
- Love it! “improve healthy” to what? How about maintain or encourage?
- More access/harvest opportunities isn’t necessarily the best management choice. We need to consider trade-offs as well and make informed decisions, which may include reducing access for other benefits as well.
- Most comments reflected confusion about the phrase “investment of uses”:
 - Suggestions:
 - Can substitute “infrastructure development” instead of “investment of uses and access to resources”.
 - ...”through collaborative management that fosters uses and access to resources for the long-term”
- The phrase “access to resources” doesn’t need to be in the objective in order for it to be properly tied to the thematic goal.

Objective 2: To only allow uses that maintain a healthy economy that forever sustains our coastal communities in order to preserve their local identity and heritage.

- Seems exclusive, resistant to growth- “only”
- Stress win-win?
- Love it.
- How will we know which ones are ok?
- Too strict or limiting
- Must be inclusive of new people. Uses change.
- Pretty good. ‘only’ is an unnecessary qualifier
- The word only is very limiting
- How will you know if you’ve succeeded
- This strikes me as prohibitive. Restrictions with no promotion or improvements
- What about allowing new uses? Who is allowing?
- Only- too limiting.
- It’s too limiting to say “only” allow uses...
- I like my own group’s objective.
- Our goals are to access and good ecosystem protection. This is a priority to me so I’d rather have been working on the economic objective... To maintain access is pretty clear.. but I have concerns about how... “to only allow” is too restricting.

- Seems fine, but I'm trying to envision what it means. We can read different things into it.

Theme 2- Social/ Cultural: Access/ Use of Resources

Draft Theme Goal: Maintain maritime coastal communities from now into perpetuity.

Objective 1: Sustain diverse traditional uses to ensure continuity of Washington's coastal culture and a high quality of life forever.

- Traditional, continuity, high quality- good!
- Perfect!
- How to sustain? Collaborating with local communities?
- Traditional uses may not be sustainable. May need to have new traditions be developed. The pie is smaller than it used to be.
- Love "diversity". Diversity of uses and quality of those diversity of habitats etc.
- Give economic priority to instead of sustain?
- I don't think "sustain" or "ensure continuity" means no room for change or development- change is inevitable and a part of sustainability.
- Let's keep good traditions, not all traditions.
- Want to maintain but prepare culture competitive work. Invite new people into culture!
- Not sure high quality of life fits without some sort of adjective.
- Good job
- Love it.
- The focus on diversity of uses is good because it allows for diversity and the uses people are attached to instead of the "least impact" uses.
- Concern about: what is a high quality of life and who measures it? What if it changes over time? The high quality of life is not necessarily consistent with traditional uses of the coast.
- I want to sustain cultural uses but kids need to be trained in new technology to have a high quality of life. We need to maintain traditions but prepare youth. How do you not see new people as a threat? Here we haven't decided whether we like the tourists or we don't like them.
- What is our context for culture and tradition? Is it just for the tribes? The fishing culture is more or less the same along the coast.

Theme 3- Ecological wealth: Environmental Change and Resiliency

Draft Theme Goal: Ensure that our marine ecosystem is preserved for future generations

Objective 1: Document, monitor, and respond to changes in marine ecosystem functions, goods and services to ensure a healthy and resilient Washington coast for the long-term.

- I am not sure "goods and service" really fits. Drop those references and it looks good.
- Good. Short and specific
- Very actionable objective

- Good! Need key public indicators. Can't succeed in the long term if we don't invest and make choices in the near and medium term.
- Document respond and monitor are strategies- what's the measure? Enhance or maintain?
- Ecosystem services language a good way to concisely describe functions and physical biology and chemistry aspects of coast
- Like the focus on goods, functions and services
- General comment on process- for all posters- personally work better to think over a little more time- answer in a week or two- instant responses maybe OK- BUT!
- "all of these basically say the same thing"
- "Why is this one getting so many stickers?" "Because people like it"
- The objectives for every poster all sound the same. It doesn't matter what topic.

Objective 2: To ensure coastal ecosystems, communities, habitats, species and gene pools are resilient into the future by documenting existing conditions, trends, and prioritizing adaptive management strategies.

- And enforcing vs. violators of eco-laws
- Nicely done
- I like the gene pools comment- very forward thinking.
- Very good! Could we shorten "habitats, species and gene pools"?
- Resiliency is a good key word.
- I like adaptive management aspect.
- I like that you include genetic diversity. Very actionable objective.
- Love it.
- Like the adaptive management –worry about our ability to ensure the health of the ecosystem- Important to monitor and document.
- Great job. Shorten the objective.
- Good! Prioritization needs decisive decision making and investment from all stakeholders. Buy into the process.
- I would simplify it. To ensure resilient coastal ecosystems into the future...
- Add response element. Ie. Respond to emerging threats/issues affecting the marine environment.
- Perfect. Love it.

Theme 4- Governance: Lack of Collective Vision/ Strategy

Draft Theme Goal: Develop an integrated decision making process which supports proactive planning

Revised Them Goal: Develop an integrated decision making process which supports proactive and adaptive coastal marine spatial planning and an efficient governance structure.

Objective 1: Develop a locally driven management structure aligning WA MSP policy that is formally recognized and strategically incorporated, giving priority to the protection of existing sustainable uses.

- Love it! First part good, last part good- Don't understand middle.
- Locally driven, Formally recognized, Existing use- Good!
- This is the heart of MSP- Great comment.
- More important to be inclusive (local, state, federal, tribe), collaborative and use common framework
- Very good. Prefer bottom one.
- Great!
- I like this, although I wonder what role future sustainable uses could have?
- Formally recognized? Is that possible? Necessary? What about collaborative? Integrated? Locally supported would work better.
- What does structure mean? Is that an entity? What is it's role?
- Locally drive means what in the context of the whole coastal zone? Agree this is a hard one to get arms around since all the agencies have different missions, mandates, and policies guiding their goals.
- Zero existing uses clause- seems out of place with governance objective- put with access/use.
- Locally driven can be too restrictive, what about the estuaries, rivers, deltas that aren't specifically linked to the CMSP
- Great comments – prefers the alternative statement, better incorporates the important info
- How can we tell the feds what to do? IT seems like it is unrealistic that it will be formally recognized? Sometimes informal is better than formal (no decisions made but agreement can be reached and projects can move forward)
- Needs to reflect the local needs but must be consistent with state law (as written now it does not)
- Don't want to hand the keys to the coast to the coast, everyone has some investment in the state coasts
- Don't care for 'structure' prefer governance (is the structure or plan formally recognized?)

Theme 5- Economic: Unbalanced Development and Resiliency

Draft Theme Goal: Encourage economic development that recognizes the aspirations of local communities and protects coastal resources

Objective 1: Enhance sustainable economic opportunities to achieve a resilient economy in coastal communities while maintaining and improving the quality of life for the future.

- Don't see anything about resources specifically stated in the objectives.
- Liked it except "for the future"
- Why aspirations of just coastal communities? The coast belongs to all of us- state/tribal/federal/citizens. We want to visit a vibrant healthy place.
- Hard to define aspirations of communities at different scales. Collective mind reading? How do you do it?

- Enhance is a little vague. Invest in infrastructure for access to sustainable economic activities?
- Need baselines to be able to change things. Can't change your world if you don't know it.
- Could just be improving
- What action is taken to "enhance"?
- The word maintaining concerns me.
- I would simplify. Enhance opportunities to achieve a resilient economy.... Also, pick either maintaining or improving quality of life. I would pick improving.
- What does "enhance" mean? Could you be a little more specific?
- *Smiley Face*
- Is for the future implied? When goals laid out, always looking present and future?
- Should it be more proactive?
- Is there an issue with access?
- Why just focused on coastal communities? All of coast should be included? Shouldn't be just local communities? Other parts of country come and visit, we want coast for whole country?
- Whenever hear enhanced, I think of Viagra.
- What is meant by resources? Human and natural resources are included in quality of life.
- Had trouble reading objective and understanding how it linked to thematic goals as it related to natural resources.
- I like the quality of life, but I get a kick out of the cultural heritage, not all heritages are great. Do we still want them?
- Fewer and fewer younger kids have hunted, clamed, fished. How do you get economic drivers in place to retain population? Is this is still what is wanted.
- Even though I may not change words or concept, I'm never prepared to come to a meeting and say this is what it's going to be forever. There are always things out there that we aren't going to be able to consider. We are being forced into a path, down this direction.
- We've all been brainwashed from too many committees. We are all just spouting the same dogma. The similarity of language is scary since we've all been through so many committees. We are like little children.
- The last workshop used the word maintain, but do we want to maintain current levels. Maintain is not adequate. If we have poor water quality right now, do we want to maintain that? Shouldn't we just say improving? By maintaining we are not going backwards?
- How do you get all these ideas into a short sentence?
- What does community mean? The communities want to have good environment and jobs. To recognize the aspirations of community, hard to get your pulse on it. Retired community wants certain things, people with kids have different view. Parents want jobs so kids don't leave, retired community wants maybe something else. The goal is actually economization.

- Some people say return to 1950's way of life. Not all want that? What is a heyday? You didn't have a hospital. People who don't remember '50's may think '80's were heyday. Also, different levels of expectations between communities. Small towns have a bad day with 20k, but larger towns have a bad day at 400k.
- How do you define unregulated development?
- Before you protect and sustain, you need to know what it is, and you need baseline. Is it going sideways, down, up. Can't change world if you don't know your world.
- Think of the three legged stool. Social economic leg, cultural leg, environmental leg, what happens if one of the legs gets to short? May not fall over, just wobble. But if something large scale happens, like losing the fishery, then your screwed. No different than planting 10k acres of one type of tree. Look back at Boeing. If it went under, Seattle in trouble. Now some diversity. This is unbalanced. Lose part of it in a balanced one, suffer a little, but stick around. Lose part in unbalanced and stool falls over.
- These thematic goals grew from previously identified areas, but really quite broad.

Full Group Discussion Notes

Workshop Facilitators

- Steve Harbell, WA Sea Grant
- Bridget Trosin, WA Sea Grant
- Jennifer Hennessey, WA Department of Ecology
- Anne Nelson , NOAA-OCRM

Welcome/Introduction/Recap of Workshop: (Bridget, Steve & Jennifer)

- Accomplishments from the last workshop:
 - Identification of the most important characteristics about the coast, what makes it a good place to live and work, sources of wealth, and threats to the coasts social, ecological, and economic resources.
 - A draft goal statement.
 - A brief discussion of boundary area.
 - Improvement of workshop process.
 - Exchange of ideas and plans for future.
- Based on the comments we received from workshop 1 participants, we identified theme areas and developed draft theme goals.
- Economic and cultural access/use of resources were broken down into two themes based on the comments provided to the planning team.
- Real focus of today's activity is to narrow down on objectives. Each team assigned one of the theme areas.
- At end of process, the State is looking for 3-5 objectives.
- Everyone will have opportunity to comment on objectives. Feedback will be captured. We are trying to stay away from group editing today, however.

- Over past month MRC's on coast have also been doing outreach for this workshop. They have been engaging their communities so that MRC Reps at the workshop today can accurately represent communities.

Guidance for the objective-setting process: (Anne)

- Overarching goal is what we are always trying to get.
- Objectives are decisive steps to get there (to goal).
- Everyone in room can understand goal.
- Objectives are more specific but always link back to the overarching goal.
- All SMART objectives will roll-up into the goal. SMART = Specific, measureable, achievable, realistic, time frame.
- Handouts/PPT Examples of good objectives and how/if they meet SMART criteria provided to each of the small groups
- Objectives put in place proactive decision making structures.
- Objectives should indicate threats, long-term goal of policies.
- Today we are taking information from the previous brainstorming workshop and using it to create objectives for each thematic goal.
- Test your objectives as group to see if they meet the SMART criteria.

Large Group Questions

- When resiliency is used in the theme goals, do we want both a resilient ecology and economy?
 - Yes
- The public workshops held in Ilwaco, MRC's, how will they be incorporated?
 - The MRC's over the past month has been doing outreach to community members on MSP. Good conversations on thoughts about MSP. The person who facilitated that is putting together report on these and will be on website. Purpose was to prepare MRC members for community interaction so they could attend this workshop.

Things that helped each group in drafting objectives (Small Group Presenters)

- Closely aligned goals from a diverse group. Sustaining and improving the quality of life a common theme.
- The key was making our specific issues and concerns broader
- We all listened to each other.
- We listened to see where each other was coming from on wording. Important to listen to perspectives so when you are saying something you are actually in agreement on it.
- One person who was good at this thing came up with one set of wording we all liked.
- Our challenge was getting the level of specificity right. It really helped having diverse perspectives and experiences in the group because it brought a lot of good ideas to the process.
- Everybody was able to talk openly about concerns and provide good input.

Next Steps

Between now and the next workshop, the planning team will document participant comments and use that feedback to revise the draft objective statements. These revised objectives will be shared with Workshop 3 participants on Friday, May 3, 2013. However, the majority of Workshop 3 will be devoted to plan boundary considerations.

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 1

Group 1: Group Members

Barbara Clabots	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Dale Beasley	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Jarod Norton	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Katie Krueger	Quileute
Laura Wigand	WA Sea Grant Fellow (Small Group Leader)
Michele Culver	WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Corey Niles	WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife

Group 1: Small group introductions

Question: Can we use this process to collectively help shape the future?

- the future is unknown and coming
- hopefully yes
- this process is similar to some of what CoE does
- yes, but I'm apprehensive because different perspectives will influence it, for example, eastern WA telling us how to manage fisheries
- I think Quileute's interests are primarily in continued sustainable fishing, and that is the biggest priority. Keeping forage fish and commercial fish and crab are needed for subsistence and ceremonial purposes, it's important to have these resources and access to them. Ocean fisheries need to be strong for this state. I think this MSP process can't hurt, pessimists... fear that industry will win out, and the people who govern will sell out. We watched the gulf coast go down the tubes, and I'm worried. At the last workshop we came up with some very concrete specific ways to solve problems, and when you use facilitators to make up the short goals, but this lost the details in what we had created.

Group 1: Drafting the Objective

Asset: diverse traditional uses

Threats: diversity of uses and loss of continuity, and loss of resources to external powers

Spatial extent: coastal

Measure: sustain

Outcome: culture and high quality of life

When: forever

Why: to address the threat of losing resources to external powers

- This “SMART” stuff is really helpful for writing grants and sorting out what’s an objective and what’s an outcome because I get confused.
- How big is a community before it stops being a maritime community? Should we think of the different character and reason for existence and port of revenue for each community/town?
- I work with broad goals and they always bury the local populations. When army corps does their job they don’t ask about the locals, they ask about net gain for the bigger economy. Too broad of an objective pushes out the locals objectives.
- Looking at each place will help us to get more specific objectives.
- So we should have a specific and different objective for each place.
- All of these ideas fit under maintaining maritime communities, and the character of each community is important. Some of them might have similar objectives.
- Look at what are the private sector jobs in each community and protect them.
- It’s the resort and the fishing industry, those are private industry and most important.
- “to preserve marine based jobs and lifestyles”. I’ve been hearing that we don’t want to destroy what we’ve got to get new things.
- You also don’t want to be just static and not have room for existing growth.
- How about sustain instead of preserve? But we want room for growth.
- We can’t think beyond the box of what’s written on the sheet?
- We need to come up with a solution to this problem.
- What we’re trying to do is say that we want the culture, is allow it to exist as the culture.
- Let’s identify threats; what would keep us from maintaining culture?
- All these people are living on the coast (whether they do tourism or fishing), the resources are the basis of their livelihood. If it’s a smelly sewer with no life in it, nobody’s going to wanna live there. we can preserve it through programs that support a diverse ecosystem.
- My mind runs off to ‘if you’ve got these jobs...’ then you’ve got to see that the sea lions are eating all these smolt that we just paid to put out there.
- He’s talking about invasive or overrun species and we’ve got to get rid of these things that are out of control.
- So if we lose a resource we can’t maintain our social/cultural traditions.
- When I say programs I mean not only protection but also control programs, because we have problems with sea lions and cormorants also- the tribe doesn’t agree with NOAA about these issues.
- When you start a program, it’s expensive and a mess.
- My thought about assets and threats is connected to economic access and sustainable continued existence of economic base. The other part of fisheries management is who gets the benefit from the resource? We want to ensure that the benefits of the state’s management flows to local communities. Local people have concerns about ITQ programs where the money flows out of the local communities.

- Once you make fish a commodity, a stock broker from NY can own all of the commodity... ITQs make it too easy to take the control of the resource away from the community.
- So the threat is that benefits from local resources will go outside of the community.
- 'sustain diverse traditional uses to ensure continuity of Washington's coastal culture and a high quality of life forever'
- Even though each community is unique, everyone values the culture they have locally. Our coast is relatively pristine and we want to keep it that way.
- Maintain and preserve is the same thing
- So I'm not sure we know how to reach the objective (we've drafted). We will need indicators- how do we do this?
- If energy proposal were to come through, we could take a look at this objective and measure it.
- When one of the tribes wanted to get in on tidal energy, the sanctuary takes very seriously anything that is considered not appropriate for the water. Even though there are 2 tribes on the coastline, they won't find it easy to do anything on the coastline, basically.
- When they put electric cables in Makah bay..
- The health of our ocean depends on each other, because everything we fish for is a migratory species, so we really care about what happens in other areas.
- When you look at theme 2 on access to resources.. it doesn't matter what we do. If we can't get to those resources because channels aren't available, we're dead ducks and can't get out of our bays without the channels dredged. That is the most important things.
- The coast guard gets us the money when we can't do anything else and nobody will give us money.
- Over 3 years... 7 people died because the coast guard wouldn't move a buoy. I kept trying to get that buoy moved.
- Even though timber companies do their thing lawfully, the big effect is on sediment. The harvest of trees is affecting us.
- The tsunami plan is going to be asking for more than timber. That's one thing we don't think about sometime, is that some impacts are a long way from the coast. Even the pebble mine affects us here.
- All the people in Montana who think there's no problem with salmon won't have access to canned salmon anymore.
- How can we manage this objective for growth?

Group 1: Boundary Discussion

- Last time we talked with Kris Wall about the boundary, and whatever the boundary is would be under CZMA but NOAA and Ecology will have to review all federal actions for consistency.

- Through the Pacific Council we did see where the council made a decision under Magnuson and the California CZMA implementing arm said it was inconsistent with CA's Ocean protection plan and overturned that fisheries decision, so I want to make sure that we address these...
- People will have questions about where are the treaty tribes involved?
- When we draft goals and objectives, this is actually bigger than MSP and off shore energy, it could be used to review any federal action.
- Are these goals specific enough to meaningfully review under Magnuson act?
- Every problem that comes along is different.
- Something else we haven't talked about is- we ask that in every scale, the areas with the most population gets the most votes and money, this is just how it is, it worries me that the pacific coast which is severely underpopulated will succeed in getting what they need. In the long run, will the legislature support it? We can come up with fantastic ideas but if they need to do something in Puget sound, they'll do it.
- The only thing stopping the corps is getting money to do what we need. We need to dredge the channels, and the earmarks helped...one of the problem

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 2

Group 2: Group Members

Bill Whiteaker	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Brit Sojka	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Leader)
Casey Dennehy	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Jennifer Hennessey	WA Dept. of Ecology
Lorenz Sollmann	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Mike Cassinelli	Pacific County

Group 2: Small group introductions

Question: Can we use this process to collectively help shape the future?

- We can definitely use this process to collect and reserve what we have for future. Most people look at coast as recreational place, a place to retire. Economy of Pacific County is natural resource economy. Maintain or grow existing jobs.
- Similar things happening at Human Use Mapping workshop. Bring people and technology and together, have different map of uses, bring history, give snapshot of where we want to go. As long as people stay engaged.
- Short answer to question is YES. MSP an opportunity to inform wise decision making. A continuous process, a big powerful tool. Extrapolating into future.
- Yes, this is a powerful tool. Preserve the things we have. Also give insight into future opportunities of Coast.

- New opportunities don't impede or effect current system. New opportunities add to options. Meeting yesterday, so many people on road for fishing derby in past, now smaller but not terrible. A lot of change from past to present. Population hasn't changed.
- Young population children's aren't staying, there are no jobs. This isn't the other driver. Jobs influenced by other things, be realistic but opportunistic.
- We want to promote recreation and tourism. Lots of places to increase economic opportunities.
- Challenges out on coast, but can be overcome.

Group 2: Drafting the Objective

Asset: Coastal resources that support a healthy coastal economy.

Threat: Potential to impair coastal resources or displace existing or future opportunities

Spatial extent: Washington Coast

Measure: Increased economic opportunity

Outcome: Stable and life sustaining communities

When: Over the short and long term

Why: Maintain and enhance quality of life

- How can you help outside community be resilient?
- Things dynamic, lot of change, respond and adapt to change
- Is that part of MSP
- You can simplify, like, this is about offshore energy. But it is more than that. Not just maps, this is a tool for the long term. Even when economics and climate change, we want to be resilient.
- This theme targets development pressures.
- What definition of resilience are we using, define this well.
- Does this definition work for you, does it reflect high level concepts?
- Unbalanced development, expanding other economies over existing economies
- unregulated under MSP. How can we bring in
- Draft theme goal is pretty accurate. Have opportunities for future. Wording a little confusing for theme.
- theme words just trying to capture threat vs. opportunity
- Other questions about draft theme goal?
- What were problems in unbalanced development and resilience. Tough to define. When I look down at what's here. You're talking about what as development? Right on coast or mining and aquaculture.
- New development can impair coastal habitat and use, but at same time provides economic opportunity.
- In bays and estuaries septics going into ocean.
- Concern is not about existing development, but about new. We are looking forward with MSP. Not repeating mistakes.
- If looking forward and don't clean up what's there, how can we go forward?
- the other objectives, like ecological, may cover this.

- For today, need to be broad, we have one single phrase to work on.
- Are we ready to dive in?
- What is asset we are trying to address with theme/goal?
- What are calling an asset?
- Coastal economy is your asset.
- Talking about economies and resilient communities.
- Asset is coastal economy
- Threat is potential for opportunity, value of resources,
- Extant is Washington coast
- Outcome is unplanned development that can harm resources use.
- Asset is coastal economy
- Threat is poor development
- Extent is all coastal communities
- Outcome is ...
- Measure is jobs/economic growth
- When is in perpetuity
- Why stability fosters healthy communities that are self sustaining and stewards of their environment.
- Asset is coastal resources. Reason is that economic development came over time because of resources. If no fishing, no timber, no development
- Threats is use and development
- Extent is coastal zone, part of what still is to be development, how far out to sea. Also at inlet level. Lots of wildlife between marine and forest.
- Outcome is education, planned growth, with multiple tools. Lessons learned.
- Measure is improving, restoring, maintaining something. Jobs is good measurable thing.
- When is 20 years because, could be short term for some, long term for some
- Why is to build resiliency through cooperative planning. We are talking about jobs based on resources, yet for most efforts our trend is still going down. We want to maintain these things, but I equated this to WWII with the generation that sacrificed to deal with issues at that time. This generation needs to make sacrifices to protect future. If we maintain current fish levels, can we ever grow back. What are we trying to truly maintain. Idea to maintain for future, must make sacrifices. Resiliency is great term, but there has to be a give somewhere. Can't keep wanting more just because they have more before us.
- Rather than trying to imagine like it was, still may need to make sacrifices to keep what is today.
- You can learn through lessons about shortsightedness of past planning in septic, stormwater. When planning prior they were using state of the art tech, but now seems like "what were they thinking?"
- one word definition to go forward, leaves little room to maneuver. In something diverse as economy. Hard to define why and when.
- Asset is healthy economy an jobs
- Threats is loss of resources, especially diversity

- Spatial is total area but maybe we should define what we mean by coastal zone? I don't consider Straits Washington coast.
- Outcome... ghost-towns is what you don't want.
- Measure is lost jobs is one of them. Links to assets.
- When, I'd just go with short vs. long term. Leave this to be defined.
- Why, I mean I guess what are we defining as why? Why is all this happening, why do we want to preserve this? Why What? Why do we care? We don't want to see the loss of what we had. We don't want to see the loss of the quality of life that is already there. I think in the coastal zone we have a different quality of life we have in the cities.
- We want to improve coastal area
- We still have quality of life even with population loss or unemployment. We want the community. All the coastal communities would like to see something to keep young people there. We want life sustaining jobs.
- Enhancing the quality of life. Preserve but make better.
- Living wage job, how do you define that. Move from this term to another, life sustaining. Enhancing those opportunities. If we are going to keep population, we need living wage jobs. Better than the bottom of minimum wage.
- For a strong economy you want diversity. You don't want eggs in one basket, you want a few baskets.
- Yeah, like when Boeing lost its jobs.
- Diversity creates resilience.
- Assets – Coastal resources that support a healthy coastal economy.* We are worried about resources but also use of resources leading to loss of opportunity.
- Spatial Extent – Washington Coast, assuming this doesn't mean Puget Sound
- When – Over the short and long term.* (Over long term be ok, but have hit in short term. National economy a good example.) Yeah, need a more sustainable growth.
- Why – Maintain and enhance quality of life*
- If all collaborative, how does unplanned development happen?
- Threat – Lack economic diversity and opportunity. Over long term not going to have resilient economy without diversity. What is threatening coastal resources? Anything attacking coastal resources. Anything impairing coastal resources. Is diversity of opportunity an outcome? Has to be tied to a threat.
- If you have oil spill in one part, localized threat. We need to find a threat that covers the whole thing. What kind of word covers short and long term threat.

- Potential to impair coastal resources from unplanned development.
- We do have economy as asset
- We want to take advantage of opportunities to enhance economy. I want to capture the idea that right now is not the way we want it. We want it better. Threat is that we won't take full advantage of resources. Can we create a win-win?

- Threat – Potential to impair coastal resources or displace existing or future opportunities.
- Outcome – Ghost towns. We don't want. Resilient opportunities. Life sustaining jobs. Not just the jobs though. People come out to use resources for enjoyment, don't actually use them. Other themes that deal with that theme. Stability and life sustaining. But need diversity. Stable and life sustaining communities. Resilient is part of goal, not necessarily explicit
- Outcome - Stable and life sustaining communities
- Measures – jobs, unemployment, economic growth. Sustainable economic growth. Trends with emphasis on resources. Stable is measuring number of jobs. Increasing opportunities? Specific measures might be jobs. If you're trying to increase, how do you maintain? Increase one, decrease something else? What is stable then? Do communities have enough jobs now? We need something besides government jobs. Stewarded economic development. Has to be an education phase. Those losing job from one reason, must be reeducated to move to new job. If people leave, taking economic inputs to local area somewhere else. If process to educate what new thing is coming in, people will stay. How do you stewardship economic development? Local gov. bringing in some other opportunities. Transition? Increased opportunities...have to come back to a metric. Is number of jobs and indicator? To detailed? Bring thoughts back up higher. Increased economic opportunities and diversity? If you put something down to measure, how do you measure it? You are measuring if you're increasing or not. Not just maintain, we want it to be better.
- Measure – Increased economic opportunity

Group 2: Individual Objectives:

- To enhance quality of life by supporting healthy coastal resources while decreasing potential threats to economic opportunities.
- Preserve coastal resources from threats to maintain and enhance the quality of life, both human and natural resources.
- Increase economic opportunity to achieve a resilient economy in coastal communities while maintaining and enhancing the quality of life and natural resources over the short and long term.
- Utilize MSP to inform wise economic decisions that ensure stable coastal communities that offer opportunities in the short and long term.

Short discussion of objectives:

- SMART goals and objectives are usually long run on sentences.
- Now we are trying to help planning process at a more detailed manner. Enhance covers increase. We don't want to just decrease threats to economic opportunities; we want more opportunities, in a way that doesn't decrease resources. This is about economic development and resilient of economy.
- What I was adding was a bit more natural resource part. I'm a little concerned about using increasing opportunity, I like enhance. In a community, you may only increase for a small community but that whole community may be benefiting.

- By nature of sustainable, covering resource loss.
- Trade short and long term for “future generations”.

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 3

Group 3: Group Members

Ben Antonius	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Britta Timpane-Padgham	US/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Leader)
Dick Sheldon	Pacific County
Mark Cedergreen	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Mike Rechner	WA Dept. of Natural Resources
Randy Lewis	Grays Harbor County

Group 3: Small group introductions

Question: Can we use this process to collectively help shape the future?

- It’s a necessary process from my perspective. We need to protect the resources that are there now. The fishing industry provides food, provides resources. These are some of the best fishing grounds on the west coast of the United States. People in the fishing industry take exception to a large industry coming in with government help and putting in fish windows... At this point I don’t believe that our fishing grounds are protected (enough). I think most people up and down the coast are looking at traditional uses and maintaining those. They can be tweaked. There aren’t a lot of negative interactions between user groups right now because they’ve learned to work with each other. We don’t want to see that upset. I’m concerned about maintaining the coastal communities because they’re small. We need jobs, we need to maintain the jobs that we have. The economy isn’t as good as in the bigger cities. We have some long term sustainable resources that we can use for food and resources that need to be preserved.
- I’m suspicious, having dealt with the government in different forms for the last 60 years. My concerns are pretty much what Mark said. It’s our position that we want to protect the coastal jobs ...
- The culture
- Yeah the culture. It takes very little when you live in a rural area to upset the apple cart. Losing one job trickles down to three or four more. In Seattle no one would miss that. We ran an oyster company – the oyster industry had a problem in the early 70s – and we closed our packing plant down. The result was about 15-20 people (lost their jobs?)...and 10 years later the (oysterville?) looked totally different. There weren’t that many jobs, so they had to move out. The character changed from a fishing village atmosphere to a celebration of wealth...Our efforts are trying to make sure that this doesn’t happen. And it certainly will...The energy issue is the big gorilla. They talk about these jobs but the biggest portion of them are

going to be over in five years and those people are going to move on and that portion of the economy will be lost if we don't sustain them right.

- Can all uses be balanced?
- I'd say it can't be done
- You've got everything that's been built up by a lot of people over the years and it's all working and someone comes up w some idea, let's put 200 square miles of windmills. And somebody says let's find a balance, we need a balance here. No we don't. We don't need wind energy in WA anyway, it doesn't work well...But people are going to try to push it, it will be a multibillion boondoggle. Folks on the coast, whether it's in fishing or whatever it is, are going to fight this until the bitter end. Hopefully MSP will show that everything works, fits where it is. (That) it's sustainable. Maybe each community has a different emphasis. But they've worked together for years. It's developed that way and people have worked together. I'm not saying there can never be any kind of energy out here whatsoever. I'm opposed to that kind of energy because it doesn't work; it's a waste of money. I have more than one reason to oppose wind energy out here. My main reason is to (prevent?) displace fishing grounds. You can't eat wind, you can eat fish. And food don't come from Safeway.

Group 3: Drafting the Objective

<p>Assets: Natural resources; Infrastructure; Coastal communities, heritage & identity</p> <p>Threats: development that ignores coastal identity; limited area for development; over-development; pollution; overfishing; overcapitalization; infrastructure loss; incompatible regional & national goals</p> <p>Spatial extent: WA Coast</p> <p>Measure: maintain</p> <p>Outcome: healthy economy</p> <p>When: long-term; in perpetuity</p> <p>Why: sustain our coastal community & heritage</p>
--

(What are some assets?)

- Living resources
- Non-living resources too. The view is a NL resource.
- That's more esoteric
- It is but if you think of an NLR that drives tourism that's one of them

(Get into more specifics- tourism?)

- I wouldn't say tourism is a resources it's a use of an asset
- Probably. I think that (with) living resources you're talking about all forms of aquatic
- fish shellfish
- So there's all forms of aquatic wildlife and shore based you know upland life and that including both animals and plants.

(wildlife? Trees?)

- Cranberries are big on the coast

- I understand all these things and I agree with them all but if we were getting to a point where we need to roll these into a pot of goals. Sorry objective. We probably aren't going to be able to list oysters, sand, cranberries as a resource. I can understand going through all this process as long as we're going down the road of lumping rather than splitting. We could list wind because people fly kites and that brings people for tourism

(so stay more broad? living or nonliving resource)

- If everyone wants to list those individual resources, I think that's great with the idea of rolling them into something more overarching so you create language that everyone knows is a broad array.
- If we are talking about one objective then are we going to do categories and pick one of those and create an objective off that. We could list some of the assets in general and then of all of those get to one of them that may or may not work.

(My impression is trying to collapse those assets and get an objective that encompasses those assets. So broader language)

- Maybe combine these two and say natural resources. Doesn't necessarily imply living or nonliving.
- if you were listing a whole set of assets for Willapa Bay. Natural resources is a good one to start from
- Fits right in with DNR's view.
- ? Tourism happens on the coast because of to a great extent natural resources. People like to come down to the beach walk on the beach fly a kite
- What about infrastructure as an asset, first of all the ability to drive to the beach. If you're there fishing you've got to be able to get product
- Those things all developed over the years and to some degree they're in great shape but to some degree our beaches aren't really passable the way they used to be. Its accessibility.
- When you talk about maintaining or increasing access to resources that might be something to look at. Or infrastructure that helps people get things from where they catch it to where they sell it. You can have all the clams you want but if you can't get them to where you want them
- The access is maintained by the people that live there. And they wouldn't be there if the people didn't support it. The people themselves are the people that create it so (?) The biggest asset you've got to maintain is the coast the way it is, the people that live there.
- I think the people are definitely an asset
- Including some of them that are assholes
- I agree with Dick: population is an asset just like resources are an asset
- Population up and down the coast have a different flavor and diversity from tribes to Microsoft millionaires to fishing communities...
- The classic failures have been where people just come in and say were going to (for example) put a Disneyland on the coast
- I've seen them come and go
- It's hard for me to participate in this kind of (?) because I've been involved in this for so long. The pros and cons of living on the coast have worked themselves out

over the years. What works works, what doesn't, those people are gone away. It's not only function but its evolved over a long time. They couldn't stay there because what they did they had to move someplace else but what you see in Westport in Ilwako in all these towns is a process that's been worked out over long periods of time. When we come in here and start talking about changing these things, it's going to change the system.

- Looking at it from a change perspective isn't how we should be. Look at it from a support perspective, what can we do to support the things that are there

(or make sure the things you like stay intact)

- Look at (?) the population has been the same for 0 years
- Would you like to see it increase
- Hell no.

(Assets are natural resources, coastal community and infrastructure)

- There has been a cultural or a social strategy that's developed over the years that has helped to establish how things work and I think one of the assets is how ... the character of the people to face difficulties and stuff like that. The community talks about the people but I think there's a heritage that has developed along the coast to continue these industries or processes.
- . I understand what you're saying but you kind of talked Dick about this is how things have worked themselves out. Doesn't that seem to be a survival of the fittest mentality rather than a let's decide (mentality)?
- Usually when that (lets decide mentality) happens some county commissioners come and screw it all up
- Westport (?) a fishing town and went through a lot of growing pains, a lot of stuff has come in that wasn't compatible with the community and ended up leaving. Ocean Shores built a town the way they want to built it, it was just go to the store and get yourself a kit to build a town. They (the towns) can change but they can't just take a 90 degree turn. Lot of good opportunities for light industry to come in.
- I'm talking about just supporting it. What do you like or not like?
- You're into the next steps. What I'm saying is an asset we have is a person but we also have an asset and we also have the heritage they've developed about what's developed along the coast. Those are assets and how we go from here to begin to support that. One asset is the communities those are the people but one is also an identity that has developed that's that philosophical part of it that I see as an asset.
- We don't want to change the identity, we want to support the identity
- My biggest fear here is we are putting all our cards on the table and we haven't heard the other side. That is wind power, wave power, things that are taking up areas along the coast. They talk about finding a balance. Warren buffet comes in and buy somebody out for \$ million and they no longer exist. We are being asked to agree to this and I wish I knew what they had in mind.
- No one could ever convince me that there aren't megacorporations backed by big government that want to put big windmills out here on the coast
- Mark you and I both know if it were profitable it would be happening
- No not necessarily. This process is by which somebody decides if they want to do it they have to get across this. It will be a stumbling block to them

- We are developing the process by which the proposals will be looked at
- ?
- adding the identity as an asset as something we want to preserve and protect. We don't want Warren Buffet to come in and buy up Ocean Shores
- That'd be OK if it's Ocean Shores
- He don't give a damn about Ocean Shores
- We need to make sure that we put some conditions in this plan that no matter what somebody else wants to propose, be it ocean energy or something we haven't even thought about yet, that the identity of pick a name of a town here is protected. If we put that in as a goal

(threat - development that ignores coastal identity. what else?)

- Pollution, loss of natural resources. Overfishing.

(You're doing this because you want to protect the amazing function that the outer WA coast provides. Make sure everybody else is using strong language as well)

- I'm looking a little broader. I wear a couple hats. I'm worried about the shellfish industry but we own our own lands and have a little protection. I'm really worried about the guys fishing in the ocean. (crosstalk) Where do you put all of these anchors? What does it take to make something out there, if it can exist? What happens to the anchors after they don't want to be there? All I can see is ruination of what we have out there. This is going to happen. Everything, all the little pictures are from the north coast. But this is going to happen on the south coast. This is a real (?)

(how to put it on this list?)

- Incursion of incompatible development?
- How about limited space for development?
- There's no place for ocean energy in the OCNMS. Take that out, I don't believe the Quinault are going to approve anything in their U&A. That leaves you from Westport to the Columbia River.
- Maybe a way to put it is forced overdevelopment of limited areas. We're saying you can't, you can't, you can't, and so that leaves this one area that's going to have to get everything crammed into it.

(other threats?)

- I want to go back to that forced overdevelopment piece though. I'm thinking the threat is the limited space rather than the overdevelopment. What you're saying is that any development in certain spaces would be bad if it's not overdevelopment.
- It's what the use is. The Coast Guard has already said you're not going to be steaming through these windmills. So where are they going to put them? We don't know if they want to put them 00 mi or mi offshore. That's a hell of a difference so we're trying to make a plan and we don't know what they're doing.
- My point is that using the word overdevelopment suggests that some development would be OK. I don't want the threat to be focused on the descriptor vs. the actual issue. I don't want it to be focused on the over- rather than that the area is limited
- In my perspective there are some areas where any development is OVER. Are we hurting ourselves by some of the restrictions we've put on areas. Part of that whole discussion is are there areas we have set off-limits that should be considered instead

of saying here's the miles that everything goes into. But maybe there's some ability to allow some things in areas that would take some pressure off that miles.

- ? Limited development area potentially resulting in overdevelopment. Rather than what he said that overdevelopment is bad. Limited development area resulting in overdevelopment.
- I just hope it makes a difference. We had meetings w our good governor face to face.
- Just a rhetorical question: if the OCNMS is off-limits for ocean energy, why is that? What's wrong with doing it there when the area south of there is just as rich and vibrant in resources and fisheries, why is it off-limits then? That's where there's less population that's all tribal U&A. I want some to give me an answer
- Then it's not rhetorical.
- I think one more threat that would be good is incompatible regional and national objectives or goals or whatever you want to call it because for instance why are they going to fill the place with wind power subsidized by the fed government? Because on a national level they have the objective of being energy independent. You have people on the east side of the (?)
- I think that's an excellent one. I think that says it all right there.

(conflicting or incompatible?)

- I think incompatible because we all might think energy independence is a good thing-
- Incompatible regional and national goals

(crosstalk re: MPAs?)

- Even if what you ultimately decide is protected areas, it's still in essence protected fish populations. If we're all focusing on that miles then were starting with a handcuff. I think they have to be in the discussion.
- Consider southern boundary of OCNMS as a starting point

(focus on outcome. What kind of future condition)

- Sustainability has to be included in there as a word. You're talking about the ongoing future and sustainability in natural resources whatever they are

(sustainable what?)

- Sustainable use
- Sustainable use of resources. That's what this objective is about
- We're not going to have a year plan to cut down every tree in the state or catch the fish in the ocean. You try to keep them at a sustainable level. That's how we manage fisheries. We're not perfect at it but that's what we try to do.

(Do we want that sustainable use to mean maintaining those resources?)

- You want your grandkid to be able to go out and buy oysters off his () oyster (grid?) in years.

(Do we want to maintain resources or increase the resources?)

- Anybody who's in an resource interest would like to see that resource increase. Sustainability is good, it's better than nothing but increasing is what we all want
- We have what we have and we want to maintain that, we don't want to lose that.
- What is our desire, the outcome is the future condition. I think of a comment last time on the issue of sustainable resources that brought up without a sustainable resource you don't have economic vitality but you can have a sustainable resource

without economic vitality. If you stop fishing tomorrow you have a sustainable resource but you don't have a fishing community any more. If we want a sustainable economy then what we are talking about is sustainable resources is an element underneath that. Do we want a sustainable economy or do we want to focus on the resource?

- They're related
- You can tell 0 people you want to improve the condition of the resource. If we've estimated that the desired outcome is a viable economy-

(maybe sustainable use of resource to sustain a viable economy?)

- Another factor in this: 0 years ago we went to the state legislature and asked for the legislature to limit the amount of licenses that are being sold to crab fishers and the reason we did that is because there was big boats that were getting bigger and bigger and bigger and they could stay in the ocean for hours a day and 0 boats could catch every goddamn crab on the west coast and we tried to freeze the thing so every crab fisher at the time could have something in the future-
- We're way beyond the goal stage now. What about the future condition of a viable economy that sustains our coastal community and heritage.
- I like that. that works
- Make that into plural viable economy that sustains our coastal communities and heritage
- Is extent Washington coast? It's not the Washington coast, it's a third of it.

(the reason is recognizing that that northern portion does play a role in the economic assets of the coast)

- it does but the intrusion is going to be on the southern coast.
- Depends on what some is proper to do
- which we don't know
- I want an answer from someone in the federal government why we can't put a windmill-

(are we going to maintain/increase? Measure of change)

(R- sounds like we want to maintain things)

- it gets difficult do we want to maintain things? Maintain doesn't mean absolutely no growth. You could maintain and still have improvements and things like that
- We don't want to make it better?
- I think if what we are saying is if the outcome is a viable economy and we have sustainable common heritage...we get into perceptions of what a word means. If you say maintain a 0 year old building it doesn't mean in 0 years it looks the same. Can mean improving it, it just means it hasn't disappeared. Are we maintaining or are we improving or are we expanding?

(brief technical difficulties)

- in perpetuity is not a bad phrase.
- I think in perpetuity is good. If you're fishing, you're looking at , , year scales. You can't go through three bust seasons and still be in business. Events can happen that eliminate salmon and that eliminates a lot of fishermen and so we do things on a short term basis but you're still looking for the long term. You still want the community to be sustainable over the long term.

- I've got one suggestion. In reality one way to maybe do this is to break up our future conditions. If we put the outcome as a viable economy and then said to sustain our coastal communities and heritage as the why. if you leave it-

(how about to maintain a viable economy that forever sustains our coastal community without inappropriate development in order to preserve their local knowledge and heritage)

- insert identity instead of knowledge

(crosstalk)

- what about healthy instead of viable
- I would do that
- I think more people can understand healthy instead of viable.
- That's good I like that because you eat a lot of oysters when you're being healthy

(concerns with inappropriate)

- I have concerns with it as well.
- how about non-compatible?
- I'm not sure it's necessary to be in here.
- I think you can have to an extent what is inappropriate, what we're trying to capture is all kinds of forms again. You could sustain an econ in essence a pretty good economy with some forms of development that would not necessarily sustain everything
- But not one that would preserve the local economy and heritage. To me it's one of those- things that goes without saying, if you did have that inappropriate development you would lose one of those things
- Encourages appropriate development in order to preserve...?
- But then you go back to what's the definition of a healthy community. By saying you want to maintain a health economy then you've got in order for the development that would have to occur would allow both those things and if it didn't then it would be inappropriate.
- I think the direction is stated right there. The way its (?) Inappropriate development could blow this whole thing and if you don't put it in there.
- Could you have appropriate development that would not allow you to maintain a healthy economy?
- If it doesn't maintain the economy it's not appropriate
- This inappropriate part goes without saying
- I thought we were trying to tighten that thing down.
- If you're only focused on inappropriate development there's many other things that could cause you to have-
- How about taking development out and putting in uses
- Change it to a positive statement. It's good to leave that in there because we discussed so many forms of potential inappropriate development

(what if it said to maintain a healthy community that forever... through uses that preserve their local ID and heritage)

- Cloudy. This is more to the point.

- From a objective perspective it would be to encourage development that would sustain...
 - That'll make a lot of people happy especially on the outside.
 - Swapping the word uses for development because when people hear development they think of buildings but the marine sanctuary is a use.
 - Only allow uses that...
 - I don't like the word encourage
 - You could go to only allow those uses that maintain a healthy economy that forever sustains our coastal community in order to preserve their local identity and heritage. Mark, can you live with that?
 - Yeah.
 - It's inherent in healthy economy
- (let's do SMART: is it specific?)
- Yeah
- (measurable?)
- I think it is measurable.
- (Achievement or outcome oriented?)
- It talks about managing uses.
 - Health economy and preservation of local identity and heritage
- (Realistic?)
- Yeah
- (Time limited?)
- Forever
 - In perpetuity worked for them in the example

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 4

Group 4: Group Members

Brian Sheldon	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Garrett Dalan	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Gretchen Glaub	WA Sea Grant Fellow (Small Group Leader)
Jessica Randall	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Katrina Lassiter	WA Dept. of Natural Resources
Laura Springer	U.S. Coast Guard
Mark Horton	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Mike Backman	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council

Group 4: Small group introductions

Question: Can we use this process to collectively help shape the future?

- Disconnect between the information provided at these meetings and the actual product. Information discussed in meetings isn't carrying through or coming

together in the final results. Importance of listening in addition to the high level of effort put forth. Resources are available, but a question of whether or not it happens – time should be as productive as possible.

- Concern that state, federal, and public connection isn't there. Lots of data gathered but unclear what it is being used for. Basis for meeting believed to be centered around energy but technology is still unproven. Coastal systems are dynamic as should the plan developed here – flexible enough to change with time and new developments.
- Multiple references to the NOAA BOEM meeting last week as an example of large amount of data collected but not clear path/process. Lots of guessing, not enough real knowledge amongst the groups, and groups trying to speak for other groups so it wasn't as productive as it could be. Port Angeles workshop was the most beneficial.
 - So many processes – how and at what stage do they fit together?
- Sea Grant + NOAA partnership for mapping tools, data partnership, and authoritative power to make it happen (this workshop). Planning process meant to identify areas that are valuable to the user groups and protect these areas.

Group 4: Revision of Theme Goal

- goal falters halfway through the statement, needs a direction or 'for' statement ie. for Washington Spatial Planning
- Governance interpreted as regulation while it should mean oversight/streamlining
- State has made progress in creating overarching regulations without many layers of regulation
- 'integrated' implies multiple agencies involved, which groups are we trying to bring in?
- Adding words adaptive/streamlined into the goal to
- Develop an integrative decision process which supports proactive coastal marine spatial planning toward an efficient regulatory structure
- Add in the word adaptive
- Add in governance language

Final: Develop an integrated decision making process which supports proactive and adaptive coastal marine spatial planning and an efficient governance structure.

Group 4: Drafting the Objective

Asset: Strong local voice/knowledge, resources & connected, invested local community, ocean dependent users

Threat: overlapping jurisdiction, many processes but unclear outcomes, federal control overruling state, wants or subjectively driven decisions, top-down

Spatial extent: federal, state, local, county

Measure: local ratification

Outcome: ocean dependent users participate in process; consistent, balanced control; CMSP aligned with local needs

When:

Why:

- Concern that each thematic goal could support multiple objectives under this SMART approach, couldn't cover the entire thematic goal with just one objective.
- Need to identify what is most important to us and build an objective off of this. Utilize the topics id'd during the last workshop.
- How does the MRC work that has already happened get integrated into this work?
- Direct channel or are members supposed to bring that knowledge? Are we sure that the public ideas are being included from all of those efforts?
- Governance shouldn't be binding over-complicate an issue. We need to make it clear that local voice should be included and keep it simple.
- Want bottom-up decision making.
- Focus should be on building the capacity (or building it up). People who are ocean dependent should be consistently consulted/involved for local issues
- Voices should be weighed more heavily by those directly linked to the area in question (need industry knowledge)
- Stakeholder/resource users too broad – should be ocean-dependent. Should ensure that their participation is protected in the industry/fishery
- Existing (at a specific time) uses must be protected and new users should be accepted pending evaluation of the impacts.
- Shoreline master programs developed by local communities and adopted at state system but control at the local level. Now we have a coastline but split jurisdiction between federal and state – participation isn't the issue but decisions
- Give local power to local government in the form of county commissioners since they are elected.
- IF the county adopts a plan, if there is federal activity in those waters they must consider those uses (go back to the state plan) and protect the existing uses.
- Data-driven, bottom-up, local control, balanced control, objectively driven – language should be included (difference between wants of the community and science)
- Could see marine spatial planning forming an umbrella over shoreline master plans
- Governance aligned with local-driven needs while complementing address CMSP structure

Summary of main concerns:

- Local importance/power was key among federal/state ruling
- Wanted existing rights to be acknowledged and maintained (not restricted federally)
- Must be formally recognized/ratified by local gov. before going to state level

Alternate statement: A new locally-driven governance structure aligning federal, tribal, and state policy that is formally recognized and strategically incorporated in CMSP giving priority to the protection of existing sustainable uses.

Final statement: A new, locally-driven management structure aligning WA CMSP policy that is formally recognized and strategically incorporated, giving priority to the protection of existing sustainable uses.

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 6

Group 6: Group Members

Crystal Dingler	Grays Harbor County
Doug Kess	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Libby Whiting	WA Sea Grant Fellow (Small Group Leader)
Megan Martin	
Miles Batchelder	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council (sub for Mark Swartout)
Sara Smith	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Tim Stearns	WA Dept. of Commerce - Energy Office

Group 6: Small group introductions

Question: Can we use this process to collectively help shape the future?

- Is attending workshop to represent salmon, interested in maintaining habitat and ecosystems function and to make sure that this isn't forgotten in the environmental planning process. He expressed concern whether the decision-makers were actually going to use these plans and ideas though.
- New to her position at MRC, so is mainly here to learn about MSP and this planning process.
- There is a new language and new set of objectives as a result of MSP. Hopes that this new tool will allow us to appeal to ecological, not just economic, perspectives.
- MSP can create a base knowledge and framework for answering ecological questions, but he questioned whether decision-makers will hold to this framework. Suggested that the tourism industry might have some interest in MSP.
- As the major of Ocean Shores, she is interested in protecting the ecology of this location. Government turnover can be rapid, so she expressed concern that moving forward with environmental plans too slowly could be problematic because

governmental turnover can be rapid. If new administrations take office it could mean that previous environmental plans won't be used.

Group 6: Revision of Theme Goal

- Group suggested that "viability" be changed to "vibrancy" in the theme goal.

Final: Protect and preserve resources access and sustainable resource use for coastal communities to ensure economic vibrancy

Group 6: Drafting the Objective

Assets: Healthy habitats; Natural & sustainable resources; Economies; Infrastructure
Threats: Change in water quality (pollution); conversion; planning; economy stress
Spatial extent: WA Coast & Rivers; Estuaries; Associated Uplands
Measure: Consistent testing & monitoring; Investment (in sustainable economies)
Outcome: proper management of uses/resources
When: Coastal Communities
Why: To ensure economic viability

1. Filled out "Developing SMART objectives" worksheet:

- Asset: Healthy habitats, natural and sustainable resource economies
 - Sustainable is a key element to these assets.
 - List of specific identified assets: Fishing industry, tourism, ber, port, infrastructure, healthy habitats.
 - Some world-class, unique features are present on the WA coast (example: marine preserves). These should be included as assets as well.
 - Should consider that some of these uses can occur at the same e, but some need to be segregated (example: Hiking and logging likely wouldn't occur in the same place at the same e.)
 - Emphasis on the importance of healthy habitats for these assets. Healthy habitats are key and enhancing other resource uses comes after. Healthy habitat is what boosts economy (fishing, tourism, etc.), so increasing habitat health is inherently tied to economic health.
- Threats:
 - Lack of planning:
 - Decisions need to be made collaboratively.
 - Need to assess whether threats are being properly buffered and to prioritize threats.
 - We should look at assets and legal requirements, and then planning around these.
 - Conversion: Ownership changes, conversion of threats
 - Example: If ber can't be sustainably managed then it might turn into subdivisions, which limits habitat availability.
 - Change in water quality/pollution

- Economic stress: Can result in poor decision-making
 - People can be considered assets as well. Coastal communities are currently losing young and bright individuals, which should also be considered as a threat.
- Larger drivers: How larger threats can impact Washington coasts.
 - Identified larger drivers: climate change, coastal industry, ecological disasters, debris
- Other discussed threats that didn't make the list:
 - Appropriate level of protection: Need to make sure we aren't limiting coastal access too much so that it becomes inaccessible to the public
 - mentioned "loving the coast to death"
 - Lack of understanding or division of interests, limited cooperatively between tribal, commercial, and recreational fishermen.
- Spatial extent: Washington coast, rivers, estuaries, and associated uplands.
 - Is there a distinction between private, tribal, public land, etc? These types of lands are treated differently and are managed differently.
 - These are all part of the larger economy, and will be considered when the plan itself is implemented (so they will be considered, but later in the planning process).
- Outcome:
 - Proper management and use of resources
 - Needs to include collaborative decision-making
 - Vibrant, healthy, diversified economy
 - Other discussed outcomes that didn't make the list:
 - Preservation
- Measure:
 - Investment in sustainable economies
 - Balanced economic opportunity: Social, ecological, and economic
 - Community health: Social aspect, how can we educate children, retain young and bright people on the coast.
 - Consistent testing and monitoring
 - What measures need to be taken can vary with economic use, but should be more standard.
 - Example: Water quality may be monitored differently where shellfish are farmed.
 - Overall indicator characteristics: Need to be visible/tangible and focus on tracking economic opportunities
- When:
 - Some disagreement in the group about what constitutes a long-term or short-term frame.
 - Group agreed goal should be long-term, meaning it is maintained into the future.

- Why: Did not discuss this due to e constraints

Proposed objectives:

- Improve inclusive access to sustainable natural resources to create economic opportunities while maintaining and enhancing existing resources for the long-term.
 - Group agreed this objective to not specific enough
 - “Improve access” could mean a lot of different things. Also, somees limiting access may result in economic benefits as well (example: limiting fishing to increase future yields).
- Enhance sustainable natural resources to create economic opportunity while maintaining existing resources and access.
 - Also not specific enough and was too close to the thematic goal.
 - This objective doesn’t encompass the identified assets.
 - Group had difficulty conceptualizing the how natural resources are converted to
 - Grow economy around natural resources, how can our management of natural resources convert to economic value?
- Group drafted objectives independently and then compared:
 - Develop and sustain natural resources through the establishment of healthy habitats and planned infrastructure to create and maintain and vibrant marine economy.
 - Improve healthy natural resource-based economic activity along the Washington coast through collaborative management and investment of uses and access to resources for the long-term.
 - To create a living system that incorporates using our natural resources to build a strong infrastructure and maintain an evolving healthy environment for the long term.
 - Develop the conditions for healthy ecological systems that promote the economic vitality of the coast including tourism, fishing, logging and shipping.

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 7

Group 7: Group Members

Carrie Backman	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Jeffrey Ward	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Kara Cardinal	WA Sea Grant Fellow (Small Group Leader)
Kathryn Graziano	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Key McMurry	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Rich Osborne	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council

Group 7: Small group introductions

Question: Can we use this process to collectively help shape the future?

- Yes.
- How will this process feed into a vision for the future?
- It's being vetted by agencies, state government and stakeholders.
- I agree, it's important because it is involving stakeholders – hopefully all the meetings don't go to the wayside (that is a main concern). Will it all be worth it, will it be listened to?
- In rural areas, the people may have a different opinion than the government, there is a history of people's input not being weighed. It gets frustrating.
- Agree – People will stop coming to meetings if their time and input isn't valued.
- The process forces you to articulate what you care about, and get it all on the table, the process gets all interests to the table, gives a formal way to explain what you care about. Also, you need a current baseline to make a plan for the future. We need to know how we're changing things. This brings better information to establish the context of what change we're making.
- This focus gives opportunity to fill data gaps on the outer coast. It utilizes data that has been collected and not used.
- It makes use of information that has been collected.
- So often, information is collected and never used. This is a chance to actually use that data.
- Despite people coming from different sectors, a lot of similar perspectives are coming out, people are on the same page.
- This process has been going on for 2 years, with a similar group of people, doing similar processes. So we all worked together. So, it's not so surprising that we're on the same page after all that.
- Most of us have worked together (Coastal Communities Action Program group – organization, southern), this was going on before MRCs, WICMAC. Starting in 2008, there was a yearlong process of setting goals and objectives for the coastal MRCs. The same goals and objectives that were stated back then are being repeated today.
- This is a good idea, but there are 2 things that have to happen. 1) State agencies have to keep it going, 2) people in the room have to stay engaged. Without both, there will be no process. It's hard to keep people engaged if they make statements/ideas that aren't valued and their input isn't used.
- I hate to see it as fighting the government, we should be working together.
- Don't invite people into a process if you don't want them to be a part of it.
- Input needs to be respected.
- From experience, I've learned that you still have to value and include the comments of all people, even with odd ideas.

Group 7: Drafting the Objective

Asset: Ecosystems (marine & estuarine), Baseline, Diversity, Habitats

Threats: Food web stability, Climate Change, Human/unnatural, Natural, Water quality, Invasives, Data Gaps, Funding

Spatial extent: Washington Coast, Shorelines, Estuaries, Nearshore, Offshore

Measure: Trends in biodiversity & ecosystem services, trends in water quality

Outcomes:

- 1) Documentation of living & nonliving resources (data gaps)
- 2) Determine ecosystem trends and ecosystem services
- 3) Develop and prioritize management strategies to improve resiliency.

When:

- 1) Short term (1-2 yrs)
- 2) Mid-term (3-10 yrs)
- 3) Forever.

Why: We don't know what we don't know; Proactive vs. reactive; Functioning ecosystem; Ecosystems that support our economies/communities

- If everyone's alright with the general goal, we'll go into objectives.
- When we refer to the marine ecosystem, does that also refer to coastal communities?
- For this one, I'd say it's focused on ecosystem
- I'd like to switch environmental change and resiliency (position in the sentence), but are we allowed? It seems to me that resilience is intact, growing, operating and environmental change is something that the ecosystem has to be resilient to.
- That is absolutely something we could do
- I don't like the word 'maintain' because what is the state of what we're maintaining, are we maintaining bad water quality?
- We don't have to use that word.
- On the green paper ('Selecting MSP Objectives'), we can choose the objectives we like and build off of them.
- Under number 1, 'living marine resources are sustained in current state' - are we ok with the current state? I think it can be improved upon/enhanced/restored.
- 'Sustained at current levels'...in some cases that's great, in other cases I don't think our current levels are good.
- Maybe a different objective would be a better fit
- A different part is the actionable part. Like, shellfish might be threatened by acidification, there's nothing anyone in this room can do about it. Are there things we can do that are actionable, like for instance sea grasses take up CO2 so if you were maintaining seagrass you could be helping the oyster industry. There are things that will derail the process that have nothing to do with whatever our group does, or governance even, doesn't make any difference.
- Yea, it's outside our ability.
- We have to focus on things that are achievable.
- Yea that makes sense.
- So if we go down the list (green paper) and choose some that work best... I like the 3rd one and the last one. Cara, how we did it at the NOAA workshop was we went

through all of them and chose which ones we definitely didn't want, then we came to consensus on ones we can use and tweaked it.

- I like number 3, I like number 2 ok. It's overlapping but it works. The last one, "Ecological processes essential to habitat existence protected," is a funny sentence structure.
- But I like what it was trying to get at, I don't like the wording (on that last one).
- I'm trying to think which one would work the best with long term preservation, which is sort of resiliency. Resilient systems are multifaceted, so it's similar.
- The third one is kind of similar to the last one (except the weird wording), we need to create a system that is multifaceted enough or that it can handle stressors better than others.
- I like the word stressors.
- Why are we... these seem like they are objectives, why are we creating new ones?
- These are the themes that came out of the last workshop, we want an objective that encompasses all of these things that people deemed important.
- If you look at number 3, within it ...it has very specific things that you could set objectives on. It talks about the spatial zone, talks about communities and habitats separately (which is important), Multi-species communities. Then it says 'adequately represented and protected,' which means you have to study them enough to know what is already there (determining a baseline first). 'Protected ' is the next step, it would be a whole nother step of objectives.
- Throughout this process 'protect and preserve' are used together all the time.
- 'Protect' is a loaded word.
- If you don't have a baseline, you can't know how you're doing or where you're headed.
- At this early stage, we have to build the baseline.
- I would say our asset is our ecosystems, both marine and estuary, but that gets into habitats and species, ya know so...
- What about diversity?
- Yea, that's important. Knowing what we have (baseline) can be an asset and can also be something that we need to do.
- We also talked about ecological processes.
- Do we agree that number 3 is the closest to our sub theme?
- All - yea sounds good. Then we can tweak it.
- I don't know if I like the word 'adequately' and don't think 'protect' is the best word there. But number 3 gets towards generally what we want.

Assets

- Let's to through this, keep that in mind, and see if we can reword it to reflect number 3. So, the assets are: Ecosystems, diversity....
- Yea, I don't think the assets are much more complex than 'diverse ecosystems.'
- And ecosystems refers to habitat and species.
- So we can keep it at that.

Threats

- So let's do threats. A threat would be a non-diverse ecosystem.
- Unrestrained coastal development, or declining water quality. Or invasive species. There are a lot of things.
- Things that could really change our ecosystem are sea level change and tsunami. So those threats are... It's funny to lump those together. One is slow and ongoing, while a tsunami is a sudden effect. It would have a much more rapid, sudden effect than sea level rise.
- Here's an example from Clallam County – We've had briefings on ocean acidification, impacts on shellfish. We are thinking about promoting restoration of Olympia oysters because there is evidence that they are tolerant to ocean acidification. So, if the asset is for example shellfish beds, and the threat is ocean acidification, the action/objective could be to increase the establishment of Olympia oysters by 2014. So that's an example of how we're thinking about that issue. You can't stop it, it's gonna happen, but we're finding ways to mitigate it.
- I see threats being natural, manmade, especially oil spills are a huge threat to our diverse ecosystems.
- Coastal zone threats could be climate change (sea level rise, ocean acidification, increased storm events,) direct human impacts (more short term) development, shoreline armoring, all that stuff.
- Another human threat is runoff, non point source pollution.
- Should we lump that under water quality?
- I've been making a little list that is not quite as specific. Starting with the idea that we don't want a non-diverse ecosystem. So water quality is a threat, food web stability (i.e., if you take out something critical in the salmon food web, all things fall apart. It could happen from any stressor)
- Ocean acidification will affect the food web
- Expansion of hypoxic areas, ocean acidification, loss of coastal habitat (tsunami, flooding, oil spill, SLR). Those are a few threats I came up with.
- Invasive species is a threat but it's pretty specific.
- It's not too specific. They do affect a lot of other things.
- Once we get everything down, we need to find a way to encompass it all – we don't want to make the objective too clunky.
- Most of us know, if you tug on one line of the food web, you tug on the whole web.
- Speaking of spatial extent... We pretty much established that it's the WA coast and estuaries. That part is pretty easy.
- How far out?
- Last time we went to 4000 fathoms, except for some exceptions (based on scientific data). Dale has asked a lot of the fishermen, most are fishing outside of the 4000 fathom line. So maybe we are already limiting ourselves. So I would just say our WA marine and estuary coastal areas.
- Another question is how far up?
- It's tidally influenced up to the river bridge, but the saltwater influence stops well before. But it's definitely well-defined.

Outcomes

- Outcomes.... What we want it to look like. We don't like the word 'maintain.'
- I used the word flora and fauna the other day and someone didn't know what it was.
- How about adequate documentation of marine resources?
- It can be a database of information, or it can be a database of information that is informed with a map, GIS layers, you gotta have more than just information.
- Everything will be mapped with GIS.
- One other threat can be data gaps, we know those exist and not knowing what they are could present a real threat.
- We could miss out on a key ecological threat. What do we want for our assets, we just want documentation? What else do we want?
- One of the first things we need to do is assess what's there, then fill data gaps.
- So, in this objective we document and assess the gaps of our marine and estuarine ecosystems, but then what do we ultimately want? If this is a permanent objective... we need a more long term view.
- We need management positions/actions based on a good quality data base (information).
- It goes back to 'protect and preserve the marine and estuarine ecosystems.' That would be the huge outcome.
- We don't know what the trajectories are here yet. We don't know if we have a good system, currently.
- Yea, we need to look at trends.
- We need to develop a sense of whether the balanced ecosystem is heading the wrong way, and becoming destabilized.
- I agree, and then the third step (after establishing a baseline & data gaps, determining trends) is managing the system to reverse that negative change.
- Well, it's figuring out if it's something you can change or not. If you're losing finfish, they're overharvesting the fish for example, or they don't have enough to eat. Is that something you can change?
- Is that like determining current ecosystem health? That way we know which way it's going.
- In the food web thing, ocean acidification ... WA has a good start on the effects that are coming from ocean acidification. How we stop that, I don't know in the outcome, but one outcome is the realization of how ocean acidification is gonna really affect our whole coastal resources, ecosystem, everything. And I don't know how to get that into the outcome or how to measure it though, because it's a huge topic.
- Instead of implement, can we say prioritize? Because there is a finite amount of money, so that's more practical.

Measures

- Measuring resiliency is almost the same as measuring health.
- That's probably same as with the NW Straights Commission – there has been a lot of work on ecosystem services. They did an economic study on Puget sound in 2011 to see what the value of the ecosystem was with regards to ecosystem services (it does stuff that you don't have to pay for). I want to focus on marine resources, what are

the things that are at risk by ocean acidification, what is the value that they represent now, and what will we lose. Not only do we lose economic value, but we lose the value of ecosystem services. If you get the economic part, that's how you get attention.

- Ecosystem services is a term that came up in other workshops. It's a huge thing.
- Ten years ago I would've run the other way when I heard the word ecosystem services. Economists were trying to put money value on everything. It's better now, it gives you a sense of what you have available.
- Is that something we want as an asset, or is it reflected in the other terms?
- I think it's reflected.
- It fits right into the beginning, to determine ecosystem services we need to know the baseline.
- So, measures: balanced ecosystems, managing systems to reverse trends...
- ...Filling gaps.
- All these water quality measures, that's easy as an indicator of all kinds of things.
- If you can measure it, and mark the change, that makes it easy.
- Another measure might be the geomorphology, biodiversity, they have them all lumped together which makes sense.
- I think those are specific measures that may be indicators, but we want something a little more overarching that encompasses it all.
- Water quality and biodiversity are the 2 big categories. I think they cover it all.
- All – agree.
- Biodiversity works for genetics and for ecology, it's good.
- Cara, it think you said not to get too specific but global climate change and warming is a threat.
- We talked about human and natural threats, there is a blurred line.
- So I think someone said nonpoint source pollution. It's short term compared to CO2.
- ...And it ties into water quality.
- All of the threats can occur naturally or with human impacts.

When

- So when – Is our asset looking at baseline and filling data gaps (short term) and long term is protect and preserve?
- It seems to make a lot of sense that the first one is earliest. So first is determine gaps, second to determine ecosystem health, services, and trends, third is develop management strategies to maintain resilience.
- I get nervous with these terms, 'short term' with no numbers, because it can be interpreted differently.
- We are kinda going through the same process in another meeting, we said 'What can we do in the next three years?'
- We could craft it in stages, like Rich said. Fill gaps, watch trends...
- Because we don't know what we don't know. You'd be surprised how many people go straight to the action without knowing the baseline

- We as a society are continually reactive instead of proactive, that was a big thing we talked about at my other meeting, the importance of being proactive. We as humans don't have very good forethought.
- What is the connection between the resources and human uses - we want to protect and preserve for future generations, or for economic stability...?
- Well that's our theme. (Ensure that our marine ecosystem is preserved for future generations). But I want to use 'estuary.'
- But that's a part of the ecosystem.
- Ok, so we want to preserve for.... economic use for the communities?
- I think we can use the word future generations, in perpetuity.
- I think it's pretty important to get actionable things, things that are related to MSP, collecting and visualizing information.
- We could put water quality and biodiversity with examples (of measures of change) underneath.
- At a minimum we should be meeting state standards.
- So look at the economic example, there is an assumption that they know the current fleet size. In this case we don't know. (We need a baseline measure)
- So, trends in water quality measures is one of them. Then we are open to any kind of physical measurement.
- But in terms of ecosystems and biodiversity....
- Maybe you could say ecosystem services.
- Consensus: Trends in biodiversity & ecosystem services.
- I have a book with a list of key words to use.
- Yea that would be really helpful. I could look when we craft the final sentences afterwards. So, is our 'when' three-pronged as well?
- '#1' (documentation of resources) is short term - immediately? Maybe between 1 to 2 years. '#2' (determine trends) is gonna be awhile.
- It could be 5 to 10 years. Or 2 to 10. It takes at least 2 years to find a trend. Well let's say 3. Until forever.... Like adaptive management.

Why

- So, recap: we don't know what we don't know. Proactive vs. reactive.
- We all need a functioning ecosystem.
- That ties into the community, social economic, and environmental part, if we don't have a functioning ecosystem our economy is down the drain and our future is down the drain.
- But, whose economy are we supporting? It might not be the local communities - others could benefit from the resource.
- But that ties into spatial extent, it doesn't extend beyond that (WA coast).

Other Comments

- Going back to number three (on the green paper) -
- "to ensure that?"
- I like 'ensure'

- “To ensure that .. Do we want to sub in our own assets that we came up with?
- “species” seems specious here. It’s redundant. Well whatever.
- “To ensure that ecosystems....”
- Can we change the word ‘resident ecosystems’ to ‘marine or coastal ecosystems’?
- “To ensure that coastal ecosystems...” “Do we like the word ‘communities?’
- I don’t like the word “adequately.”
- So take it out “...to ensure they are healthy and diverse.”
- We don’t need gene pools and species both.
- Well that’s for ESA listings. How about ‘biodiversity’?
- Are we incorporating everything we brainstormed? “To ensure that coastal ecosystems, communities, habitats, species and gene pools are healthy and diverse.”
- Something about the objective has to say something about the collection of information...
-or end with ‘resilient enough to support ecosystem services in the future.’
- Something about supporting the development and prioritizing management strategies?
- “To ensure that coastal ecosystems, communities, habitats, species and gene pools are resilient into the future. “Does it incorporate everything? Spatial extent is coastal. Do we need to say WA?
- We could say WA coastal.
- Are our threats incorporated? We don’t talk about data gaps... is that necessary?
- We could bring back “adequately represented and protected.” I don’t know, I think it’s ok to just say resilient.
- I still think ‘species’ and ‘gene pool’ is resilient.
- Well we could use biodiversity.
- Make sure we don’t use words that people don’t understand. ‘Gene pool’ works in this room but might not translate (to a broader audience).
- ‘Species, and genetic diversity...’ I see why they have both gene pool and species – it’s a hierarchy of nesting. The population level is below the species level, so that’s why gene pool is put in there.
- Each of those pieces, you can measure or express some kind of comment of what they are.
- Is it specific (yes), measurable (yes) outcome oriented (yes, but our objective doesn’t reflect the phases that we talked about).
- We could add steps at the end of the objective.
- “...By documenting living and on living resources, determining trends and ecosystems services, and developing and prioritizing management strategies to improve resiliency.”
- I think that makes it more outcome-based, and more specific, more guided, more action –oriented (Agreement).
- OK, so we determined that if you go from more general to more specific, gene pool is still important.
- “..... are resilient into the future by documenting existing conditions, trends, and developing and prioritizing adaptive management strategies.”

- Develop data and trends TO support management actions. Forget about developing management, just prioritize.
- One thing I really like about this system, I really like working in a small group together to come up with a theme. Our table worked great together.
- Yea I had a great time.
- Having 3 or 4 people works well together.

Small Group Discussion Notes: Group 8

Group 8: Group Members

Constance Sullivan	WA Sea Grant Fellow (Small Group Leader)
George Galasso	NOAA-Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
George Hart	U.S. Navy
Joshua Cummings	UW/WA Sea Grant (Small Group Notetaker)
Mike Nordin	WA Coast Marine Advisory Council
Tami Pokorny	Jefferson County

Group 8: Small group introductions

Question: Can we use this process to collectively help shape the future?

- Depends on outcome. Glaring comment at previous meetings in local input, but doesn't seem to be working. Must be more bottom-up approach. I'm pretty engaged.
- I represent naval region northwest. I'm a biologist by profession. I sit on Olympic coast NMR council with George Selaso. We have to be compatible in with everything in the ocean. I have to be able to let fleet know where objects are at (latitide and longitude). It must be easy to communicate and collaborate with pacific fleet to let fleet know where objects are at. Currently doing marine mammal surveys in Alaska. Get ideas if whales are actually there. Biggest this for us is compatibility. I agree with George that the amount of hoops you have to jump through will dictate success. When there are different jurisdictions with different rules, how is MSP going to benefit if it's so generic?
- I am employed by Environmental Health Jefferson County. I'm an alternate for Ron Fleck. As far is outreach goes, I write a newsletter. We need to have resource outreach to groups. How will MSP affect them? They need to hear this a lot from many directions. This will help plan be respected.
- I have worked for NOAA since 1982. I am always interested in natural resource management. Thought a lot about these things. If you want cooperation there needs to be give and take. In a non-regulatory situation for success, what is value of system? We formed an additional advisory council to further coordinate. Not regulatory, more coordination. I just don't know where this ignoring to go. Struggle with top down versus bottom up. For effective change, it's about peoples' behavior

and industry. People must be interested and collaborated. But don't know what those are. Lots of coordination bodies, but who's coordinating them, and that's what I'm going to do. I think MSP will have value, but whether it's successful is unknown.

Group 8: Drafting the Objective

Assets: WA Coast; Marine Ecosystems; Goods & Services; Function

Threats: Climate Change; Ocean Acidification; Changing Ocean Conditions

Spatial extent: WA Coast

Measure: Maintain & approve conditions where appropriate; measurable indicators

Outcome: Goods & Services; Sustainability; Function of Ecosystems; Productivity

When: Long-term; In perpetuity

Why: Cultural; Healthy economically rewarding ecosystems

- We are group that creates the ecological objectives. Our theme is ecological wealth environmental change and resiliency. That's the theme, and our goal is to ensure our marine ecosystem is preserved for generations. We have worksheets to remind us how to create an objective.
- If we want specific I would think marine ecosystem is broad and we would want to be more specific
- it is pretty big goal
- No matter what objective is, it should be used as tool
- you would have indicators, but overarching goal
- we have condition report at the sanctuary and we have do these report cards on ecosystem health every 5 years or so.
- I'm at PPP so we do that to, but we have an overreaching goal too. (says goal). It is an overreaching goal for our objectives.
- How many objectives are we creating?
- 1
- we have different types? (Conservation, economic, cultural, etc) are we picking something new?
- yes. These are types of objectives
- It says we have to pick one. Pick one and modify to fit
- yes pick one, but based off of these (handouts)
- We are talking about marine ecosystem to become more specific? I guess we need a direction
- We can have one goal and many objectives under that goal.
- like you said, objective doesn't have to cover all things, just some of them
- I do too
- If our goal is to preserve mar ecosystem for future generations, we have to maintain ecosystem goods and services and restore them in order to achieve for future generation?
- Should we start writing at bottom of page?
- Is an objective pretty vague?

- It would depend on the asset.
- If overarching theme is objective, how do we break that up? I hate to write one objective not to have it be in conflict with another.
- At the Puget Sound Partnership we have an overarching objective and it gets broken down more specifically after objective. A trend towards recovery is an example of an objective. Do you want to maintain ecosystem as now or see it improved? Then you can get specific later on.
- I think we're generalizing too much.
- do you all have this inn notebook? It's helpful to start to identify assets/
- Question? We have a goal and want to define objectives. One objective? Or series of objectives/
- My understanding: you want to write one objective for each theme. Later in process you can do ore specificity. It will be helpful when you do gallery walk.. that's why you should focus on the poster.
- And we have only 1 hour?
- We can have different spatial extent and pick and choose.
- Asset: WA coastal marine ecosystems would be an asset. That's how broad it is. Spatial extent is entire WA coast. Maintain and improve for outcome. I guess that's a measurement. You see where I'm going with this? This is all too broad. So I'm a little bit confused.
- It is pretty big.
- How do you look at MRC objectives down the coast? A lot of thought went into these and they took a lot of time.
- The example you gave (Willapa Bay) is specific. But on state level cannot be so specific.
- Unless you have multiple objectives.
- Is that an option for us?
- No the state wants one. It's a process not complete in one hour. Try filling out poster.
- Trying to wrap brain around it
- Not an easy thing. These worksheets help us figure out how these go to your concerns.
- Look at the goal. Is there something about the goal that needs change? To start, is the asset the WA ecosystem?
- I think asset is functioning marine ecosystem.
- Maintain current or improve?
- I'm just thinking about where we are right now. One way we can do that is to maintain or restore. If you look at fisheries 30 years ago, they were healthier.
- Right now we are looking.
- How about ecosystem goods and services?
- How about ecosystem function?
- I thought goods and services to determine wealth.
- Mike had that as outcome.
- Maintain ecosystem goods and services

- We could focus on sustainability of goods and services.
- A sustainable healthy ecosystem.
- Just as example at sanctuary we have a (cut off)
- I think putting in “maintain and improve” is appropriate.
- Yeah measure right?
- Only one is ok for now.
- One threat for that, climate change.
- Yeah, climate change is definitely a threat, as well as ocean acidification.
- I deal with that.
- Ocean acidification is important too.
- We did on several scenarios for ocean acidifications in several time periods.
- Do we want overfishing? Biodiversity?
- Climate Change and Associated Impacts
- That, and invasive species, other issues, etc.
- About climate change, fishing will be impacted because fish runs will change.
- That and hypoxia.
- That’s the word I was thinking of. Hypoxia.
- You can’t say everything is contributed to climate change, but a lot of issues are connected to it.
- That is where models come in. Spatially: the WA coast. I think our time scale is the long term.
- yeah because “future generations” is in the goal.
- Ongoing though. Can we put products under outcome?
- Here are some examples on the paper
- I have to be so generic because I cover huge area. Took me a while to get used to that because I worked in a box.
- A lot of oil spill stuff as far as threats.
- I do oil spill prevention.
- Sea level rise is another threat.
- It could be.
- I added these threats to our poster.
- We discuss feasibility.
- I think measuring an improvement mechanism is important.
- We want a healthy ecologically... to ensure a resilient healthy marine ecosystem.
- Talk about goods and services here (writing on the poster).
- How about noting that “a healthy economy is dependent on maintaining healthy marine ecosystems”
- I like that.
- Our objective for the hour is to answer these boxes on the poster?
- And also we need to make a sentence.
- When you have something this broad, we may have trouble with allocations of funding. Our objectives may be to make a car, but why you doing that? What’s involved in the process?

- We did that too (at NOAA for Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary). We had goals, objectives and strategies.
- Are we supposed to do develop strategies here?
- Is a workshop for developing strategies later??
- But who's invited to that workshop? Not me.
- It's very limited who was invited.
- You get more and more specific as you implement objectives.
- Ocean Policy Institute out of Washington DC was meant to give guidance to MSP and MSP was supposed to give guidance to marine advisory council and you give recommendations like WA Department of Ecology, DFW and DNR.
- Problem is you can't do that unless there is a change in authority or you give people resources to participate.
- I couldn't agree more.
- Local residents should have input. I think that there is a role for state, federal and local governments, but what locals want is to help define what filters are. Locals need to be more involved in the process.
- Josh is taking notes to get this input.
- A lot of this is in place, but needs to be better.
- I think feedback valuable,. To get back to the poster, do you want to pencil something in for the objective? Threats outcome and measure.
- We need a verb for objective. Currently we have no action there.
- Maintain or improve?
- Maintain and improve ecosystems goods and functions in loo of these threats.
- We need something in there that we understand whats happening. Where's the monitoring? In order to understand what's happening, we need to do monitoring to see what the problem is. You need resources and to have a system to measure what you're doing.
- Monitoring can establish a baseline.
- Maybe that should be an outcome. To have measurable indicators.
- That would be nice (to have indicators).
- Even if you had all the money in the world it would be hard.
- We have the issue with the Puget Sound Partnership now since we have limited money.
- Maybe we can start with measurable indicators for the outcome.
- I'm not good at throwing everything together, but others are.
- You want to combine everything on the poster into an objective
- Sure. What did you write down?
- WA coast goods and services. Do we want to say ecosystem goods and services or ecosystem functions?
- Conditions?
- To ensure sustainable...
- To ensure resilient and healthy.. to ensure a healthy WA coast.
- for the long term

- Yeah. Document monitor and respond to changes in marine ecosystems functions, goods and services to ensure a healthy and resilient Washington coast for the long term.
- It's hooked up to the internet right now. They are putting our objective there.
- and facebook haha

On May 3rd, 2013, representatives from local government, state and federal agencies, coastal treaty tribes and the Washington Coast Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) convened at the Rotary Log Pavilion in Aberdeen, WA for a third marine spatial planning workshop in a series of three designed to establish the goal, objectives and spatial boundary for the Washington Coast Marine Spatial Plan (WCMSP). At the workshop, attendees reviewed and finalized the draft WCMSP objectives and discussed the appropriate plan boundary needed to ensure that proposed federal actions in the coastal area will be required to meet the enforceable policies of Washington's coastal management program.

The workshop was jointly facilitated by Bridget Trosin and Steve Harbell from Washington Sea Grant. Brian Lynn from Washington's Department of Ecology and Kris Wall from NOAA's Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management presented information on Washington's Coastal Zone Management Program and NOAA's federal consistency review determination process. Bridget Trosin moderated a full group discussion, revision and finalization of the draft plan objectives. Kris Wall facilitated a question and answer session with workshop attendees on NOAA's criteria for approving the geographic location descriptions (GLDs) of the WCMSP.

The following five long-term objectives were approved for public review and comment:

- **Objective 1:** Protect and encourage healthy existing natural resource-based economic activity on the Washington Coast
- **Objective 2:** Sustain diverse traditional uses to ensure continuity of WA's coastal identity, culture, and high quality of life.
- **Objective 3:** Foster healthy and resilient marine ecosystem functions, biodiversity and habitats.
- **Objective 4:** Develop a locally-supported and collaborative process for aligning management decisions.
- **Objective 5:** Enhance sustainable economic opportunities to achieve a resilient economy and improved quality of life.

Regarding the WCMSP boundary, there was general consensus by workshop attendees that the State should work to establish the maximum possible spatial extent for federal consistency review for which there is sufficient data available to meet NOAA's reasonably foreseeable effects requirement. However, the group also agreed that a proposed WCMSP boundary line of both 400 and 700 fathoms could be opened up for public review and comment as long as a record of the workshop boundary discussion also be made available for public review.

Next in the WCMSP planning process will be a series of consultations with Washington Coast tribes to take place in May and June of 2013. State agencies will also reach out to federal partners to gain feedback on the WCMSP boundary and to learn more about the current and future federal actions likely to occur in Washington's coastal area. A public comment period for the draft MSP goal, objectives and boundary selection will also be initiated and workshop attendees were encouraged to engage their constituents and local communities in the public comment process.

Marine spatial planning is a public process to analyze and plan uses of the marine environment and ocean-related human activities to achieve agreed-on ecological, economic and social objectives. The MSP planning workshop series was designed to support the coordinated effort currently underway to solve Washington Coast's shared resource management challenges. The workshop series outcomes—a clear draft goal, draft plan objectives and the proposed spatial plan boundaries—will now be used to engage the broader public in Washington's Marine Spatial Plan development.

Washington Marine Spatial Planning Workshop Discussion Notes

Aberdeen, WA – Rotary Log Pavilion

May 3, 2013

Table of Contents

1. Workshop Agenda – pg 1
2. Small Group Discussion: Desired Outcomes for the Workshop – pg 1
3. Large Group Discussion: Draft Objectives – pg 2
4. Large Group Discussion: MSP Boundary – pg 7

Workshop Agenda

9:00: Introduction by Steve Harbell, Washington Sea Grant
9:15: Small group discussion on desired outcomes for the today
9:30: Review of workshop 1 and 2 outcomes by Bridget Trosin, Washington Sea Grant
11:00: Overview of Washington's Coastal Zone Management Program by Brian Lynn, DOE
11:25: Federal consistency considerations for boundary development by Kris Wall, NOAA
11:55: Presentation of 400 fathom boundary map by Michelle Culver, WDFW
12:05: Lunch break
12:25: Large group discussion on MSP boundary
1:05 End of workshop

Small Group Discussion: Desired Outcomes for the Workshop

Question: What do you hope to accomplish today?

- To gain information useful to the design of our data portal
- To make sure everyone in this room is on the same page and that we are not duplicating our research efforts and projects
- To prepare objectives that will help us assess new projects being presented
- To develop information in a way that is useful for guiding future uses of the coastal area
- To be able to use this work to guide future funding allocations
- To figure out how the MSP will tie into current regulations
- To figure out where we will be at the end of this process
- To keep moving the planning process forward
- To use the expertise in the room and input gathered to start drilling down into specific plan actions
- To learn more about what we are up against in the boundary-setting process
- To set a good boundary
- To push the boundary as far out as the state can negotiate
- To see the draft objectives

- To come to consensus around the objectives and boundary
- To talk about information that has been missing from the process so far
- To make sure draft objectives are representative of the group's thinking
- To use our time well
- To avoid getting caught up arguments over specific words with the entire group
- To learn more about when the plan might actually get adopted
- To learn more about where we go from here with the boundary discussion
- To learn more about boundary benefits and responsibilities for local governments
- To come to consensus on a realistic boundary everyone can live with
- To wrap this stage of the planning process up so we can move on to the next one
- To see how the bottom-up stakeholder process/requests of the MRCs translate to the interactions between the State and Federal government
- To see how the desired benefit of cross-sector/cross-jurisdiction alignment and consistency will balance with our ability to be responsible for the area we select
- To advocate for more public education about the MSP issues
- To establish the MSP boundaries
- To identify an upland boundary for the plan as well
- To identify how new uses will fit into the MSP (including new upland uses)
- To see the final products from the last two workshops
- To get clarity on how the objectives will be applied
- To make sure everyone was aware of how and where these objectives will steer use and planning decisions
- To clarify information needs (GIS, maps, data, etc) necessary for applying these objectives
- To learn how the draft goals and objectives will guide the project as planning becomes more specific
- To revisit the boundary discussion from workshop 1
- To follow the State's MSP process closely and use this information to inform coastal governance in areas with federal jurisdiction

Large Group Discussion: Draft Objectives

Long-Term Objectives Approved for Public Review:

- Protect and encourage healthy existing natural resource-based economic activity on the Washington Coast.
- Sustain diverse traditional uses to ensure continuity of WA's coastal identity, culture, and high quality of life.
- Foster healthy and resilient marine ecosystem functions, biodiversity and habitats.
- Develop a locally-supported and collaborative process for aligning management decisions.
- Enhance sustainable economic opportunities to achieve a resilient economy and improved quality of life.

After the second MSP workshop, the workshop planning team further revised the small group objectives to incorporate additional written feedback and comments received during the open review period. These revisions were presented to attendees of MSP workshop three for comment. Workshop three comments related to specific objectives follow:

- **(Protect and) encourage healthy (existing) natural resource-based economic (and recreational) activity on the WA coast for the long term.**
 - There needs to be an objective that addresses the need to “protect and preserve existing uses”
 - This idea is not sufficiently covered by other objectives. It is the language that people respond to politically at the MRC outreach meetings. If it is used, you are more likely to get interest in the marine spatial plan because more will believe it has been developed to serve the needs of the public.
 - It is really helpful to focus on the “kernels” of each objective as we move forward: 1. encourage resource based activity, 2. sustain diverse traditional uses, 3. ensure ecosystem function, 4. locally-supported processes, 5. enhanced economic opportunities. But there is no kernel in there that addresses the idea of “protect and preserve”. Should this be a 6th kernel?
 - More clarity is needed around the idea of “existing” uses
 - “Existing” could be used as a trump card if we don’t define what we mean. What exists now might not be what exists when this plan is actually printed.
 - The language should be “protect and preserve existing *sustainable* uses”. In every aspect of MSP I’ve been involved in, the one consistent thing is protecting and preserving existing, sustainable uses. The lack of clarification in the original legislation causes confusion.
 - “Existing uses” suggests new uses will not replace them. What do we do if new uses are shown to be beneficial over existing uses?
 - With “sustainable” needs to be something that also implies “beneficial”. Just because something is there already doesn’t alone give it priority. We don’t want to be subsidizing something that is burdensome, in decline or economically weak. We want uses to be successful now and into the future.
 - How will existing and new users demonstrate their relative value?
 - Existing users should not have to prove anything. The burden of proof should be on the new users. The new use should prove it’s not hurting the existing use.
 - There should be some way for decision-makers to determine if proposed new uses negatively impact existing uses. Simply saying “I’m here, I will be negatively impacted” isn’t sufficient. If a fisherman wants to open up new fishing areas and a surfer

says no way because it impacts their existing use, how does the fisherman disprove that?

- The language should be “protect and preserve ecosystem services”
 - Does this include the ability to expand or grow existing uses (example: shellfish industry defined geographically) ? Add “enhance” or “grow”.
 - This concept can be built into the economic objective but recreational use should also be specified because many do not view it use as a priority
 - Isn’t recreational just another economic activity? If you add recreational why not commercial?
 - Some recreation is not economic in nature, but access is still required. Most people already relate “commercial” to economic activity but we also need to preserve existing sustainable uses that are not economically-driven.
 - Proposed objective: “Preserve and protect healthy existing natural resource-based economic and recreational activity”
 - Does the word “encourage” imply that decision-makers and administrators should spend money on an activity? That could be a problem and counterproductive.
 - Is “foster” a word that avoids this issue?
 - The theme goal for the objective is “Protect and preserve resource access and sustainable resource use for coastal communities to ensure economic viability”. This captures many of the concerns that have been expressed. Does it make sense to use theme goal as the objective instead?
 - **Final revised objective:** “Preserve and protect healthy existing natural resource-based economic and recreational activity”
- **Sustain diverse traditional uses to ensure continuity of WA’s coastal identity, culture, and high quality of life for the long term.**
 - Could we elaborate on what “coastal identity”, “culture” and “high quality of life” mean? Is this access? A place to raise a family? Economic activity? Will I know it when I see it?
 - It is all of these things and more and should be up to the different communities involved to define for themselves. The small group that crafted the original objective left it broad intentionally for that reason.
 - **Maintain (Foster) healthy and resilient marine ecosystem functions, biodiversity and habitats for the long term.**
 - The word maintain is a problem
 - We want to do more than to maintain
 - At the very least, it needs a qualifying word: “maintain healthy” or “maintain a high level”
 - Maintain, increase and decrease are things that can be measured. Other words like “ensure” are harder to measure.

- “healthy and resilient” is an end product, it needs a process word. Some are there to be maintained but others are not
 - “Maintain and strengthen”
 - You can’t do both
 - We want to maintain the highest capabilities we have in these areas
 - What about the word “encourage”?
 - Does the word “encourage” imply that decision-makers should spend money on this activity? That could be a problem.
 - “Encourage” doesn’t have a measurable direction
 - Is “foster” a word that avoids these concerns?
 - **Final revised objective:** “Foster healthy and resilient marine ecosystem functions, biodiversity and habitats for the long term”
- **Develop a locally supported and collaborative process for aligning management decisions.**
 - The challenge of the State will be aligning future Federal activities with the vision we are creating.
 - It is unrealistic to hope for anything other than cooperative management with the Federal government. The State might not be right all the time. We do want locally-supported management but it also needs to be federally consistent.
- **Enhance sustainable economic opportunities to achieve a resilient economy and improved quality of life for the long term.**
 - This objective seems very similar to the first objective because they’re both about economic sustainability. Could these be combined into one objective.

General comments related to the objectives and planning process:

- It was common for every objective to be used for the long term so the planning team pulled this phrase out and expressed as an overall goal quality, allowing the objectives themselves to be more concise.
- I’m happy we got rid of the word “forever.”
- We’ve lost action words and many of the “how” and “why” answers are no longer in the revised objectives
- I didn’t feel it was well communicated that the comments provided would be used to revise the objectives unilaterally. We lost important detail with the planning team revisions. Part of our jobs are to go back to constituents and say this is what we did. Now it seems that the words have been changed back to what they were on day one.
 - **RESPONSE:** If you see something that has been lost, workshop 3 is an opportunity to bring something back. Also, remember that each objective will eventually be accompanied by more specific actions. The rich discussion that has taken place around each objective will inform the development of plan actions. Conversation details have been documented and will be referenced in next steps.

Workshop notes have been compiled to document these conversations and will be available to the public and sent out to workshop attendees

- These all sound the same. The language in each one is similar to the next. We have all sat in committees and learned how to turn these discussions into general platitudes. We all want the same goal but we still don't have a any form of procedural due process in place to negotiate how these objectives will be achieved.
- It is difficult being asked to provide feedback without any time to review
 - RESPONSE: The objective/goal & boundary review process is not ending today. The next step will be opening up what has been drafted to public review/comment.
- These can't be SMART if they are not measurable. We need indicators.
 - RESPONSE: The state has another workshop process planned for creating ecological indicators.
 - The most important thing is the economic indicators. That's really the bottom line – we need to have a healthy ecosystem, but that needs to translate into economic benefit as well.
- Definitions need to be developed for terms that may be interpreted differently in various contexts or by different stakeholders. Guiding definitions would allow these words to be used with clarity and without having to debate the intended meaning every time they are discussed.
 - It is not helpful to try and do this kind of work as a group today. It would be more productive for a draft document to be prepared by the planning team that people can respond to.
- The objectives do not yet provide a clear picture of what data/information would need to be collected/produced by resource managers. If the objectives can lead to specific GIS layers, then it is successful. If I was in charge of the GIS database and I looked at these objectives, I wouldn't know what to collect.
- We all need to know how these objectives will be used to be able to edit them effectively. The objectives are guides we will look to when difficult decisions have to be made about conflicting use. When tradeoffs are necessary, these must be able to inform the decision-making process. If we all understanding what the objectives are for and how they intend to be used in the same way it may be easier to come to consensus on wording, etc.
- What specific types of activities meet the requirements of each objective will have to be fleshed out during and after the public comment period.
- We need to make sure that the people who follow in our footsteps are able to interpret our intentions so that they can continue to protect the things we value and achieve the long-term vision of the plan
- These objectives will be a part of Washington's Marine Spatial Plan. However, that plan will only serve as a guidance document for state agencies and decision-makers. It will not be a regulatory document. Even so, we still need at least one or two more tiers specific detail to help provide substantive guidance.
- It would be useful to test the document using hypothetical project scenarios. We could test the guidance we have produced this way to see if we end up with results we do/don't like.

- Should we prioritize the objectives logically? They all compete equally as they are stated now. But, doesn't everything stem from a functioning ecosystem? And, then, don't we all want a healthy economy? Could we prioritize the objectives as they relate to 1. ecosystem 2: economic and 3: social values.
- We have to think about what we can actually change with this planning process and these objectives. We can change our actions: how we spend time, how we spend money, the decisions we make. There are other things we can't change, things like geography.
 - We do change geography. The Army Corps of Engineers has moved the mouth of the Columbia River. Our potential to change geography is strong and how we deal with it is important.
- Will these objectives be suitable for both the northern and southern uses of WA Coast?
- The word "access" is not in any of the objectives but the idea has been a big part of all conversations to date. It's important to maintain access as we move forward, it's an important word.
 - RESPONSE: Is this covered sufficiently in the overarching theme goal? ("To ensure a resilient and healthy marine ecosystem on Washington's coast that supports sustainable economic, recreational, and cultural opportunities for coastal communities, visitors and future generations.")

Large Group Discussion: MSP Boundary

There was general consensus by workshop attendees that the State should work to establish the maximum possible spatial extent for federal consistency review for which there is sufficient data available to meet NOAA's reasonably foreseeable effects requirement. However, the group also agreed that a proposed WCMSP boundary line of both 400 and 700 fathoms could be opened up for public review and comment as long as a record of the workshop boundary discussion also be made available for public review.

CZMA & Federal Consistency Presentation Notes

- The Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) was adopted by congress in 1972 and set up a state and federal partnership for the management of coastal waters. Washington developed the first CZMP in 1971. The MSP being developed will inform the State's coastal zone management program (CZMP) and will ensure that the State has the ability to review federal actions taking place within the MSP boundary for consistency with state law.
- An important question to ask is what enforceable state policies will be used to manage our coastal waters. If we are working to ensure that federal actions are consistent with state law, the consistency review can only be as strong as the state policies being used for the review. The state doesn't have many laws related to marine mammals, for example. (Brian shows a ppt slide with a number of laws/regulations listed).
 - A request was made to clarify which policies outlined today (and in future discussions) were in fact statutes
 - In this context "policies" was intended to mean both laws and regulations.

- Would the Ocean Resources Management Act give the state authority to protect marine mammals?
 - We should have a session on that. There is nothing explicit in the law about protecting marine mammals. The regulations were written to carry out the law shaping local shoreline master programs.
- The Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council (FSEC) is a “one stop shop” for energy projects over 350MW. Large wind projects have gone through this. It is made up of multiple agencies that go through an EIS and the Governor signs off.
- Local Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs) are formally submitted to NOAA and become part of the enforceable policies of the state.
- This is a learning process for the state. No other non-regulatory guidance plan like the MSP has been developed in the past nor does the state currently make many consistency determinations on the outer coast
- State jurisdiction is 3 miles. The federal jurisdiction goes out to 200 miles

- Federal consistency applies even if the federal action takes place outside the state’s coastal zone.
- If a state wants to review a federal license/permit outside the state’s coastal zone it must identify the activity, describe the location, and have it on a review list with NOAA.
- Currently the state has the ability to petition for consistency review on a case by case basis.
- To establish the basis for federal consistency reviews, you need to connect impacts to state coastal resources with reasonable foreseeable effects.
- Effects analysis does not have to show proof of coastal effects, but must show a reasonable causal connection and you must be able to specify the geographic location or Geographic Location Description (GLD) of the effects.
- The location of resources that could be effected must be documented. Uses need to be documented.
- Consider which Federal activities you want to list. If agencies have done NEPA analysis already, use their Environmental Impact Statements. Use their boundary, their data. This makes it easy to approve.
- Boundary suggestions/ considerations:
 - Consider which federal activities (licenses or permits) are most likely to have reasonably foreseeable coastal effects and where those activities occur
 - Consider bathymetric features for ecologically important areas, migratory patterns of mammals
 - Boundary should be defined by lat long or fixed natural features
 - Consider geographic constraints/limits of certain activities or technologies (ex. pipeline distances/costs, technology, depths)
 - Attest to reasonably foreseeable effects on WA State coastal resources – the further you are the harder it is to draw that line
 - Consider migration, foraging, breeding
 - Remember uses like fishing

Federal Consistency Q & A

Q - Does NOAA ever deny the one time review request?

A - Yes, sometimes. On a case by case basis you still need to adequately document why you want review.

Q – Are there any federal preemptions on consistency review?

A – There are very few. Usually related to national security.

Q - Can you amend what is submitted to NOAA?

A - Yes, at any point in time.

Q - If new technology or science comes out, can the State can submit a new review request.

A - Federal Pre-emption? Yes. Effects analysis does not have to show proof, but it has to show a reasonable connection.

Q- Is the federal government going to accept a boundary that broadly defines the MSP area?

A - Maybe, will come down to being able to demonstrate effects.

Q- Most fishermen won't tell where they catch fish, how do you protect those resources?

A - Maybe you don't use fishery impacts in your argument. If people won't share this data, you can't demonstrate effects.

Q – They ended up with a 24 mile boundary, but what was Delaware's original request?

A – 200 miles. Connecticut's MSP was reduced to certain fishing areas based on NMFS statistical areas/data showing a reasonable basis for effects to commercial fishing in these areas from potential oil and gas development. They also started with a 200 nm request but they had to make the connection that activity in Federal waters could hurt Connecticut. It can be hard to make that connection. The Rhode Island MSP area is large and continuous, around 25 nm. They based their effects argument on short and long term exclusions for fishing, water quality, electromagnetic fields, acoustic impacts. Their request to list dredge spoils was challenged by the Army Corps of Engineers and couldn't be approved. Offshore energy defined limits in some East Coast cases.

Q – What was the public reaction to the end result in Connecticut?

A - A lot of discussion and a lot of changes during implementation.

Q – Do you know what Alaska's is right now?

A – Zero miles, they are not a part of the CZMA.

Q – Who makes decisions as to how far out state request goes?

A – Ultimately, this happens at the federal level in Washington D.C.

PLANNING TEAM CLARIFICATION:

The Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA's) National Ocean Service (NOS) interprets the CZMA and oversees the application of federal consistency. NOAA's Office of the Assistant General Counsel for Ocean Services assists OCRM and processes federal consistency appeals to

the Secretary of Commerce. For more information see OCRM's Federal Consistency web page at: <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/consistency/welcome.html> . In addition, the NOAA Office of General Counsel has a separate website containing decisions of the Secretary and the administrative records of ongoing appeals: www.ogc.doc.gov/czma.htm

Q – It is not clear how much data is needed to prove effects. How much is enough? Hypothetically, suppose we don't know where orcas go in the winter. But we have some proof they go here. How much data is enough data?

A – The best thing to do is to give NOAA as much data as possible. If possible, provide data that shows multiple effects per area proposed as backup. NOAA will work it through with the state.

Q - What is NOAA's criteria for making decision?

A - You give NOAA your reasons and we say yes, no, or let's discuss based on what justifications have been submitted. Rarely do we say no. We work through the process with you so we don't have to. If a request is denied it is likely due to a perceived issue from a federal agency that has not been involved in the process or doesn't think they have the impact suggested.

Q – How is this like Oregon? Fishing data collected was supposed to identify the most important areas. It produced a heat map rather than mapping exact uses. Oregon defined its MSP zones but new energy is still going into some areas identified as sensitive. Energy projects can still get permitted into sensitive areas.

A –. They didn't just say “this can't go here”. It becomes much more difficult to permit energy projects outside of the areas specified for potential energy projects.

Q – How many miles out is 400 Fathom line?

A - 40-60 miles offshore.

Q - Some states had requested a larger areas and got turned down. At 40-60 miles, ours would be the biggest area that has been approved?

A - Yes, if the data is there to support this. Most states tried to start at 200nm, but had to come in until the relationship between federal activities and foreseeable effects are justified. Look at where majority of data and uses are and start there.

Q – Do we care about federal activities or impact of federal activities?

A – Both

Q – Suppose we have a 700 fathom line. If wave energy is placed as far from shore as possible but still creates an impact to upwelling beyond or within the 700 fathom line, we should be able to consider those effects, yes? A - If you can document it, yes.

Q - So, the project has to be in place, just like the dams?

A - Data from anywhere in world can be used to link use with reasonably foreseeable effects.

Q – BOEM has asked us to map uses but not the impact of uses. We only designated where the existing uses are. Impact is more subjective. Is that being mapped as well?

A - I think what BOEM is trying to do is get a broad scale understanding of the uses in the whole area. The technology and the economics of their activities limit their activities to 30 miles. It is during the permitting process when a project gets proposed where consideration of impacts comes in.

Q – How easy is it to extend the MSP area at a later date?

A - It's the same process, no more difficult later than the first time. Nothing in Washington's MSP law requires updates or review but there is an opening for adaptive management.

Modification to the plan does not have to be a full blown 3 year planning process. If you have new data, NOAA won't require you to update the whole plan. NOAA approval now is easier if it is based on existing activities because it is easier to demonstrate impacts. You can always expand later if there is a new activity proposed or new data down the road. The boundaries can be adjusted. You are not giving up a future chance to broaden the plan area

Q – Has any other state expanded their boundary once it has been set?

A – No yet. There has not been a reason to do so.

Boundary Discussion General Comments

- When you add shipping lanes and tuna to this, you are out 200 miles plus
- Shipping lanes don't go out 200 miles. The ships go out further, but the formal vessel traffic lanes don't go out that far. They don't even go out 20 miles. It depends on how you define shipping lanes.
- The plan has to be approved by NOAA and has to show state interest within the proposed boundary. I think strong case can be made for continental shelf. Case is not as strong for 200 miles. Once you drop off the continental shelf, you have a tough time anchoring anything like offshore energy. I don't see any energy developing beyond the continental shelf. How would they get energy back? It's not technically feasible.
- Someone will try to do it. They can make energy generators that don't require anchoring
- It will be telling when PNL does something.
- People can make case that the state has an interest past 200 miles.
- Look at OR, they closed a section to commercial and recreational fishing. The CG said once anchors are it makes them no go zones
- CG has authority over navigation, but not over fishing regulations
- But they enforce fishing recommendations
- Tuna fish are out 6-700 miles
- That's high seas. No one regulates that
- But boats can end up that far. Some years they are far, some years they are close
- If we are going to look at a western max, let's go to the max. Why limit ourselves? If we are going to have any say, we should say the max
- If DNR has fishery data to support 700 fathom boundary. That would be better for us.
- It is not enough to have fishing rights in an area to demonstrate foreseeable effects. You also need to show fishing is taking place in those areas. The boundary has to be backed up by use data.
- I've fished for albacore tuna from 40 to 700 miles. In commercial tuna fisheries you are looking at 50 miles as a mid point. They probably fish from 30 miles out because you

have to find blue water and upwelling for tuna to be around. Wherever you find those points, within the 30 mile range to probably 100 miles are the tuna grounds. They are very important to the processors on the WA coast. That is something to consider if we are looking at the fishing grounds I think we can make a strong argument to push for at least 100 miles for tuna. It shocks me that in the mid 70s tuna were identified as being around the 150 to 200 mile area. By the 80s they had shifted offshore to the 800 mile. And now I hear from W DFWS that they think tuna are mainly being caught in the 40 mile area. It concerns me because the data necessary to establish this area is probably going to come from WDFWS. It completely misses the fact that tuna are fished everywhere.

- To clarify, WDFWS has data from commercial and recreational tuna fisheries showing tuna is being fished from 25 miles throughout the EEZ to 200 miles. Because fishermen don't like to go further, if they run into tuna 50 to 60 miles off shore that's where they'll stay it's opportunistic. But we do have fishing throughout the EEZ.
- You don't have to encompass the entire fishing area in your GLD in order to assess the effects on that activity. So if a portion of that fishing activity occurs within your GLD and the proposed new activity occurs within the GLD you can analyze the effect on that activity both inside and outside the GLD. If, for example, we did go with the 400 fathom line and there was a new proposed use that occurred shoreward of that fathom line, its effects on all of the activities that occur inside 400 fathoms and even outside could be considered and reviewed. We do have the albacore fishery occurring shoreward and seaward of the 400 fathom line. If we went with this line we would be able to analyze the effects on the majority of the fishing that is occurring.
- What listed federal activities are we interested in? Offshore aquaculture, energy? If we have data on state uses that could be impacted, that will help define boundary. Is resource or use occurring? Yes to tuna. But what is the federal activity that will impact that use? This is what NOAA needs.
- When you talk about this use of the ocean right now you're talking about BOEM projects but there are a lot of other uses that need to be considered that we haven't even thought up. Ocean ranching, high offshore, where they set nets out to raise tuna in net pens, offshore drilling, other activities. I don't think we want to limit ourselves to looking at one industry that will occur within the 30 mile range. We need to talk about interests other than energy. We don't know what changes will happen in our lifetime.
- We are planning for the future, we don't want to focus only on 'right now'.
- How can you say what is hot spot for fishery with annual changes and climate change? No one can predict where the hotspots are. You can only get a snapshot of these areas. When they did this in Oregon they tried to document these areas but the hotspots never stopped moving.
- What is important is our consideration of where federal impacts will likely occur. Where is it economically feasible for projects to occur? The economics of current energy technology probably limit development out to 30miles. The impacts we are worried about come from permitting and siting.
- BOEM is also trying to get a picture of uses in the area.
- There is no sense in putting a boundary out there or review if it is not supported by use data. The boundary can always be expanded later. NOAA cannot approve an impact that

isn't happening. Focus now on what can be documented. You are not giving up future ability to broaden that later.

- This will not be as easy to change as some think. It will be harder once things are set up. We've been trying to get changes in CZMA consistency for 15 years. If an action happens in Oregon, Washington will not invoke CZMA consistency even though the federal government has given the state the right to do so.
- It seems to me we want as large an area as the state can justify. I don't know why we would take anything less. I don't know what's at 400 or 700 fathoms, but don't we want just as much as we can control?
- We need more information before we can make this decision. We need data layers, etc. Once we have more info we can make a more educated decision.
- I agree that we should go as far as we can. But we are all ignoring that the state has data out to the 700 fathom line. We keep bringing it back to 400 line.
- If we are advisory to the state, we don't need to have all the data right now. Our advice right now to the state is to set the boundary out as far as we can justify.
- I would encourage the federal government to look at what's going on in Japan – drilling for methane. I don't know where our deep methane is, but I hope we don't go that direction.
- Good point. There is a list of likely federal activities from the advisory committee – oil, gas, mining (methane hydrates). We don't know if it's technically feasible, but it would occur mostly in the continental margins. 500 m depth is the average.
- I understand need to establish boundary based on data and use. But we don't have complete data. We don't know life histories of biology moving in and out of chosen area. Most of us in this room can't create this data. We need to be proactive on improving data sets that might give us more justification to take the boundary out further. A step is to get agreement with federal partners to develop that data set. There are a large number of permitted federal activities in this area. Fishing, cruise ships, nuclear submarines and air craft carriers, oil transportation, shipping bunker fuel. There's a lot of activity impacts that we don't fully understand.
- The biggest danger is energy. But I agree that most energy will happen within 25 miles. It's a million dollars a mile to build a transmission line on land, 2-3 million to build transmission lines offshore. It will be nearshore in the foreseeable future. All experimentation within 12 miles.

Next Steps

Next in the WCMSP planning process will be a series of consultations with Washington Coast tribes to take place in May and June of 2013. State agencies will also reach out to federal partners to gain feedback on the WCMSP boundary and to learn more about the current and future federal actions likely to occur in Washington's coastal area. A public comment period for the draft MSP goal, objectives and boundary selection will also be initiated and workshop attendees were encouraged to engage their constituents and local communities in the public comment process.