



Photo by Katrina Lassiter

Marine Spatial Plan for Washington's Pacific Coast

October 2017

Publication no. 17-06-027 Revised June 2018



Publication and Contact Information

This report is available on the Department of Ecology's website at <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1706027.html>

For more information contact:

Jennifer Hennessey
Senior Ocean Planner
Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program
P.O. Box 47600
Olympia, WA 98504-7600
Jennifer.hennessey@ecy.wa.gov
360-407-6595

Washington State Department of Ecology - www.ecy.wa.gov

- Headquarters, Olympia 360-407-6000
- Northwest Regional Office, Bellevue 425-649-7000
- Southwest Regional Office, Olympia 360-407-6300
- Central Regional Office, Yakima 509-575-2490
- Eastern Regional Office, Spokane 509-329-3400

Accommodation Requests: To request ADA accommodation including materials in a format for the visually impaired, call Ecology at 360-407-6600. Persons with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. Persons with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341.

In Memoriam

In late February 2018, Dwight “John” Pierce lost his long, hard battle with cancer. John was a friend to many, a mentor for a few, and is deeply missed by all who knew him. He worked for the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) for nearly 34 years, serving as the Chief Scientist for the Wildlife Program for the latter part of his career.

John worked with a team at WDFW to identify the Ecologically Important Areas for the Marine Spatial Plan for the Washington Coast, bringing together information on seabirds, marine mammals, fisheries, and habitat. He also led the development and application of the Marxan analysis to model the suitability of offshore areas for potential renewable energy siting. John worked with researchers and scientists at NOAA, the University of Washington, the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council, state natural resource agencies, and coastal stakeholders to test assumptions, promote transparency, and ensure a common understanding of the information feeding into the model and the analysis results and conclusions.

John was an advocate for conservation, a passionate and dedicated biologist, a supporter of citizen science, a global thinker, and the biggest Seattle Seahawks fan. He had a practical approach to problem solving—the more difficult the problem, the better. His verbal communication style was always respectful, and his enthusiasm helped bring opposing viewpoints together. Thank you, John.

Table of Contents

List of Figures and Tables.....	iv
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	viii
Authors and Contributors.....	xi
Acknowledgements.....	xi
Executive Summary.....	xiv
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1-1
1.1 Purpose and Need for the Marine Spatial Plan.....	1-1
1.2 Marine Waters Management and Planning Act Requirements.....	1-2
1.3 Plan Goals and Objectives.....	1-4
1.4 Planning Process Summary.....	1-8
1.5 The MSP Study Area.....	1-12
1.6 Pacific Coast Indian Tribes and Treaty Rights.....	1-14
1.7 Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary.....	1-19
Chapter 2: Current Conditions and Future Trends.....	2-1
2.1 Ecology of Washington’s Pacific Coast.....	2-2
2.2 Cultural and Historical Resources.....	2-60
2.3 Socio-Economic Setting.....	2-64
2.4 State and Tribal Fisheries.....	2-80
2.5 Aquaculture.....	2-116
2.6 Recreation and Tourism.....	2-132
2.7 Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure.....	2-142
2.8 Military Uses.....	2-162
2.9 Research and monitoring activities within the Plan area.....	2-166
2.10 Potential New/Expanded Uses	
2.10.1 Renewable Energy.....	2-169
2.10.2 Offshore Aquaculture.....	2-210
2.10.3 Dredging and Dredged Material Disposal.....	2-223
2.10.4 Marine Product Extraction.....	2-245
2.10.5 Mining.....	2-250
Sand and Gravel Mining.....	2-250
Gas Hydrate Mining.....	2-258
2.11 Climate Change.....	2-271

Chapter 3: Spatial Analyses.....	3-1
3.1 Seabird and marine mammal ecological modeling.....	3-1
3.2 Ecologically Important Areas Analysis.....	3-12
3.3 Use Analysis.....	3-24

Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework.....	4-1
4.1 Existing Policies and Authorities.....	4-1
4.2 State Plan Implementation.....	4-11
4.2.1 Processes for coordination, review and consultation on ocean use proposals...	4-12
4.2.2 Other state implementation activities.....	4-18
4.3 Spatial designations and spatial limitations.....	4-21
4.4 Project and site-specific information requirements.....	4-27
4.5 Contents of a written effects evaluation.....	4-30
4.6 Review standards and design considerations.....	4-34
4.6.1 Siting and Development Standards for the Construction, Deployment, or Maintenance of an Ocean Use Facility.....	4-34
4.6.2 Additional State Standards and Recommended Approaches to Protect Specific Coastal Resources and Uses of the State.....	4-35
4.6.3 Fisheries Use Protection Standards.....	4-38
4.6.4 Recommended Additional Approaches to Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Coastal Uses.....	4-39
4.7 Project Construction and Operation Plans.....	4-40
4.8 State Standards Specific to New Use Type.....	4-42

Chapter 5: WCMAC MSP Policy Recommendations.....	5-1
---	------------

Appendices

Appendix A	Plan Maps
Appendix B	Definitions
Appendix C	Data Sources, Methods, and Limitations
Appendix D	Marine Waters Planning and Management Act
Appendix E	CZMA Federal Consistency
Appendix F	Sources of Information

List of Tables and Figures

Tables

Table 2.1-1	Forage fish species.....	2-27
Table 2.1-2	Anadromous fish species found (at some point in their adult life stage) within the MSP Study Area.....	2-30
Table 2.1-3	Listed Salmon ESUs that may be found in the MSP Study Area.....	2-31
Table 2.1-4	Marine mammals within the MSP Study Area on the federal or state Species of Concern lists.....	2-33
Table 2.1-5	Birds on the federal or state species of concern lists occurring within or directly adjacent to the MSP Study Area.....	2-37
Table 2.1-6	Sea turtles within the MSP Study Area and their federal and state species of concern status.....	2-38
Table 2.3-3	Socioeconomic parameters for the four coastal counties and Washington State.....	2-65
Table 2.3-1	Ocean economy of individual counties, the Pacific Coastal counties combined, and Washington State.....	2-66
Table 2.3-5	The total number and community proportions of residents residing within the tsunami hazard zone for select coastal communities.....	2-75
Table 2.4-6	Washington incorporated coastal communities adjacent to the MSP Study Area with high commercial fishing dependence.....	2-81
Table 2.4-7	Fisheries sector groupings and available maps.....	2-84
Table 2.4-8	Landings, ex-vessel revenues, and participation by county for Washington coast commercial fisheries in 2014.....	2-87
Table 2.4-9	Count of vessels and total non-tribal ex-vessel revenues in 2014 in Washington coastal ports by vessel owner’s address.....	2-87
Table 2.4-10	Landings, ex-vessel revenue, and average revenue per pound in Washington coastal ports by fisheries management group, non-tribal fishery sector. Includes 2014 and 2004-2014 range.....	2-88
Table 2.4-11	Total coast-wide annual and estimated catch off the Washington coast by vessels operating in the non-tribal, at-sea Pacific whiting sector.....	2-91
Table 2.4-12	Sport fishing effort by trip mode 2004-2013 average for all coastal Washington port areas.....	2-98
Table 2.4-13	Charter boat fishing effort by targeted species 2004-2013 annual average for all coastal Washington port areas.....	2-98
Table 2.4-14	Average annual private vessel fishing effort by targeted species 2004-2013 for all coastal Washington port areas.....	2-99
Table 2.4-15	Average annual sport catch in marine waters along the Washington coast 2007/2008 through 2011/2012 sportfishing seasons.....	2-99
Table 2.4-16	Makah tribal fisheries.....	2-103
Table 2.4-17	Average Makah Tribe harvest by fishery, 2011-2015.....	2-103
Table 2.4-18	Quileute tribal fisheries 2014 harvest and annual range from 2005-2014 by species (thousands of lbs.).....	2-104
Table 2.4-19	2004-2013 Annual ex-vessel revenues from Quinault treaty fisheries (2014 dollars).....	2-105
Table 2.4-20	Total contributions to the five-county coastal region economy from 2014	

	Washington coast non-tribal commercial fishing and seafood processing by county of the activity.....	2-108
Table 2.4-21	Total contribution to the State of Washington economy from 2014 Washington coast non-tribal commercial fishing and seafood processing by county of the activity.....	2-108
Table 2.4-22	Trip-related expenditures associated with ocean sportfishing trips in 2014 from charter vessels, private vessels, and shore and jetty fishing in the Washington coastal region (2014 dollars)	2-109
Table 2.4-23	Contribution of trip-related angler expenditures in the MSP Study Area/Coastal Area to coastal area and statewide employment and labor income.....	2-109
Table 2.5-1	High and low values for harvest (round lbs.) and value (2014 \$) of Pacific Oyster and Manila Clam aquaculture in Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties, 2004-2013.....	2-120
Table 2.5-2	Primary regulatory agencies for Washington shellfish aquaculture and their roles.....	2-122
Table 2.5-3	Economic impact of shellfish aquaculture on Washington State in 2010.....	2-123
Table 2.5-4	Estimated regional expenditures by the Pacific coast shellfish aquaculture industry and total economic contribution (employment and labor income) to the Washington coast region and statewide.....	2-124
Table 2.6-1	2015 Recreational duck hunting in Washington coastal counties.....	2-134
Table 2.6-2	Recreational goose hunting in Washington coastal counties.....	2-134
Table 2.6-3	Estimated recreation and tourism trip spending associated with Study Area coastal trips by Washington State residents and out-of-state visitors. And, total economic contribution (employment and labor income) to the Washington coast region and statewide.....	2-137
Table 2.7-1	Summary of economic impacts from maritime subsectors in Washington State	2-148
Table 2.7-2	Marine transportation contribution to the ocean economy of the five Pacific coastal counties and statewide.....	2-149
Table 2.7-3	Economic impacts of cargo activity at Port of Grays Harbor marine terminals	2-150
Table 2.7-4	Revenue impact by commodity generated by the Port of Grays Harbor marine cargo terminals.....	2-150
Table 3.1	Summary of seabird and mammal survey data compiled by NCCOS for the distribution analysis.....	3-3
Table 3.2	Summary of predictor variables incorporated into distribution models.....	3-5
Table 3.3	EIA Layers.....	3-13
Table 3.4	EIA scoring metrics.....	3-16
Table 3.5	Data layers used to represent existing uses and Ecologically Important Areas.....	3-26
Table 3.6	Summary of overlay analysis.....	3-30
Table 3.7	Hexagon footprints of “best” solutions shown in Figure 3.15.....	3-36
Table 3.8	Selection frequency results for different wind technologies.....	3-36
Table 3.9	Examples of Selection frequency outputs overlapping with high-intensity existing uses or resources.....	3-39
Table 3.10	Count of overlay analysis scores for the three Marxan best solutions.....	3-42
Table 4.1.4-1	State permits or authorizations for aquatic projects.....	4-6

Table 4.1.4-2	Local permits and other authorities for aquatic projects.....	4-9
Table 4.4-1	Project- and site-specific data and information requirements.....	4-28
Table 4.6.2-1	Goals, additional standards, and approaches to protect Washington State coastal uses and resources.....	4-36
Table 4.8-1	Additional state requirements specific to new use type.....	4-43

Figures

Figure 1	Number of Existing High Intensity Uses in the MSP Study Area.....	xv
Figure 2.1-1	Schematic of upwelling forces.....	2-3
Figure 2.1-2	Integrated chlorophyll (all depths) for 2005-2006.....	2-3
Figure 2.1-3	Schematic of general physical factors limiting nutrient availability and surface response during January, May, July, and September.....	2-4
Figure 2.3-1	Illustration of regional economic impacts, leakage, and multiplier effects.....	2-73
Figure 2.5-1	Relative harvest (round lbs.) of farmed shellfish products in Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties, 2013.....	2-119
Figure 2.5-2	Relative value (dollars) of farmed shellfish products in Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties, 2013.....	2-119
Figure 2.10.1-1	Components of a wind turbine.....	2-173
Figure 2.10.1-2	Floating offshore wind designs.....	2-174
Figure 2.10.1-3	Diagram displaying examples of differences in offshore wind technology types by depth.....	2-175
Figure 2.10.1-4	Wave energy technology types.....	2-177
Figure 2.10.1-5	Primary technology types for tidal current energy devices.....	2-178
Figure 3.1	Spatial distribution of the 11 surveys used in bird and mammal models.....	3-4
Figure 3.2	Long-term predicted relative density for Tufted Puffin, summer.....	3-7
Figure 3.3	Predicted long-term relative density for Tufted Puffin, summer.....	3-8
Figure 3.4	Predicted long-term relative density for Marbled Murrelet, summer.....	3-9
Figure 3.5	Predicted long-term relative density for Gray Whale, summer.....	3-10
Figure 3.6	Predicted long-term relative density for Black-footed Albatross, summer (left) and winter (right).....	3-11
Figure 3.7	Greatest relative ecological importance score assigned to each hexagon in the Study Area, across all data layers.....	3-18
Figure 3.2	Hotspots for all combined EIA layers.....	3-19
Figure 3.3	Hotspots for sensitive species and habitats.....	3-20
Figure 3.4	Hotspots for all fish and habitat layers.....	3-21
Figure 3.11	Hotspots for all wildlife layers.....	3-21
Figure 3.5	Fish and wildlife coldspots.....	3-22
Figure 3.13	Overlay analysis showing a comparison of renewable energy potential and the number of high intensity uses in each hexagon of the planning area.....	3-29
Figure 3.6	Combined map of weighted existing uses incorporated into Use Analysis.....	3-34
Figure 3.7	Use Analysis outputs for clumped, industrial-scale wind energy.....	3-37
Figure 3.16	Number of times hexagons were selected in Marxan frequency solutions for the three wind energy technology scenarios.....	3-38

Figure 3.17	Number of high-intensity existing uses and resources with Marxan clumped results.....	3-40
Figure 3.18	Total count of Marxan selections by overlay analysis score and wind technology type.....	3-43

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AC	Alternating Current
AIS	Automated Identification System
ATB	Articulated Tug-Barges
ATBA	Area to Be Avoided
ATON	Aids to Navigation
BMP	Best Management Practice
BOEM	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
BPA	Bonneville Power Administration
CCS	California Current System
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CLA	Cultural Landscapes Approach
CMAP	Coastal Monitoring and Analysis Program
CMEC	Coastal and Marine Ecological Classification
CPS	Coastal Pelagic Species
CSP	Catch Sharing Plan
CSZ	Cascadia Subduction Zone
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
DAHP	Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
DC	Direct Current
DMMP	Dredge Material Management Program
DNR	Washington Department of Natural Resources
DOH	Washington Department of Health
Ecology	Washington Department of Ecology
EFSEC	Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council
EIA	Ecologically Important Areas
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMD	Emergency Management Division
EMF	Electromagnetic Fields
ENOW	Economics National Ocean Watch
ENSO	El Niño-Southern Oscillation
EPA	Environmental Protection Act
EPRI	Electric Power Research Institute
ERTV	Emergency Response Towing Vessel
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
ESU	Evolutionary Significant Units
FAC	Federal Advisory Committee
FADS	Fish Aggregation Devices
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FMP	Fishery Management Plan
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GRP	Geographic Response Plan
HAB	Harmful Algal Bloom

HDD	Horizontal Directional Drilling
HPA	Hydraulic Project Approval
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPC	Intergovernmental Policy Council
ISU	Important, Sensitive and Unique Area
ITB	Integrated Tug-Barges
JARPA	Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application
LCSG	Lower Columbia Solutions Group
MCR	Mouth of the Columbia River
MCTS	Marine Communications and Traffic Services
MHHW	Mean Higher High Water
MHK	Marine Hydrokinetic Energy
MLLW	Mean Lower Low Water
MPA	Marine Protected Areas
MRC	Marine Resource Committee
MSA	Magnuson Stevens Act
MSP	Marine Spatial Plan
MW	Megawatt
MXPS	Marine Exchange of Puget Sound
NAD	North American Datum
NANOOS	Northwest Association of Networked Ocean Observing Systems
NCCOS	National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NNMREC	Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NPCC	Northwest Power and Conservation Council
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory
NWFSC	Northwest Fisheries Science Center
NWR	National Wildlife Refuge
NWTRC	Northwest Training Range Complex
OCNMS	Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
OHOW	Over-high/ Over-wide
ONMS	Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
ORHAB	Olympic Region Harmful Algal Blooms Partnership
ORMA	Ocean Resource Management Act
OSP	Ocean Sampling Program
PacFIN	Pacific Fisheries Information Network
PARIS	Permit and Reporting Information System
PDO	Pacific Decadal Oscillation
PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
PFMC	Pacific Fishery Management Council
PMEC	Pacific Marine Energy Center
PNNL	Pacific Northwest National Laboratory
PNW	Pacific Northwest

PSMFC	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
PSP	Paralytic Shellfish Poisoning
PUD	Public Utility District
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
RSMP	Regional Sediment Management Plan
SAC	Sanctuary Advisory Council
SCA	Seashore Conservation Area
SDP	Southern Distinct Population
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SMA	Special Management Area
SMP	Shoreline Master Program
TCDD	Tetrachlorodibenzodioxin
TEU	The Equivalent Unit
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TSS	Traffic Separation Schemes
U&A	Usual and Accustomed Area
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VGP	Vessel General Permit
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WCMAC	Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WETS	Wave Energy Test Site
WSDA	Washington State Department of Agriculture
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant

Interagency Team Authors and Contributors

Washington: Department of Ecology

Erica Bates
Kelsey Gianou
Jennifer Hennessey

Department of Natural Resources

Ashleigh McCord
Katrina Lassiter
Libby Whiting

Department of Fish and Wildlife

Michele Culver
Jessi Doerpinghaus
Corey Niles
John Pierce

Acknowledgments

The authors of this report would like to thank the vast array of tribal and federal agency staff, scientists, researchers, and stakeholders who provided information, technical reviews, and other contributions throughout the planning process and to this Marine Spatial Plan.

In particular, the authors would like to thank:

- The members of the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council's (WCMAC) who advised the interagency team on the MSP:

Beasley, Dale	Commercial Fishing
Berger, Joshua	Washington State Department of Commerce
Costanzo, Charlie	Shipping
Dalan, Garrett	Grays Harbor MRC
Dalton, Penny	Sea Grant
Dennehy, Casey	Recreation
Ervest, Carol	Wahkiakum Marine Resource Committee
Fleck, Rod	North Pacific Marine Resource Committee
Fluharty, Dave	Educational Institution
Grunbaum, RD	Conservation
Helsley, Jessica	Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership
Horowitz, Julie	Governor's Office
Kess, Doug	Pacific County Marine Resource Committee
Kline, Randy	State Parks
Krueger, Katie	Quileute Liaison
Lewis, Randy	Ports
Niles, Corey	Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife
Osborne, Rich	Science
Plackett, Mark	Citizen
Rechner, Michal	Washington State Department of Natural Resources
Sheldon, Brian	Shellfish Aquaculture
Thevik, Larry	Commercial Fishing
Toste, Ray	Commercial Fishing

Toteff, Sally
Turner, Tiffany
Ward, Jeff
Weinstein, Alla
Batchelder, Miles
Cedergreen, Mark
Niles, Corey
Horton, Marc

Washington State Department of Ecology
Economic Development
Coastal Energy
Energy Industry & Organizations
Washington Coast Sustainable Salmon Partnership
Recreational Fishing
Washington State Department of Fish & Wildlife
Ports

- Susan Gulick, Sound Resolutions, for facilitating the WCMAC and helping them provide feedback, advice, and consensus-based recommendations for consideration in the plan. Ashleigh McCord, for copyediting and formatting the draft plan.
- The scientists, researchers, consultants, and experts who produced critical scientific data and analyses or conducted outreach and tool development to support the plan, including:

BST Associates - Paul Sorenson

Cascade Consulting

Michael Taylor
Janet Baker
Edward Waters

Industrial Economics, Inc.

NOAA National Centers for Coastal and Ocean Science

Charlie Menza
Tim Battista

NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center

Kelly Andrews
Chris Harvey

NOAA Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary

Liam Antrim
Carol Bernthal
George Galasso
Nancy Wright

Northern Economics, Inc. - Katharine (Trina) Wellman

Oregon State University

Bran Black
Chris Goldfinger
Chris Romsos

Pacific Northwest National Labs

Brie Van Cleve
Simon Geerlofs

Parametrix

Pt. 97/Ecotrust

Surfrider Foundation

TCW Economics – Thomas Wegge

The Nature Conservancy

UW's Olympic Natural Resource Center
– Kevin Bennett

Washington Department of Ecology
George Kaminsky

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Phillip Dionne
Andrew Duff
Dale Gombert

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

Steven Jefferies
Jane Jenkerson
Daniel Masello
Mariko Langness
Dayv Lowry
Josh Oliver
Scott Pearson

Lori Salzer
Theresa Tsou
Andy Weiss
George Wilhere

Washington Sea Grant

Kevin Decker
Melissa Poe
Bridget Trosin

- Tribal staff for their technical reviews and feedback, including Makah Tribe – Katie Wrubel, Chad Bowechop; Hoh Tribe – Joe Gilbertson; Quileute Tribe - Katie Krueger (*retired*) and Jennifer Hagen; Quinault Indian Nation – John Foster and Joe Schumacker.
- Science Advisory Panel members who provided technical review and feedback on data quality and methods for particular aspects of the MSP, including

NOAA: Charles Menza and Todd Lee

University Washington: Tim Essington, Miles Logsdon, Emilio Mayorga, Brian Polagye, and Charles Simenstad

US Forest Service: Lee Cerveny

Washington State agencies: Helen Berry, George Kaminsky, and Theresa Tsou

- Other interagency team members who guided the development of the MSP: JT Austin, Julie Horowitz, Brian Lynn, Randy Kline, and Michal Rechner.
- Other federal agency participants including from Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Environmental Protection Agency Department of Defense - Navy, NOAA, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and U.S. Coast Guard.

Executive Summary

Why a Marine Spatial Plan?

The marine waters along Washington’s Pacific Coast contain abundant natural resources and diverse habitats that support biological diversity and resilience of the marine ecosystem. These resources support multiple public uses that benefit the economies and cultures of nearby communities as well as the entire state. The citizens of Washington, as well as the Native American tribes that have rich histories and treaty-protected interests along the coast, strongly depend upon marine resources and will continue to do so into the future.

Potential new ocean uses such as offshore wind energy, offshore aquaculture, or other development uses could adversely affect these important ocean resources and uses. Multiple, overlapping jurisdictions and authorities create additional challenges for coordinated decision-making and proactive planning.

The Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) for Washington’s Pacific Coast helps address these challenges by providing a tool to protect ocean resources and uses, to guide potential applicants as they develop proposals for new ocean uses, and to assist state agencies and others, including local, tribal, and federal governments, in evaluating and engaging in those proposals more effectively.

The Marine Spatial Plan Study Area

The MSP Study Area consists of marine waters of the Pacific Ocean adjacent to Washington’s coastline from the intertidal zone out to the continental slope. It extends from ordinary high water on the shoreward side out to a water depth of 700 fathoms (4,200 feet) offshore – a distance of 35 to 55 nautical miles. The Study Area extends along the coast from Cape Flattery on the north of the Olympic Peninsula south to Cape Disappointment at the Mouth of the Columbia River – a distance of 136 nautical miles. It also includes two large estuaries: Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay. Altogether, the Study Area covers approximately 325 nautical miles of coastline and spans 5,951 square nautical miles (7,881 square statute miles).

The northern coastal portion of the Study Area contains mostly rocky coast with several coastal rivers, rocky outcrops, and pocket beaches. The northern portion of the Study Area overlaps with the majority of the Usual and Accustomed Areas of four treaty tribes (3924 square nautical miles), the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (2561 square nautical miles), as well as, with three National Wildlife Refuges. Adjacent uplands are rural, consisting mostly of Olympic National Park land and tribal reservations of the Makah, Quileute, and Hoh tribes and the Quinault Indian Nation.

The southern coastal portion of the Study Area generally has sandy beaches and includes Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor – both of which have a National Wildlife Refuge. This part of the study area overlaps with the lower portion of the Quinault Indian Nation’s Usual and Accustomed Area, which includes Grays Harbor. Several small cities and towns are located along the

southern coast, as well as the Shoalwater Bay Tribe's reservation. Uplands in the southern area are largely managed private and public timber lands and agriculture.

Washington's Pacific Coast is rural and less developed than other areas of the state. Coastal communities in this area are very dependent on natural resources, recreation, and tourism. Studies conducted as part of the planning process gathered information on existing ocean uses, including participation rates in ocean uses, patterns of use, current and future trends, and the contribution of ocean uses to the coastal and state economies.

Some summary statistics include:


- In 2014, commercial (non-tribal) fisheries landed a total of 129 million pounds into Washington's coastal ports with an ex-vessel value of \$93 million. 700 commercial vessels participated in fisheries landings in the Study Area, with 299 vessels licensed in Clallam, Grays Harbor, Jefferson, Pacific, or Wahkiakum County.
- Commercial (non-tribal) fishing and primary seafood processing support 1,820 total jobs and \$77 million in total labor income in coastal counties adjacent to the MSP study area. Their total statewide contribution is 2,830 jobs and \$117 million in labor income.
- Annual recreational fishing effort in the study area, between 2003 and 2014, averaged 47,000 trips on charter vessels and another 98,000 trips on private vessels. In 2014, trip-related expenditures for coastal recreational fishing generated over \$30 million in coastal spending, supported 325 jobs in coastal counties, and contributed \$17 million in labor income.
- Shellfish aquaculture in Pacific and Grays Harbor counties provides an estimated 572 direct jobs, supports 847 total jobs, and generates \$50 million in total labor income in the coastal region alone.
- Washington residents took an estimated 4.1 million trips to Washington's coast in 2014, with nearly 60 percent indicating their primary purpose was recreation. These trips generated an estimated \$481 million in expenditures. In the coastal study area, recreation trip-related spending by Washington residents is estimated to support 4,725 jobs and \$196.8 million in labor income within the coastal economy.
- Recreational razor clamming generates between 275,000 and 460,000 digger trips each season and provides between \$25 million and \$40 million in tourist-related income to coastal communities.
- The MSP Study Area supports shipping and trade, particularly ship traffic among ports along the West Coast and from ports in Washington across the Pacific Ocean to countries in Asia. The Port of Grays Harbor's marine cargo activities supports 1,524 total jobs (including 574 direct jobs) and generates over \$130 million in total income.
- Washington State hosts a large military presence with over 46,000 active duty military personnel, including 10,000 active duty Navy (Navy 2016). Due to the large military installations nearby in Puget Sound, the US Navy actively trains and tests in the MSP Study Area.

Existing Patterns of Uses and Resources

To improve understanding of the Study Area, many planning projects gathered and developed data on patterns and intensity of existing ocean uses and resources. These data are displayed in over 50 individual plan maps (Appendix A) and in an online, interactive mapping tool (www.msp.wa.gov). Geospatial (GIS) analyses were conducted to aggregate and further explore the combined patterns in the data, including ecological modelling of seabirds and marine mammals, an Ecologically Important Areas analysis, and a Use Analysis (see Chapter 3 for more details).

Figure 1 below displays a combination of existing high intensity uses by commercial and recreational fishing (non-tribal), shipping, known cultural sites, and recreation. Areas of high ecological importance are also included in the figure (also referred as ecologically important area “hotspots”). Everywhere within the Study Area is highly used by at least 1 to 3 existing ocean uses or resources. Most of the Study Area is highly used by at least 4 and up to 14 existing uses or resources. In particular, the most heavily used areas include the continental shelf break, the Juan de Fuca Canyon in the north, and much of the southern area from the nearshore to about 15-20 miles offshore, especially near the entrances to Grays Harbor and the Columbia River.

Total Number of Existing High Intensity Uses in the MSP Study Area



Note: the Makah Tribe's Ué-A extends into the Strait of Juan de Fuca, which is not shown on this map.



**Estuary data was not included in this map, due to inadequate comparable data across sectors. Estuaries are of high ecological importance and are heavily used by sectors such as aquaculture, which currently occurs only in these areas. Please consult other maps for available estuary data.*

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Figure 1 - Number of Existing High Intensity Uses in the MSP Study Area

What's in the plan? How to use the plan?

The MSP provides information and guidance intended for use throughout the development of new ocean use proposals along Washington's Pacific Coast. It assists agencies, tribal governments, and others in evaluating and engaging in proposals for new ocean uses and guides potential applicants as they develop those proposals. The plan also identifies the various local and state authorizations that a project may be required to obtain, such as city or county shoreline permits (under their Shoreline Master Programs) and aquatic land use authorizations from the Department of Natural Resources.

The plan provides:

- Guidance for new ocean uses along Washington's Pacific coast, such as renewable energy projects, offshore aquaculture, and other development uses.
- Baseline data on coastal uses and resources to capture current conditions and future trends.
- Requirements and recommendations for evaluating new ocean uses through different phases of project review, consistent with existing laws and regulations – particularly those contained in the Ocean Resources Management Act and its regulations. It also identifies other important state and local authorizations, which contain more specific requirements, such as individual city or county Shoreline Master Programs.
- Recommendations to protect important and sensitive ecological areas and existing uses like fishing through new policies and standards.

The State of Washington and tribal governments are legal co-managers of marine resources within the planning area. The information in the MSP will also assist the state and tribal governments, in reviewing and influencing federal activities that may affect ocean resources or uses off the Washington coast, including those proposed in federal waters.

How to use the plan

The plan's information provides potential new ocean use applicants, governments, and others with the ability to:

- Understand other known activities, resources, interests, designations, and authorities that may conflict with or complement a proposal.
- Identify appropriate parties to discuss the proposal with prior to submitting an application.
- Understand issues, information, effects, and requirements to be addressed during the project review process.
- Identify potential ways to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse impacts to marine resources or existing ocean uses, such as alternative locations and configurations of projects.

The MSP also provides a wealth of baseline information that may be helpful to a variety of people or groups interested in understanding Washington's Pacific Coast, conducting further research or monitoring on specific topics, assessing future changes in conditions, or performing other types of planning.

Outline of Plan Contents

The plan's major sections include:

- An overview, including purpose, scope, planning process and background on federal and tribal management in the MSP Study Area (Chapter 1).
- A summary of current conditions and trends of the MSP Study Area, including: ecology, socio-economics, archeological and historic resources, existing ocean uses, and potential new ocean uses (Chapter 2).
- Details about spatial analyses including methods and outputs examining ecology and human uses in the Study Area (Chapter 3).
- A MSP management framework that covers process and substantive requirements tied to existing state laws and policies and the need for consultation with tribal governments (Chapter 4). The plan only applies to state waters. Yet, the information provided may assist with analysis of impacts for tribal waters and in and affecting tribal U&As. It provides overall guidance and recommendations for applicants, agencies and third parties on using the plan in practice, including:
 - Identifying ecologically-sensitive resources in state waters to protect from adverse effects of offshore development.
 - Defining policies in state waters to protect fisheries from long-term significant adverse impacts of offshore development and to ensure all reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize adverse impacts to fisheries.
 - Detailing the data, information, and plans necessary for proposed projects. Specifies the effects to people, communities, tribal shared resources, and the environment that need to be evaluated, including state standards and policies that need to be met. Listing the various state and local authorizations that projects may need to obtain, such as city or county shoreline permits or use authorizations for state-owned aquatic lands.
 - Creating a process for enhanced coordination with stakeholders and among state, tribal, and federal governments as co-managers.
 - Evaluating projects on a case-by-case basis. Recommending industrial-scale renewable energy development as likely incompatible in state waters.
- Issues and recommendations on the plan provided by the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (Chapter 5).
- Maps and appendices including maps of existing ocean uses and ocean resources and more detailed information (Appendices).

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Purpose and Need for the Marine Spatial Plan

The marine waters along Washington’s Pacific Coast host abundant natural resources and a wide diversity of species and habitats. These ocean resources support multiple uses that are vital to the economy and social fabric of nearby communities and the entire state, such as fishing, recreation, and shipping. The citizens of Washington, as well as the Native American tribes that have rich histories and treaty-protected interests along the coast, strongly depend upon ocean resources and will continue to do so into the future.

Existing ocean resources, uses, and communities along Washington’s Pacific Coast may be adversely affected by increasing pressures on the resources in this area, conflicts among existing uses, and proposed new ocean uses such as offshore wind or wave energy, offshore aquaculture, or sand and gravel mining. In addition, multiple, overlapping jurisdictions and authorities create challenges for coordinated decision-making and proactive planning.

In March 2010, the Washington State Legislature enacted a marine planning law to foster integrated coastal decision making and ecosystem-based management ([RCW 43.372](#)). Marine Spatial Planning is a comprehensive, place-based and ecosystem-based planning tool. In July 2012, the State Legislature began targeting funding to the creation of a plan for Washington’s Pacific coast.

The Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) for Washington’s Pacific Coast provides a baseline of scientific information, a consistent way of evaluating future proposals, and a framework to coordinate decisions around human uses of the sea. The plan also creates a process for coordinating across all levels of government and ensuring stakeholder input on new ocean uses. This process will improve marine resource management by planning for new ocean uses and reducing conflict. The MSP will increase certainty for those using or seeking to use Washington’s coastal waters. It will also allow us to reduce our impact on our marine environment. In this way, the plan helps maximize the social, economic and ecological benefits we receive from ocean resources.

Specifically, the MSP provides the following:

- Guidance for new ocean uses along Washington’s Pacific coast, including renewable energy projects, offshore aquaculture, dredged material disposal in new locations, marine product extraction, sand and gravel or gas hydrate mining, and other development uses.
- Baseline data on coastal uses and resources to capture current conditions and future trends.
- Requirements and recommendations for evaluating new ocean uses through the different phases of project review, consistent with existing laws and regulations – particularly those contained in the Ocean Resources Management Act and its regulations. Identifies the various state and local authorizations that a project may be required to obtain, such as

city or county shoreline permits (under their Shoreline Master Programs) and aquatic land use authorizations from the Department of Natural Resources.¹

- Recommendations to protect the environment and existing uses. This includes specific new policies to protect specific environmentally-sensitive areas and fisheries.
- A framework and analyses for increased coordination and guidance for decision-making.
- Activities that enable plan monitoring, evaluation, and adaptation.

Washington State developed the MSP with the support of state agencies and the involvement of key stakeholders, the public, and local, federal, and tribal governments. The planning process was led by the State Ocean Caucus, an interagency team. Interagency team members included representatives from: the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), the Governor’s office, the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission (State Parks), and Washington Sea Grant.² The Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC), a Governor-appointed advisory group inclusive of stakeholders and government, participated throughout the planning process.

The marine planning law requires the final MSP to be submitted to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for review and approval in order to be incorporated into the State's federally-approved coastal zone management program ([RCW 43.372.040 \(12\)](#)). Washington will benefit from incorporating the MSP into Washington’s Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP). Once approved, this will improve the State’s ability to review federal actions that have reasonably foreseeable effects on Washington’s coastal resources and uses through the federal consistency provision under the Coastal Zone Management Act (more details are provided in Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework, Section 4.2 and Appendix E). In addition, by developing its own plan for the Pacific coast, Washington State will be well positioned to work in partnership with the other states, the federal government, and tribes in West Coast regional marine spatial planning coordination.

1.2 Marine Waters Management and Planning Act Requirements

The Marine Waters Management and Planning Act ([RCW 43.372](#)) provides the overall intent, purpose, principles, and elements for development of the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) for Washington’s Pacific Coast. For details on specific requirements, please see the full language of [RCW 43.372 in Appendix D](#).

The MSP creates a framework for integrating existing state and local authorities. It does not supersede current authority of state agencies or local governments ([RCW 43.372.060](#)). For example, local city or county Shoreline Master Programs are one of the many existing authorities that set forth more detailed requirements for ocean uses within local jurisdictions. The MSP must rely on existing state and local authorities to be implemented ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(e\)](#)). The

¹ The MSP does not attempt to describe all the detailed requirements within each of these authorities and jurisdictions. Project proponents should plan to review the specifics of applicable state and local authorizations in more detail.

² Governor Gregoire designated the Department of Ecology as the overall lead for coordinating the planning process.

marine planning law exempts projects, uses, and activities existing prior to or during the planning process from meeting the MSP's requirements ([RCW 43.372.060](#)).

This section summarizes some of the key principles and requirements for the MSP from the state marine planning law.

Key Planning Principles

According to [RCW 43.372.040\(4\)](#), “The marine management plan must be developed and implemented in a manner that:

- a) Recognizes and respects existing uses and tribal treaty rights;
- b) Promotes protection and restoration of ecosystem processes to a level that will enable long-term sustainable production of ecosystem goods and services;
- c) Addresses potential impacts of climate change and sea level rise upon current and projected marine waters uses and shoreline and coastal impacts;
- d) Fosters and encourages sustainable uses that provide economic opportunity without significant adverse environmental impacts;
- e) Preserves and enhances public access;
- f) Protects and encourages working waterfronts and supports the infrastructure necessary to sustain marine industry, commercial shipping, shellfish aquaculture, and other water-dependent uses;
- g) Fosters public participation in decision making and significant involvement of communities adjacent to the state's marine waters; and
- h) Integrates existing management plans and authorities and makes recommendations for aligning plans to the extent practicable.”

The marine planning law also requires the plan to use the best available science, rely on existing data and resources, and procure additional data necessary for planning, when possible ([RCW 43.372.040\(5\)](#)).

Plan Requirements

The marine planning law requires the final MSP to contain several elements ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)](#)), see Appendix D for complete language). These elements include:

- An ecosystem assessment that analyzes the health and status of Washington marine waters including key social, economic, and ecological characteristics and incorporates the best available scientific information, including relevant marine data. The plan must also develop key ecosystem indicators (Chapter 2 and separate indicator reports).
- A series of maps that, at a minimum, summarize available data on (Chapter 3 and Appendix A):
 - The key ecological aspects of the marine ecosystem, including physical and biological characteristics, as well as areas that are environmentally sensitive or contain unique or sensitive species or biological communities that must be conserved and warrant protective measures.

- Human uses of marine waters, particularly areas with high value for fishing, shellfish aquaculture, recreation, and maritime commerce.
- Appropriate locations with high potential for renewable energy production with minimal potential for conflicts with other existing uses or sensitive environments.
- Guidance for decisions on uses proposed for marine waters consistent with existing plans and processes and applicable state laws and programs (Chapter 4).
- An implementation strategy describing how the plan's management measures and other provisions will be considered and implemented through existing state and local authorities (Chapter 4).
- A framework for coordinating state agency and local government review of proposed renewable energy development uses requiring multiple permits and other approvals that provide for the timely review and action upon renewable energy development proposals while ensuring protection of sensitive resources and minimizing impacts to other existing or projected uses in the area (Chapter 4).
- Recommendations for the federal government (Chapter 4 and Appendix E).
- A list of provisions of existing management plans that are substantially inconsistent with the plan (Chapter 4).
- A list of data gaps, a strategy for acquiring new scientific information, and a process for updating the plan with new information (Chapters 2, 3, and 4 and Appendix C).

The marine planning law provides Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) the option of including a fisheries management element in the MSP. The MSP includes a considerable amount of information on fisheries. However, given the existing, extensive processes for managing fisheries, WDFW has chosen not to include an element in the MSP that would alter how fisheries are managed (see Chapter 2.4: State and Tribal Fisheries).

Furthermore, the law requires that any provision of the marine management plan that does not have as its primary purpose the management of commercial or recreational fishing but that has an impact on this fishing must minimize the negative impacts on fishing. The interagency team³ must accord substantial weight to recommendations from the director of WDFW for plan revisions to minimize the negative impacts. See Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework for a description of the fisheries consultation process and fisheries protection standards designed to minimize impacts from new ocean uses on fishing.

1.3 Plan Goals and Objectives

To assist with the marine spatial planning process, Washington Sea Grant and the State Ocean Caucus (SOC) convened a series of workshops in 2013 to develop draft goals and objectives for the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) for Washington's Pacific Coast. The workshops also aimed to improve communication and coordination among the groups involved in the planning process. These workshops brought together government representatives and local stakeholders with a vested interest in or management authority over Washington's marine resources and waters. Representatives from local government, state and federal agencies, tribes, and the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) attended.

³ Interagency team refers to the State Ocean Caucus, as described in [RCW 43.372.020](#).

The draft goals and objectives resulting from the workshops went through State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) scoping and public comment to give other individuals and organizations the opportunity to weigh in on the plan development process. Comments provided during the public comment period were considered in adopting the final goals and objectives for the Marine Spatial Plan.

Subsequent to adoption of the final goals and objectives, SOC worked iteratively with WCMAC and MRCs to identify and refine a list of actions for each of the plan objectives.⁴ These actions describe the information and analyses the State incorporated in the general content of the MSP, or the activities that the State pursued as part of the planning process. Appendix F provides an index of MSP chapters, sections, and projects that address the specific actions listed below.

The goals, objectives, and actions adopted for the Marine Spatial Plan as a result of this process are as follows.

Overarching Goal

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.

Goal 1

Protect and preserve existing sustainable uses to ensure economic vibrancy and resource access for coastal communities.

Objective 1: Protect and preserve healthy existing natural resource-based economic activity on the Washington coast.

- Better understand, define, and document all existing marine activities taking place in the Study Area (commercial, recreational, cultural, and ecological) through scientific research and traditional knowledge research. Document context for existing uses and current and future trends of existing uses, including information on present conflicts and potential future conflicts for existing uses.
- Assess economic contributions of existing marine uses to the local and state economy.
- Identify and assess indicators of economic health.
- Following existing laws, protect and preserve existing uses by first avoiding and then minimizing adverse impacts from potential future activities, including impacts on aquaculture, recreation, tourism, navigation, air quality, and recreational, commercial, and tribal fishing. Identify policies and recommended actions that enable the implementation of the plan.
- Involve individuals and organizations representing existing uses in the planning process, such as by documenting current and future trends of existing uses, reviewing data and

⁴ In July 2014, WCMAC recommended the State use the final, adopted list of actions presented here.

maps of their use, understanding potential impacts, and evaluating scenarios and plan recommendations.

Goal 2

Maintain maritime coastal communities from now into perpetuity.

Objective 2: Sustain diverse traditional uses and experiences to ensure continuity of Washington's coastal identity, culture, and high quality of life.

- Understand culturally important uses of the marine environment, including documenting areas and uses of historical and cultural significance and current visual resources.
- Provide recommendations for uses that protect and enhance the aesthetic quality of marine environment, maritime activities, marine culture, and sense of place.
- Document vulnerability of coastal communities to coastal hazards as they relate to proposed future activities.
- Identify and assess indicators of social well-being within coastal communities.

Goal 3

Ensure that our marine ecosystem is preserved for future generations.

Objective 3: Foster healthy and resilient marine ecosystem functions, biodiversity, and habitats.

- Understand the current status of natural resources, ecosystem conditions, and impacts of natural variability and natural stressors on the marine ecosystem over the short and long term. Where possible, document information on ecosystem services and values.
- Understand the implications of various human activities to the marine ecosystem, including documenting species and habitats that face higher potential risk or impact from proposed activities.
- Identify and assess areas of ecological importance or particular sensitivity.
- Identify and assess ecological indicators of ecosystem health on Washington's coast.
- Following existing laws seek to avoid first and then minimize adverse environmental impacts, with special protection provided for the marine life and resources of the Columbia River, Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor estuaries, and coastal areas of Olympic National Park.

Goal 4

Develop an integrated decision-making process which supports proactive, adaptive, and efficient spatial planning.

Objective 4: Develop a locally-supported and collaborative process that is coordinated with existing authorities for aligning management decisions.

- Synthesize information on climate change and predicted impacts to marine resources and existing uses in the Study Area. Address how climate change may influence plan scenarios and potential impacts of new uses.
- Engage local, state, federal and tribal governments in all phases of the marine spatial planning process to ensure relevant management information and requirements are integrated into the process. The use or activity must comply with all applicable laws and regulations.
- Coordinate with neighboring states and provinces to share technical information across all sectors and enhance management of coastal ecosystems.
- Recommend approaches for improving the efficiency of the permitting process, where and if appropriate.
- Involve individuals and organizations representing existing uses and proposed new uses as well as individuals working elsewhere on similar issues in all phases of the planning process.
- Describe the management and implementation framework, including existing state laws, policies and regulations and how they address existing and proposed uses. The plan will articulate a strategy for ongoing interagency communication and the adaptation, implementation and review of the Marine Spatial Plan, including aligning MSP with other state management plans and goals and incorporating it into state plans and processes.
- Provide opportunities for public engagement and input throughout the planning process including public education, workshops and meetings. Identify barriers to participation and work with local stakeholders to address and reduce barriers to public participation. Document comments and provide responses, as appropriate.
- Engage scientific experts in review of data and methods. Develop data standards for data collection and analysis.
- Use best available science and information throughout the planning process and drafting of the plan. Provide a common information base to assist management decisions, including through the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

Goal 5

Encourage economic development that recognizes the aspirations of local communities and protects coastal resources.

Objective 5: Enhance sustainable economic opportunities to achieve a resilient economy and improved quality of life.

- Understand potential new uses and their potential benefits and potential adverse impacts on existing uses and the environment. Evaluate direct, indirect and cumulative impacts in environmental review documents for the plan.
- Develop coastal decision-making tools, analyses and recommendations to determine appropriate and compatible roles for future activities within the Study Area, including siting of offshore renewable energy, new locations for dredge disposal or aquaculture, and other potential new activities such as mining and bioextraction.

- Identify appropriate mitigation measures to address adverse impacts posed by proposed future uses of Washington’s coastal waters. Develop mitigation measures in accordance with state laws and regulations.

1.4 Planning Process Summary

As described in the introduction, the interagency team coordinated the planning process and development of the MSP. The following section summarizes the key outreach activities and groups that were engaged during the planning process.

Plan Scoping

In the spring of 2013, Washington Sea Grant and state agencies convened a series of marine spatial planning scoping workshops in Aberdeen, Washington. Over 50 people attended each of the workshops, representing local government, state and federal agencies, tribes, and the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC). Participants worked together to develop draft goals, objectives, and a planning boundary for the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) for Washington’s Pacific Coast.

Using the draft language developed by the scoping workshops, the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), as the plan development lead, issued a scoping notice and comment period for the plan under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The public comment period ran from July 16, 2013 through September 23, 2013, and allowed for broader input and review from interested parties and the public. Ecology received and considered 17 unique comment letters and 28 signed form letters. Based on these comments, Ecology revised the scope of the proposed Marine Spatial Plan and released a document summarizing SEPA scoping, comments, and responses in January 2014.

Coastal Marine Resource Committees (MRCs)

From the very initial steps, the Marine Resource Committees (MRCs) were actively involved in the State’s marine spatial planning process. Each MRC has a representative on WCMAC to ensure regular communication of their interests and input to the process. Some additional activities have included:

- Funding priorities and projects (Summer 2012 and Summer 2013): State planning staff attended meetings of each of the coastal MRCs in Summer 2012 and Summer 2013 to gather input on their priorities for marine spatial planning.
- Coastal Voices workshops (Spring 2013): MRCs worked with The Surfrider Foundation and The Nature Conservancy to host five workshops with a total of over 100 participants to gather input from coastal residents and stakeholders on their interests and goals, and to inform scoping for the MSP. A report from the workshops is available at: http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/060413_Coastal-Voices-Version-Final.pdf.

- MRC Summits (November 2013, October 2016, November 2017): State planning staff presented to MRCs on marine spatial planning at these annual meetings of all the coastal MRCs.
- Input on MSP actions (Spring 2014): Each MRC reviewed a list of draft actions for each of the Marine Spatial Plan goals and provided input. State planning staff used MRC input to further revise the actions, which WCMAC then recommended the State adopt in July 2014.
- Input on social indicators (Spring 2015): At their regular meetings, coastal MRCs each received a presentation on social indicator work and provided feedback on draft indicators.
- Input on WCMAC draft policy recommendations (Spring 2016): Washington Sea Grant and State planning staff presented draft WCMAC recommendations to MRCs to ensure they were providing input to their MRC representatives prior to the adoption of final recommendations by WCMAC.
- News articles in the West End newsletter distributed by the North Pacific MRC (Summer 2014, 2016, and 2017).
- Preliminary draft plan (Spring 2017): Washington Sea Grant presented updates on the planning process and the preliminary draft MSP to coastal MRCs.

Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC)

The Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) is a gubernatorial-level council with a diverse group of representatives from coastal stakeholder interest groups, coastal MRCs, and state agencies. WCMAC provided advice on the MSP throughout the planning process. This included:

- Participating in scoping workshops.
- Reviewing and recommending actions to carry out goals and objectives.
- Identifying data, project, and funding priorities.
- Providing input on approaches and deliverables for projects.
- Sharing interests and concerns.
- Recommending ways to address concerns within the plan.
- Providing feedback on and recommendations for the plan analyses and preliminary draft plan.

WCMAC members serve as liaisons with the interest groups they represent. They identified additional experts for MSP project consultants to interview for information. Tribal governments may also designate a liaison to participate in the WCMAC as a nonvoting member, and some have chosen to do so.

WCMAC has met about 5-6 times per year since the beginning of the planning process. Additionally, a Technical Committee and Steering Committee met by conference call approximately monthly to assist the group with tasks. A contracted facilitator assists the Committees and Council with developing agendas and other meeting materials, facilitating meetings, consensus-building, and tracking and recording discussions and recommendations.

More information is available on the Advisory Council website at:
<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/advisorycouncil.html>.

Initially formed by Ecology in December 2011, legislation prompted the reformation of this advisory council under the Governor's office in September 2013, but with the council still staffed by Ecology. A total of 25 advisory council meetings were held between March 2012 and May 2017.

Local Governments

State agency staff met with local coastal planning staff, presented at quarterly Shoreline Planner Coordination meetings, provided updates at work sessions for county commissioners (Clallam and Jefferson Counties, 2013), and shared written updates on the planning process. Local governments were invited to attend the scoping workshops held in Spring 2013. In addition, Ecology distributed a comprehensive white paper with information on ocean management guidelines, Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs), and marine spatial planning targeted at local planners. Ecology also provided a shorter Frequently Asked Questions document to answer specific questions about the relationship between SMPs, marine spatial planning, and the state's Coastal Zone Management Program.

MSP 101

State planning staff gave presentations and hosted workshops providing introductory information on marine planning to a variety of other audiences throughout the planning process. This included engagement with community members at events such as at open houses and panel presentations, at conferences, and through learning exchange workshops (Neah Bay and Aberdeen, Spring 2012).

Washington Sea Grant presented introductory and updated information on marine spatial planning to a number of community organizations across the Washington coast, including economic development councils, councils of governments, chambers of commerce, non-profit organizations, and other similar groups. Between the fall of 2012 and 2017, Washington Sea Grant presented to over 25 community groups and reached over 610 people.

Coastal Events and General Outreach

Washington Sea Grant attended local events throughout Washington's coast to raise awareness and engage the broader public on marine spatial planning, including distributing brochures and talking with people about the plan and the process. Washington Sea Grant and the local MRCs also co-hosted two local film showings of *Ocean Frontiers*⁵, a film about marine planning in the United States. Combined, these efforts reached nearly 1000 people between the summer of 2014 and the fall of 2016. Washington Sea Grant also distributed brochures and summaries of Frequently Asked Questions on marine spatial planning to local libraries and community centers across the coast.

⁵ <http://ocean-frontiers.org/>

MSP Project Engagement

Washington Sea Grant organized presentations on specific projects or topics of high interest to target audiences. Examples of this outreach include providing draft results on ecological models and ecological, economic, and social indicators to the Grays Harbor Coalition for Infrastructure and Citizens for a Clean Harbor, or reviewing recreational survey results with the Long Beach Visitors Bureau and Olympic Peninsula Visitors Bureau. State planning staff also organized workshops on the coastal economic analysis to assist contractors in scoping the project and getting input on draft results from a range of stakeholders and agencies. Over 110 people participated in these various events.

Tribes

State agency staff met with technical and policy staff of coastal tribes throughout the planning process, including sending letters inviting their participation in the process and providing updates. The state and the four coastal treaty tribes (the Hoh, Makah, and Quileute tribes, and the Quinault Indian Nation) had between 2-4 joint technical and policy staff meetings per year. The state also met with staff from the Shoalwater Bay Tribe.

Depending on the tribe, various tribal staff participated in workshops, meetings, and forums; reviewed and provided input on MSP project priorities, deliverables, and draft products; provided technical and scientific information and feedback; met with consultants; and partnered on data collection and field work. State staff also met with and briefed tribes separately (including with tribal natural resource staff and council members, in some cases) at various points in the planning process. See Section 1.6 below for more details and context on tribes and their unique relationship with Washington State and the federal government.

Federal Agencies

State agencies involved federal agencies in the planning process in many ways, such as including them in scoping and technical workshops; contacting them for specific data and information; gathering input on priorities, needs, and interests; meeting to discuss the MSP and process; and partnering with them on several specific projects (see below for examples). State staff presented on the MSP and planning process several times to the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary's Advisory Council.

Federal agency staff played an important technical and scientific support role in the state's marine spatial planning process. Federal staff activities included: coordinating the science-based development of and assessment of conceptual models and ecological indicators for Washington's coast; creating ecological models for distributions of seabirds and marine mammals; conducting an inventory of and prioritization of seafloor mapping data; creating a seafloor atlas from existing data; providing GIS data and other information (e.g. satellite vessel traffic data provided by Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary); and participating on the science advisory panel.

Science Advisory Panel

In 2013, Washington Sea Grant facilitated a graduate-level class that engaged graduate students and a diverse group of research professors in reviewing available marine spatial planning data and identifying data gaps. Washington Sea Grant subsequently set up a Science Advisory Panel with these and other researchers and scientists from academic, state, and federal entities. This group provided independent review of and feedback on particular data sources, project methods, and data analyses. The Science Advisory Panel's feedback provided important direction for the State to understand datasets, adjust methods, and improve accuracy of findings and results.

Data and Tool Development

Throughout the planning process, state agencies sought input on data and tool development. This included working with The Nature Conservancy and EcoTrust to host a number of training and input sessions on the online data mapping tool as it was being developed. These sessions with MRCs, planners, and other audiences aimed to improve functionality and ease-of-use. Washington also partnered with federal agencies to host participatory human use mapping workshops to map ocean use areas based on expert user knowledge. The four workshops involved 65 participants representing all ocean use sectors, such as ocean industries, marine operators, and federal, tribal, and state resource managers (April 2013). State planning staff engaged representatives from ocean use sectors and WCMAC to: 1) identify available data, data priorities, and projects to fill data gaps; and 2) understand how best to display and analyze the data on their use to understand potential conflicts with new uses.

1.5 The MSP Study Area

The MSP Study Area consists of marine state and federal waters along the Pacific Ocean.⁶ The Study Area extends from ordinary high water on the shoreward side out to 700 fathoms (4,200 feet) depth offshore – a distance of 35 to 55 nautical miles offshore, with an average distance of approximately 40 nautical miles. It extends along the coast from Cape Flattery on the north of the Olympic Peninsula south to Cape Disappointment at the Mouth of the Columbia River – a distance of 136 nautical miles (Map 1). It encompasses estuaries along the coast, including two large estuaries: Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay. The Study Area was chosen because it is where the highest intensity and density of existing coastal uses exist. It is also ecologically meaningful in terms of connections to Washington's coastal zone, and maximizes the use of existing data and available information (Washington Department of Ecology, 2014). The Study Area was also based on the expected locations for potential new federal activities, and where effects on the state's coastal uses or resources from those new uses or activities are reasonably foreseeable (Washington Department of Ecology, 2014).

Altogether, the Study Area encompasses approximately 325 nm of coastline, including the Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay estuaries, and spans 5951 square nautical miles (7,881 square

⁶ Development of Marine Spatial Plans for other waters of Washington including the Columbia River, Strait of Juan de Fuca, and Puget Sound is dependent on future funding.

statute miles).⁷ This area includes the intertidal, nearshore, continental shelf, and continental slope areas of Washington's Pacific waters. It includes both state waters (0-3 nm) and federal waters beyond 3 nm. Adjacent upland areas include the Olympic Peninsula and the southwestern portion of the state. Four counties (Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, and Pacific Counties) border the Study Area, along with the reservations of five federally-recognized tribes (the Hoh, Makah, Quileute, and Shoalwater Bay Tribes, and the Quinault Indian Nation) (Map 2). At the Study Area's southern boundary is the Mouth of the Columbia River, the largest river in the Pacific Northwest with source waters from the Rocky Mountains. At the northern boundary is the Strait of Juan de Fuca, with source waters from Puget Sound and the Strait of Georgia (Canada).

Two-thirds (67%) of the MSP Study Area overlaps with the Usual and Accustomed Areas (U&As) of one of the coastal treaty tribes – the combined area for adjudicated tribal fishing U&As is approximately 3924 nautical miles of the Study Area (Map 2 – note: only U&As that overlap with the MSP Study Area are shown. The Makah U&A extends into the Strait of Juan de Fuca, which is not displayed on this map.). Section 1.6 discusses Indian Tribes and Treaty Rights in greater detail.

A large portion (32%) of the Study Area's marine environment is a part of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (See Section 1.7 for more details). There are also five national wildlife refuges within the Study Area: Copalis, Flattery Rocks, Grays Harbor, Quillayute Needles, and Willapa. It also includes the Washington State Seashore Conservation Area and several state parks, which are managed by the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission for public recreational use (Map 1). The Navy has a facility located at Pacific Beach - Naval Station Everett Annex Pacific Beach.

The northern coastal portion of the Study Area consists of a mostly rocky coast with several coastal rivers, rocky outcrops, and pocket beaches. Adjacent uplands are rural, consisting mostly of Olympic National Park land and tribal reservations. The southern coastal portion has generally sandy beaches and includes Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor. Several small cities and towns are located along the southern coast. Uplands in the southern area largely consist of managed private and public timber lands and agriculture.

The description above and Map 1 define the MSP Study Area. In some cases, the MSP also includes data and information that extend beyond this area to assist in fully describing the activity or resource, its importance to coastal communities and Washington State, and future trends. Many of the uses and resources of Washington's Pacific coast are related to or supported by activities, resources, infrastructure, or communities that are outside of the MSP Study Area.

For example, the economic impacts of coastal industries like commercial or recreational fishing are not limited to the counties adjacent to the MSP Study Area. A recreational or commercial fisher may be catching fish within the MSP Study Area, but launching from a marina and selling fish to buyers that are outside the Study Area. Additionally, marine transportation and shipping operations within the Study Area are not only traveling to and from the Port of Grays Harbor (within the MSP Study Area), but also to and from ports in Puget Sound, the Columbia River, other West Coast states, or across the Pacific Ocean. Trends in shipping and transportation within the Study Area are influenced by changes in ports, vessels, and trade across a wide geographical area. In addition, the best available data for different uses varies in scale and method of data collection. In many cases, this makes it difficult to separate information outside of the MSP Study Area from data describing areas within. The inclusion of information outside

⁷ The shoreline estimate was calculated using GIS files of the Study Area.

of the MSP Study Area does not alter the boundary of the Study Area and will be noted, where relevant, in later sections of the MSP.

1.6 Pacific Coast Indian Tribes and Treaty Rights

The Washington coast has been home to native peoples for at least 6,000 years. The Native people of the coast traditionally lived at the water's edge, thriving on the riches of the ocean plants, fish, shellfish, seabirds, and marine mammals. With the settlement of Euro-Americans, many northwest tribes ceded much of their land to the United States.

Governor Isaac Stevens negotiated the Stevens Treaties in the mid-1850s with northwest tribes throughout what was then the Washington Territory.⁸ Four of the five tribes adjacent to the MSP Study area signed treaties and include the Hoh, Makah, and Quileute Tribes, and the Quinault Indian Nation (referred to collectively as the coastal treaty tribes).⁹ The 1855 Treaty of Neah Bay¹⁰ with the Makah Tribe and the 1856 Treaty of Olympia¹¹ with the Hoh Tribe, Quileute Tribe, and the Quinault Indian Nation govern the relationships between the federal government and the coastal treaty tribes. Through signing those treaties, the treaty tribes agreed to allow the peaceful settlement of much of western Washington and ceded land to do so, in exchange for, among other things, their reserved right to harvest fish, shellfish, wildlife, and plants, and exercise other cultural practices both on and off-reservation. The treaties reserved the right to fish in “usual and accustomed grounds and stations” beyond a tribe’s reservation boundaries. Other tribes were recognized by the federal government through federal processes and maintain tribal reservations, but do not have treaties with the United States. The Shoalwater Bay Tribe did not complete the treaty process and is a federally-recognized tribe (Map 2).

In 1974, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington (Judge Boldt presiding) upheld the tribes’ treaty fishing rights, affirming the tribal right to harvest up to 50% of the harvestable salmon passing through their respective usual and accustomed fishing areas (U&As) (*U.S. v. Washington*, 384 F. Supp. 312 (W.D. Wash. 1974)). This ruling became known as the Boldt Decision. In 1979, the United States Supreme Court upheld the Boldt Decision. The court has also acknowledged that the concurrent jurisdiction of treaty tribes creates a co-management relationship with the State. A court decision in 1994 (*U.S. v Washington*, 873 F. Supp. 1422 (W.D. Wash. 1994)), also known as the Rafeedie decision (named for the judge), recognized the right of Washington treaty tribes to take up to 50% of all fish, including naturally occurring shellfish, in their respective U&As.

The management of the marine environment is crucial to each of the coastal tribes, as the marine environment is integral to their history, culture, identity, and future. Marine resource management as a matter of law is shared with the State and federal government. The MSP Study Area overlaps with 3,924 square nautical miles (67%) of the combined, adjudicated tribal fishing U&As and can be seen in Map 2 (*U.S. v. Washington*, Subproceeding 09-01, March 5, 2018, order). Individual U&As vary in their specific geographic coverage, extending seaward from 30 to 42 nautical miles and extending along the coast from the international border to south of, and

⁸ Many tribes throughout Washington signed treaties with the United States and are collectively referred to as “treaty tribes.” However, the MSP will focus primarily on the coastal tribes that are located within the MSP Study Area and use the term “coastal treaty tribes” to distinguish these four treaty tribes from other treaty tribes.

⁹ The Shoalwater Bay Tribe is a federally recognized tribe but is not party to a treaty with the United States.

¹⁰ Treaty of Neah Bay available at: <https://nwifc.org/member-tribes/treaties/>

¹¹ Treaty of Olympia available at: <https://nwifc.org/member-tribes/treaties/>

including, Grays Harbor. Map 2 only displays only portions of the adjudicated tribal fishing U&A boundaries that overlap with the MSP Study Area. For example, the Makah’s tribal fishing U&A extends into the Strait of Juan de Fuca (beyond the MSP Study Area), which is not displayed on Map 2.

The MSP provides an opportunity for the State of Washington to progressively plan for new ocean uses, while protecting the current uses, culture, environment, and identity of coastal Washington, including respecting the treaty rights and interests of the five federally-recognized tribes within to the Study Area. The State relationship with each of the tribes is of high importance in the MSP process for current and future “new” use discussions.

Government-to-Government Relationship

The State of Washington and the tribes have government-to-government relationships, meaning that tribes have independent relationships with each other and with the State. These relationships recognize and respect the sovereignty of the other (Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs, 2015). The State of Washington and federally-recognized tribes signed the Centennial Accord and subsequent Millennium Agreement and agreed to consult on matters that may affect tribal and State interests (Governor’s Office of Indian Affairs, 2015). In 2012, a state law established state agency procedure requirements for the government-to-government relationship with tribes ([RCW 43.376](#)).

The federal government has a trust responsibility to federally-recognized tribes. Through this obligation, the federal government works directly with tribes as sovereign nations. The exact implementing procedures may vary between the federal agencies, but the federal trust obligation includes consulting with tribal governments prior to taking actions that may affect federally-recognized tribes and treaty rights (The White House, 1994).

Fishing Treaty Rights Co-Management

Each treaty tribe regulates the fishing activities of its members within its respective U&A in accordance with tribal law and judicially-prescribed fishery management responsibilities. Each tribe also maintains its own fisheries management and enforcement staff, enters into management agreements with other co-managers, and engages in a wide variety of research, restoration, and enhancement activities to protect marine resources and improve the scientific basis for resource stewardship (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011).

The coastal treaty tribes, the State of Washington, specifically the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), and United States government (NOAA Fisheries and USFWS), are co-managers of federal fishery resources in Washington.

The MSP does not address, alter, or attempt to influence the fisheries co-management process or relationship. Fisheries co-management is outlined here to recognize its importance within the Study Area and provide context for the fishing and shellfishing industry descriptions provided later in the MSP. The procedures for tribal and state consultation, coordination, and communication to address specific new use proposals within the MSP Study Area are provided in Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework (See Section 4.2.1).

Coastal Tribes

The State invited each of the coastal tribes to provide a description of their use of and reliance on marine resources, their management of these resources, important future activities, and any concerns or opportunities including those related to new uses. The inclusion of these tribal descriptions, below, does not constitute an endorsement nor concurrence by the State of Washington of the specific information, including any unresolved legal claims, provided by the tribes.

To date, three participating tribes have provided descriptions, including their main concerns and interests in the marine spatial planning process. Additional descriptions may be added as they become available.

Makah Tribe

On January 31, 1855, the Makah Tribe entered into an agreement with the United States of America, known as the 1855 Treaty of Neah Bay. Under Article 6 of the U.S. Constitution, treaties between the U.S. Government and sovereign nations are the “supreme law of the land.” The Treaty of Neah Bay is the official agreement between the Makah Tribe and the U.S. Government that reserved the Makah Tribe’s inherent sovereign rights to natural and cultural resources and other services and benefits in exchange for the cession of 469 square miles of its territory to the U.S. Government. The Makah Tribe reserved the right of “taking fish, and of whaling or sealing” at usual and accustomed fishing grounds.

Since time immemorial, the Makah culture has been dependent on resources from the ocean. The Makah people are the southernmost of the Nuu-chah-nulth tribes, being the only member of the Wakashan-speaking people within the United States. The traditional name for the Makah Tribe is qwidičča?ɑ·tš which means “People of the Cape.” Located at the northwestern tip of the Olympic Peninsula of Washington state, the Makah Indian Reservation currently encompasses a land area of approximately 47 square miles. Unlike most other coastal Pacific Northwest tribes who had village sites located on productive salmon rivers, the Makah Tribe had village sites located near productive ocean resources. During the negotiation of the Treaty, a tribal leader declared, “I want the sea. That is my country.” This statement is a testament to the Makah’s unique connection to the ocean.

The Makah Tribe is active in domestic and international fisheries management forums (e.g. Pacific Fishery Management Council, Pacific Salmon Commission, North of Falcon, International Pacific Halibut Commission, US Canada Whiting Agreement, International Whaling Commission), ocean policy forums (National Ocean Policy’s Governance Coordinating Committee, West Coast Regional Planning Body, and Washington Sub-Regional Planning Team as well as the Intergovernmental Policy Commission), and research. The fisheries of the Makah Tribe include but are not limited to Pacific Halibut, salmon, whiting, Black Cod, groundfish, and others. The Makah Tribe is currently seeking a waiver under the Marine Mammal Protection Act so that it can resume the exercise of its treaty whaling rights, as secured in the 1855 Treaty of Neah Bay.

The Makah Tribe’s current marine U&A area is constrained by the U.S./Canada border to the north, extends to 48° 02’ 15” N (Norwegian Memorial) to the south, extends to 125° 44’ 00” W (approximately 40 nautical miles offshore) to the west, and extends to 123° 42’ 30” W (Tongue Point) to the east. This area represents approximately 1,550 square miles of marine waters – of this area, approximately 921 square nautical miles of the Makah’s U&A marine

fishing grounds overlap with the MSP Study Area (11.7 % of the Study Area). Makah maritime culture has been sustained through an ecosystem-based management approach to natural resources, including an understanding that the utilization and protection of resources go hand-in-hand. A thriving ecosystem in the Makah U&A area and its surrounding marine areas provide resources for fishing and hunting, the preservation of cultural practices, as well as jobs, tourism, recreation and other economic activities.

The concerns of the Makah Tribe relevant to marine spatial planning include, but are not limited to: impacts to treaty fishing grounds and the ability to exercise treaty rights through the siting of permanent or temporary offshore development in important habitats within and outside the Makah U&A; temporary spatial conflicts such as military exercises, vessel traffic, etc.; oil spill risk and the associated impacts to treaty resources and the environmental conditions on which they depend (i.e., fish, marine mammals, seabirds, etc.); and regulatory actions planned, proposed, or taken by the State or federal government. Climate change impacts, especially on species distribution and harvest access, including but not limited to ocean temperature increases, ocean acidification, hypoxic events, and harmful algal blooms, may also impact marine resources subject to Makah treaty rights. Any siting of projects (renewable energy, offshore aquaculture, or other), expansion of or change in existing uses (shipping lanes, dredge disposal locations, etc.), or potential impacts to the ocean ecosystem and/or treaty resources within and outside the U&A will require consultation with the Makah Tribal Council.

In January 2017, the Makah Tribal Council approved by formal resolution the Makah Ocean Policy. The purpose of this Policy is to “protect and exercise the treaty-reserved rights and culture” of the Makah Tribe that are inextricably tied to the health of the ocean. The Policy acknowledges that in order for the Makah Tribe to preserve its treaty rights, “it is critical for the Tribe to be informed of and actively involved in decisions on actions that may affect the Tribe’s use of treaty resources or the health of the ecosystems upon which these resources depend.” The Makah Ocean Policy contains consultation procedures that establish the requirements for when consultation is needed, including when it should begin, as well as pre-notification requirements, points of contact at the Tribe, and what is required of state and federal permitting agencies to initiate formal closure of consultation. To obtain a copy of the Makah Ocean Policy, please contact the Makah Tribe (Rosina DePoe, Chief of Staff for tribal council).

Quileute Tribe

The Quileute Tribe is part of the Treaty of Olympia of January, 1856, with the Quinault Indian Nation and the Hoh Tribe. It is headquartered at La Push at the mouth of the Quillayute River, but its U&A fishing grounds under the Treaty of Olympia include marine waters from Cape Alava south to the Queets River and 40 nautical miles west. Approximately 1538 square nautical miles of the marine area of the Quileute U&A fishing grounds overlaps with the MSP Study Area (19.5% of the Study Area). The Tribe also has freshwater fishing rights to the entire Quillayute River Basin, north to Lake Ozette (shared with Makah) and south to Goodman Creek (shared with Hoh).

Quileute has defined its presence on the Washington coast as “since time immemorial.” It has been actively fishing for marine mammals, groundfish, salmonids, and shellfish throughout its history. While commercial use of these fisheries (initially through trade and later through more conventional commercial compensation) has long been their tradition, fisheries are critical to subsistence of their members, and special attention is given to assuring food for elders or other needy persons in the community. Many traditional ceremonies derive from the ancient fishing practices and the appreciation of nature’s bounty. Ceremonial events celebrating the fisheries are

also part of the tribe's culture, related in potlatches, traditional songs, and dances. Recent recognition of the full scope of the Quileute's ocean fishery was provided by the federal court decisions in *U.S. v. Washington*, sub-proceeding 2009-01, in 2015.

In 1998, the Quileute Tribe was recognized officially as having self-regulatory capacity by the State, under provisions of the *U.S. v. Washington* court for demonstrated government capacity. The Tribe has a modern fleet, with emphasis on the crab, halibut, Black Cod, and salmon fisheries at present. Tribal representatives participate in intergovernmental processes to determine appropriate harvest levels for the fisheries, such as the Pacific Fishery Management Council, North of Falcon, Pacific Salmon Treaty, and numerous meetings with NOAA Fisheries, WDFW, and coastal treaty tribe representatives. The Tribe has a commissioner to the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission.

Immediate future concerns are reductions in allowable harvest that may derive from climate, severe weather, harmful algal blooms, or anthropogenic causes such as fishing practices. The Tribe is also concerned about access that may be interrupted by naval operations, shipping lanes, or conservation measures, and engages fully in intergovernmental meetings and review of publications on all matters that can impact its marine resources.

The Tribe is open to exploring opportunities for energy generation that can be done with respect for the ecosystem and fishing rights, and treaty rights in general.

Quinault Indian Nation

The Quinault Indian Nation (QIN) is a signatory to the Treaty of Olympia (1856), by which it reserved, among other things, the right of "taking fish, at all usual and accustomed fishing grounds and stations" and the privilege of hunting and gathering, among other rights, in exchange for ceding lands it historically roamed freely. QIN's treaty fisheries provide physical sustenance that is both direct, through subsistence uses, and indirect, through commercial uses. Those fisheries also provide and embody values that cannot be quantified, and are personally and closely felt and treasured. Fishing is used by Quinault people to educate younger generations in life lessons, to pass on traditional knowledge, and to perpetuate ceremonial values.

QIN's U&A fishing grounds and stations encompass the area that begins at the mainland adjacent to Destruction Island and extend westward for thirty miles, then southward to the intersection of a line that is directly westward of Point Chehalis, and proceed to Point Chehalis. QIN relies upon the marine area of its U&A fishing grounds and stations for harvesting species that include crab, salmon, halibut, Black Cod (sablefish), sardines, rockfish, and Lingcod. Methods of harvest include pot fisheries, trolling, longline, and both bottom and mid-water trawling. QIN also relies on the harvest of Razor Clams on the beaches of its U&A. Approximately 1419 square nautical miles of the marine area of the QIN's U&A fishing grounds overlaps with the MSP Study Area (18% of Study Area).

Given QIN's federally-protected treaty right, while QIN may not fish a given species today, QIN does reserve a right to harvest that species tomorrow. A non-exhaustive list of species for which QIN may, at some yet-to-be determined future time, opt to exercise its treaty right, includes Pacific Whiting, tuna, shrimp/prawns, mackerel, Dover/Petrale/English Sole, and schooling rockfish. QIN's interest includes habitat that supports those resources. This includes all bottom habitat (benthic) and water column habitat (pelagic). These habitats are directly influenced by the great currents of the west coast (California and Davidson Currents), localized nearshore currents, seasonal winds that drive upwelling and biological productivity, terrestrial inputs including fresh water and erosion products and, of course, changing climate.

1.7 Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary

Designated in 1994, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (Sanctuary) is a place of regional, national, and global significance. The Sanctuary encompasses approximately 32.5% of the MSP Study Area (Map 1) and is one of North America's most productive marine regions and pristine, undeveloped shorelines. The Sanctuary is a part of a system of 14 marine protected areas coordinated and administered by National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

The Sanctuary spans 2,561 square nautical miles (3,391 square miles) of marine waters off the coast of Washington's Olympic Peninsula. It extends seaward 32 to 43 nautical miles and to depths of over 4,500 feet. The densely complex shoreline covers 117 nautical miles from Cape Flattery to the Copalis River, including all bays, inlets, points, and other shoreline features. The Sanctuary is located within the northern portion of the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem, is connected to the Big Eddy Ecosystem, and supports high primary productivity. The Sanctuary is home to some of the largest U.S. seabird colonies, at least twenty-nine species of marine mammals, commercially-important fish species, deep-sea corals, and one of the most diverse seaweed communities in the world.

The Sanctuary borders Olympic National Park and lies within the U&As of four federally-recognized American Indian tribes: the Hoh, Makah, and Quileute Tribes, and the Quinault Indian Nation (the four coastal treaty tribes). The Sanctuary also enhances protection of the Washington Maritime National Wildlife Refuge Complex, which includes more than 600 offshore islands and emergent rocks within the Sanctuary. Major ocean activities occur within the Sanctuary, including shipping, tribal and non-tribal commercial fisheries, naval operations, and research activities.

The mission of the Sanctuary is "to protect the Olympic Coast's natural and cultural resources through responsible stewardship, to conduct and apply research to preserve the area's ecological integrity and maritime heritage, and to promote understanding through public outreach and education." The Sanctuary is managed using a unique collaborative framework. In 2007, the four coastal treaty tribes, the State of Washington, and the National Sanctuary Program created the Olympic Coast Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC) to provide a regional forum for resource managers to exchange information, coordinate policies, and develop recommendations for resource management within the Sanctuary.

In addition, the Sanctuary also works with a Sanctuary Advisory Council (SAC), an advisory group with representatives from the coastal treaty tribes, state and federal agencies, local governments, and a variety of local stakeholder interests. The SAC advises the Sanctuary superintendent on the management and protection of the Sanctuary; and deliberates and provides recommendations on Sanctuary operations, education and outreach programs, regulations and enforcement efforts, and marine policy and management plans.

The Sanctuary has several goals and objectives aimed at protecting the ecological resources and cultural uses within the Sanctuary. Examples of their goals and programs include: investigating and enhancing the understanding of ecosystem processes through research, enhancing ocean literacy, conserving natural resources within the Sanctuary, enhancing understanding and appreciation of the Olympic Coast's maritime heritage, and facilitating wise and sustainable uses within the Sanctuary. The 2011 Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Management Plan outlines several Action Plans involving topics such as oil spill prevention and

preparedness, marine debris, education and outreach, research coordination, and community involvement (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011).

For more information about the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, please see the 2011 Final Management Plan (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011) or the Sanctuary website at <http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/>.

Authority and Legal Framework

Under the National Marine Sanctuaries Act ([16 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.](#)), sanctuaries have the authority to prohibit particular activities and permit certain activities, if the proposal will not substantially injure Sanctuary resources and qualities and is found to satisfy the Sanctuary's criteria for permitted activities. Activities that would disturb or place a constructed object on the seafloor within the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary would require a Sanctuary permit. The Sanctuary could also consider an application to authorize, and potentially condition, other federal or state authorizations ([15 CFR Part 922](#)).

The Sanctuary requires a permit when an individual or organization wishes to conduct an activity within the Sanctuary that is prohibited by Sanctuary regulations. Prohibited activities include low-altitude overflights¹², seafloor disturbances, construction or placement of any structure on the seafloor, and discharge or deposit of any material. Military activities performed by the Department of Defense are exempt from Sanctuary prohibitions.¹³ Military activities are carried out in a manner that avoids adverse impacts on Sanctuary resources, to the maximum extent possible. Whether the Sanctuary chooses to issue a permit or authorization for other activities is dependent upon a number of project-specific factors including:

- Assessment of the potential injury to Sanctuary resources and qualities
- Professional qualifications and finances of the applicant
- Duration of the project
- Cumulative effects
- Impacts of the activity on adjacent tribes, as reviewed by the respective tribes

Permits may be issued for projects that will not substantially injure Sanctuary resources and qualities and will further one of the following:

- Research related to Sanctuary resources and qualities
- Education, natural or historical resource value of the Sanctuary
- Salvage and recovery operations
- Archeological understanding
- Tribal self-determination and government functions, exercise of treaty rights, economic development, or other tribal activities

The Sanctuary includes conditions in permits and authorizations to ensure that an approved project has minimal negative impacts to the marine environment.

¹² To protect seabirds and marine mammals, Federal Regulations prohibit disturbing wildlife in the sanctuary by operating aircraft below 2,000 feet, within one nautical mile of the coast and offshore rocks and islands. Failure to maintain a minimum altitude of 2,000 feet above ground level over any such waters is presumed to disturb marine mammals or seabirds (15 CFR Part 922.152.) See:

<https://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/protect/wildlifedisturbance/overflight.html>

¹³ In accordance with 15 C.F.R. section 922.152(d).

Of the potential future uses addressed within the MSP, mining (methane hydrate mining and sand/gravel mining) as well as new dredge disposal locations¹⁴ are prohibited activities and may not be permitted by the Sanctuary ([15 CFR Part 922.152](#)). Marine renewable energy, offshore aquaculture, and marine product extraction¹⁵ would require Sanctuary authorization, and the Sanctuary may choose to permit these activities if they meet the criteria discussed above.

Coordination with Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary in the Planning Process

Staff from the Sanctuary were involved in the planning process and will continue to be engaged during MSP implementation. Sanctuary staff recommended that the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary be included within the MSP Study Area and that the Marine Spatial Plan integrate the Sanctuary Management Plan. Sanctuary staff assisted the planning process by participating as technical advisors in projects such as seafloor mapping prioritization and ecological indicator development, assisting in several data gathering and mapping projects, and providing input on overall plan development.

¹⁴ Emergency dredge disposal may be permitted by the Sanctuary.

¹⁵ Marine product extraction will require permits if benthic organisms are extracted (seafloor disturbance).

References

Court Decisions [Source type 6]

Seminole Nation v. United States, 316 US 386, 1942

U.S. v. Washington, 384 F. Supp. 312, 403 (W.D. Wash. 1974)

U.S. v. Washington, 873 F. Supp.1422 (W.D. Wash. 1994)

U.S. v. Washington, Subproceeding 09-01, March 5, 2018, amended order

U.S. v. Washington, Subproceeding 09-01, unpublished opinion to date (by Westlaw). Available at <http://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/sites/wawd/files/Makah09-01FFCLandMemorandum.pdf>.

Laws [Source type 5]

Revised Code of Washington (RCW)

Government-to-government relationship with Indian Tribes, RCW 43.376

United States Code (U.S.C)

National Marine Sanctuaries Act 16 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.

Magnuson Stevens Act; 16 U.S. 1801 et seq.

Regulations [Source type 7]

Code of Federal Register (CFR)

National Marine Sanctuary Program Regulations, 15 CFR Part 922

Reports, Journals, Etc.

Governor's Office of Indian Affairs. (2015). State-tribal relations and Centennial Accord.

Retrieved May 5, 2015, from <http://www.goia.wa.gov/Relations/Relations.html>.

<http://www.goia.wa.gov/government-to-government/data/centennialaccord.htm> [Source type 11].

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Magnuson-Stevens Act provisions; fisheries off west coast states; tribal usual and accustomed fishing areas, 50 CFR Part 660 §

(2016). Retrieved from

<http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/frn/2016/81fr36806.pdf> [Source type 7].

Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. (2011). Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary final management plan and environmental assessment. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from

http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/management/managementplan/mgmtplan_complete.pdf

[Source type 11].

The White House. (1994). Memorandum on government-to-government relations with Native American tribal governments. Federal Register. Retrieved from

<https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/WCPD-1994-05-02/pdf/WCPD-1994-05-02-Pg936.pdf>

[Source type 11].

Washington Department of Ecology. (2014). *Marine Spatial Plan for Washington's Pacific Coast: Summary of SEPA Scoping and Response to Comments*. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/MSP_scoping_summary_2014.pdf [Source type 4].

Chapter 2:
Current Conditions and Future Trends

2.1 Ecology of Washington's Pacific Coast

Washington's Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) Study Area¹ is a highly productive, diverse ecosystem. Living resources within this ecosystem are the foundation of Washington's ocean uses. The health and status of the MSP Study Area's species, habitats, and ecosystem are of primary importance to ocean and estuarine users, coastal residents, tribes, and the state of Washington. The MSP Study Area has several federally and state designated protected areas (Map 1) designed to protect and foster the health of important habitats and species off Washington's Pacific coast.

This section describes the ecology of the MSP Study Area by summarizing the physical oceanography, water quality status, geomorphology, biology, and ecological stressors of Washington's outer coast. Information presented here can be used not only to understand the ecological context of Washington's ocean and estuaries, but also to consider potential future new uses and how they may affect the ecological status of the MSP Study Area. While climate change is mentioned briefly in this section, a more detailed and thorough explanation of the impacts of climate change on the ecology of the MSP Study Area can be found in Section 2.11: Climate Change.

Physical Oceanography

The currents, tides, eddies, plumes, upwelling, and other physical features of Washington's Pacific coast shape habitat, fisheries, and other important services provided by these highly productive waters. The following section discusses the main physical oceanographic features that influence the MSP Study Area.

Currents, Upwelling, and Productivity

The Pacific Northwest (including Washington's Pacific coast) is predominantly influenced by large-scale ocean processes that exhibit seasonal patterns and a highly dynamic ocean environment (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003). The dominant oceanographic feature of the Pacific Northwest (PNW) is the California Current System (CCS), which has strong interannual, seasonal, and daily variability. The CCS includes the strong southward-flowing California Current, which flows year-round offshore from the shelf break, and a California Undercurrent which flows northward along the continental slope. The CCS also includes the northward-flowing Davidson Current in the winter and the southward-flowing California Coastal Jet Current in the summer. Each current has distinct properties (e.g., temperature, nutrients, oxygen, salinity) depending upon its source waters, including the Pacific Subarctic, North Pacific Central, and Southern water masses (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003; Pirhalla et al., 2009).

Seasonal circulation patterns bring the water properties from these currents into the region and strongly influence productivity, transportation routes for larval fish and shellfish, plankton, and other important ecological features (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003, 2008; Pirhalla et al., 2009). The PNW has an upwelling/downwelling seasonal pattern driven by wind direction. Upwelling occurs mostly during the spring and summer when the wind comes from the north,

¹ The MSP Study Area is defined in Section 1.5.

but with important ‘conditioning’ events occurring in the winter (Black et al., 2011). Upwelling is the process by which currents and wind stress from the north combine with the Coriolis force to push surface water offshore and replace it with deep, cold, highly saline, and nutrient-rich water from below (Figure 2.1-1). Upwelling brings nutrients up into the upper portion of the water column where sunlight penetrates, known as the photic zone. These nutrients are then available to phytoplankton that form the base of the coastal and ocean food web. Upwelling can be variable on a several day scale, with periods of strong upwelling and periods of relaxed wind and reduced upwelling during the spring and summer (Andrews, Harvey, & Levin, 2013; B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003, 2008; Pirhalla et al., 2009).

The seasonal pattern generally transitions to downwelling during the fall, which persists throughout winter. During downwelling, currents and wind stress from the south push water onshore. This water is typically warmer, less saline, and less nutrient-rich (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003). Seasonal upwelling and downwelling events can be detected by analyzing parameters such as sea surface height and chlorophyll-a concentration (Pirhalla et al., 2009). Figure 2.1-2 provides a general example of seasonal chlorophyll measurements along Washington’s coast corresponding to increases in chlorophyll in spring and summer (upwelling) and decreases in fall and winter (downwelling).




Figure 2.1-1. Schematic of upwelling forces. Source: (NOAA Fisheries, n.d.-a).




Figure 2.1-2. Integrated chlorophyll (all depths) for 2005-2006. Source: (B. Hickey, Banas, & MacCready, 2013) at <http://msp.wa.gov/msp-projects/ocean-conditions/#Chlorophyll>.

In addition to upwelling, other features influence ocean and coastal productivity along the Washington coast. A significant element is the Juan de Fuca Eddy, a semi-permanent feature located off the coasts of northern Washington and southern Vancouver Island in British Columbia. The eddy forms in the spring, dissipates in the fall, and is formed by the outflow from the Salish Sea through the Strait of Juan de Fuca. The eddy is characterized by high nutrient content, increased productivity and retention, and enhanced higher trophic-level biomass (Andrews et al., 2013; B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2008).

The Columbia River Plume is another major feature that influences productivity along Washington’s Pacific coast. The river plume brings fresh water, sediment, nutrients, carbon, and organic matter, which increase primary productivity in marine waters. The plume also influences water circulation, retention, and transportation, which effect plankton and larval fish. The Columbia River Plume can vary in orientation, but is generally pushed northward along the coast in the winter during downwelling and generally southwestward during the summer. Although, this may vary during weak upwelling periods (Andrews et al., 2013; Burla, Baptista, Zhang, & Frolov, 2010; B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2008). While the Columbia River Plume generally provides fewer nutrients to the ocean during the summer months, some research suggests the plume may help sustain local ecosystems by providing a nutrient supply during periods of weak to no upwelling or during late spring transitions (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2008).

Coastal trapped waves, another important physical process and feature in the Study Area, are a complex interaction of shelf slope, wind, and angular momentum. They can accelerate local longshore currents. Coastal trapped waves can generate as far south as central California (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003). Features such as the Juan de Fuca Eddy, the Columbia River Plume, coastal trapped waves, and submarine canyons (described below) are estimated to contribute significantly to the relatively higher productivity of the Washington coast as compared to the rest of the PNW (southern Oregon and northern California) (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2008). See Figure 2.1-3.




Figure 2.1-3. Schematic of general physical factors limiting nutrient availability and surface response during January, May, July, and September. Source: Pirhalla et al., 2009.

Estuaries

Several estuaries occur within the MSP Study Area. Estuaries in the northern portion of the MSP Study Area are relatively small outlets from coastal rivers. Two large estuaries in the southern portion of the MSP Study Area, Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay, are significant features of the southern coast.² Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay consist of multiple channels surrounded by wide, shallow mudflats. Over half of the surface area in each of these two estuaries is intertidal (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003).

Rivers emptying into Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay are dominated by local rainfall. This leads to higher river flow in the winter, intermittent flows in the spring, and low flows in the summer (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003). During periods of downwelling, the Columbia River Plume enters both Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor estuaries (Banas, Hickey, MacCready, & Newton, 2004). In the large estuaries within the MSP Study Area, upwelling rather than riverflow is the primary source of estuarine nutrients and primary production (Banas et al., 2004).

Tides

Tidal patterns contribute to the high biological diversity of intertidal habitats along the Washington coast. Tides in Washington are mixed semidiurnal, meaning that there are typically two high tides and two low tides per day and the consecutive highs and lows differ in height. The daily tidal range is 2 to 4 meters (6.5 to 13 feet) (Ruggiero et al., 2013). In Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay, oceanic waters flush up to half of the water volume twice a day.

In the spring and summer, very low tides occur in the morning when cool temperatures and fog minimize physical stresses (high temperature, desiccation, etc.) on the tidal flats. Low tides in the winter can cause freezing and increased mortality of exposed organisms (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). Tides contribute to the exchange of water, oxygen, nutrients, heat, and other physical conditions in the estuaries and beaches. This is influential on the various organisms occupying different tidal zones, mudflats, rocky shores, and other communities (Andrews et al., 2013).

Climate and Large-scale Influences

Washington's Pacific coast has a temperate climate, with high seasonal precipitation mostly from October to March and dry, warmer conditions during the summer months. This seasonal rainfall and snowfall influences river flows, coastal turbidity and sediment input, temperature, and salinity gradients along the coast and estuaries. Storms during the winter months also play an important role in shaping the physical environment (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003; Pirhalla et al., 2009; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011).

Large-scale, global processes influence weather from year to year and affect climate on an interdecadal scale. These large-scale climatic processes interact in complex ways and significantly influence ocean productivity. The El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) pattern causes system-wide differences in sea surface temperature, sea surface height anomalies,

² The estuary at the Mouth of the Columbia River is not included within the MSP Study Area.

turbidity, and sediment transport processes (Pirhalla et al., 2009; Ruggiero et al., 2013; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011).

In the northeast Pacific Ocean, the observable responses to a warm phase of ENSO include warm upper-ocean temperatures, winds that are favorable to downwelling, reduced primary productivity, the appearance of southern marine species that do not normally frequent this range, and an elevated average water level. During a cold phase, sometimes referred to as La Niña, the opposite will occur (I. M. Miller, Shishido, Antrim, & Bowlby, 2013; Moore, Mantua, Hickey, & Trainer, 2010). During an El Niño phase, storms, large waves heights, and wave angles have also been documented creating erosion hotspots in the PNW (Ruggiero et al., 2013).

The Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) also influences sea surface temperature and sea level (Pirhalla et al., 2009). In the northeast Pacific, PDO positive phases cause warm temperatures, positive sea level pressure, and higher sea level (I. M. Miller et al., 2013). The PDO is a climatic recurring event and studies have shown that marine fisheries abundances vary over these time series (Mantua, Hare, Zhang, Wallace, & Francis, 1997). During a positive PDO phase, decreases in production in salmon stocks in Washington, Oregon, and California are observed. During a negative PDO phase the salmon stocks experience high production in the same areas (Mantua & Hare, 2002; Mantua et al., 1997; Parson, Mote, Hamlet, Keeton, & Lettenmaier, 2003). PDO and ENSO occur on different time scales, but positive phases of ENSO tend to be associated with positive phases of PDO. A typical ENSO event will last for 6-18 months and a typical PDO event will last for 20-30 years (Mantua & Hare, 2002; Moore et al., 2010).

Another large-scale process, the Blob (aka North Pacific Mode or marine heat wave), has influenced sea surface temperature in the MSP Study Area. In 2013-2015, the Blob caused exceptionally warmer waters off the West Coast (Kintisch, 2015), and may have influenced marine species ranges and ocean productivity (Bond, Cronin, Freeland, & Mantua, 2015; Hartmann, 2015; Kintisch, 2015). The Blob is believed to have resulted from a high-pressure atmospheric ridge (Kintisch, 2015). This unusual, anomalous event is expected to become more common as oceans absorb more heat and as climate patterns shift in the future.

Storms and Wave Energy

The Pacific Northwest (PNW) is known for its severe waves, particularly during winter storms. Winter storms create deep-water significant wave heights greater than 10 meters (33 feet) and have generated wave heights up to 15 meters (49 feet). The strongest storms can achieve hurricane wind speeds. Winter months (November through February) are characterized by high, long-period waves with a west southwest approach, and small waves (1 meter or 3 feet) from the west northwest are typical of calmer, summer conditions (May through August) (Ruggiero et al., 2013).

Increases in wave height and storm intensity have been observed in the PNW over the last half of the 20th century (Ruggiero et al., 2013). The frequency of strong storms has also increased, while the frequency of weak to medium-strength storms has decreased (Ruggiero et al., 2013).

The storm and wave energy of the PNW has a significant influence on the physical conditions of the ocean and coast. Wave and storm energy influences erosion, accretion, sediment transportation, surf zone energy, and flooding. While storm and wave energy impact the entire PNW coast, the sandy beaches, dunes, and bluffs of the southwestern coast of

Washington are particularly vulnerable to erosion. Major episodes of erosion often occur during storm events, and this will be exacerbated by increased storm strength or frequency (Climate Impacts Group, 2009).

Water Quality

Water quality is important for species, habitats, and human health. Several parameters are regularly monitored to study the causes, trends, and impacts of water quality. This information is used to develop and adapt management plans to address ecological and public health issues such as pollution and toxins.

For some water quality parameters, the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) has developed enforceable water quality standards to protect beneficial uses including human contact and aquatic life uses (e.g. salmonid migration, rearing, and spawning). The State is also required to use these standards to prepare a list of water quality limited segments under the Clean Water Act and Environmental Protection Agency's implementing regulations. The Washington State Department of Health (DOH) regulates shellfish harvesting under the National Shellfish Sanitation Program. This program designates commercial and recreational shellfish harvest areas and establishes fecal coliform bacteria limits to protect those uses. Water bodies are regularly monitored to evaluate whether these standards are met.

For Ecology's water quality assessment, all available and credible water quality and fish tissue data³ are assessed. Waterbody segments are evaluated and categorized using a water quality rating system based on the results (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2012b). Water quality assessment categories are as follows:

- Category 1: meets standards for pollutants tested
- Category 2: waters of concern where there is some evidence of a water quality problem, but not enough to require production of a water quality improvement project at this time
- Category 3: insufficient data
- Category 4: polluted waters that do not require a total maximum daily load (TMDL)
 - Category 4a: polluted waters with an approved total maximum daily load
 - Category 4b: polluted waters with an approved water quality improvement plan that is equivalent to a TMDL
 - Category 4c: impaired by a non-pollutant
- Category 5: polluted waters that require a TMDL or another type of water quality improvement project

Category 5 listings are commonly referred to as 303(d) listings for impaired waters, in reference to section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act. Category 5 waterbody segments will need a TMDL, pollution control program, or other actions to reach compliance with water quality standards.

TMDLs or other water quality improvement projects are a management approach to cleaning up 303(d)-listed (polluted) waterbodies so that they meet state water quality standards. Water quality improvement plans allocate pollutant discharges to point and nonpoint sources so

³ Data must meet the state Credible Data Quality Act.

that the loading capacity (the maximum amount of pollutants a waterbody can receive and still meet water quality standards) is not exceeded. Wasteload allocations for point sources are incorporated into National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, which set effluent limits and requirements for treatment of their effluent. The implementation of best management practices (BMPs) is intended to reduce nonpoint pollution sources that affect water quality. The federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approved the current water quality assessment in 2016.

Ecology also conducts water quality monitoring for parameters that are not included in the water quality standards, to track changes in overall marine conditions due to human and climatic influences (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2014a, 2014b). Other priority water quality issues are monitored in Washington by Ecology, other state agencies, and various organizations. The four coastal treaty tribes also monitor water quality in their respective U&As,⁴ particularly for HABs and recreational beach safety. The following are summaries of the main water quality considerations within the MSP Study Area.

Dissolved Oxygen

Dissolved oxygen in the water is essential for all aerobic marine and estuarine life. Dissolved oxygen levels are primarily influenced by the water's temperature, gas exchange with the atmosphere, and source. Dissolved oxygen can decline in waters with high levels of respiration, either from an excess of nutrients producing decaying organic matter, or from deep ocean waters with a prolonged absence of photosynthesis. Colder water holds more dissolved oxygen, and warmer water holds less. Deep waters beyond the continental shelf naturally have low oxygen concentrations.

Hypoxia (a state of low dissolved oxygen concentration) in Washington shelf and coastal waters is related to upwelling. Upwelling delivers oxygen-depleted water from the bottom up to the surface, periodically causing hypoxic or even anoxic (no oxygen) conditions (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008). The nutrients delivered by upwelling can induce algal blooms, leading to increased quantities of sinking organic matter. This matter is then respired which further depletes oxygen (Rabalais et al., 2010). Along the upper continental slope, the layer of deep water extending to depths greater than 1,000 meters (3,280 feet) that has persistently low oxygen is called the oxygen minimum zone. Historical data suggests that this layer, which is already normally hypoxic, is showing trends of increased temperature and even lower oxygen (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008).

Decreased oxygen levels in already low-oxygen deep waters or the intrusion of low-oxygen waters into shallower areas towards shore (via upwelling) can stress communities and kill marine organisms (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008). In 2006, hypoxic conditions were severe enough to cause widespread fish and invertebrate mortality along the Washington and Oregon coasts (Chan et al., 2008; Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008). Data indicate that the frequency, intensity, and extent of hypoxic conditions off Oregon's shelf waters has been increasing since 2000. Anoxic conditions had never been recorded before 2006 (Chan et al., 2008).

In Willapa Bay, one water quality segment at the mouth of the Willapa River has been listed as Category 4a for dissolved oxygen. Other segments towards the southern part of the bay

⁴ The State does not address 303(d) listings on tribal lands but does for the tribal U&As off-reservation.

near the mouth of the Naselle River and just west of Long Island are listed as Category 2 (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2012a). The Willapa River Dissolved Oxygen TMDL study found that point sources were the primary negative influence on dissolved oxygen levels in the Willapa River. A TMDL established wasteload allocations for wastewater treatment facilities and seafood processors that discharge to the Willapa River (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2006). Grays Harbor currently has no TMDLs for dissolved oxygen. Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay are strongly influenced by large oceanographic forces on the coast, and may experience low dissolved oxygen levels during upwelling events (C. Krembs, personal communication, May 7th, 2015).

Nutrients

Nutrients like nitrogen and phosphorus are essential to plant and animal nutrition, but in high concentrations can lead to a decline in water quality (Andrews et al., 2013). The over-enrichment of water by nutrients can lead to eutrophication, which causes enhanced primary productivity and increased algal blooms. When this happens, much of this organic matter then descends into bottom waters, which leads to increased microbial activity and decreased dissolved oxygen (Diaz & Rosenberg, 2008). The resulting decrease in dissolved oxygen can cause mortality of fish and invertebrates. Nutrient concentrations can vary between locations and systems, and are a result of complex natural and human-influenced sources. Anthropogenic sources of nutrients can come from point sources, such as sewage treatment plants and urban stormwater, or nonpoint sources such as failing septic systems and agricultural runoff (Andrews et al., 2013).

Nutrient concentrations can be naturally quite high along the Pacific coast of Washington. This is due to upwelling of nutrient-rich water, as well as the Juan de Fuca outflow and Columbia River Plume, which drive the high productivity along the coast (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003). While the northern coast of Washington does not have significant population centers, the southern coast does have greater human pressures that could lead to increases in nutrients through point or nonpoint sources. However, determining the contributions of regional nutrient influences to the Pacific coast from human sources is very difficult given the strong oceanographic influence through upwelled waters and high variability (C. Krembs, personal communication, May 7th, 2015).

Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay are strongly influenced by oceanographic forces such as currents and upwelling (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003), as well as riverine supply from the Chehalis River or Columbia River during downwelling winds from the south. Nutrient monitoring data from Ecology's Environmental Assessment Program show no significant trends in nutrient changes from 1999-2013 within Grays Harbor or Willapa Bay for nitrogen or phosphorus parameters (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2014a). There are currently no TMDLs related to nutrients for either Grays Harbor or Willapa Bay (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2012a).

Carbon Dioxide and Ocean Acidification

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) dissolved in seawater decreases the pH of the water, making the ocean more acidic. This results in a corrosive environment for some shell-forming organisms. The decline in pH is known as ocean acidification.⁵ CO₂ in the ocean can come from several sources. The primary driver of ocean acidification is from the ocean absorbing atmospheric CO₂, which is currently at significantly elevated levels compared to historic conditions from the burning of fossil fuels.

On the Washington coast, low ocean pH is also a result of upwelled high-CO₂ ocean waters. Decomposition (respiration) of organic material releases CO₂, and these cold bottom waters, which have been out of contact with the ocean surface for up to a few decades, bring cold, CO₂-rich waters to the surface. This is a natural phenomenon. Other sources that contribute to ocean acidification include increased nutrient inputs. These inputs can increase algal blooms, and in turn, increase the decomposition of organic matter when the algae die, thereby decreasing pH. Freshwater river inputs may also be more acidic than ocean water and therefore influence the acidity of estuarine and coastal waters (Feely, Klingler, Newton, & Chadsey, 2012).

When the oceans take up CO₂, the pH is lowered and the availability of carbonate (CO₃²⁻) is also reduced. The reduced pH and carbonate availability lowers the saturation state of the calcium carbonate (CaCO₃) biominerals aragonite and calcite, which many marine species use in shell and exoskeleton formation. When the saturation state is lowered, it can become more difficult for shell-forming organisms such as oysters, crabs, corals, pteropods, and phytoplankton to build the shells necessary for their survival (Feely et al., 2012). Studies have also shown a range of impacts from ocean acidification on fish larva development, behavior, tissue and organ structure, otoliths, olfaction, and egg survival (Stiasny et al., 2016). Ocean acidification has the potential to affect populations, species distributions, food webs, and disease prevalence (Feely et al., 2012).

The Washington coast is particularly vulnerable to ocean acidification because upwelling naturally brings low-pH waters to the coast. Effects of low aragonite saturation states have already been observed in the oyster industry. PNW oyster hatcheries raising oyster larvae experienced mass mortalities in the mid-2000s. Natural oyster recruitment was also low during these years. CO₂ and saturation state monitoring revealed that the water intake during those failure events was low in pH and saturation state. The industry has used monitoring equipment and pH buffering to adapt to acidic conditions and increase hatchery success (Feely et al., 2012). Pteropods are an important component of the marine food web in Washington as they are consumed by fish, seabirds, and whales, and are a key prey for salmon. Studies have shown that pteropod species suffer decreases in calcification and growth rates with declining pH (Feely et al., 2012).

Recent laboratory experiments have found that Dungeness Crab larvae experience slower development and decreased survival with decreasing pH. This would likely have population-scale impacts and could potentially cause a decline in the fishery (J. J. Miller, Maher, Bohaboy, Friedman, & McElhany, 2016).

Scientists anticipate that ocean acidification and associated effects will increase in the future, causing more challenges for the recreational and commercial fishing industries and resulting in unknown effects to PNW species, habitats, and ecosystems. These impacts could

⁵ Ocean acidification is also discussed in Section 2.11: Climate Change.

extend to fisheries, human health, and the economy. Ongoing research and monitoring is focused on understanding this phenomenon to better prepare industry responses and resource management actions (Feely et al., 2012).

Harmful Algal Blooms

Phytoplankton concentrations can become quite high in areas with sufficient nutrients, light, and water retention. Some types of phytoplankton produce toxins which can be harmful to marine organisms and humans at concentrated levels. The diatoms of *Pseudo-nitzschia spp.* can produce the neurotoxin domoic acid, which causes amnesic shellfish poisoning. The dinoflagellate *Alexandrium cantenella* produces the neurotoxin saxitoxin, which causes paralytic shellfish poisoning, and the dinoflagellates of *Dinophysis spp.* produce okadaic acid, which causes diarrhetic shellfish poisoning. When consumed by humans, these toxins can result in illness and even death (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008; Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015b; Washington State Department of Health, n.d.-b).

Harmful algal blooms (HABs) occur when levels of phytoplankton with toxins reach a particular threshold. Shellfish that filter the toxic phytoplankton, such as clams and mussels, can concentrate the toxins and expose human consumers to harmful levels. Safety levels for toxins in shellfish are set by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

The Olympic Region Harmful Algal Blooms Partnership (ORHAB) and coastal tribes cooperating with ORHAB, such as Quileute and Makah, regularly monitor phytoplankton levels in water and toxin levels in both water and in shellfish tissue. The partnership is coordinated by the Olympic National Resources Center and consists of the Washington State Department of Health, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Quinault Indian Nation, and others. The Quileute Tribe operates with separate funding and sends samples to DOH; results are posted through WDFW.

When toxin concentrations reach a particular threshold, the harvest of affected shellfish is restricted. State beaches have been closed to shellfish harvest and marine waters have been closed to recreational and commercial crab fishing to protect human health (Olympic Regional Harmful Algal Bloom Partnership, 2015; Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015b). DOH publishes a recreational shellfish safety map and list of public beaches and their status online. They also post warning signs at beaches, maintain a hotline for beach closure information, and provide similar information for commercial shellfish growers (Washington State Department of Health, n.d.-a). The Quileute Tribe posts advisories about high levels of HAB for its members on its website, on a hotline, and at trailheads for shoreline access.

The occurrence of HABs on the coast is considered a natural phenomenon. Nutrients and water retention in the Juan de Fuca Eddy create conditions for high productivity and can result in HABs. Variable winds and upwelling/downwelling forces can push the eddy closer to shore, bringing the HABs along the coast. This contaminates shellfish harvest beaches, with higher toxin levels in the northern portion of the Study Area generally occurring during summer and fall. Southern Washington coast beaches are also affected by HABs, with the Juan de Fuca Eddy and Heceta Bank (Oregon) suggested as possible primary sources of toxic phytoplankton (B. M. Hickey et al., 2013). The Columbia River Plume may act as a HAB barrier for southern Washington beaches during the summer and fall, which can prevent accumulation of toxins in shellfish. But, it may also act as a HAB conduit during winter and spring, resulting in shellfish closures (B. M. Hickey et al., 2013).

Suspected increases in the frequency of HABs along the Study Area could be related to the reduced outflow of the Columbia River Plume due to dams and water removals, as well as climate-related phenomena (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008). In 2015, the U.S. West Coast experienced possibly the largest HAB in recorded history, with HABs extending from central California to British Columbia and possibly as far north as Alaska. Unusually warm waters of the Pacific Ocean, referred to as the Blob, are thought to have contributed to this massive HAB (Doughton, 2015).

Chemical Contaminants

Chemical contaminants such as metals, persistent organic pollutants, hydrocarbons, and PCBs are also potential pollutants that can affect the health of marine waters. At present levels, these pollutants are not a concern within the waters of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS), and monitoring suggests that water quality is currently good throughout the Olympic Coast (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008).

Grays Harbor is surrounded by commercial forestry and agriculture and has municipal and commercial point source discharge facilities. Water quality is monitored for various contaminants including metals, pesticides, and organic pollutants. In 1992 a TMDL was established for dioxin, a contaminant released into Grays Harbor as a by-product of pulp and paper bleaching from paper mills. Wasteload allocations for 2,3,7,8, TCDD (dioxin) were made for two facilities in Grays Harbor, one of which has since ceased operation. Dieldrin, a legacy pesticide, is listed as a Category 5 for a segment near Westport based on tissue samples from mussels (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016a).

Willapa Bay's surrounding watershed is mostly rural except for the cities of Raymond and South Bend. City industries include lumber mills and seafood processing. The river valley is dominated by agriculture, with the surrounding area mostly used for forestry. Willapa Bay is monitored for contaminants, including several pesticides and other pollutants. Chrysene, a compound from creosote used for preserving wood, as well as the polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons Benzo(a)anthracene and Benzo(b)fluoranthene are listed as Category 5 in limited segments of Willapa Bay based on results from mussel tissue samples. Willapa Bay has no other water or fish tissue contaminant TMDL listings (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016a).

Fecal Coliform Bacteria

Bacteria from human and animal waste can pose a threat to human health. Bacteria can enter the water from malfunctioning wastewater treatment plants, improperly functioning septic systems, vessel discharge,⁶ and from livestock, pets, wildlife, and humans. As bacteria levels increase, so does the risk of human illness. When bacteria levels in water become high enough, swimming beaches and shellfish harvesting areas along state beaches are closed to protect human health (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2014c). Bacteria in shellfish growing areas and swimming beaches are routinely monitored by DOH in coordination with the Washington State Department of Ecology, tribes, and local partners.

⁶ Vessel discharges as a source of pollution are discussed below in the Stressors section.

A particular area of concern is the Pacific Coast Growing Area in Grays Harbor County, which extends north from Ocean Shores to Point Grenville. This area is approved for commercial shellfish harvest,⁷ and the portion from Moclips to Ocean Shores is a tourist destination and popular spot for recreational harvest of Razor Clams. Fecal coliform bacteria levels became high enough for DOH to close two sections of the Mocrocks Razor Clam beach in the summer beginning in 2011. A portion of the Copalis beach at Oyhut was closed year-round to shellfish harvesting starting in 2013. Three zones within this area are listed as Category 5 on the state Water Quality Assessment (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016a). The Washington Department of Ecology is working with DOH, Grays Harbor County, and the Quinault Indian Nation to identify the source(s) of fecal coliform bacteria contamination within the area of concern. Potential sources of contamination in this area include stormwater, wastewater treatment plants, failing on-site septic systems near beaches and creeks, pet and horse waste, human waste from recreation activities, and wildlife waste (Swanson & Anderson, 2014).

Segments within Grays Harbor are listed as Category 4A on the state Water Quality Assessment for fecal coliform bacteria and there is a TMDL to address this issue. Bacteria levels have resulted in repeated temporary shellfish harvest closures for commercial shellfish growers in the central and western areas of the harbor that are approved for commercial shellfish harvest. The Grays Harbor Bacteria TMDL includes waste allocations for NPDES-permitted sources of bacteria into the Harbor including: two seafood processors in Westport; Ocean Spray Cranberries; two pulp mills; discharges from sewage treatment plants in Aberdeen, Hoquiam, Ocean Shores, and Westport; and stormwater runoff from the cities of Hoquiam and Aberdeen. Load allocations were also established for nonpoint source pollution reductions for all tributaries to Grays Harbor including: the Chehalis River, Hoquiam River, Humptulips River, and the numerous smaller watersheds surrounding the harbor (Rountry & Pelletier, 2002).

Segments of Willapa Bay are listed as Category 5 in the state Water Quality Assessment for fecal coliform bacteria. The section of the bay at the mouth of the Willapa River is listed as 4a and is associated with the Willapa River Bacteria TMDL. The TMDL established wasteload allocations for NPDES discharges to the Willapa River and load allocations for nonpoint source reductions throughout the watershed including tributaries to Willapa River (Ahmed & Rountry, 2007). There is a prohibited commercial shellfish harvest area in the Bay at the mouth of and including the lower part of the Willapa River because of the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). Commercial shellfish harvest is also prohibited in an area at Bay Center because of high fecal coliform samples in that area (Office of Environmental Health and Safety, 2015). Recent construction of a regional wastewater treatment plant and closure of the South Bend and Raymond sewage treatment plants are expected to help improve bacteria and DO conditions in the Willapa River.

North of the Pacific Beach Growing Area ending at Point Grenville, monitoring efforts along the coast within the Sanctuary and in tribal U&As indicate that there is reduced concern for bacteria in these waters (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008).

⁷ There is no public access north of the Moclips River. Commercial harvest of Razor Clams is conducted by the Quinault Indian Nation.

Temperature

The Pacific Ocean and Washington coastal water temperatures are driven by large-scale oceanographic forces, upwelling, currents, and climatological factors. Average sea surface temperature ranges from about 8°C to 16°C (46°F to 61°F) annually. Sea surface temperature varies across the shelf (nearshore to offshore) due to local upwelling/downwelling forces (Pirhalla et al., 2009). At a larger scale, ocean temperature is influenced by climatic forces such as the El Niño-Southern Oscillation and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation. In recent years, warm temperature anomalies ranging from 1°C to 4°C (2°F to 7°F) have been observed (the Blob) in the Pacific Ocean along the West Coast and are attributed to decreased cooling during the winter months (Bond et al., 2015; Hartmann, 2015). Ocean temperature is important to track because it influences species distributions, interactions, and survival, and changes in temperature may have important implications for commercially important and sensitive species (Andrews et al., 2013)

The shallow estuaries of Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay are influenced by upwelling/downwelling but are also subject to solar heating during the summer (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003). Both Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay are monitored for temperature water quality standards and have Category 2 (waters of concern) water segments, yet there are currently no temperature TMDLs for these estuaries. Grays Harbor segments with temperature increases beyond the water quality standards have been attributed to natural conditions (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2012a). Willapa Bay has several Category 2 temperature segments, and it is unclear to what extent natural conditions and human actions are influencing temperature increases (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2012a).

Geomorphology

Washington's coast is located in a tectonically active region, in which the Juan de Fuca oceanic plate is subducting under the North American continental plate. This is known as the Cascadia Subduction Zone. This geologic activity has resulted in the creation of the Olympic mountain range, the Cascade mountain range, and the dynamic coastal cliffs along the northern coast. Up until about 5 million years ago, much of the material forming the present coastal mountain ranges and western Washington was under the ocean, at which time they began to be uplifted as the oceanic plate slid under the continental plate. Today's coastline is the result of erosion processes acting on the uplifted material over the past 5 million years, and is considered to be a relatively young landscape (Ruggiero et al., 2013).

Washington's shoreline has a diverse physical landscape with dramatic coastal cliffs, rocky outcrops, expansive beaches, dunes, and pocket beaches separated by headlands (Map 3). The northern portion of the Washington coastline from Neah Bay to Point Grenville is dominated by rocky shores with short stretches of pocket beaches. Wave erosion has formed steep cliffs at various locations. In many places, wave-cut platforms inundated by tides contain small islands, sea stacks, and rocks protruding from the platform surface (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011; Ruggiero et al., 2013).

From Point Grenville south to Cape Disappointment on the Columbia River, the southern boundary of the MSP Study Area, the coastline is dominated by broad sandy beaches, dunes, and ridges (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011; Ruggiero et al., 2013). Coastal dunes are derived from sand carried by longshore drift and wind erosion (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011), and wetlands have formed behind the dunes in many areas (Hruby, 2014). The large estuaries in

the southern portion of the Study Area, Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay, are fronted by large barrier spits, and have large expanses of wetlands. The Long Beach Peninsula (aka North Beach Peninsula), which consists mostly of the barrier spit separating Willapa Bay from the Pacific Ocean, is about 28 miles long. The low-lying central and southern portion of Washington's Pacific coast is vulnerable to rising sea level with the potential for increased coastal inundation, erosion, flooding, and higher tidal and storm surge (Snover, Mauger, Whitely Binder, Krosby, & Tohver, 2013).

Sediment is transported along the coast and nearshore areas by waves and currents. Winter storms generate large waves that push the sediment in a northerly direction, while calm summer waves transport sediment to the south. In the Columbia River Littoral Cell, which extends from Tillamook Head, Oregon to Point Grenville, Washington, the net sediment transport is to the north, particularly in the subcells north of the Columbia River (Washington's coast). Storm events have caused localized, short-term erosion in some areas. Anthropogenic changes such as jetties and dams have resulted in erosion and accretion changes to the beaches. Some locations are subject to chronic erosion, most notably the North Cove area just north of the mouth of Willapa Bay (aka Washaway Beach). This area has seen long-term erosion rates (100 years) of about 30 meters (100 feet) per year, and short-term erosion rates (20-40 years) of 56 meters (180 feet) per year. However, erosion areas like this are fairly limited and the vast majority of Washington's shoreline is currently stable or accreting over time (Ruggiero et al., 2013).

Washington's continental shelf and slope progressively widen to the north, ranging from 15 nm to 78 nm in width. The 330 foot water-depth contour occurs fairly close to shore, usually within 22 nm (Minerals Management Service, 2007). The continental shelf is composed primarily of soft sediments and glacial deposits of gravel, including cobble and boulders, punctuated by rocky outcrops (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). The coast from northernmost end of the MSP Study Area south to the Hoh River consists largely of hard and mixed substrate, with rocky reefs and outcrops. From the Hoh River south to the Columbia River there is mostly soft, sandy substrate. Throughout the Study Area, outcrops may form rocky reefs scattered among the soft substrate (Map 3). Most notable is Grays Bank, a large rocky reef about 9 miles across the inner and middle shelf characterized by high habitat diversity. Seafloor modeling predicts that an unknown number of rocky outcrops could be scattered throughout the presumably mostly soft substrate of the Washington continental shelf (Goldfinger, Henkel, Romsos, Havron, & Black, 2014).

Empirical seafloor mapping data for the MSP Study Area is limited. Modeling efforts have attempted to create regional maps of geology and habitats to estimate the primary features and makeup of the seafloor. Data quality, confidence, and predictability vary by location and site specific mapping is recommended to accurately assess substrate and habitat features on a local scale (Goldfinger et al., 2014). Some seafloor mapping projects undertaken in the MSP Study Area include the Washington State Outer Coast Seafloor Atlas of the OCNMS,⁸ and a 2011 lidar coastal survey by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers National Coastal Mapping Program.⁹ More recently, detailed work under the leadership of the coastal treaty tribes has compiled data on substrate, geform, ecological marine units and translated it into a standard classification scheme

⁸ Available at <http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/science/habitatmapping/habitatmapping.html>

⁹ Available at <https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/washington-2011-lidar-coverage-usace-national-coastal-mapping-program>

(Coastal Marine and Estuarine Classification System) through the Habitat Framework Initiative.¹⁰

NOAA completed a seafloor mapping prioritization process for the Washington Marine Spatial Plan in 2015. This process evaluated existing seafloor data and prioritized locations within the Study Area that resource managers, scientists, and other stakeholders identified as being important for informing future management decisions. Two offshore and three nearshore priority areas were identified and represent opportunities to focus limited resources on key mapping needs. The most important management issues identified for these areas by participants were ecosystem based management, living resource management, coastal inundation & natural coastal hazards, “other regulatory” issues, sediment management, and research were identified as the most important management issues for these areas (NCCOS, 2015).¹¹

The MSP Study Area also includes the shelf break and slope (a.k.a. coastal margin), a transition zone between the oceanic plate and the continental plate, which rapidly increases in depth toward the abyssal plain. Several submarine canyons cut into Washington’s continental slope and shelf, including the Nitinat, Juan de Fuca, Quinault, Gray’s, Guide, Willapa, and Astoria Canyons (B. M. Hickey, 1995) (Map 3). The canyons vary in size, with the Juan de Fuca Canyon trough transecting the northern portion of the Study Area angling toward the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

Submarine canyons are regions where massive submarine landslides occur and act as channels for coastal sediment to reach the deep seafloor (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). Submarine canyons are also noted to be habitats with high biological activity and diversity (B. M. Hickey, 1995). Canyons can enhance coastal upwelling by providing a conduit for deep, cold, nutrient rich seawater to reach the bottom boundary layers of shelf water, where it can be upwelled by local wind forcing and contribute to the high productivity of Washington’s ocean waters (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2008).

Earthquakes and Tsunamis

The Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ), located along the West Coast from northern Vancouver Island down to northern California, is a region full of active earthquake faults. The Juan de Fuca Plate is subducting underneath the North American Plate, which causes friction and stress. Scientists believe the two plates are currently locked, so that a major earthquake has not occurred. Eventually when the stress becomes too great, the major faults will rupture, causing significant earthquakes. There are three different types of earthquakes: deep, shallow, and subduction zone.

In the 1980s, scientists became aware of the risk of “great” subduction zone earthquakes in the Cascadia region. Geologic records revealed that in 1700, an earthquake with an approximate magnitude of 9.0 on the Richter scale occurred in the CSZ, and further investigations revealed that a similar great earthquake occurs on average every 500 years in the

¹⁰ Data from this project is accessible through the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission at: <https://nwifc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Cascade/index.html?appid=8ee7967fbb5f43948a803438b07938b8> and

<https://geo.nwifc.org/ocean/>

¹¹ The final prioritization report can be found at http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/NCCOS_SeafloorMappingReport.pdf.

Cascadia region (Cascadia Region Earthquake Workgroup, 2013). Smaller CSZ earthquakes are thought to occur off the Oregon and northern California coasts (Goldfinger et al., 2012).

The next great CSZ earthquake is anticipated to have a magnitude from 8.0 to over 9.0. It will cause substantial damage, particularly to coastal areas, and may result in several large tsunamis. During a CSZ earthquake, a portion of the seafloor is suddenly thrust upwards, which displaces the entire ocean above it, resulting in long-period waves radiating outward from the source. Multiple waves can be generated, and travel up to about 500 miles per hour through the deep ocean. Recent examples of subduction earthquakes and associated tsunamis in other areas of the world include the 2011 magnitude 9.0 earthquake in Tohoku, Japan and the 2010 magnitude 8.8 earthquake in Maule, Chile (Cascadia Region Earthquake Workgroup, 2013).

Biology

MSP Study Area waters have high biological productivity and support a variety of habitats and species, many of which are important ecologically, culturally, and economically to Washington, the United States, and the world.¹² Habitats are where organisms live, eat, shelter, and reproduce. A living ecosystem is a collection of habitats, and healthy marine habitats are the foundation of healthy communities of marine life. The MSP Study Area is comprised of many habitats which support numerous species of fish, mammals, and birds. This section describes the key habitats and species found within Study Area waters to tell the story of marine life off Washington's Pacific coast and to emphasize the importance of protecting these biological resources now and in the future.

As a part of the marine spatial planning process, scientists at NOAA developed conceptual models of the key ecological components, physical drivers, and human activities in the MSP Study Area. They also evaluated and selected a portfolio of indicators for these key components and quantified the status and trends of the indicators. The results are presented in the following two reports, which are used as frequent references for this section. Readers are encouraged to consult the reports for references to the original research.

- Andrews, K. S., Coyle, J. M., & Harvey, C. J. (2015). Ecological indicators for Washington State's outer coastal waters. Seattle, WA: Northwest Fisheries Science Center. Report to the Washington Department of Natural Resources. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/NWFSC_EcosystemIndicatorReport.pdf.
- Andrews, K. S., Harvey, C. J., & Levin, P. S. (2013). Conceptual models and indicator selection process for Washington State's marine spatial planning process. Conservation Biology Division, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/NOAA_NWFSC_ConceptualModel_FinalReport.pdf.

¹² Olympic National Park is a UNESCO World Heritage Site.

Habitats

Several habitats occur within the MSP Study Area. For the purposes of this MSP, six major habitat types are described: pelagic, seafloor, kelp forests, rocky shores, sandy beaches, and large coastal estuaries. These habitat categories were chosen by the National Marine Fisheries Service Northwest Fisheries Science Center for the ecological indicators and the ecological status and trends reports produced for the MSP (Andrews, Coyle, & Harvey, 2015; Andrews et al., 2013). They were derived from categories used in WDFW's "State of the Washington Coast" (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011) and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary "Condition Report" (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008).

Pelagic habitat

The pelagic zone represents all water column habitat from the surface to near-bottom in MSP Study Area waters. Physical drivers important to pelagic habitat include currents, eddies and plumes, wind-driven upwelling, climatic forces, and solar energy. These forces create a dynamic pelagic zone, which in turn affects primary productivity, pelagic community composition, and species survival. For more information on these forces in the MSP Study Area, please see the Physical Oceanography section.

Phytoplankton are the base of the food web for the entire marine community. The phytoplankton community off the Washington coast is highly productive due to strong upwelling of nutrient-rich waters and the influence of the Juan de Fuca Eddy and the Columbia River Plume. Diatoms and dinoflagellates generally dominate the phytoplankton communities (Andrews et al., 2013).

Zooplankton are key links in the food chain, connecting primary production to upper trophic levels.¹³ Many zooplankton migrate vertically in the water column from near the seafloor to the surface to feed on phytoplankton. Shifts in zooplankton species composition can be correlated with regional climate and seasonal patterns. Copepods can be categorized based on their affinity for water type. Cold water copepods tend to be lipid-rich, providing a key energy source to pelagic fish, while warm water copepods have a lower lipid concentration and can be a lower quality food source. Cold water species typically dominate the zooplankton community during the summer upwelling season, while the warm water species usually dominate during winter. Climate forces such as El Niño events, the Blob, and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation can alter these seasonal patterns (Andrews et al., 2015, 2013).

Pteropods can serve as an indicator for ocean acidification because they are experiencing shell dissolution as acidification increases, and they are a key food source for herring, mackerel, salmon, and other fish species (Chan et al., 2016). Gelatinous zooplankton are also an important part of the pelagic food web. Jellyfish compete with forage fish and juvenile salmon for similar food items, so changes in jellyfish abundance can impact community structure (Andrews et al., 2015).

The pelagic zone provides important habitat and food for a variety of fish. Forage fish species, including smelt, Pacific Herring (*Clupea pallasii*), Northern Anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*), and Pacific Sardine (*Sardinops sagax*), live and feed in the upper pelagic zone. They

¹³Trophic levels refer to a class of organisms that occupy the same position in a food chain. Primary production is the bottom of the food chain, typically made of plants (e.g. phytoplankton). Primary consumers are those organisms that eat those plants (e.g. zooplankton) and secondary consumers eat primary consumers (e.g. fish that eat zooplankton), etc. Upper trophic levels refer to organisms that are higher up on the food chain.

act as key links in the food web by transferring energy from plankton to larger predatory fish, marine mammals, and seabirds. Salmon also spend much of their time in the pelagic zone after their initial entry into the ocean, feeding on zooplankton (e.g. pteropods) and forage fish.

Albacore Tuna are seasonal visitors to the MSP Study Area. Midwater rockfish, such as adult Widow Rockfish (*Sebastes entomelas*), Pacific Ocean Perch (*S. alutus*), Yellowtail Rockfish (*S. flavidus*), and Black Rockfish (*S. melanops*), spend a large portion of their time above the seafloor substrate and feed primarily on large zooplankton. Pacific Whiting (a.k.a. hake) are one of the most abundant fish species in the California Current. They also feed in pelagic waters on prey items similar to those consumed by salmon, rockfish, and other groundfish species (Andrews et al., 2013). Myctophids (a.k.a. lanternfish) may be the most abundant pelagic family of fish. Like many zooplankton, they occupy deeper waters during the day and rise to feed on phytoplankton at night, providing an important trophic link between primary production and deeper waters (Davison, Checkley Jr., Koslow, & Barlow, 2013).

Many species of seabirds and marine mammals feed in and transit through the pelagic habitat of the MSP Study Area. At least 29 species of marine mammals inhabit or transit through Washington coastal and offshore waters, and numerous species of marine birds live, reproduce, feed, and transit through the MSP Study Area, some migrating thousands of miles to “winter” in MSP waters. These animals feed on zooplankton, forage fish, salmon, and other fish (Andrews et al., 2013; Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). Occasionally, leatherback sea turtles also feed in the pelagic habitat of the MSP Study Area, preying mainly upon jellyfish (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2013).

Existing human pressures within this habitat primarily include fishing, atmospheric deposition of pollutants, and commercial shipping activities (Andrews et al., 2013).

Seafloor habitat

Seafloor habitat includes all bottom habitats in water up to 30 m (98 feet) in depth in the MSP Study Area.¹⁴ Physical seafloor habitat can consist of soft/mixed substrates or rocky/mixed substrates. Empirical mapping of the entire MSP Study Area seafloor habitat is not available. However, direct seafloor mapping of limited areas along with models suggest that the majority of seafloor habitat is soft/mixed substrates (Goldfinger et al., 2014). Rocky/mixed seafloor substrates mainly occur in the northern portion of the Study Area (Map 3). Biogenic seafloor habitat made up of deep-sea corals, sponges, and anemones has also been observed in the Study Area, with fish and invertebrates congregating in these areas. While the entire MSP Study Area has not been surveyed to date, within the Study Area the highest density of biogenic habitat has been observed in the canyon areas, such as the northernmost region in the Juan de Fuca Canyon area. However, many areas with biogenic habitat have been observed throughout the Study Area (Andrews et al., 2015).

Large zooplankton such as euphausiids (a.k.a. krill) are an important component of the seafloor habitat food web, as they are a large portion of the diet of many groundfish. The abundance of predominant krill species has been observed to be much higher during high upwelling conditions than low upwelling conditions. Sinking microscopic aggregates of organic and inorganic particles such as bacteria, phytoplankton, detritus, fecal pellets, and bio-minerals are also an important component of the seafloor food web. Aggregates of this material fall from the pelagic zone to the seafloor as “marine snow”, where they become food for detritus-feeding

¹⁴ This seafloor depth cutoff was chosen in the Ecological Indicators report. For more details, please see Andrews et al., 2015.

invertebrates and deposit feeders. Peaks in marine snow are commonly observed following large diatom blooms (Andrews et al., 2013).

Deposit feeders live and feed on the seafloor. Species include several benthic invertebrates such as amphipods, isopods, small crustaceans, snails, sea cucumbers, worms, polychaetes, sea slugs, and hermit crabs. They feed primarily on detritus on the seafloor, and are key links in the food web. Deposit feeders are prey for several commercially or recreationally valuable species, including Dover Sole (*Microstomus pacificus*) and Pacific Halibut (*Hippoglossus stenolepis*). Other benthic invertebrates include bivalves, corals, sea urchins, and sea stars, which make up significant proportions of some flatfish and rockfish diets. The seafloor is also important habitat for Dungeness Crab (*Metacarcinus magister*), a highly valuable commercial fishery and important prey for sharks, large rockfish, and octopus. Spot Prawns (*Pandalus platyceros*) and Pink Shrimp (*P. eous* and *P. jordani*) are also commercial harvest species associated with the seafloor habitat (Andrews et al., 2013).

Groundfish provide one of the primary fisheries for Washington coastal communities. The groundfish assemblage consists of many different families, including rockfish, roundfish, flatfish, and elasmobranchs. These species rely on seafloor habitat and their diets consist of many benthic invertebrates and other fish. Commercial fishing activity from bottom trawl and other gear may interact with the seafloor and cause damage, particularly to high relief or hard substrate areas.

Low dissolved oxygen events (hypoxia and anoxia) are physical stressors to seafloor habitat. These events can cause stress to and mortality of organisms along the seafloor, especially immobile or slow-moving benthic invertebrates that are unable to leave the area during low oxygen conditions. This may affect the seafloor food web and possibly impact the groundfish assemblage (Andrews et al., 2013). Hypoxia impacts are expected to grow rapidly in intensity and extent over the coming decades (Chan et al., 2016). For more information, please see the Dissolved Oxygen section.

Kelp forests

Kelp forest habitat includes floating kelp canopies of bull kelp (*Nereocystis leutkeana*) or giant kelp (*Macrocystis pyrifera*), submerged kelp beds (e.g., *Laminaria* spp. and *Pterogohora californica*), and rocky reefs that occur at depths of less than 30 meters (98 feet). Rocky reefs are included in the kelp forest habitat category because many animal species that inhabit kelp forests also inhabit shallow rocky reefs without canopy-forming kelp. In addition to the two conspicuous species of canopy-forming kelp, more than 20 species of kelp that do not form floating canopies occur on rocky reefs in the region, comprising one of the most diverse kelp communities in the world (Mumford, 2007). This habitat occurs primarily along the northern coast of the MSP Study Area with patchy areas in the central coast and estuaries (Map 4) (Andrews et al., 2015).

Kelp forests form diverse communities and provide physical structure and energy to the food web. Kelp provides surface area, creating habitat for sessile organisms. The complex structural component of kelp serves as a nursery, refuge, and forage area for a variety of fish, especially rockfish, sculpins, greenling, lingcod, perch, juvenile salmon and others, including many fish on Washington's list of Species of Concern.¹⁵ Floating kelp provides surface habitat that dampens waves, and these semi-protected areas are used as foraging habitat for seals and

¹⁵ A current list of Species of Concern is available on WDFW's website, at <http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/endangered/>.

several species of birds. Sea otters feed in kelp habitats and rest among floating kelp beds (Andrews et al., 2013).

Kelp forests and other macroalgae also play a key role in supplying particulate organic matter and dissolved organic matter to the food chain. Decomposing kelp supports a strong bacterial community that fuels phytoplankton and benthic filter-feeder growth in the nearshore environment. In addition, sections or entire plants break loose during storms and sink to the bottom or wash up on beaches, where they are scavenged by small crustaceans, insects, and other scavengers (Mumford, 2007).

The total extent of surface canopy, area, and density of kelp beds affects the species assemblages found in this habitat. Trends in kelp bed characteristics thus provide insight into ecosystem condition and provide important information about trends in fish and invertebrate populations. Kelp populations fluctuate seasonally and inter-annually depending upon reproductive cycles, oceanographic conditions, and herbivore pressure.

Strong storm events and nutrient-poor waters associated with El Niño events can decrease kelp coverage, while cold, nutrient-rich La Niña events provide extraordinary growth conditions. Disturbance from storm-driven waves is, however, a natural process and provides an important opportunity for bull kelp and macroalgae recruitment. Years with suppressed cold water upwelling can negatively affect kelp forests, as bull kelp is sensitive to increases in water temperature and the availability of nutrients. Light penetration is also an important physical factor, and increased sediment runoff due to events like heavy rains or landslides may reduce densities of bull kelp (Andrews et al., 2013).

In the northern hemisphere, the most widespread and herbivore-induced kelp deforestations have resulted from sea urchin grazing (Steneck et al., 2002). Three common sea urchin species graze upon kelp in Washington: red (*Mesocentrotus franciscanus*), purple (*Strongylocentrotus purpuratus*), and green (*S. droebachiensis*). Sea urchin abundance is controlled by predation, and the most notable predators of sea urchins are sea otters, sea stars, humans, and crabs. Sea urchin removal by sea otters can promote the growth of kelp and kelp-associated communities. Sea otters have ecosystem-level effects across the nearshore marine communities they inhabit, and this sea urchin/sea otter/kelp trophic interaction has been well documented in the Pacific Ocean (Andrews et al., 2013). In Washington waters, sea otter reintroduction and range extension was followed by decreases in sea urchin densities and increases in algal abundance (Kvitek, Iampietro, & Bowlby, 1998; Laidre & Jameson, Ronald J., 2006). Sea otters also prey on other shellfish including commercially and recreationally valued species such as clams and crab (Lance, Richardson, & Allen, 2004).

Existing human pressures for kelp forest habitat identified in the ecological indicators report for the MSP include recreational fishing, pollutants, and excess nutrient inputs (Andrews et al., 2015). Increases in water temperature have been shown to negatively impact kelp (Dayton, 1985; Tegner, Dayton, Edwards, & Riser, 1996), and anthropogenic climate change is expected to negatively affect kelp communities (Harley et al., 2012). Turbidity and sedimentation profoundly affect kelp communities by changing light availability, scouring plants, or burying hard substrate (Airoldi, 2003; Shaffer & Parks, 1994).

Rocky shores

The rocky shores habitat category represents rocky and mixed intertidal shorelines in the MSP Study Area. This habitat generally occurs north of Point Grenville (Map 3) (Andrews et al., 2015). Rocky shores cover a broad range of substrate types including bedrock, boulder fields,

and cobble and gravel. Tide pools, boulder size, and proximity to sand can influence the communities within this habitat (Andrews et al., 2013).

Variations in substrate types, tidal elevation gradient, productivity, and local physical disturbances (storms, drift wood, etc.) lead to a wide diversity of macrophytes in this habitat. Over 120 species of macrophytes (e.g. macroalgae, surfgrass) have been documented to occur in rocky habitats within the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS). Macrophytes not only provide food, but also provide microhabitats for fauna, protecting them from stressors such as waves, desiccation (drying out), and temperature changes.

This habitat also supports a large biomass of sessile, suspension-feeding benthic invertebrates. Suspension-feeding taxa include barnacles, mussels, sponges, tubeworms, tunicates, and others. The upper and lower distribution limits within the intertidal zone for each species depends upon their resilience to physical factors such as desiccation and temperature, and other factors like competition and predation. Suspension feeders provide habitat for macroalgae, invertebrates, and fish. They can influence nutrient concentrations in intertidal waters and provide food for predators including humans (Andrews et al., 2013).

Dozens of grazing invertebrates inhabit the rocky shores of Washington's outer coast, most notably snails, limpets, chitons, and small crustaceans. Grazers are also stratified in their vertical distribution limits within the intertidal zone. As a group, grazers feed on a variety of organisms including benthic microalgae, coralline algae, macroalgae, and algal detritus (Andrews et al., 2013). Prevalent suspension feeders in the rocky shores include barnacles and mussels that feed on phytoplankton and detritus (Andrews et al., 2015). Predators within rocky shore habitat include the ochre sea star (*Pisaster ochraceus*), whelks, anemones, worms, and crabs. Predators on rocky shores also exhibit zonation and microhabitat preferences (Andrews et al., 2013).

Pisaster is considered a keystone predator and its presence helps maintain the diversity of intertidal rocky communities (Andrews et al., 2013). Sea star wasting disease (SSWD) devastated over 20 species of sea stars from Mexico to Alaska in 2013 and 2014 (Eisenlord et al., 2016). SSWD has been linked to a densovirus, and disease progression and mortality rates may have been increased by warm temperature anomalies. In Washington, monitoring showed high mortality rates in 2014 and continued levels of wasting in survivors in 2015 (Eisenlord et al., 2016). Larger sea stars were more likely to be observed with the disease and to experience greater reductions in abundance. As a keystone species, the shift in population to smaller individuals could have lasting impacts on population recovery and the composition of rocky intertidal communities (Eisenlord et al., 2016).

Several fish live within rocky shores, moving in and out with the tides and residing in tide pools. Common species include small sculpins and gunnels. Many seabirds, shorebirds, raptors, and general foraging bird species also use rocky shores. Oystercatchers, gulls, and crows forage within the rocky intertidal zone. Species such as petrels, cormorants, gulls, and murre nest in colonies on offshore rocky islands and sea stacks. Bald Eagles prey on adults, chicks, and eggs at seabird colonies. This activity has likely contributed to population declines in Common Murres (*Uria aalge*) and Glaucous-winged Gulls (*Larus glaurescens*).

Harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*) are common in rocky intertidal habitats along the outer coast, and are year-round residents. Rocky islands are also used as haul-outs for Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*) and California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*). Northern elephant seals (*Mirounga angustirostris*) have been observed occasionally at some rocky islands (Andrews et al., 2013).

Several important physical drivers influence rocky shore habitat. The intertidal zone is defined by tides. Geomorphology and tidal elevation determine which zones are exposed to various stressors and the length of time they are exposed. Stressors include exposure to air, temperature changes, predation, and changes in freshwater inputs, wave action, and light.

Organisms that tolerate similar conditions and tidal exposures will group together (aka zonation). The upper limit of a species distribution is often determined by their tolerance to physical extremes, while the lower limit is often determined by forces such as competition and predation. Rocky intertidal organisms are also subject to wave energy, which can cause physical disturbance, particularly during severe storms. It has also been suggested that wave energy increases the productivity of rocky intertidal systems by providing competitive advantages for wave tolerant organisms, replenishing nutrients, and enhancing light uptake by algae. Upwelling provides nutrients, plankton, and larval recruits to the rocky intertidal system (Andrews et al., 2013).

There are several existing pressures that could impact the health of rocky shores. Specific activities include trampling and harvest by human visitors and competition from non-native species. An additional pressure is pollution, including but not limited to oil spills, marine debris, and untreated discharge from land or marine facilities or activities (Andrews et al., 2013).

Sandy beaches

Sandy intertidal beach habitat stretches mainly along the southern shorelines of the MSP Study Area south of Point Grenville, making up about half of Washington's outer coastline. Sandy pocket beaches between headlands and near estuaries occur also north of Point Grenville (Map 3). Physical drivers for sandy beach habitats include sediment deposition, wave energy, beach slope, upwelling, and climate variability. Upwelling provides nutrients and food to beach habitat. Weather and climate, such as hot sunny days and strong winter storms, create variable conditions for organisms living in sandy habitats (Andrews et al., 2013).

Physical forces are central to the ecology and functioning of sandy beaches. Wave energy, the size of sand grains, and the elevation gradient interact to shape sandy beach systems. Washington's southern beaches are generally characterized as dissipative, meaning they are relatively flat and have fine sand, large tide ranges, and broad surf zones (Andrews et al., 2013; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). The wave energy reaching and shaping a particular stretch of beach will vary depending upon factors such as proximity to headlands and bays, winds during storms, and offshore structures such as islands, reefs, or sea stacks (Andrews et al., 2013).

Primary producers within sandy habitats are surf zone phytoplankton, benthic diatoms, and other small autotrophs. The Razor Clam (*Siliqua patula*) is an invertebrate commonly associated with Washington's sandy beaches. Razor Clam digging is a popular recreational activity along the coast, providing significant economic benefits. Razor Clams also recycle ammonium into the nearshore water, promoting primary production. Other invertebrate macrofauna within Washington's sandy beach habitat include crustaceans such as shrimp, crabs, and amphipods, along with polychaetes, snails, and isopods that live in the middle to lower tidal elevations.

Higher on the beach near the drift line are crustacean scavengers such as beach hoppers and isopods, as well as terrestrial arthropods. Sandy beaches are also habitat for several meio- and microfaunal invertebrates (e.g. small worms, mollusks, cnidarians, and unicellular heterotrophs), although not many studies have been conducted to characterize these communities on Washington's beaches (Andrews et al., 2013).

An important ecological interaction in the sandy beach habitat is the importation of phytoplankton, particulate organic matter, and detritus. Organic matter brought in by waves and currents provides substantial support for the food chain. In addition, detached kelps and other macrophytes wash up as wrack on the beach and provide habitat for invertebrates and fish as well as food sources for foragers. The habitat structure of sandy beaches (beach zonation, grain size, wave energy, and moisture content) also heavily influences community composition. It is hypothesized that dissipative beaches like those in Washington support a greater diversity of microhabitats and niches than intermediate and reflective beaches, which are characterized by features such as steep slopes, coarser sand, and a lack of surf zones (Andrews et al., 2013).

Dozens of species of fish inhabit subtidal waters along sandy beaches in Washington. Some, such as surf smelt, spawn in intertidal sand substrate. Common fish include sculpins, sand lance, surf perches, juvenile tomcod, and flatfish. Birds, including gulls, diving birds, wading birds, shorebirds, and crows, forage on sandy beaches at high and low tides. Sandy beaches are also visited by foraging terrestrial mammals (Andrews et al., 2013; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011).

Sand dunes occur along many of the sandy beaches of Washington's outer coast. Vegetated dunes are colonized by native or introduced dunegrasses and various small shrubs and trees. Dunes provide habitat for shorebirds such as sanderlings and snowy plover (*Charadrius nivosus*) (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). The beaches north of Kalaloch are often characterized by the buildup of large logs that have either eroded off adjacent forested cliffs, or have been carried down river systems to the coast. Dunes also provide important protection to the shoreline from wave and storm erosion.

Many existing human activities may affect Washington sandy beaches, including clamming and recreation, shoreline development, non-native species, sediment changes, oil spills, and pollution. Sandy beaches south of Point Grenville receive most of their sand from the Columbia River; therefore, dams and disposal of dredged sand from the mouth of the Columbia River into offshore waters have greatly decreased the sediment source from the Columbia River to these beaches (Andrews et al., 2013). This is adversely affecting beach habitat north of the mouth of the Columbia, since materials removed by erosive action are not replaced.

Large coastal estuaries

Coastal estuaries are semi-enclosed, brackish bodies of water that form where rivers meet the ocean. They are highly productive ecosystems that support a wide range of species at different life history stages, along with numerous ecosystem services.¹⁶ They are also important transitional systems that are linked to freshwater, terrestrial, and marine processes. In particular, this habitat discussion focuses on Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor, the two largest coastal estuaries in the MSP Study Area (Andrews et al., 2015).

Large coastal estuaries have varying sediment types (gravel, sand, mud, or silt). Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay have vast areas of mudflats below salt marshes or terrestrial vegetation, cut with multiple tidal channels. Wave exposure varies by location, with sand flats replacing mud flats in areas more exposed to coastal wave energy. Washington's large coastal estuaries are significantly influenced by ocean upwelling and downwelling. Salinity varies with proximity to rivers and bay mouths, and ocean forces and tides can break up the stratification of freshwater on the surface and saltwater below. Freshwater inputs are highest in the winter and lowest in the

¹⁶ Ecosystem services describes the types of benefits humans receive from functioning ecosystems. Examples of ecosystem services include providing food and clean water; controlling climate and disease; and supporting primary production and nutrient cycling.

summer. Tidal mixing is a key driver in this habitat, as over 50% of Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor are intertidal (B. M. Hickey & Banas, 2003; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). Other physical drivers include sediment dynamics, river plumes, large-scale climate patterns, and weather (Andrews et al., 2015).

Estuaries are critical habitat for a variety of marine and terrestrial organisms. Primary producers include phytoplankton, benthic diatoms, benthic microalgae, macroalgae, and macrophytes such as eelgrass, kelp, salt marsh plants (Map 4), and terrestrial plants. Salinity and tidal elevation influence the distribution of plants throughout the estuaries, with the upper estuarine habitat being host to a variety of plants, and mudflats being mostly unvegetated. Invertebrates include insect larvae, amphipods, polychaetes, burrowing shrimp, and others (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011)

Shellfish and fish are abundant in the estuaries. Specific shellfish species include the Olympia Oyster (*Ostrea lurida*),¹⁷ non-native Pacific Oyster (*Crassostrea gigas*), non-native Manila Clam (*Venerupis philippinarum*), and Dungeness Crab. Numerous listed and commercially important fish spend at least some part of their life-cycle within estuaries. Specific fish species include six species of salmon (*Oncorhynchus* spp.), herring, three-spined stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*), sturgeon (*Acipenser* spp.), sevengill sharks (*Notorynchus cepedianus*), and many others.

Estuaries provide crucial nursery habitat for the juveniles of many species of fish and crabs. Pacific Herring spawn in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a). Many studies have confirmed that juvenile salmon use estuaries as a source of food and refuge from predators, and have detailed the spatial and temporal differences between populations (Hughes et al., 2014; Sandell, Fletcher, McAninch, & Wait, 2013; Simenstad, Fresh, & Salo, 1982).

Dungeness Crab are also known to rely extensively on estuaries as habitat for juveniles (Gunderson, Armstrong, Shi, & McConnaughey, 1990; Hughes et al., 2014) Estuaries are also important foraging areas for visiting wildlife such as migratory shorebirds, ducks, and geese, as well as terrestrial animals like deer and elk. Harbor seals also reside within coastal estuaries. Seals haul out on rocks, reefs, beaches, and docks, and feed on invertebrates and fish in marine, estuarine, and occasionally fresh waters (Andrews et al., 2015; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011).

Biogenic habitats are an important part of the coastal estuarine ecosystem. Eelgrass beds and oyster reefs are two types of biogenic habitats that are very common in Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay. Native and non-native eelgrass (*Zostera marina* and *Z. japonica*, respectively) form patchy beds covering thousands of hectares in these coastal estuaries (Map 4). Eelgrass beds perform a primary production role in the nearshore food web. They create a physical habitat that provides three-dimensional structure to otherwise bare mudflats, slows water currents, dampens waves, and traps sediments (Abdelrhman, 2003; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). Eelgrass is a key part of the estuarine food web for several species, including birds, invertebrates, and fish.

Brant Geese (*Brant bernida*) are one of the few large animals that are direct consumers of eelgrass, and these plants are an important food source during their twice-annual migration on the Pacific flyway (Ganter, 2000; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). Eelgrass provides habitat for epiphytes, microalgae, macroalgae, and invertebrates that attach to its leaves and are preyed upon by fish and marine-associated birds. Eelgrass habitat is also vital for several highly important commercial species at some point in their life-cycle, such as Dungeness Crab, Pacific Herring, salmonids, shrimp, and flatfish (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011).

¹⁷ The Olympia Oyster is also a Washington State Candidate Species on the Species of Concern List.

The presence of non-native eelgrass can impact the estuarine system. *Z. japonica* colonizes unoccupied mudflats and converts them to vegetated habitat (J. L. Ruesink et al., 2010; Shafer, Kaldy, & Gaeckle, 2014). Direct competition between *Z. marina* and *Z. japonica* is often limited due to their ranges. *Z. marina* is typically found in high subtidal to low intertidal zones while *Z. japonica* is typically found in mid- to high intertidal zones (Mach, Wyllie-Echeverria, & Chan, 2014; Shafer et al., 2014).

Studies designed to assess the ecological impacts of non-native *Z. japonica* are limited, but have found both positive and negative outcomes (Mach et al., 2014). Shellfish growers are concerned about the impacts of the non-native eelgrass on clam and oyster species important to aquaculture. One study on commercial clam farms in Willapa Bay found that *Z. japonica* impacted Manila Clam growth. The study showed decreased growth rates in study plots with *Z. japonica* and greater growth rates where it was removed. In 4 out of 5 commercial clam farms studied, productivity was greater where *Z. japonica* was removed than where it was left untreated (Patten, 2014).

Oysters also create a three-dimensional biogenic habitat in the lower intertidal and subtidal zones. Fish and invertebrates live within accumulations of oyster shell, and the oysters provide ecosystem functions by circulating and clarifying water, reducing hypoxia, and filtering nutrients. Historically, Willapa Bay supported large populations of Olympia Oysters in the low intertidal zone and the shallow subtidal zone, but they may have been uncommon in Grays Harbor (Baker, 1995; Cook, Shaffer, Dumbauld, & Kauffman, 2000). Overharvest and habitat loss led to commercial extinction of the Olympia Oyster by 1930. Recovery has been hindered by the removal of shell accumulations (the preferred habitat of Olympia Oyster larvae) and the expansion of eelgrass beds. Recent aquaculture has focused on the non-native Pacific Oyster (Blake & Zu Ermgassen, 2015; J. Ruesink et al., 2005; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011).

Many human pressures currently exist within Washington's large coastal estuaries including fishing, dredging, shellfish aquaculture, non-native species, watershed activities, port development, and commercial shipping. Pollution is another pressure, including both pollution of a physical nature like suspended sediment and temperature increases, as well as chemical pollution including but not limited to acidification (Andrews et al., 2015). While the estuaries provide valuable habitat functions and ecosystem services, there is an extensive history of human activities and management within Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor, which has significantly altered habitats and functions from their original state. For example, in Willapa Bay about 30% of the tidal marshes between high and extreme high water have been diked and converted to agricultural or developed land, and sediment loads have been altered by logging and damming on the Columbia River. In addition, 45 introduced marine species have been documented, and the Olympia Oyster became commercially extinct due to overexploitation and habitat loss (J. L. Ruesink et al., 2006).

Estuaries are highly valuable ecosystems. While the MSP has spatial data for some estuarine species and habitats (e.g. Green Sturgeon critical habitat, marine mammal haulout locations, seabird colonies, dunegrass, kelp, seagrass, and saltmarsh), up-to-date spatial data for many estuarine species is not available. However, estuaries are known to be vital habitat for many commercially and recreationally valuable species, wildlife, and endangered and threatened species, many of which support key human uses. As a result, the state considers Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor estuaries to be Ecologically Important Areas. See Section 3.2 for more information on the Ecologically Important Areas analysis and Section 4.3 for recommendations related specifically to estuaries and resources within them.

Species

The MSP Study Area is home to many species of marine animals and plants. Various species are important for commercial and recreational fisheries, are key links in the marine and estuarine food web, are popular for wildlife viewing, may be state and/or federally protected, or are simply important to the quality and character of the region's ecosystem. This section highlights key fish, marine mammals, birds, and sea turtles that occur within the MSP Study Area to help tell the biological story of Washington's ocean and estuaries. Many other taxonomic groups such as invertebrates, zooplankton, phytoplankton, algae, and plants are also important to the MSP Study Area. While these taxa are not specifically described here, many are mentioned briefly within the Habitat section.

Fish

The MSP Study Area is habitat for a variety of fish. Fish are important both ecologically and economically to the state of Washington. Key groups of fish discussed here are pelagic fish, groundfish, and salmonids and other anadromous fish.¹⁸ Map 5 shows the results of the Ecologically Important Areas (EIA) analysis for fish species.¹⁹

Forage fish, migratory species, and pelagic fish

Forage fish are important links in the ocean food web, connecting primary and secondary trophic levels to larger predatory fish, marine mammals, and seabirds. Several species of forage fish inhabit the MSP Study Area (Table 2.1-1). Forage fish tend to be present in high abundance, feed on plankton for a portion of their life cycle, and form dense schools or aggregations. Forage fish often feed in pelagic waters, and certain species such as smelt and sand lance spawn on coastal intertidal sandy beaches (Map 6). Forage fish are prey for a variety of commercially important and legally protected fish (i.e. salmon), marine mammals, and birds and can be of interest for commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishing (Andrews et al., 2013; Langness, Dionne, Masello, & Lowry, 2015).

Table 2.1-1. Forage fish species

Common Name	Scientific Name
Surf Smelt	<i>Hypomesus pretiosus</i>
Night Smelt	<i>Spirinchus starksi</i>
Whitebait Smelt	<i>Allosmerus elongates</i>
Pacific Sand Lance	<i>Ammodytes hexapterus</i>
Pacific Herring	<i>Clupea pallasii</i>
Northern Anchovy	<i>Engraulis mordax</i>
Pacific Sardine	<i>Sardinops sagax</i>

Many migratory fish species travel through and feed within the pelagic waters of the MSP Study Area, including species such as the Common Thresher Shark and Albacore Tuna. These species feed at a variety of levels on the food chain, ranging from plankton to fish or

¹⁸ Information on fishing is available in Section 2.4: State and Tribal Fisheries.

¹⁹ Details of the EIA analysis, data sources, and maps are provided in Section 3.2: Ecologically Important Areas Analysis.

mammals. Migratory species are important state and tribal fisheries, and because of their migratory nature can be fished by vessels from multiple nations (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011; Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2015). Pelagic fish species are subject to pressures including those from fishing, pollution, and climate variations. These variations can include upwelling and influences from source waters, as well as El Niño/La Niña events and the impacts they have on prey availability and habitat (Andrews et al., 2013).

Groundfish

The groundfish (a.k.a. bottomfish) assemblage consists of dozens of species including rockfish, lingcod, dogfish, halibut, whiting, flatfish, skates, and sablefish. Rockfish refers to a group of numerous species, with 30 species identified by NOAA in the waters of the Study Area. Over 15 species of flatfish have been identified in Sanctuary waters. Groundfish occupy several habitats, including rocky bottoms, kelp, seafloor, and even pelagic areas. Groundfish prey on a variety of organisms such as euphausiids, plankton, deposit feeders, benthic invertebrates, forage fish, and other small groundfish (Andrews et al., 2015, 2013; Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011).

Fishing is a human pressure that has affected groundfish. Several species have been subject to overfishing, especially during the 1980s and 1990s (Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2014a). Some rockfish species, like Yelloweye Rockfish, are particularly sensitive to fishing pressure because they are long-lived and exhibit low productivity life history characteristics. A few stocks of rockfish within MSP Study Area waters have been declared overfished since 2000. However, recent fishery management measures appear to have been successful at rebuilding most groundfish stocks, with only two stocks still classified as ‘overfished’: Yelloweye Rockfish and Pacific Ocean Perch (Garfield & Harvey, 2016; Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2014a).

Essential Fish Habitat and Rockfish Conservation Area closures for groundfish bottom trawling have been established. At the time of publication, they are being reconsidered by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) in several areas within the MSP Study Area to protect habitat and aid in stock recovery. NOAA Fisheries, tribes, and state fisheries management agencies monitor and assess the status of groundfish populations. However, there are data gaps in the monitoring of rockfish populations due to the difficulty and cost of conducting routine, scientific surveys in rocky reef habitats. These habitats are difficult or not possible to access with the bottom trawl gear used for stock assessments.

Salmon and other anadromous fish

Salmonids (salmon and related species) and other anadromous fish are of high ecological and economic importance in Washington. Anadromous species spawn in freshwater systems, migrate to nearshore and offshore marine areas to feed and grow, and then return to home rivers, streams, and lakes upon maturity to start the cycle again. Eight species of salmonids, Pacific Eulachon, Green Sturgeon, White Sturgeon, and Pacific Lamprey spend some portion of their life within the MSP Study Area (Table 2.1-2). Note that species occurrence can vary by year due to changing ocean conditions and other environmental factors. American Shad is a non-native anadromous species that was introduced to the West Coast in the late 1800s and has thrived in the region. Nine of the thirteen anadromous species in the MSP Study Area are listed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) or on the Washington State Species of Concern lists (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017b).

Salmon in particular are a cultural icon to Washington residents, both tribal and non-tribal. After leaving freshwater, salmon rely on estuarine (Sandell et al., 2013), nearshore, and pelagic waters and prey on a variety of animals including euphausiids, amphipods, larval decapods, and forage fish (Andrews et al., 2015, 2013).

Salmon have been and continue to be impacted by numerous pressures including fishing, loss of freshwater habitat, hydropower dams, land use activities, predation, and poor ocean conditions, which collectively can include changes in chemical or physical conditions and an accompanying loss of food supply (NOAA Fisheries, 2014b). Salmonids are considered for listing and recovery under the ESA by distinct populations known as evolutionarily significant units (ESUs).

Several listed ESUs (e.g. Puget Sound Chinook) and non-listed ESUs (e.g. Washington Coast Chinook) spend some or all of their adult lives in the MSP Study Area. Under the ESA, critical habitat is designated for certain salmon ESUs in streams, rivers, and some bays or estuaries adjacent to the Study Area. Under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, Essential Fish Habitat has been designated for marine salmon (Chinook and Coho Salmon) for the entire EEZ. For Pink Salmon, Essential Fish Habitat has been designated in Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca, and extends into the Study Area. (Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2014b).

Ocean conditions have been used to forecast returns of Chinook and Coho Salmon, including the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, sea surface temperature anomalies, coastal upwelling, spring transition dates, and copepod biomass anomalies (Andrews et al., 2015; Burke et al., 2013; Peterson et al., 2015). Salmon recovery management measures in Washington include hatchery programs, habitat improvement efforts, and fisheries management (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2008).

Fish in the Coastal-Puget Sound population of Bull Trout are anadromous, as they spawn in rivers and streams but rear their young in the ocean. Designated critical habitat for anadromous Bull Trout in Washington includes 655 nautical miles of streams and shoreline (Map 7) (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2015). The shoreline critical habitat stretches from north of La Push south to Grays Harbor (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, n.d.).

Green Sturgeon are believed to spend most of their lives in nearshore oceanic waters, bays, and estuaries. The southern distinct population (SDP) of Green Sturgeon spawns only in the Sacramento River in California, and is listed under the Endangered Species Act as threatened (Adams et al., 2007). Adult sturgeon from the SDP enter Willapa Bay in the late spring and early summer months and feed on burrowing shrimp (*Neotrypaea californiensis*) (Dumbauld, Holden, & Langness, 2008; Moser & Lindley, 2007). It is conjectured that they also feed on mollusks, amphipods, and even small fish (NOAA Fisheries, 2014a). Green Sturgeon ESA critical habitat is within much of the Study Area. It occurs along the entire coast, including Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay (Map 7) (NOAA Fisheries, 2014a).

Pacific Eulachon (aka “candlefish” or “smelt”) are small anadromous fish that typically spend three to five years in salt water before returning to fresh water to spawn. While in the ocean, eulachon typically spend their time in nearshore waters and offshore in waters up to 1,000 feet (300 meters) deep. Eulachon populations have declined in the last two decades, partially due to changing ocean conditions. The fish was listed as threatened under the ESA in 2010 (NOAA Fisheries, 2015). The latest status review notes that the population has increased since its listing in 2010; higher estimates may also be a result of improved monitoring (Gustafson et al., 2016). Eulachon are also key prey for pinnipeds in the MSP Study Area including harbor seals, California sea lions, Steller sea lions, and Northern fur seals (National Marine Fisheries Service,

2016). The MSP Study Area is important habitat for eulachon, and eulachon ESA critical habitat is directly adjacent to the Study Area. Eulachon are an important cultural fishery for many tribes in Washington.

Table 2.1-2. Anadromous fish species found (at some point in their adult life stage) within the MSP Study Area. Source: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017b.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Bull trout	<i>Salvelinus confluentus</i>	Threatened	State candidate
Chinook Salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	See Table 2.1-3 below	
Chum Salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus keta</i>	See Table 2.1-3 below	
Coho Salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>	See Table 2.1-3 below	
Pink Salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus gorbuscha</i>	None	None
Sockeye Salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus nerka</i>	See Table 2.1-3 below	
Steelhead	<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>	See Table 2.1-3 below	
Coastal Cutthroat Trout	<i>Oncorhynchus clarki</i>	None	None
Pacific Eulachon	<i>Thaleichthys pacificus</i>	Threatened	State candidate
Green Sturgeon	<i>Acipenser medirostris</i>	Threatened	None
White Sturgeon	<i>Acipenser transmontanus</i>	None	None
Pacific Lamprey	<i>Entosphenus tridentatus</i>	Species of concern	State monitored
American Shad	<i>Alosa sapidissima</i>	None	None

Table 2.1-3. Listed Salmon ESUs that may be found in the MSP Study Area. Source: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017b.

Common Name	ESU	Federal Status	State Status
Chinook Salmon	Puget Sound	Threatened	State candidate
	Upper Columbia River	Threatened	State candidate
	Snake River spring/summer	Threatened	State candidate
	Snake River fall-run	Threatened	State candidate
	Upper Willamette River	Threatened	State candidate
	Lower Columbia River	Threatened	State candidate
Chum Salmon	Columbia River	Threatened	State candidate
	Hood Canal summer-run	Threatened	State candidate
Coho Salmon	Lower Columbia River	Threatened	None
	Oregon coast	Threatened	N/A
Sockeye Salmon	Snake River	Endangered	State candidate
	Lake Ozette	Threatened	State candidate
Steelhead	Puget Sound	Threatened	None
	Upper Columbia River	Threatened	State candidate
	Snake River Basin	Threatened	State candidate
	Middle Columbia River	Threatened	State candidate
	Upper Willamette River	Threatened	State candidate
	Lower Columbia River	Threatened	State candidate

Marine mammals

At least 29 species of marine mammals inhabit or transit through the MSP Study Area at some point in their lives. Species include baleen and toothed whales, seals and sea lions, and sea otters. Many marine mammals are top predators within the ecosystem, while some large baleen whales are primarily filter or bottom feeders (e.g. humpback and gray whales). Their diets vary and include krill, invertebrates, forage fish, salmon, other fish, and even other marine mammals.

About 20,000 gray whales migrate through the Study Area, with the abundance of gray whales at any time influenced by environmental variability within the Arctic feeding grounds and the timing of migration (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011).

In southern Washington, a visual survey of marine mammals was conducted over eight trips between July 2008 and June 2009 in the area between Grays Harbor, the Quinault Canyon, and Grays Canyon. This survey found the harbor porpoise to be the most commonly sighted marine mammal in nearshore waters, and the Dall's porpoise the most commonly sighted marine mammal in offshore waters (Oleson & Hildebrand, 2012). A visual survey in June 2008 within the OCNMS found that humpback whales were the most commonly sighted cetacean (Oleson & Hildebrand, 2012).

Orcas

Orcas (aka killer whales) are also found in the MSP Study Area.²⁰ Orcas are divided into four populations based on ecology, genetics, diet, behavior, and social interactions. Three populations are described as “resident” orcas: northern, southern, and offshore. Resident orcas are fish-eating, with northern and southern populations mainly feeding on salmonids and occasionally bottomfish. Transient orcas in Washington waters are mammal-eating, preying mainly upon harbor seals. All four populations of orcas occur within the MSP Study Area, although their distribution, abundance, and temporal use of the area varies by population.

The distribution of the populations is best known for the summer months, when the most monitoring has occurred. During this time, the northern resident population has a core range in inshore British Columbia. The southern resident population is centered in the inshore waters near the border of Washington and British Columbia, and the offshore population is generally found on the continental shelf from southern California to the Aleutian Islands (Lance, Calambokidis, Baird, & Steiger, 2011). Satellite tags and passive acoustic recorders have been used to learn more about southern resident killer whale winter migrations and the extent of their range. Satellite tagging data from 2015 shows that the resident orcas spend time feeding outside the Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor estuaries and at the mouth of the Columbia River (NOAA Fisheries, n.d.-b).

Population sizes are well established for northern and southern resident orcas, with less precision around population estimates of offshore resident and transient orcas. Southern resident orcas are listed as endangered under the ESA, and all killer whales are listed as endangered in the state of Washington (Table 2.1-4) (Lance et al., 2011).

Seals and sea lions

Harbor seals, elephant seals, California sea lions, and Steller sea lions aggregate and haul out on the rocky islands, coastal areas, and estuaries the MSP Study Area (Map 10) (S. J. Jeffries, Gearin, Huber, Saul, & Pruett, 2000; Lance et al., 2011). Harbor seals and California sea lions use the coastal estuaries frequently. Northern fur seals also transit through and forage within the MSP Study Area (Lance et al., 2011). NOAA's National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) developed relative density models to inform the likely distributions of these animals in the MSP Study Area (excluding their use of the estuaries). Please see Chapter 3 for a more detailed description of the modeling process and results.

²⁰ Orcas are found in all oceans and seas of the world, with their density being greatest in colder waters within 800 km of major continents. Off the west coast of North America they are found in relatively high density in nearshore waters from Alaska to central California (Lance, Calambokidis, Baird, & Steiger, 2011).

Table 2.1-4. Marine mammals within the MSP Study Area on the federal or state Species of Concern lists.
Source: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017c.

Common name	Scientific name	Federal status	State status
Blue whale	<i>Balaenoptera musculus</i>	Endangered	State Endangered
Fin whale	<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i>	Endangered	State Endangered
Gray whale	<i>Eschrichtius robustus</i>	None	State Sensitive
Harbor porpoise	<i>Phocoena</i>	None	State Candidate
Humpback whale	<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Killer whale	<i>Orcinus orca</i>	Endangered ²¹	Endangered ²²
North Pacific right whale	<i>Eubalaena japonica</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Sea otter	<i>Enhydra lutris</i>	Species of Concern	Endangered
Sei whale	<i>Balaenoptera borealis</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Sperm whale	<i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>	Endangered	Endangered
Steller sea lion	<i>Eumetopias jubatus</i>	Species of Concern	None

Sea otters

A population of sea otters also occurs in the Study Area. They typically inhabit rocky habitats and kelp forests, but also are found in lower densities in soft-sediment areas along the Olympic Peninsula coast from Destruction Island northward to Tatoosh Island (Map 10) (Andrews et al., 2013). Extirpated by fur trade hunters in 1911, sea otters were reintroduced to the outer coast in 1969 and 1970 (Lance et al., 2011). The sea otter population has continued to grow since reintroduction, with an annual growth rate of 7.6% between 1991 and 2012 (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2013). The population in 2015 consisted of approximately 1,394 animals (S. Jeffries, Lynch, & Thomas, 2016). Sea otters are listed as endangered by the State of Washington (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017c).

Sea otters are a keystone species that help maintain kelp forest habitat structure by preying on sea urchins (Andrews et al., 2013; Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). Other sea otter prey includes abalone, mussels, crabs, snails, and chitons (Andrews et al., 2013).

Marine mammals with special protection

Ten marine mammal species listed under the federal ESA or Washington Species of Concern list occur within the MSP Study Area (Table 2.1-4). Stressors for marine mammals include collisions with boats and other boat interactions (e.g. noise), entanglement in fishing gear and marine debris, contaminants, oil spills, alterations in habitat and prey, HABs, and

²¹ This listing is for the Southern Resident Orca population, the other three populations (northern, offshore, and transient) are not listed under the ESA.

²² The State of Washington lists all Killer Whales in the state as Endangered.

oceanographic conditions (Andrews et al., 2013; Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). All marine mammals, whether listed under the ESA or as a state Species of Concern, are currently protected by the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16.U.S.C. §§1631 et seq).²³

Marine mammal mapping

The National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) developed relative density models for four species of cetaceans and two species of pinnipeds to inform the likely distributions of these animals for the MSP. Species were chosen by Ecology and WDFW because they are species of management concern or are representative of specific ecological roles in the environment (C. Menza et al., 2016). The maps were created by using models that link at-sea mammal observations with environmental data. Cetacean maps were produced for Dall's porpoise (*Phocoenoides dalli*), harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*), gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*), humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). These maps do not include cetacean use of the estuaries. Cetaceans, especially gray whales and harbor porpoises, are known to use the estuaries. NCCOS also produced models and maps for harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina*) and Steller sea lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*). More details on the NCCOS modeling effort and available maps are in Chapter 3: Spatial Analyses.

The interagency team worked to identify ecologically important areas (EIAs). EIAs are defined as areas where available data shows that animals, especially those of interest in fisheries and wildlife management, use the MSP Study Area the most. More information about the EIA analysis process and additional maps are available in Chapter 3: Spatial Analyses. WDFW produced an EIA hotspot map for all marine mammals included in the analysis (Map 8) and one specifically for humpback whales (Map 9).

Birds

Numerous bird species use and transit through the MSP Study Area. Many species of birds, including seabirds, raptors, marshbirds, waterbirds, and shorebirds, forage and nest in sea stacks, rocky offshore islands, cliffs, bluffs, dunes, marshlands, estuaries, tidal flats, coastal beaches, and old-growth forests. Seabird and shorebird populations occur throughout the outer coast of Washington, with the majority located along the west coast of the Olympic Peninsula (Map 11).

Washington is also along the Pacific Flyway, a migratory pathway for millions of waterbirds, shorebirds, and raptors. Some seabird species migrate thousands of miles to forage in the offshore waters of the MSP Study Area, such as albatross and shearwaters (Kaplan, Beegle-Krause, French McCay, Copping, & Geerlofs, 2010; Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). Estuaries are also crucial habitat for several resident and migratory bird species. Five national wildlife refuges have been established in or directly adjacent to the MSP Study Area (Map 1) to protect land-based resources where large concentrations of birds occur and where seabirds nest.

The interagency team developed EIA maps for some bird species. Additional information and maps can be found in Chapter 3: Spatial Analyses.

²³ There are some exceptions to the Marine Mammal Protection Act, including small takes of incidental harvest such as harvest by Alaskan natives.

Marshbirds

The term marshbird broadly encompasses birds that feed, nest, or otherwise utilize tidal or freshwater marshes, including herons, egrets, rails, and passerines. They do not swim, but rather forage on sandy beaches, in marshes, and in other coastal areas. Examples of marshbirds in Washington include the Great Blue Heron (*Ardea Herodias*), Marsh Wren (*Cistothorus palustris*), Great Egret (*Ardea alba*), and American Bittern (*Botaurus lentiginosus*). Marshbirds are associated with estuaries such as Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay. Marshbirds are sensitive to human disturbance, and nesting sites can be abandoned due to land development, wetland loss, logging, and human intrusions (Kaplan et al., 2010; United States Department of the Navy, 2015).²⁴

Ducks and geese

Ducks and geese (family Anatidae) are generally present along protected shores, bays, and estuaries. Large numbers of these birds occur during the winter, and migrate north or east to summer breeding grounds. Most species of ducks and geese feed by diving, dabbling, or foraging from the surface and have diverse diets ranging from mollusks and fish eggs to vegetation. Species include the Black Brant (*Branta bernicla*), Greater Scaup (*Aythya marila*), Green-winged teal (*Anas crecca*), tundra swan (*Cygnus columbianus*), bufflehead (*Bucephala albeola*), Canada Goose (*Branta canadensis*), and others. Willapa Bay is an important stopover for wintering Black Brant. The Columbia River estuary provides habitat for swans and wintering ducks. Harlequin Ducks (*Histrionicus histrionicus*) winter along the Pacific Coast and forage for crustaceans, mollusks, and aquatic insects within rocky substrate and kelp beds (Kaplan et al., 2010; United States Department of the Navy, 2015).

Shorebirds

Shorebirds include species such as sandpipers, plovers, oystercatchers, avocets, and stilts. Shorebirds can migrate long distances (up to thousands of miles) between wintering and breeding grounds. Coastal estuaries and wetlands are used during migratory stopovers to rest, feed, and replenish the fat reserves needed for the continuing migration, primarily to the high Arctic where they nest. Shorebirds can congregate in high concentrations, sometime numbering in the millions. Shorebirds mainly feed on invertebrates present in shallow waters and associated wetlands, beaches, mudflats, and other tidelands. Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay represent important stopover sites for many species, such as dunlin (*Calidris alpina*).

There are also a few species that breed locally. The Western Snowy Plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*) breeds on sandy beaches adjacent to the MSP Study Area in Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties. Black Oystercatchers (*Haematopus bachmani*) also breed in areas adjacent to and within the MSP Study Area, along the rocky coast and on offshore rocks and islands. Coastal development and human activities have degraded shorebird stopover and colony habitat (Kaplan et al., 2010; Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011; United States Department of the Navy, 2015).

Seabirds

Seabirds include species of albatrosses, petrels, shearwaters, and alcids. Seabirds found within the MSP Study Area include murre, puffins, albatrosses, fulmars, shearwaters, gulls,

²⁴ The Navy is not the original source for these data and studies, although the information is included in Navy publications.

murrelets, cormorants, terns, and others. Seabird use of the area varies seasonally and is influenced by physical and biological processes. Some species travel vast distances across the globe to forage in the waters of the MSP Study Area during summer, such as the Sooty Shearwater (*Puffinus griseus*), which breeds in New Zealand. Several species of seabirds breed on coastal islands within the Study Area, such as Tatoosh and Destruction Islands.

Some seabirds forage far offshore over the continental shelf and oceanic waters, while others such as the Common Murre and Marbled Murrelet forage in fairly nearshore environments. Diets vary by species, but mainly consist of fish and invertebrates, including zooplankton, crabs, and crustaceans. Seabird abundance and reproductive success is influenced by short-term and long-term oceanographic conditions, oil spills, disturbance of breeding colonies, fisheries bycatch, and predators such as raptors (Kaplan et al., 2010; Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011; United States Department of the Navy, 2015).²⁵

Unlike most seabirds that nest on offshore islands and rocks, Marbled Murrelets nest in old-growth forests, up to 55 miles inland in Washington. Marbled Murrelets are listed as threatened on the federal and state species lists and are subject to many pressures. Reduction of appropriate nesting habitat and poor at-sea foraging conditions are some of the primary pressures experienced by these birds. Marbled Murrelets are monitored annually in Washington (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1997; Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2013).

Seabirds are often considered indicators for ocean conditions because they forage across multiple habitats and trophic levels. Because of their behavior and life history characteristics, seabirds can be difficult to monitor. Some species are monitored as indicators for other seabird populations. The National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) developed models to predict relative density to inform the MSP, using environmental variables and survey data. Species were chosen to represent different habitat uses ranging from nearshore species like the Marbled Murrelet to pelagic species like the Northern Fulmar and Black-footed Albatross. Species that are locally rare or declining were also included (e.g., pink-footed shearwater and tufted puffin). These maps do not include seabird use of the estuaries because surveys largely did not occur in the estuaries. Maps were produced for Marbled Murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*), Tufted Puffin (*Fratercula cirrhata*), Common Murre (*Uria aalge*), Black-footed Albatross (*Phoebastria nigripes*), Northern Fulmar (*Fulmarus glacialis*), Pink-footed Shearwater (*Puffinus creatopus*), and Sooty Shearwater (*Puffinus griseus*) (Charles Menza, Battista, & Dorfman, 2013). See Chapter 3: Spatial Analyses for more information and maps.

Map 12 shows the results of the Ecologically Important Areas hotspot analysis for seabirds.

Raptors

A few species of raptors forage in areas within and adjacent to the MSP Study Area, including Bald Eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) and Peregrine Falcons (*Falco peregrinus*). Bald Eagles and Peregrine Falcons nest along the outer coast. The eagles prey upon seabirds, waterfowl, and salmon, and the falcons prey upon shorebirds, seabirds, ducks, and other birds (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2013). These birds also prey upon Common Murres and other surface nesting birds during the breeding season (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011).

²⁵ The Navy is not the original source for these data and studies, although the information is included in Navy publications.

Birds with special protection

Several species of birds occurring adjacent to and within the Study Area have federal or state special protection (Table 2.1-5). Seabirds, raptors, shorebirds, waterbirds, marshbirds, and terrestrial birds are included in this list. A terrestrial bird, the Streaked Horned Lark, nests and forages on sandy beaches along the southern outer coast, in Grays Harbor at Damon Point and Johns River Island, and on the islands of the lower Columbia River (See Chapter 3: Spatial Analyses for the EIA map) (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2013). Common reasons for bird population declines include oceanographic factors that affect their prey (e.g. El Niño), habitat degradation, pollution and oil spills, and predation (Kaplan et al., 2010; Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). Birds are also susceptible to illness and death from consuming prey affected by HABs (NOAA, 2015).

National wildlife refuges, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, WDFW, and DNR implement management measures to help protect and recover populations of listed species in Washington. Bald Eagles are also protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act ([16 U.S.C. 668](#)) which prohibits anyone from “taking” Bald Eagles including their parts, nests, or eggs, or disturbing the birds.

Table 2.1-5. Birds on the federal or state species of concern lists occurring within or directly adjacent to the MSP Study Area. Source: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017b.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Bald Eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Species of Concern	State Sensitive
Brandt’s Cormorant	<i>Phalacrocorax penicillatus</i>	None	State Candidate
Brown Pelican	<i>Pelecanus occidentalis</i>	Species of Concern	State Endangered
Cassin’s Auklet	<i>Ptychoramphus aleuticus</i>	None	State Candidate
Clark’s Grebe	<i>Aechmophorus clarkii</i>	None	State Candidate
Common Loon	<i>Gavia immer</i>	None	State Sensitive
Common Murre	<i>Uria aalge</i>	None	State Candidate
Marbled Murrelet	<i>Brachyramphus marmoratus</i>	Threatened	State Threatened
Peregrine falcon	<i>Falco peregrinus</i>	Species of Concern	State Sensitive
Purple Martin	<i>Progne subis</i>	None	State Candidate
Sandhill Crane	<i>Grus canadensis</i>	None	State Endangered
Short-tailed Albatross	<i>Phoebastria albatros</i>	Endangered	State Candidate
Snowy Plover	<i>Charadrius nivosus</i>	Threatened	State Endangered
Streaked horned Lark	<i>Eremophila alpestris strigata</i>	Threatened	State Endangered
Tufted Puffin	<i>Fratercula cirrhata</i>	None	State Endangered
Western Grebe	<i>Aechmophorus occidentalis</i>	None	State Candidate

Sea Turtles

Three species of sea turtles occur within the MSP Study Area: leatherback, loggerhead, and green sea turtles. All three of these turtles are listed under the federal Endangered Species Act and on the Washington State Species of Concern list (Table 2.1-6). These sea turtles feed in and migrate through the waters of the Study Area. However, no nesting sites occur within Washington State, as the turtles nest in tropical regions. The leatherback sea turtle is the only sea turtle regularly found in Washington waters. Leatherbacks feed primarily on jellyfish, which are found in the upper part of the water column. Leatherbacks are found in the waters of the MSP Study Area during the summer and fall, especially in the Columbia River Plume and in other areas where the oceanographic conditions tend to aggregate jellyfish (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2013).

Designated critical habitat for leatherback sea turtles occurs throughout the MSP Study Area. A primary stressor for turtles within the Study Area is pollution, particularly plastic bags which leatherbacks mistake for jellyfish and ingest. Entanglement in fishing gear can also be a stressor, but the drift gillnet and pelagic longline fishing gears that primarily affect leatherbacks are no longer permitted in the Study Area. Therefore, the risk of entanglement is now quite low (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2013). NOAA’s Critical Habitat Designation identifies an area of nearshore waters from Cape Flattery, Washington to Cape Blanco, Oregon that includes important habitat for foraging of prey that is important to leatherbacks.

In this habitat of high conservation value, tidal, wind, wave energy, and liquid natural gas projects were identified as having the potential to affect prey abundance and prey contamination levels (NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center, 2012). Sightings of loggerhead and green sea turtles are rarely recorded off the Washington coast. Only four strandings of green sea turtles were recorded between 2002 and 2012. No strandings of loggerheads were recorded in that period (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2013).

Table 2.1-6. Sea turtles within the MSP Study Area and their federal and state species of concern status. Source: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017b.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	State Status
Green sea turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	Threatened	State Threatened
Leatherback sea turtle	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	Endangered	State Endangered
Loggerhead sea turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	Endangered	State Threatened

Stressors

The MSP Study Area is subject to many anthropogenic stressors, or stressors from human activities. These stressors may harm wildlife, alter water quality, and degrade habitat. This section presents summaries of some of the key anthropogenic stressors in the MSP Study Area: invasive species, oil spills, marine debris, vessel discharges, fishing pressures including habitat modifications related to bottom gear, shoreline development, human disturbance and trampling, ocean noise, and vessel strikes.²⁶ While this is not meant to be an exhaustive discussion of various human stressors that affect ocean ecology, these topics are presented to acknowledge the major identified impacts that Washington's ocean environment currently faces.

Invasive Species

Invasive species are non-native organisms that harm or pose a risk of harming the state's environmental, economic, or human resources.²⁷ Invasive species including diseases, parasites, plants, invertebrates, and vertebrates occur along the Washington coast in a variety of habitats. Invasive species can be intentionally or unintentionally introduced in a variety of ways, including ballast water discharge, the use of organisms for packing material, fouling on aquaculture shipments, the aquarium trade (with subsequent release into the environment), recreational boating, and floating debris (e.g. biofouling on debris arriving from the 2011 Japanese tsunami) (Andrews et al., 2015, 2013; Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008).

Invasive species can have a profound impact on the habitat, trophic interactions, and ecology of an area. This can also lead to significant social and economic burdens on industries such as fisheries and aquaculture, and can particularly impact the recovery of species such as salmon (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008). Statewide, there are 94 recorded marine invasive species, 59 of which occur on Washington's Pacific coast (Davidson, Zabin, Ashton, & Ruiz, 2014).

The MSP Study Area has been subject to impacts from invasive species, with some of the more well-known invasions occurring in the coastal estuaries. Examples include Atlantic cordgrass (*Spartina alterniflora* and *S. densiflora*), Japanese eelgrass (*Zostera japonica*), and European Green Crab (*Carcinus maenus*). The brown alga (*Sargassum muticum*) is an example of an invasive species that has been found in rocky shores and mixed substrate sites on the Pacific Ocean coast, yet little is currently known about its impacts to native species or other algae in Washington (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011).

The prevention and control of invasive species is a complex task and depends upon how a species is introduced or spread, as well as the effective treatments available for that species. Resource managers consider prevention to be the best and most cost-effective way to manage invasive species (Cusack, Harte, & Chan, 2009). Recreational vessel cleaning, ballast water management, vessel inspections, biofouling management, and prohibitions of the release of non-native species are some of the primary ways Washington attempts to prevent the introduction and spread of aquatic invasive species (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015a).

In the case of established invasive populations, Washington may take direct action to control and prevent further spread of species that are significant threats to native habitat and/or

²⁶ Climate change is discussed in Section 2.11 Climate Change.

²⁷ Management of native species that become harmful is handled differently by the State, and is not discussed here.

natural resource industries. The management approaches used in these situations, ranging from physical removal to application of pesticide treatments, depend on multiple factors including the species, extent of establishment, degree of containment possible, and urgency of the threat to Washington's environmental, economic, or human resources. For example, management of invasive species on Japanese tsunami marine debris was primarily accomplished using physical removal (Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015c). However, in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor, herbicides were ultimately the best management tool used to control invasive Atlantic cordgrass (Washington State Department of Agriculture, 2015).

Multiple agencies are involved with decisions related to invasive species control. The Washington Invasive Species Council coordinates among state agencies to support a comprehensive strategy for making effective investments to protect Washington from invasive species (Washington Invasive Species Council, 2014). Washington also has specific programs related to the prevention and control of invasive species.²⁸ These programs focus on various aspects of invasive species outreach, education, reporting, prevention, enforcement, and treatment.

Invasive species will continue to be a stressor in the future with a significant risk of impact to the MSP Study Area and Washington State. It is possible that potential new uses such as marine renewable energy, offshore aquaculture, or other activities could introduce invasive species.

It should be noted that some introduced species have become important for commercial and recreational harvest in the MSP Study Area. Pacific Oysters and Manila Clams are both non-native species that were introduced to the area. Pacific Oysters were introduced to the MSP Study Area as spat from Japan beginning in 1928. They are now the focus of economically important aquaculture operations that contribute significantly to the coastal and statewide economy (for more information see Section 2.5 Aquaculture) (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Oil Spills

Oil is routinely transported through the MSP Study Area on many types of vessels as fuel, lubricating oil, hydraulic fluid, and as a byproduct from fish processing. Crude oil and refined products are also carried as cargo on tankers and oil barges. Vessels of all types transit through the Study Area, including vessels entering and exiting the Strait of Juan de Fuca, Grays Harbor, and the Columbia River.

The West Coast Offshore Vessel Traffic Risk Management Project developed recommendations that vessels 300 gross tons or larger that are transiting coastwise anywhere between Cook Inlet and San Diego should voluntarily stay a minimum distance of 25 nm offshore (West Coast Offshore Vessel Traffic Risk Management Project Workgroup, 2002). As a result, larger vessels including oil tankers and oil barges typically travel 25 to 50 nautical miles off the coast (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2015a, 2015b; Washington State Department of Ecology et al., 2015).

Oil spills in the marine environment can negatively affect water quality and directly injure plants, animals, and habitat. An oil spill may also negatively impact human activities and

²⁸ Some examples include including the Washington State Aquatic Invasive Species Prevention and Enforcement Program co-administered by WDFW and Washington State Patrol, the Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board that advises the WSDA on noxious weed control, and the Washington Department of Ecology's Aquatic Weeds Program.

interests such as recreation, cultural resources, tribal resources, human health, fisheries, and aquaculture. The extent of impact to these resources depends on the location and volume of the spill and the type of oil; a large oil spill would likely have a significant negative impact on many or all of the above listed resources (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2015a, 2015b).

While rare, large oil spills have occurred on the Washington coast. This includes the 1972 spill of 2,300,000 gallons of heavy fuel oil off Clallam County and the Makah Reservation by the troop transport vessel *USS General M.C. Meigs* under tow. Other notable spills are the 1988 *Nestucca* barge spill off Grays Harbor (231,000 gallons of heavy fuel oil) and the 1991 *Tenyo Maru* fishing vessel spill off Cape Flattery and the Makah Reservation (100,000 gallons of diesel and heavy fuel oil released in initial incident, with the vessel containing over 400,000 gallons when it sank) (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2007). Smaller spills occur more frequently than large spills, and sources for spills reported off the coast between 2011 and 2015 include fishing vessels, recreational vessels, and a tank vessel (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2015).

The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS) recognizes the potential accidental release of oil into the marine environment as the greatest threat to sanctuary resources and qualities. Prevention of spills is one of OCNMS' highest priorities, along with preparation for and response to spills. OCNMS initially promoted and currently monitors compliance with the Area to be Avoided.²⁹ The ATBA is a voluntary measure that routes large vessels offshore and decreases the risk of vessel groundings and spills reaching the shore, with greater than 95% compliance (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011).

Oil spill response and prevention is a key concern for federal agencies, state agencies, local governments and communities, tribes, and industry. The Region 10 Regional Response Team and Northwest Area Committee focus on oil spill prevention, planning, and response. Participating agencies include the U.S. Coast Guard, EPA, and Ecology. More information on proposed oil projects and oil spill prevention and response, including the emergency response towing vessel (ERTV) stationed at Neah Bay is provided in Section 2.7: Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure.

Marine Debris

Marine debris is known to have both ecological and economic impacts worldwide, and is a notable stressor in the MSP Study Area. One of the most visible impacts of marine debris is wildlife entanglement in debris, which can lead to injury, illness, and death. Ingestion of marine debris is also harmful to wildlife. Sea turtles, seabirds, and marine mammals have been known to ingest marine debris, often mistaking debris items for food. Economic impacts include negative impacts on tourism, costs associated with cleanup, degradation of beaches and habitat, vessel damage, and navigation hazards. Marine debris can also introduce non-native species, which can have both ecological and economic impacts on an area (NOAA Office of Response and Restoration, 2017).

²⁹ The Area to be Avoided is a boundary indicating where all vessels above 400 gross tons and all ships and barges carrying petroleum and hazardous materials in bulk as cargo or cargo residue are advised to maintain a 25nm buffer from the coast. The ATBA compliance rate has consistently been very high and was estimated to be over 97% in 2014 (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2015)(Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2013).

Marine debris is present along the entire coast of the MSP Study Area and comes from a variety of sources. Human trash from direct beach recreation activities and upland sources as well as trash generated from locations around the Pacific Rim is found on Washington's beaches. Debris from fishing, aquaculture, and shipping activities is also found on the shore. Plastics make up approximately 92% of the debris on outer coast beaches in Washington.

Debris from the Japanese tsunami has also been arriving on Washington's ocean beaches since the event occurred in 2011. Tsunami debris has included a variety of objects such as construction materials, boats, a large dock, and some hazardous materials like propane tanks. Non-native species have often been found attached to this debris, requiring removal. Tsunami debris has been intermittent and widely scattered, sometimes in significant quantities, but reports have become rare in recent years. It is often difficult to tell if debris was lost during the tsunami because marine debris is a daily problem. Efforts to safely remove tsunami debris have been coordinated by NOAA, the State, and others. NOAA continues to work with other federal, state, local, and tribal partners to monitor and remove tsunami debris (Barnea, 2015; NOAA Office of Response and Restoration, 2017).

Several marine debris volunteer cleanup events occur yearly on beaches in the Study Area. Currently, most of these cleanups are coordinated by the Washington CoastSavers with many nonprofit, business, and government organizations participating. While CoastSavers has been coordinating cleanup events since 2007, community groups have held cleanup events on the Washington coast as early as 1971 (Washington CoastSavers, 2015). Other organizations that contribute considerably to beach cleanups include Washington State Parks, the Grassroots Garbage Gang, and Surfrider Foundation chapters. Significant annual marine debris collection events include the Washington Coast Cleanup held in April around Earth Day, the International Coastal Cleanup held in late summer, and the July 5th cleanup held on several southern beaches to clean up trash and fireworks from 4th of July celebrations.

The amount of marine debris collected from these events can be quite large. CoastSavers estimates that over 320 tons of marine debris have been collected during the April Washington Coast Cleanup events from 2000-2012, ranging from 15 to 40 tons collected per year. The July 4th, 2015 cleanup from Moclips to Long Beach collected 115 tons of debris (Washington CoastSavers, 2015).

Efforts are also underway to remove derelict (abandoned or lost) fishing gear from Washington's Pacific coast. All fixed, pot or trap gear fisheries (hagfish, shellfish, and groundfish) are required to have biodegradable escapes as part of gear design ([WAC 220-360-220](#), [WAC 220-340-060](#), [WAC 220-300-050](#), and [WAC 220-355-070](#)). Other types of derelict gear, such as trawl nets or fishing lines, can continue to catch or entangle fish, crabs, and other wildlife. Tribes, the State (particularly DNR's Restoration Program and Derelict Vessel Program), and The Nature Conservancy are working to remove lost crab pots off the Washington coast. Removal benefits the crab, the fishermen, and the environment (M. Miller, 2015).

While cleanup remains an important part of addressing marine debris as a stressor for Washington's beaches and waters, programs also focus on prevention education and outreach to reduce the amount of marine debris on the beach and in the ocean. Potential new ocean uses may generate new sources of marine debris, unless their gear and waste are effectively managed to prevent entry of debris into the environment.

Vessel Discharges

All types of vessels generate wastewater. The type and amount of wastewater generated depends on the vessel and its passenger load, size, function, and condition. Examples of wastewater include sewage, graywater (e.g., water from showers or dishwashing), bilgewater (a mixture of engine water, cleaning agents, and many other sources), and ballast water (water used for stability). Sewage can be directed to a marine sanitation device to either treat the material prior to discharge, or to hold it until it can be pumped to a land-based facility.

There are concerns surrounding the water quality impacts vessel discharges could have on ocean waters. Vessel discharges could contain pathogens, elevated nutrient contents, or toxic substances which may harm wildlife or human health. Regulatory and voluntary measures for vessel discharge within state, OCNMS, and federal waters are currently in place to address many types of vessel discharges. Regulations and agreements are complex, and depend upon the vessel type, vessel size, discharge type, location of discharge, and other factors. As one example, in the U.S., all non-recreational vessels 79 feet or greater in length may not discharge substances to marine waters without a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Vessel General Permit (VGP).³⁰ The VGP contains restrictions on the discharge to OCNMS waters, and to the waters of Flattery Rocks and Willapa National Wildlife Refuge in the MSP Study Area, as well as several other waters within the state.³¹

The amount of wastewater discharged into the MSP Study Area is unknown, however cruise ships are one factor with the potential to contribute significant quantities. OCNMS regulations implemented in 2011 now prohibit all cruise ship wastewater discharges within sanctuary waters ([15 CFR §922.152](#)). In state waters, Ecology regulates waste discharge and has developed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Cruise Lines International Association North West & Canada and the Port of Seattle to outline requirements. The MOU prohibits discharges of sewage and graywater from all cruise ships except when discharges are treated with advanced wastewater treatment systems. In addition, no discharges are allowed within 0.5 mi of shellfish beds, and sampling and monitoring of wastewater discharges is required (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016b).

In addition to cruise ships, all vessels including recreational, fishing, commercial, and other passenger vessels generate wastewater. Vessel discharges must meet state water quality standards. However, many onboard treatment systems do not meet these standards, so vessels are guided to use onshore pumpout facilities or withhold discharges until outside of state waters (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). Additionally, Ecology is in the process of developing a no discharge zone in Puget Sound. The EPA has found that there are adequate pumpout facilities in Puget Sound to do so, and Ecology will move forward with rulemaking (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2017). The EPA is currently in the process of developing an NPDES permit for discharges from fish processing vessels off the coasts of Washington and Oregon. The original draft permit was released for public comment at the end of 2015 and a revised draft permit is expected in 2017. The draft permit establishes standards and exclusions for discharge of fish processing effluent into federal waters off the coast. The draft

³⁰ Certain discharge and vessel types are not covered or are exempt from the general permit. For more information please see <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/permits/VGP/index.html>

³¹ For a list of Washington water bodies affected by the Vessel General Permit, please see Appendix G of the VGP available at <http://www.epa.gov/npdes/vessels-incident-discharge-permitting-3>

permit does not authorize the discharge of pollutants into inland or state waters (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2015).

Washington State agencies, OCNMS, the Environmental Protection Agency, and vessel users will continue to work together to address vessel wastewater discharge to protect the marine ecosystem and human health.

Fishing Pressures and Bottom Gear

The MSP Study Area is important for commercial, tribal, and recreational fishing. Several fisheries occur within the MSP Study Area and are managed by the Pacific Fisheries Management Council, Washington State, and the coastal treaty tribes.³² The MSP Study Area has a long history of fishing activity, with some periods of unsustainable and habitat-damaging practices.

One of the most prominent examples is the use of bottom trawl gear for groundfish fishing. Bottom trawl gear can directly damage seafloor habitat, particularly hard bottom habitats and areas with biogenic habitat such as deep sea coral reefs and sponges. These biogenic habitats are slow-growing, and may take decades to recover. While the exact extent of biogenic and hard bottom habitats within the MSP Study Area is unknown, the extensive bottom trawl fishing spanning several decades likely damaged some of this habitat (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008). Researchers have found that trawl activity in soft sediments has minor impacts on the seafloor including leaving scour marks, but has minimal impacts on the topographic structure of the seafloor or the densities of invertebrates (Lindholm et al., 2013).

A few stocks of rockfish within MSP Study Area waters have been declared overfished since 2000, but recent fishery management measures appear to have been successful at rebuilding most groundfish stocks, with only two stocks still classified as ‘overfished’ (Yelloweye Rockfish and Pacific Ocean Perch) (Garfield & Harvey, 2016; Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2014a).

Governments and fishermen are working together to sustainably utilize the valuable fishery resources within the area. For example, the groundfish fishery has been rationalized and reduced through a buyback program, and groundfish and rockfish conservation closure areas have been created as part of fishery management. Gear restrictions and closure areas for non-tribal commercial fishermen are expected to aid in the recovery of depleted groundfish stocks as well as to allow critical, slow-growing biogenic seafloor habitat to recover (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008).

Shoreline Development

Shoreline development such as jetties, groins, and residential structures near beaches can degrade habitat by causing changes to sediment supply or loss of beach habitat. As coastal populations continue to grow, these changes represent a potential increasing stressor to the natural system. The northern half of the MSP Study Area coast (Clallam and Jefferson Counties) is largely undeveloped. New coastal development in this area will likely remain limited in the foreseeable future, partially due to the presence of Olympic National Park. The southern MSP

³² For more information on fisheries and management, please see Section 2.4: State and Tribal Fisheries.

Study Area coast (Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties) has a higher population with more cities and towns along the shoreline. The current primary driver for development on southern beaches is construction for vacation and retirement homes; however, development pressure is relatively low compared to other marine shorelines in the state (e.g. Puget Sound).

Through Washington's Shoreline Management Act, local governments and the Washington State Department of Ecology have regulations and standards for shoreline development in order to protect habitat, facilitate water dependent and preferred uses, and provide public access ([RCW 90.58.020](#)). For Pacific Coast jurisdictions, this also includes regulations specific to ocean uses and resources stemming from the Ocean Resources Management Act (RCW 43.143 and WAC 173-26-360). Local governments and the State will continue to evaluate coastal development projects to allow for coastal population growth and the use of shoreline resources while protecting the marine environment.

Human Disturbance and Trampling

Human visitors to the coast can have varying impacts on shore habitats and wildlife, depending on the habitat types, types of activities, and the intensity of use. Many of Washington's southern beaches are visited frequently by beach combers, razor clammers, beach drivers, and other users. Sandy beaches are relatively resilient to these types of human activities, although there are potential impacts to birds through disturbance of nesting and foraging habitats (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011).

Harvest and trampling of intertidal organisms on rocky shores can harm these habitats. Non-tribal harvest from rocky areas is generally focused on gooseneck barnacles and mussels. WDFW, the tribes, and Olympic National Park regulate intertidal harvest, although effective enforcement along the coast is limited. Trampling and souvenir collecting by visitors can have direct, localized impacts on rocky shore habitat and organisms, but the extent of this activity on the outer coast is not well documented (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). The OCNMS condition report (2008) and management plan (2011) stated that while select habitat loss and degradation has occurred from human visitation activities, cumulative activities are unlikely to cause substantial or persistent harm to intertidal areas along the OCNMS shoreline.

Ocean Noise

Many marine animals use sound to hear, communicate, find food, avoid predators, navigate, select mates, and more. Marine mammals in particular rely on sound for communication, navigation, and food detection. Noise within the ocean can be natural, such as that generated from animals, waves, wind, storms, and other physical processes. Ocean noise can also be created by humans, through activities such as shipping and other vessel traffic, drilling, military activities, mining, and many other activities. Noise can even travel across ocean basins (Hatch & Broughton, 2015).

Coastal and ocean waters are getting noisier, and anthropogenic ocean noise (from humans) is a growing problem for marine ecosystems with increasing and more varied human activities taking place. Anthropogenic noise can either be acute (intense noise, generally for relatively short time periods) or chronic (lower intensity background noise). Acute noise can cause adverse physical and behavioral impacts, while chronic noise can limit marine animals' communication ranges and their ability to sense their environment (Hatch & Broughton, 2015).

Researchers have studied the impacts of ocean noise on Southern Resident killer whales and found that vessel noise affects echolocation abilities of foraging whales. Studies also found that killer whales spend a greater proportion of time traveling and less time foraging in the presence of vessels (NOAA Fisheries, 2014c). The frequency of noise (i.e., high pitch versus low pitch tones) has different effects on different animals, depending on their hearing sensitivity thresholds. NOAA and the U.S. Navy are actively researching noise in the ocean, with NOAA focusing on recording noise in marine sanctuaries to better understand the potential effects of human noise on our nation's marine protected areas (Hatch & Broughton, 2015).

The MSP Study Area has many acoustically active whale species, many of which are listed under the ESA and all of which are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Study Area waters are impacted by both chronic and accumulated acute anthropogenic noise sources. However, in pelagic habitat, ocean noise pollution (cumulative acoustic signature of human activities) is currently not well characterized or evaluated for potential impacts on wildlife (Hatch & Broughton, 2015; Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). Therefore, noise pollution remains a concern, yet more information is needed to assess the actual impacts to the Washington marine ecosystem, as well as any potential noise impacts a potential new use may have on wildlife.

Vessel Strikes

Collisions between vessels and marine mammals, especially large whales, is a known stressor globally, particularly in areas where high amounts of ship traffic and large whale populations intersect (Douglas et al., 2008; Redfern et al., 2013). Whales are vulnerable to strikes from all vessel types, and vessel strikes can lead to animal injury and death. Large vessel crews may not even notice when a strike has occurred. Additionally, injured whales may not be noticed and whale carcasses may not wash up on shore, so the number of whale strikes is greater than the number of documented incidents (Douglas et al., 2008; National Marine Sanctuaries, 2015; Redfern et al., 2013). In Washington, blue whales, fin whales, and gray whales have been struck and killed by ships (Lance et al., 2011).

The West Coast Marine Mammal Stranding Network collects data on stranded marine mammals in Washington, Oregon, and California. Participants in the stranding network are authorized by NOAA to respond to stranded marine mammals and to examine dead marine mammals. Information gathered from strandings contributes to research and public education and to the implementation of NOAA Fisheries mandates under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act (NOAA Fisheries, n.d.-c).

References

- Abdelrhman, M. (2003). Effect of eelgrass *Zostera marina* canopies on flow and transport. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 248, 67–83.
- Adams, P. B., Grimes, C., Hightower, J. E., Lindley, S. T., Moser, M. L., & Parsley, M. J. (2007). Population status of North American green sturgeon, *Acipenser medirostris*. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 79, 339–356.
- Ahmed, A., & Rountry, D. (2007). *Willapa River fecal coliform bacteria total maximum daily load: Water quality improvement report* (Publication No. 07-3–21). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/0110025.html> [Source type 4].
- Airoidi, L. (2003). The effects of sedimentation on rocky coast assemblages. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review*, 41, 161–236.
- Andrews, K. S., Coyle, J. M., & Harvey, C. J. (2015). *Ecological indicators for Washington State's outer coastal waters*. Seattle, WA: Northwest Fisheries Science Center. Report to the Washington Department of Natural Resources. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/NWFSC_EcosystemIndicatorReport.pdf [Source type 11].
- Andrews, K. S., Harvey, C. J., & Levin, P. S. (2013). *Conceptual models and indicator selection process for Washington State's marine spatial planning process*. Conservation Biology Division, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/NOAA_NWFSC_ConceptualModel_FinalReport.pdf [Source type 11].
- Baker, P. (1995). Review of ecology and fishery of the Olympia oyster, *Ostrea lurida*, with annotated bibliography. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 14(2), 501–518.
- Banas, N. S., Hickey, B. M., MacCready, P., & Newton, J. A. (2004). Dynamics of Willapa Bay, Washington: A highly unsteady, partially mixed estuary. *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 34, 2413–2427.
- Barnea, N. (2015, November). *The Japan tsunami marine debris: Current status and lessons learned*. Presented at the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Committee Meeting. Retrieved from http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/involved/sac/present_noaa_marinedebris_japantsunami.pdf [Source type 11].
- Black, B. A., Schroeder, I. D., Sydeman, W. J., Bograd, S. J., Wellls, B. K., & Schwing, F. B. (2011). Winter and summer upwelling modes and their biological importance in the California Current Ecosystem. *Global Change Biology*, 17, 2536–2545. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02422.x> [Source type 1].
- Blake, B., & Zu Ermgassen, P. S. E. (2015). The History and Decline of *Ostrea Lurida* in Willapa Bay, Washington. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 34(2), 273–280.
- Bond, N. A., Cronin, M. F., Freeland, H., & Mantua, N. (2015). Causes and impacts of the 2014 warm anomaly in the NE Pacific. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *accepted manuscript*. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1002/2015GL063083>. [Source type 1]

- Burke, B. J., Peterson, W. T., Beckman, B. R., Morgan, C., Daly, E. A., & Litz, M. (2013). Multivariate models of adult Pacific salmon returns. *PLOS One*, 8(1), e54134. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0054134> [Source type 1].
- Burla, M., Baptista, A. M., Zhang, Y., & Frolov, S. (2010). Seasonal and interannual variability of the Columbia River plume: A perspective enabled by multiyear simulation databases. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 115(C2). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2008JC004964> [Source type 1].
- Cascadia Region Earthquake Workgroup. (2013). *Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquakes: A magnitude 9.0 earthquake scenario* (Washington Division of Geology and Earth Resources Information Circular No. 116). Cascadia Region Earthquake Workgroup. Retrieved from http://www.dnr.wa.gov/Publications/ger_ic116_csz_scenario_update.pdf [Source type 11].
- Chan, F., Barth, J. A., Lubchenco, J., Kirincich, A., Weeks, H., Peterson, W. T., & Menge, B. A. (2008). Emergence of anoxia in the California Current large marine ecosystem. *Science*, 319(5868). Retrieved from <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/319/5865/920.abstract?maxtoshow=&RESULTFORMAT=&issue=5865&resourcetype=HWCIT>. [Source type 1].
- Chan, F., Boehm, A. B., Barth, J. A., Chornesky, E. A., Dickson, A. G., Feely, R. A., ... Whiteman, E. A. (2016). *The West Coast Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Science Panel: Major findings, recommendations, and actions*. Oakland, CA: California Ocean Science Trust [Source type 11].
- City of Hoquiam, & Washington State Department of Ecology. (2015a). *Imperium Terminal Services expansion project: Draft environmental impact statement volume 1*. City of Hoquiam and Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/geographic/graysharbor/imperiumterminal.html> [Source type 11].
- City of Hoquiam, & Washington State Department of Ecology. (2015b). *Westway expansion project: Draft environmental impact statement volume 1*. City of Hoquiam and Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/geographic/graysharbor/westwayterminal.html> [Source type 11].
- Climate Impacts Group. (2009). *The Washington climate change impacts assessment*. Seattle, WA: Center for Science in the Earth System, Joint Institute for the Study of the Atmosphere and Oceans, University of Washington. Retrieved from <http://www.cses.washington.edu/db/pdf/wacciareport681.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Cook, A. E., Shaffer, J. A., Dumbauld, B. R., & Kauffman, B. E. (2000). A plan for rebuilding stocks of Olympia oysters (*Ostreola Conchaphila* Carpenter 1857) in Washington State. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 19(1), 409–412.
- Cusack, C., Harte, M., & Chan, S. (2009). *The economics of invasive species*. Corvallis, OR: Oregon Sea Grant; Prepared for the Oregon Invasive Species Council [Source type 11].
- Davidson, I., Zabin, C., Ashton, G., & Ruiz, G. (2014). *An assessment of marine biofouling introductions to the Puget Sound region of Washington State*. Olympia, WA: Report to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from http://wdfw.wa.gov/grants/ps_marine_nearshore/files/biofouling_assessment.pdf [Source type 11].
- Davison, P. C., Checkley Jr., D. M., Koslow, J. A., & Barlow, J. (2013). Carbon export mediated by mesopelagic fishes in the northeast Pacific Ocean. *Progress in Oceanography*, (116), 14–30.

- Dayton, P. K. (1985). Ecology of kelp communities. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 16, 215–245.
- Diaz, R. J., & Rosenberg, R. (2008). Spreading dead zones and consequences for marine ecosystems. *Science*, 321, 926–929.
- Doughton, S. (2015, June 15). Toxic algae bloom might be the largest ever. *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/health/toxic-algae-bloom-might-be-largest-ever/> [Source type 11].
- Douglas, A. B., Calambokidis, J., Raverty, S., Jeffries, S. J., Lambourn, D. M., & Norman, S. A. (2008). Incidence of ship strikes of large whales in Washington State. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, 88(6), 1121–1132.
- Dumbauld, B. R., Holden, D. L., & Langness, O. P. (2008). Do sturgeon limit burrowing shrimp populations in Pacific Northwest estuaries? *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 83, 283–296.
- Eisenlord, M. E., Groner, M. L., Yoshioka, R. M., Elliott, J., Maynard, J., Fradkin, S., ... Harvell, C. D. (2016). Ochre star mortality during the 2014 wasting disease epizootic: role of population size structure and temperature. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 371(1689). Retrieved from <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/371/1689/20150212> [Source type 1].
- Feely, R., Klinger, T., Newton, J. A., & Chadsey, M. (eds). (2012). *Scientific summary of ocean acidification in Washington state marine waters* (NOAA OAR Special Report). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of Ocean and Atmospheric Research. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1201016.pdf>. [Source type 11].
- Ganter, B. (2000). Seagrass (*Zostera* spp.) as food for brent geese (*Branta bernicla*): an overview. *Helgoland Marine Research*, 54, 63–70.
- Garfield, T., & Harvey, C. (2016). *California Current Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (CCIEA) State of the California Current report, 2016*. Retrieved from http://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/D1a_NMFS1_2016_IEA_SoCC_FINAL_MAR2016BB.pdf
- Goldfinger, C., Henkel, S. K., Romsos, C., Havron, A., & Black, B. (2014). *Benthic habitat characterization offshore the Pacific Northwest volume 1: Evaluation of continental shelf geology* (OCS Study BOEM 2014-662) (p. 161). U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Pacific OCS Region. Retrieved from <http://www.boem.gov/2014-662-v1/>. [Source type 9].
- Goldfinger, C., Nelson, C. H., Morey, A. E., Johnson, J. E., Patton, J. R., Karabanov, E., ... Vallier, T. (2012). *Turbidite event history-methods and implications for Holocene paleoseismicity of the Cascadia Subduction Zone* (U.S. Geological Survey Paper No. 1661–F). United States Geological Survey. Retrieved from <http://pubs.usgs.gov/pp/pp1661f/> [Source type 9].
- Gunderson, D. R., Armstrong, D. A., Shi, Y.-B., & McConnaughey, R. A. (1990). Patterns of estuarine use by juvenile English sole (*Parophrys vetulus*) and Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*). *Estuaries*, 13(1), 59–71.

- Gustafson, R. G., Weitkamp, L., Lee, Y.-W., Ward, E., Somers, K., Tuttle, V., & Jannot, J. (2016). *Status review update of eulachon (Thaleichthys pacificus) listed under the Endangered Species Act: Southern distinct population segment*. NOAA Fisheries. Retrieved from http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/status_reviews/other_species/eulachon/eulachon_2016_status_review_update.pdf [Source type 11].
- Harley, C., Anderson, K., Demes, K., Jorve, J., Kordas, R., Coyle, T., & Graham, M. (2012). Effects of climate change on global seaweed communities. *Journal of Phycology*, 48(5), 1064–1078.
- Hartmann, D. L. (2015). Pacific sea surface temperature and the winter of 2014. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL063083>. [Source type 1]
- Hatch, L., & Broughton, K. (2015, November). *Listening to our sanctuaries*. PowerPoint presented at the OCNMS Sanctuary Advisory Council Meeting. Retrieved from http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/involved/sac/present_ocean_noise.pdf [Source type 11].
- Hickey, B., Banas, N., & MacCready, P. (2013). *Marine spatial planning report: November 1, 2012- June 30, 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/UWOceanography_FinalReport.pdf [Source type 11].
- Hickey, B. M. (1995). Coastal submarine canyons. In P. Muller & D. Henderson (Eds.), *Topographic Effects in the Ocean* (pp. 95–110). Manoa, Hawaii: School of Ocean and Earth Science and Technology and the Department of Oceanography, University of Hawaii [Source type 11].
- Hickey, B. M., & Banas, N. S. (2003). Oceanography of the U.S. Pacific Northwest coastal ocean and estuaries with application to coastal ecology. *Estuaries*, 26(4B), 1010–1031.
- Hickey, B. M., & Banas, N. S. (2008). Why is the northern end of the California Coastal Current system so productive? *Oceanography*, 21(4), 90–107.
- Hickey, B. M., Trainer, V. L., Kosro, P. M., Adams, N. G., Connolly, T. P., Kachel, N. B., & Geier, S. L. (2013). A springtime source of toxic Pseudo-nitzschia cells on Razor Clam beaches in the Pacific Northwest. *Harmful Algae*, 25, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hal.2013.01.006>. [Source type 1].
- Hruby, T. (2014). *Washington State wetland rating system for Western Washington: 2014 update* (Publication No. 14-6–29). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1406029.html> [Source type ???].
- Hughes, B. B., Levey, M. D., Brown, J. A., Fountain, M. C., Carlisle, A. B., Litvin, S. Y., ... Gleason, M. G. (2014). *Nursery functions of U.S. West Coast estuaries: The state of knowledge for juveniles of focal invertebrate and fish species*. Arlington, VA: The Nature Conservancy. Retrieved from http://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/39882601/Nursery_functions_of_U.S._west_coast_est20151110-14424-16a398v.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1491592495&Signature=AiFnOEiRJfQIUraPNHW4b%2FfbJ8%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DNursery_functions_of_U.S._west_coast_est.pdf [Source type 11].

- Industrial Economics Inc. (2014). *Marine sector analysis report: Aquaculture* (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/AquacultureSectorAnalysis.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Jeffries, S. J., Gearin, P. J., Huber, H. R., Saul, D. L., & Pruett, D. A. (2000). *Atlas of seal and sea lion haulout sites in Washington*. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Sciences Division. Retrieved from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00427/wdfw00427.pdf> [Source type 9].
- Jeffries, S., Lynch, D., & Thomas, S. (2016). *Results of the 2015 survey of the reintroduced sea otter population in Washington State*. Retrieved from https://www.fws.gov/wafwo/documents/SeaOtter_WASURV2015.pdf [Source type 11].
- Kaplan, B., Beegle-Krause, C. J., French McCay, D., Copping, A., & Geerlofs, S. (editors). (2010). *Updated summary of knowledge: Selected areas of the Pacific coast* (OCS Study BOEMRE 2010-014). Camarillo, CA.: Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement, Pacific OCS Region. Retrieved from <https://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Kaplan%20et%20al.%202010.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Kintisch, E. (2015). “The Blob” invades Pacific, flummoxing climate experts. *Science*, 348(6230). Retrieved from <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/348/6230/17> [Source type 1].
- Kvitek, R. G., Iampietro, P., & Bowlby, C. E. (1998). Sea otters and benthic prey communities: a direct test of the sea otter as keystone predator in Washington State. *Marine Mammal Science*, 14(4), 895–902.
- Laidre, K. L., & Jameson, Ronald J. (2006). Foraging patterns and prey selection in an increasing and expanding sea otter population. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 87(4), 799–807.
- Lance, M., Calambokidis, J., Baird, R., & Steiger, G. (2011). *Marine mammals of Washington’s outer coast (unpublished)*. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.
- Lance, M., Richardson, S., & Allen, H. (2004, December). State of Washington sea otter recovery plan. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00314/wdfw00314.pdf> [Source type 4].
- Langness, M., Dionne, P., Masello, D., & Lowry, D. (2015). *Summary of coastal intertidal forage fish spawning surveys: October 2012-October 2014* (FPA No. 15-01). Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from <http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/ForageFishReport.pdf> [Source type 9].
- Lindholm, J., Gleason, M., Kline, D., Clary, L., Rienecke, S., & Bell, M. (2013). *Central coast trawl impact and recovery study: 2009-2012 final report*. (Report to the California Ocean Protection Council). Retrieved from http://montereybay.noaa.gov/research/techreports/lindholm_etal_2013.pdf [Source type 11].
- Mach, M. E., Wyllie-Echeverria, S., & Chan, K. M. A. (2014). Ecological effect of a nonnative seagrass spreading in the Northeast Pacific: A review of *Zostera japonica*. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 102, 375–382.
- Mantua, N. J., & Hare, S. R. (2002). The Pacific Decadal Oscillation. *Journal of Oceanography*, 58, 35–44.

- Mantua, N. J., Hare, S. R., Zhang, Y., Wallace, J. M., & Francis, R. C. (1997). A Pacific interdecadal climate oscillation with impacts on salmon production. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 78, 1069–1079.
- Menza, C., Leirness, J., White, T., Winship, A., Kinlan, B., Kracker, L., ... Antrim, L. (2016). *Predictive mapping of seabirds, pinnipeds and cetaceans off the Pacific Coast of Washington* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 210). Retrieved from http://www-stage.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Final_Report_NCCOS_MarineMammals_Birds.pdf [Source type 11].
- Menza, Charles, Battista, T., & Dorfman, D. (2013). *Technical and mapping support for Washington marine spatial planning: Final report*. Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/NOAABiogeography_FinalReport.pdf [Source type 11].
- Miller, I. M., Shishido, C., Antrim, L., & Bowlby, C. E. (2013). *Climate change and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary: interpreting potential futures* (Marine Sanctuaries Conservation Series No. ONMS-13-01). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. Retrieved from http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/science/conservation/cc_ocrms.html [Source type 11].
- Miller, J. J., Maher, M., Bohaboy, E., Friedman, C. S., & McElhany, P. (2016). Exposure to low pH reduces survival and delays development in early life stages of Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*). *Marine Biology*, 163(118). Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00227-016-2883-1> [Source type 1].
- Miller, M. (2015, January 14). Ghost hunters: Recovering lost & abandoned fishing gear saves fish. Retrieved December 29, 2015, from <http://blog.nature.org/science/2015/01/14/ghost-fishing-lost-fishing-gear-science/> [Source type 11].
- Minerals Management Service. (2007). *Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Alternative Energy Development and Production and Alternate Use of Facilities on the Outer Continental Shelf: Final Environmental Impact Statement*. Retrieved from <https://www.boem.gov/Renewable-Energy-Program/Regulatory-Information/Guide-To-EIS.aspx> [Source type 4].
- Moore, S. K., Mantua, N. J., Hickey, B. M., & Trainer, V. L. (2010). The relative influences of El Niño-Southern Oscillation and Pacific Decadal Oscillation on paralytic shellfish toxin accumulation in Pacific Northwest shellfish. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 55(6), 2262–2274. <https://doi.org/doi:10.4319/lo.2010.55.6.2262> [Source type 1].
- Moser, M. L., & Lindley, S. T. (2007). Use of Washington estuaries by subadult and adult green sturgeon. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 79, 243–253.
- Mumford, T. F. (2007). *Kelp and eelgrass in Puget Sound* (Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership Report No. 2007-05). Seattle, WA: Seattle District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Retrieved from http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/kelp.pdf [Source type 11].

- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2016). *Draft Recovery Plan for eulachon (Thaleichthys pacificus)*. National Marine Fisheries Service, West Coast Region, Protected Resources Division. Retrieved from http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/protected_species/other/eulachon/draft_eulachon_plan_oct202016.pdf [Source type 11].
- National Marine Sanctuaries. (2015). Reducing ship strike risk to whales. Retrieved January 8, 2016, from <http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/protect/shipstrike/welcome.html> [Source type 11].
- NCCOS. (2015). *Summary report for spatial prioritization seafloor mapping for Washington's Pacific coast (phase II and IV)*. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Ocean Service, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/NCCOS_SeafloorMappingReport.pdf [Source type 9].
- NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center. (2012). *Final biological report. Final rule to revise the critical habitat designation for leatherback sea turtles*. National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service. Retrieved from http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/species/leatherback_criticalhabitat_biological.pdf [Source type 11].
- NOAA. (2015). *West coast harmful algal bloom*. Retrieved from <https://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sites/default/files/west-coast-hab091515.pdf> [Source type 11].
- NOAA Fisheries. (2014a). Green sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*). Retrieved September 22, 2015, from <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/fish/greensturgeon.htm> [Source type 11].
- NOAA Fisheries. (2014b). Pacific salmonids: Major threats and impacts. Retrieved September 22, 2015, from <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/fish/salmon.html> [Source type 11].
- NOAA Fisheries. (2014c). *Southern Resident killer whales. 10 years of research and conservation*. Retrieved from https://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/news/features/killer_whale_report/pdfs/bigreport62514.pdf [Source type 9].
- NOAA Fisheries. (2015). Eulachon (*Thaleichthys pacificus*). Retrieved December 31, 2015, from <http://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/pr/species/fish/eulachon.html> [Source type 11].
- NOAA Fisheries. (n.d.-a). Coastal Upwelling. Retrieved March 27, 2017, from <https://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/research/divisions/fe/estuarine/oeip/db-coastal-upwelling-index.cfm> [Source type 11].
- NOAA Fisheries. (n.d.-b). Southern resident killer whale tagging. Retrieved March 16, 2017, from https://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/research/divisions/cb/ecosystem/marinemammal/satellite_tagging/index.cfm [Source type 11].
- NOAA Fisheries. (n.d.-c). What is the West Coast marine mammal stranding network? Retrieved March 16, 2017, from http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/protected_species/marine_mammals/stranding_network.html [Source type 11].
- NOAA Office of Response and Restoration. (2017). Japan tsunami marine debris. Retrieved from <https://marinedebris.noaa.gov/tsunamidebris/> [Source type 11].

- Office of Environmental Health and Safety. (2015). Commercial shellfish map viewer. Retrieved May 19, 2015, from <https://fortress.wa.gov/doh/eh/maps/OSWPViewer/index.html>. [Source type 11].
- Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. (2008). *Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary condition report 2008*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries [Source type 11].
- Oleson, E., & Hildebrand, J. (2012). *Marine mammal demographics off the outer Washington coast and near Hawaii* (Final Technical Report for Naval Postgraduate School Grant No. N00244-08-1-0023). Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School. Retrieved from <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a561312.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. (2011). Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary final management plan and environmental assessment. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/management/managementplan/mgmtplan_complete.pdf [Source type 11].
- Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. (2013). *Vessel transits through Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and Area to be Avoided (ATBA) - 2012 estimated compliance*. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/protect/incidentresponse/2012_ais.pdf [Source type 11].
- Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. (2015). *Vessel transits through Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and Area to be Avoided (ATBA)-2014 estimated compliance*. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/protect/incidentresponse/2014_ais.pdf [Source type 11].
- Olympic Regional Harmful Algal Bloom Partnership. (2015, May 7). ORHAB update-May 7th, 2015. Olympic Regional Harmful Algal Bloom Partnership.
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. (2014a). *Status of the Pacific coast groundfish fishery*. Portland, OR: Pacific Fishery Management Council. Retrieved from http://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/SAFE_Dec2014_v12.pdf [Source type 11].
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. (2014b, September). Appendix A to the Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan: Identification and description of essential fish habitat, adverse impacts, and recommended conservation measures for salmon. Pacific Fishery Management Council. Retrieved from http://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/Salmon_EFH_Appendix_A_FINAL_September-25.pdf [Source type 11].
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. (2015). Pacific Fishery Management Council. Retrieved September 18, 2015, from <http://www.pcouncil.org/> [Source type 11].
- Parson, E. A., Mote, P. W., Hamlet, A. F., Keeton, W. S., & Lettenmaier, D. (2003). Preparing for climatic change: The water, salmon, and forests of the Pacific Northwest. *Climatic Change*, 61(1-2), 45-88.

- Patten, K. (2014). The impacts of nonnative Japanese eelgrass (*Zostera japonica*) on commercial shellfish production in Willapa Bay, WA. *Agricultural Sciences*, 5, 625–633.
- Peterson, W. T., Fisher, J. L., Morgan, C. A., Peterson, J. O., Burke, B. J., & Fresh, K. (2015). *Ocean ecosystem indicators of salmon marine survival in the Northern California Current*. NOAA/NMFS/Fish Ecology Division. Retrieved from http://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/research/divisions/fe/estuarine/oeip/documents/Peterson_et_al_2015.pdf [Source type 11].
- Pirhalla, D., Ransibrahmanakul, V., Clark, R., Desch, A., Wynne, T., & Edwards, M. (2009). *An oceanographic characterization of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and Pacific Northwest: Interpretive summary of ocean climate and regional processes through satellite remote sensing* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 90). Silver Spring, MD: Prepared by NCCOS's Coastal Oceanographic Assessments, Status and Trends Division in cooperation with the National Marine Sanctuary Program [Source type 11].
- Rabalais, N. N., Diaz, R. J., Levin, L. A., Turner, R. E., Gilbert, D., & Zhang, J. (2010). Dynamics and distribution of natural and human-caused hypoxia. *Biogeosciences*, 7, 585–619.
- Redfern, J. V., McKenna, M. F., Moore, T. J., Calambokidis, J., DeAngelis, M. L., Becker, E. A., ... Chivers, S. J. (2013). Assessing the risk of ships striking large whales in marine spatial planning. *Conservation Biology*, 27(2), 292–302.
- Rountry, D., & Pelletier, G. (2002). *Grays Harbor/Chehalis watershed fecal coliform bacteria total maximum daily load* (Submittal Report Publication No. 01-10-025). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/0110025.html> [Source type 4].
- Ruesink, J. L., Feist, B. E., Harvey, C. J., Hong, J. S., Trimble, A. C., & Wisheart, L. M. (2006). Changes in productivity associated with four introduced species: ecosystem transformation of a “pristine” estuary. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 311, 203–215.
- Ruesink, J. L., Hong, J.-S., Wisheart, L., Hacker, S. D., Dumbauld, B. R., Hessing-Lewis, M., & Trimble, A. C. (2010). Congener comparison of native (*Zostera marina*) and introduced (*Z. japonica*) eelgrass at multiple scales within a Pacific Northwest estuary. *Biological Invasions*, 12, 1773–1789.
- Ruesink, J., Lenihan, H., Trimble, A., Heiman, K., Micheli, F., Byers, J., & Kay, M. (2005). Introduction of non-native oysters: ecosystem effects and restoration implications. *The Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 36, 643–689.
- Ruggiero, P., Kratzmann, M. G., Himmelstoss, E. A., Reid, D., Allan, J., & Kaminsky, G. (2013). *National assessment of shoreline change: Historical shoreline change along the Pacific Northwest coast* (Open-File Report No. 2012–1007) (p. 62). U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. Retrieved from <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2012/1007/> [Source type 11].
- Sandell, T., Fletcher, J., McAninch, A., & Wait, M. (2013). *Grays Harbor juvenile fish use assessment: 2012 annual report*. Wild Fish Conservancy Northwest. Retrieved from http://wildfishconservancy.org/projects/grays-harbor-juvenile-salmon-fish-community-study/WFCGraysHarbor2012Report_final.newplots.pdf [Source type 11]
- Shafer, D. J., Kaldy, J. E., & Gaeckle, J. L. (2014). Science and management of the introduced seagrass *Zostera japonica* in North America. *Environmental Management*, 53, 147–162.

- Shaffer, J. A., & Parks, D. S. (1994). Seasonal variations in and observations of landslide impacts on the algal composition of a Puget Sound nearshore kelp forest. *Botanica Marina*, 37, 315–323.
- Simenstad, C. A., Fresh, K. A., & Salo, E. O. (1982). The role of Puget Sound and Washington coastal estuaries in the life history of Pacific salmon: an unappreciated function. In *Estuarine Comparisons* (pp. 343–364). New York, NY: Academic Press. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Charles_Simenstad/publication/283701763_The_role_of_Puget_Sound_and_Washington_coastal_estuaries_in_the_life_history_of_Pacific_salmon_an_unappreciated_function/links/5654b91808ae1ef92976d65f/The-role-of-Puget-Sound-and-Washington-coastal-estuaries-in-the-life-history-of-Pacific-salmon-an-unappreciated-function.pdf [Source type 1].
- Skewgar, E., & Pearson, S. F. (Eds.). (2011). *State of the Washington coast: Ecology, Management, and Research Priorities*. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from <http://dfw.wa.gov/publications/01198/> [Source type 11].
- Snover, A. K., Mauger, G. S., Whitely Binder, L. C., Krosby, M., & Tohver, I. (2013). *Climate change impacts and adaptation in Washington State: technical summaries for decision makers* (State of knowledge report prepared for the Washington State Department of Ecology). Climate Impacts Group, University of Washington. Retrieved from <http://ces.washington.edu/db/pdf/snoveretalsok816.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Steneck, R. S., Graham, M. H., Bourque, B. J., Corbett, D., Erlandson, J. M., Estes, J. A., & Tegner, M. J. (2002). Kelp forest ecosystems: biodiversity, stability, resilience and future. *Environmental Conservation*, 29(4), 436–459. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892902000322>
- Stiasny, M. H., Mittermayer, F. H., Sswat, M., Voss, R., Jutfelt, F., Chierici, M., ... Clemmesen, C. (2016). Ocean acidification effects on Atlantic cod larval survival and recruitment to the fished population. *PLOS One*, 11(8). Retrieved from <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0155448> [Source type 1].
- Swanson, T., & Anderson, P. (2014). *North ocean beaches fecal coliform bacteria source investigation study: Water quality study design (quality assurance project plan)* (No. 14-03-108). Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/publications/1403108.pdf>. [Source type 11].
- Tegner, M. J., Dayton, P. K., Edwards, P. B., & Riser, K. L. (1996). *Is there evidence for long-term climatic change in southern California kelp forests?* (No. Volume 37). California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations Reports.
- United States Department of the Navy. (2015). *Northwest training and testing activities final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Silverdale, WA: United States Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Northwest. Retrieved from <http://nwtteis.com/default.aspx> [Source type 4].
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2015). *Authorization to discharge under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System for offshore seafood processors discharging in federal waters off the Washington and Oregon coast* (No. NPDES Permit No. WAG520000).
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1997). *Recovery plan for the threatened marbled murrelet (Brachyramphus marmoratus) in Washington, Oregon, and California*. Retrieved from https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/970924.pdf [Source type 4].

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2015). *Final projects biological opinion: Endangered Species Act- Section 7 consultation* (Programmatic Biological Opinion No. FWS reference: 01EOFW00-2014-F-0222). Portland, OR. Retrieved from http://www.habitat.noaa.gov/pdf/201505_15PROJECTS-FINAL.pdf [Source type 11].
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (n.d.). Bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*). Retrieved May 17, 2017, from <https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp0/profile/speciesProfile?spcode=E065#crithab> [Source type 11].
- Washington CoastSavers. (2015). Washington CoastSavers. Retrieved December 28, 2015, from <http://www.coastsavers.org/> [Source type 11].
- Washington Invasive Species Council. (2014). Washington invasive species council fact sheet. Washington Invasive Species Council, Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office. Retrieved from <http://www.invasivespecies.wa.gov/documents/Factsheet.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Agriculture. (2015). *Spartina eradication program 2014 progress report*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Agriculture. Retrieved from <http://agr.wa.gov/PlantsInsects/Weeds/Spartina/docs/SpartinaReport2014.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2006). *Willapa River dissolved oxygen total maximum daily load: Water quality improvement report and implementation plan* (No. 06-10-017). Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Ecology, Water Quality Program. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/0610017.html> [Source type 4].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2007). *Oil spills in Washington State: A historical analysis* (No. Publication #97-252). Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/97252.html> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2012a). *2012 Water Quality Assessment 305(b) report and 303(d) list*. Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/currentassessmt.html> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2012b, July). Water Quality Program policy 1-11. Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/WQpolicy1-11ch1.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2014a). *Long-term nutrient trends: 1999-2013*. Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology, Environmental Assessment Program. Retrieved from http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/eap/mar_wat/trends.html. [Source type ??].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2014b). *Marine water condition index (MWCI): Years 2004-2013*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Ecology, Environmental Assessment Program. Retrieved from http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/eap/mar_wat/pdf/mwci.pdf. [Source type 2].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2014c). Water quality improvement projects: Grays Harbor area. Retrieved May 14, 2015, from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/tmdl/ChehalisBasin/GraysHbrTMDL.html>. [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2015). Spills map. Retrieved January 5, 2016, from https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/coastalatlant/storymaps/spills/spills_sm.html [Source type 9].

- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2016a). *Current Water Quality Assessment*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/currentassessmt.html> [Source type 9].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2016b). *Memorandum of Understanding cruise operations in Washington State*. Retrieved from http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/wastewater/cruise_mou/2016MOUAmendment.pdf
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2017). Puget Sound no discharge zone. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/nonpoint/CleanBoating/ndzstatus.html> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology, Etkin, D. S., Joeckel, J., Walker, A. H., Scholz, D., Moore, C., ... Culpepper, D. (2015). *Washington State 2014 marine and rail oil transportation study* (Publication No. 15-8-10). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1508010.html> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2008). 21st century salmon & steelhead initiative. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00036/wdfw00036.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2013). *Threatened and endangered wildlife: 2012 annual report*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01542/wdfw01542.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2015a). Ballast water management program. Retrieved December 22, 2015, from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/ais/ballast/> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2015b). Olympic regional harmful algal blooms. Retrieved May 26, 2015, from http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/research/projects/algal_bloom/index.html. [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2015c). *Washington State aquatic invasive species prevention and enforcement program: 2015 report to the legislature*. Olympia, WA. Retrieved from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01697/wdfw01697.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2017a). Species and ecosystem science, marine fish monitoring, herring population structure and stock assessment. Retrieved from http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/research/projects/marine_fish_monitoring/herring_population_assessment/ [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2017b). Washington State species of concern lists. Retrieved May 16, 2017, from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/endangered/> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2017c). Washington State species of concern lists. Retrieved from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/endangered/lists/search.php?searchby=All&search=&orderby=AnimalType%20ASC#> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Health. (n.d.-a). Shellfish beach closures. Retrieved from <http://www.doh.wa.gov/CommunityandEnvironment/Shellfish/BeachClosures> [Source type 11].

- Washington State Department of Health. (n.d.-b). Shellfish-related illnesses. Retrieved from <http://www.doh.wa.gov/CommunityandEnvironment/Shellfish/RecreationalShellfish/Illnesses> [Source type 11].
- West Coast Offshore Vessel Traffic Risk Management Project Workgroup. (2002). *West coast offshore vessel traffic risk management project, final report and recommendations*. Retrieved from http://www.oilspilltaskforce.org/docs/vessel_traffic/Table_of_Contents.pdf [Source type 11].

2.2 Cultural and Historic Resources

Cultural and historic resources are an important part of the modern context and uses of the Washington coast and the MSP Study Area. Washington's coastal areas are rich with cultural resources. These resources include archaeological sites providing prehistoric records of native peoples' marine-oriented uses, and traditional cultural properties associated with the cultural practices, traditions, beliefs, lifeways, arts, crafts, or social institutions of living communities. Maritime history is embedded along Washington's coast, with many existing historic resources representing Euro-American maritime culture and shipwrecks.

American Indian Archaeological Resources

People have lived along Washington's shoreline and used its marine environment for thousands of years (United States v. Washington, No. C70-9213 (W.D.WA. 2015)). One of the earliest dated archeological sites on the Washington coast is located within the Ozette Reservation and establishes human presence in the area for at least the last 6,000 years (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). It is likely that humans may have been present along the West Coast as early as before 14,500 BP (Before Present) (ICF International, Southeastern Archeological Research, & Davis Geoarchaeological Research, 2013).

The native peoples of the Washington coast relied heavily on ocean and coastal resources, as they continue to do today. Archeological sites, traditional oral histories, and ethnographies provide records of the types of marine-oriented uses participated in by the coastal tribes during prehistoric times and in the years up to the signing of the treaties. Marine resources not only served subsistence purposes, but also played an integral role in native peoples' cultures, ceremonies, and economies.

While specific uses varied for each tribe, native peoples harvested many different species from the ocean, estuaries, and bodies of fresh water. These living resources include but are not limited to: salmon, steelhead, halibut, cod, sea bass, sole, rockfish, and crabs. They also harvested shellfish and hunted seals, sea lions, sea otters, and whales. Some communities developed specialized gear for fishing, sealing, and whaling. Examples include various types of seaworthy canoes optimized for hunting specific types of animals, dried kelp for fishing lines, and specialized hooks (United States v. Washington, No. C70-9213 (W.D.WA. 2015)).

Records of this activity can be found at various types of coastal archaeological sites and in numerous anthropological reports. Sites include shell middens, villages, petroglyphs, burial grounds, fish weirs, canoe runs, traditional cultural properties, and others (ICF International et al., 2013). The modern shoreline and uplands adjacent to the MSP Study Area contain dozens of late prehistoric archeological sites. Some of these sites are known to occur within the intertidal zone, directly above the intertidal zone, and up to several kilometers inland.

Specific examples of Native American sites listed in the National Register of Historic Places include the Ozette Indian Village Archaeological Site, Tatoosh Island, and the Wedding Rock Petroglyphs (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). Enormous middens have also been discovered in La Push, providing a connection between native peoples and their extensive use of the ocean (United States v. Washington, No. C70-9213 (W.D.WA. 2015)). There are likely undiscovered coastal archaeological sites in the area. Map 13 displays the output

of a predictive model for upland archaeological sites developed by the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP).

Due to changes in sea level since prehistoric times, it is very possible that prehistoric Native American archeological sites exist that are now submerged beneath the ocean. Sea level was at its lowest at about 19,000 BP, when the shoreline was located up to about 30 miles offshore from the present-day shoreline in some locations. Since then sea level has risen at varying rates, pushing possible prehistoric occupants farther and farther inland (ICF International et al., 2013). The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) modeled paleoshorelines from 19,000 BP to 1,000 BP in federal waters to illustrate how shoreline locations have changed over time (Map 13). Further analysis by BOEM indicates that much of the Study Area has a moderate likelihood of preserved submerged prehistoric sites, with a somewhat higher likelihood of preservation toward the south (ICF International et al., 2013).

Historic Resources

The rich maritime history of Washington's Pacific coast that began with the coastal tribes expanded when Europeans first encountered the coast as early as 1579. Mapping of this area began in the late 1700s. Sustained Euro-American settlement in Washington began in the 1850s, and the territory was declared a state in 1889. Maritime trade and commerce, processing, and resource extraction quickly became growing and profitable industries. Maritime trade and the foggy, dangerous conditions of the coast necessitated the construction of lighthouses. The Cape Disappointment lighthouse at the mouth of the Columbia River, built in the 1850s, was one of the first lighthouses to be constructed along the Washington coast. Lifesaving stations operated by the U.S. Lifesaving Service (predecessor to the United States Coast Guard) were also established to assist mariners. Many lighthouses along the Washington coast remain intact and open to visitors (Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, 2011).

Communities sprouted and thrived along Washington's shoreline, using access to water to transport natural resources such as fish, shellfish, and timber. Working waterfronts hosted canneries and seafood packers, lumber mills, pulp mills, and shipyards. As the region's sea-based commerce became increasingly profitable, recreational boating and tourism also thrived. The natural beauty of rugged shorelines drew people looking for waterfront vacations, and resulted in the construction of marine-oriented resorts, hotels, and campgrounds. These activities and industries shaped the history and culture of coastal communities. Many of these industries continue today, particularly shipping, fishing, aquaculture, seafood processing, timber, recreation, and tourism (Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, 2011).

Historical places along the coast provide a link to the past of the Washington coast. Historical resources include buildings, structures, sites, districts, and objects. Examples include light stations, historic districts, hotels, and architecturally distinct buildings. There are several historical resources listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the Washington Historic Register that are adjacent to the MSP Study Area (Map 14). Many more historical sites are listed in the Washington Historic Property Inventory (Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, 2015).

Shipwrecks

The Washington coast is home to perilous waters. Historically, fog, waves, storms, strong currents, sand bars, and a rugged coastline made navigation a challenge. Over 180 ships were reported wrecked or lost at sea in or near Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary waters between 1808 and 1972. These ships ranged from clippers and steam freighters to fishing boats and barges. Several wrecks are famous in local lore (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2011). The Columbia River bar at the southern end of the MSP Study Area is reported to be the second most dangerous bar crossing in the world (Oregon Solutions, Cogan Owens Cogan, & Oregon State University Institute of Natural Resources, 2011), and many shipwrecks have occurred there. Discovered archaeological shipwreck sites represent just a small portion of known losses at sea (Map 14), and many more sites may remain undiscovered within the MSP Study Area.

Potential Impacts to Archaeological and Historic Resources

Historical places, archaeological sites, and traditional cultural properties include areas important for maintaining cultural identities, places of spiritual power or healing, places associated with origins or important events, and areas with aesthetic significance for people today. These sites could be disturbed by new uses that impact the seafloor.

Some historical resources and traditional cultural properties may also be sensitive to various levels of visual disturbance from new ocean uses, such as offshore wind. The state analyzed how far offshore objects of different heights would be visible from shore (Map 15). This coarse assessment is useful in understanding what types of structures may be visible from the coast, but specific assessments for individual projects will be needed to evaluate the full potential visual impact from any new use proposal.

Understanding and integrating cultural landscapes into marine use decisions is important. In an effort to meaningfully integrate the nation's cultural heritage into marine management decisions, the Department of Commerce and the Department of the Interior, through the Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee (MPA FAC), developed a Cultural Landscapes Approach (CLA) (<http://marineprotectedareas.noaa.gov/toolkit/cultural-landscape-approach.html>). The CLA provides a means for developing new levels of information about marine areas and their resources by integrating knowledge, memories, and empirical observations of tribal indigenous cultural groups and other resource users. The CLA aims to make cultural resources and human relationships with the environment visible across time and culture (Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee, 2011). This approach may be useful for Washington State when making decisions for new ocean and coastal uses.

References

- United States v. Washington, No. C70-9213 (W.D.WA. 2015) U&A court opinions, at <http://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/sites/wawd/files/Makah09-01FFCLandMemorandum.pdf> (main opinion of July 9th, and https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=6861728881534294093 (details of U&A boundary, on Sept. 3rd.)) [Source type 6].
- ICF International, Southeastern Archeological Research, & Davis Geoarchaeological Research. (2013). *Inventory and analysis of coastal and submerged archaeological site occurrence on the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf* (OCS Study BOEM 2013-0115). Bureau of Ocean Energy Management [Source type 11].
- Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee. (2011, November). Recommendations for integrated management using a cultural landscape approach in the national MPA system. Retrieved from http://marineprotectedareas.noaa.gov/pdf/helpful-resources/mpafac_rec_cultural_landscape_12_11.pdf [Source type 11].
- Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. (2011). Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary final management plan and environmental assessment. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/management/managementplan/mgmtplan_complete.pdf [Source type 11].
- Oregon Solutions, Cogan Owens Cogan, & Oregon State University Institute of Natural Resources. (2011). *Mouth of the Columbia River Regional Sediment Management Plan* (Draft report). Prepared for Lower Columbia Solutions Group [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. (2011). *A maritime resource survey for Washington's saltwater shores* (DAHP Grant No. FY11- PA-Maritime-02). Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Retrieved from <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/sites/default/files/MaritimeResourcesSurvey.pdf>. [Source type 9].
- Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. (2015). Washington Information System for Architectural and Archaeological Records Data. Retrieved October 22, 2015, from <https://fortress.wa.gov/dahp/wisaard/> [Source type 9].

2.3 Socioeconomic Setting

Washington's coastal communities adjacent to the MSP Study Area are generally rural, with natural resources playing an important part in their economy and cultural character. Parks, forests, and natural areas cover much of the land area of the four coastal counties: Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, and Pacific (Maps 1 and 16). The Pacific coastal areas of Clallam and Jefferson Counties are quite remote and sparsely populated, while Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties have several small incorporated and unincorporated communities along the coast (Map 16). Key industries include natural resource-based industries (fishing, aquaculture, and timber), tourism, manufacturing, and government services. The five federally-recognized tribes, the Makah Tribe, Quileute Tribe, Hoh Tribe, Quinault Indian Nation, and Shoalwater Bay Tribe (Map 2), are also an integral part of the socioeconomic character of the coast. All except Shoalwater Bay have treaties with the United States, the adjudicated areas extend their tribal fishing rights as much as 42 nautical miles west into the Pacific.

Coastal communities are exposed to several natural hazards and unique coastal challenges such as powerful winter storms, tsunami events, and the resulting inundation. Continued participation in marine resource-based industries, a healthy marine ecosystem, and a future with a sustainable local economy are among the commonly shared visions of many coastal residents (Butler et al., 2013; Kliem, 2013).

Funding was provided through the marine spatial planning process to gather social and economic information for coastal counties and tribes adjacent to the MSP Study Area. This section briefly summarizes the extensive information provided by these projects.¹ Readers are encouraged to consult these reports and other references for further details on the socioeconomic context of Washington's coastal communities. Additional economic analyses specific to individual current uses in the MSP Study Area are referenced in relevant sections of Chapter 2.

- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). *Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington*. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_small.pdf.
- Poe, M. R., Watkinson, M. K., Trosin, B., & Decker, K. (2015). *Social indicators for the Washington coast integrated ecosystem assessment* (A report to the Washington Department of Natural Resources; Interagency Agreement No. IAA 14-204). Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/SeaGrant_SocialIndicatorsReport.pdf.
- Butler, K., Fryday, C., Gordon, M., Ho, Y., McKinney, S., Wallner, M., & Watts, E. (2013). *Washington's working coast: An analysis of the Washington Pacific coast marine resource-based economy* (Keystone Project). University of Washington Environmental Management Certificate Program. Retrieved from http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2eea5_7a4796fc90c3f86ff0ae22e675bd6b55.pdf.

¹ Economic information specific to each marine industry is provided under the relevant sections within Chapter 2 of the Marine Spatial Plan.

- Marine Sector Profiles (Sector Analyses): Industrial Economics Inc. and BST Associates (2014). Sector assessment reports on: Fishing, Aquaculture, Recreation and Tourism, Shipping, and Marine Renewable Energy.

County Profiles

Primary socioeconomic measures for the four coastal counties are presented in Table 2.3-3. The four coastal counties are rural along the Pacific coast. In Clallam and Jefferson Counties, the majority of centers are in areas not adjacent to the Pacific Coast.² For each county, the median household income is below the state average and the unemployment rate is higher than the state average. The information presented below includes tribal and non-tribal data, and it should be noted that information collected and reported by the state of Washington categorizes all employment by tribe-owned establishments as “government.”

The ocean economy represents a significant portion of the total economy for the four coastal counties. Pacific County has the highest percentage with over a quarter of total jobs (26%) within ocean industries (i.e., living resources, marine transportation, tourism and recreation, ship and boat building, offshore mineral extraction, and marine construction). Grays Harbor County has the lowest proportion at 13%, yet it still represents a significant element of total employment (Table 2.3-4). Ocean economy gross domestic product (GDP) represents approximately 10% of the total GDP for Clallam, Jefferson, and Grays Harbor Counties, and about 18% of the total GDP for Pacific County (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016).

Table 2.3-3. Socioeconomic parameters for the four coastal counties³ and Washington State (tribal and non-tribal data).

	Clallam County	Jefferson County	Grays Harbor County	Pacific County	Washington state
Population ⁴	72,500	30,700	73,300	21,100	7,061,530 ⁷
Median household income ⁵	\$46,033	\$46,320	\$42,405	\$39,830	\$59,478
Gross regional product ⁶	\$2,033 million	\$ 703 million	\$2,038 million	\$519 million	\$408,049 million
Industry diversity index ^{5,6}	0.7340 (increase over time)	0.6609 (increase over time)	0.5848 (increase over time)	0.4647 (slight increase over time)	0.5220 (increase over time)
Unemployment ⁵	9.2%	9%	11.8%	10.6%	7%
Percent below the poverty level ⁷	14.6%	13.3%	19.0%	17.2%	13.4%

² Clallam and Jefferson County’s major cities are not directly adjacent to the MSP Study area.

³ These numbers are county-wide, and are not limited to just the Pacific Ocean coastal portion of the counties.

⁴ Estimated for 2014. Source: Taylor et al., 2015.

⁵ As of 2013. Source: Poe et al., 2015.

⁶ This value is from the Ogive index, an index for economic diversity. A value of 0 on the Ogive index would mean that employment is equally distributed among the sectors, and would be the most diverse. Therefore, an increase in the Ogive index means that employment is unequal and that there is a larger concentration in fewer sectors.

⁷ 2009-2013 five-year estimate. Source: United States Census Bureau, 2013.

Table 2.3-4. Ocean economy⁸ of individual counties, the Pacific Coastal counties combined, and Washington State. (Tribal and non-tribal data)

Ocean-related industries	Countywide - 2013 ⁹				Statewide – 2013 ⁹	
	Clallam County	Jefferson County	Grays Harbor County	Pacific County	4 Pacific coastal county total (2011)	Washington state (2011)
Employment	3,098	1,262	2,702	1,651	8,713	121,131
Self employment	179	201	327	278	985	6,936
% of total jobs	14%	16%	13%	27%	8% of WA ocean jobs	4% of total WA jobs
Total wages	\$78.7 million	\$26.2 million	\$72.3 million	\$39.5 million	\$216.7 million	\$4.9 billion
Gross Domestic Product (GDP)	\$185.1 million	\$63.4 million	\$171.6 million	\$98.9 million	\$519 million	\$11.8 billion
% of total economy GDP	9.1%	9.1%	8.4%	19%	4.4% of WA ocean economy	2.9% of total WA economy

Clallam County

Clallam County extends along the northernmost portion of the Olympic Peninsula and makes up the northwestern-most corner of the state. It covers 1,739 square miles (1.11 million acres). Much of Clallam County is under public ownership. Federal lands, primarily Olympic National Park (325,047 acres) and Olympic National Forest (197,782 acres), make up 47% of the county’s acreage. State Forest Lands account for another 92,525 acres (Taylor, Baker, Waters, Wegge, & Wellman, 2015). The County is bordered by the Pacific Ocean to the west and the Strait of Juan de Fuca to the north. The Pacific shoreline adjacent to the MSP Study Area is

⁸ Ocean-related industries included in NOAA’s Economics: National Ocean Watch (ENOW) data are: living resources, marine transportation, tourism and recreation, ship and boat building, offshore mineral extraction, and marine construction. For more information on methods and specific industry codes please see: <https://coast.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/tools/enow>.

⁹ Online ENOW explorer data from 2013. (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016)

almost entirely within Olympic National Park (Map 1) or Indian reservation land (Makah and Quileute reservations) (Map 2).

The industries in Clallam County with the highest levels of employment are government (32.7%); wholesale and retail trade (17%); health care and social assistance (10.7%); and accommodation and food services (10.1%) (Taylor et al., 2015). Government is a significant source of employment in Clallam County, with a location quotient of 1.7 times more concentration in the government sector as compared to the rest of the state (Butler et al., 2013). Economic development strategies focus on manufacturing, marine services, natural resources, renewable energy, tourism, and others. The Port of Port Angeles is a major port in Clallam County, and significantly contributes to the county's economy with marine terminals, marinas, airports, and log yards. The Port of Port Angeles is not located within MSP Study Area (Taylor et al., 2015).

A zip code-based analysis revealed that Pacific Coast-based businesses accounted for only 4% of Clallam County's ocean-dependent activity. The Strait of Juan de Fuca ocean-dependent activity accounts for the remaining 96% (NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2014).

Jefferson County

Jefferson County is located on the Olympic Peninsula south of Clallam County. The county comprises about 1,800 square miles (1.15 million acres) with most of the land in public ownership. Federal lands, primarily Olympic National Park (538, 849 acres) and Olympic National Forest (166,299 acres), make up about 61% of the county's total area. State Forest Lands account for 14,703 acres (Taylor et al., 2015). The County is bordered by the Pacific Ocean on the west and Puget Sound, Hood Canal, and the Kitsap Peninsula on the east. The Pacific shoreline adjacent to the MSP Study Area almost entirely within Olympic National Park or Indian reservation land, including the Hoh reservation and the northwest corner of the Quinault Indian Nation reservation (Maps 1 and 2).

The industries with the highest levels of employment include government (27.1%); wholesale and retail trade (14%); accommodation and food services (12.8%); and health care and social assistance (10.7%) (Taylor et al., 2015). Economic development strategies are focused on industries such as manufacturing, arts and culture, education, healthcare, marine trades, and others. The Jefferson County Economic Development Council is working to increase access to investment capital in the county (Taylor et al., 2015).

A zip code-based analysis revealed that the Pacific Coast-adjacent businesses account for 14% of Jefferson County's ocean-dependent activity, while Puget Sound ocean-dependent activity accounts for the remaining 86% (NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2014).

Grays Harbor County

Grays Harbor County is the largest of the four coastal counties, covering an area of about 1,900 square miles (1.22 million acres). Grays Harbor County is bordered by the Pacific Ocean on the west, and has topography of mountains, foothills, and river valleys. The Grays Harbor estuary covers 58,000 acres and extends inland about 25 miles. Federal lands make up about 12% of the county, including Olympic National Forest (138,724 acres) and a small part of Olympic National Park (6,662 acres). The Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) manages about 31,300 acres of State Forest Lands within the county. The majority of the

Quinalt Indian Nation reservation is within Grays Harbor County. However, the community of Queets is located in Jefferson County and has hundreds of residents (Map 2) (Taylor et al., 2015).

More than 60% of the county's population lives in incorporated areas. The county has nine municipalities, five of which are adjacent to the MSP Study Area: Aberdeen, Cosmopolis, Hoquiam, Ocean Shores, and Westport (Taylor et al., 2015). The industries with the highest levels of employment include government (27.4%); wholesale and retail trade (14%); manufacturing (12.7%); and health care and social assistance (10.8%) (Taylor et al., 2015).

Grays Harbor County is part of the Columbia Pacific Resource Conservation and Economic Development District. The District identified four natural resource-related industrial clusters considered integral to the Columbia-Pacific region's economy: forest products; fishing, fish processing, and related aquaculture; agriculture; and food products. Grays Harbor County has highlighted recent success in the tourism industry cluster, with increased hotel/motel tax revenues and taxable retail sales. The Port of Grays Harbor is located within Grays Harbor County and plays a major role in the coastal economy (Taylor et al., 2015).¹⁰

Pacific County

Pacific County is about 933 square miles (596,902 acres) in size. It is bordered on the west by the Pacific Ocean and by the Columbia River to the south. Pacific County includes the North Beach Peninsula (aka Long Beach Peninsula), which separates Willapa Bay from the Pacific Ocean. Less than 1% of the county is under federal ownership, yet DNR-managed State Forest Lands account for 23,340 acres, or about 4% of the county. More than 70% of the county is forested, or close to 420,000 acres (Taylor et al., 2015). The Shoalwater Bay Tribe is located along the northern shoreline of Willapa Bay (Map 2).

A vast proportion (98.8%) of the county is unincorporated. The county has four municipalities: Ilwaco, Long Beach, South Bend, and Raymond. The industries with the highest levels of employment include government (29.9%); manufacturing (12.3%); accommodation and food services (11.9%); and wholesale and retail trade (10%) (Taylor et al., 2015). The agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting industry also makes up a significant portion of employment in Pacific County (9.2%). This sector has a location quotient of more than 2.7 times more concentration as compared to the rest of the state, and more than 9.4 times more concentration in the sector as compared to the rest of the country (Butler et al., 2013). In fact, the Brookings Institute ranked Pacific County as the fourth most fishing-intensive local economy in the U.S. by share of total 2012 earnings (Kearney et al., 2014).

Pacific County's vision for their economic future includes maintaining and enhancing a rural lifestyle by promoting long-term development of viable agriculture, aquaculture, forest, and fisheries resources; promoting economic development that is compatible with the area's resources; and promoting the safety and general welfare of all residents (Taylor et al., 2015). Four Port Authorities are located in Pacific County: the Port of Willapa Harbor, the Port of Peninsula, the Port of Ilwaco, and the Port of Chinook.¹¹

¹⁰ For more information on the Port of Grays Harbor, see 2.7: Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure.

¹¹ For more information on the ports of Pacific County, see 2.7: Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure.

Tribal Socioeconomic Profiles

There is considerable economic interaction among the tribes, tribal members, and the non-Indian communities on Washington's coast. Economic activity is often intertwined, as tribal members work and shop off-reservation, non-Indians are employed by the tribes, and many tourists and local residents visit tribally-owned businesses, including resorts and marinas.

In addition, commercial, ceremonial, and subsistence fishing activities occur off-reservation in usual and accustomed fishing grounds (U&As) for treaty tribes,¹² both on the ocean and in freshwater bodies (rivers and lakes). Yet, each tribe has its own socioeconomic identity. Available socioeconomic information for each of the five federally-recognized tribes adjacent to the MSP Study Area is summarized below. The socioeconomic profiles below include information about the economic value of marine resource-based industries such as fishing and tourism to the tribes. However, it is commonly recognized that while economic analysis is a useful tool, it does not encapsulate the cultural and spiritual values that marine resources represent to tribal communities.

Makah Tribe

The Makah Reservation is located on the northwestern most tip of the Olympic Peninsula and covers about 47 square miles (30,142 acres), including Tatoosh and Waadah Islands and the Ozette Reservation (Map 2). Physically isolated from Washington and even other parts of Clallam County, Neah Bay is the primary community on the Makah Reservation and is located 60 miles north of Forks and 75 miles northwest of Port Angeles. Harsh natural conditions accompany the rural setting of this area. The area receives over 100 inches of rain per year and is subject to high winds. Over 40% of the reservation is on slopes exceeding a 30% grade and only 6% of the roads are paved (Taylor et al., 2015).

In 2010, 1,414 individuals were living on the reservation. In 2005, tribal enrollment was at 2,534. During a period from 2009-2013, the main industries of employment were public administration (30.7%); agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining (18.6%); and educational services, healthcare and social assistance (17.7%). The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that almost 55% of these jobs were government positions, including tribal employees and other local, state, and federal employees. Median earnings for workers on the Makah reservation during this time were \$27,102 (Taylor et al., 2015).

The economy of the reservation is very dependent on two sectors: tourism and fishing. Neah Bay is said to offer some of the best saltwater fishing in the United States, and the marina serves as a base for one of Washington's most important locations for charter halibut fishing. Other popular tourist activities include hiking, surfing, kayaking, and diving. Tourism-related tribal enterprises include the Warmhouse Restaurant, Cape Resort, Hobuck Beach Resort, and Makah Mini-Mart. Another attraction is the Makah Museum. Tourism slows down during the winter months, resulting in layoffs during the winter. The tribe is interested in attracting wintertime tourists to increase year-round revenue and jobs in this industry (Taylor et al., 2015).

¹² The four coastal treaty tribes adjacent to the study area are: Hoh Tribe, Makah Tribe, Quileute Tribe and Quinault Indian Nation. See Section 1.6 for detailed description of treaty rights.

Commercial fishing is also a large part of the Makah's economy. About 70 commercial fishing vessels operate out of Neah Bay. There is also a Cape Flattery Fisherman's Co-op with a small processing plant, and the Makah Tribe owns the commercial fishing dock in Neah Bay (Taylor et al., 2015). More information on the economics of commercial fishing on the Makah Reservation is described in Section 2.4.

Other economic industries on the reservation include the forestry industry and the commercial filming industry which utilizes the area and tribal services. Plans for the Makah Tribe's economic future include expanding the four tourist-oriented enterprises in the short term, and possibly developing a 9-hole golf course and/or a high end resort or retreat center in the long term. Challenges include developing opportunities for younger tribal members with college degrees who wish to stay on the reservation (Taylor et al., 2015).

Quileute Tribe

The Quileute Reservation covers approximately 2,161 acres, including the community center of La Push, a fishing community, and James Island, a sea stack just off the coast connected to the mainland at extreme low tides. The reservation is located on the Olympic Peninsula and is roughly bounded by the Quillayute River, the Pacific Ocean, and Olympic National Park (Map 2). Much of the reservation is surrounded by wilderness areas managed by the National Park Service. La Push is about 15 miles west of Forks (Taylor et al., 2015).

In 2010, 460 individuals were living on the reservation, and 2016 estimated tribal enrollment was 806 members. Industry clusters with the highest levels of employment from 2009-2013 were educational services, healthcare, and social assistance (46.1%); public administration (28.9%); and agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining (13.8%). The median earnings for workers on the Quileute Reservation were \$24,205 for 2009-2013. According to the Quileute Tribe's Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies document completed in fall of 2013, the primary sources of employment are government services, commercial ocean fisheries, subsistence river fisheries, and the Quileute Ocean Park Resort. Annual surveys show that many households derive some proportion of their income from fishing. The fishing and tourism industry are both seasonal (Taylor et al., 2015).

Tourism is a source of employment and income to the tribe. The remoteness and natural beauty of the area attracts many visitors. The reservation offers a wide range of recreational activities including wildlife viewing, nature photography, coastal hiking, boating, fishing, kayaking, surfing, camping, swimming, and storm watching. The Quileute also host a number of tribal events, many of which are open to the public. Tourism-related businesses include the Quileute Oceanside Resort complex (open year-round), and River's Edge Restaurant. The Quileute Tribe also owns and operates the marina at La Push. The tribe is also engaged in commercial fishing and hatchery operations (Taylor et al., 2015).

Plans for the economic future of the Quileute Tribe include the creation of jobs as a major priority. Plans include improvements to the Oceanside Resort, development of a permanent cultural center/museum facility, development of the tribal owned Ki'tla Business Parks in Forks, expansion of commercial fishing, and the acquisition of broadband internet service. Similar to the Makah Tribe, a challenge for the Quileute is to develop new employment opportunities for the next generation (Taylor et al., 2015). Additionally, the reservation acreage was doubled after 2012 federal legislation ([PL 112-97](#)) designed to enable moving much of the village to higher ground to minimize risk to the community from tsunamis. The Tribe has a major multi-

departmental effort underway called Move to Higher Ground, and has completed a hazard mitigation study.

Hoh Tribe

The Hoh Reservation is located on the Olympic Peninsula in Jefferson County, about 25 miles south of Forks and 80 miles north of Aberdeen. The reservation is bounded to the north by the Hoh River and includes one mile of ocean shoreline to the west. Until recently, the reservation was about one square mile (640 acres). However, the changing course of the Hoh River and the resulting flooding of tribal homes and facilities prompted land purchases and land transfers starting in 2008. Today, the reservation encompasses more than 900 acres (Map 2) (Taylor et al., 2015).

In 2010, there were 116 individuals living on the reservation. There are about 230 enrolled tribal members. The isolated location of the reservation limits employment opportunities primarily to commercial fishing (21.2%) or to jobs directly with the tribe (75.8%). The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that almost 82% of jobs in 2009-2013 were government positions, including tribal employees as well as other local, state, or federal positions. The median earnings for 2009-2013 for workers on the Hoh Reservation were estimated to be \$38,462 (Taylor et al., 2015).

The Hoh depend on the fish and wildlife of the Hoh River and their other usual and accustomed areas for both subsistence and their commercial economy. The Hoh manage tribal forestlands to provide a safe and healthy environment for tribal members and protect basic watershed functions for the cultural and economic needs of the tribe. The Hoh Tribe plans for minimal and infrequent harvests of tribal forest lands, and focuses on the regeneration of tree species for cultural use. Plans for the future include using the lands added to the reservation for housing and government facilities and opportunities for economic development (Taylor et al., 2015).

Quinault Indian Nation

The Quinault Reservation is located in the southwestern corner of the Olympic Peninsula. The reservation covers 208,150 acres, and is mostly forested. It is crossed by several major rivers including the Queets, Raft, and Quinault Rivers (Map 2). The Pacific Ocean lies to the west, Queets village to the north, Lake Quinault to the east, and Moclips to the south. The rainforest climate brings 80 inches of precipitation to the coastal end, and up to 150 inches at higher elevations. A total of 173,000 acres of the reservation is tribal and Bureau of Indian Affairs-managed forestland (Taylor et al., 2015).

In 2010, 1,406 individuals were living on the reservation. As of 2015, total tribal enrollment was 2,928. Communities within the Quinault Reservation include Amanda Park, Queets, Qui-nai-elt Village, Santiago, and Taholah. During a period from 2009-2013, industry clusters providing the highest proportion of employment included educational services, healthcare, and social assistance (33.2%); public administration (28%); and arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services (11%). Additional industries include agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining (5.2%); construction (5.2%); and manufacturing (4.5%). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, almost 70% of jobs were government employee

positions. The median earnings for workers on the Quinault Reservation during 2009-2013 were \$24,375 (Taylor et al., 2015).

Three primary industry clusters are central to the Quinault Indian Nation: hospitality and tourism, fisheries, and forestry. Tourism-related businesses include the Quinault Beach Resort and Casino (located off-reservation in Ocean Shores), the Quinault Sweet Grass Hotel (also in Ocean Shores), Quinault Marina and RV Park (located in Ocean Shores, yet currently closed), guided fishing trips, and the Quinault Tribal Museum. Fisheries-related businesses include the Quinault Pride Seafood Processing Plant in Taholah, the Quinault National Fish Hatchery, and a fishing support facility at Westport Marina (Taylor et al., 2015).

Plans for the future include upgrades to the fish processing plant in Queets, proposed development of land-based sand and gravel resources, development of biomass for renewable energy, and relocating the Taholah village beyond the tsunami hazard zone (Taylor et al., 2015).

Shoalwater Bay Tribe

The Shoalwater Bay Reservation is located in Pacific County on the north shore of Willapa Bay. The reservation was created by executive order in 1866 (Shoalwater Bay Tribe, 2017). The reservation is slightly more than one square mile with 440 acres of uplands and 700 acres of salt marsh and tide flats (Map 2). The upland portion of the reservation is mostly a steep ridge, leaving only a narrow piece of developable land along the shoreline, and much of this strip is within the tsunami hazard zone. Unlike the other four coastal tribes, the Shoalwater Bay Tribe did not sign a treaty with the federal government, and therefore does not have secured U&A or hunting areas (Taylor et al., 2015).

In 2010, 82 individuals were living on the reservation. The tribe has more than 300 enrolled members. From 2009-2013, the industries with the highest proportion of employment were arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services (33.3%); educational services, healthcare and social assistance (26.4%); and public administration (18.1%). The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that over 40% of workers on the reservation are government employees, and about 43% of jobs are with private companies. The median earnings for workers on the Shoalwater Bay Reservation during 2009-2013 were \$23,958 (Taylor et al., 2015).

Current Shoalwater Bay tribal-owned businesses include the Shoalwater Bay Casino, San Verbena Seafood & Grill, Tradewinds on the Bay (condos for rent), and the Georgetown Station convenience store and gas station. The tribe has recently added several hundred acres and plans to add additional housing outside of the tsunami hazard zone (Taylor et al., 2015).

Economic Impact Modeling of Ocean and Coastal Uses

The Marine Spatial Planning process funded an economic report that estimated economic contributions of commercial and recreational fisheries, aquaculture, and recreation and tourism to local and state economies. Cascade Economics, Inc. produced estimates of economic contributions using an input-output model that captures the key measurable linkages between economic activities. Estimates of jobs and labor income were created and are referred to as total effects. They are the sum of direct, indirect, and induced effects.

Direct effects are those that arise directly from the spending being studied. For example, spending comes from recreational trip-related expenditures. Indirect effects are those that relate to the businesses that receive a portion of the direct expenditures in exchange for goods and services provided to the focal economic activity. Induced effects are those related to the spending of personal income earned by the owners and employees of these linked businesses. The “economic multiplier” effect captures the degree to which indirect and induced activities expand the impact of direct expenditures on the economy of interest (see Figure 2.3-1).¹³

Specific economic contribution numbers (total labor income and total jobs) estimated for each industry are discussed within their respective sections in the MSP. These numbers highlight the economic importance of these ocean and coastal industries to the coastal region and the state. The Cascade Economics report provides additional explanation of the IMPLAN input-output model and its supporting data.




Figure 2.3-1: Illustration of regional economic impacts, leakage, and multiplier effects. Source: Northern Economics, Inc., 2013.

Coastal Hazards and Community Vulnerability

Washington coastal communities are exposed to various natural hazards which may influence human safety, businesses, and quality of life. Community vulnerability to hazards can be defined as the attributes of a human-environmental system that increase the potential for hazard-related losses or reduced performance. Characteristics that influence vulnerability include exposure, sensitivity, and resilience of a community. Socioeconomic factors, such as population and economy within hazards zones, vary by community (Wood, 2007). While a detailed analysis of coastal community vulnerability is outside the scope of the MSP, a general description of

¹³ 2014 commercial landing data and recreational trip data were used to calculate economic contributions of those sectors, while 2013 data was used for this purpose for the aquaculture sector. In all cases the multipliers used were derived using IMPLAN models based on 2012 regional economic data.

Washington community exposure to coastal hazards is provided to give context to the challenges these communities face today and into the future.

Coastal natural hazards posing a risk to communities adjacent to the MSP Study Area include severe storms, flooding, coastal erosion, landslides, earthquakes, and tsunamis. With regards to the severe storm hazard, all four coastal counties are vulnerable to high winds (Washington Emergency Management Division, 2013). Exposure to severe storms increased from 2005 to 2010 (Poe, Watkinson, Trosin, & Decker, 2015). Coastal storms can impact other natural hazards, such as erosion and flooding events.

Coastal storm surge flooding affects low elevation areas along the Pacific Ocean coast and is most common during winter storm events, generally from November through February. Coastal flooding results from the combination of storm-driven surges and daily tides, with maximum flooding occurring when the peaks of storm-driven surges coincide with extreme high tides, also known as king tides. Flooding may destroy structures through wave force, erosion scour, or impact from debris. All of the MSP Study Area coastal counties are susceptible to wind and barometric tidal flooding (Washington Emergency Management Division, 2013).

Coastal erosion is another hazard within the MSP Study Area and has been studied from Point Grenville south to the Columbia River. Erosion in this area is generally cyclical, with shoreline erosion occurring during the winter storm months and accretion (accumulation of sediment) during the calmer summer months. Areas of localized chronic and episodic erosion have impacted communities such as Westport, North Cove (a.k.a. Washaway Beach), Ocean Shores, and Cape Disappointment and is often influenced by jetties and coastal sediment supply. Coastal storms can increase erosion (Talebi, 2015).

Landslides occur when gravity overcomes the strength of the soil and rock in a slope. Saturation, erosion, ground shaking, and human action are contributing factors to landslides. According to the Washington State Emergency Management Division (EMD), areas adjacent to the MSP Study Area that are at risk of landslides include portions of Jefferson County, areas of Grays Harbor County near Aberdeen, and some areas of Willapa Bay in Pacific County (Washington Emergency Management Division, 2013).

As discussed in the Geomorphology section, a subduction earthquake is a large looming hazard for the Washington coast. Washington communities are also vulnerable to other earthquakes generated from other faults. Earthquakes can damage infrastructure, disrupt public services and utilities, impact businesses, and cause injury and loss of life. All four MSP coastal counties are considered to be among the most vulnerable in Washington to earthquakes (Washington Emergency Management Division, 2013).

Earthquakes may also cause tsunamis. Tsunamis can be generated by distant earthquakes, such as those occurring in Alaska or Japan. However, Washington's tsunami hazard zone planning is modeled after a potential 9.1 magnitude Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ) earthquake located along the West Coast, from northern Vancouver Island down to northern California. This earthquake could produce the largest tsunamis along the coast. Many communities adjacent to the MSP Study Area have significant proportions of their populations within the tsunami hazard zone. Examples of coast-wide, county, tribal, and select city populations within the hazard zone are given in Table 2.3-5. These numbers do not account for the thousands of visitors who travel to coastal areas every day (Washington Emergency Management Division, 2013).

Table 2.3-5. The total number and community proportions of residents residing within the tsunami hazard zone for select coastal communities. Source: Washington Emergency Management Division, 2013

County, tribe, or city	Proportion of community population	Number of residents¹⁴
Four coastal counties combined	24%	42,972
Clallam County	3%	2,239
Jefferson County	7%	1,692
Grays Harbor County	42%	28,447
Pacific County	50%	10,595
Makah Tribe	59%	802
Quileute Tribe	15%	54
Hoh Tribe	61%	62
Quinault Indian Nation	42%	572
Shoalwater Bay Tribe	85%	59
Aberdeen (Grays Harbor County) ¹⁵	72%	11,781
Long Beach (Pacific County)	100%	1,281

Many coastal communities are planning and preparing for subduction zone-generated tsunamis, including: posting evacuation route and hazard zone signs, establishing 24-hour warning capabilities, and promoting public readiness through community education (Washington Emergency Management Division, 2013). Some of the tribes are planning to use recently-acquired lands to build housing and other public facilities outside of the tsunami hazard zone (Taylor et al., 2015).^{16,17}

Project Safe Haven, a community and tribal effort to identify vertical evacuation options initiated by EMD and the University of Washington, developed several community strategies for tsunami evacuation preparedness (Washington Emergency Management Division, 2013). One example is the Ocosta Elementary School, which is the first vertical evacuation structure built in

¹⁴ Based on 2000 U.S. Census data.

¹⁵ The city of Aberdeen has the greatest number of residents within the tsunami hazard zone, representing the greatest number of people at risk in one local community.

¹⁶ The Quileute Reservation occupies a small piece of land on the coast that is threatened by tsunamis. The Quileute will use 275 acres of newly acquired land from the Olympic National Park as a new site for the Tribal Council's headquarters, tribal school, pre-school, senior center, and other facilities to provide tsunami protection for the tribe (Taylor, Baker, Waters, Wegge, & Wellman, 2015). Other acreage was acquired in the same legislation (PL 112-97), but is not going to be developed (e.g., wetlands).

¹⁷ The Quinault Indian Nation village of Taholah is in the official tsunami hazard zone. Over 1,000 residents, as well as the Taholah Mercantile, jail, courthouse, daycare facility, Head Start facility, and a K-12 school are located within the tsunami zone. The Quinault are currently developing a master plan to relocate Taholah to higher ground beyond the tsunami and flood hazard zone (Taylor et al., 2015).

North America. It is located in Grays Harbor County, just south of Westport. A vertical evacuation platform was built on top of the gym roof and is designed to hold 1,000 people, which provides safe refuge for the children and local community (Buehner, 2016).

In addition to tsunami preparation, Washington's coastal communities are working to understand, prepare for, respond to, and mitigate against various natural hazards to reduce risk and increase community resilience. This work is being done in coordination with EMD, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Ecology's Coastal Program, Washington Sea Grant, and other local, state, and federal agencies. One example is the Coastal Hazards Resilience Network, which brings together federal and state government agencies, tribes, academic institutions, consultants, and nonprofit organizations to improve regional coordination, integration, and understanding of coastal hazards.¹⁸ Other recent efforts include the Ruckelshaus Center's work to characterize resilience issues on the coast with the "Washington State Coastal Resilience Assessment Final Report" and work by The Washington Coastal Resilience Project to refine sea level rise projections and integrate projections into local planning processes and capital funding projects (See also Section 2.11 Climate Change).

Coastal Stakeholder Views

People living on Washington's coast hold important, diverse views on the social and economic issues and interests that are a part of defining the character of these coastal communities. Summary reports of workshops and interviews completed for the MSP process have helped to capture the various community perspectives of Marine Resource Committee (MRC) participants and other coastal stakeholders in the four coastal counties.

Two MSP reports which capture coastal stakeholder interests and perspectives in further detail are:

- *Washington's working coast: An analysis of the Washington Pacific coast marine resource-based economy* (2013) by Butler et al. provides a qualitative analysis of interviews conducted with the Marine Resources Committees and other coastal stakeholders. Available at: http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2eea5_7a4796fc90c3f86ff0ae22e675bd6b55.pdf
- *Coastal voices: A report on citizen priorities, interests, and expectations for Marine Spatial Planning along Washington's Pacific coast* (2013) by Kliem summarizes Marine Resources Committee workshops held to identify interests, priorities, and expectations for MSP. Available at: http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/060413_Coastal-Voices-Version-Final.pdf

Perspectives of coastal residents and stakeholders provided important context for social and economic interests and concerns during the marine spatial planning process. The section below briefly highlights some of the frequent themes and perspectives conveyed by coastal stakeholders and residents to provide an insight into commonly expressed views regarding social and economic interests and concerns. Of course, not all residents and coastal users share these perspectives, and even within these interviews and workshops there were a diversity of views.

¹⁸ More information available at www.wacoastalnetwork.com.

A primary common theme expressed among these comments and workshops was the importance of protecting and valuing the natural resource-based economy of coastal communities. The marine resource-based economy was described as part of their coastal heritage. The desire to protect existing marine resource industries, such as fishing and aquaculture, was shared by a wide range of participating stakeholders (Butler et al., 2013; Kliem, 2013). This view was further highlighted through the development of goals by stakeholders and government officials to guide the MSP. The goals adopted include to “protect and preserve existing sustainable uses to ensure economic vibrancy and resource access for coastal communities.”

Other themes included the importance of a healthy marine ecosystem, and access to natural resources for jobs and the enjoyment of the rural, natural character of the coast. Protecting these attributes for the benefit of future generations is important to many stakeholders. Many participants shared concerns that new ocean uses would negatively impact local communities and economies, through displacement of local long-term jobs and impacts to the ecosystem. Stakeholders expressed the need to use science as well as local, traditional knowledge in the decision-making process to avoid and minimize impacts.

Another theme was meaningful local community involvement in decision-making for siting new uses to reduce conflicts, and balancing the perspectives and needs of local, state, and national interests. Many stakeholders highlighted the unique, multi-jurisdictional management of marine resources in Washington (e.g. fisheries co-management with tribes, and the presence of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary) and a desire for a unique approach and management solution for new uses within the MSP Study Area (Butler et al., 2013; Kliem, 2013).

Future Trends

While each coastal county and community has a distinct socioeconomic profile, many will share similar challenges and opportunities in the future. One example of a socioeconomic challenge common to all four coastal counties is the relatively low proportion of working-age residents (Poe et al., 2015). Coastal residents have observed that many working-age individuals have moved to areas that offer more job opportunities, and there is a concern that without a strong workforce, the coastal region will become less competitive, attract fewer businesses, and lose innovative thinkers (Butler et al., 2013). In contrast, many of the tribes have relatively high proportions of young residents entering the workforce, and are pursuing ways to provide job opportunities for those who wish to stay and work on the reservations (Taylor et al., 2015).

Coastal communities have also identified many opportunities for socioeconomic growth for an economically sustainable future. For example, many governments and economic council plans reflect the intention of increasing economic diversification, while continuing to strengthen their existing industries. Resources for small, local business start-ups and expansions are in place and more are under development. The Washington Coast Works Sustainable Small-Business Competition is an example of a recently launched initiative aimed at supporting entrepreneurs within coastal communities in identifying many opportunities for socioeconomic and environmentally sustainable growth. Throughout many coastal communities, sustainable natural resource-based industries are seen as vital to a healthy, local economy, and will likely continue to be a focus into the future (Butler et al., 2013; Taylor et al., 2015).

References

- Buehner, T. (2016, June). Dedication of the nation's first tsunami vertical evacuation school structure. *TsuInfo Alert*, 18(3), 1–2 [Source type 11].
- Butler, K., Fryday, C., Gordon, M., Ho, Y., McKinney, S., Wallner, M., & Watts, E. (2013). *Washington's working coast: An analysis of the Washington Pacific coast marine resource-based economy* (Keystone Project). University of Washington Environmental Management Certificate Program. Retrieved from http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2eea5_7a4796fc90c3f86ff0ae22e675bd6b55.pdf [Source type 11].
- Kearney, M. S., Harris, B. H., Hershbein, B., Boddy, D., Parker, L., & Di Lucido, K. (2014). *What's the catch? Challenges and opportunities of the U.S. fishing industry* (Policy Brief). Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute. Retrieved from http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/papers/2014/09/challenges-and-opportunities-of-us-fishing-industry/challenges_opportunities_fishing_industry_policybrief.pdf [Source type 11].
- Kliem, J. M. (2013). *Coastal voices: A report on citizen priorities, interests, and expectations for Marine Spatial Planning along Washington's Pacific coast*. Surfrider Foundation and The Nature Conservancy, with funding from the Washington Department of Natural Resources. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/060413_Coastal-Voices-Version-Final.pdf [Source type 11].
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2016). Economics: National Ocean Watch (ENOW) Explorer. Retrieved February 2, 2017, from <https://coast.noaa.gov/enowexplorer/#/> [Source type 11].
- NOAA Coastal Services Center. (2014). *Washington State's ocean economy-A profile using the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Economics: National Ocean Watch (ENOW)*. NOAA Coastal Services Center [Source type 11].
- Northern Economics, Inc. (2013). *The economic impact of shellfish aquaculture in Washington, Oregon, and California*. Prepared for Pacific Shellfish Institute. Retrieved from http://www.pacshell.org/pdf/Economic_Impact_of_Shellfish_Aquaculture_2013.pdf. [Source type 11].
- Poe, M. R., Watkinson, M. K., Trosin, B., & Decker, K. (2015). *Social indicators for the Washington coast integrated ecosystem assessment* (A report to the Washington Department of Natural Resources; Interagency Agreement No. IAA 14-204). Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/SeaGrant_SocialIndicatorsReport.pdf [Source type 11].
- Shoalwater Bay Tribe. (2017). About the tribe, our history. Retrieved from <http://www.shoalwaterbay-nsn.gov/home/about-the-tribe/our-history/> [Source type 11].
- Talebi, B. (2015). *Washington State coastal zone management section 309 assessment and strategy, 2016-2020* (Publication No. 15-6–13). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1506013.html> [Source type 4].
- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). *Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington*. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_small.pdf [Source type 11].

- Washington Emergency Management Division. (2013). *2013 Washington State Enhanced State Hazard Mitigation Plan*. Washington Emergency Management Division of the Washington Military Department. Retrieved from <http://mil.wa.gov/other-links/enhanced-hazard-mitigation-plan> [Source type 11].
- Wood, N. (2007). *Variations in city exposure and sensitivity to tsunami hazards in Oregon* (Scientific Investigations Report 2007-5283). U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. Retrieved from <http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2007/5283/sir2007-5283.pdf> [Source type 9].

2.4 State and Tribal Fisheries

In the marine planning law for Washington’s marine waters, fishing is recognized as a longstanding and important use of the MSP Study Area. Among the policies the law establishes for the state to follow when conducting marine spatial planning, one requires state planners to “recognize that commercial, tribal, and recreational fisheries, and shellfish aquaculture are an integral part of our state’s culture and contribute substantial economic benefits” ([RCW 43.372.005\(3\)\(i\)](#)). The law also mandates that “any provision of the marine management plan that does not have as its primary purpose the management of commercial or recreational fishing but that has an impact on this fishing must minimize the negative impacts on the fishing” ([RCW 43.372.040\(8\)](#)).

This section recognizes fishing’s importance by describing the state and tribal fisheries that occur within the MSP Study Area and highlighting some of the key benefits that they contribute to coastal communities and to the state. The MSP’s framework for minimizing negative impacts to fishing is described in Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework.

Note on Sources and Terminology

The information presented in this section is summarized primarily from two reports that were produced specifically for this planning effort by Industrial Economics (2014) and Taylor et al. (2015). Readers are encouraged to consult the two reports for further detail. In addition, the basic fisheries statistics on which both reports rely are collected and maintained by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and the coastal treaty tribes. These statistics are publicly available upon request, subject to certain restrictions in place to protect confidentiality of individual fishery participants.

- Industrial Economics Inc. (2014). Marine sector analysis report: Non-tribal fishing (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/FishingSectorAnalysis.pdf>.
- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_small.pdf.

In addition, the term “commercial” in this section should not be read to include treaty tribal fisheries. Tribal fisheries are often described separately because they are conducted under special authorities held by tribal governments. Many tribal fisheries, however, are comparable to non-tribal commercial fisheries in the areas they fish, the fishing methods they use, and the markets into which they sell their catch. On a similar note, tribal members also harvest fish and shellfish non-commercially, for ceremonial and subsistence purposes, yet they would not refer to these fishing activities as “recreational” fishing. Although “commercial” does not refer to tribal fisheries and the value of tribal commercial catches are not included in “commercial” fisheries

value, tribal fishing contributes significantly to the overall value of the coastal fishing economy. The specific fishing activities of the four coastal treaty tribes are described in more detail below.

Summary of History and Current Use

Fishing Community Engagement and Dependence

The MSP Study Area contains some of the most productive regions of the California Current ecosystem and supports abundant fish and shellfish resources. Washington’s coastal tribes have depended on these resources for thousands of years and early European settlers began commercial fishing when they arrived in the region in the mid-1800s. Today, tribal and coastal communities remain highly engaged, reliant, and dependent on commercial, recreational, and tribal fisheries.

Recent studies have evaluated the engagement, reliance, and dependence of Washington’s communities on fishing. Engagement is an absolute measure of fishing activity that can be measured by metrics like permits or pounds and values of landings. Reliance indices are relative measures such as permits per capita and value of landing per capita. Communities with high levels of both engagement and reliance on fishing are considered to be highly dependent on fishing (Jepson & Colburn, 2013).

A NOAA study identified a number of communities located adjacent to the MSP Study Area as being some of the most highly fishing dependent incorporated communities¹ on the West Coast (Table 2.4-6). This classification is based on both fisheries and social variables. The methodology in the 2017 study relies on social data available via the census that is only available for a census designated place. Therefore, unincorporated communities, such as La Push² and Nahcotta, were not included in the 2017 study. However, these communities, among others, are recognized as important fishing communities in the MSP Study Area, serving not only tribal fishers, but also non-tribal commercial and recreational fishers. Detailed information about the methodology and data used is available in the full NOAA reports. In addition, a national study by the Brookings Institute found that Pacific County was the fourth most fishing intensive local economy in the United States in terms of the share that fishing contributed to total county earnings (Kearney et al., 2014).

Table 2.4-6. Washington incorporated coastal communities adjacent to the MSP Study Area with high commercial fishing dependence. Source: Norman, NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center

Bay Center, Pacific County
Chinook, Pacific County
Ilwaco, Pacific County
Neah Bay, ³ Makah Indian Reservation, Clallam County
Taholah, Quinault Indian Reservation, Grays Harbor County
Tokeland, Pacific County
Westport, Grays Harbor County

¹ Fishing dependence was a combination of reliance and engagement indices for commercial and recreational fisheries. For details on methods, please see work by NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center at: <https://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/research/divisions/cb/ecosystem/humandim/analyses.cfm>.

² Identified with South Bend, Tokeland, Bay Center, and La Push as communities with high fishing dependence and engagement in a 2007 NOAA study (Norman et al, 2007).

³ Neah Bay is located outside, but adjacent to, the MSP Study Area.

The coastal communities adjacent to the MSP Study Area and their fishing activities are the primary focus of this section. However, the fishery resources of the MSP Study Area support a broader set of communities that can reach the Study Area through ports located within Puget Sound and along the Columbia River. More distantly located ports such those in the Blaine-Bellingham area of Washington and the Astoria-Warrenton area of Oregon have been as engaged in the fisheries of the MSP Study Area as communities that are located alongside it, such as Westport and Ilwaco.

Conversely, the Plan also recognizes that fishing communities adjacent to the Study Area are engaged in and dependent on fishing grounds elsewhere, such as those in Puget Sound and off Oregon, California, and especially Alaska. Revenue earned by commercial fishing and seafood businesses from fisheries, like the Bristol Bay Sockeye Salmon fishery, contribute to the viability of these businesses. The Albacore Tuna fishery offers another example. Much of the commercial and recreational catch in this fishery occurs beyond the 700 fathom boundary of the MSP Study Area, yet still supports the communities of the coastal counties.

Fisheries Management

Washington's marine planning law provides the state with the option of including, at the discretion of WDFW's director, a "fishery management element" in the MSP, described as "existing fisheries management plans and procedures and standards for consideration in adopting and revising fisheries management plans in cooperation with the appropriate federal agencies and tribal governments" ([RCW 43.372.040\(7\)](#)). At this time, the state does not propose incorporating any such fisheries management elements into the MSP. Existing fisheries management processes are described below.

Almost every species supporting fisheries in the MSP Study Area migrates across or straddles jurisdictional boundaries. Shared jurisdiction over fisheries resources is the norm rather than the exception, and management of these resources involves a complex mix of state, federal, regional, and international processes. In addition, as further discussed in Section 1.6: Pacific Coast Indian Tribes and Treaty Rights, Washington is unique compared to other states because of the presence of tribal governments with treaty rights to fish in ocean waters. Several other tribes hold treaty rights to fish in Puget Sound or the Columbia River for species that are impacted by fisheries in the MSP Study Area. Cooperation and co-management with tribal governments occurs in several state, regional, and international fisheries management processes as well as in fisheries research and monitoring activities. This section briefly outlines existing fisheries management forums. More details are given below in the descriptions of individual fisheries.

In Washington, the state's principal authority for managing fisheries is delegated to WDFW. The Washington Fish and Wildlife Commission, which consists of nine citizen members appointed by the governor, holds rule-making authority and is responsible for setting fish and wildlife policy for WDFW. The Commission was established to provide an open and deliberative process that promotes public involvement and confidence in management decisions. WDFW's mandate to preserve, protect, and perpetuate fishery resources includes both state and offshore waters, with the latter term defined as the "marine waters of the Pacific Ocean outside the territorial boundaries of the state, including the marine waters of other states and countries."

The Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) is another open and deliberative process for managing fisheries. It was established by Congress to sustainably manage fisheries in federal waters off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and California. PFMC's voting

membership consists of six governmental representatives and eight private citizens. The governmental representatives include representatives from WDFW; the state fisheries management agencies of Oregon, California, and Idaho; NOAA Fisheries; and a tribe with federally-recognized fishing rights. The citizen members are nominated by the governors of each state and are appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce.

PFMC makes conservation and management recommendations that are reviewed for consistency with national standards and other applicable federal laws and implemented into federal regulation by NOAA Fisheries. PFMC organizes its work primarily around a Fishery Ecosystem Plan and four fishery management plans (FMPs): Salmon, Groundfish, Coastal Pelagic Species, and Highly Migratory Species.

The Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) was created as an interstate compact agency in 1947 with Washington, Oregon, and California as the original members. Idaho joined in 1963 as did Alaska in 1968. The PSMFC coordinates research activities, monitors fishing activities, and collects data and maintains databases on salmon, steelhead, and other marine fish. The PSMFC does not regulate fisheries, but provides a forum for coordination between states for state-managed fisheries. For example, under the PSMFC, the states of Washington, Oregon, and California have the Dungeness Crab Tri-State Committee to consult on issues affecting the commercial Dungeness Crab fishery.

In the international arena, five major processes directly affect fisheries in the MSP Study Area. Three operate under treaties between the U.S. and Canada: the International Pacific Halibut Commission, the Pacific Salmon Commission, and the Pacific Hake/Whiting Treaty. These bilateral management agreements monitor shared stocks, establish sustainable catch levels, and allocate them among the two nations. The halibut and salmon stocks covered by the agreements also involve the fisheries and interests of Alaska.

The other two processes affect fishing for Albacore Tuna. Albacore management involves both the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission and the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission. Albacore management processes incorporate the interests of many nations with fishing interests in the Pacific Ocean.

Fishery Sectors

The general convention is to classify fisheries, or fishery sectors, based on some combination of the main species or species group harvested, the area fished, and the fishing gear used. However, other factors may be used to differentiate one type of fishing from another, and the definition of a fishery sector may differ depending on the management purpose being addressed. Furthermore, broader species groups, e.g. “Groundfish,” are sometimes used to summarize the activities of multiple fishery sectors. As fisheries and fishery sectors are described and grouped differently within the Cascade Economics report (2015) than in this section of the MSP, Table 2.4-7 translates the groupings. Each fishery sector is discussed individually below.

Within each sector description, the main fisheries occurring within the Study Area are also discussed in detail. However, while discussed separately, the Plan recognizes that there are links between sectors with businesses relying on revenue from more than one fishery sector. Note that some fisheries may have both a commercial and recreational component, while others only have one or the other. Furthermore, due to data availability, maps are only available for those fisheries listed in the fourth column. The far right column of the table provides source data for each map with a more detailed description of source data and development of the maps

provided below the table. Map 17 shows the combined commercial and recreational fishing intensity for the MSP Study Area.

Table 2.4-7. Fisheries sector groupings and available maps (continued on following page)

Sector	Fishery grouping	Fisheries described in Section 2.4	Economic report description	Fisheries use maps available	Map Data Sources
Commercial	Groundfish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fixed gear • Bottom trawl • Midwater rockfish trawl • Whiting (shoreside and at-sea) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At-sea Pacific Whiting • Shore-based fisheries (Whiting trawl and non-Whiting trawl) • Non-trawl 	• Sablefish, fixed gear (Map 18)	• Industry interviews
				• Groundfish, bottom trawl (Map 19)	• State trawl logbooks (2003-2014)
				• Pacific Whiting (Map 20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At-sea Hake observer program logbooks (2003-2014) • State trawl logbooks (2003-2014)
	Salmon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ocean troll • Gillnet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salmon troll • Salmon net 	• Salmon troll (Map 21)	• Industry and fishery manager interviews
	Highly Migratory Species	• Albacore Tuna	• Albacore Tuna ⁴	• Albacore Tuna (Map 22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly Migratory Species commercial logbooks (1995-2014) • Industry interviews
	Coastal Pelagic Species	• Pacific Sardine	• Coastal pelagic species	• Pacific Sardine (Map 23)	• State logbooks (2002-2014)
	Shellfish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness Crab • Pink Shrimp • Spot Prawn • Razor Clam 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dungeness Crab • Shrimp • Other species⁵ 	• Dungeness Crab (Map 24)	• Tri-state logbooks (2009/2010-2013/2014 seasons)
				• Pink Shrimp (Map 25)	• State logbooks (2011-2014)
Pacific Halibut	• Pacific Halibut	• Other species ⁶			
Other	• Hagfish	• Other species ⁶			

⁴ Some tables report within a general Highly Migratory Species grouping, which is referenced as being comprised of mostly Albacore Tuna.

⁵ Other species includes Spot Prawn, Pacific Halibut, and Hagfish.

Table 2.4-7 (continued). Fisheries sector groupings and available maps

	Fishery grouping	Fisheries described in Section 2.4	Economic report description	Fisheries use maps available	Map data sources
Recreational	Salmon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salmon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salmon • Steelhead 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salmon (Map 26) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry and fishery manager Interviews
	Groundfish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bottomfish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bottomfish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bottomfish and Lingcod (Map 27) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry and fishery manager interviews
	Halibut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pacific Halibut 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pacific Halibut 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pacific Halibut (Map 28) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industry and fishery manager interviews
	Highly Migratory Species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albacore Tuna 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albacore Tuna 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albacore Tuna (Map 29) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Charter Logbooks (2006-2014) • Industry Interviews
	Shellfish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Razor Clam • Dungeness Crab 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Razor Clam 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Razor Clam (Map 30) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known WDFW and tribal management areas • DOH

About Fisheries Maps and Data

The fisheries use maps used in the Plan were developed by WDFW to summarize available information on areas of high importance to fisheries, as required by [RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(c\)](#). Identifying the footprint of each fishery was the primary goal. The areas within each footprint, which represent the area where fishing has occurred or has the potential to occur, should be considered to be of potential importance to fishing. The next step—identifying areas of high importance within each footprint—is a more difficult task given limitations in the available spatial information. WDFW used three general approaches to identify areas of relatively high, medium, and low use intensities:

1. *Fishery logbook data and percentile rankings*: Each hexagon was ranked based on the number of intersecting fishing sets or tows and scored using three bins:
 - a. “High”- Top 25% of hexagons
 - b. “Medium”- Middle 50% of hexagons
 - c. “Low”- Bottom 25% of hexagons
2. *Logbook data with criteria-based intensity definitions*: Limited location and effort data is presented in logbooks for some fisheries. As a result, each hexagon was evaluated based on available effort data and other criteria that correlate with high activity in that particular fishery (e.g. depth, distance from shore).
3. *Interviews with fishery participants and managers*: Some fisheries have no logbook or other data that records the locations of fishing. In such cases, WDFW consulted with fishery participants and managers to determine intensity levels and footprints of select fisheries.

WDFW published more specific details for the methods behind producing each map (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017). WDFW considers the maps produced by all three methods to advance public knowledge of where fisheries use the Study Area. At the same time, the maps are subject to uncertainty stemming from limitations in the source data and from variability in the fisheries themselves. Data limitations aside, fishing patterns change for a variety of reasons. Changes in regulations, the environment, economic conditions, and more can all change the level and location of fishing effort. Area of high importance may shift from one year to the next, and past patterns may not be reflective of future conditions.

In addition, WDFW emphasizes that the maps' intensity rankings do not represent conflict with or impact from potential new uses in the same area. Although impact would be expected to be proportional to fishing intensity, conflicts in areas ranked as "low" intensity could still cause unacceptable harm to a fishery. Conversely, potential conflicts in areas ranked as "high" intensity might be avoidable or otherwise mitigated. While the presented fishery maps will be helpful in assessing which fisheries may be affected by future project proposals, understanding potential conflict and impact will require consideration of all available information.

Commercial Fisheries

This section describes the various commercial fisheries operating within the MSP Study Area. The focus is on their general size based on pounds landed and ex-vessel revenue earned and the basics of how they are regulated. This section also addresses key aspects of operations for these fisheries such as gear used, number of participants, major species targeted, and the areas and time of year in which participants fish.

The core information on commercial fishing activity comes from fish receiving tickets, commonly referred to as "fish tickets." These tickets are a record of the transaction between a vessel owner or operator that is making a delivery of commercially caught fish and the purchaser. The fish ticket reports the species or species group landed, amount of each species (typically in weight, but sometimes in numbers of fish), catch area, and the price paid by the buyer for each species or species group landed (i.e. as noted above, "ex-vessel" revenues). Fish tickets are sent to WDFW and maintained in a state database. This database is also shared with state and federal fisheries management agencies through the PSMFC Pacific Fisheries Information Network (PacFIN) database, along with data from Oregon and California. Fish tickets do not reflect the overall impacts from commercial fishing landings on the economy.

Table 2.4-8 describes commercial fishing activity for the four coastal counties that are the focus of this section. While the focus of this section is on the landings and revenue by fishery to each county or port, additional information on the impact of these fisheries by community (e.g. jobs, contribution) can be found in the section titled "Economic Impact of Commercial and Recreational Fishing." Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties have been the most active based on all participation metrics (Table 2.4-8). Coastal county residents make up the largest proportion of commercial fishing vessel owners (299 vessels) and ex-vessel revenue (\$40.4 million) from landings into coastal ports (Table 2.4-9). Commercial fishermen residing outside of the Washington coastal county region also fish in the MSP Study Area and use coastal ports.

As Table 2.4-9 shows, there were over 230 vessels registered to Washington residents residing outside of the Pacific coast region, accounting for more than \$23.5 million in ex-vessel revenue in coastal ports in 2014. There were also 72 vessels registered in Oregon and 90 vessels registered elsewhere that delivered landings to Washington coastal ports in 2014 (Taylor, Baker,

Waters, Wegge, & Wellman, 2015). Table 2.4-10 summarizes the total landings, ex-vessel revenue, and price of each species management group landed within the Washington coastal counties.

Of note, by longstanding convention WDFW has recorded the port of landing on fish tickets indirectly by using the principal buying location that fish buyers list on their licenses. However, buyers can and do purchase fish in different ports. For example, a buyer may list his or her buying location as Port Angeles but may also purchase fish in Neah Bay. If so, their Neah Bay purchases will be recorded as having occurred in Port Angeles. This convention inserts some degree of unavoidable inaccuracy when considering landings by port.

Table 2.4-8. Landings, ex-vessel revenues, and participation by county for Washington coast commercial, non-tribal fisheries in 2014. Source: WDFW as reported in Taylor et al. (2015).

County⁶	Round weight (1,000 lbs.)	Ex-vessel revenue (\$1,000)	Number of dealers	Number of vessels
Clallam ⁷	2,020	2,975	20	88
Grays Harbor	97,355	59,742	45	354
Pacific	29,206	29,285	30	364
Wahkiakum	779	966	7	80
WA Coast totals	129,360	92,967	98	700

Table 2.4-9. Count of vessels and total non-tribal ex-vessel revenues in 2014 in Washington coastal ports by vessel owner's address. Source: WDFW as reported in Taylor et al. (2015).

Vessel owner's region	Number of vessels	Ex-vessel revenue (\$1,000)
Washington coast ⁸	299	40,439
Other Washington	232	23,657
Oregon	72	13,143
Elsewhere	90	13,326
Unknown	7	1,058
No vessel ID	-	1,344
Total	700	92,967

⁶ There have been no non-tribal commercial fishery landings recorded in Jefferson County ports along the outer Washington coast since 2007.

⁷ Includes Neah Bay, Sequim, and Port Angeles which are located outside the MSP Study Area.

⁸ Vessel owner's address is in one of the five Washington coast counties.

Table 2.4-10. Landings, ex-vessel revenue, and average revenue per pound in Washington coastal ports by fisheries management group, non-tribal fishery sector. Includes 2014 and 2004-2014 range. Source: WDFW as reported in Taylor et al. (2015).

Management Group	Landings in 2014 (1,000s of round weight lbs.)	Landings range during 2004-14 (1,000 lbs.)		Ex-vessel revenue in 2014 (\$1,000)	Ex-vessel revenue range 2004-14 (\$1,000 2014 inflation adjusted)		Revenue per lb. in 2014	Revenue per lb. (11 year average) (2014 inflation adjusted)
		Low	High		Low	High		
Groundfish	51,182	26,702	80,517	9,324	5,819	13,703	0.18	0.16
Salmon	2,568	799	2,568	5,152	2,022	5,152	2.01	2.18
Crab	8,615	5,615	19,540	36,567	12,503	43,511	4.24	2.58
Shrimp	30,543	3,382	30,543	16,398	1,868	16,398	0.54	0.49
Coastal Pelagic	17,666	9,759	78,936	3,208	521	8,212	0.18	0.10
Albacore	17,184	10,084	18,600	20,216	11,333	28,216	1.18	1.21
Razor Clam ⁹	282	103	282	560	182	589	1.98	1.86
Other ¹⁰	1,444	268	2,833	1,769	512	2,832	1.23	1.01
Total	129,360	-	-	92,967	-	-	-	-

Groundfish

The fishery sectors described here are grouped together largely because they are managed under the PFMC’s Groundfish FMP. Groundfish is an umbrella term used to describe a diverse group of species that prefer seafloor habitats. The PFMC Groundfish FMP includes over 90 species, two thirds of which are species of rockfish, although the great majority of commercial landings and revenues come from just a handful of stocks. These key commercial stocks include Pacific Whiting, Sablefish, Dover Sole, Petrale Sole, Lingcod, and Shortspine Thornyhead.

⁹ The numbers from the shellfish category reported in Taylor et al. (2015) included geoduck harvest from the Strait of Juan de Fuca. WDFW updated these figures to include only razor clams commercially harvested in the Study Area.

¹⁰ Commercial fisheries included in the “other” category of this table are: Pacific Halibut, Spot Prawn, and Pacific Hagfish.

In aggregate, the groundfish fisheries provide some of the largest annual landings into coastal ports (Table 2.4-10). From 2004-2014, groundfish was the largest fishery by volume in all years except 2012 and 2013. This high volume of landings is attributable mainly to the Pacific Whiting fishery. However, the low price per pound paid for Pacific Whiting limits the overall ex-vessel revenue earned by the groundfish sector.

Though often described together because they are managed under a single Groundfish FMP, there are distinct fishery sectors that operate in the Study Area. These sectors use different fishing methods, fishing grounds, and target different groundfish species. A first level of distinction can be made between vessels that use fixed gear (i.e. hook-and-line or pot gear) and those that use trawl gear. Among vessels using trawl gear, there is a further distinction between vessels that target Pacific Whiting (“whiting”) and those that fish for species other than Whiting (“non-whiting” or “traditional groundfish”). Within the category of non-whiting trawl, a third distinction can be made between vessels that use bottom trawl gear and vessels that use midwater gear to target rockfish off the seafloor. Lastly, another distinction can be drawn between the at-sea sector, where catch is processed aboard vessels, and the shoreside sector, where vessels land their catch in port. Each groundfish sector is described below.

Fixed gear

Sablefish is the main target of the fixed gear sector. This species made up roughly 86% of total landings by weight and 95% of the total ex-vessel revenue over 2004-2014 in the fixed gear sector. Total fixed gear landings ranged from 0.9 million pounds to 1.7 million pounds, and earnings ranged from \$2.1 million to \$5.8 million in revenues. Sablefish is highly valued as seafood and has a strong export market. The ex-vessel price per pound received for fixed gear caught Sablefish is one of the highest on the coast and in some years has been greater than that paid for Dungeness Crab. In 2014, at least 37 vessels recorded at least \$1,000 of landing value in this sector, with 29 vessels receiving \$10,000 or more.

Fixed gear vessels target sablefish throughout the West Coast. However, the MSP Study Area, especially north of Point Chehalis, has provided some of this sector’s most important fishing grounds. Submarine canyons and the continental shelf break and upper slope provide key fishing grounds for this sector (Map 18). Off Washington, fixed gear vessels have been required to fish seaward of 100 fathoms since 2002 because of the need to reduce the catch of Yelloweye Rockfish. The fish are targeted using baited hooks or pots that are linked on longlines and left on or near the seafloor and later retrieved. A string of hooks or pots are commonly referred to as a “set.”

Bottom trawl and midwater rockfish trawl

As noted, non-whiting trawl vessels use bottom or midwater trawl gear to target a variety of species. Bottom trawl gear has been the more common gear during the 2004-2014 period and is the basis for the use map for this sector (Map 19). Bottom trawl vessels target flatfish (e.g. Petrale and Dover Sole), Sablefish, and many other species, and are active over much of the Study Area’s continental shelf and slope habitats (Map 19). The midwater targeting strategy focuses on schooling rockfish, primarily Yellowtail Rockfish and Widow Rockfish, and occurs on the continental shelf. Because this fishery was depressed from 2004-2014 in comparison to historical levels due to measures taken to rebuild Canary and Widow Rockfish stocks, no maps were produced for this fishing strategy. Midwater trawling has rebounded some since 2011. It is expected to increase further because both Canary and Widow stocks have been rebuilt, resulting in increased allowable harvests.

Overall, non-whiting trawl accounted for between approximately 1.1% and 3.8% of total Washington coast landings during 2004-2014. Ex-vessel revenue value ranged from \$0.6 million to \$1.4 million during that same period. Sablefish earns the highest ex-vessel value per pound among trawl fishery species, although Petrale Sole is a highly valued species as well. The management changes made by PFMC in the 2000s to rebuild overfished rockfish stocks and reduce fishing capacity substantially reduced Washington's bottom trawl fleet. This included the groundfish "buy back" program, which aimed to reduce the number of permits by 50% throughout the West Coast. Washington's fishing communities were disproportionately affected. Bellingham area ports were particularly affected, losing all nine bottom trawl vessels. The MSP Study Area still provides important fishing grounds for the Astoria-based (Oregon) bottom trawl fleet, which is the most active trawl port on the West Coast. The majority of non-whiting groundfish landings in Washington occur in Pacific County, Whatcom County (Puget Sound), and Grays Harbor County.

Whiting

As noted above, the fishery for Pacific Whiting includes both shorebased and at-sea catcher vessels. The two are reported separately, highlighting the difference in the way the catch contributes to the local economy. All whiting catcher vessels use midwater trawl gear designed to fish in the water column, although trawling can take place close to the seafloor. Vessels in the at-sea sector tend to be larger and have more horsepower with the ability to stay at sea for long periods of time.

Whiting are caught predominately off Washington and Oregon. The amount of whiting caught off Washington varies from year to year, particularly in the at-sea sector (Table 2.4-11). Shoreside vessels tend to stay as close to port as possible because the flesh quality of Pacific Whiting is improved if processed quickly. The continental shelf and upper continental slope regions of the Study Area are key fishing grounds (Map 20). Avoidance of salmon and rockfish bycatch has been a key influence on where the fishery occurred between 2004 and 2014. Bycatch constraints have pushed the fishery into smaller areas than would otherwise be fished if whiting catch were the only consideration.

The shorebased Pacific Whiting trawl fishery is conducted off the coasts of Washington and Oregon with active ports at Westport and Ilwaco in Washington. Landings from this fishery have consistently constituted the largest component of total commercial landings on the Washington coast in terms of weight from 2004-2014, with the exception of 2012 and 2013 when they were surpassed by Pacific Sardine landings. In 2014, ex-vessel revenue was \$5.5 million. Half of the 10 vessels participating in 2014 received at least \$250,000 in ex-vessel revenue.

Within the at-sea sector, there are two distinct sectors: motherships and catcher-processors. In the mothership sector, catcher vessels deliver to a mothership vessel, which only processes whiting. In the catcher-processor sector, vessels both catch and process their own catch. Each of the at-sea sectors operates under a co-op system that divides the PFMC's quotas for whiting and bycatch species like Darkblotched Rockfish. The catcher-processors, mothership processing vessels, and many of the mothership catcher vessels are based in Puget Sound.

Table 2.4-11. Total coast-wide annual and estimated catch off the Washington coast by vessels operating in the non-tribal, at-sea Pacific whiting sector. Source: WDFW as reported in Taylor et al. (2015).

Sector	Sector total 2014 (metric tons)	Sector total range during 2005-2014 (metric tons)		Washington share in 2014	Estimated portion of Washington share 2005-2014	
		Low	High		Low	High
Catcher-Processors	103,486	34,620	108,121	0%	0%	52%
Motherships	62,109	24,091	62,109	14%	13%	91%

Salmon

Salmon are perhaps Washington’s most historic and iconic fish. They are highly valued as seafood and earn the second highest revenue per pound of the species fished in the MSP Study Area, with an 11-year average of \$2.18 per pound. The total value of the fishery, however, is limited by low allowable catches relative to fisheries like Dungeness Crab and Pacific Whiting (see Table 2.4-10). Commercial salmon fisheries have decreased greatly from historic highs primarily because of population declines across several salmon runs, major changes in how salmon harvests are shared with the treaty tribes following the Boldt Decision in 1974, and other factors (see Tribal Fisheries Section below and Section 1.6 for details on treaty rights). Salmon fisheries are intensively managed by the State and treaty tribes on an annual basis.

Two distinct sectors fish commercially for salmon in the MSP Study Area: the ocean troll fishery and the gillnet fishery. PFMC manages the main process for setting seasons in the troll fishery, while WDFW sets seasons for the gillnet fisheries. Both fishery sectors, however, are intertwined with larger, complex salmon management processes that involve the three West Coast states as well as Alaska, Idaho, Canada, and the many tribes holding rights to fish for salmon across the Pacific Northwest. The core challenge across all salmon fisheries has been to focus harvest on hatchery-raised fish and healthy wild populations while reducing pressures on wild stocks of high conservation concern.

Ocean troll

Troll gear is a type of hook and line gear that vessels pull through the water using bait or artificial lures to attract fish. Vessels operate over a wide range of ocean waters with the most fishing activity occurring in depths of 20 to 80 fathoms north of the Queets River, and depths of 20 to 60 fathoms south of the Queets River (Map 21). Chinook and Coho Salmon are the main targets of the troll fleet. Chinook is the more frequently landed fish in this sector, constituting about 84% of landings by weight and earning 94% of ex-vessel revenue in 2014. Total ex-vessel revenue was about \$2.4 million in 2014. In general, ocean troll salmon fetches a relatively high price, with an average of \$4.30 per lb. in 2014 and an 11-year average of \$4.08 per lb. The number of licenses issued to ocean troll vessels by WDFW ranged from 152 to 157 between 2004 and 2014. In 2014, at least 111 vessels recorded at least \$1,000 of salmon troll landings, 79 of which received at least \$10,000 in ex-vessel revenue from those landings. On average, Pacific County has reported the greatest share of ex-vessel revenues (49.4%), although Grays Harbor County surpassed Pacific County in 2013.

Gillnet

Gillnet fisheries operate in Willapa Bay, Grays Harbor, and the Columbia River.^{11,12} WDFW regulates the two estuaries separately, with seasons timed to intercept the adult fish returning to their natal streams to spawn. Vessels deploy and actively tend free floating nets that entangle the fish in their mesh. In addition to Chinook and Coho, gillnetters also target Chum Salmon. In 2014, Coho constituted about 57% of landings by weight and about 50% of landings by value, although these numbers can vary greatly from year to year. Between 2004 and 2014, the number of gillnet licenses has ranged from 192 to 195 for Willapa Bay and from 63 to 64 for Grays Harbor. Landings have ranged from a low of 0.5 million lbs. in 2007 to a high of 2 million lbs. in 2011 with corresponding ex-vessel revenues of \$1 million to \$3 million. The 11-year annual average ex-vessel price for salmon gillnet fishery landings for 2004-2014 was about \$1.51 per lb. In 2014, 138 vessels recorded at least \$1,000 of salmon net landings on the Washington coast, with 72 vessels receiving at least \$10,000 in ex-vessel revenue from those landings.

Highly migratory species

Albacore Tuna

The Albacore Tuna commercial fishery is managed under PFMC's Highly Migratory Species FMP. Because of the stock's wide ranging migration, stock assessments, and international agreements, regulation of the fishery is minimal. It is one of the few fisheries on the West Coast in which participation is still open to entry from new fishers. Albacore are caught off Washington by both local and other West Coast-based vessels using troll and/or pole and line fishing ("bait boat") techniques. Canadian vessels also fish in U.S. waters and make landings in Washington under a treaty between the U.S. and Canada.

The fishery occurs in the summer and fall when the fish migrate to the West Coast. While most of the fishing occurs outside the MSP Study Area, fishing within the Study Area is most common between 30 and 50 nautical miles offshore but sometimes occurs closer in, to 20 nautical miles (Map 22). The Albacore Tuna fishery has the highest participation level among the Washington coast fishery sectors, with between 221 and 338 unique vessels making landings into Washington ports each year. Many vessels that participate in the salmon troll fishery also fish for Albacore.

Washington coast Albacore landings ranged from about 10 million lbs. to 18.6 million lbs. between 2004 and 2014. Ex-vessel values ranged from about \$11.3 to \$28.2 million during that same period. The average ex-vessel price in 2014 was about \$1.18 per lb., with an 11-year average of \$1.21 per lb. (Table 2.4-10). In 2014, 210 vessels received at least \$10,000 in ex-vessel revenue from tuna landings on the Washington coast. Westport (Grays Harbor) and Pacific County land the vast majority of Albacore on the Washington coast.

Coastal pelagic species

PFMC's coastal pelagic species (CPS) FMP includes Northern Anchovy, Market Squid, Pacific Sardine, and Pacific Mackerel. These species are caught mostly by vessels using purse seine gear. Off Washington, Pacific Sardine and Northern Anchovy are the main commercial species caught, with Pacific Mackerel landed incidentally. WDFW authorized a trial Pacific Mackerel fishery for the first time in 2016. Small scale harvest of anchovies occurs in the

¹¹ The Columbia River fishery is not included in this discussion as it is outside the MSP Study Area.

¹² Spatial data are unavailable to produce a map of the salmon gillnet fisheries in the estuaries for the MSP.

nearshore including in state waters, Willapa Bay, and Grays Harbor. Anchovies are generally used for bait, and most anchovies are landed in Grays Harbor.

The CPS fishery has brought in relatively high landing volumes (up to 78.9 million lbs. in 2012), yet low value per lb. (\$0.10 per lb. as the 11-year average from 2004-2014). However, this fishery is also highly volatile. This volatility is driven by Pacific Sardine, with landings as low as 9.7 million lbs. between 2004 and 14, with large swings from year to year. Ex-vessel revenue from CPS landings in Washington ranged from about \$0.5 million to \$8.2 million from 2004-2014, with \$3.2 million landed in 2014 (Table 2.4-10). In 2014, 10 vessels recorded at least \$1,000 of revenue from CPS landings in Washington, seven of which received at least \$10,000 from CPS landings.

Pacific Sardine

When the Pacific Sardine population is large enough to support harvest, fishing takes place in late spring and summer months when water temperatures warm and the sardine migrate into the area. However, state waters are closed to harvest by state law. Grays Harbor County received about 75% of the ex-vessel revenues from sardine on average over 2004-2014. Similar to the groundfish fishery, boats based out of Astoria can take a large portion of their harvest in the Study Area. Washington's share of coast-wide sardine harvest increased later in the 2004-2014 period. This was due to the changing focus to squid in California and the proximity of the fish to Westport (Map 23). However, the Pacific Sardine fishery was closed by PFMC in 2015 because the stock biomass had dropped below a threshold limit, and the fishery remains closed in 2017. The stock is known to fluctuate in abundance based largely on environmental factors and may rebound above the limit if conditions become favorable.

Shellfish

Dungeness Crab

Dungeness Crab have been the biggest revenue earner among the commercial species. Ex-vessel revenue ranged from \$12.5 million to \$43.5 million between 2004 and 2014 (Table 2.4-10), and earned the most coastal fisheries revenue for 9 of those 11 years. They are highly valued as seafood both locally and internationally and earn the highest average price per lb. on the coast. The 11-year average ex-vessel price was \$2.58 per lb. The price has exhibited an increasing trend since 2010, as markets for live crab in Asia have continued to develop. Prices reached extraordinary levels in 2014 with buyers paying \$4.24 per lb. on average over the year and over \$6.00 per lb. in March, April, and May. Dungeness Crab can fluctuate strongly in abundance from year to year because of variability in ocean conditions that affect survival and settlement of the larvae; the annual harvest fluctuates in kind. For example, crab landings were 5.6 million lbs. in 2004 and 19.5 million lbs. the following year.

Fishery participants trap the crabs using baited pots. Pots are deployed on soft bottom in depths ranging from outside the surf line, or approximately 18 feet, to 600 feet (3 to 100 fathoms). Each pot is individually "fished," although pots are often laid out in "strings" that may be up to several miles long. Crab are harvested along the entire Washington coast, including inside Grays Harbor, Willapa Bay, and the Columbia River. However, the most intensive fishing takes place in the southern third of the MSP Study Area, south of tribal U&As (Map 24). The primary landing ports and processing facilities are in Westport, Chinook, Tokeland, South Bend and Ilwaco.¹³ Neah Bay¹⁴ and La Push on the northern coast are minor ports for crab, and

¹³ The Ports of Chinook and Ilwaco are located inside the Columbia River and outside of the MSP Study Area.

¹⁴ Neah Bay is located outside of the MSP Study Area.

product landed there is typically sent elsewhere for processing. Growth in this aspect of the industry drives increasing prices and economic benefits to the industry and coastal communities.

WDFW manages the Dungeness Crab fishery in coordination with the coastal treaty tribes and the fisheries management agencies of Oregon and California. Coast-wide coordination occurs on several issues, including a tri-state agreement negotiated through PSMFC which establishes procedures for opening the season. As with salmon, the Dungeness Crab fishery is intensively managed by WDFW and the coastal treaty tribes each year to ensure consistency with the U.S. v. Washington treaty rights decisions. Congress provides specific authority for Washington, Oregon, and California to set rules for Dungeness Crab vessels fishing in waters adjacent to their states. This special authority had a sunset clause of September 30, 2016 that Congress let pass. The authority was reinstated in August 2017 with the sunset clause removed.

Co-management of the crab fishery began much later than that of the Salmon fishery. Prior to 1994, tribal participation was very limited accounting for only 1% of coastal landings, on average, from the 1990-1991 to the 1994-1995 seasons. After the 1994 Rafeedie Decision, tribal catches took some time to ramp up to current levels. Since the 2003-2004 season, tribal catches have averaged 20% of all coastal Dungeness Crab catches. Just considering the U&A areas (i.e. north of Point Chehalis), tribal landings averaged 42% of total landings from the 2003-2004 to 2013-2014 seasons. The 2013-2014 season marked the largest share at just over 60%. The main tools for sharing catch have been Special Management Areas (SMAs) which close portions of the tribal U&As to non-tribal fishers during part or all of the state fishing season and delayed state openings called "Head Starts." "Head Starts" within tribal U&As have provided up to 49 days of exclusive tribal fishing opportunity over two-thirds of the MSP Study Area prior to opening the state fishery in those areas.

In terms of participation, 192 vessels recorded at least \$1,000 of Dungeness Crab landings on the Washington coast in 2014, representing the second highest participation level among the Washington coast fishery sectors. Of those, 117 vessels received at least \$100,000 in ex-vessel revenue. Although historically Dungeness Crab fishermen participated almost exclusively in the crab fishery, currently many participate in multiple fisheries in order to sustain their businesses year-round. The fishery is highly competitive and results in a race for crab, where the bulk of the harvest is taken within the first two months of the season.

The season begins December 1 and closes September 15 of the following year, except where state-tribal agreements have dictated otherwise or when crab quality delays are put in place. In recent years, state and tribal agreements have kept areas north of Klipsan Beach closed to the non-tribal commercial fishery until January, sometimes late into the month. With these closures, there has been an increase in competition and concentration of fishing effort in the areas south of the U&As. The percentage of catch taken in these areas showed an increasing trend with these areas accounting for less than 50% of state catch in 2004 and over 80% in 2014. Furthermore, WDFW may close the fishery for other reasons, like high levels of biotoxins such as domoic acid, to ensure a safe product in the marketplace. Most recently, elevated levels of domoic acid in Dungeness Crab necessitated a partial closure of the fishery in 2015.

Pink Shrimp

Pink (a.k.a. "Ocean") Shrimp are caught using trawl gear that is designed to fish slightly above the seafloor. Most shrimp trawl vessels are "double-rigged" meaning they tow two nets, one on either side of the vessel. The fishery operates in depths of 300 to 750 feet (50 to 125 fathoms) off the Washington and Oregon coasts during a season that runs from April 1 to October 31 annually (Map 25). Westport and Ilwaco are the two key landing ports with Westport

receiving the bulk of the landings. In seafood markets, Pink Shrimp are often referred to as cocktail shrimp.

Because Oregon-based fishing vessels also fish in the MSP Study Area, WDFW manages and coordinates regulation of the Pink Shrimp fishery with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. Volumes of shrimp landings have increased since 2012 with 30.5 million lbs. landed on the Washington coast in 2014. This was more than twice the amount landed in 2013. Ex-vessel revenues have similarly been increasing, with \$1.9 million earned in 2007 and \$16.4 million earned in 2014. This may be partially due to the value of shrimp also rising, with a price of \$0.54 per lb. in 2014, which is higher than the 11-year average of \$0.49 per lb. (Table 2.4-10). In 2014, 32 vessels recorded at least \$1,000 of Pink Shrimp landings on the Washington coast, including 26 vessels that received at least \$100,000 in ex-vessel revenue from those landings. Shrimp abundance, improved processing capacity, and other factors have contributed to the expansion of this fishery in Washington in recent years. More plans to increase shrimp processing capacity in Westport and the recent purchase of the idle shrimp processing plant in South Bend may further boost this industry.

Spot Prawn

The commercial Spot Prawn fishery is relatively new, beginning in 1999. The fishery occurs along the outer coast of Washington between March 15 and September 15, about 20 to 40 nm offshore at depths between 420 and 600 feet (70 and 100 fathoms). Gear used in this fishery is primarily pot longline. It has been managed as a limited-entry fishery, with eight licenses currently in circulation; between three and five of these licenses are actually active. Participants in this fishery typically also participate in other fisheries, such as Dungeness Crab and Albacore Tuna. From 2004 to 2013, the highest value in ex-vessel revenues was \$754,585 (2010) with a low of \$102,257 (2013). Live spot prawns can earn \$10 per lb. or greater. It has also become popular to sell “prawn tails” directly to the public during summer. Primary ports for spot prawn landings include Westport, Seattle, Neah Bay, and Port Angeles, with Grays Harbor (Westport) accounting for an average of 87% of fishery revenues from 2004-13 (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).¹⁵

Razor Clams

The commercial Razor Clam fishery occurs from May through June each year. In Washington, harvest is limited to the detached spits at the mouth of Willapa Bay in Pacific County, accessible only by boat. Unlike other commercial fisheries, vessels are not used in the actual harvesting. Most commercial Razor Clam catch is sold as bait for the Dungeness Crab fishery. In 2015, 132 commercial Razor Clam licenses were issued by WDFW, and 122 of those license holders were residents of Pacific or Grays Harbor Counties.

Razor Clams are landed exclusively in Pacific County and Grays Harbor, with Pacific County averaging large majority of revenues. Total harvest has ranged from a low of 102,900 lbs. to a high of 281,900 lbs. between 2004 and 2014. Total revenue has ranged from a low of \$182,390 to a high of \$588,620 between 2004 and 2014.

¹⁵ Seattle, Neah Bay, and Port Angeles are located outside the MSP Study Area.

Pacific Halibut

Pacific Halibut fisheries are managed under the PFMC's Pacific Halibut Catch Sharing Plan (CSP) for Area 2A (Pacific Fishery Management Council, 2017).¹⁶ The CSP specifies how the Area 2A total allowable catch, as defined by the International Pacific Halibut Commission, is allocated or "shared" among various state commercial and recreational fishing interests. The commercial harvest of Pacific Halibut takes place in an open access directed commercial fishery and through an incidental retention allowance of halibut in the fixed gear Sablefish fishery north of Point Chehalis and for the salmon troll fishery coast-wide. Due to the derby nature of the fishery and recent increases in effort, the directed commercial fishery only lasts a few days.

When open, the directed fishery is only open south of Point Chehalis. Participation varies depending on the timing and availability of other fishing opportunities. While a commercial Pacific Halibut map is not available, the area north of Point Chehalis on Map 18 for the Sablefish fixed gear fishery and Map 21 of the salmon troll fishery provide the footprint of where the incidental fishery may occur. Vessels that participate in the salmon troll (Map 21) and Albacore troll (Map 22) fisheries south of Point Chehalis generally participate in the directed commercial fishery.

Hagfish

The commercial Hagfish (aka slime eel) fishery began in 2005 and operates off Washington and Oregon. It remains as one of the state's few open access fishing opportunities with licenses available to anyone wanting to participate. There have been between 15 and 20 licenses in circulation, with the number active in any given year ranging from fewer than 3 to all 15. This fishery is open year-round, and uses pot gear on muddy or sandy bottom in depths of 300 to 480 feet (50 to 80 fathoms), as it is prohibited in waters shallower than 300 feet. The market is extremely volatile with almost all product going to Korea. The voluminous slime produced by hagfish makes the fishery a difficult one as well.

Westport is a key landing port, and landings are also made in Ilwaco, Port Angeles, Port Townsend, and Blaine.¹⁷ Landings, the price per lb., and total revenue in Washington have increased steadily since the fishery started, with ex-vessel values reaching a historical high of about \$2.27 million in 2012.

Recreational Fisheries

This section describes the major recreational fisheries occurring within the MSP Study Area. Fisheries managers typically classify recreational fisheries based on the species or species groups being targeted, but again, they may be classified and categorized differently for different management purposes.

Table 2.4-12 lists the categories used here and the average number of angler trips associated with each. Unlike most commercial fisheries, recreational fisheries are open to anyone wishing to participate and a single fishing license authorizes anglers to participate in all MSP Study Area recreational fisheries. A single fishing trip might include several of what are described here as separate fisheries (e.g., salmon and bottomfish "combo" trip). The full diversity of fishing opportunities, seasons, and rules can be viewed in in the Sport Fishing

¹⁶ Area 2A is comprised of the area off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and Northern California.

¹⁷ Ilwaco, Port Angeles, Port Townsend, and Blaine are located outside the MSP Study Area.

Regulation Pamphlet published by WDFW each year (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2016).

The major categories described here include salmon, groundfish (called “bottomfish” in state fishing regulations), Pacific Halibut, Albacore Tuna, and Razor Clams. With the exception of Razor Clam harvests, which take place on the beach, the major recreational fisheries discussed here are conducted on boats on the open ocean, as well as inside the estuaries¹⁸ for certain species like salmon. Anglers also fish from shore for species like Redtail Surfperch and from jetties for species like Lingcod, but these activities are not discussed in detail here. Likewise, while the focus in this section is on the fisheries happening within the MSP Study Area, some fishing trips cross over into the Strait of Juan de Fuca or Columbia River Estuary.

The core information on recreational fisheries in the MSP Study Area is collected by WDFW’s Ocean Sampling Program (OSP). Using a survey sampling design, WDFW staff counts vessels active in the major ports and samples the catch from a portion of them on random days of the week. This information on fishing effort (“angler-trips”) and catch is then used to estimate the total effort and catch for each month of the year. The estimates of catch and effort are publically available together with those from Oregon and California through the PSMFC’s RecFIN database. OSP focuses primarily on boat-based fishing but also samples anglers fishing from certain jetties.

Boat-based recreational fishing has two distinct components: a charter boat or “for-hire” fleet carrying paying passengers and a “private boat” fleet where anglers fish aboard vessels they rent or own. On average over the past decade, charter vessels carried approximately 32% of anglers making fishing trips while 66% of anglers were on private vessels (Table 2.4-12). Charter boats and private vessel activity varies by species caught and port location. Westport and Ilwaco have had the largest charter boat operations (Table 2.4-12).

The Washington charter boat industry has been a major part of coastal communities for decades. The industry developed rapidly after World War II, with the focus exclusively on salmon through the 1960s and Westport billing itself as the “Salmon Fishing Capital of the World.” Businesses have since diversified their portfolio of trips and now target bottomfish, Albacore, and Pacific Halibut. Charter boat activity has been relatively stable since the 1990s, but remains below the historical peak in the 1970s (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

A survey of the charter boat industry indicated that 100% of the charter boat crew, owners, and guides/skippers were Washington coast residents. Charter boat clients out of the Westport area are estimated to be comprised of between 85% and 95% Washington residents, whereas 45% of clients out of the Ilwaco area were estimated to be Oregon residents, 45% residents from inland Washington counties, 5% from the Washington coast, and 5% from other areas (Taylor et al., 2015).

On average, over half of the current charter boat trips target salmon, with bottomfish representing the second most frequently targeted species group (Table 2.4-13). A comparison of the number of trips made between 2004 and 2008 with those made between 2009 and 2013 shows that the average number of charter boat trips annually has decreased by about 8%. Comparing those same time periods, the numbers of trips targeting Pacific Halibut, salmon, and bottomfish have declined while Albacore trips have increased.

¹⁸ Recreational fishing occurs in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor estuaries. However, while maps were produced for recreational fishing activities in the ocean, spatial data for recreational fishing in the estuaries were unavailable. Therefore, the State is unable to provide maps showing recreational fishing in the estuaries.

Table 2.4-12. Sport fishing effort by trip mode 2004-2013 average for all coastal Washington port areas. Source: Ocean Sampling Program, WDFW as reported in Taylor et al. (2015)¹⁹

Mode of fishing trip	Westport	Ilwaco	Neah Bay	La Push	Chinook	All areas
Charter boat	32,695	10,171	3,131	1,144	48	47,188
Private boat	20,020	26,181	29,754	7,051	15,416	98,420
Jetty ²⁰	-	-	-	-	-	1,783
Total ²¹	52,711	36,351	32,881	8,192	15,461	147,389

Table 2.4-13. Charter boat fishing effort by targeted species 2004-2013 annual average for all coastal Washington port areas. Source: Ocean Sampling Program, WDFW as reported in Taylor et al. (2015).

Targeted species	Average annual number of trips	Percent of total
Albacore	1,707	4%
Bottomfish	13,877	29%
Halibut	4,976	11%
Salmon	26,555	56%
Other	74	<1%
Total	47,188	100%

On average, private vessel anglers launch primarily from Neah Bay (30%), Ilwaco (27%), and Westport (20%) (Table 2.4-12). The smaller ports of La Push and Chinook also offer a limited number of slips for private boats as well as boat launches. No data are currently available that identify the county of residence of private boat anglers fishing in ocean waters off the Washington coast. Overall, private boat trips have increased by about 11% when comparing the number of average annual trips made between 2009 and 2013 with average annual trips made between 2004 and 2008. Targeted species with the largest increases in trips were salmon, Albacore, and bottomfish. More than 74% of trips taken by private vessels target salmon (Table 2.4-14). Cascade Economics (Taylor et al., 2015) reports a recent trend toward larger private vessels capable of traveling farther offshore.

¹⁹ Ilwaco, Neah Bay, and Chinook are located outside the MSP Study Area.

²⁰ North Bay jetty area of the Columbia River.

²¹ Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table 2.4-14. Average annual private vessel fishing effort by targeted species 2004-2013 for all coastal Washington port areas. Source: Ocean Sampling Program, WDFW as reported in Taylor et al. (2015)

Targeted species	Average annual number of trips	Percent of total
Albacore	2,621	3%
Bottomfish	13,254	14%
Halibut	7,844	8%
Salmon	73,018	74%
Dive	397	<1%
Other	1,285	1%
Total	98,420	100%

Shore- and jetty-based anglers primarily fish from the Columbia River Jetty near Ilwaco. In 2013, 3,467 trips were recorded by anglers here, substantially higher than the 2004-2013 annual average of 1,783 trips. An estimated 87% of the fish caught by jetty anglers in 2013 were salmon, with rockfish making up the remainder (Taylor et al., 2015).

Sport catch (a.k.a. the number of fish caught or clams dug) by species group is shown in Table 2.4-15. Catch, trends, and management for each species group are discussed below.

Table 2.4-15. Average annual sport catch in marine waters²² along the Washington coast 2007/2008 through 2011/2012 sportfishing seasons. Source: WDFW as reported in Taylor et al. (2015).

Species group	Average annual number caught ²³
Salmon ²⁴	105,077
Sturgeon ²⁵	378
Pacific Halibut	7,613
Bottomfish ²⁶	277,912
Razor Clams	3,129,482

Salmon

The recreational salmon fishery occurs in Willapa Bay (and into the Willapa River), the Chehalis Basin (Grays Harbor, Humptulips River, and Chehalis River), and the Pacific Ocean (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Ocean salmon are the most popular finfish target species for effort (Table 2.4-13 and Table 2.4-14), and are the second highest finfish in terms of average catch between 2007 and 2012 (Table 2.4-15). Salmon catch has been relatively inconsistent in recent years, with the lowest number of fish caught (37,272 fish) in the 2008/09 season and the highest number (221,205 fish) in the following season (2010/11).

²² Marine areas include coastal streams, which are outside of the MSP Study Area.

²³ Numbers represent the number of fish caught or clams dug.

²⁴ Salmon totals include all species, including Coho and Chinook.

²⁵ Sturgeon total includes only fish caught in coastal streams.

²⁶ Bottomfish include all rockfish species and other bottomfish.

During the 2011/12 fishing season, about half of all salmon caught in the Study Area occurred off Westport (WDFW Marine Area 2), about 25% were near the Ilwaco area (WDFW Marine Area 1), and about 12% were caught in the area near Cape Flattery (WDFW Marine Area 4a). The species of salmon caught also varies by area, with about half of all Chinook Salmon landed in Westport, and about three quarters of all Pink Salmon caught being landed in Neah Bay (Taylor et al., 2015). Areas of high and moderate ocean salmon fishing intensity are shown in Map 26. The coastal estuary recreational salmon fishery has also been inconsistent from 2003-2012, with a high of 33,109 fish caught in 2012. Grays Harbor accounts for about 60% of the fish caught (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Salmon recreational fisheries within three miles off the coast of Washington are managed by WDFW, with management coordinated with PFMC and co-managed with the tribes. Because of the migratory behavior of salmon, management is a complex process. FMPs are in place for salmon because some evolutionarily significant units are listed under the Endangered Species Act. Most of the Chinook Salmon caught, however, are of hatchery origin, largely from hatcheries in nearby coastal streams as well as in the Columbia River and Puget Sound. Marine recreational fishing regulations for salmon include daily limits, release rules, minimum sizes, and season dates, all of which vary by Marine Catch Area.

Bottomfish

The recreational bottomfish fishery represents the largest recreational finfish fishery by average number of fish caught annually (Table 2.4-15). The bottomfish fishery is also the second most popular recreational finfish fishery in terms of number of trips taken for targeted species for both charter boat and private boat fishing (Table 2.4-13 and Table 2.4-14, respectively). Primary targets within this fishery are rockfish and Lingcod, with Black Rockfish being the main target. Other bottomfish species targeted or kept include Cabezon, Kelp Greenling, and Pacific Cod.

While the season has been open year-round, weather typically limits fishing to March through October. Westport, Neah Bay, and La Push are the primary ports for this fishery. Westport sees the greatest amount of recreational bottomfish caught, consisting mostly of Black Rockfish, while Neah Bay has a much higher diversity of rockfish species caught, including China, Quillback, and Copper Rockfish. Westport supports most of the charter trips, and Neah Bay hosts most private vessels. The fishery has been relatively stable over time (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015). Areas of high and moderate recreational bottomfish fishing activity in the MSP Study Area are shown in Map 27.

Pacific Halibut

The recreational Pacific Halibut fishery occurs from May through September. It is a quota-limited fishery that lasts only four to five days per year in the most popular areas on the coast. The fishery has been relatively stable since 2003 (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014), with a five year average of 7,613 fish caught per year from 2007/08 to 2011/12 (Table 2.4-15). The North Coast ports of Neah Bay²⁷ and La Push accounted for about twice the number of angler trips for halibut during the 2011/12 season than along the south coast (Taylor et al., 2015). Neah Bay and La Push have also consistently had recorded the large majority of recreational halibut harvest over the past decade (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Areas of high and moderate recreational halibut fishing activity in the MSP Study Area for halibut are shown in Map 28.

Both private and charter vessels participate in this fishery, but the fishery favors larger vessels since it occurs fairly far offshore. Managers have noticed an increase in private vessels

²⁷ Neah Bay is located outside the MSP Study Area.

participating in this fishery, growing from about equal participation between private and charter vessels in 2004 and 2005, to double the number of trips made by private vessels than charter vessels in the 2013 season (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

WDFW manages its recreational fisheries by three subareas: North Coast, South Coast, and the Columbia River. The fishery is managed through quotas (based on the CSP described above under Commercial Pacific Halibut), and is monitored regularly to close or extend the fishing season as appropriate (Taylor et al., 2015).

Albacore Tuna

Albacore Tuna is a popular recreational fishery along the Washington coast during the summer and early fall when these fish migrate into the area. As with the commercial fishery, the fish tend to be available between 20 and 100 nautical miles offshore (Map 29). Albacore are caught using jigs, which are trolled behind the vessel, as well as with live bait while drifting. Albacore are targeted by both charter boats and private vessels. The average number of total Albacore trips from 2004-2013 was 4,328 (Table 2.4-13 and Table 2.4-14). Substantial increases in private boat fishing activity for Albacore occurred in 2013, with 7,056 private vessel trips. Westport and Ilwaco are the main ports for this fishery.

Razor Clams

The coastal beach-based Razor Clam fishery is an extremely popular recreational fishery along the Washington coast. Razor Clam recreational harvesting, cleaning, cooking, eating, and canning have been an important focus of family relationships and local culture in Washington State coastal communities for many generations. Between 275,000 and 460,000 seasonal digger trips result in the harvest of as many as 6.1 million clams. The fishery generates between \$25 and \$40 million in tourist-related income to the economies of the rural coastal communities along the MSP Study Area. About 70% of the fishery harvest occurs along the Long Beach and Twin Harbors areas.

Recent years (2013 and 2014) have seen a marked increase in fishery participation and clams dug. The number of clams dug is highly correlated with the number of digger trips. Razor clamming occurs along the southern Washington coast south of the Quinault Indian Reservation to the mouth of the Columbia River, and at Kalaloch²⁸ (Map 30).

Active state management of the Razor Clam fishery began in 1929 with a daily bag limit of 36 clams per person and no season. Over the years, clamming seasons have been established and daily bag limits have been adapted based on Razor Clam population assessments. Starting in 1993, governments of coastal tribes began to exercise treaty fishing rights for shellfish, and since that time Razor Clam beaches north of Point Chehalis have been co-managed through state and tribal fishery management agreements.

Openings of tribal fisheries (commercial, ceremonial, and subsistence) are timed to avoid conflicts with the state recreational fishery openers. At present, with stable populations, the state recreational season starts with the first good tide series in October with sporadic openings each month, depending on the number of harvestable clams by area, and ends in early to late May. The state (WDFW) recreational daily bag limit is 15 clams per person. Occasionally, long-term area closures of both state and tribal razor clam fisheries have occurred in response to large scale population declines or human health factors. Recently, closures have been due to increases in

²⁸ The beach at Kalaloch is located within the Olympic National Park. The recreational razor clam fishery at this beach is jointly managed by Olympic National Park and WDFW.

levels of naturally occurring marine biotoxins (caused by blooms of harmful algae), which can significantly disrupt these fisheries.

Dungeness Crab

The Dungeness Crab recreational fishery is one of the most popular in the state, but mainly occurs in Puget Sound. Relatively little activity occurs within the Study Area, with most coastal activity limited to Willapa Bay, Grays Harbor, and the Columbia River. There has been a recent increase in the number of recreational crabbers who hire charter boats to participate in the fishery prior to the opening of the commercial fishery. The recreational Dungeness Crab harvest is managed by WDFW. However, WDFW does not require reporting of recreational harvest along the coast and therefore data on landings or the number of harvest trips are unavailable.

Tribal Fisheries

The coastal tribes have been engaged in fishing throughout their history. Fishing is an integral part of the history, culture, identity, economy, and future of the coastal tribes. Each tribe participates in and relies on fishing for employment and income within their communities as well as for ceremonial and subsistence purposes. It is important to note that tribes rely on fisheries for cultural and spiritual reasons that go beyond any measurable or quantifiable value. As noted in the introduction to this section, many tribal fisheries use the same or similar techniques and deliver their catch to many of the same markets as state and federally licensed commercial fishermen. For sake of terminology however, this section refers to them as tribal or treaty fisheries to indicate that they are managed under separate authorities held by the tribes. Ceremonial and subsistence fishing are distinguished where appropriate.

The four coastal treaty tribes (the Makah, Quileute, and Hoh Tribes and the Quinault Indian Nation) are co-managers of fisheries resources with the state of Washington and/or federal agencies. Federal courts have ruled that the treaty tribes have the right to 50% of the harvestable resources passing through their respective treaty areas, generally referred to as their “usual and accustomed areas”, or U&As (*U.S. v. Washington*, 384 F. Supp. 312 (W.D. Wash. 1974), *U.S. v. Washington*, 873 F. Supp. 1422 (W.D. Wash. 1994)). The combined, adjudicated tribal fishing U&As overlap with 3,924 square nautical miles, or 67%, of the MSP Study Area. Each treaty tribe regulates the fishing activities of its members within its respective U&A in accordance with tribal law and judicially prescribed fishery management responsibilities, maintains its own fisheries management and enforcement staff, enters into management agreements with other co-managers, and engages in a wide variety of research, monitoring, restoration, and enhancement activities to protect marine resources and improve the scientific basis for resource stewardship.

The coastal treaty tribes also participate in the PFMC process, where these four tribes as well as other West Coast tribes participate within many of the subcommittees established under PFMC. One tribal seat is appointed on PFMC by the Secretary of Commerce from nominees submitted by the federally recognized tribes with recognized fishing rights in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. PFMC does not set fisheries management regulations for the tribes, as each tribe manages its own fisheries directly. Catch sharing and other management measures are negotiated with state, federal, and tribal co-managers through forums that can differ by fishery (see Section 1.6: Pacific Coast Indian Tribes and Treaty Rights). The tribal fisheries profiles

below summarize available information on fishing activities and economic impacts for each of the four coastal treaty tribes.²⁹

Makah Tribe

Fisheries are an important component of the Makah Tribe’s culture, ceremonies, subsistence, and economy. Makah tribal fisheries include 20 different fisheries based on species, gear types, and season. They include five species of salmon, groundfish, and shellfish (Table 2.4-16). The salmon gillnet fishery occurs along the shore near Cape Flattery and in the Strait of Juan de Fuca, while other fisheries occur offshore of the north coast of the Olympic Peninsula within the MSP Study Area (Taylor et al., 2015).

Table 2.4-16. Makah tribal fisheries.

Mid-water (Pacific Whiting, Yellowtail Rockfish)	Bottom trawl (cod, flatfish)
Longline (halibut, Black Cod/Sablefish)	Ocean troll (Chinook and Coho Salmon)
Summer strait (Chinook Salmon)	Winter strait (Chinook Salmon)
Drift gill net (Sockeye, Chum, and Pink Salmon)	Set gill net (Chinook Salmon)
Dive fisheries (shellfish, sea cucumber, sea urchin)	Dungeness Crab (ocean and Strait of Juan de Fuca)
River set net/hook-and-line (salmon)	Tuna
Hagfish (in development)	

Currently, about 70 tribal fishing vessels operate out of Neah Bay (Makah Fisheries Management, 2017). The estimated annual, average ex-vessel value for all Makah tribal fisheries between 2007 and 2011 was about \$6.5 million. The majority of ex-vessel value comes from the groundfish fishery. This value does not include catch by tribal fishers that was not delivered to Neah Bay. The Makah tribe also participates in the Pacific Whiting fishery, in which fish are either processed at sea or delivered to Westport. As a result, the ex-vessel values reported understate the total Makah tribal fishery ex-vessel value (Taylor et al., 2015). Makah’s participation in the whiting fishery contributes an additional estimated \$4 million in ex-vessel value, when active (Makah Fisheries Management, 2017). Combined, Makah tribal fisheries support more than 50 percent of the economy of Neah Bay (Makah Fisheries Management, 2017).

Table 2.4-17. Average Makah Tribe harvest by fishery, 2011-2015. (Makah Fisheries Management, 2017)

Fishery	Average 2011-2015 harvest (thousands of lbs.)
Salmon	425
Whiting	7,636
Groundfish	3,203
Halibut	130
Shellfish	81
Total	11,474

²⁹ Information related to fishing activity by the Shoalwater Bay Tribe is not included.

Quileute Tribe

Fishing is a mainstay of the life and economy of the Quileute Tribe; nearly every family on the Quileute Reservation has members involved in fishing. The tribe regulates its own fisheries. It sets season length, catch, and other restrictions and shares this information with other co-managers. The Dungeness Crab fishery is of particular importance to the tribe. The crab season typically begins in November and runs through October, but this can vary. The Quileute and the State negotiate agreements annually for sharing of the available harvest of crab within the Quileute U&A. In recent years “Special Management Areas” that provide exclusive access to tribal fishers for a period of time have been an important tool for co-managers.³⁰

Crab, salmon (Steelhead, Coho, and Chinook), black cod (Sablefish), and Pacific Halibut are the majority of the catch. Other species include tuna, sea cucumber, certain rockfish, and other groundfish, such as Lingcod (Table 2.4-18). The tribe has shown growing interest in Pacific Whiting, although has not fished whiting to date. The tribe has an agreement with a non-tribal processor, High Tide Seafood of Port Angeles, as a buyer for their catch in La Push. Total revenue from Quileute fisheries in 2014 was estimated at about \$1.1 million, and ranged from \$1.1 million to \$3.6 million from 2005-2014 (Taylor et al., 2015).

Table 2.4-18. Quileute tribal fisheries 2014 harvest and annual range from 2005-2014* by species (thousands of lbs.).
Source: Taylor et al. (2015).

Species	2014 Harvest	Annual range from 2005-2014 ³¹	
		Low	High
Crab	65	65	1,184
Black cod	42	7	97
Halibut	12	6	54
Groundfish	33	1	58
Chinook	66	28	66
Coho	279	120	777
Steelhead	28	21	76
Other	0	0	12
Total	525	-	-

Hoh Tribe

The Hoh Tribe is dependent economically, culturally, and spiritually upon fisheries within the tribe’s U&A, and the tribe places considerable emphasis and resources on the management and protection of its U&A fisheries. Although the tribe does not have a port or

³⁰ The specific elements of state-tribal agreements may change from year to year. WDFW issues Letters to Fishers announcing the agreed to management measures on its website before the start of each season at: http://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/commercial/crab/coastal/letters_notices.html

³¹ Data from 2010 is not included.

marina on the reservation, a high proportion of tribal members participate in, and are dependent upon, the treaty salmon fishery. No public information is available about the Hoh Tribe’s treaty harvest or ex-vessel revenues (Taylor et al., 2015).

Quinault Indian Nation

The Quinault Indian Nation regulates several tribal treaty fisheries within their usual and accustomed treaty harvest area that includes three major river systems (Queets, Quinault, and Chehalis/Humtulpis), Grays Harbor, and a large ocean area. Fisheries include gillnet for Chinook, Coho, Sockeye, Chum Salmon, Steelhead, and White Sturgeon; ocean troll for Chinook and Coho Salmon; marine fisheries for halibut, Sablefish, Lingcod, rockfish, and sardines; Dungeness Crab; and Razor Clams harvested from the beaches.

According to the Quinault Department of Fisheries, the average number of vessels to participate per year from 2004 to 2013 was 35, with 22 of those being crab vessels. The average number of treaty fishers and helpers participating per year during that period was 159. The 2004-2013 annual average ex-vessel revenues from Quinault treaty fisheries were about \$9.2 million (Table 2.4-19). Dungeness Crab represents the largest proportion of these revenues, highlighting the crab fishery’s economic importance to the tribe. Recent years have shown the highest crab fishery revenues, indicating the continued and growing importance of this fishery (Taylor et al., 2015).

Quinault continues to develop other treaty fisheries within its ocean U&A including Pacific Whiting, tuna, Hagfish, Spot Prawns, Pink Shrimp, and others.

Table 2.4-19. 2004-2013 Annual ex-vessel revenues from Quinault treaty fisheries (2014 dollars).
Source: Taylor et al. (2015).

Fishery	Total
Grays Harbor gillnet	\$654,000
Ocean salmon troll	\$71,000
Marine fish ³²	\$1,066,000
Dungeness Crab	\$6,794,000
Razor Clam	\$637,000
Total fisheries	\$9,223,000

Economic Impact of Commercial and Recreational Fishing

Commercial and recreational fisheries in the Study Area target and gain economic benefits from many of the same fish and shellfish populations. This section describes the different manners in which commercial and recreational fisheries produce those benefits, and summarizes their estimated economic contributions to the coastal and state economies. The Cascade Economics study produced these estimates (Taylor et al., 2015), which are based on

³² Combined halibut, sablefish, lingcod, rockfish, and sardine fisheries.

information from 2014. While 2014 provides a baseline that is reflective of the general magnitude of the economic contributions made by commercial and recreational fisheries in the MSP Study Area, actual economic contributions should be expected to vary from year to year. These variations result from many factors ranging from fluctuations in fish populations to changing conditions in the global economy. For a further explanation of the models used to estimate the economic contribution of MSP Study Area fisheries, please see Section 2.3: Socio-economic Setting and the Cascade Economics Report.

The Cascade Economics report was produced specifically to inform the MSP and so is the focus of this section. Other studies focusing on the coast have been produced for various purposes but are not discussed here.³³ Economic studies use data, assumptions, models, and other methods to produce estimates of economic activity. Studies that differ in data, assumptions, methods, and input data will produce different estimates. Therefore, while the Cascade Economics report provides an informative picture of how fishing contributed to economic activity in 2014, its estimates should be recognized as involving uncertainty.

“Direct” economic inputs to state and coastal economies include the revenues earned by fishing operations through the sale, barter or trade of their catch, and those earned by seafood businesses who process and facilitate transactions with restaurants, retailers, and other consumers. The money received by fishing operations for their catch is referred to as ex-vessel revenues, which are commonly used by managers to report the economic size of a fishery.

However, ex-vessel revenues are just part of the economic activity generated by a fishery, as their effect is multiplied as they move between links in the economy. For example, fishing businesses use ex-vessel revenues to purchase goods and services used in their operations and to pay income to owners and crew. Spending on things like fuel, boat repair and maintenance, gear, and supplies leads to “indirect” effects on the economy, as the businesses providing these goods and services then spend a portion of their revenues on expenses and income. A third type of effect, called “induced” effects, happens as owners and employees from fishing business and supporting industries spend their disposable income throughout the economy.

Seafood buyers and processors are the next direct link in the economic chain. Some fishing operations sell their catch directly to the public at the dock, and some processing businesses own and run their own fishing vessels. However, most fishing operations landing in the state sell their catch to a seafood processing or distribution business. Fish and shellfish from

³³ Additional economic baseline studies include but are not limited to:

- Butler, K., Fryday, C., Gordon, M., Ho, Y., McKinney, S., Wallner, M., & Watts, E. (2013). Washington’s working coast: An analysis of the Washington Pacific coast marine resource-based economy (Keystone Project). University of Washington Environmental Management Certificate Program. Available at: http://media.wix.com/ugd/e2eea5_7a4796fc90c3f86ff0ae22e675bd6b55.pdf
- Radtke, H. (2011). Washington State Commercial Fishing Industry Total Economic Contribution. Prepared for Seattle Marine Business Coalition. Available at: <http://www.philippublishing.com/smbc/attachments/SMBC%20Washington%20Total%20Commercial%20Fisheries%204.pdf>.
- Martin Associates (2014). The 2013 Economic Impact of the Port of Grays Harbor. Prepared for the Port of Grays Harbor. Available at: http://www.portofgraysharbor.com/downloads/reports/Grays_Harbor_Economic_Report.pdf.
- Resource Dimensions (2015). Economic Impacts of Crude Oil Transport on the Quinault Indian Nation and the Local Economy. Available at: <http://www.fogh.org/pdf/QIN-Economic-Study.pdf>.
- Resource Dimensions (2015). Economic Impacts of Crude Oil Transport on the Grays Harbor Economy. Available at: http://www.fogh.org/pdf/FOGH_Economic_Impacts_Crude_Oil_Transport.pdf.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015). Fisheries of the United States 2014 (Current Fishery Statistics No. 2014). Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Available at: <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/Assets/commercial/fus/fus14/documents/FUS2014.pdf>.

the MSP Study Area are sold into a diverse set of markets. They are sold for uses including direct human consumption at restaurants and retail stores, pet food, fertilizer and feed in various agriculture and aquaculture operations worldwide, and more. These markets are what give commercial value to the fish and shellfish and are the source of the ex-vessel revenues seafood businesses pay to fishing operations.

On top of paying ex-vessel revenues, the businesses first receiving fish and shellfish landings create other indirect and induced effects. The degree to which these effects contribute to the state and coastal economies varies, as a dollar of ex-vessel revenue can translate to a much different total economic contribution depending on various factors. For instance, some catch goes to large processing facilities located in port that provide substantial employment opportunity to local residents. Other catch requires minimal labor to prepare for market, and so supports few jobs and may have a lower total economic contribution. As another example, some landings are transferred from the fishing vessel straight onto a truck and quickly transported to a processing facility in Oregon. The economic contribution of this landing could be of equal size to the first example, but much of it would “leak” from the state’s economy and be less beneficial to Washington coastal counties. However, the reverse also happens with some landings of seafood in Oregon that are transported to Washington for processing.

Using their model of the economic linkages³⁴ outlined above, Cascade Economics estimated that in 2014, commercial fishing and primary seafood processing had a total economic contribution of 1,820 jobs and \$77.2 million in labor income in the coastal counties (Table 2.4-15) and 2,830 jobs and \$117.0 million statewide (Table 2.4-21). This total economic contribution is based on over 129 million lbs. of fish and shellfish and \$93 million in ex-vessel revenues reported to WDFW in 2014. Note that depending on the data and methodology used, estimates of total economic contribution from fishing activity may vary between studies.³⁵

While these estimates capture a core portion of economic activity related to Washington’s commercial seafood industry, they are not intended to be comprehensive. For instance, the estimates do not include the effects of secondary processing activities (e.g. fish oil or fishmeal produced as byproducts of primary processing) or the effects from the additional distribution and retailing of the seafood landed in the coastal counties. They also do not include activities related to imports or fish caught in Alaska. In addition, the estimates do not cover catch from the Study Area that are landed into Oregon or Puget Sound, or the harvesting and processing activities of the Puget Sound-based at-sea whiting sector. While no estimate was made for landings into Oregon, Cascade Economics estimated that Puget Sound landings contributed an additional \$2.3 million in income and approximately 60 jobs in the coastal counties, with an additional \$8.2 million in income and approximately 190 jobs statewide. They also estimate that the Puget Sound based at-sea whiting processing vessels contribute an additional 220 jobs and \$15.8 million in labor income to the state.

Lastly, Washington’s commercial fishing and seafood industries have strong ties to the fisheries of Alaska as well as to fish and shellfish imported from elsewhere. Additional information about the economic linkages between Washington’s fishing communities and commercial fishing in other areas can be found in the Cascade Economics report (Taylor et al., 2015).

³⁴ Cascade Economics derived economic multipliers using IMPLAN models based on 2012 regional economic data.

³⁵ See list of additional studies in footnote 26.

Table 2.4-20. Total contributions to the five-county³⁶ coastal region economy from 2014 Washington coast non-tribal commercial fishing and seafood processing by county of the activity. Source: Taylor et al. (2015).

	Coast-wide	Clallam County	Grays Harbor County	Pacific County	Wahkiakum County
Income (\$ mil.)	77.2	2.3	50.3	23.7	0.9
Jobs	1,820	70	1,080	610	60

Table 2.4-21. Total contribution to the State of Washington economy from 2014 Washington coast non-tribal commercial fishing and seafood processing by county of the activity. Source: Taylor et al. (2015)

	Coast-wide	Clallam County	Grays Harbor County	Pacific County	Wahkiakum County
Income (\$ mil.)	117.0	3.4	75.8	36.6	1.2
Jobs	2,830	120	1,700	950	60

In contrast to commercial fishing, recreational fishing is conducted for sport, enjoyment, or personal use, and state law prohibits anglers from selling their catch. The willingness of anglers to spend income to make fishing trips in the Study Area provides the direct economic input to coastal and state economies. These “trip related expenditures” on things like fuel for vehicles and boats, fishing gear and supplies, lodging, food at grocery stores and restaurants, bait, charter boat fees, and more also produce indirect and induced economic benefits. Revenues earned by businesses that provide goods and services to anglers and the income earned by owners and employees of these businesses are spent throughout the economy.

Recreational trip related expenditures provide another example of how the location of spending affects where economic benefits are received. Anglers traveling into coastal areas from elsewhere produce extra benefit by injecting new money into the local economy. On the other hand, anglers may make a significant portion of the trip-related expenditures at home, benefitting the economy there instead of the coastal economy.

The charter boat industry is a distinct portion of the recreational fishing sector. Owners and crew receive trip related expenditures in the form of fees and tips that anglers pay when taking trips aboard charter vessels. Because 100 percent of charter boat owners and crew reside in the coastal counties, a relatively high proportion of their spending is thought to remain in and benefit the coastal economy (Taylor et al., 2015).

Using 2014 as a baseline, Cascade Economics estimated that anglers taking trips to fish in the MSP Study Area made \$30.4 million in trip related expenditures in the coastal area and \$40.9 million statewide (Table 2.4-22). This spending translates to an overall economic contribution of 325 jobs and \$17.3 million in labor income within the coastal economy and 596 jobs and \$32.3 million statewide (Table 2.4-23). Labor income includes money and benefits paid to employees as well as the earnings of owners and the self-employed. It is of note that these estimates do not include purchases of equipment or durable goods such as fishing boats, boat trailers, or the vehicles needed to haul them. Such purchases certainly increase recreational

³⁶ There were no non-tribal commercial fisheries landings recorded in Jefferson County in 2014.

fishing's economic contribution to the state and coastal economies, but Cascade Economics reports that they are very difficult to estimate accurately.

Table 2.4-22. Trip-related expenditures associated with ocean sportfishing trips in 2014 from charter vessels, private vessels, and shore and jetty fishing in the Washington coastal region (2014 dollars). Source: Taylor et al. (2015).

	MSP Study Area / Coastal Spending	Spending Elsewhere in WA	Total Spending in WA
Charter vessels	\$15,770,540	\$3,865,590	\$19,636,130
Private Vessels	\$14,416,219	\$6,416,963	\$20,833,182
Shore and Jetty	\$256,964	\$160,641	\$417,606
Total	\$30,443,723	\$10,443,194	\$40,886,917

Table 2.4-23. Contribution of trip-related angler expenditures in the MSP Study Area/Coastal Area to coastal area and statewide employment and labor income. Source: Taylor et al. (2015).

	MSP Study Area / Coastal Area	Statewide
Contribution to Employment	325	596
Contribution to Labor Income	\$17,327,751	\$32,338,444

Related Infrastructure

Ports and marinas

The state's fishing industry operates from several ports located adjacent to the Study Area as well as in the Strait of Juan de Fuca and in Puget Sound. These ports provide infrastructure like moorage and access (e.g. boat ramps) for commercial and recreational fishing vessels. They also provide gear and boat maintenance opportunities and are the site of fish buying and processing activities. Below are brief descriptions of commercial and recreational fishing activity by port to highlight key coastal locations and communities connected to fishing. Tribal fisheries are not included in the statistics reported in this section but they do operate out of many of the same ports and depend on the same infrastructure. A map of MSP Study Area ports and adjacent ports is provided in Map 31. Additional discussion of Ports is in Section 2.7: Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure.

Clallam County ports

Neah Bay

Neah Bay is the largest commercial fishing port in Clallam County and is also home to the fishing fleet of the Makah Tribe, who own the fishing dock. It has had the greatest buyer participation, vessel participation, and landed ex-vessel revenues in the county for most years. Recently (2010-2014), there have been about seven buyers and 40 vessels operating out of Neah Bay. Total ex-vessel revenues from landings in the port in 2014 were about \$1.1 million, the fourth largest in terms of ex-vessel revenues landed in Washington coastal ports.

Neah Bay also serves as an important marina for recreational fishing. On average over 3,000 charter boat trips were taken from Neah Bay annually during 2004-2013. Almost 30,000 trips were taken annually by private vessels during that same time period, on average (Table 2.4-12). Neah Bay serves as the primary private boat marina supporting the greatest average number of annual private vessel trips along the Washington outer coast. Salmon, Pacific Halibut, and bottomfish are popular targets from this marina (Taylor et al., 2015).

La Push

The port in La Push is owned and operated by the Quileute Tribe, but the port also supports non-tribal commercial and recreational fisheries. The port has a seafood processing plant onsite. Data confidentiality limits the reporting of non-tribal fishing into La Push for some years. Recent available data indicate that about six buyers and 33 vessels operate in the port. Total ex-vessel revenues from landings in the port for 2014 were about \$0.9 million, the fifth largest in terms of revenue landed on the Washington coast. About 1,600 recreational trips originated from La Push in 2014, with an average of 1,144 charter boat trips per year from 2004-2013. The annual average number of private vessel trips from La Push was about 7,051 during that same period (Table 2.4-12). Recreational fishing trips target bottomfish, salmon, Pacific Halibut, and tuna (Taylor et al., 2015).

Jefferson County ports

There have been no non-tribal commercial fisheries landings recorded in Jefferson County ports along the outer Washington coast since 2007. In previous years, fewer than three buyers and fewer than six vessels were operating there (Taylor et al., 2015).

Grays Harbor County ports

Westport

Westport is the largest commercial fishing port on the Washington coast in terms of number of buyers, number of vessels, and total ex-vessel revenues generated from landings. Approximately 30 buyers and 300 commercial vessels have been operating in the port in recent years. Total ex-vessel revenues for landings in 2014 were \$59.7 million, more than twice the value of the next largest port on the Washington coast (Taylor et al., 2015). Westport also ranks among the most important commercial fishing ports in country. Considering landings for 2014, Westport was ranked 13th by landed weight (100 million lbs.) and 14th by landed value (\$64 million) for commercial ports in the United States (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015).

Westport is also the most popular port for recreational charter fishing on the Washington coast. About 35 recreational charters operated from the port recently, fishing for salmon, groundfish, Pacific Halibut, and tuna. About 38,500 charter angler trips were taken from Westport in 2014, with an annual average of 32,695 trips during 2004-2013. Approximately 20,020 average annual private vessel trips were taken during that same period (Table 2.4-12) (Taylor et al., 2015).

Pacific County ports

Willapa Bay

In recent years, about 10 buyers and more than 100 vessels have been operating out of Willapa Bay ports. The main ports within Willapa Bay include South Bend and Tokeland. Total ex-vessel revenues from commercial landings in 2014 were about \$4.8 million, the third largest in terms of value on the Washington coast. Salmon is the primary target for commercial

fisheries, although anchovies and crab are also fished in Willapa Bay (Taylor et al., 2015). Willapa Bay ports also support recreational fishing within the estuary.

Ilwaco and Chinook

Ilwaco is the largest port in Pacific County and the second largest commercial fishing port on the Washington coast in terms of number of buyers, number of vessels, and total ex-vessel revenues generated. About 13 buyers and more than 200 vessels have been operating in the port in recent years. In 2014, total ex-vessel revenues paid for landings were \$24.3 million, more than five times greater than the amount recorded in the next largest port, Willapa Bay (Taylor et al., 2015). The Ilwaco/Chinook port areas also rank among the most important commercial fishing ports in country. Based on landings in 2014, Ilwaco/Chinook ranked 35th by landed weight (27 million lbs. average) and 49th by landed value (\$25 million) for commercial ports in the United States (National Marine Fisheries Service, 2015). Commercial fisheries landing in Ilwaco/Chinook primarily target groundfish, salmon, Dungeness Crab, Albacore Tuna, and shrimp.

Popular recreational fisheries operating from the Ilwaco/Chinook area target salmon, Albacore Tuna and sturgeon. In Chinook, all charter boat trips ceased in 2009 while the average annual number of trips for private vessels out of Chinook was 15,416 (Table 2.4-12). In Ilwaco, 10,171 charter boat trips were made per year on average between 2004 and 2013, with 26,181 private vessel trips made per year on average during that same time period (Table 2.4-12) (Taylor et al., 2015).

Data confidentiality restricts the availability of fisheries data for other Pacific County ports. In recent years, about 11 vessels were making landings in other Pacific County ports along the coast, and as many as 17 vessels were landing in ports along the Columbia River (Taylor et al., 2015).

Wahkiakum County ports

A total of 72 vessels made landings in Wahkiakum County ports in 2014, with nearly \$1 million in ex-vessel revenue. Between five and eight buyers were operating in these ports in recent years. Data from individual ports within the county were not available. Wahkiakum County ports deal almost exclusively with salmon landings (Taylor et al., 2015).

Future Trends

Future trends within the commercial and recreational fishery industries are difficult to predict. Several factors can significantly influence the participation and economics of these industries. While no predictions can be made for certain, primary factors are summarized below to provide insight into the future trends and challenges of these industries.

Barriers to Participation in the Commercial Fishing Industry

Initial entry into the commercial fishing industry can be quite costly. For example, the sector analysis completed by Industrial Economics, Inc. (2014) cited that between purchasing a crabbing vessel, permits, and gear, it could cost around \$250,000 to \$1 million to enter the Dungeness Crab fishery. The younger fishing generation typically does not have access to this amount of money.

In addition to the high initial costs to enter a fishery, the current trend of participating in multiple fisheries also means additional initial costs to obtain permits and gear types for each fishery. While a diverse portfolio increases the opportunities to earn income throughout the year, it also requires more money to be paid or borrowed before any actual fishing takes place, increasing risk. These financial barriers to entry and participation can create uncertainty around the future of fishing industries, particularly for locally-based fishermen (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

Regulatory Uncertainty: Commercial Fishing and Recreational Fishing

Fisheries are a highly regulated industry and the primary management aim of long-term sustainability can sometimes be at odds with economic interests in the short term. Estimates of sustainable catch levels can be highly variable because of uncertainty in estimates and real fluctuations in the size of fish and shellfish populations, even in the best monitored fisheries. Catch rates and fishing effort can be likewise variable.

All in all, this variability and uncertainty makes it difficult for commercial and recreational fishing industries to make long-term business plans or even to rely on the forecasts for any given year. For example, if catch in-season reaches the quota for a limiting species like Yelloweye Rockfish, emergency closure of the groundfish fisheries could occur, which would cut the season short and cause economic losses. Another example is the quota-based recreational Pacific Halibut fishery, which concentrates the fishing season in some areas to a handful of days. Yet, the season may be extended for additional days if the quota is not caught. Under such circumstances, it is difficult for recreational charters and the supporting hotels, restaurants, and other businesses that cater to recreational fishermen to prepare for the influx of Pacific Halibut anglers (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

Other examples of how regulations impact fisheries were noted above. For instance, the salmon, Dungeness Crab, and groundfish bottom trawl fisheries all saw major declines from historic highs in the 1980s and 1990s. Legal and regulatory changes were the major causes of these declines. Looking ahead, some degree of uncertainty in fisheries management and available quotas will be unavoidable given natural fluctuations in fish populations and uncertainty in stock assessments. This uncertainty is expected to continue affecting fishers and processors who may be considering making capital investments (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

Environmental Factors

As living, natural resources, fisheries are influenced by environmental conditions, which are frequently outside of human control. As noted in the previous section, natural variability in ocean conditions influences stocks from year to year and from fishery to fishery. A warming climate and changing water temperatures may influence fish stocks and fishery seasons, especially for species such as Albacore Tuna, salmon, Dungeness Crab, Pacific Whiting, and Pacific Sardine. Although many species may be forced out of the area by warming ocean temperatures, other species may expand their range and open new opportunities for fisheries.

Ocean acidification may also affect fisheries. Studies are currently investigating the impact of increased ocean acidity on juvenile Dungeness Crab and several other types of fish and shellfish. Concerns also surround ocean acidification's effect on important food sources for salmon (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

Harmful algal blooms (HABs) also influence resource availability. Closures of Razor Clam beaches to protect human health due to HABs have a significant impact on recreational clamming and on the coastal communities supporting the tourism that accompanies razor clamming trips. Recently, HABs have closed both recreational and commercial shellfish fisheries. In May of 2015, an extremely large HAB event occurred that affected the entire west coast of the U.S. In Washington, all Razor Clam fisheries closed in May and most beaches did not reopen until sometime between late December 2015 and mid-February 2016. In early June, the southern half of the Washington coast (including the Columbia River and Willapa Bay) was closed to all Dungeness Crab fishing, followed in early August by a closure of a substantial portion of the northern half of the Washington coast (including Grays Harbor). Most of this area remained closed to crabbing through September, the normal end of the commercial season. Current speculations suggest that HABs may increase in the future as oceans warm and ocean acidity increases (Feely, Klinger, Newton, & Chadsey, 2012; Moore, Mantua, Hickey, & Trainer, 2010), potentially leading to more frequent Razor Clam and other shellfish closures.

Salmon Production and Survival

Salmon represent one of the most culturally and economically important fishery species in both the commercial and recreational sectors. However, many factors influence the salmon fishery including: oceanic conditions (which influence ocean survivability, spawning runs, and prey availability), predators (such as California sea lions at the foot of dams and Caspian terns on artificial islands), reductions in hatchery programs, habitat loss, fragmentation, pollution, and overfishing. Due to the complex nature of salmon life histories, as well as human history with salmon, the future of this fishery will likely continue to be dynamic and unpredictable (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

Seafood Markets

World markets can have a profound effect on the supply, demand, and distribution of seafood products. Exchange rates, political events, and overseas demand can influence demand for those Washington seafood products that rely on foreign markets. Some of these market forces can significantly influence profitability almost overnight. Overseas markets for Sablefish and Dungeness Crab are particularly influential. Market volatility will likely continue to be a source of uncertainty in the commercial fishing economy (Taylor et al., 2015).

Oil Spills

Oil spills from marine traffic could potentially affect multiple fisheries for significant periods of time. The anticipated increase in oil tanker traffic along the coast and over the dangerous Columbia River bar has led to stakeholder concerns about the risks of an oil spill to commercial, recreational, and tribal fisheries and how quickly they could recover from such an event (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

Vessel Safety

Fishery representatives have voiced concerns over the safety of fishermen operating in restricted spaces with high competition. This is of particular concern in the Dungeness Crab industry, where the first part of the season is marked with highly competitive, derby-style fishing. The pressure to catch as much crab as quickly as possible can lead to dangerous conditions. Individuals within the fishing industries have expressed great concern that further restrictions in fishing grounds will exacerbate safety issues and may increase fatality rates (Taylor et al., 2015).

Summary

In summary, there are many factors influencing the commercial and recreational fisheries of the Washington coast which cause significant uncertainty when forecasting future trends. What is certain, however, is the importance of this industry to the economy and social identity of the coastal communities adjacent to the MSP Study Area, and to the state of Washington. To coastal residents, losses within these fishing sectors could mean a loss of jobs, income, and a cultural way of life, for both non-tribal and tribal residents. Fisheries stakeholders are concerned about further space restrictions from new ocean uses within the MSP Study Area and what this would mean for their industry (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Uncertainty over future management decisions, allocation issues between user groups, the potential for future spatial displacement, and restricted access to marine space causes additional uncertainty, clouds investment and entry decisions and adds additional barriers to future participants.

References

- Feely, R., Klinger, T., Newton, J. A., & Chadsey, M. (eds). (2012). *Scientific summary of ocean acidification in Washington state marine waters* (NOAA OAR Special Report). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of Ocean of Atmospheric Research. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1201016.pdf>. [Source type 11].
- Industrial Economics Inc. (2014). *Marine sector analysis report: Non-tribal fishing* (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/FishingSectorAnalysis.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Jepson, M., & Colburn, L. L. (2013). *Development of social indicators of fishing community vulnerability and resilience in the U.S. Southeast and Northeast regions* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-129). U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service. Retrieved from [Source type 11]
- Kearney, M. S., Harris, B. H., Hershbein, B., Boddy, D., Parker, L., & Di Lucido, K. (2014). *What's the catch? Challenges and opportunities of the U.S. fishing industry* (Policy Brief). Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute. Retrieved from http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/papers/2014/09/challenges-and-opportunities-of-us-fishing-industry/challenges_opportunities_fishing_industry_policybrief.pdf [Source type 11].
- Makah Fisheries Management. (2017). *Data on Makah tribal fisheries. Unpublished raw data.* Neah Bay, WA. [Source type 9].
- Moore, S. K., Mantua, N. J., Hickey, B. M., & Trainer, V. L. (2010). The relative influences of El Nino-Southern Oscillation and Pacific Decadal Oscillation on paralytic shellfish toxin accumulation in Pacific Northwest shellfish. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 55(6), 2262–2274. <https://doi.org/doi:10.4319/lo.2010.55.6.2262> [Source type 1].
- National Marine Fisheries Service. (2015). *Fisheries of the United States 2014* (Current Fishery Statistics No. 2014). Silver Spring, MD: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.st.nmfs.noaa.gov/Assets/commercial/fus/fus14/documents/FUS2014.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Pacific Fishery Management Council. (2017). *2017 Pacific halibut catch sharing plan for Area 2A*. Retrieved from http://www.pcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Final_2017_PACIFIC_HALIBUT_CATCH_SHARING_PLAN_FOR_AREA_2A.pdf [Source type 7].
- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). *Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington*. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_small.pdf [Source type 11].
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2016). Fishing and shellfishing: Regulations and seasons. Retrieved August 4, 2016, from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/regulations/> [Source type 7].
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2017). *Methods and Sources for Marine Spatial Planning Fisheries Maps*. (Unpublished Report.).

2.5 Aquaculture

Aquaculture is a major use within the large coastal estuaries of the MSP Study Area. The shellfish aquaculture industry provides income and jobs to the region and the state, promotes environmental monitoring in the estuaries, and is a key part of the cultural history and identity in Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties.¹ As a state, Washington ranks first in shellfish aquaculture sales in the nation, with Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties producing a substantial portion (about 29% in 2012) of the state's mollusk sales (United States Department of Agriculture, 2014). The industry has a long history within the region and has adapted to several challenges to sustain and thrive. Current challenges such as invasive and nuisance species management, regulatory complexities, and climate change will continue to influence the future of aquaculture.

This section summarizes the history and current use, economic impacts, related infrastructure, and future trends of shellfish aquaculture in the MSP Study Area.

Summary of History and Current Use

Marine aquaculture is one of the oldest industries in the state of Washington and includes a variety of shellfish species, marine plants, and net-pen-raised salmon. Washington is currently a leader in shellfish aquaculture production in the United States. The U.S. Census of Aquaculture from 2013 ranks Washington first in value of sales of farmed mollusks (\$149.3 million) accounting for 45% of the value of U.S. farmed mollusk production (United States Department of Agriculture, 2014).

Aquaculture in the MSP Study Area consists exclusively of shellfish culture and occurs primarily in Willapa Bay (Pacific County) and to a lesser extent in Grays Harbor (Grays Harbor County). Nearly all the shellfish farms are family-owned businesses, ranging from small “mom and pop” operations to larger, vertically-integrated farms with many thousands of acres. The communities of South Bend and Nahcotta on Willapa Bay are the primary centers for aquaculture activity (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

In 1895, Washington passed the Bush Act and the Callow Act which allowed for the sale of state-owned tidelands into private ownership for shellfish cultivation. Under the Bush and Callow Acts, 7,054 acres in Grays Harbor and 25,511 acres in Willapa Bay were sold into private ownership (Washington State Department of Natural Resources, 2017b). Aquatic lands that were retained by the state may be available for lease. Currently, approximately 21,000 acres of state-owned aquatic lands are under lease for aquaculture throughout the state, with around 80% being used for commercial oyster cultivation (Washington State Department of Natural Resources, 2017a). The state also established oyster reserves in 1890, of which there are currently about 10,873 acres with the majority located in Willapa Bay (Dumbauld, Kauffman, Trimble, & Ruesink, 2011). The reserves were retained in the public domain to provide seed and an exploitable stock of oysters.

Native Olympia Oysters (*Ostrea lurida*) originally dominated Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor. Willapa Bay had a large industry based on the harvest of the Olympia Oyster, but by 1920 it had almost completely ceased. The first trade in oysters from Willapa Bay to San Francisco via schooner began in 1850 (Blake & Zu Ermgassen, 2015). Natural intertidal oyster beds were harvested by hand and transported to culling stations at higher tidal elevations where

¹ Shellfish aquaculture is also important to the coastal tribes for sustaining cultural and subsistence uses and providing commercial opportunities. Tribal shellfish aquaculture activities are not discussed in this section.

they were sorted. The remaining shells and undersized oysters were deposited onsite rather than being returned to the natural beds, which then hindered recruitment. There were also severe losses of bedded oysters due to freezing weather. This continued to occur throughout the late 1800s along with increased spatial competition from eelgrass. In 1899 the state authorized dredging for oysters, which allowed the harvest of deeper subtidal beds (Blake & Zu Ermgassen, 2015).

As a result of these factors, stocks have been depleted and there has been only occasional trade in Olympia Oysters since 1913. Production has shifted to the Pacific Oyster (Blake & Zu Ermgassen, 2015). Although harvest pressure has been negligible for over 80 years, Olympia Oysters have been unable to recover to their former population levels and status in Willapa Bay (Trimble, Ruesink, & Dumbauld, 2009). There are many potential contributing factors to this inability to recover, including increased mortality from exposure to air, competition from fouling organisms, recruitment preference for Pacific Oyster reefs (Trimble et al., 2009), and spatial competition from eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) (Blake & Zu Ermgassen, 2015).

Pacific Oyster (*Crassostrea gigas*) spat was transplanted from Japan starting in 1928. As importation of Pacific Oyster seed continued, the Pacific Oysters began to spawn naturally in Willapa Bay, but not at rates capable of fully supporting the industry. Imports continued until the mid-1970s when hatchery technology began to successfully produce Pacific Oyster larvae, providing a more stable seed production method. A thriving oyster industry has existed in the region ever since. Pacific Oysters have naturalized in Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay, yet hatchery production has been necessary to ensure stable aquaculture production and supply (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Beginning in the mid-2000s, hatcheries in the Pacific Northwest began to experience production failures. An increase in the acidity of coastal waters due to climate change is identified as the likely cause, and hatcheries have had to adapt their practices to address the increased acidity in local coastal waters (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012).

Invasive and noxious species have also shaped estuary management and the shellfish industry. Most notable was the extensive infestation of the non-native cordgrass species *Spartina alterniflora* and *S. densiflora*. *S. alterniflora* was unintentionally introduced to Willapa Bay during the late 1800s. By 2003, it had spread to over 8,500 solid acres within Willapa Bay. *S. alterniflora* has been present in Grays Harbor since the early 1990s and *S. densiflora* was discovered in Grays Harbor in 2001. *Spartina* is an aggressive plant that disrupts estuary ecosystems by outcompeting native vegetation and converting mudflats into *Spartina* meadows. This impacts shellfish beds, as well as migratory bird habitats (Washington State Department of Agriculture, 2015).

An extensive effort led by the Washington State Department of Agriculture (WSDA) in partnership with the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR), the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), local governments, tribes, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and private landowners has been extremely successful at the reduction and control of *Spartina*. Control methods include herbicide application and manual removal. In Pacific County (Willapa Bay) only 0.9 solid acres of *S. alterniflora* were reported in 2014, a 99.9% reduction since the peak in 2003. In order to maintain the program and prevent a resurgence of *Spartina* along the coast, resources continue to be dedicated to this purpose and surveys and removal treatments are ongoing (Washington State Department of Agriculture, 2015).

Burrowing shrimp (*Neotrypaea californiensis* and *Upogebia pugettensis*) have also been a nuisance species to the aquaculture industry in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor. These shrimp are native to Washington, but populations have grown drastically starting in the 1940s and 1950s. Burrowing shrimp destabilize the sediment, and cause beds to become too soft to support oysters and aquaculture equipment. This has a dramatic economic influence on the aquaculture industry.

The pesticide carbaryl has been used to control burrowing shrimp since the 1960s, yet was recently phased out of use. An integrated pest management plan has been in place for several years to develop cost-effective and environmentally acceptable methods of controlling burrowing shrimp (Booth, 2007). Some growers are pursuing the use of an alternative pesticide, imidacloprid, to replace carbaryl and effectively control the expansive populations of burrowing shrimp. Managing these species will continue to be a major challenge for the industry in the future (Taylor, Baker, Waters, Wegge, & Wellman, 2015; Washington State Department of Ecology, 2014).

The aquaculture industry is currently enjoying strong demand for its products. These products primarily include oysters and Manila Clams. According to WDFW data for 2013, Pacific Oysters account for about 82% of the shellfish farmed and harvested in Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties. Manila Clams account for about 16% of harvest. Small amounts of Eastern Oysters, Kumamoto Oysters, and Blue and Bay Mussels are also produced (Figure 2.5-1). By value, Pacific Oysters accounted for approximately 83% of the relative value for shellfish in Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties, with Manila Clams accounting for about 11% (Figure 2.5-22.5-2) (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Pacific County produces more shellfish than Grays Harbor County. Harvest and value have varied over time (Table 2.5-1). Production data suggest that over the past 10 years, there has been a general decrease in Pacific Oyster harvest² and a general increase in Manila Clam harvest (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Due to challenges associated with accurate and comprehensive reporting within the industry, WDFW recognizes that these numbers may underrepresent actual harvest. While WDFW data may not reflect true production values, they are currently the best available data for illustrating aquaculture production status and trends (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

² The reduction in oyster production is likely tied to the reduced number of oysters naturally reproducing in Willapa Bay. Most companies have traditionally relied on a combination of natural- and hatchery-produced oyster seed. A reduction in natural oyster sets in Willapa Bay since the mid-2000s is now affecting the overall oyster seed supply (B. Sheldon, personal communication, May 26, 2016).




Figure 2.5-1. Relative harvest (round lbs.) of farmed shellfish products in Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties, 2013.
 Source: Industrial Economics (2014).




Figure 2.5-2. Relative value (dollars) of farmed shellfish products in Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties, 2013.
 Source: Industrial Economics (2014).

Table 2.5-1. High and low values for harvest (round lbs.) and value (2014 \$) of Pacific Oyster and Manila Clam aquaculture in Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties, 2004-2013. Source: Industrial Economics (2014).

Species	Gray Harbor County		Pacific County		Total	
	Harvest (lbs.)	Value	Harvest (lbs.)	Value	Harvest (lbs.)	Value
Pacific Oyster	1,030,586-	\$3,519,614	4,276,566-	\$11,194,059	5,842,470-	\$16,381,505-
	1,804,434	-	6,803,533	-	8,274,431	\$21,494,323
		\$6,134,273		\$16,707,209		
Manila Clams	0-9,034	\$0-\$24,983	704,446-	\$1,419,160-	704,529-	\$1,419,160-
			1,187,787	\$2,638,361	1,196,821	\$2,638,361

Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor make a considerable contribution to state and national aquaculture production. According to the USDA, Pacific County ranked 3rd among all Washington counties and 15th among all U.S. counties in aquaculture sales in 2012. Grays Harbor ranked 7th statewide, and 43rd nationally. For mollusk production specifically, Pacific County and Grays Harbor County ranked 2nd and 4th, respectively, statewide in 2012. Pacific County produced about 23% of state farmed mollusk sales, and Grays Harbor County produced about 6% of state sales³ (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Reporting challenges make it difficult to derive consistent, representative participation numbers in the aquaculture sector. The Willapa Grays Harbor Oyster Growers Association (WGHOGA) reports that in 2014, 28 growers were members in Willapa Bay and 7 growers were members in Grays Harbor. Numbers of farms can fluctuate on a regular basis and are not always consistent with WDFW estimates, which reported 20 farms in Willapa Bay and 6 farms in Grays Harbor in 2012. These inconsistencies are due to small operations or frequent changes that may not be reflected in WDFW reported numbers (Taylor et al., 2015).

Another way to measure participation is through tideland leases. All reported shellfish farms operate on privately owned tidelands or on tidelands that are owned by the state and leased through DNR to growers. DNR reports that in 2015, approximately 50 leases were held for shellfish farming in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor (DNR personal communication, December 18, 2015). The Washington Department of Health (DOH) also tracks the number of harvester and dealer licenses for commercial shellfish, as well as the number of certified harvest sites for the shellfish industry.

Shellfish aquaculture is an extensive spatial use of privately and publicly owned tidelands in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor. Commercially farmed acreage for aquaculture is estimated to total between 2,288 to 3,278 acres in Gray Harbor and 14,681 to 17,288 acres in Willapa Bay. This represents approximately 66% to 80% of the total acreage for shellfish aquaculture in the state.⁴ There is significant uncertainty about the actual number of acres in aquaculture production, because acreage is continuously rotated and some portions of tracts may go unused from year to year. Growers report that they typically farm between one-half and two-thirds of the acreage they own or lease (Taylor et al., 2015).

In addition to privately owned and DNR leased lands, WDFW manages about 10,000 acres of intertidal and subtidal land as oyster reserves in Willapa Bay. About 1,000 acres of these reserves are currently used for oyster production and allow licensed individuals to harvest

³ County and growing area aquaculture production and sales amounts vary annually, and therefore so do relative rankings and percentages. Also, data discrepancies between WDFW, USDA, and industry sources may lead to variation in sales and production numbers between reports.

⁴ Estimate ranges are based on WDFW data compared with grower survey data.

naturally occurring oysters (WDFW personal communication, May 23, 2016). Spatial use of the estuaries by the shellfish aquaculture industry is represented in Map 32.

Oyster production can be accomplished using natural (a.k.a. wild or natural set) or artificial cultivation. In a natural set, naturally recruited oysters settle onto tidelands covered with oyster shells. Artificial cultivation requires the purchase or growth of oyster larvae, which are placed in upland tanks. Tanks contain warmed water and are filled with bags of oyster shells onto which the larvae settle. After five to ten days, the shells with the settled larvae (a.k.a. “spat”) are removed and placed into a nursery area. They are then moved to a “grow-out ground” within the estuary, then transported again to a “fattening bed” where they mature and grow until reaching harvest size (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). The vast majority (approximately 95%) of oysters cultured in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor use bottom culture methods, though some oysters are cultured using off-bottom techniques such as longlines, flip bags, and racks and bags. 100% of Manila Clam crops rely on bottom culture techniques. (B. Sheldon, personal communication, May 26, 2016).

Oysters are sold in-shell or processed by shucking. Oysters for shucking are sent to shucking houses, where the meat is removed and packaged for sale. Shucked meat can also be used for smoked oysters. Oysters sold in-shell are generally purchased for cooking (e.g. on the grill) or to be eaten raw on the half shell (aka “shellstock”). Generally, large oysters are sent to Asia, medium and small oysters stay in the U.S., and extra small oysters are sent to local oyster bars on the West Coast. Demand for in-shell oysters is increasing, and some farms are expanding their in-shell production (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Clams are typically cleaned and bagged by the pound and sold to wholesalers or retail outlets. Some companies are vertically integrated, meaning they farm, process, and distribute their product as well as provide a retail market. Other farms rely on separate processing facilities and distributors to move their product (Taylor et al., 2015).

The aquaculture sector makes significant contributions to social, cultural, and environmental systems. Ecologically, oyster beds are important biogenic habitat. They form complex structures that provide refuge and hard substrate for marine plants and animals, enhancing biodiversity. Shellfish in the estuaries provide important nursery habitat for commercially and recreationally important species, such as fish, crab, and others. Research also suggests that shellfish provide environmental services, such as water quality improvement through nitrogen removal (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011; Taylor et al., 2015).

Shellfish aquaculture can also bring water quality impairments to the attention of local communities. Because of stringent U.S. health standards set by the National Shellfish Sanitation Program for water in which shellfish fisheries and aquaculture operate, these coastal areas often have amplified environmental monitoring. Harvest area closures due to water quality impairments can result in economic hardships for the industry (Taylor et al., 2015). The industry has assisted state and local government agencies, tribes, and private citizens in the planning and implementation of improvements to sewage treatment systems, programs to fix local septic systems, and other water quality pollution reduction programs. The aquaculture industry is often a protective steward of water quality in and along the coastal estuaries.

The aquaculture industry is managed through a complex interaction of multiple agencies, each with its own mandate, jurisdiction, and standards related to aquaculture. Table 2.5-2 provides a summary of the primary agencies involved with shellfish aquaculture and their general role.

Table 2.5-2. Primary regulatory agencies for Washington shellfish aquaculture and their roles in state waters.

Agency	Role
Washington Department of Ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures Coastal Zone Management Act consistency • Ensures Shoreline Management Act consistency through review and approval of certain Shoreline Permits • Issues 401 Water Quality Certifications for new and expanded aquaculture operations • Issues NPDES permits for herbicide and pesticide applications
Washington Department of Natural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leases state-owned aquatic lands and authorizes use of those lands for aquaculture operations
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manages oyster reserves • Processes aquatic farm registrations • Authorizes in-state and out-of-state shellfish importation and transfer
Washington Department of Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Shellfish Authority, ensures compliance with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration’s National Shellfish Sanitation Program • Sets growing area classifications and boundaries; monitors water quality for toxins, pathogens, and viruses; closes areas that are unsafe for harvest; licenses and inspects commercial shellfish harvest and operations; certifies harvest sites; and responds to shellfish related reports and outbreaks
United States Army Corps of Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires a Section 404 permit for the discharge of material into waters of the United States • Requires a Section 10 permit for work in navigable waters of the United States
Washington Department of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguards the public from consuming unsafe, adulterated, or misbranded food through processing plant licenses and product identification requirements • Oversees the control of noxious and invasive species • Issues registrations for pesticides
Local Governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue aquaculture use permits under local Shoreline Master Programs to protect natural resources, provide for public access, and plan for water-dependent uses

Economic Impact of Aquaculture

The coastal shellfish aquaculture industry provides a significant contribution to local and statewide economies. However, comprehensive economic impact estimates are particularly challenging to generate for this industry due to discrepancies between data collected by the state and other reports from the industry.

In addition to the data collected by WDFW, further analyses have been conducted to capture more complete information on the economic impact of the industry. Northern Economics, Inc. (NEI) conducted an assessment of shellfish aquaculture in WA, OR, and CA based on a survey of producers and detailed interviews (Northern Economics, Inc., 2013). The study collected data on employment, revenue, expenditures, production, and acres of land in production. NEI then conducted an input-output analysis using the IMPLAN software tool to evaluate the impact of the industry on the Washington economy (Northern Economics, Inc., 2013). Results of the analysis are in Table 2.5-3. Additional details on the IMPLAN analysis and results can be found in the report at:

http://www.pacshell.org/pdf/economic_impact_of_shellfish_aquaculture_2013.pdf.

Table 2.5-3. Economic impact of shellfish aquaculture on Washington State in 2010.
Source: Northern Economics, Inc., 2013.

Multipliers per dollar	Expenditures	Employment	Labor income
Direct	\$101.4 million	1,900	\$37.3 million
Indirect	\$38.2 million	390	\$21.2 million
Induced	\$44.8 million	420	\$18.6 million
Total	\$184.4 million	2,710	\$77.1 million

Taylor et al. (2015) built on the study by NEI and data from the state to conduct an additional economic analysis as part of the marine spatial planning process. They conducted a focus group with members of the shellfish aquaculture industry in the coastal counties to evaluate the results of the NEI study. As a result, a few topics were identified for additional analysis.

Taylor et al. conducted a survey and interviews to capture information about the processing and distribution activities of shellfish growers in Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties. Of the 14 companies identified, eight completed the survey. Respondents to the survey reported total sales of nearly \$56 million and total expenditures of nearly \$56 million in 2014. Expenditures made by the shellfish industry include payments for goods and services such as payroll and benefits, seed oysters, ice, packaging, and taxes. Approximately 71% of expenditures were made in the coastal counties and nearly 94% of expenditures were made in Washington. Including non-respondent processors and distributors, estimated expenditures totaled \$59.37 million (Taylor et al., 2015).

To determine the total economic contribution of the shellfish aquaculture industry including harvesting, processing, and distribution, Taylor et al. (2015) analyzed 2013 production data from the state and the surveys from the shellfish harvesting and processing industry. Taylor et al. (2015) determined that the WDFW data was the best available for this analysis. However, this analysis is not directly comparable to the NEI analysis or results discussed above. The total direct expenditures for growing, processing, and distribution of shellfish estimated from the

survey and interviews were used. IMPLAN data were used to generate estimates of employment and labor income, including jobs directly provided by shellfish growing and processing as well as jobs generated in the region through indirect and induced activity. Results indicate that about 847 jobs and \$50 million in labor income were generated by the aquaculture industry in the Washington coastal region. An additional 383 jobs and \$23.2 million in total labor income were generated in Washington State outside of the coastal region by the coastal aquaculture sector's activities (Table 2.5-4) (Taylor et al., 2015). Estimated expenditures, total employment, and total labor income generated by the shellfish aquaculture industry in Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties are presented in Table 2.5-4.

Table 2.5-4. Estimated regional expenditures by the Pacific coast shellfish aquaculture industry and total economic contribution (employment and labor income) to the Washington coast region and statewide. Source: Taylor et al. (2015).⁵

	Expenditures	Total employment	Total labor income
Washington coastal region	\$65.2 million	847	\$50 million
Statewide total	\$78 million	1,230	\$73.2 million

Implicitly included in the total economic contribution to the state economy from shellfish aquaculture are revenue to the state from aquaculture land leases, from license and permit fees paid by shellfish farmers, and from sales of access to the state-owned Willapa Bay Oyster Reserves for commercial harvest (Taylor et al., 2015).⁶ DNR-leased lands generated about \$327,230 in revenue in 2010. Oyster sales from the Oyster Reserves have averaged about \$173,000 per year, and clam sales average about \$15,000 per year (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

At the county level, Pacific County has a particularly high economic dependence upon shellfish aquaculture. A report by Washington Sea Grant (2015) estimated that in 2010, 20% of Pacific County's total economy relied on aquaculture. This indicates that Pacific County's economy is at relatively high risk if the industry experiences reduced business activities or shellfish area closures.

Industry representatives, state managers, and economists understand well the limitations of the abovementioned estimates of the economic contributions of aquaculture. The Washington State Shellfish Initiative is looking to address this issue by designing a system to improve data collection and sharing of information related to the economics of shellfish (Office of the Governor, 2016).

Related Infrastructure

Hatcheries

Shellfish hatcheries are vital to the aquaculture industry. Four companies provide hatchery larvae to farms in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor: Whiskey Creek Shellfish Hatchery of Netarts, Oregon; Taylor Shellfish of Shelton, Washington; Coast Seafoods Company of Bellevue, Washington (now owned by Pacific Seafood); and the Nisbet Oyster Company of Bay

⁵ The results in Table 2.5-3 and Table 2.5-4 cannot be directly compared due to differences in scope and methodology.

⁶ 60% of the proceeds from sales of oysters on the reserves go to research activities in Willapa Bay (WDFW, personal communication, May 31, 2016).

Center, Washington. Some other companies are able to produce some larvae for their own operations, but it is often not enough to entirely meet their seed needs. Most hatchery production occurs in the Pacific Northwest. However, the Nisbet Oyster Company has an operation in Hilo, Hawaii, Coast Seafoods has a clam larvae operation in Kona, Hawaii, and Taylor Shellfish has nurseries in California and Hawaii. Some operations were established in Hawaii in response to the large scale oyster larvae failures in the mid 2000's and the concern of ocean acidification (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

Processors

Processing facilities are also vital to the sale of shellfish aquaculture product. Processing can consist of simply cleaning the shell to prepare for selling live⁷. The product can also be processed in-shell (non-living) or be shucked and packed. DOH has different licensing requirements for different categories of shellfish processors (a.k.a. “dealers”). Processors can be licensed to perform various processing and selling activities, such as shellstock shippers or shucker-packers.⁸ Several processing companies licensed to shuck shellfish operate in Pacific County, including Coast Seafoods, Nisbet Oyster Company, Wiegardt Brothers, Ekone Oyster Company, Bay Center Mariculture, Chetlo Harbor Shellfish, Palix Oyster Company, and South Bend Products. Another large company, Taylor Shellfish, ships its product out of the Study Area to a facility in Shelton for processing.

Processing in Grays Harbor is more limited, and Brady's Oysters and Lytle Seafood are the only processors of oysters in the area (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Processors also ship their product in- and out-of-state, as well as overseas. Many processing companies transport the product themselves or rely on another company or consolidated shipper (Taylor et al., 2015).

Water Access

Because it is an estuary use, water access is required for the farming of shellfish. Willapa Bay has marinas, such as Bay Center Marina and Nahcotta, that are primarily used by oyster growers to transport and store boats, along with being used for other aquaculture water access related activities. Some farms and processors have their own private docks and water access for operations in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor.

Future Trends

Shellfish growers and processors face many existing challenges and future uncertainties within the industry. Primary among future uncertainties are invasive and native nuisance species control, regulatory and policy changes, climate change, workforce availability, and changes to estuary uses. Experimentation with geoduck culture and the development of the Manila Clam market are opportunities for aquaculture expansion.

⁷ DOH uses the term “shellstock” to describe oysters that are washed and kept live.

⁸ For descriptions of the various dealer license categories, please see Industrial Economics (2014).

Invasive and Native Species Control

Invasive and native noxious and nuisance species are perceived by aquaculture stakeholder representatives as the greatest threat to the industry (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). While the 99.9% reduction in *Spartina* in Willapa Bay is a substantial success story (Washington State Department of Agriculture, 2015), other invasive and native species pose current and future risks to aquaculture growing conditions in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor. Current species include (but are not limited to) the noxious weed⁹ Japanese eelgrass (*Zostera japonica*), native burrowing shrimp (*Neotrypaea californiensis* and *Upogebia pugettensis*), and two species of non-native oyster drills (*Ceratostoma inornatum* and *Urosalpinx cinerea*) (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

The impacts of these species on aquaculture production can be quite significant, with one expert suggesting declines of as much as 10%-20% in shellfish production per year in areas of high burrowing shrimp populations (Taylor et al., 2015). Controlling burrowing shrimp can be quite challenging and costly to the industry, and oyster growers have pursued the use of pesticides as their most effective means of control. Similarly, Japanese eelgrass also requires the use of herbicides for control. The industry must comply with several regulations in order to treat oyster beds with pesticides. This includes obtaining permits from Ecology and following the requirements from the WSDA and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for registering and labeling the pesticides. Even so, the application of chemicals for these species in some cases is environmentally controversial and has been met with resistance from certain consumer and public groups, adding to the challenges the aquaculture industry faces in managing these species.

In addition, new species may be introduced in the future, or environmental changes to the estuaries could result in a species interaction shift that could have unforeseen impacts to aquaculture. Present day and potential future invasive and nuisance species will continue to be a threat and create significant operational, regulatory, and economic challenges for the aquaculture industry (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

In March 2017, the Willapa/Grays Harbor Oyster Growers Association (WGHOGA) submitted a permit request to Ecology to allow and regulate the use of the pesticide imidacloprid to control ghost and mud shrimp in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor. Commercial shellfish growers requested treating 485 acres of shellfish beds in Willapa Bay and 15 acres in Grays Harbor. After completing a thorough environmental review, Ecology denied the request for a permit in April 2018. Ecology cited concerns about impacts to marine organisms in sediments, too much uncertainty about long-term impacts, negative impacts to fish and birds by killing food sources and disrupting the food web, and significant impacts to the environment resulting even at low concentrations of imidacloprid.

⁹ A “noxious” weed in Washington is the traditional, legal term for any invasive, non-native plant that threatens agricultural crops, local ecosystems or fish and wildlife habitat. For more information on noxious weeds in Washington, including Japanese eelgrass, go to <http://www.nwcb.wa.gov/default.asp>.

Regulatory Burden and Uncertainty

Regulatory requirements are seen by many industry representatives as complicated, burdensome, costly, time consuming, and not conducive to a growing aquaculture industry. Main concerns voiced include: (1) resources required to comply and keep up with processes such as permit applications, renewals, and reporting requirements; (2) that as a result of new permit requirements, the industry is vulnerable to additional challenges or appeals which can result in expensive legal proceedings; and (3) that environmental requirements with which shellfish farms must comply are burdensome.

The complicated nature of aquaculture industry regulations is a current challenge, and will continue to pose challenges to the future of the industry, particularly if new, more restrictive regulations are put into place (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015). The Shellfish Interagency Permitting Team, part of the Washington Shellfish Initiative, has recently released recommendations to address permitting challenges in the aquaculture industry and will continue to work to improve the permitting process (Lund & Hoberecht, 2016).

Climate Change

A changing climate could lead to alterations of environmental conditions within the estuaries, and ultimately the growing conditions for the aquaculture industry. Among the key concerns related to climate change are the consequences of ocean acidification, sea level rise, and increasing water temperature.

Ocean acidification is one of the primary environmental concerns for the shellfish aquaculture industry in the MSP Study Area and elsewhere in Washington. As ocean acidity increases, the calcium carbonate on which young oysters rely to grow their shells becomes less available. This leads to thinner shells, slower growth rates, and higher mortality rates. Because oysters and other shellfish are most vulnerable when they are young, scientists believe that ocean acidification is likely the cause of natural set failures in recent years, as well as large scale hatchery failures using local seawater.

The State of Washington has recognized the severity of this issue and the potential risks to the economy and culture of the aquaculture industry. The Governor's office has taken a number of steps to promote research and actions to address this issue, including a Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012). Based on the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Panel, the Governor and the legislature created the Marine Resources Advisory Council and the Washington Ocean Acidification Center to advance coordinated efforts to address ocean acidification.¹⁰

Hatcheries and oyster production companies have incurred considerable costs in addressing the consequences of ocean acidification, and are investing for the future in anticipation of further impacts. The Blue Ribbon Panel estimated that ocean acidification has already cost the oyster industry over \$110 million. Some companies have opened hatcheries in Hawaii to avoid the increased acidification of waters entering the Pacific Northwest, which has increased the cost of producing and providing oyster spat. Many companies may not have the means to relocate hatcheries if they own one or may not be able to absorb the costs of purchased spat (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

¹⁰ More information on the Marine Resources Advisory Council can be found at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/water/marine/oceanacidification.html>

The failure of natural oyster sets (either resulting from ocean acidification or other conditions) creates challenges and increased costs for the oyster industry. One company has seen a five- to six-fold increase in seeding process costs. A natural set failure in the Willapa Harbor State Oyster Reserve, which depends completely on the occurrence of natural larvae sets, will diminish oyster supply. This in turn will decrease income provided by the reserve as well as reduce the quality of oyster habitat and the associated ecosystem services within Willapa Bay (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

Sea level rise may also impact the shellfish industry. Most shellfish culture occurs on intertidal substrate, and the intertidal zone will shift landward or be reduced as a result of sea level rise. This may decrease access to aquaculture beds, decrease available harvest time at low tides, and will likely shift optimal growing areas. Changes in property boundaries and harvest areas will create logistical and management challenges for the oyster industry (Taylor et al., 2015).

As water temperatures rise with climate change, the shellfish industry could be impacted in a number of ways. First, increased temperatures may reduce shellfish growth, reproduction, distribution, and health. Second, rising water temperatures may increase the occurrence of Harmful Algal Blooms (HABs), which can produce natural toxins that cause human illness or death when they are concentrated within filter feeding shellfish, and the occurrence of bacteria, which also can cause human illness. *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* is a naturally-occurring bacterium common in Washington in the warm summer months. *V. parahaemolyticus* causes illnesses each year, mostly impacting consumers of raw oysters.

DOH is responsible for monitoring HABs and *V. parahaemolyticus* in shellfish growing areas. DOH is concerned that HABs and instances of *V. parahaemolyticus* will increase in frequency, duration, and severity with rising water temperatures. Rising water temperatures may also result in new, more dangerous varieties of toxins and other pathogens. DOH tracks reports of shellfish-related illnesses and monitors for emerging toxins and pathogens in close collaboration with research partners at the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and academic institutions. The emergence of new toxins and pathogens would result in a significant negative economic impact to the industry (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014; Taylor et al., 2015).

Potential Changes to Estuary Uses

Changes in the intensity and frequency of current co-uses of the estuaries may influence the shellfish aquaculture industry on the coast. Projected increases in crude oil transportation by ship and by rail are of particular concern (See Section 2.7: Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure). Concerns center on the risk of an oil spill, and the potentially severe impact it could have to the industry through contamination of shellfish beds. Another concern for Grays Harbor growers is the deepening of the federal navigation channel (See Section 2.10.3: Dredge Disposal). Past navigational dredging is believed to have contributed to the loss of oyster beds now buried by sand, decreased production from wave action, and changes in substrate size (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). These changes to marine traffic and increases in oil transportation are sources of additional uncertainty for the future of the aquaculture industry.

Potential new uses addressed within the MSP also cause some concern among industry representatives. Aquaculture is highly dependent upon environmental conditions such as water flow and water quality. Some representatives are concerned about what effect a marine renewable energy project within or near the estuaries may have on water flow (Industrial

Economics Inc., 2014). Another potential concern is the possibility of net pen aquaculture within the estuaries. Risks of finfish aquaculture include reduced water quality in shallow and poorly flushed sites, disease, and escape of cultivated fish (See Section 2.10.2: Offshore Aquaculture). There is currently no commercial net pen aquaculture of finfish within the estuaries. If net pens were constructed within Grays Harbor or Willapa Bay, growers may be concerned about potential water quality changes and the consequences for the shellfish industry. Currently, there is no known active interest in commercial, net pen aquaculture in Willapa Bay or Grays Harbor and it is unlikely this activity would be sited here in the future.

In summary, even while facing several existing challenges and future uncertainties, the aquaculture industry is currently enjoying strong demand for its products. Experts believe the industry can continue to grow and thrive if the industry can innovate and adjust to changing climatic conditions and other challenges, such as invasive and nuisance species; if policy makers can address concerns about uses such as crude oil transportation; and if regulatory structure allows for a reasonable and flexible opportunity to address these challenges. Furthermore, experts have identified areas of potential expansion into the culture of geoduck clams and further development of production and markets for Manila Clams (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Aquaculture is important economically and socially to the coast and to Washington, and will continue to play a role in future policies and decisions related to coastal and marine uses.

References

- Blake, B., & Zu Ermgassen, P. S. E. (2015). The History and Decline of *Ostrea Lurida* in Willapa Bay, Washington. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 34(2), 273–280.
- Booth, S. R. (2007, February 1). An updated plan for integrated pest management of burrowing shrimp on commercial shellfish beds. WGHOGA, Submitted to the Washington Department of Ecology.
- Dumbauld, B. R., Kauffman, B. E., Trimble, A. C., & Ruesink, J. L. (2011). The Willapa Bay oyster reserves in Washington State: Fishery collapse, creating a sustainable replacement, and the potential for habitat conservation and restoration. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 30(1), 71–83.
- Industrial Economics Inc. (2014). *Marine sector analysis report: Aquaculture* (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/AquacultureSectorAnalysis.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Lund, P. J., & Hoberecht, L. H. (2016). *Shellfish Interagency Permitting Team Phase I Report*. Shellfish Interagency Team. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/aquaculture/sip.html> [Source type 11].
- Northern Economics, Inc. (2013). *The economic impact of shellfish aquaculture in Washington, Oregon, and California*. Prepared for Pacific Shellfish Institute. Retrieved from http://www.pacshell.org/pdf/Economic_Impact_of_Shellfish_Aquaculture_2013.pdf. [Source type 11].
- Office of the Governor. (2016, January). Washington Shellfish Initiative Phase II Work Plan. Washington Governor's Legislative and Policy Office. Retrieved from <http://www.governor.wa.gov/issues/issues/energy-environment/gov-inslee%E2%80%99s-shellfish-initiative> [Source type 11].
- Skewgar, E., & Pearson, S. F. (Eds.). (2011). *State of the Washington coast: Ecology, Management, and Research Priorities*. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from <http://dfw.wa.gov/publications/01198/> [Source type 11].
- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). *Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington*. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_small.pdf [Source type 11].
- Trimble, A. C., Ruesink, J. L., & Dumbauld, B. R. (2009). Factors preventing the recovery of a historically overexploited shellfish species, *Ostrea lurida* Carpenter 1864. *Journal of Shellfish Research*, 28(1), 97–106.
- United States Department of Agriculture. (2014). *2012 Census of agriculture. Census of aquaculture (2013) Volume 3, special studies, part 2*. (No. AC-12-SS-2). Retrieved from https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/Aquaculture/ [Source type 11].
- Washington Sea Grant. (2015). *Shellfish aquaculture in Washington State*. (Final report to the Washington State Legislature.) (p. 84). Washington Sea Grant. Retrieved from <https://wsg.washington.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/Shellfish-Aquaculture-Washington-State.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification. (2012). *Ocean acidification: From knowledge to action, Washington State's strategic response*. (H. Adelman & L. W.

- Binder, Eds.). Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1201015.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Agriculture. (2015). *Spartina eradication program 2014 progress report*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Agriculture. Retrieved from <http://agr.wa.gov/PlantsInsects/Weeds/Spartina/docs/SpartinaReport2014.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2014, October 24). Fact sheet for Willapa Grays Harbor Oyster Growers Association National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit no. WA0039781. Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/pesticides/imidacloprid/docs/WillapaGraysHarbor-OysterGrowers-Factsheet.pdf> (Source type 11).
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2015). *Final Environmental Impact Statement control of burrowing shrimp using Imidacloprid on commercial oyster and clam beds in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor, Washington* (No. Publication no. 15-10-013). Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1510013.pdf> [Source type 4].
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources. (2017a). Aquaculture. Retrieved from <http://www.dnr.wa.gov/programs-and-services/aquatics/shellfish/aquaculture> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources. (2017b). Bush and Callow Act Aquatic Lands Maps. Retrieved from <http://www.dnr.wa.gov/programs-and-services/aquatics/aquatic-leasing-and-licensing/bush-and-callow-act-aquatic-lands-maps> [Source type 11].

2.6 Recreation and Tourism

Washington's Pacific coast relies on an economy based in recreation, tourism, and natural resources. The tourism and recreation benefits offered by the mostly rural coast are important to both the residents of local communities and to visitors from throughout the state and beyond. A survey by Point 97 and the Surfrider Foundation (2015) found that recreational visits to the coast by Washington residents are a substantial driver for local economies, with spending totaling \$481.2 million in 2014.

This chapter summarizes the role of recreation and tourism in the MSP Study Area and highlights popular recreational activities. The economic impacts, related infrastructure, and future trends in recreation and tourism are also described here.¹

Summary of History and Current Use

The natural setting of Washington's Pacific coast has always been a major draw for visitors and residents. Large portions of the coast have been designated to protect and facilitate public recreation. For example, Olympic National Park, established in 1938 by President Roosevelt, has three park districts directly on the coast adjacent to the MSP Study Area (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Another example is the Washington State Seashore Conservation Act of 1967 which recognized the importance of the pristine Washington shoreline in "...provid(ing) the public with almost unlimited opportunities for recreational activities, like swimming, surfing, and hiking; for outdoor sports, like hunting, fishing, clamming, and boating; for the observation of nature as it existed of hundreds of years before the arrival of Europeans; and for relaxation away from the pressures and tensions of modern life" ([RCW 79A.05.600](#)). The Act also established much of the southern coast as a Seashore Conservation Area (SCA) for public recreational use and enjoyment.

The coastline in the northern portion of the MSP Study Area (Clallam and Jefferson Counties) has rugged, dramatic cliffs and limited public access points. The Makah, Quileute, and Hoh Indian Tribes have reservation lands in the northern portion of the Study Area, and much of the rest of the northern coast is within Olympic National Park. Recreational features of the northern coast include Cape Flattery; Olympic National Park campgrounds and trails; several surfing beaches; coastal trails and beaches for walking, hiking, and camping; and various tribal facilities including lodging, marinas, and trails. The northern coast primarily attracts visitors looking to spend time connecting with nature (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

The southern coast (Grays Harbor and Pacific counties) provides visitors with opportunities to enjoy nature while taking advantage of amenities associated with more developed areas. The southern coast is dominated by long, sandy beaches as well as two large estuaries with calmer waters protected from the open ocean. The southern coastal area contains more than ten state park facilities, the SCA, the Quinault and Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservations, and several major coastal communities (Maps 1 and 2). Second-home communities that incorporate amenities and rental programs have become popular along the southern coast (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

¹ Recreational fishing is not included in this section, as it is covered in Section 2.4: State and Tribal Fisheries.

Recreation Activities

A panel survey conducted from 2014 to 2015 by Point 97 and the Surfrider Foundation (2015) collected data on Washington resident recreation activities in the MSP Study Area. The survey evaluated where respondents recreated, what types of activities they participated in, and how much they spent on various activities and trips.² In total, the study estimated that Washington State residents (18 years of age and older) take about 4.1 million trips to the MSP Study Area per year. Pacific (37%) and Grays Harbor (35.6%) Counties received the largest proportion of recreational trips to the Study Area by Washington residents, followed by Clallam (20.2%) and Jefferson (7.2%) Counties. Areas with high densities of recreation trips include Ocean Shores, Westport, Long Beach/Seaview, Pacific Beach, La Push, and Kalaloch, although it is clear that the entire MSP Study Area coast is used to some extent for recreation (Map 33) (Point 97 & Surfrider Foundation, 2015).

Respondents were asked to identify all the recreational activities they participated in during coastal trips to the MSP Study Area in the previous twelve months. The top five most popular activities identified were beach going (67.7%), sightseeing/scenic enjoyment (62.3%), watching marine life from shore (39.9%), photography (36.3%), and hiking or biking (33.1%). Respondents were also asked to identify their primary activity on their most recent trip. The top three primary recreation activities in the MSP Study Area were beach going (32%), sightseeing/scenic enjoyment (22.6%), and camping (11.3%).

Other types of recreation along the coast include swimming, beach driving, tide pooling, surfing, kayaking and paddle boarding, SCUBA diving, windsurfing, boating, horseback riding, whale watching, and other activities (Point 97 & Surfrider Foundation, 2015). Maps displaying the spatial intensity of grouped and individual recreational activities in the MSP Study Area can be found in the report by Point 97 & the Surfrider Foundation (2015). Some of these recreational activities are highlighted below.

Wildlife viewing

Wildlife viewing from shore ranked highly as a frequent activity among visitors to the coast in the MSP Study Area. Visitors also participate in wildlife viewing on the water from private boats, charter boats or guide services. Popular marine wildlife to view along the coast, in the estuaries, and on the ocean include a variety of birds like bald eagles, osprey, blue herons, brown pelicans, and snowy plovers. Visitors also view marine mammals like whales, seals, otters, and sea lions. The peak season for whale watching is between March and May, when gray whales migrate along the coast and even can be found swimming inside Grays Harbor. Humpback whales can also be spotted as they migrate seasonally along the coast (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016).

Along the northern coast, Neah Bay offers opportunities to view seabirds, sea lions, seals, sea otters, humpback whales, and gray whales. La Push offers whale watching from the beach and boat charters out of the marina to view the gray whale migration near shore and occasionally to view transient orcas. South of La Push through Kalaloch and Queets the coast provides many more opportunities to view wildlife including whales, brown pelicans, sea lions, harbor porpoise harbor seals, and sea otters.

On the southern coast the whale watching and wildlife viewing opportunities continue near Moclips, Pacific Beach, Copalis, and Ocean City. In Westport, whale watching tours are available leaving from Westport Marina. In the Ocean Shores area, Damon Point and the Oyehut

² Details on the methodology used are available in the full report: Point 97 & Surfrider Foundation, 2015.

Wildlife Recreation Area are notable for their bird watching opportunities (Taylor, Baker, Waters, Wegge, & Wellman, 2015).

The Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay estuaries and wildlife refuges are particularly popular sites for shore-based bird watching. The Grays Harbor National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) is a migration stopover for thousands of shorebirds in the spring and fall, with the peak bird migration typically occurring in late April and early May (Taylor et al., 2015). Thousands of people attend the Grays Harbor Shorebird Festival to view the migration of hundreds of thousands of Arctic-bound shorebirds. The festival features shorebird viewing, field trips, lectures, and a birding marketplace and nature fair (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016).

The Willapa National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) estimates that in 2010 there were 109,500 visitor use days in which visitors participated in wildlife observation/photography. The diverse habitats found in the Willapa NWR support over 200 species of resident and migratory birds. At Leadbetter Point on the northern tip of the Long Beach Peninsula over 100,000 birds can be seen during peak spring migration (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011).

Waterfowl hunting

Waterfowl hunting is another recreational use in the areas adjacent to the MSP Study Area. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has management authority over all non-tribal waterfowl hunting within the state. All hunting requires a small game license with additional regulations applicable dependent on the species. Treaty tribes set hunting regulations for their members and tribal members do not require a state license (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011).

Duck and goose hunting occurs in all of the coastal counties. Statistics from WDFW for 2015 show that the numbers of duck and goose hunters are highest in Grays Harbor County, while the rate of harvest is highest in Pacific County for both ducks and geese. See Table 2.6-1 and Table 2.6-2 for details. The Willapa NWR estimates that in 2010 there were 350 visitor use days to the Refuge to hunt waterfowl (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2011). The Grays Harbor NWR does not allow hunting.

Table 2.6-1: 2015 Recreational duck hunting in Washington coastal counties. Source: WDFW, 2017.

County	Number of hunters	Hunt days	Harvest	Harvest rate (harvest/days)
Clallam	379	2231	5815	2.61
Jefferson	210	1228	2278	1.86
Grays Harbor	865	4765	11144	2.34
Pacific	398	2080	5866	2.82

Table 2.6-2: Recreational goose hunting in Washington coastal counties. Source: WDFW, 2017.

County	Number of hunters	Hunt days	Harvest	Harvest rate (harvest/days)
Clallam	118	836	331	0.40
Jefferson	31	207	24	0.12
Grays Harbor	224	839	542	0.65
Pacific	123	626	827	1.32

Clamming

A particularly popular recreational activity on the southern coast of the MSP Study Area is razor clamming. The recreational harvesting, cleaning, cooking, eating, and canning of Razor Clams (*Silqua patula*) have been an important focus of family relationships and local culture in coastal communities for many generations. With between 275,000 and 460,000 seasonal digger trips resulting in the harvest of as many as 6.1 million clams, the fishery generates between \$25 and \$40 million in tourist-related income per season to the economies of small coastal communities (Ayres, D., WDFW, personal communication, June 1, 2016).

Clamming is allowed at designated beaches along much of the southern half of the Washington coast (Map 30). Occasional long-term area closures of the Razor Clam fishery due to increases in levels of naturally occurring marine biotoxins (caused by harmful algal blooms) can significantly disrupt the fishery. These closures negatively impact the coastal tourism industry which significantly benefits from recreational razor clammers visiting the coast (Ayres, D., WDFW, personal communication, June 1, 2016). For more information on the recreational Razor Clam fishery, please see Section 2.4: State and Tribal Fisheries.

While razor clamming is the more popular recreational activity, there is also a recreational hardshell clam fishery. Hardshell clams include Littleneck Clams (*Leukoma staminea*) and Butter Clams (*Saxidomus gigantea*). The National Park Service has done some population assessment of hardshell clams on beaches in Olympic National Park as shown in Map 30. Hardshell clamming differs from razor clamming in that there is a relatively lower density of hardshell clams. They live on remote, exposed wilderness beaches, and digging them is more challenging because they live in a mixed-coarse substrate of sand, gravel, and cobble. The hardshell clam recreational fishery in Olympic National Park is relatively small due to the challenges of harvest and the lower density of the clams (Fradkin, S., NPS, personal communication, October 28, 2016). WDFW does also allow harvest of hardshell clams within the Willapa Bay estuary. Those stocks receive greater harvest pressure (Ayres, D., WDFW, personal communication, November 18, 2016).

Boating

As seen in Map 34, recreational vessels transit most of the MSP Study Area. The category of recreational vessels includes private vessels like sailboats, motorboats, and small independent fishing boats (only when they are transiting the area, but not when fishing). The data for this map was obtained through the Automatic Identification System (AIS) which is a tracking system used on ships and by vessel traffic services to identify and locate vessels by electronically exchanging data.³ Recreational boaters on Washington's Pacific Coast participate in a variety of activities including sailing, cruising, viewing wildlife, and fishing. One unique activity on the coast is the Coho Ho Ho, a sailing rally from Puget Sound to San Francisco. About a dozen boats participate annually and many of the participants will continue from San Francisco down to San Diego to join up with the larger Baja Ha Ha sailing rally, with a final destination of Cabo San Lucas, Mexico. (Lombard, D., Coho Ho Ho, personal communication, October 26, 2016).

³ While AIS is required for larger vessels, it is not required for recreational private vessels. The map only includes data from vessels that choose to use AIS, therefore not all usage of the MSP Study Area by recreational vessels is represented in this map.

Surfing

Surfing is practiced by a relatively small percentage of the overall recreational user community, yet surfers are a dedicated user group. Surfers are known to make frequent trips to the coast and, therefore, are considered avid users of coastal resources and important contributors to local economies. Several surfing spots are scattered along the Washington coast and surfers will travel great distances to reach quality waves. While surfers in the MSP Study Area are predominately from Washington, visitors from Oregon and British Columbia are also common. Surfers also come from as far away as Montana, California, the East Coast, and even Australia. The Clean Water Classic, the longest running Pro/Am Surf Competition in the Pacific Northwest, is held in Westport in the late September to early October timeframe. The event is organized by volunteers and draws nearly 700 visitors, benefiting the Surfrider Foundation chapters in Washington, Oregon, and British Columbia (Dennehy, C., Surfrider, personal communication, August 10, 2016).

Beach prospecting

Ocean beach prospecting is another recreational use with a relatively small, yet committed group of participants. Beach prospecting first began in 2008 on three beaches within the SCA. Interest from the prospecting community prompted a two year pilot program that was jointly evaluated by WDFW and the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission (State Parks) (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife & Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, 2010). The pilot program was successful and currently, small scale mining and prospecting are allowed year-round on ocean beaches within the SCA between the line of ordinary high tide and the line of extreme low tide. This activity is managed by WDFW and State Parks, and miners are required to follow the rules within the WDFW Gold and Fish pamphlet (a type of umbrella Hydraulic Project Approval) (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015). Because WDFW no longer issues individual Hydraulic Project Approvals (HPA) for this activity and State Parks does not quantitatively track ocean prospecting, the state cannot provide current participation numbers. The most recent estimates are for May 2014 to July 2015, when WDFW required and issued about 260 individual HPAs for beach prospecting (Aaron, K., WDFW, personal communication, June 1, 2016).

Economic Impact of Recreation and Tourism

Recreation has always been a part of the economies of the coastal counties. Historically, recreation and tourism have played a small part relative to other industries such as fishing, forestry, and manufacturing, yet the recreation and tourism sector is growing and increasing in prominence (Taylor et al., 2015). Currently, recreation and tourism are often the most popular human uses of coastal and marine settings. A 2011 study on the ocean economy for the five Pacific coastal counties adjacent to the MSP Study Area (Clallam, Grays Harbor, Jefferson, Pacific, and Wahkiakum) shows that tourism and recreation was the largest sector. It accounted for approximately 78% of employment and 50% of GDP for the portion of the economy that depends directly on ocean resources. This study was not limited to the Study Area, but also includes Wahkiakum County and the portions of Clallam and Jefferson Counties adjacent to the Strait of Juan de Fuca and Puget Sound (NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2014).

Specific to the MSP Study Area, survey respondents spent an average of \$117.14 per person per coastal trip in 2014-2015. Point 97 & the Surfrider Foundation (2015) estimated that the total annual spending on coastal trips by Washington residents was about \$481.2 million

statewide (Table 2.6-3). This and other surveys indicate that Washington residents and out-of-state visitors spend the most money on accommodations, food and beverages, and transportation when visiting the coast (Point 97 & Surfrider Foundation, 2015; Taylor et al., 2015). Estimated trip spending associated with trips to the coast in the MSP Study Area by out-of-state visitors is about \$160 million within the coastal region, with an additional \$29.8 million spent elsewhere in the state (Table 2.6-3) (Taylor et al., 2015).

Recreation and tourism trip spending in the MSP Study Area generates economic activity that supports jobs and personal income for residents of coastal areas and elsewhere in the state. In the coastal Study Area, recreation trip-related spending by Washington residents is estimated by Taylor et al. (2015) to support 4,725 jobs and \$196.8 million in labor income within the coastal economy. As dollars and economic activity multiply throughout the state's economy, an estimated 9,309 jobs statewide and \$413 million in labor income are supported directly and indirectly by recreation and tourism in the coastal area (Table 2.6-3).⁴ Many communities adjacent to the MSP Study Area are heavily reliant on employment generated by the recreation and tourism industry. For example, resident employment in tourism-sensitive industries exceeds 50% of overall employment for communities such as Pacific Beach (57.5%), Copalis Beach (82%), Ocean City (85.7%), and Seaview (57.5%) (Taylor et al., 2015).

Table 2.6-3. Estimated recreation and tourism trip spending associated with Study Area coastal trips by Washington State residents and out-of-state visitors. And, total economic contribution (employment and labor income) to the Washington coast region and statewide. Source: Taylor et al. (2015).

	Trip spending by Washington residents	Trip spending by out-of-state visitors	Total employment (from trip spending by WA residents)	Total labor income (from trip spending by WA residents)
Washington coast region	\$330.9 million	\$160 million	4,725	\$196.8 million
Statewide (total)	\$481.2 million	\$189.8 million	9,309	\$413 million

Related Infrastructure

Coastal recreation and tourism activities are linked closely with available access for outdoor activities and associated supporting amenities such as lodging or camping, food, and entertainment. As noted earlier, the northern and southern coastal regions differ in the types of recreational and tourism experiences they offer, and in available public access and amenities. The northern coastal region offers recreation and tourism users with an opportunity to connect with nature in a more private and rugged wilderness setting supported by Olympic National Park lands, coastal hiking, surfing, and a few camping and lodging amenities. The southern coast provides users with long sandy beaches optimal for kite flying, beach driving, razor clamming, horseback riding, and other activities. Several coastal communities are nearby to provide dining and lodging options.

⁴ Total employment and labor income estimates were generated by Taylor et al. (2015) using economic multipliers derived from IMPLAN models based on 2012 regional economic data. For more information see Section 2.3: Socio-economic Setting, and the Cascade Economics report.

National park and wildlife refuges

Olympic National Park (ONP) is located on the Olympic Peninsula and covers much of Clallam and Jefferson Counties. In addition to the large park area inland on the peninsula, the park also has three coastal districts which account for much of the northern MSP Study Area coastline (Map 1). ONP is the region's predominant recreation and tourism destination. It receives an estimated 3 million visitors annually, with about 759,000 to 783,000 estimated visitors each year to the three coastal park districts from 2011 to 2014. Park facilities include coastal public access points, trails, campgrounds, and wilderness campsites (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Five National Wildlife Refuges (NWRs) managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are located within the Study Area (Map 1). Flattery Rocks, Quillayute Needles, and Copalis NWRs are offshore. Public access to these islands is prohibited, although wildlife viewing from boats is allowed (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Grays Harbor and Willapa NWRs are on the mainland and open to visitors. Grays Harbor NWR is a main attraction in the Grays Harbor/Aberdeen area, where an 1,800-foot boardwalk provides access for viewing the hundreds of thousands of migrating shorebirds visiting the Refuge's muddy tidal flats. Willapa NWR has several units located adjacent to Willapa Bay encompassing habitat such as salt marsh, muddy tidelands, forest, freshwater wetlands, streams, grasslands, coastal dunes, and beaches. This diversity supports a variety of recreational activities including wildlife viewing, hiking, hunting, boating, photography, fishing, and shellfish harvesting (Taylor et al., 2015). A study in 2011 estimated 114,680 visits to the Willapa NWR in 2011, with associated spending totaling an estimated \$1.8 million (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

State parks and public areas

The Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission manages several state parks, the SCA (Map 1), and ocean beach approaches along the coast within Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties. Many of the parks have overnight facilities with campground sites, while others are day use only. Over 9.2 million people visited Pacific Coast state parks, the SCA, and ocean beach approaches in 2013, associated with an estimated \$3,299,696 in revenue. The most popular state managed areas for visitation along the coast are North Beach SCA (1.5 to 2.6 million visitors per year), Long Beach SCA (1.7 to 3 million visitors per year), Cape Disappointment (0.6 to 1.5 million visitors per year), and South Beach SCA (0.7 to 1.3 million visitors per year) (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Public access is critical for supporting and facilitating coastal recreation. In general, there are more public access opportunities in the southern half of the Study Area than in the northern half (Map 35). Coastal towns, state parks, the SCA, and broad sandy beaches are among the main reasons the public has more opportunities to access the beach in Grays Harbor and Pacific Counties. In Jefferson and Clallam Counties, remote locations, a rugged coastline, limited population centers, and tribal reservations limit the opportunity for convenient public access. Although, in some locations the tribes support and facilitate public tourism and recreation on their reservation lands. ONP also has access points, campgrounds, and wilderness campsites to facilitate enjoyment of the coast. While visited less frequently and in more restricted areas, the northern half of the MSP Study Area provides visitors with a unique opportunity to enjoy the remote beauty of the Olympic Peninsula's ocean coast.

Marinas

Marinas and boat launches (Map 31) support public access to the water. Marinas provide opportunities for private boat owners to launch their boats, as well as support charter operations for bird and wildlife viewing, sightseeing, and fishing. The two marinas in Clallam County that support recreation within the MSP Study Area are owned by tribes, the Makah Tribe (Makah Marina in Neah Bay⁵) and the Quileute Tribe (La Push Harbor Marina). There are no marinas for use by the public in Jefferson County in the MSP Study Area. Several marinas and ports provide public access for recreational users in the southern half of the MSP Study Area, including the popular Westport Marina. The Quinault Indian Nation purchased the Ocean Shores Marina but it has been closed due to needed repairs and dredging. There is also a boat launch in the river mouth in Taholah that is only open to tribal members. In Willapa Bay, there are several marinas and public boat launches, including but not limited to Nahcotta, Bay Center Marina, Tokeland Marina, Raymond Port Dock, and South Bend. Ilwaco and Chinook⁶ also have recreational boat access and support users of the MSP Study Area.

Lodging

Lodging is an important part of the coastal infrastructure that both attracts visitors and supports the tourism industry. Lodging options on the Pacific coast of the MSP Study Area include campgrounds, RV parks, motels, hotels, bed and breakfast inns, and rental homes. The Point 97 & Surfrider Foundation (2015) study found lodging and camping expenses to be the greatest per-trip expenditure for coastal trips (averaging \$25.96 spent per person on their last trip, including trips without lodging expenses). The average estimated total of annual expenditures for all visitors is approximately \$481 million. 22% of that total is accounted for by lodging, or approximately \$107 million annually (Point 97 & Surfrider Foundation, 2015).

Lodging highlights in Clallam County include the Hobuck Beach Resort owned by the Makah Tribe, the Quileute Oceanside Resort owned by the Quileute Tribe, and campgrounds and wilderness campsites in Olympic National Park. In Jefferson County, lodging within Olympic National Park includes the Kalaloch Lodge as well as a variety of campgrounds and wilderness campsites. In Grays Harbor County, the Quinault Indian Nation owns the Quinault Beach Resort and Casino. State parks offer camping, RV camping, and yurts, and the coastal towns and cities offer a variety of lodging, including hotels, motels, and vacation rental homes, such as Seabrook. In Pacific County, lodging options include the Shoalwater Bay Casino owned by the Shoalwater Bay Tribe; RV and tent campsites, cabins, and yurts at state parks; and hotels and motels in the coastal cities (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Future Trends

Future trends within the recreation and tourism industry on Washington's Pacific coast are difficult to predict. The industry may be influenced by population growth, development of second home communities, access limitations, and water quality issues. These issues are discussed below.

⁵ Neah Bay is outside the MSP Study Area.

⁶ Ilwaco and Chinook are outside the MSP Study Area.

Population Growth and Access

The specific recreational activities preferred by visitors to the coast have not changed substantially in recent history. A comparison of the results of the Surfrider Foundation recreation survey from 2014-2015 to a Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office report for 2002-2012 shows that of the top five recreational activities of beach going, sightseeing, camping, hiking, and photography, only the rate of beach going changed significantly, with an increase in rates (as cited in Taylor et. al, 2015). New trends in recreation are growing on the coast of the MSP Study Area, including stand up paddleboarding and kiteboarding, showing demand for access.

Between 2015 and 2025, total population growth in the coastal counties is projected to average 9%, and statewide growth is predicted at 11% (as cited in Taylor et al, 2015). While it can be inferred that an increase in population would lead to an increase in demand for recreation and tourism activities and facilities, this growth may be restricted by limited access to some areas of the Pacific coast. As discussed above, the northern half of the study area has fewer public access opportunities than the southern half of the study area. Although there are many opportunities for access to the beach along the southern coast, anecdotal evidence shows that during peak periods certain facilities lack sufficient parking to handle large crowds. Population growth and the increasing popularity of certain activities may increase overcrowding (Taylor et al., 2015).

Environmental Factors

The potential exists for a variety of environmental issues to impact the recreation and tourism industry in the future. Potential erosion, particularly along the southern coast, could impact recreation facilities and access to recreation and port facilities. Water quality is also a concern. Past water quality issues have impacted recreational users of ocean resources, and the potential exists for future effects as well. The razor clam fishery, which supports a highly popular recreational activity, has had frequent closures due to harmful algal blooms. Marine algal blooms have also killed birds and likely caused illness in other marine wildlife (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Similar to the concerns highlighted in Section 2.4: State and Tribal Fisheries, local stakeholders are also concerned about the potential for oil spills to threaten coastal recreational resources. The impacts of an oil spill on the natural resources of the Pacific coast could affect the recreation and tourism industry for an extended period.

References

- City of Hoquiam, & Washington State Department of Ecology. (2016). *Westway expansion project: Final environmental impact statement, main report*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/geographic/graysharbor/westwayterminal.html> [Source type 4].
- Industrial Economics Inc. (2014). *Marine sector analysis report: Recreation and Tourism* (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/RecreationSectorAnalysis.pdf> [Source type 11].
- NOAA Coastal Services Center. (2014). *Washington State's ocean economy-A profile using the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Economics: National Ocean Watch (ENOW)*. NOAA Coastal Services Center [Source type 11].
- Point 97, & Surfrider Foundation. (2015). *An economic and spatial baseline of coastal recreation in Washington*. Prepared for Washington Department of Natural Resources. Retrieved from <http://publicfiles.surfrider.org/P97SurfriderWACoastalRecreationReport.pdf>. [Source type 9].
- Skewgar, E., & Pearson, S. F. (Eds.). (2011). *State of the Washington coast: Ecology, Management, and Research Priorities*. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from <http://dfw.wa.gov/publications/01198/> [Source type 11].
- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). *Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington*. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_small.pdf [Source type 11].
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2011). *Willapa National Wildlife Refuge Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Statement*. Retrieved from https://www.fws.gov/refuge/willapa/conservation/comprehensive_conservation_plan.html [Source type 4].
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2015, July). *Gold and fish: Rules for mineral prospecting and placer mining*. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from <http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01729/wdfw01729.pdf> [Source type 11]
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, & Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. (2010). *2008-2010 small scale mining and prospecting on ocean beaches (SSB 6343) pilot program report*. Olympia, WA. Retrieved from http://app.leg.wa.gov/ReportsToTheLegislature/Home/GetPDF?fileName=Legislative%20Report_44a2f30a-c5dd-45d0-ae44-9e1b7d34feb4.pdf [Source type 11]

2.7 Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure

Marine shipping, transportation, and associated infrastructure are significant uses of the MSP Study Area. Although this report is focused on the MSP Study Area, it is impossible to discuss marine transportation, navigation, and infrastructure without recognizing the relationship to activity in the Strait of Juan de Fuca, Puget Sound, and coastal points north and south of the Study Area. It is also challenging to separate out the economic impacts of these uses for just the Study Area as most studies and economic forecasts encompass broader areas. Therefore, this discussion of marine transportation, navigation, and infrastructure will often highlight impacts to the larger region.

This section summarizes the history, current use, economic impacts, and future trends of marine transportation, navigation, and associated infrastructure in the MSP Study Area.

Summary of History and Current Use

Shipping

Early trade began with Native peoples along the coast traveling widely by water, and expanded with the introduction of European explorers focused on the region's natural resources. Trade continued to grow into the 18th and 19th centuries as competition for the northwest and its trade resources intensified. Washington eventually developed into an exporter of raw materials with well-developed trading networks (Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, 2010). Settlers were drawn to the region due to the availability of natural resources and the potential for trade with important early exports in lumber, shingles, and high-grade coal. Railroad companies developed a monopoly on moving cargo and received grants of federal land, with state and local governments often providing further land concessions leading the railroads to own large parcels of prime waterfront property (Caldbeck, 2010).

As a response to the railroad monopoly, Washington passed the Port District Act of 1911, which allowed voters to create and form public port districts that were required to devote their efforts and resources to developing and operating harbors and related facilities for public benefit. They also had the power to levy taxes, incur debt, and take land through eminent domain. Within 15 years of the Port District Act, all 11 of the state's currently operating deep-draft ports had been established including the Ports of Grays Harbor, Seattle, and Tacoma. The ports and trade generally prospered during World War I and World War II, and suffered challenges during each transition to a postwar economy. Over time, the ports became more technically sophisticated and able to handle a greater variety of cargoes with reduced effort and expense. The Port of Grays Harbor is the only deep-draft port in the MSP Study Area. Although the Port of Grays Harbor took 11 years to open its first public deep-draft pier and terminal in 1922, by 1924 more than one billion board feet of lumber exports passed through the port (Caldbeck, 2010). Today the Port of Grays Harbor has four terminals and five deep-draft berths with direct access to railroad lines. Primary imports and exports are liquid- and dry-bulk cargo and automobiles.

A report by BST Associates (2014), describes cargo shipping transits and provides projections for the Pacific Northwest (PNW) Gateway which includes 11 seaports, airports, and international land crossings in the states of Washington and Oregon.¹ The PNW Gateway accounted for \$204 billion worth of goods in international trade in 2013. The PNW is the key gateway for goods moving between the United States and Asia and totals 13% of waterborne U.S.-Asia trade. The PNW was also the sixth largest gateway for waterborne trade of exports of American products based on 2013 export value. The largest trading partners through PNW ports for waterborne trade are China (31%), Alaska and Hawaii (23%), Japan (18%), and South Korea (6%) (BST Associates, 2014).

Marine traffic through the MSP Study Area is highly influenced by trends and shifts in trade patterns throughout the United States and the world. These patterns dictate the traffic flow through the ports in Puget Sound, the Columbia River, and the Pacific Coast. Container traffic through Tacoma, Seattle, and Portland saw strong growth through 2005, but then experienced a decline due in part to the economic recession and competition from other ports. Container volumes began to recover in 2011, remained flat in 2012-2013, and are projected to grow slowly at a rate of 2.2 percent annually from 2013-2035. However, even as container volumes have recently increased, container vessel traffic has continued to decline slightly, due largely to the increasing size of container vessels (BST Associates, 2014).

Cargo shipments

Grain exports in the PNW are primarily handled through Columbia River ports. However, global competition in the market is intense and the volume of corn available for export has decreased due to increased domestic demand for use in ethanol production. Soybean exports through the PNW have increased and there continues to be strong demand for vegetable oils. Upgrades at port facilities on the Columbia River and at Grays Harbor have improved the grain elevator capacity. Annual exports of grain and oilseeds through PNW ports doubled between 2002 and 2010 from less than 16 million metric tons to nearly 33 million metric tons. Growth is projected at 2.2 percent annually from 2013 to 2035 (BST Associates, 2014)

Key dry bulk commodities for Puget Sound and coastal ports include scrap metal, wood chips, sand and gravel, cement, and gypsum. Columbia River exports include minerals, ores, chemicals and fertilizers, petroleum by-products, and wood chips. Since 2000, dry bulk shipments have experienced generally slow growth in volume and are projected to continue to grow at a rate of 1.3 percent per year from 2013 to 2035 (BST Associates, 2014). This forecast could change substantially with increases in dry bulk shipments of coal or potash if potential projects on the Columbia River or Puget Sound move forward (BST Associates, 2014).

Liquid bulk commodities in the PNW are primarily petroleum, including crude oil and refined products, with other liquids like chemicals and fertilizers being handled in much smaller volumes. The Port of Grays Harbor primarily handles biodiesel, which includes the byproducts of methanol and glycerin, while ports in the Columbia River handle petroleum products and chemical products. In addition to the existing volume of shipments, there are multiple projects in the planning or permitting stages that could substantially increase the volume of shipments. These include crude oil rail-to-vessel transfer facilities in Grays Harbor (discussed further in future trends section below) and Columbia River ports. Additional facilities are proposed for methanol production and export on the Columbia River and for LNG export at Ferndale.

¹ Throughout this section, Pacific Northwest (PNW) refers to Washington and Oregon.

The volume of liquid bulk transport by vessel has decreased over the past decade. This decrease was driven by a reduction in receipts of crude oil from Alaska as production there has decreased and been replaced by other sources, including crude oil coming to the PNW by rail from North Dakota. Waterborne movement of petroleum products is projected to decline from 2013-2035 with an average annual growth rate of -0.4 percent. This does not include the potential future projects which could increase the shipments (BST Associates, 2014).

Other major PNW commodities include neobulk² such as automobiles, lumber, heavy machinery, bundled metal, and scrap steel, and breakbulk³ such as logs, forest products, and other project cargoes like wind turbines and heavy equipment parts. Most PNW automobile imports are handled in Columbia River ports, though some are handled in Tacoma and more recently the Port of Grays Harbor, which now handles exports of Chrysler vehicles.

Log exports have been relatively strong in the past few years due to growing demand from China, Japan, and Korea. Breakbulk exports of forest products like lumber, pulp, and paper have declined significantly, though they experienced an increase in 2013. Steel breakbulk shipments declined significantly with the downturn in U.S. commercial and residential construction markets but have begun to rebuild slowly. The economic recession caused breakbulk and neobulk trade to bottom out in 2008, with particularly significant impacts on vehicle imports. Since 2008, volumes have recovered and now exceed pre-recession levels. Volumes are expected to continue to grow slowly at an annual rate of 0.7 percent through 2035 (BST Associates, 2014).

Vessel traffic

Various types of vessels transit the MSP Study Area, including tank vessels and cargo vessels. Tank vessels carry bulk liquids like oil, methanol, biodiesel, and vegetable oil, and are either self-propelled tankers or tank barges that are propelled using a tug. Cargo vessels carry dry goods like grain and wood and include self-propelled cargo ships, cargo barges propelled using tugs, and RoRo (roll-on/roll-off) vessels that carry automobiles or other wheeled vehicles (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016). Passenger vessels such as cruise ships also transit the study area occasionally. Patterns of use by other vessels such as those used for fishing or recreation are described in other sections (see Section 2.4: State and Tribal Fisheries and Section 2.6: Recreation and Tourism).

Vessels are defined by their carrying capacity or deadweight tonnage (dwt), which describes the number of metric tons of cargo, stores, and bunker fuel that a vessel can transport. Tankers arriving to ports in the PNW range from 12,000-190,000 dwt. In Puget Sound, tankers carrying crude oil and petroleum products are limited to 125,000 dwt. There is no regulatory tonnage limit for tankers operating in Grays Harbor or the Columbia River. The depth of the navigation channels for the Columbia River and Grays Harbor do limit the size of vessel used in these areas. Crude oil and petroleum products are also handled by integrated tug-barges (ITB)⁴ and articulated tug-barges (ATB).

² Neobulk includes general cargo that is prepackaged, counted, and loaded individually (not in containers), and transferred as units at the terminal.

³ Breakbulk includes general cargo that is loaded in bulk units and either packaged in boxes or barrels or attached to pallets or skids (not in containers), and transferred at the terminal.

⁴ There have not been any ITBs in the Puget Sound region in recent years (Veentjer, J., personal communication, February 6, 2017).

The average size of vessels calling in PNW ports increased by 2-3 percent annually for most vessel types between 2002 and 2011 based on the average deadweight tons per call. Container vessels calling at PNW ports serve Alaska, Hawaii, and smaller international trade routes and range from in size from 1,000 to 5,000 TEU. Container vessels engaged in Transpacific trade have increased in size, with shipping line vessels increasing from 5,000 TEU to well over 10,000 TEU. The growing size of container ships for efficiency has resulted in a decrease in the number of container ship calls. This trend is expected to continue or level out in the future (BST Associates, 2014).

The number of vessel calls in the PNW is forecast to decline to 3,336 vessel entrances in 2035. The number of vessel calls peaked in 1996 at 5,431 and fell to 3,947 by 2013. This decline, averaging a 1.9 percent decrease per year, was due in part to increases in vessel sizes. Between 2013 and 2035 a forecast decline of 611 vessel calls averages out to -0.8 percent per year. This prediction is based on historical trends from Ecology reports on Vessel Entries and Transits and on Marine Exchange of Puget Sound data for Puget Sound and Grays Harbor. This does not include any of the projects in the planning or permitting stages that could increase the volume of dry bulk or liquid bulks shipped through the PNW (BST Associates, 2014). If the proposed projects move forward, there is the potential for significant increases in vessel traffic.

Several maps show the density of different vessel types in the MSP Study Area: cargo vessel density (Map 36), passenger vessel density (Map 37), tanker vessel density (Map 38), and tug and tow vessel density (Map 39).

Navigation

The variety and density of vessels transiting the MSP Study Area necessitate several schemes designed to guide vessel paths through the area to avoid conflicts. These are discussed below, and shipping lanes, federal navigation channels, and navigation agreement lanes are highlighted in Map 40.

The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) maintains aids to navigation (ATON) within the MSP Study Area, which include a mixture of lateral and non-lateral buoys, beacons, and automated identification systems (AIS) (USCG, personal communication, February 7, 2017). The USCG also maintains lighthouses at Cape Flattery, North Head, Grays Harbor, and Cape Disappointment (United States Coast Guard, 2016).

Vessel Traffic Service Puget Sound, maintained by the USCG, facilitates good order and predictability on the Salish Sea waterways by coordinating vessel movements through the collection, verification, organization, and dissemination of information. Vessels required to carry AIS in accordance with [33 CFR 164.46](#) can be tracked for informational purposes (USCG, personal communication, February 7, 2017). The USCG works cooperatively with the Canadian Coast Guard's Marine Communications and Traffic Services (MCTS) to manage vessel traffic in adjacent waters in order to cover offshore approaches and all of the Salish Sea (U.S. Coast Guard Navigation Center, 2016). The Marine Exchange of Puget Sound (MXPS) monitors arriving and departing commercial vessels in the Puget Sound region and Grays Harbor. The MXPS does not proactively track or monitor vessels offshore, but has the capability to do so out to about 50 miles (Veentjer, J., personal communication, February 6, 2017). The Merchants Exchange of Portland also monitors arriving and departing commercial vessels in the Columbia River. The Exchange has the capability to monitor vessels out to about 50 miles off the coasts of Washington and Oregon (Veentjer, J., personal communication, February 6, 2017).

Traffic separation schemes (TSS) are designed to establish traffic lanes that separate opposing streams of traffic. There are TSS designated for the approaches to the Strait of Juan de Fuca including a western approach, a southwestern approach, and a precautionary area.

Additional TSS are designated within the Strait of Juan de Fuca, for approaches to Puget Sound, and within Puget Sound. Washington Sea Grant worked with towboaters and crab fishermen to establish towboat lanes along the Pacific Coast between San Francisco, CA and Cape Flattery, WA. Towboat lanes are designed to limit interactions between fishing gear and towing vessels that can destroy gear and foul the propellers and shafts of towing vessels (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016).

The Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS) encompasses much of the northern half of the MSP Study Area. Prevention of spills of oil or other hazardous material from a major marine accident is one of OCNMS' highest priorities as such a spill would be a threat to the resources and qualities of the sanctuary. The International Maritime Organization (IMO) designated an Area to Be Avoided (ATBA) within OCNMS (Map 40). The IMO establishes ATBAs in defined areas where navigation is very hazardous or where they can contribute to avoiding casualties.

The ATBA within OCNMS recommends certain classes of transiting vessels to stay outside of the defined area. It is a voluntary program that applies to ships and barges carrying oil or hazardous materials as cargo, and to all ships 400 gross tons and above that are solely in transit. Voluntary compliance rates are very high. The ATBA does not apply to vessels engaged in activities like fishing and research that are otherwise allowed in the sanctuary. It also does not apply to government vessels, but they are encouraged to avoid the area when solely in transit (Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, 2015).

Most deep-draft vessels and barges carrying liquid bulks (petroleum, petroleum products, biofuels and chemicals) travel well offshore unless they are entering or departing a port. However, barges and vessels that are accessing the Port of Grays Harbor and barges that are carrying dry cargoes (regardless of destination) do transit the coastal area just below the Area to Be Avoided (ATBA). This is a consideration for the development of offshore energy systems (BST Associates, 2014). The Grays Harbor Navigation Channel is nearly 23 nautical miles (nm) long. It begins approximately 4 miles offshore and runs in an easterly direction, allowing access for deep-draft vessels to Port of Grays Harbor facilities (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016). All deep-draft vessels are limited by the depth of the navigation channel in Grays Harbor.

The West Coast Offshore Vessel Traffic Risk Management Project Workgroup⁵ recommends that where no other management measures such as ATBAs, Traffic Separation Schemes (TSS), or recommended tracks already exist, vessels 300 gross tons or larger transiting coastwise anywhere between Cook Inlet, AK and San Diego, CA should voluntarily stay a minimum distance of 25 nm offshore. They also recommend that with those same management exceptions, tank ships laden with crude oil or persistent petroleum products should voluntarily stay a minimum distance of 50 nm offshore (West Coast Offshore Vessel Traffic Risk Management Project Workgroup, 2002). AIS data, as seen in Maps 36, 37, 38, and 39, indicates that most of the vessels transiting the MSP Study Area do stay offshore as recommended. Exceptions to this include vessels entering and exiting Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay as well as smaller vessels including tug/tow vessels.

⁵ The West Coast Offshore Vessel Traffic Risk Management Project was co-sponsored by the Pacific States/British Columbia Oil Spill Task Force and the U.S. Coast Guard, Pacific Area. The full report and workgroup membership are available at: <http://oilspilltaskforce.org/>.

Ship and boat building, maintenance, and repair

The ship and boat building, maintenance, and repair sector of the maritime industry includes new construction, maintenance, refurbishment, and modernization of commercial, recreational, and military vessels. This sector has a long history in Washington, including a great demand for shipbuilding as the timber industry drove early shipping and Seattle developed as a trade and shipping center. Another center for trade developed on Puget Sound when Tacoma was chosen as the western terminus of the Northern Pacific Railroad's transcontinental line. As a result, shipyards began to establish themselves on Puget Sound (Community Attributes Inc., 2013).

The majority of the activity associated with this industry occurs outside the MSP Study Area and adjacent areas. The commercial companies in this sector are larger, but there are fewer of them, while recreational companies are smaller but more numerous. The Puget Sound Naval Shipyard in Bremerton is the largest and most diverse shipyard on the west coast, and has more than 11,000 civilian employees (Community Attributes Inc., 2013).

One example of this sector in the MSP Study Area is the Westport Shipyard. The Westport Shipyard in Grays Harbor was founded in 1964. It began by building oceangoing vessels for the Pacific commercial fishing fleet but now specializes in yacht and commercial construction. The company also has a shipyard in Port Angeles, WA and a yacht sales center in Fort Lauderdale, FL. Since the founding of the shipyard, vessels built by Westport include over 100 recreational yachts, 170 commercial fishing vessels, 35 commercial passenger vessels, and 7 other commercial vessels. The Westport Shipyard is a 170,000 square foot enclosed facility, and the Port Angeles shipyard is a 100,000 square foot enclosed facility. A cabinet shop and upholstery shop also support the operation (Westport, 2016).

In addition to the larger boat building operations, there are a number of locally important, smaller facilities in the ports and marinas within or directly adjacent to the MSP Study Area that support boat haul-out and repairs. These facilities are important to the operation of other sectors including fishing and aquaculture.

Economic Impact

Marine transportation and shipping have an economic impact on the coastal counties adjacent to the MSP Study Area, but is challenging to isolate the impacts to just the coastal counties. This is because vessels transiting through the MSP Study Area are coming from and bound for a variety of locations, including Puget Sound or Columbia River ports, which are part of the total ocean economy in the state.

Washington State

Community Attributes Inc. performed an economic impact study of the maritime cluster in Washington in 2013. They define the maritime cluster to include six core sectors: maritime logistics and shipping; ship and boat building, maintenance, and repair; maritime support services; passenger water transportation; fishing and seafood processing; and military and other federal operations. The focus of this section is on the first three sectors listed, but the economic information covers all six sectors. For Washington in 2012, the entire maritime cluster directly employed more than 57,700 people in the state and was responsible for \$15.2 billion in gross business income (Community Attributes Inc., 2013).

Subsectors relevant to this section include maritime logistics and shipping, boat and ship building, repair, and maintenance, and maritime support services. Maritime logistics and shipping includes port and harbor operations, deep and shallow water goods movement, inland water freight transport, and refrigerated warehousing and storage. Boat and ship building, repair, and maintenance includes new construction of vessels, maintenance, refurbishment and overhaul, and modernization. Maritime support services include support for commercial, recreational, and defense-related maritime activities like boat dealers, marinas, fueling and lubricant businesses, engineers, naval architects, parts suppliers, and construction. Table 2.7-1 summarizes the maritime impacts of these subsectors throughout Washington.

Table 2.7-1: Summary of economic impacts from maritime subsectors in Washington State.
Source: Community Attributes Inc., 2013.

Maritime subsector	Employer establishments	Wages (\$ millions)	Jobs	Gross business income (\$ millions)
Maritime logistics and shipping	800	1,156.0	16,700	3,722.4
Maritime support services	300	387.7	4,600	864.2
Boat and ship building, repair, and maintenance	150	1,163.8	16,500 ⁶	1,489.7
Fishing and seafood processing	720	1,113.4	15,400	8,592.6
Passenger water transportation	130	262.8	4,500	544.5
Total	2,100	4,083.7	57,700	15,213.3

Coastal Counties

The NOAA Coastal Services Center⁷ conducted a separate economic analysis using data from the Economics: National Ocean Watch (ENOW) database from 2005-2011 (NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2014). ENOW describes six economic sectors that depend on the ocean: living resources, marine construction, marine transportation, offshore mineral resources, ship and boat building, and tourism and recreation. The ENOW analysis describes the ocean economy at the county level and shows the contribution of the five Pacific coastal counties (Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, Pacific, and Wahkiakum) to Washington’s ocean economy. These five counties accounted for 6 percent of employment and 3.9 percent of GDP in the statewide ocean economy. The impact of the marine transportation sector on Pacific coastal counties compared to its impact statewide is displayed in Table 2.7-2.

⁶ Included in this subsector are more than 11,000 civilian jobs at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyards in Bremerton.

⁷ In 2014, the NOAA Coastal Services Center merged with NOAA’s Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management to form NOAA’s Office for Coastal Management.

Table 2.7-2: Marine transportation contribution to the ocean economy of the five Pacific coastal counties and statewide.
Source: NOAA Coastal Services Center, 2014.

Marine Transportation	Pacific Coastal Counties⁸	Statewide
Establishments	6	409
Employment	63	19,105
Wages (thousands of dollars)	4,523	1,279,000
Average wages	71,794	66,961
GDP (thousands of dollars)	7,976	2,594,000
Self-employed workers	40	523

Port of Grays Harbor

The Port of Grays Harbor is a major economic driver for coastal Washington and also has economic impacts on other parts of the state. Port of Grays Harbor facilities support the movement of waterborne cargo into and out of the state. In total, 2.38 million metric tons of cargo moved through Port of Grays Harbor facilities in 2013. This included soy meal and other bulk commodities, automobiles, forest product exports in chips and logs, and liquid bulk (Martin Associates, 2014). Table 2.7-3 estimates total economic impact based on five commodities at 2013 cargo levels: wood chips, grain, automobiles, logs, and liquid bulk. Table 2.7-3 shows 574 direct jobs and \$143.5 million in direct business revenue generated by these five commodities through the port. Of the 574 direct jobs, 94 percent were held by Grays Harbor residents (Martin Associates, 2014).

The Port of Grays Harbor marine cargo terminals have a total revenue impact of \$143 million, \$118 million of which can be allocated to specific commodity types (Table 2.7-4). Much of this revenue can be tied to the state of Washington through the payment of salaries and wages, purchases of local goods and services, and the payment of state and local taxes. However, the revenue also has a national and international impact beyond those uses. The impact of the specific commodities being shipped through the Port of Grays Harbor can also be seen through the distribution of direct revenue impact. The greatest revenue on a per ton/revenue basis is generated by handling of autos followed by grain. The majority of the revenue generated by autos and grain is in the surface transportation sector, followed by terminal operations (Martin Associates, 2014).

⁸ These numbers are reported for the five Pacific coastal counties, and not by individual county, due to data confidentiality requirements. Where the number of establishments is low in one county, the data is suppressed, allowing results for only the larger coastal area to be shown. In Jefferson and Clallam counties, it is likely the analysis overestimates the numbers for establishments directly adjacent to the MSP Study Area. This includes the entire county, so information from establishments on the Strait of Juan de Fuca and Puget Sound is included.

Table 2.7-3: Economic impacts of cargo activity at Port of Grays Harbor marine terminals.
 Source: Martin Associates, 2014.

Category	
Jobs (number)	
Direct	574
Indirect	645
Induced	305
Total Jobs	1,524
Personal Income (\$1,000)	
Direct	\$36,239
Induced	\$79,654
Indirect	\$14,860
Total Income	\$130,754
Business Revenue (\$1,000)	\$143,488
Local Purchases (\$1,000)	\$31,513
State and Local Taxes (\$1,000)	\$12,291

Table 2.7-4: Revenue impact by commodity generated by the Port of Grays Harbor marine cargo terminals.
 Source: Martin Associates, 2014.

Commodity	Direct revenue (\$1,000)	Tonnage (metric tons)	Revenue (1,000 tons)
Chips	\$1,130	94,732	\$11.93
Grain	\$69,186	1,360,611	\$50.85
Autos (units)	\$32,513	92,790	\$350.39
Logs	\$5,165	317,390	\$16.27
Liquid bulk	\$10,241	433,981	\$23.60
Not allocated	\$25,253		
Total	\$143,488		

The Port of Grays Harbor and other ports outside of the MSP Study Area face competition from each other, from ports on the West Coast, and even from the East and Gulf Coasts. Shifts in trade patterns have the potential to cause economic impacts within the areas adjacent to the MSP Study Area.

Related Infrastructure

Ports and Marinas

There are a number of ports and marinas adjacent to the MSP Study Area that provide a variety of functions including moorage and access for recreational and commercial fishing vessels, fish processing, shipping, storage, and vessel and gear maintenance. An overview of ports and marinas is provided here, with further detail on fishing-related functions available in the State and Tribal Fisheries section and dredging requirements in the Dredging and Dredge Disposal section.

Some of the ports discussed below are outside of the MSP Study Area, including the Port of Neah Bay, Port of Ilwaco, and the Port of Chinook. These ports and marina all provide critical services important to uses within the Study Area and contribute significantly to the coastal economy.

Clallam County ports

Neah Bay

The Makah Tribe owns and operates the Makah Marina in Neah Bay (adjacent to the MSP Study Area), which primarily serves as a fishing marina and dock. The facility has undergone recent upgrades that are expected to help retain fishing related jobs and improve oil spill response capabilities by providing a safe dock for response vessels. Upgrades to the dock included building a new concrete dock and a new facility with offices, a hoist, an ice plant, and two icing stations (Taylor, Baker, Waters, Wegge, & Wellman, 2015). The Makah Marina at Neah Bay is protected from waves by an Army Corps of Engineers maintained riprap wave barrier. The marina has 200 slips and caters mostly to private boats. It is open for recreational use from April through September. The USCG operates a small boat station just east of the marina.

Quileute Harbor Marina

The Quileute Harbor Marina, owned and operated by the Quileute Tribe and located in La Push, is the only designated safe harbor between Neah Bay and Westport. The marina has 95 slips, some of which are leased to commercial and recreational fishermen. The U.S. Coast Guard uses the marina as the homeport for the Quillayute River Station, the only search and rescue station between Grays Harbor and Neah Bay. In 2014, the marina underwent improvements including plank replacement on existing docks and construction of a new boat ramp that will allow for removal of larger vessels. The Army Corps of Engineers also performed some dredging of the Quillayute River at the harbor at that time, and generally does so every two years. The west end of the marina has facilities that the tribe leases to High Tide Seafoods including a high dock with a lift, an ice machine, and space for a fish processing plant in La Push. The marina serves both tribal and non-tribal fishers (Taylor et al., 2015).

Jefferson County ports

Jefferson County does not have any ports or marinas on the coast in the MSP Study Area. The Port of Port Townsend and other marinas are located on Puget Sound.

Grays Harbor County ports

Port of Grays Harbor

The Port of Grays Harbor is the only deepwater port on the Pacific Coast of Washington. It is also two days of travel time closer to Asia than Puget Sound ports, which gives it a locational advantage promoting expansion beyond traditional commodity shipments (Taylor et al., 2015). The Port of Grays Harbor was the second Port District to be created in the state in 1911, after the Port District Act passed earlier in the year. The Port's first facility, Pier 1, opened in 1922. For several years in the 1920s, Grays Harbor was the largest lumber exporting port in the world with exports exceeding a billion board feet annually. Lumber exports continued to provide the bulk of the Port's business into the 1980s. After a dramatic reduction in logging in the 1980s and 1990s, the Port worked to diversify its business (Ott, 2010). The Port did this in part by undergoing a dredging project to accommodate oceangoing vessels that continue to increase in size. The Port also utilized an agreement with a shortline railroad to maintain a connection with two Class 1 Railroads, which allowed for the development of a bulk handling facility and automobile export operation (R. Lewis, personal communication, Jan. 13, 2017). The Westport Marina, a facility of the Port of Grays Harbor, is the number one seafood landing point in Washington. The Port of Grays Harbor is the number one exporter of American grown soybean meal (Taylor et al., 2015). The Port has diversified and now ships goods including automobiles, biodiesel, other liquid, dry bulk, and overhigh/overwide (OHOW)⁹ products.

The Port of Grays Harbor operates four marine terminals at the eastern end of Grays Harbor that are supported by secure cargo yards, an on-dock rail system, and covered storage. Terminal 4 is the main general cargo terminal and the largest, with a 1,400-foot-long berth that can handle two vessels and serves as the primary Ro/Ro and breakbulk cargo terminal. Terminal 3 is a deepwater terminal with on-site rail. Terminal 2 is a dry and liquid bulk facility that is served by a rail loop. Terminal 1 is a barge and liquid loading facility with an on-site rail loop (Port of Grays Harbor, n.d.).

Westport Marina

The Westport Marina is a 550-slip marina owned and operated by the Port of Grays Harbor. It is home to a large commercial fishing fleet and to recreational fishing vessels, including the state's largest charter fishing fleet. Current annual moorage rates show 94 recreational vessels and 188 commercial fishing vessels. There is also a boat launch for private boats and boat trailer parking (Taylor et al., 2015). The USCG operates a small boat station located at the south corner of the marina.

Quinault Marina

The Quinault Nation owns the Ocean Shores Marina, but it is currently closed due to needed repairs and dredging (Taylor et al., 2015).

⁹ Overhigh/overwide cargo products are handled specially, not normally a full cargo, and can be added to both neobulk and breakbulk vessels.

Pacific County ports

Port of Peninsula

The Port of Peninsula owns a commercial facility in Nahcotta, WA located on the Willapa Bay side of the Long Beach Peninsula. The Port District serves the oyster, clam, and crab industries, a gillnet fleet, and recreational users with 90 slips and a public boat launch. In 2009, the Port rebuilt the service pier, providing the shellfish industry on Willapa Bay with a modern, environmentally responsible, and secure facility to support business expansion and improve productivity. The service pier provides the only fuel service on the bay and utilizes an aboveground storage tank (M. Delong, personal communication, October 8, 2014). The Port also sponsors the Willapa Bay Oyster House Interpretive Center, an interpretive center focused on the local oyster industry. Twenty-five percent of the nation's oysters go through the Port of Peninsula (Coast & Harbor Engineering, 2011; Cook, 2012). Increased Manila Clam and oyster production in Willapa Bay have elevated the Port to a major landing facility for the region (M. Delong, personal communication, October 8, 2014).

Willapa Bay

The Port of Willapa Harbor was formed in 1928, and developed port facilities for shipping lumber and other forest products as well as for fishing and oyster vessels. The Port of Willapa Harbor owns and operates three water access facilities within Willapa Bay: the Raymond Port Dock, Tokeland Marina, and Bay Center Marina.

The Raymond Port Dock has a 50,000 square foot "high dock" that services commercial vessels. An additional 700 feet of floating dock is available for moorage (Port of Willapa Harbor, n.d.). The Bay Center Marina provides moorage for oyster barges and fishing vessels, with capacity for approximately 40 vessels. The Bay Center Marina is located within the navigation channel of the Palix River and requires regular dredging to maintain viability as a marina (Port of Willapa Harbor, n.d.).

The Tokeland Marina is located at the north end of Willapa Bay and offers recreational and commercial moorage with over 1,000 feet of floating dock. There is also a public fishing pier and boat ramp. The marina and entrance channel experience significant sedimentation, and the Port of Willapa Harbor has launched a maintenance dredging program in Tokeland to maintain the dredging previously done by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Port of Willapa Harbor, n.d.).

South Bend has a recreational dock for canoeing, kayaking, and fishing as well as a boat launch (Taylor et al., 2015). South Bend also has commercial fish landings directly at seafood processors in the area.

Ilwaco and Chinook

The Port of Ilwaco is located in the southwest corner of Washington just inside the Columbia River, adjacent to the MSP Study Area. The Port serves commercial fishermen, recreational boaters, two major seafood processing businesses, and a U.S. Coast Guard Station. The Port serves vessels from Washington, Oregon, Alaska, and Canada with an 800-slip marina (Pacific County Economic Development Council, 2013; G. Glenn, personal communication, October 22, 2014). In 2013, 23,720 private trips were launched from Ilwaco, a popular sport fishing port. Facilities at the port include a boat launch, two small boat hoists, and two fuel docks (Taylor et al., 2015).

The Port of Chinook is located on the southwest corner of Washington, a few miles up the Columbia River from the Port of Ilwaco, adjacent to the MSP Study Area. The Port of Chinook is home to recreational and commercial fishing boats as well as a major crab cannery facility (Pacific County Economic Development Council, 2013). The Port has 300 slips and can accommodate commercial and sport fishing vessels up to 60 feet in length. Additional facilities include a boat launch, a boat hoist, and a fueling facility (Taylor et al., 2015).

Emergency Response

United States Coast Guard

The USCG 13th District is made up of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana and the entire coast of the Pacific Northwest, including the MSP Study Area. The Study Area is served by operations based in Sector Puget Sound and Sector Columbia River. Daily operations include conducting search and rescue and patrolling the coast to enforce safety and fishing regulations (United States Coast Guard, 2015).

The USCG Station Grays Harbor has the Coast Guard's first on-water response responsibility over the area ranging from the Queets River south to the Long Beach Peninsula, including Willapa Bay. The station has four vessels that perform search and rescue activities. The U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port of Sector Columbia River, whose office is located in Astoria, Oregon, has the authority to close the bar at Grays Harbor due to severe weather that makes it unsafe for vessels to transit (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016).

USCG Station Cape Disappointment is in Ilwaco at the mouth of the Columbia River. It is the largest search and rescue station on the Pacific Northwest coast with 50 crewmembers. The station has five search and rescue boats and provides search and rescue for commercial and recreational mariners within 50 nm of the Columbia River entrance. This area is one of the most dangerous river bars in the world, and crewmembers respond to 300-400 calls for assistance each year (United States Coast Guard, 2016). Station Cape Disappointment and Station Grays Harbor are units of the USCG Sector Columbia River with headquarters in Warrenton, Oregon. The headquarters has more response assets available than individual stations. Sector Columbia River's area of responsibility includes 420 nm of coastline in Washington and Oregon and the Columbia River (United States Coast Guard, 2016).

USCG Station Quillayute River is located in La Push on the Quileute Tribe's reservation. The station has two lifeboats to respond to emergency calls in the area between Cape Alava and Queets River. The station is supported by USCG Air Station/Sector Field Office Port Angeles (U.S. Coast Guard, 2004).

USCG Station Neah Bay is located within the Makah Indian Reservation, adjacent to the MSP Study Area. Station Neah Bay has two lifeboats to respond to emergencies from Cape Alava to the northern extent of the MSP Study Area (U.S. Coast Guard, 2003).

Emergency towing vessel

There is an emergency response towing vessel (ERTV) permanently stationed at Neah Bay and available to assist vessels off the coast of Washington or in the Strait of Juan de Fuca. Any "covered" vessels¹⁰ (essentially tank vessels, cargo vessels, and passenger vessels) that are

¹⁰ RCW 88.46.010(5) defines covered vessel as "...a tank vessel, cargo vessel, or passenger vessel." The RCW further defines a cargo vessel as "...a self-propelled ship in commerce, other than a tank vessel or a passenger vessel, of three hundred or more gross tons, including but not limited to, commercial fish processing vessels and

transiting to or from a Washington port through the Strait of Juan de Fuca are required to include the towing vessel in Neah Bay in their oil spill emergency response plans (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016). The ERTV is industry-funded to be on station in Neah Bay and available for hire 24 hours a day to assist vessels experiencing maneuvering issues (e.g. propulsion and steering problems) or vessels that are directed by the U.S. or Canadian Coast Guard to obtain towing or escort assistance (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016). More than 90% of the assistance provided by the ERTV has been escorting, often as required by the U.S. Coast Guard (J. Veentjer, personal communication, February 6, 2017).

The ERTV is intended to be able to make up to, stop, hold, and tow a drifting or disabled vessel of 180,000 metric dead weight tons in severe weather conditions (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2016). The ERTV could assist with vessels in a difficult situation in or near Grays Harbor, however, under normal weather conditions, it could take an average of 12 hours to reach the harbor. Under adverse weather conditions, transit time to Grays Harbor could be as much as 18 hours. Tugs currently operating on the Columbia River could provide the same assistance; travel time would be approximately 12 hours to Grays Harbor (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016).

Since it was first stationed at Neah Bay in 1999, the ERTV has been deployed to either stand by for or directly assist 67 vessels that were either completely disabled or had reduced ability to maneuver.¹¹ The types of vessels assisted have included deep draft cargo vessels, large fishing and fish processing vessels, fully laden oil and chemical tank ships, and tugs with tank barges in tow. (Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016). The ERTV has significantly contributed to preventing oil spills along the north Olympic Peninsula and around Cape Flattery.

Future Trends

Shipping

For Washington and Oregon, waterborne cargo volumes are projected to continue growing at modest rates. Overall growth is projected to average 1.3 percent per year between 2013 and 2035 across all cargo types. However, the number of vessels is predicted to continue to decrease as companies shift to using larger vessels and therefore require fewer vessels (BST Associates, 2014).¹² These predictions are not specific to the coast of Washington, but also include Puget Sound, Columbia River, and Oregon ports. It is hard to predict impacts on individual Pacific coast ports and activities based on projections for the larger area. These projections do not include potential increases in cargo and vessel traffic that could occur if projects proposed for areas impacting the MSP Study Area move forward.

Changes in world trade patterns may affect trade flow through the PNW. Trade with China is being affected by economic shifts including rising wages and an increasing exchange rate. If multinational firms decide to relocate production away from China, this could shift waterborne container trade and decrease the trade moving through the PNW. So far, there has

freighters.” It also further defines passenger vessels as “...a ship of three hundred or more gross tons with a fuel capacity of at least six thousand gallons carrying passengers for compensation.”

¹¹ More details on the ERTV are available at: <https://www.ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Reporting-requirements/Emergency-response-towing-vessel>

¹² The average size of deep-draft vessels calling at the Port of Grays Harbor has increased on average by 3.2 percent per year between 2005 and 2012, from 28,300 tons to 35,300 tons (BST Associates, 2014).

only been a modest shift in trade routes and it is unknown how this will change in the future. This potential loss of cargo trade may be offset by exports of containerized and non-containerized products from the PNW to China as a result of rising incomes in China stimulating increased consumption of U.S. products (BST Associates, 2014).

Cargo forecasts for specific commodities for the PNW include a 2.2 percent increase in grain and oilseed exports between 2013 and 2035. There have been significant increases in grain and oilseed exports due to increased demand in Asia, increased production, and favorable ocean freight rates (BST Associates, 2014). Neobulk, including automobiles and logs, is an important component of Grays Harbor trade and is predicted to grow annually at 0.7 percent through 2035. For liquid bulk, the largest volumes in the PNW are in crude oil and refined products. There has been a trend of declining waterborne shipments of petroleum products as a result of production shifting from Alaska to Canada and the Bakken region of the United States and a shift to rail transportation. This trend is expected to continue and then stabilize with a forecasted negative 0.4 percent growth rate from 2013-2035 (BST Associates, 2014). This trend could be impacted by proposed oil transfer projects in Grays Harbor, Vancouver, Portland, and British Columbia. The potential impact of these proposed facilities to vessel transit is discussed below.

The Port of Grays Harbor is constantly in competition with other ports, not only nearby in the Puget Sound and Columbia River but also on the West, East, and Gulf Coasts. The Port has previously been able to diversify to maintain a competitive edge as products being shipped have shifted away from forest products and towards other cargo like auto exports. However, the competition between ports is also based on rail rates, port rates, and ocean accessibility, so it is unknown how this will affect the Port in the future (Taylor et al., 2015).

Oil shipping and facilities

Another dynamic factor in attempting to forecast cargo movements to and from PNW ports is the energy sector. Changes in oil supply in the U.S. and Canada are likely to influence the movement of crude oil in Washington State to refineries in the Puget Sound area as well as in Vancouver, British Columbia. Alaskan crude oil, transported by tankers and pipelines, has been decreasing and is expected to continue to decline. However, an increased supply of crude oil from the Bakken formation in North Dakota has substantially increased the amount of crude oil entering the state by train. This has stimulated project proposals for updating existing refineries and for crude oil storage and transfer facilities in Grays Harbor and along the Columbia River (Washington State Department of Ecology et al., 2015). Heavier tar sands crude oil from Canada may also be transported in Washington by existing and proposed pipeline facilities.

Recently, two facilities proposed developing new or modify existing bulk crude oil terminals on the coast of Washington with several others proposed in Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia that could impact the coast. If permitted, such new facilities could increase the number and type of vessels transiting through the MSP study area and increase the volume of crude oil carried through the area.¹³

One of the proposals was to expand existing bulk liquid storage facilities owned by Contanda (formerly Westway Terminal Company) at the Port of Grays Harbor. The maximum annual throughput of crude oil would be 17.9 million barrels per year (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016). Another proposal by Imperium Renewables

¹³ As ruled by the Washington State Supreme Court in *Quinault Indian Nation, et al v. Imperium Terminal Svcs., et al.* No. 92552-6, the City of Hoquiam's shoreline permit for these crude oil export projects, if issued, must demonstrate the projects meet the permit criteria in the Ocean Resources Management Act (RCW 43.143.030(2)) and any associated regulations. See Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework for additional information.

Inc., now under new ownership under the name Renewable Energy Group (REG), to expand existing bulk liquid storage facilities at the Port of Grays Harbor was paused after the comment period for its draft EIS ended on Nov. 30, 2015. REG is now revising its expansion proposal, which will not include crude oil (Washington State Department of Ecology, n.d.).

Contanda operates at Terminal 1 at the Port of Grays Harbor and proposed to expand facilities to store crude oil brought in by rail from the Bakken area in the U.S. or from Canada. . The final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was issued for the Westway Expansion Project on September 30, 2016 (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016). This proposal was withdrawn. Contanda has a new proposal to expand the current facility for other bulk liquids, but that does not involve crude oil (Washington State Department of Ecology, n.d.).¹⁴

Additional projects involving crude oil have been proposed along the Washington side of the Columbia River. One project currently in the permitting stages is Vancouver Energy, proposed by Tesoro-Savage. The project would have included a rail unloading facility, storage tanks, and a vessel loading area. It proposed to bring up to 360,000 barrels of crude oil by rail to the Port of Vancouver daily, where it would then be loaded onto vessels for transport to refineries in Alaska, Hawaii, California, and Washington. Under proposed typical operations there would be an additional 365 vessel calls per year to load and transport the crude oil (Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, 2015). Upon the unanimous recommendation by the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council, Governor Inslee rejected this application in January 2018.

Oil spill preparedness and response

Vessels transiting the MSP Study Area bring the potential for oil spills, an ongoing challenge of managing marine transportation. Oil spill risk can be defined as the probability that a particular type of spill incident is likely to occur and is influenced by the spill source, volume, oil type, season, and location (Environmental Research Consulting, 2009). Oil spill prevention, preparedness, and response activities address this risk but cannot completely eliminate it.

Different types of oil present different risks when spilled. Bakken crude and other shale oils can most closely be compared with light oils like diesel and have high evaporation rates. However, they are also highly flammable and volatile. Diluted bitumen from “oil sands” has been transported in Washington for decades and may sink when spilled in water depending on its formulation and the density of the water. A study conducted for the State found that the environmental risks from oil spills are highest for heavy fuels, followed by crude oil, and lower for light oils and gasoline. This trend is related to the higher persistence of heavier oils and the associated increased threats to organisms and habitats (Washington State Department of Ecology et al., 2015)

There are a number of state and federal laws and regulations that address the potential for oil spills on or near the water and associated preparedness and response planning and actions. The USCG is the federal agency responsible for oil spill prevention and preparedness and for response actions relating to vessels or vessel loading facilities.¹⁵ The Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) has state responsibility for preventing and planning for oil spills and response actions in state waters for all sources of oil discharge. These agencies provide oversight and ensure that the responsible party initiates a rapid and satisfactory response.

¹⁴ Contanda submitted a new application to the City of Hoquiam for a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit on January 25, 2018.

¹⁵ The EPA is the federal agency responsible for oil spill prevention and preparedness and for response actions relating to rail unloading facilities and storage tanks.

Vessels transporting oil have a variety of required measures that contribute to the prevention of oil spills. These include construction design (double bottoms and sides), mechanical measures (oil discharge monitoring systems and emergency shutdown devices), and navigational equipment (depth sounders and electronic position fixing devices to verify position and prevent collisions or groundings). Onsite storage and handling facilities at the terminals and trains that transport oil also have federal and state design standards, equipment, and training requirements to prevent oil and pollutants from reaching the environment. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Westway crude oil expansion recommended over 70 mitigation measures for the facility and project related vessels and trains. The proposed mitigation for vessel transport included using tug escorts for laden tankers and tank barges in Grays Harbor and implementing a formalized vessel management system. The EIS identified that no mitigation measures would completely eliminate the adverse consequences of a fire, spill or explosion and that the potential adverse environmental impacts could be significant (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016).

There is a coordinated oil spill response framework that establishes roles and responsibilities, identifies resources, and identify response procedures for oil spills or threat thereof. This framework includes the National Contingency Plan, Northwest Area Contingency Plan, local response plans, facility response plans, vessel response plans, and transportation regulations. The Northwest Area Contingency Plan¹⁶ covers Washington, Oregon, and Idaho and includes site-specific geographic response plans (GRPs). A GRP has two main objectives: to identify sensitive resources at risk of injury from oil spills, and to describe and prioritize strategies to protect these sensitive resources at risk (City of Hoquiam & Washington State Department of Ecology, 2016). GRPs relevant to the MSP Study Area include those for the Strait of Juan de Fuca, the Outer Coast, Grays Harbor, Willapa Bay, and the Lower Columbia River.

¹⁶ The state has adopted the Northwest Area Contingency Plan (NWACP) as the state's Oil and Hazardous Substance Spill Prevention and Response Plan, which applies to the activities of all state and local agencies involved in managing oil and hazardous substance spills. Ecology is the state's lead agency to oversee prevention, abatement, response, containment and cleanup efforts with regard to an oil or hazardous substance spill to waters of the state. Ecology coordinates with federal, state, and tribal members of the Region 10 Regional Response Team and the Northwest Area Committee to prevent and respond to oil and hazardous substance spills. For more information on the Region 10 Regional Response Team and NWACP, please go to <http://www.rrt10nwac.com/Default.aspx>

References

- BST Associates. (2014). *Washington coast marine spatial planning assessment of shipping sector: Final sector assessment*. Prepared for the Washington Department of Natural Resources. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/ShippingSectorAnalysis.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Caldbick, J. (2010). Deep-draft ports of Washington (Essay 9529). In *Online Encyclopedia of Washington State History*. HistoryLink.org. Retrieved from <http://www.historylink.org/File/9529> [Source type 11].
- City of Hoquiam, & Washington State Department of Ecology. (2016). *Westway expansion project: Final environmental impact statement, main report*. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/geographic/graysharbor/westwayterminal.html> [Source type 4].
- Coast & Harbor Engineering. (2011). *Willapa Bay flow lane disposal sites feasibility study* (Technical memorandum). [Source type 9].
- Community Attributes Inc. (2013). *Washington state maritime cluster. Economic impact study*. Prepared for Economic Development Council of Seattle and King County; and Workforce Development Council of Seattle-King County. Retrieved from <http://www.edc-seaking.org/catalog/industry-clusters/maritime-and-logistics> [Source type 11].
- Cook, W. M. (2012). *Port of Peninsula comprehensive scheme of harbor improvements & parks and recreation plan update*. Nahcotta, WA: Port of Peninsula. Retrieved from <http://www.portofpeninsula.org/> [Source type 11].
- Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council. (2015, November). Tesoro Savage Vancouver energy project: Draft environmental impact statement. Retrieved December 21, 2015, from http://www.efsec.wa.gov/Tesoro%20Savage/SEPA%20-%20DEIS/DEIS%20Chapters/20151124_DEIS_CovrTOCAcronms.pdf [Source type 11].
- Environmental Research Consulting. (2009). *Oil spill risk in industry sectors regulated by the Washington State Department of Ecology Spills Program for oil spill prevention and preparedness*. Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/spills/studies_reports/ERC%20Ecology%20Oil%20Spill%20Risk%20Analysis-Final.pdf [Source type 11].
- Martin Associates. (2014). *The 2013 economic impact of the Port of Grays Harbor*. Prepared for the Port of Grays Harbor. Retrieved from http://www.portofgraysharbor.com/downloads/reports/Grays_Harbor_Economic_Report.pdf [Source type 11].
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2016). United States Coast Pilot 7. Pacific Coast: California, Oregon, Washington, Hawaii, and Pacific Islands. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://www.nauticalcharts.noaa.gov/nsd/coastpilot_w.php?book=7 [Source type 7].
- NOAA Coastal Services Center. (2014). *Washington State's ocean economy-A profile using the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Economics: National Ocean Watch (ENOW)*. NOAA Coastal Services Center [Source type 11].
- Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. (2015). *Vessel transits through Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary and Area to be Avoided (ATBA)-2014 estimated compliance*. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/protect/incidentresponse/2014_ais.pdf [Source type 11].

- Ott, J. (2010). Port of Grays Harbor becomes Washington's second public port on December 12, 1911. (Essay 9390). In *Online Encyclopedia of Washington State History*. HistoryLink.org. Retrieved from <http://www.historylink.org/File/9390> [Source type 11].
- Pacific County Economic Development Council. (2013). *Pacific County channel and harbor maintenance and economic impact assessment*. (White paper). Pacific County Economic Development Council. [Source type 11].
- Port of Grays Harbor. (n.d.). Marine terminals. Retrieved November 28, 2016, from <http://www.portofgraysharbor.com/terminals/terminals.php> [Source type 11].
- Port of Willapa Harbor. (n.d.). Bay Center Marina. Retrieved November 17, 2016, from http://www.portofwillapaharbor.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=9:bay-center-marina&catid=2:facilities&Itemid=5 [Source type 11].
- Port of Willapa Harbor. (n.d.). Raymond Port Dock. Retrieved November 17, 2016, from http://www.portofwillapaharbor.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3:raymond-port-dock&catid=2:facilities&Itemid=5 [Source type 11].
- Port of Willapa Harbor. (n.d.). Tokeland Marina. Retrieved November 17, 2016, from http://www.portofwillapaharbor.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=8:tokeland-marina&catid=2:facilities&Itemid=5 [Source type 11].
- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). *Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington*. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_small.pdf [Source type 11].
- United States Coast Guard. (2015, May 28). Welcome to the U.S. Coast Guard 13th District. Retrieved July 1, 2015, from <http://www.uscg.mil/d13/> [Source type 11].
- United States Coast Guard. (2016). Coast Guard Sector Columbia River. Retrieved December 20, 2016, from <http://www.uscg.mil/d13/sectcolrvr/default.asp> [Source type 11].
- United States Coast Guard. (2016). Coast Guard Station Cape Disappointment. Retrieved from <http://www.uscg.mil/d13/sectcolrvr/stacapedisappointment/capedisappointment.asp> [Source type 11].
- United States Coast Guard. (2016). Light list, Volume VI, Pacific coast and Pacific islands. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, United States Coast Guard. Retrieved from <http://www.navcen.uscg.gov/pdf/lightLists/LightList%20V6.pdf> [Source type 11].
- U.S. Coast Guard. (2003). U.S. Coast Guard Station Neah Bay. Retrieved from https://www.uscg.mil/d13/lib/doc/factsheet/station_neah_bay.pdf [Source type 11].
- U.S. Coast Guard. (2004). U.S. Coast Guard Station Quillayute River. Retrieved from https://www.uscg.mil/d13/lib/doc/factsheet/station_quillayute_river.pdf [Source type 11].
- U.S. Coast Guard Navigation Center. (2016, September 8). Vessel traffic services. Retrieved February 6, 2017, from https://www.navcen.uscg.gov/?pageName=vtsLocations#VTS_PS [Source type 11].
- Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. (2010). *Washington State National Maritime Heritage Area. Feasibility Study for Designation as a National Heritage Area*. Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Retrieved from <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/sites/default/files/NationalMaritimeHeritageAreaStudy.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Commerce. (2014). *Maritime sector strategy. A strategy to leverage Washington State's unique maritime assets, geography, history, and*

- infrastructure*. Retrieved from <http://www.commerce.wa.gov/commerce-maritime-sector-strategy-2014/> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (2016, May 11). Emergency Response Towing Vessel (ERTV). Retrieved December 14, 2016, from http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/spills/response_tug/tugresponsemainpage.htm [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology. (n.d.). Grays Harbor Terminal Expansion Projects. Retrieved June 14, 2018, from <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/SEPA/Environmental-review/SEPA-at-Ecology/Grays-Harbor-Terminal-Expansion> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Ecology, Etkin, D. S., Joeckel, J., Walker, A. H., Scholz, D., Moore, C., ... Culpepper, D. (2015). *Washington State 2014 marine and rail oil transportation study* (Publication No. 15-08-010). Olympia, WA: Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1508010.html> [Source type 11].
- West Coast Offshore Vessel Traffic Risk Management Project Workgroup. (2002). *West coast offshore vessel traffic risk management project, final report and recommendations*. Retrieved from http://www.oilspilltaskforce.org/docs/vessel_traffic/Table_of_Contents.pdf [Source type 11].
- Westport. (2016). Westport company profile-America's yacht builders. Retrieved December 6, 2016, from <http://westportyachts.com/> [Source type 11].

2.8 Military Uses

There is an extensive and ongoing history of military presence within Washington State and the MSP Study Area. Ocean uses primarily include United States Coast Guard navigation, search and rescue, vessel safety, and coastal defense operations, and activities within the United States Department of the Navy training and testing ranges. Other military services occasionally use the MSP Study Area.

Summary of History and Current Use

United States Department of the Navy

The United States Department of the Navy has had an active presence in Washington since the mid-nineteenth century. Active range complexes within the Navy's Northwest Training and Testing Area include parts of Puget Sound, Alaska, and offshore Pacific Ocean waters. The Navy's mission is to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready naval forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas. This mission is achieved in part by conducting training and testing within the MSP Study Area (United States Department of the Navy, 2015).

These sites have existed for decades, some dating back to the 1910s. For over 70 years, the Navy has and continues to use the airspace over the Washington Peninsula for training Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard aircrews. For example, the Quillayute State Airport (now Quileute Airfield and owned by the City of Forks) was formerly a Naval Auxiliary Air Station, the northern base for blimp patrols running up and down the Washington and Oregon coast during WWII.

Navy training and testing in the Pacific Northwest is conducted in established maritime operating areas and warning areas in the eastern North Pacific Ocean which overlap with the MSP Study Area, including both air and water space areas. These training and testing areas are located within and outside of Washington state waters. Existing range complexes and facilities that overlap with the MSP Study Area include the Northwest Training Range Complex and the Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division Keyport Range Complex (Map 41).

The Northwest Training Range Complex (NWTRC) encompasses land, air, and sea areas that extend westward into the Pacific Ocean from the Strait of Juan de Fuca to 130 degrees west longitude (about 250 nautical miles), and continue southward parallel to the coasts of Washington, Oregon, and Northern California. The NWTRC includes Special Use Airspace (SUA), which comprises Warning Area 237 (W-237) off of Washington (Map 41). W-237 includes sea surface and underwater areas, and extends into airspace to varying degrees. Various sub-areas have ceilings of 27,000 ft, 50,000 ft, or unlimited height depending on the sub-area. The Olympic Military Operation Areas (MOAs) overlay land (the Olympic Peninsula) and waters out to 3 nm from the coast. The Navy's Offshore Area, which encompasses but is larger than the Study Area, includes sea and undersea space with a total of 121,000 nm² of surface area. The sea space is used for all levels of Navy training and for U.S. submarine transit lanes (United States Department of the Navy, 2015).

The Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division Keyport Range Complex includes the Quinault Range Site within the boundaries of the Offshore Area. The Quinault Range Site is

located off the coast of Jefferson and Grays Harbor Counties with the same boundaries as W-237A and includes 1 mile of shoreline at Pacific Beach, WA. Surf zone activities would be conducted from an area on the shore and seaward (United States Department of the Navy, 2015).

The Navy tests ships, aircraft, weapons, combat systems, and sensors and related equipment, and conducts scientific research activities to achieve and maintain military readiness. The Navy uses the Offshore Area (including the MSP Study Area) for training activities such as anti-air warfare, anti-surface warfare, anti-submarine warfare, electronic warfare, mine warfare, and naval special warfare. Sonar, ordnance, munitions, and targets are used during testing and training activities. Specific examples of Navy activities include flight formation practice, submarine mine exercises, target practice, tracking exercises, and torpedo testing (United States Department of the Navy, 2015).

The Navy must train and test to meet the requirements of [Title 10 of the U.S. Code](#) to maintain, train, and equip combat-ready naval forces capable of winning wars, deterring aggression, and maintaining freedom of the seas. In addition to the types of training and testing activities that could occur in the Offshore Area as identified in Appendix A of the Final Northwest Training and Testing Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement of October 2015, routine surface and submarine vessel transits, ocean observing systems, research projects and seafloor cable systems can occur within the MSP Study Area.

United States Coast Guard

The United States Coast Guard and its preceding agencies have been operating in Washington State since 1854. The arrival of the cutter *Jefferson Davis* in 1854 and the construction of 16 lighthouses in Washington during the 1850s, including the Cape Disappointment Lighthouse, established the Coast Guard's presence in Washington (Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, 2011). Today, the U.S. Coast Guard 13th District serves Washington, Oregon, Montana, and Idaho and is headquartered in Seattle.

The purpose of the Coast Guard is to safeguard the Nation's maritime interests in the heartland, in ports, at sea, and around the globe. The Coast Guard plays a vital role in navigational safety and regulation in the region. Coast Guard activities within the MSP Study Area include conducting search and rescue operations, patrolling the coast to enforce safety and fisheries regulations, conducting safety and compliance inspections and exams on commercial vessels and waterfront facilities, and protecting our nation's strategic defense and critical infrastructure. The Coast Guard also includes an Auxiliary, a civilian volunteer element of the Coast Guard which focuses on recreational boating safety (United States Coast Guard, 2015).

The Coast Guard serves the dangerous waters of the Washington Pacific coast. The stormy and foggy conditions often encountered in the MSP Study Area necessitated the development of several lighthouses and lifesaving stations to protect lives and respond to emergencies. Today, the 13th District operates within the MSP Study Area based out of units in Ilwaco (Station Cape Disappointment), Westport (Station Grays Harbor), La Push (Station Quillayute River), and Neah Bay¹ (Station Neah Bay) (Map 41) (Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, 2011). The Coast Guard also operates and maintains several federal aids to navigation throughout the Study Area (United States Coast Guard, 2015).

¹ Neah Bay is outside the MSP Study Area, but Coast Guard vessels out of Station Neah Bay operate within the MSP Study Area.

While some areas may be subject to higher activity based on proximity to units or other infrastructure, the Coast Guard operates throughout the entire MSP Study Area.

Related Infrastructure

The Navy's use of the MSP Study Area consists mostly of training and testing activities, and does not include pier-side infrastructure (United States Department of the Navy, 2015). The Navy currently has a facility on the coast of Washington at Naval Station Everett Annex Pacific Beach that provides electronic systems training for aircraft. Infrastructure for the Coast Guard includes lifesaving stations, lighthouses, stations to house fleet operations, and federal aids to navigation. Coast Guard Units are operated out of Neah Bay, La Push, Westport, and Ilwaco (Map 41). Federal aids to navigation, which include lighthouses, buoys, warning signs, sound signals, warning lights, and others, are located throughout and adjacent to the Study Area (United States Coast Guard, 2015).

Unexploded ordnance are explosive weapons that did not explode when they were employed and still pose a risk of detonation. They are mapped in the MSP Study Area based on NOAA navigation charts (Map 41). This data is not considered a complete representation of all unexploded ordnance on the seafloor, nor are locations exact.

Future Trends

The Navy and the Coast Guard will continue to operate within the Study Area, with possible adjustments to their activities based on requirements to fulfill their respective missions. The Navy will continue to train and test within the Northwest Training and Testing Area (United States Department of the Navy, 2015). At the time of writing, the Navy has proposed to conduct small unit, intermediate and advanced land and cold-water maritime training for Navy special operations personnel. The intent of the proposed training is to teach trainees: 1) the skills needed to avoid detection; and 2) not to leave any trace of their presence during or after training activities. The proposed training locations in the MSP Study Area include the following State Park properties: Westhaven, Westport Light, Twin Harbors, Leadbetter Point, Pacific Pines, and Cape Disappointment.

References

United States Code (U.S.C.) [Source type 5]

Armed Forces, 10 U.S.C.

Reports, Journals, Etc.

United States Coast Guard. (2015, May 28). Welcome to the U.S. Coast Guard 13th District. Retrieved July 1, 2015, from <http://www.uscg.mil/d13/> [Source type 11].

United States Department of the Navy. (2015). *Northwest training and testing activities final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement*. Silverdale, WA: United States Department of the Navy, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Northwest. Retrieved from <http://nwtteis.com/default.aspx> [Source type 4].

Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. (2011). *A maritime resource survey for Washington's saltwater shores* (DAHP Grant No. FY11-PA-Maritime-02). Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. Retrieved from <http://www.dahp.wa.gov/sites/default/files/MaritimeResourcesSurvey.pdf>. [Source type 9].

2.9 Research and Monitoring Activities

The marine waters off Washington's Pacific coast host a wide variety of research and monitoring activities conducted by numerous institutions and government agencies, including many focused on collecting baseline data to understand oceanographic conditions. Other research includes surveys of fisheries and other marine animal populations, habitat surveys, and tectonic research. Emergent issues such as hypoxia, ocean acidification, water temperature, and harmful algal blooms are already a focus of research and will likely continue to expand in the future.

Summary of History and Current Use

Washington's marine environment is the focus of a variety of oceanographic, geologic, and marine biological research. Several academic and research institutions, governments, and other organizations participate in research activities within the MSP Study Area. Examples of organizations conducting research and monitoring include the University of Washington School of Oceanography, Oregon State University, NOAA's Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory, the Northwest Fisheries Science Center, the National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science, the National Data Buoy Center, tribal governments, Washington state agencies, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary.

Other federal agencies that perform research also include the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the United States Geological Survey, and Olympic National Park. Many of these institutions work collaboratively with each other and other organizations through research centers and initiatives, such as the Northwest Association of Networked Ocean Observing Systems (NANOOS), the Ocean Observatories Initiative, and the Oregon Health Sciences University's Center for Coastal Margin Observation and Prediction (see NANOOS, 2015; Oregon State University, 2015; University of Washington, 2015).

A primary focus of research within the MSP Study Area is the collection of baseline data to understand oceanographic conditions, marine habitats and populations, and marine hazards. Information collected includes data describing temperature, salinity, carbon dioxide levels, tides, water currents, oxygen levels, and plankton blooms along with other oceanographic parameters (NANOOS, 2015). Population assessments for fishery resources, seabirds, and marine mammals are conducted routinely for management and conservation purposes (e.g., Menza et al., 2015; NOAA Fisheries, 2015). Other research is directed at, but not limited to, intertidal, pelagic, and deep-sea habitat (Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008), the Cascadia Subduction Zone (e.g., Johnson, Solomon, Harris, Salmi, & Berg, 2014), benthic substrate sampling and seafloor habitat mapping (e.g., Goldfinger, Henkel, Romsos, Havron, & Black, 2014; Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, 2008), and coastal geomorphology.

Research equipment includes moorings, anchored hydrophones, vessels outfitted with sampling and trawling gear, shore-based instrumentation, and in-water gliders equipped with oceanographic sensors. Research vessels owned by state universities are based in Seattle or in Newport, Oregon. NOAA's research ships serve the entire West Coast from California to Alaska and are based in Newport, Oregon. OCNMS utilizes a research vessel, the *R/V Tatoosh*, which operates out of La Push during the field season from April to October. State agencies operate small (<30 ft) research vessels. Private vessels can also be contracted for specific projects. Research vessels, gliders, and other mobile equipment may perform established transect cruises

or focus on more temporary locations for specific projects. Fixed-location platforms may be deployed seasonally or year-round.

Related Infrastructure

Limited infrastructure is in place within the MSP Study Area to conduct long-term monitoring. Permanent and semi-permanent infrastructure includes buoys, moorings, and shoreside stations (Map 42). These are generally equipped with sensors to measure oceanographic conditions, such as water temperature, carbon dioxide, light, wave height, and wind. Oceanographic buoys, both seasonal and year-round, include NANOOS' Chá bã buoy and the accompanying NEMO sub-surface profiler off of La Push, NOAA National Data Buoy Center's Cape Elizabeth and Neah Bay buoys, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary's nearshore seasonal mooring array (NANOOS, 2015).

Another example is the Washington Line, which is part of the Ocean Observatories Initiative's Endurance Array, recently deployed offshore of Grays Harbor. The array consists of three buoys along an east-west transect (Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, 2011). The Navy funds long-term passive acoustic monitoring conducted using temporary devices that are deployed on the bottom to record high frequency acoustics (Department of the Navy, 2015).

Future Trends

Although not the most spatially extensive use within the MSP Study Area, research and monitoring activities will continue to have a presence within Washington's offshore and nearshore waters. The MSP Study Area will likely remain an important region for scientific research and resource management surveys, particularly for activities which provide information on key processes and issues such as fisheries populations and practices, ocean circulation, climate change, water temperature, ocean acidification, hypoxia, and harmful algal blooms.

References

- Department of the Navy. (2015). *Marine species monitoring report for the U.S. Navy's Northwest Training Range Complex- Annual Report 2 May 2014 to 1 May 2015*. Pearl Harbor, Hawaii: U.S. Pacific Fleet. Retrieved from http://www.navymarinespeciesmonitoring.us/files/9014/3560/7485/Navy_2015_NWTRC_Annual_Monitoring_Report-1_July_2015.pdf [Source type 9].
- Goldfinger, C., Henkel, S. K., Romsos, C., Havron, A., & Black, B. (2014). *Benthic habitat characterization offshore the Pacific Northwest volume 1: Evaluation of continental shelf geology* (OCS Study BOEM 2014-662) (p. 161). U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Pacific OCS Region. Retrieved from <http://www.boem.gov/2014-662-v1/>. [Source type 9].
- Johnson, H. P., Solomon, E. A., Harris, R., Salmi, M., & Berg, R. (2014). A geophysical and hydrogeochemical survey of the Cascadia subduction zone. *GeoPRISMS Newsletter*, (32 [Source type 1]).
- Menza, C., Leirness, J., White, T., Winship, A., Kinlan, B., Zamon, J. E., ... Bowlby, E. (2015). *Modeling seabird distributions off the Pacific coast of Washington*. Silver Spring, MD. [Source type 9]: NOAA, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science.
- NANOOS. (2015). Northwest Association of Networked Ocean Observing Systems (NANOOS). Retrieved July 16, 2015, from <http://www.nanoos.org/home.php> [Source type 11].
- NOAA Fisheries. (2015). U.S. West coast groundfish bottom trawl survey. Retrieved July 16, 2015, from http://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/research/divisions/fram/groundfish/bottom_trawl.cfm [Source type 11].
- Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. (2008). *Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary condition report 2008*. Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries [Source type 11].
- Oregon State University. (2015). College of earth, ocean, and atmospheric sciences research. Retrieved July 16, 2015, from <http://ceoas.oregonstate.edu/research/> [Source type 11].
- University of Washington. (2015). School of oceanography, college of the environment. Retrieved July 16, 2015, from <http://www.ocean.washington.edu/> [Source type 11].
- Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. (2011). The Endurance Array. Retrieved August 4, 2015, from http://www.whoi.edu/ooi_cgsn/endurance-array [Source type 11].

2.10 Potential New and Expanded Uses

2.10.1 Marine Renewable Energy

Marine renewable energy includes the conversion of potential energy from waves, tidal currents, and offshore wind¹ to electric power through the installation of energy-generating devices in the marine environment. The State of Washington, the United States, and several other countries around the world have identified marine renewable energy as a potential option to diversify their energy portfolios and reduce carbon emissions from traditional energy sources such as coal, oil, and gas (Copping et al., 2013; Musial & Ram, 2010). The State of Washington's Energy Independence Act of 2006, also known as Initiative 937, enacted a Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard that requires electricity utilities with 25,000 or more customers to acquire a minimum percentage of their power from eligible renewable energy resources.² Minimum percentage targets were set at acquiring 3% of total load from renewable energy sources by January, 2012, 9% by January 2016, and 15% by January 2020 ([RCW 19.285](#)).

Types of renewable energy that qualify under the Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard include marine renewable energy (e.g., offshore wind, wave, and tidal currents) and other renewable energy types such as terrestrial wind,³ solar, biomass, and biodiesel.⁴ Solar, biomass, biodiesel, ocean thermal energy conversion, and other renewable energy resources are currently not relevant options within the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) Study Area and therefore are not addressed here.

Marine renewable energy is a potential new use of ocean space within the MSP Study Area and state law requires marine renewable energy to be addressed within the MSP. Specific requirements include a series of maps that summarize locations with high potential for marine renewable energy production that have minimal potential for conflicts with other existing uses or sensitive environments (RCW 43.372.040(6)(c)). Development of a framework for coordinating local and state agency review of proposed energy projects is also required ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(f\)](#)).

The MSP is non-regulatory, meaning that it does not have the authority to explicitly approve or prohibit marine renewable energy projects. The MSP can identify key information about offshore wind, wave, and tidal current energy. This includes information about technologies, suitability, related infrastructure, environmental concerns, potential compatible uses, potential conflicts, and potential locations where energy-generating facilities could be sited to reduce environmental and user conflicts. This information is used as context to inform MSP recommendations made by the State and shaped by stakeholders. The following sections provide key information about marine renewable energy.

¹ Offshore wind energy is wind energy extracted over water and is therefore included as marine renewable energy in the MSP.

² Utilities may use renewable energy credits or bundled renewable energy resources to meet the targets. Renewable energy resources must be located within the PNW, with limited exceptions.

³ Terrestrial wind has been the predominant renewable resource acquired so far (Washington State Department of Commerce, 2014).

⁴ Most hydropower (i.e., energy derived from hydroelectric dams) is not included as an eligible renewable energy source to meet the state's Renewable Portfolio Standard.

Summary of History and Current Use

History in the United States and Abroad

Several countries are currently promoting the use of marine renewable energy. Europe is currently the leader in offshore wind development and installed capacity, with the United Kingdom, Denmark, Belgium, and Germany leading the market (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). The United Kingdom is also leading the market for testing sites for wave and tidal energy devices (Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, 2017). As of 2015, the global offshore wind energy capacity of installed devices was about 12,107 megawatts (MW) (Global Wind Energy Council, 2015). Navigant Consulting (2014) estimated that about 6,600 MW are currently under construction globally, yet the future long-term capacity growth of the industry is uncertain.

Several pilot projects have tested wave and tidal current energy technology and environmental effects around the world (Copping et al., 2013; Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, 2015). Wave and tidal current technologies are mostly in the pre-commercial (research, development, and testing) phase (Augustine et al., 2012). However, the first commercial tidal current array became operational in Scotland in 2016 (Nova Innovation Ltd., 2016).

The United States has an active interest in marine renewable energy. The U.S. is working toward diversifying its energy portfolio, with a strong interest in advancing clean energy technologies. A diverse clean energy portfolio can increase the nation's energy security while reducing emissions that contribute to climate change (Musial & Ram, 2010). Offshore wind, wave, and tidal current energy resources, technologies, market factors, infrastructure requirements, cost feasibility, and other factors are being actively assessed by researchers at Department of Energy facilities including the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), and Sandia National Laboratory. Research is also ongoing at other institutions such as the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC), the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), and others (Augustine et al., 2012; EPRI, 2011; Lopez, Roberts, Heimiller, Blair, & Porro, 2012; Musial & Ram, 2010; Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2013b, 2014; Schwartz, Heimiller, Haymes, & Musial, 2010).

The first marine wind farm in the United States, Block Island Wind Farm, began operations in December 2016 off the coast of Rhode Island. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM), the federal agency responsible for issuing leases for offshore energy in federal waters, has issued 12 commercial wind energy leases on the outer continental shelf (OCS) as of March 2017 (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2017). BOEM has created several wind energy areas along Atlantic coast to facilitate development of projects. BOEM has awarded lease sales along the Atlantic coast through competitive auctions and is in the process of scoping and announcing additional lease sales. BOEM has also processed several unsolicited lease requests. BOEM task forces and panels have been established in at least 14 states to help coordination between federal, state, and local governments and to engage stakeholders (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014).

At the time of writing, no marine renewable projects have moved beyond planning or permitting on the West Coast. In Oregon, Principle Power proposed an offshore wind project to be located about 18 miles offshore from Coos Bay. The WindFloat Pacific Project was planned to consist of up to five deep-water turbines in approximately 350 meters (1,150 feet) of water depth with an estimated project capacity of up to 30 MW. (Principle Power, Inc., 2013). Principle Power withdrew its lease request in 2016 and BOEM is no longer processing the

application. In 2016 in California, BOEM and the state initiated the competitive planning and leasing process for possible future offshore wind development in response to an unsolicited request for a commercial lease and a subsequent notification of competitive interest (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, n.d.).

The majority of offshore renewable energy projects in the United States are under development on the East Coast. At the time of writing, BOEM has issued active commercial leases in New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. There are also lease requests under consideration in New York and Massachusetts. In Virginia, BOEM has three cooperative research agreements with the State. In South Carolina, BOEM has published a Call for Information and Nominations (Call) to gauge the interest of the offshore wind industry in acquiring leases for four offshore areas. Additionally, BOEM has issued a Call to seek nominations from companies in Hawaii. The status of BOEM's leasing activities and the progress of industry projects is constantly evolving (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, n.d.). Timely information and additional details can be found on BOEM's website at: <https://www.boem.gov/Renewable-Energy-State-Activities/>.

The U.S. also has a small number of wave and tidal current energy device testing facilities, sites, and pilot projects. These enable feasibility testing of technology as well as the study of potential environmental effects (Augustine et al., 2012). The Pacific Marine Energy Center (PMEC) is a collection of NNMREC marine energy testing facilities. NNMREC is a partnership between Oregon State University and the University of Washington. NNMREC has been working with partners on establishing a grid-connected, open-water wave energy test site off Newport South Energy Site (PMEC-SETS) in which is in the advanced stages of planning, and additional capacity for testing sub-scale current turbines is being developed (Oregon State University, 2015). In addition to these facilities, the U.S. Department of Energy and U.S. Department of Defense have established the Wave Energy Test Site (WETS) on Oahu, Hawaii for field testing of full-scale wave energy converters. Some pilot projects are anticipated to become larger-scale commercial projects once testing is completed (PNNL, 2013).

History in Washington

There have been several marine renewable energy proposals in the State of Washington in the past, some located within the MSP Study Area. The MSP Study Area has significant offshore wind and wave resources (EPRI, 2011; Lopez et al., 2012; Schwartz et al., 2010), and limited tidal current resources (Van Cleve, Judd, Radil, Ahmann, & Geerlofs, 2013). However, there are currently no actively operating or proposed marine renewable energy projects within the MSP Study Area.

A notable past energy proposal within the MSP Study Area was the Makah Bay Offshore Wave Energy Pilot Project. This project proposed four wave energy conversion buoys with an estimated 1 MW maximum capacity, enough to power about 150 homes on the Makah Indian Reservation. The project was estimated to have a mooring footprint of 625 x 450 ft and would have been located within the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS). The project received a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) conditioned license, which included approval of a 3.7-mile long transmission cable to connect to the onshore electricity grid. The Clallam County Public Utility District (PUD) planned to purchase the power once the applicant acquired all state and federal licenses (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 2006, 2007). The project proponent surrendered the rights to the project in April 2009, citing economic reasons (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 2009).

Another past proposal was for a tidal current energy demonstration project outside of the MSP Study Area in Puget Sound. Located in Admiralty Inlet near Whidbey Island, the Snohomish County Public Utility District #1 (SnoPUD) proposed installing two OpenHydro tidal energy turbines at a depth of about 190 feet to operate for three to five years. Starting in 2007 SnoPUD, along with other agencies and stakeholders, identified potential environmental impacts and performed several baseline studies. They collected information describing the physical environment and benthic habitat, as well as water quality data. SnoPUD received a FERC pilot project license in March, 2014 (PNNL, 2014). In September 2014, SnoPUD issued a press release stating that they suspended the tidal pilot project due to rising costs (Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1, 2014). They surrendered the FERC license in December 2015.

The University of Washington is a partner in NNMREC for researching and testing tidal current devices. The University has supported testing for two intermediate-scale temporary wave converters, one in Puget Sound and one in Lake Washington, both of which are outside of the MSP Study Area (Oregon State University, 2015). Further wave energy converter testing in Lake Washington is planned, and NNMREC is also modifying a vessel to conduct in-water testing of research-scale current turbines from a mobile platform (B. Polagye, personal communication, June 7th, 2015). PNNL's Marine Laboratory in Sequim is testing environmental monitoring technologies to potentially be used in the presence of scaled tidal current or wave power devices (S. Geerlofs, personal communication, May 20th, 2015).

Current and Emerging Technologies

As mentioned above, marine renewable energy involves converting naturally-occurring energy in the ocean into electricity from three types of energy resources available within the MSP Study Area: offshore wind, waves, and tidal currents. The following sections briefly describe the technologies associated with harnessing each of these three resource types.

Offshore Wind Energy

Offshore wind energy technology evolved directly from the land-based wind energy industry. Wind turbines operate by converting kinetic wind energy into electrical energy. Turbines typically have three blades and rotate around a hub which is connected to a nacelle with a gearbox and generator (Figure 2.10.1-1) (Augustine et al., 2012). Offshore wind turbines are trending toward larger sizes compared to onshore wind turbines, because larger turbines can capture energy more efficiently and are not constrained by the land-based transportation logistics which restrict onshore wind turbine size (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2013b, 2014). Planned offshore wind projects in the U.S. currently have an average turbine capacity of about 5 MW, and range from 3 to 8 MW (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). For example, the turbines for the now defunct WindFloat Pacific project were planned to have 6 MW capacity with rotor diameters up to about 500 feet (Principle Power, Inc., 2013). Some manufacturers are pursuing turbine designs in the 10 to 15 MW range (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014).

Globally, there is a trend toward selecting sites in deeper water at greater distances from shore. There are associated increased costs due to more complex installation, longer export cables with related line losses, and increased operation and maintenance costs for vessels (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014).

The amount of power produced from an offshore wind farm will depend upon the installed capacity of the project, wind speeds, location, and capacity factor. The capacity factor is the percentage of time that the generator is producing power. The average capacity factor for recently installed offshore wind projects ranges from about 28%-50% (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). This is greater than that for terrestrial wind, with an average net capacity factor of about 32% in the Columbia Basin (Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2016).




Figure 2.10.1-1. Components of a wind turbine. Source: Augustine (2012).

Offshore wind turbines are attached to foundations within the marine environment. These foundations vary in design, with different designs suitable for different water depth zones. Currently, the most commonly used foundation in constructed projects globally is the monopile design, followed by a gravity base design (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). These two foundation designs are suitable for shallow water about 30 meters (100 feet) or less in depth (Musial & Ram, 2010; Sotta, 2012). Technologies in the development and demonstration stages for transitional water depths (30 to 60 meters; or 100 to 200 feet) include tripod, jacket, multi-pile (Musial & Ram, 2010), and twisted jacket foundations (Department of Energy, 2014).

At greater than 60 meters depth (200 feet), bottom-fixed structures are no longer economically feasible and therefore require floating foundations that are moored to the bottom. These designs include floating semi-submersibles, tension legs, and spar buoys (Musial & Ram, 2010) (Figure 2.10.1-2). Anchor and mooring systems will vary by floating project. For example, the Coos Bay WindFloat project was designed to use a floating semi-submersible design. The project planned to use vertical load anchors, commonly used in the oil and gas industry (Principle Power, Inc., 2013). Figure 2.10.1-3 shows the projected variations in offshore wind foundation designs by depth.

Off the West Coast of the United States, the seafloor drops off much more quickly than on the East Coast. This results in much deeper waters closer to shore, and affects the type of infrastructure required. The National Renewable Energy Laboratory researched the offshore wind resource available throughout the United States (Schwartz et al., 2010). In Washington, there is significant wind resource available from the Pacific coast out to 50 nm. Within state waters (0-3 nm from shore), the wind resource is mostly found in water depths of 0-30 m. However, in some areas the wind resource is available in areas with water depths over 60 m. Within 3-12 nm from shore, the areas with available wind resource are mostly associated with water depths greater than 30 m. At distances of 12-50 nm from shore, the majority of the wind resource is found at water depths greater than 60 m (Schwartz et al., 2010).



Figure 2.10.1-2. Floating offshore wind designs. Source: Department of Energy.




Figure 2.10.1-3. Diagram displaying examples of differences in offshore wind technology types by depth. Source: Musial and Ram (2010).

Wave Energy

Wave energy is categorized as a type of marine hydrokinetic energy (MHK) technology. MHK technologies convert energy from a moving fluid, such as a wave, into electricity (Augustine et al., 2012). Wave energy technology is in the early stages of development and is not as advanced as offshore wind. Many different wave technology designs are currently under development and testing in the U.S. and around the world (Augustine et al., 2012; Van Cleve et al., 2013). The following summaries describe some of the types of technology for wave energy (2012). Figure 2.10.1-4 provides a visual summary of the following types of technology:

- **Point absorbers** extract kinetic energy from the movement of a buoy relative to the ocean floor with the rise and fall of waves. This movement is converted to electrical energy through either a linear or rotary generator.
- **Overtopping devices** allow waves to lift water over a barrier, which fills a reservoir that is drained through a hydro-turbine. They are often described as low-head hydropower facilities because they convert the potential energy of the elevated water in the upper reservoir to generate power, much like a conventional hydropower dam.

- **Oscillating water columns** are partially submerged structures. Air fills the upper part of the structure above the water level. Incoming waves are funneled into the structure from below the waterline, causing the water column within the structure to rise and fall with the wave motion. This alternately pressurizes and depressurizes the air column, pushing and pulling it through an air turbine mounted in a portal in the top of the column structure.
- **Attenuators** capture wave energy with a principal axis oriented parallel to the direction of the incoming wave. They convert the energy created by the relative motion of the articulated bodies of the device as the wave passes along it.
- **Inverted pendulum devices** use the surge motion of waves to rotate a large, hinged paddle back and forth. The flapping motion drives hydraulic pumps that in turn drive electrical generators. Alternatively, linear generators are used to directly convert wave energy into electrical energy.

The **M3 nearshore wave energy device** is an additional wave device type described in the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) energy suitability analysis for Washington. It is a pressure device that sits below the ocean's surface and gathers energy from the pressure created in the sea column from passing waves (Van Cleve et al., 2013).

As described by Van Cleve et al. (2013), wave energy devices are designed for various depths. Some devices are designed for the coastline and shallow waters (<10 meters or 32 feet), and others are designed for mid-water depths and water depths of up to 125 meters (410 feet).

Mooring technology and configuration will vary by project and technology type. They are influenced by device array configurations and whether or not the project is motion-dependent (i.e., point absorber) or motion-independent (i.e., overtopping device) (Benjamins et al., 2014).




Figure 2.10.1-4. Wave energy technology types. Source: Augustine (2012).

Tidal Current Energy

Tidal current energy is also categorized as a type of MHK technology, because it converts energy from a moving fluid into electricity.⁵ Tidal turbines essentially work in the same manner as wind turbines, except they extract energy from flowing water instead of air. Similar to wave energy technology, tidal current energy technology is also in the early stages of development and includes several different types and configurations of technology (Augustine et al., 2012). Examples of tidal current technologies are shown in Figure 2.10.1-5. Tidal turbines

⁵ Tidal range technologies (also known as tidal barrages) are conventional hydropower in the marine environment and are not addressed within the Marine Spatial Plan.

require relatively strong currents to produce significant amounts of electricity. The depth of turbine deployment is dependent on the type of technology and site factors. Tidal turbines sited below a commercial shipping lane will require at least 15 to 25 meters (49-82 feet) of overhead clearance. First-generation deployments have generally been outside of shipping channels (Polagye, Van Cleve, Copping, & Kirkendall, 2011).




Figure 2.10.1-5. Primary technology types for tidal current energy devices. Source: Augustine (2012).

Related Infrastructure

Marine renewable energy will require energy transmission and support infrastructure. Energy transmission infrastructure will include cables from the device and submarine transmission cables to bring the energy to shore, along with shore-based substations to connect the energy to the electricity grid. Support infrastructure requirements will include ports, specialized service vessels, and likely coastal manufacturing facilities (Musial & Ram, 2010).

Energy Transmission Infrastructure

The exact technology requirements for energy transmission infrastructure will depend upon the specific energy project. Common elements of existing offshore wind energy infrastructure include inter-array electric power cables, transformer stations to collect the power and step-up voltage, long-distance transmission cables, and onshore substations to connect the energy with the electricity grid (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). Wave and tidal device arrays will also have these basic components (Boehlert, McMurray, & Tortorici, 2008; Polagye et al., 2011).

Underwater power transmission cables are made up of a conductive material such as copper or aluminum and are surrounded by insulation (Bergstrom et al., 2012). Electricity flowing through long-distance transmission cables is either Alternating Current (AC) or Direct Current (DC). Efforts to develop effective and efficient long-distance transmission technologies for both high voltage AC and DC are ongoing (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). Transmission cables will either be buried or weighted along the seafloor depending upon sediment type and risk to the cable (Bergstrom et al., 2012). If the sediment type allows, cables can be buried from 1 to 3 meters (3 to 10 feet) deep to insulate and protect the cable (Polagye et al., 2011). When the cable approaches shore, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) may be used to cross under sensitive nearshore areas and make landfall at an onshore substation (Polagye et al., 2011).

Another important element of energy transmission infrastructure is the availability of onshore substations and connections to the land transmission grid. The distance from marine renewable energy projects to land-based substations and the transmission grid will influence where energy projects can feasibly be sited (Van Cleve et al., 2013). These substations must also be capable of accepting additional electricity loads for distribution (electricity “on-ramps”). Therefore, existing substations and transmission lines may need upgrades to accommodate added capacity (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014).

Marine renewable energy developers continue to face challenges and complications associated with overcoming transmission capacity and efficiency constraints on bringing the energy to shore and integrating it into the grid (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). Some developers are exploring the option of providing site-based energy with limited or no connection to the grid, for use in remote coastal communities or powering other nearby uses such as aquaculture or desalinization. Examples include a wave buoy array that provides electricity to a military station on an island in Australia, where the energy is used to help power a desalination plant (Yee, 2015). A company in Scotland is also testing wave energy to provide electricity to finfish farms (Mercador Media, 2014). The former Makah Bay Offshore Wave Energy Pilot Project was a local example of interest in providing site-based energy for remote communities within the MSP Study Area.

Support Infrastructure

Marine renewable energy projects will require various types of maritime support infrastructure for the construction, operation, and decommissioning of devices. Distances to service ports, deepwater ports with sufficient overhead clearance (needed for offshore wind devices), and helicopter operations (also for offshore wind) were identified by PNNL to be contributing attributes to the suitability of a location for marine renewable energy projects (Van Cleve et al., 2013). Specialized vessels will also likely be required for installation, operation, maintenance, and decommissioning, particularly for shallow-water offshore wind. Under the

Jones Act, only U.S. flagged vessels are allowed to serve marine renewable energy projects (Musial & Ram, 2010).

Potential Benefits and Use Compatibilities

Potential Benefits of Marine Renewable Energy

Marine renewable energy has the potential to provide many benefits to Washington's coastal communities, the state, and the nation. Commonly cited benefits to marine renewable energy include providing a cleaner, renewable energy source to replace conventional carbon-emitting energy sources, providing opportunities for economic development, diversifying the energy portfolio, and increasing energy security.

Cleaner, renewable energy

Marine renewable energy is considered a clean energy source because it does not burn carbon-rich fuel sources, or fossil fuels. Fossil fuels emit carbon into the atmosphere and contribute to climate change and ocean acidification (Boehlert et al., 2008; Musial & Ram, 2010; Polagye et al., 2011). Clean energy can displace the use of traditional, fossil fuel energy sources and thereby mitigate climate change and reduce the risk of catastrophic spills associated with fossil fuel extraction and transportation (Polagye et al., 2011). Marine renewable energy is considered "renewable" because it is continuously produced from the interactions of the sun-water cycle and geography, unlike depletable inputs such as oil, natural gas, or uranium. Offshore wind and wave energy are forms of solar energy, and tidal energy is a result of the gravitational force between the earth, moon, and sun (Augustine et al., 2012).

Washington State has a history of producing and obtaining its electricity from renewable energy sources. Utilities in Washington purchase electricity from a variety of sources in a multi-state, regional bulk power system (Washington State Department of Commerce, 2016). In 2014, about 68% of the total annual electricity delivered in Washington was from renewable sources. Hydropower (dams) accounted for 65% of total electricity consumed, land-based wind accounted for 3%, and other renewable energy sources accounted for less than 1% (Washington State Department of Commerce, 2016). After hydropower, coal (15%) and natural gas (12%) were the next largest sources of electricity (Washington State Department of Commerce, 2016). The Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard, enacted in 2006, is an example of Washington's commitment to increase energy availability from clean, renewable energy sources. The Washington Department of Commerce administers a Clean Energy Fund for Washington research institutions to develop or demonstrate clean energy technologies (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014).

Economic development

Offshore wind has the potential to significantly contribute to the U.S. domestic manufacturing sector and create high-paying, stable jobs (Musial & Ram, 2010; Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2013b, 2014). A domestic offshore wind industry is estimated to create direct jobs in manufacturing, installation and decommissioning, and maintenance and operations. These jobs could include both temporary and permanent positions.

At this time, it is difficult to estimate how many new jobs a marine renewable energy project in Washington will create because these numbers are based upon project-specific details, such as project size, project type, and infrastructure update requirements. Some of these jobs

may be locally-sourced, while others may be sourced throughout the region, state, country, or internationally.

NREL estimates that most of the labor for the U.S. offshore wind industry will be sourced locally or regionally (Musial & Ram, 2010). It is possible that a marine renewable energy project may displace jobs from other industries (e.g., commercial fishing) due to direct space conflicts and other factors (see section on potential human use conflicts), causing further uncertainty related to the economic effects from marine renewable energy within the region. Once a specific project is proposed, it may be possible to perform a cost-benefit analysis for jobs, to provide a more accurate estimation of the type of economic effect a project may have on the local community and the state.

Washington benefitted economically from the former WindFloat Pacific project in Oregon, as Washington-based companies participated in the development, permitting, and siting of the project. Had the project been completed, Principle Power estimated that it would have attracted more than \$200 million in federal and private investment into the Northwest economy (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). In addition, some Washington-based companies are or will be suppliers of components for floating offshore wind installations (A. Weinstein, personal communication, May 15th, 2015). There is also the potential for benefits to ports, as offshore operations will need shoreside support. Proximity to a deepwater port (such as Grays Harbor) will also be important for constructing and transporting wind turbines. The necessary shoreside support facilities do not currently exist, so this would require investment (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014).

Diverse energy portfolio and increased energy security

Another commonly-cited benefit of marine renewable energy development is the diversification of the U.S. energy portfolio (Copping et al., 2013; Musial & Ram, 2010; Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). The U.S. is actively pursuing a broad suite of domestic energy developments, from expanding domestic oil and gas operations to investing in both renewable and fossil fuel energy technology development (Department of Energy, 2012). A diverse energy portfolio will increase national energy security by reducing reliance on foreign energy sources (Department of Energy, 2012; Musial & Ram, 2010). NREL estimates that offshore wind has the potential to contribute significantly to the U.S. clean energy portfolio (Musial & Ram, 2010; Schwartz et al., 2010).

Marine renewable energy has the potential to provide renewable energy near coastal areas with high energy demand (Musial & Ram, 2010). Transmission infrastructure updates would be required, and there is active interest on the Atlantic coast in developing comprehensive offshore transmission plans for offshore wind projects (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014).

Some rural Washington coastal communities have also recognized this potential benefit and are looking to increase their local energy supply. The majority of coastal communities, including tribal communities, are currently the end of the line for energy transmission. Therefore, power supply from the grid can become unreliable during high demand periods (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). The former Makah Bay Offshore Wave Pilot Project planned to produce energy for up to 150 homes on the Makah Reservation (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 2006) to improve energy resilience. Some experts have indicated that small-scale community based projects continue to have some potential in the MSP Study Area in the near future (10 to 15 years) (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014), yet the cost may be a limiting factor in the near term (A. Weinstein, personal communication, May 15th, 2015).

Potential Compatible Uses

Properly designed and sited marine renewable energy projects have the potential to be compatible in space and time with specific ocean uses. While there are few direct on-the-ground examples of compatible uses due to the limited deployment of marine renewable energy projects, a number of potentially compatible ocean uses have been identified. Examples of current uses that may be compatible include recreational fisheries, tourism activities, fishing exclusion zones, and some types of aquaculture. Opportunities for compatible uses will likely depend on project type (offshore wind, wave, or tidal), size, and other factors.

Boehlert et al. (2008) and Bergstrom et al. (2014) state that renewable energy projects are very likely to act as Fish Aggregation Devices (FADs). Recreational fisheries may benefit from targeting their efforts near a project site. This type of activity and benefit has been reported around offshore oil and gas platforms in the Gulf of Mexico (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). This benefit may be influenced by potential exclusion zones around project sites.

Boehlert et al. (2008) and Bergstrom et al. (2014) also discussed the possibility of marine renewable energy co-existing with fishing exclusion zones since a project may exclude some commercial and recreational fishing. The FAD effect combined with fishing exclusion may act as a fish protection area and possibly boost some fish populations. The potential for energy projects to be co-located with currently established and future fishing exclusion areas will be influenced by the goals of the fishing exclusion area and the ability of the energy project to meet those goals.

Tourists may be interested in viewing renewable energy projects, either from land or by boat. This could attract tourists to an area with an energy project. Studies reviewed in Musial and Ram (2010) found that some land-based and offshore wind projects have boosted the tourism industry within a project area. Shipping may also be compatible with offshore wind farms and tidal current energy arrays. Depending on the separation distance between wind turbines, it is possible that shipping lanes could be located within offshore wind sites (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). Tidal current devices may be sited below commercial shipping lanes, if there is an overhead clearance of 15 to 25 m (49-82 feet) (Polagye et al., 2011). Stakeholders also mentioned the possible benefit of improved search and rescue operations in ocean waters surrounding energy projects (Washington Coast Marine Advisory Council, 2015).

Marine renewable energy is also potentially compatible with other potential future uses of the ocean, such as co-location of offshore wind with offshore shellfish (Buck et al., 2008; Buck, Ebeling, & Michler-Cieluch, 2010) and seaweed aquaculture (Buck et al., 2008). The foundation structures for offshore wind may provide an opportunity for anchoring, protecting, and accessing shellfish or seaweed cultured in the ocean environment (Buck et al., 2008). Seaweed cultivated through aquaculture could then potentially be processed and used for biofuels (Renewable Energy Magazine, 2012). Using marine renewable energy to provide electricity to aquaculture operations is also a prospect currently under development (Mercador Media, 2014).

Potential Environmental Impacts

Potential effects of marine renewable energy on the marine environment are a key concern to many scientists, regulators, stakeholders, and the industry. While active research is working to study, monitor, and model potential environment effects from marine renewable energy deployments in ocean and coastal waters, relatively little is known about the level of

actual impact that these devices may have when deployed at substantial scale (Bergstrom et al., 2014; Boehlert et al., 2008; Clark, Schroeder, & Baschek, 2014; Copping et al., 2013; Musial & Ram, 2010; Polagye et al., 2011; Sotta, 2012).

Multiple efforts around the world are establishing a scientific knowledge base about offshore wind, wave, and tidal current devices and their potential impacts to the marine environment. Among the most notable is the Tethys database hosted by PNNL, which serves as a clearinghouse for information about offshore wind, wave, and tidal environmental research, literature reviews, and other data from around the world (Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, 2015). Annex IV, an international partnership connected with Tethys, produced a report with a series of case studies analyzing existing information about MHK (Copping et al., 2013). In 2016, Annex IV released a report on the state of the science on the environmental impacts of renewable energy as an update to the 2013 report (Copping et al., 2016). A variety of other reports from experts in the Pacific Northwest, United States, and other countries are also referenced here.

In general, these reports have identified and discussed numerous potential environmental effects and impacts. However, there is often relatively high uncertainty (i.e., a potential effect may actually be significant or may turn out to be inconsequential). Limited deployments of marine renewable energy projects, most of which are pilot- and small-scale projects, make studying potential effects and increasing certainty difficult. Overall, the literature generally agrees that the majority of potential effects are of low concern for small-scale projects, and the impacts from multiple large-scale commercial operations, while possible, are uncertain (Bergstrom et al., 2014; Boehlert et al., 2008; Clark et al., 2014; Copping et al., 2013; Musial & Ram, 2010; Polagye et al., 2011).

The following sections review the primary potential effects discovered in the literature. They are organized generally by impacting mechanism, also known as a stressor. The information review focused mainly on comprehensive summary reports accessed from the Tethys database. Many potential environmental effects identified are common among wind, wave, and tidal devices, while others are more technology-specific. The following review presents potential effects for marine renewable energy in general. Any predicted effects specific to a device are also discussed. Possible environmental effects, predicted level of impact, and uncertainty as discussed in the literature are described for each impacting mechanism when available.

Noise

Acoustic disturbance (a.k.a. noise) is a potential effect of marine renewable energy devices in ocean and coastal environments. Noise can be generated from sources such as construction activities, machinery and moving parts (such as moving turbine blades or generators within wave buoys), wave and wind interactions, and strum noises from mooring cables (Bergstrom et al., 2014; Boehlert et al., 2008; Polagye et al., 2011).

Noise from construction, particularly that generated from pile driving, is the source of noise most commonly cited within the literature as having the largest potential for negative impacts to marine animals. Pile driving creates intense, pulsed noise. It been observed to cause avoidance behavior in marine mammals, and is likely to cause mortality and tissue damage in fish (as cited in Bergstrom et al., 2014; Sotta, 2012). Pile driving may be used for monopile and jacket foundation installations for offshore wind projects in relatively shallow water (Bergstrom et al., 2014). It may also possibly be used for tidal current devices, depending on the water depth (Polagye et al., 2011).

Mitigation techniques presented in the literature to reduce harm to marine animals from construction sound include slow ramp-up for pile driving, bubble curtains, and acoustic deterrents (Polagye et al., 2011). Bergstrom et al. (2014) summarize mitigation measures for construction activities including avoiding important recruitment areas for marine mammals and fish, and timing construction activities to occur outside of key migration time periods. New pile driving technologies have also been developed that inherently reduce noise generation without secondary mitigation measures (Reinhall & Dahl, 2011).

Operational sources of noise (e.g. machine operation, strum, wave and wind interactions) are expected to be low frequency and low intensity. Some marine animals may be sensitive to low frequency sounds, such as baleen whales (gray and humpback whales) and fish. It is possible that these low frequency sounds could either deter or attract whales, which could restrict migration corridors, reduce feeding areas, or increase susceptibility to predation by killer whales. Fish may experience behavior changes or losses of sensory capabilities. Fish thought to be particularly noise-sensitive include salmon, sardines, herring, rockfish, Midshipman (*Porichthys* sp.), and a number of other groundfish species (Boehlert et al., 2008). Hearing thresholds and responses of whales, pinnipeds, and fish are uncertain (Copping et al., 2013).

Low frequency, continuous sounds may be masked by environmental background noise. Devices will likely be sited in high energy areas subject to relatively high background noise (e.g., waves, rain, bubbles and spray, sediment movement) (Boehlert et al., 2008; Copping et al., 2013; Polagye et al., 2011). Isolating and measuring sound generation and propagation from marine renewable energy devices is difficult, particularly in high energy environments (Copping et al., 2013, 2016). Experts recommend that baseline studies of background noise, field observations, and sound modeling be used to determine the nature of the sound produced from marine renewable energy device arrays (Boehlert et al., 2008; Copping et al., 2016; Polagye et al., 2014, 2011).

Boehlert et al. (2008) presented several mitigation methods for reducing the effect of operational noise from wave energy devices. These include varying the array design to reduce synchronous sound (additive noise), using thicker mooring cables to reduce the frequency of cable strum, using cable anti-strum devices, and developing wave technology with noise reduction designs.

Some marine animals may not be able to detect sound produced by renewable energy devices. Or, they could even be attracted to the devices (Boehlert et al., 2008). Animals unable to hear the device arrays, animals that become confused by multiple sound sources, or animals attracted to the devices may be at increased risk for collision and injury. The use of sound “pingers” has been considered as an acoustic deterrent method for marine mammals (Copping et al., 2013).

The Annex IV case study on acoustic disturbance of MHK devices summarizes field, laboratory, and modeling studies for determining noise effects and risk to marine animals. Based on this case study, Copping et al. (2013, 2016) conclude that the limited available information suggests that animals are unlikely to be killed or seriously injured as a result of noise disturbance from operation or construction activities. There is higher uncertainty around the behavior, hearing shifts, or migratory effects from noise disturbance. Copping et al. (2013, 2016) indicate that it is unlikely that individual devices or small arrays will have large-scale effects on animal behavior or survival. Most concerns are related to the uncertainty around additive noise from larger device arrays. More data will need to be collected as additional devices are deployed.

Entanglement

Entanglement of marine megafauna (whales, sharks, pinnipeds, and other large animals) in mooring lines of marine renewable energy devices is another commonly expressed environmental concern. Yet, there is little direct evidence to substantiate this concern (Benjamins et al., 2014; Boehlert et al., 2008; Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014; Polagye et al., 2011). Two recent literature searches performed by Benjamins et al. (2014) and Kropp (2013) concluded that marine renewable energy devices pose a relatively low to modest risk of entanglement to large marine animals.

Benjamins et al. (2014) assessed reports of entanglement for a wide variety of large marine animals, encompassing fisheries and other marine activities throughout the world. They also reviewed marine renewable energy mooring system designs and created a qualitative risk assessment approach to assess relative risk to marine animal groups. The authors concluded that for most animal groups, entanglement in marine renewable energy moorings is not likely to pose a major threat. They did indicate that baleen whales may be at greatest risk due to their size and foraging habits. The authors also cautioned that relative risk may be influenced by mooring configuration, with catenary moorings (those that are looser and have slack in the mooring line) having the greatest relative risk and taut moorings the lowest risk (Benjamins et al., 2014).

Benjamins et al. (2014) also concluded that the great majority of entanglement reports to date are associated with ropes from fishing gear, with very few reports of large marine animals becoming entangled in moorings or cables of any kind. The authors stated that a greater risk posed by renewable energy device moorings may come from entanglement and bycatch in derelict fishing gear caught on moorings or energy devices, as this gear will continue to capture and likely kill animals.

A similar study by PNNL (Kropp, 2013) assessed entanglement risk to baleen whales, particularly gray whales, from potential wave energy parks along the U.S. West Coast. Kropp (2013) assessed the biological, behavioral, and migratory patterns of whales. The study described how whales become entangled in slack fishing lines when the slack in the fishing lines wraps around whale body parts. Kropp (2013) stated that moorings for wave energy devices would not have sufficient slack to entangle a whale. The study concluded that entanglement with wave energy device moorings in Oregon waters should not be a significant issue for baleen whales.

Electromagnetic fields

Electromagnetic fields (EMF) can be produced by underwater energy transmission cables. The types of EMFs emitted by a cable include an electric field, an induced magnetic field, and an induced electrical field created from the movement of water through the magnetic field. Cables can be shielded to prevent direct electric field emissions, but the induced magnetic and electric fields cannot be completely shielded. AC and DC underwater cables, therefore, will emit induced electric and magnetic fields.

There is significant uncertainty around the strength of EMF emissions from marine energy cables, which will likely vary between projects (Woodruff, Cullinan, Copping, & Marshall, 2013). The strength of the EMF field is related directly to the intensity of the source current and attenuates with distance from the cable (Polagye et al., 2011; Sotta, 2012; Woodruff et al., 2013). EMF may also be emitted by in-water generating devices themselves, as well as by transformer substations (Boehlert et al., 2008; Polagye et al., 2011).

Scientists and regulators have identified concerns about EMF effects on marine animals, particularly animals that use natural electric or magnetic fields to locate prey and mates, avoid predators, or orient for migration. Species known to use electro-reception include elasmobranchs

(e.g. sharks and rays), lampreys, sturgeons, and decapod crustaceans (e.g. Dungeness Crab). Species known to use natural magnetic fields include elasmobranchs (e.g. sharks and rays), bony fishes (e.g. salmon and tuna), marine mammals, mollusks, and arthropods (Boehlert et al., 2008; Woodruff et al., 2013).

PNNL (Schultz, Woodruff, Marshall, Pratt, & Roesijadi, 2010; Woodruff et al., 2013) conducted preliminary laboratory studies to assess what potential effects EMF may have on fishes and invertebrates. Studied species included Coho Salmon, Dungeness Crab, Atlantic Halibut, and American Lobster. Studies included testing for behavior modification, food and predator detection, and developmental delays. These studies found limited evidence for significant differences between exposed and control groups, yet many of the studies were inconclusive due to sample sizes and husbandry challenges (Schultz et al., 2010; Woodruff et al., 2013). A study in progress on the U.S. East Coast is currently assessing potential EMF impacts from high voltage DC cables on elasmobranch and American Lobster movement and migration (King et al., in progress). It is important to note that there are already many submarine cables in the ocean associated with land-based energy transmission, yet studying the biological effects of these cables is difficult and conclusions are highly speculative (Bergstrom et al., 2012; Normandeau Inc., Exponent Inc., Tricas, & Gill, 2011).

A study was performed to assess changes in the behavior and paths of bony fishes and sharks before and after the activation of the Trans Bay Cable (TBC), a transmission line buried through the San Francisco Bay. The results indicate that Chinook Salmon smolts may be attracted to the cable after activation, but their successful migration through the bay was not impeded. Green Sturgeon migrations were impacted, with outbound migrations having significantly longer transit times and inbound migrations having significantly shorter transit times. Overall, the proportion of successful migrations was not strongly impacted after the cable activation (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2016).

Overall, literature summaries, environmental effects workshops, and limited empirical evidence indicate that EMF may have a relatively low potential impact to species, with likely localized effects. However, there is a high level of uncertainty surrounding the sensitivity and response of many marine species to EMF (Bergstrom et al., 2014; Boehlert et al., 2008; Schultz et al., 2010; Woodruff et al., 2013). Mitigation measures discussed in the literature include shielding and burying the cables to reduce potential exposure (Boehlert et al., 2008). However, more recent reports contradict this suggestion because burial does not actually reduce the EMF, but only increases the distance between the species and the cable. This lowers the maximum EMF encountered in the water column, but for some species this may make the EMF more attractive (Copping et al., 2016).

Marine animal strikes

Offshore wind and tidal current energy devices pose a risk of striking marine animals with their rotating turbine blades or other moving parts. Stakeholders and regulators are concerned with this potential for marine animal strikes. Animals identified that may be at risk from interaction with tidal turbine blades include sea otters, pinnipeds (e.g. seals and sea lions), whales, sea turtles, fish, and diving birds (Copping et al., 2013). Wind turbines present a risk of strike to birds and bats (Flowers, Albertani, Harrison, Polagye, & Suryan, 2014).

An Annex IV case study (Copping et al., 2013) examined available information to estimate the effects of interactions between tidal turbine blades and marine animals. The case study included monitoring studies for potential marine mammal displacement at a tidal turbine site in Northern Ireland; fish interactions with tidal turbines in Maine, New York, and Scotland; fish survival after passing through a turbine in Minnesota; laboratory studies with fish; and

models of mammal encounters. Copping et al. (2013) concluded that the current limited information provides no evidence that direct interactions of marine mammals or fish with tidal turbine blades has caused harm to the animals. Results have not suggested that major effects should be expected as more devices are deployed.

In the 2016 Annex IV update report, the authors again confirmed no observed instances of marine mammals, fish, diving seabirds, or other marine animals colliding with an operational tidal turbine (Copping et al., 2016). The authors do recommend that new technical methods need to be developed and implemented to observe the interactions of marine animals and turbines (Copping et al., 2016)

A study by PNNL assessed the potential and severity of an injury to a killer whale from a tidal turbine in Admiralty Inlet, Puget Sound. This study suggested that strike risk was low, and the worst-case strike injury results would possibly be equivalent to bruising, although the injury data were limited and associated with high uncertainty (Carlson et al., 2014). Diving birds may be attracted to prey congregating around tidal turbines and therefore may be at risk of tidal turbine strike, but there is not much evidence to determine the level of risk (Copping et al., 2013; Sotta, 2012).

Offshore wind turbines may pose a risk to flying birds and bats. Information on bird strike risk comes mostly from land-based wind farms, where the impact of bird strikes is largely site-specific. Studies suggest that birds are at higher risk of strike from wind turbines during storms, at night, or during other periods of low visibility (Musial & Ram, 2010; Sotta, 2012). Bird flight height and diving behavior also likely influence strike risk (Flowers et al., 2014; Musial & Ram, 2010; Sotta, 2012). Monitoring and modeling studies of European and commissioned U.S. offshore wind sites indicate a relatively low impact to birds from turbine strikes. Some monitoring studies in Europe suggest that many birds avoid flying through offshore wind farms and collision rates are low (Flowers et al., 2014; Musial & Ram, 2010; Sotta, 2012). Birds strikes with wave energy devices, while possible, are considered by Sotta (2012) to be less likely than strikes with offshore wind turbines.

Limited information is available to assess the impact to birds from wind farm lighting. According to Musial and Ram (2010), no studies have documented negative impacts to birds from wind farm lighting. The authors do reference the behavioral attraction of nocturnal birds to offshore oil and gas platform lights, which suggests there may be an increased risk of strike to nocturnal birds. Wave energy workshop participants identified a strike risk to birds from lighting on wave energy devices as a potential high impact (Boehlert et al., 2008).

Bird strike risk reduction and mitigation measures highlighted by Musial and Ram (2010) include monitoring and understanding transient and resident bird behaviors. Measures also include careful siting to avoid high-density and migratory waterfowl areas, breeding areas, migratory pathways of concern, and potential cumulative impacts.

Bat strikes by offshore wind turbines are also a concern, as this has been an issue with land-based wind turbines. There is limited information regarding bats and offshore wind farms, but it is known that bats do migrate over water. A monitoring study in Scandinavia suggested that bats did not avoid turbines when hunting for insects (Musial & Ram, 2010). Flowers et al. (2014) are currently developing a remote monitoring system to detect bird and bat interactions with offshore wind turbines.

Effects on the biological environment

Marine renewable energy devices and associated moorings will create novel static structures within the marine environment. The presence of new structures can create a reefing effect, otherwise known as creating a fish aggregation device (FAD), in which fish opportunistically congregate around these devices.

FADs can be considered to have either a positive or negative effect on marine communities, depending on fish management goals and the trophic interactions that occur as a result of the FAD. Some fish populations may increase, as the physical structure provides physical refuge and food from biofouling organisms. Other fish may experience increased susceptibility to predation, as predators may opportunistically target areas with high concentrations of prey. Predators could include fish, sharks, mammals, and seabirds (Bergstrom et al., 2014; Boehlert et al., 2008; Copping et al., 2013; Polagye et al., 2011; Sotta, 2012).

Overall, there is a high level of agreement within the literature that marine energy devices will act as FADs. However, there is significant uncertainty surrounding the exact interactions this may cause and the influences it may have on individual species and communities (Boehlert et al., 2008; Copping et al., 2013; Polagye et al., 2011; Sotta, 2012).

As mentioned above, marine renewable energy devices and associated hard structures will also be subject to biofouling, or the accumulation of marine organisms on structures. In particular, biofouling increases populations of organisms such as mussels, sponges, kelp and other algae, and other sessile organisms. These organisms can provide food for fish and other predators. However, it is possible that these devices can provide habitat for non-native and invasive species colonization (Boehlert et al., 2008; Musial & Ram, 2010; Sotta, 2012). Invasive species have been documented on offshore wind turbines in Denmark and Sweden (as cited in Musial & Ram, 2010).

The physical presence of marine energy device arrays may also influence migration patterns of marine species, including fish, mammals, and birds. Energy devices could create a physical barrier to migration, act as deterrent for animals actively avoiding the arrays, or possibly attract some animals along their migration route, thereby altering migration behavior. There is a significant level of uncertainty around this potential impact. Recommendations include avoiding major migratory routes when siting marine energy installations (Boehlert et al., 2008; Copping et al., 2013; Polagye et al., 2011).

Anchors, cables, and fixed foundations may directly disturb bottom habitat through placement and removal of the equipment. This effect was not discussed in detail within the literature. In general, effects were predicted to be small and localized (Boehlert et al., 2008; Polagye et al., 2011).

Effects on the physical environment

Marine renewable energy devices are designed to extract energy from the environment, and the resulting decreased energy could influence physical processes. The physical presence of these devices could also affect physical processes such as wave propagation and water flow. Limited research is available on the impacts of marine renewable energy devices on the physical environment, and most concerns are highly speculative and restricted to large-scale deployments (Clark et al., 2014; Copping et al., 2013).

Concerns identified in the Annex IV case study (wave and tidal energy) include alterations to sediment transport and deposition, changes in tidal ranges and flushing rates of oxygenated seawater in enclosed waterbodies, changes in water movement that effect distribution of planktonic larvae or marine plant propagules, and changes in water column

mixing. The authors noted that many of these potential effects would likely only occur when device arrays extract very large amounts of energy from the system (Copping et al., 2013).

The majority of physical effects from single and pilot scale device deployments will likely be immeasurable. Measuring effects, even from large-scale deployments, may be difficult given natural variability. Effects might not be seen for years or decades after deployment, and can be difficult to distinguish from natural variations in conditions. Copping et al. (2013) highlight that baseline measurements of oceanographic conditions in high energy environments (the environments most suitable for energy devices) are limited due to the challenges of deploying equipment. Modeling may be the best tool for understanding potential oceanographic effects from large-scale energy deployments, but current challenges exist for model validation (Copping et al., 2013).

Summary reports suggest that commercial-scale tidal current arrays in particular may influence water quality when placed in estuaries. These effects will likely be highly site-specific. Modeling techniques for estimating energy changes are limited, and there is much uncertainty surrounding the magnitude of impacts to water quality (e.g., dissolved oxygen, temperature, salinity, water exchange, etc.) and habitat (Copping et al., 2013; Polagye et al., 2011).

Authors conducting a comprehensive review of research and modeling of offshore wind farms in the Baltic and North Seas came to similar conclusions for offshore wind effects on the physical environment (Clark et al., 2014). This study identified many similar physical effect concerns (e.g. wave propagation, water column mixing, sediment transport) and some additional wind-related concerns. For example, offshore wind farms will produce a wind wake, but it is unclear what effects this may have on the physical environment. For example, offshore wind farms will produce a wind wake, but it is unclear what effects this may have on the physical environment such as on wave propagation. Given that wave generation occurs over much larger areas, it is uncertain how a wind farm may effect overall wave propagation. Clark et al. (2014) stated that impacts are uncertain (especially for large offshore wind farms), that the current accuracy of modeling is limited, and that most research indicates that any effects are either undetectable or remain within the footprint of the offshore wind farm.

Washington stakeholders specifically raised concerns about changes in wave action and sediment transport (Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council, 2015). Current monitoring of offshore wind farms in Europe suggests that effects on wave action and sediment transport are generally localized and limited to the footprint of the offshore wind farm. Models of far-field (long distance) wave action and sediment transport effects from offshore wind farms vary in their results, with predictions ranging from no effect to reductions in beach width. The authors highlight that the disagreement between studies emphasizes that effects are poorly understood (Clark et al., 2014).

The Annex IV case study for MHK devices also highlighted several modeling studies with highly variable results, generally influenced by energy device type and size of project array. The larger the array, the more potential for effects on wave action and sediment transport. However, current models are associated with high levels of uncertainty, and directly measuring these effects will be difficult (Copping et al., 2013), particularly given the natural variability in coastal processes associated with storm events. Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) members developed policy recommendations that include a survivability assessment for all new ocean structures, with requirements for plans and sufficient performance bonding to ensure site rehabilitation after use (Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council, 2016).

Chemical contaminants

Exposure to chemicals from marine renewable energy devices and operations is discussed in the literature as a potential concern. Polagye et al. (2011) divides possible chemical contaminants into two categories: fuel and hydraulic fluid spills from accidents and collisions, and the slow release of anti-fouling chemicals into the environment. Hydraulic fluid leaks from devices are considered to be unlikely due to precautionary measures to contain fluids in the event of a leak during operation or maintenance. Therefore, they are considered to be of low concern (Musial & Ram, 2010; Polagye et al., 2011). Large oil spills from collisions (e.g. supply vessels) would likely have a high impact on fish, birds, habitats, and marine mammals. However, precautionary safety and response measures should limit the likelihood and extent of a large spill (Polagye et al., 2011).

Anti-biofouling chemicals may be continuously released into the marine environment. The effects will be dependent upon the specific chemicals used, and therefore the local and community effects are highly uncertain. Avoiding and minimizing the use of toxic anti-fouling chemicals (e.g., employing non-toxic foul release coatings) is recommended where feasible (Polagye et al., 2011).

Another factor related to chemical exposure is the possibility of chemicals becoming released into the water column from project placement or cable trenching over contaminated sediments. The potential effects are highly site specific and depend upon the contaminants present in the sediment. Avoiding contaminated sites for project and cable locations is recommended to avoid this potential impact (Polagye et al., 2011).

Potential Impacts on Human Uses

Marine renewable energy has the potential to conflict with current and other potential future uses of the ocean, potentially impacting marine industries, local communities, and the state. Some of these conflicts are spatial in nature, meaning that the physical presence and use of ocean and coastal space will directly conflict with other uses.

Spatial conflicts

Spatial conflicts include interactions related to usage of space. These can be direct conflicts in space that may result in temporary or permanent displacement or increases in the time or cost necessary to complete an activity. Spatial conflicts may directly impact the economics of an affected industry, which could lead to hardships within industries and the local communities which depend on them. The MSP assists in identifying the types of spatial conflicts present in the Study Area and recommends ways to avoid and minimize impacts from new uses (see Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework).

Direct displacement of fishing, shipping, and other activities

Marine renewable energy device arrays will take up physical ocean space. The amount of space needed for arrays will depend on project specific factors such as device type, the number of devices, array configuration, and mooring designs. The physical placement of these devices may displace current ocean uses, most notably fishing and shipping activities (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). The extent of displacement impact will depend upon project size and location.

Offshore wind and wave device arrays placed within established shipping lanes could pose a direct safety conflict. Marine renewable energy devices could be sited to avoid shipping lanes, or lanes could be adjusted around project locations. Some stakeholders have indicated that depending upon spacing between offshore wind turbines, it is possible that shipping and other navigation uses could operate between the turbines (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). However, floating offshore wind installations would likely not be able to allow commercial shipping in between turbines due to the larger ocean floor footprint from moorings (A. Weinstein, personal communication, May 15th, 2015).

Marine renewable energy projects may also directly conflict with commercial and recreational fishing activities (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012). According to Bergstrom (2014), fisheries are not routinely excluded from offshore wind farms in Europe, but movement within the farms may be restricted for safety reasons. The first offshore wind farm in the U.S., Block Island Wind Farm off the coast of Rhode Island, started commercial operations in December 2016. The U.S. Coast Guard established a 500-yard safety zone around each of the wind turbine foundations while they were being constructed. Now that construction is completed the restrictions have been lifted and boats are free to transit as close to the turbines as they wish. The U.S. Coast Guard is the agency responsible for setting safety exclusion zones if necessary in the future at Block Island or other offshore wind farms ([33 C.F.R. § 165.20](#)).

Some fisheries may be subject to more displacement/exclusion than others, possibly due to the gear type used by those fisheries. Impacts to various fisheries may also vary due to the nature of the fishery (e.g. a highly localized versus a mobile pelagic fishery) and the type of displacement they experience. Navigation conflicts may include increased transit times to fishing grounds and possibly increased risk of collisions with device support vessels. Transmission cables may also pose a conflict with fisheries, particularly those fisheries which use bottom-contact gear (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012).

It is impossible to know at this point how extensive impacts to Washington fisheries would be. This will be highly dependent upon project specifics such as location, project size, mooring configuration, and device type. Spatial conflicts with fisheries may result in decreased catch, increased transit times and fuel consumption, and loss of gear. This could put economic stress on the industry, and may result in reductions in fishing jobs, decreases in jobs that rely on the fishing industry (e.g. seafood processors, maritime support) and impacts to the broader community.

BOEM has developed best management practices (BMPs) and avoidance and mitigation measures to foster compatible uses within offshore wind energy areas and decrease conflicts with fishermen. Several best management practices have been developed for the U.S. East Coast (Ecology and Environment, Inc., 2014). These include a recommendation for a fisheries communication and outreach plan for communicating between the fishing industry and the project developer. Another BMP is the use of siting considerations to avoid conflict. This includes meeting with local fishing groups to avoid key fishing locations and seasons, maximize fishing access, communicate construction schedules, and discuss cable routing (Ecology and Environment, Inc., 2014).

Safety standards are another BMP, including recommendations for markings, radio use, and lighting, as well as procedures for emergency events. An environmental monitoring BMP includes monitoring procedures and incident reporting requirements. Ecology and Environment also recommended BOEM consider financial assistance to mitigate hardships to fishermen and support continued fishing. Possibilities for monetary support may include financial assistance with gear improvements, port facility updates (e.g., freezers, storage facilities, etc.), fuel subsidies, or enhancements to fisheries research (Ecology and Environment, Inc., 2014).

A study of several U.S. ocean regions (including the Pacific Northwest) identified numerous potential conflicts and avoidance and mitigation measures upon which BOEM's BMPs were based. This study suggested that each local region may desire a tailored set of BMPs and mitigation measures to meet local circumstances. The report identified that commercial fishing stakeholders in the Pacific Northwest strongly preferred conflict avoidance over mitigation, and emphasized the fishermen's desire to be involved in the decision-making process (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012).

Other Use Conflicts: Recreation, Research, Military, and Historic and Cultural Sites

Other current ocean uses that may potentially conflict with marine renewable energy over direct use of ocean space include recreational activities, research activities, military operations, dredge disposal, archaeological and historical sites, and permanent infrastructure. Recreational boaters may need to alter travel and destination patterns, and may experience an increased risk to safety. Wave energy technologies which utilize surf waves may directly conflict with established surfing locations. Research activities with repeated sampling transects may also be affected if an energy array is placed along or near transects. The presence of marine renewable energy devices may alter data and disrupt long-term baseline monitoring and scientific surveys (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012).

Marine renewable energy devices may also pose a direct space conflict if sited within military practice zones and other frequently used military areas. This includes potential impacts to Navy gunnery training, ship and submarine maneuvers and transit, and aircraft training. Obstruction issues may result from off shore renewable energy development, including potential safety of flight issues due to the height of wind energy turbines and the cumulative effect of pushing commercial surface vessel traffic further offshore. Offshore structures may also interfere with the operation of Federal Aviation Administration and Western Air Defense radars. Other designated areas, including dredge disposal zones and navigation channels, may also experience direct conflict if energy devices are located within or along frequently trafficked areas associated with these zones. Areas with permanent infrastructure such as seafloor cables may also be affected by marine renewable energy projects (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012).

Potential direct spatial conflicts with historic, cultural, and archaeological sites are possible if projects are located on or directly near such sites (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012). Construction, foundations, and moorings may damage historic resources. BOEM and other federal agencies are required under [Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act](#) to identify and assess impacts to cultural and historical resources. Consultations with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) will be required if the project occurs in state waters and with the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) for tribal lands. BOEM's regulations in [30 CFR 585](#), specifically those regarding renewable energy leases on the outer continental shelf, require a site assessment to identify historic properties.

A space use conflict assessment funded by BOEM identified several potential avoidance and mitigation measures for a variety of uses, including many discussed above. The primary strategies identified for avoiding and mitigating conflict that could apply generally to several user-group conflicts included: avoiding spatial conflict through avoiding high use and high values areas, communication and stakeholder engagement to identify specific conflicts and avoidance/mitigation strategies, coastal and marine spatial planning, spatial analysis to understand areas of high economic and environmental value, and minimizing impacts through project design and construction. Environmental assessments, mitigation funds and subsidies, stock enhancements, research, emergency response plans, and other strategies were also presented (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012).

Viewshed and tourism conflicts

Marine renewable energy projects may have varying degrees of visual impact to coastal or ocean viewsheds. How visible a project is will depend on the type of device (which influences the height and size of an array), distance from shore or other highly used ocean areas, and visibility of an area (i.e., during fog and haze vs. on a clear day). Due to the height and size of wind turbines, offshore wind will likely have the greatest potential impact on viewsheds, followed by wave energy. Within offshore wind structures, floating offshore wind will have the most flexibility to reduce viewshed impacts, as it can be sited farthest from shore. Tidal current energy may have little potential impact on a viewshed. The majority or entirety of these devices will be located below the sea surface, with the exception of possible surface platforms or foundations.

Viewshed impacts are difficult to estimate. Local residents, tourists, and individuals from marine industries may have different perspectives on and tolerances for viewshed alteration by marine renewable energy devices. Communities in Washington (Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council, 2015), the U.S. East Coast, and Europe have expressed concerns related to the potential impact to tourism as a result of an altered viewshed. Evidence to date suggests that offshore wind farms in Europe have had little to no negative impact on tourism, and some European communities saw increases in tourism as people traveled to see operating offshore turbines (as cited in Musial & Ram, 2010). Studies from Europe also suggest that individuals may become accustomed to the change in view over time, exhibiting less resistance to a project once it becomes operational. The ultimate effects of marine renewable energy projects on tourism will likely be highly site-specific. Therefore, potential impacts are associated with a significant amount of uncertainty (Musial & Ram, 2010).

Another concern related to viewshed is the potential impact on property values. No studies were available on offshore wind impacts on property values. U.S.-based studies on land-based wind farms cited in Musial and Ram (2010) revealed that properties located within the viewshed of a wind farm had comparable property values to similar properties outside the viewshed. It remains unclear what effect offshore wind farms or other marine energy projects may have on U.S. coastal property values (Musial & Ram, 2010).

In addition, particularly pristine or culturally-important viewsheds may experience more of an impact from the visual presence of marine renewable energy (Musial & Ram, 2010). Onshore substations and other new or expanded shoreside support infrastructure may also contribute to an altered coastal viewshed. Projects that could impact culturally important viewsheds would require consultation with THPOs and tribal governments ([36 CFR § 800.2](#)).

Use conflicts from physical effects

While marine renewable energy devices may directly conflict in space with many ocean uses, there is also the potential for conflicts with users that rely upon ocean energy resources, such as the waves used by surfers, wind used for sailing activities, and coastal zone mixing that affects water quality. As described within the section on effects on the physical environment, energy devices work by extracting energy from the environment, which can reduce the energy within the system. Offshore wind turbines may create a wind wake, which may alter the leeward wind dynamics from an offshore wind farm (Clark et al., 2014). This may impact sailing activities, with the likelihood of impacts increasing with the size of the offshore wind array and the amount of energy extraction. However, these effects are uncertain. Offshore wind foundations and wave energy devices may also remove energy from waves, which could influence wave behavior (wave height, direction, etc.) (Boehlert et al., 2008; Clark et al., 2014;

Copping et al., 2013). This could potentially affect the surf for surfing and other wave-related user activities (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012).

Energy extraction may also influence the surf mixing zone, tidal ranges, oxygen exchange, and water exchange. If these processes were altered, there may be effects to water quality and habitat along the nearshore, particularly for commercial-scale tidal current energy within semi-enclosed water bodies (i.e., estuaries) (Boehlert et al., 2008; Copping et al., 2013; Polagye et al., 2011). This could potentially impact coastal aquaculture and recreational shellfishing, which rely on natural physical processes to maintain water quality and optimal shellfish growing conditions. Although, it is currently unclear how likely or to what extent the impacts would be.

Impacts on water circulation, water quality, wave alterations, and other physical processes are highly uncertain (Clark et al., 2014; Copping et al., 2013; Polagye et al., 2011). Therefore, so are the potential impacts to current uses that rely upon physical ocean processes. As mentioned earlier, small-scale and pilot projects in general are anticipated to have no measurable impact on physical processes, and high uncertainty surrounds the potential physical impact of large-scale commercial operations. Models may provide the best opportunity to predict the potential level of impacts (Clark et al., 2014; Copping et al., 2013; Polagye et al., 2011).

Potential Conflicts with Future Uses

Marine renewable energy devices may also conflict with potential future and expanded ocean uses. In particular, conflicts may exist between future sand and gravel mining operations, new dredge disposal locations (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012), and possibly some types of offshore aquaculture (e.g., current technology for finfish aquaculture). It is unknown at this time what the likelihood of these potential conflicts would be.

Permitting Marine Renewable Energy

Marine renewable energy projects require a number of authorizations including licenses, leases, permits, and consultations. These actions are performed by several federal, state, and local agencies, often in coordination. This is a complex process that varies depending on the type of proposed project (offshore wind, tidal, or wave) and location (state, federal, tribal, or marine sanctuary waters). One of the requirements for the MSP is to include a framework that coordinates state agency and local government review of proposed renewable energy development to streamline the process ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)](#)). This is addressed in Section 4: MSP Management Framework. The following describes the primary federal authorities for authorizing marine renewable energy projects in ocean waters.

Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management (BOEM)

BOEM has the authority to issue leases, easements, and rights of way for all renewable energy development (including offshore wind, wave, and tidal) on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). The OCS lies from 3 nautical miles to 200 nautical miles offshore.⁶ BOEM has a flexible process for establishing leases for renewable energy which generally occurs in four phases:

⁶ State jurisdiction lies between 0 and 3 nautical miles offshore.

planning and analysis, leasing, site assessment, and construction and operations (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2014).

The Outer Continental Shelf Renewable Energy Program does not give BOEM the authority to issue a lease within the National Marine Sanctuary system ([30 CFR 585.204](#)). However, this does not necessarily mean that marine renewable energy projects cannot occur on the OCS in the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Other federal agencies, such as the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), can issue authorizations for marine renewable energy projects in Sanctuary waters.

BOEM can be the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) lead agency for preparing Environmental Impact Statements/Environmental Assessments for proposed projects on the OCS ([40 CFR Parts 1500-1508](#); FERC and U.S. Department of Interior, 2009). This means that on the OCS, outside of the Sanctuary, BOEM is the lead agency for evaluating and coordinating environmental review to ensure that the lease will not significantly affect the environment. BOEM coordinates with several federal, state, and local authorities as well as the public throughout the NEPA process. The NEPA process is completed prior to authorizing any lease, easement, or right of way. BOEM and FERC have agreed to cooperate on the NEPA process for wave and tidal energy projects within the OCS (FERC and U.S. Department of Interior, 2009).

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)

FERC is an independent federal agency that regulates the interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas, and oil. FERC is responsible for licensing the construction and operation of hydrokinetic projects (wave and tidal) in state and federal waters. Some types of projects may conduct limited testing without obtaining a FERC license (Federal Power Act, [18 CFR § 4 and 5](#)). FERC does not have authority over offshore wind power projects. FERC does have the authority to issue licenses for wave and tidal projects within marine sanctuaries (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012a).

FERC is the NEPA lead agency for wave and tidal projects in State waters (0 to 3 nautical miles), and wave and tidal projects within marine sanctuaries. FERC and BOEM have an agreement to work together in the NEPA process for wave and tidal projects within the OCS. Environmental analysis during the licensing phase of the project may be led by FERC, with BOEM as a cooperating agency or with FERC and BOEM as co-leads. The two agencies have agreed that FERC will not issue a license on the OCS until BOEM has issued a lease to the applicant (FERC and U.S. Department of Interior, 2009).

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps)

The Corps is responsible for issuing permits under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act for any construction that will affect the navigable capacity of any waters of the United States. This includes wind, wave, and tidal projects in state and federal OCS waters. It is possible that a project authorized by FERC may not require a Section 10 permit from the Corps (Federal Power Act, [33 CFR § 221.1\(f\)\(1\)](#)).

Under Section 10 authority, the Corps is likely the NEPA lead agency for marine renewable energy projects that do not fall under BOEM or FERC federal authority. An example of this may be any offshore wind projects that are proposed within State waters, or possibly any offshore wind projects proposed within the marine sanctuary (since BOEM does not have the authority to offer leases within marine sanctuaries, and FERC does not have authority for wind

projects). Federal agencies do have the option to choose which agency is the NEPA lead ([40 CFR § 1500-1508](#)). Therefore, it is possible that another federal agency may take the lead when BOEM or FERC does not have authority.

The Corps is also responsible for issuing permits under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for dredge and fill actions in any waters of the United States. This approval may be required to install marine renewable energy structures or devices in the marine environment. The EPA also reviews Section 404 permit applications.

Marine Renewable Energy Technical Suitability Within the MSP Study Area

To support the MSP, PNNL produced a report in 2013 analyzing the potential technical suitability of the MSP study area for various offshore wind, wave, and tidal current energy devices. As required by [RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(c\)](#), the report included a series of maps which indicated the relative technical suitability of devices by location.⁷ PNNL created these maps by evaluating site suitability using several criteria, which were grouped into three categories: site quality, shore-side support, and grid connection. Specific criteria analyzed were energy resource potential, depth, substrate, distance to substation, distance to shore, distance to transmission line, distance to service port/airport, and distance to deepwater port. The analysis evaluated potential technical suitability only,⁸ and did not take into account potential conflicts and considerations with current ocean uses (Van Cleve et al., 2013).

This section presents the maps and key results in the PNNL report for technical suitability of marine renewable energy in MSP Study Area waters. For further details on the analysis methods, results, and maps, please see the original report by Van Cleve et al. (2013).

Offshore Wind Energy Suitability

Offshore wind energy assessments suggest that Washington has significant wind resources (Lopez et al., 2012; Schwartz et al., 2010). Van Cleve et al. (2013) assessed technical suitability for three offshore wind technology types: monopile (nearshore), tripod and jacket (mid-depth), and floating platform (deepwater). Three maps illustrating potential relatively suitable locations for tripod and jacket, monopile, and floating foundation technologies are shown in Maps 43, 44, and 45 respectively.

In general, the southern half of the Study Area shows relatively higher areas of suitability than the northern half for all offshore wind foundation types. Areas offshore of Grays Harbor and Cape Disappointment show higher suitability for all three types of offshore wind, and floating offshore wind also shows higher suitability around Cape Flattery (Van Cleve et al., 2013).

⁷ The suitability score was calculated using attribute scores and weighted models divided by a potential maximum suitability score. The maps summarize relative suitability based on these scores.

⁸ Technical suitability was based on input from the current marine renewable energy industry. Suitability may change as technologies mature.

Wave Energy Suitability

A report by the Electric Power Resource Institute (EPRI) (2011) estimates that Washington has approximately 19% of the available wave energy resource on the West Coast. Wave energy technical suitability in the MSP Study Area was analyzed by Van Cleve et al. (2013) for four device groups: nearshore, nearshore M3, mid-depth, and deepwater wave. Maps 46, 47, 48, and 49 show locations with potential technical suitability for nearshore, nearshore M3, mid-depth, and deepwater wave devices, respectively.

Similar to site suitability patterns for offshore wind, all wave device groups displayed the highest relative suitability locations mostly in the southern half of the Study Area, particularly offshore from Grays Harbor and Cape Disappointment. High suitability areas were also located offshore from Cape Flattery (Van Cleve et al., 2013).

Tidal Current Energy Suitability

Tidal current energy suitability is limited within the MSP Study Area. PNNL's suitability assessment combined all tidal current energy device types to create one tidal energy site suitability map, shown in Map 50. Van Cleve et al. (2013) identified one area at the Mouth of the Columbia River as having the potential for medium to low percent suitability for tidal current energy. All other areas showed no suitability. Van Cleve et al. (2013) did state that in the future, potential sites may be discovered in Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay, particularly with new technologies optimized for lower current speeds.

Key Results for Suitability

PNNL assessed relative technical suitability for marine renewable energy sites based on economic and site feasibility factors. This assessment did not include suitability based on conflicts with current uses or ecological habitats. Suitability in this analysis is relative, meaning that a site with a high suitability score may not necessarily be an appropriate site. However, this analysis provides a valuable first look at what areas may present possibilities for renewable energy based on technical factors. The suitability results show a greater number of areas with higher suitability for renewable energy development off the southern half of the Washington coast than the northern half, and many sites are suitable for more than one device type (Maps 43-50).

Van Cleve et al. (2013) indicate that the primary driver of this pattern for offshore wind and wave technologies is grid connectivity, i.e. the lack of supporting electrical infrastructure, including transmission lines and substations along the northern mid-section of the coast (Map 51). The authors note that distance to shore support (service ports and deepwater ports) also influences this pattern. Areas most suitable for marine renewable energy development are within 25 miles of the coast. There are limited areas with suitability for tidal current energy within the MSP Study Area primarily due to lack of sufficient tidal flows for analyzed devices (Van Cleve et al., 2013).

Future Trends and Factors

Several drivers and barriers exist for the marine renewable energy industry in Washington state. Significant offshore wind and wave energy resources exist within the MSP Study Area (EPRI, 2011; Lopez et al., 2012; Schwartz et al., 2010). Many areas have high potential technical suitability for wind and wave energy devices (Van Cleve et al., 2013), which could contribute to satisfying Washington State's Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard. Marine renewable energy projects may also stimulate economic development and provide high-paying, stable jobs (Musial & Ram, 2010; Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2013b, 2014).

However, the marine renewable energy industry is relatively new, and there are several economic, technological, and logistical barriers to its development (Augustine et al., 2012; Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014; Van Cleve et al., 2013). Regional and locally-specific factors, along with community concerns and the high use of Washington's ocean space, add to the barriers for local development of marine renewable energy projects. A sector analysis (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014) produced specifically for the MSP concluded that the likelihood of marine renewable energy development is limited over the next 20 years. There are currently no marine renewable energy projects operating or under development within the MSP Study Area.

Potential impacts from climate change may pose risks or challenges to marine renewable energy infrastructure in the MSP Study Area. As described in Section 2.11: Climate Change, scientists project that storms will increase in intensity and frequency as a result of climate change. This is also likely to include increasing wave heights and potentially changes in wave direction in the MSP Study Area (Miller, Shishido, Antrim, & Bowlby, 2013). Marine renewable energy infrastructure in the MSP Study Area would be exposed to any increases in storm energy and frequency that result from climate change. Extreme winds carry an increased risk of turbine damage and the resulting cost of repairs. Extreme weather may cause seafloor sediment to become more mobile and cause foundation instability, structural issues, and cable exposure (Diamond, 2012).

Potential Within the MSP Study Area

The technical suitability study by PNNL (Van Cleve et al., 2013) and the sector analysis by Industrial Economics, Inc. (2014) provide valuable information specific to the MSP Study Area. As discussed earlier in this section, PNNL's suitability analysis revealed a greater number of areas with higher suitability for marine renewable energy development in the southern half of the Study Area compared to the northern half. The primary driver of this pattern is the lack of grid infrastructure and distance to ports along the northern mid-section of the coast (Van Cleve et al., 2013).

The presence of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS) along the northern half of the coast also lowers the likelihood for marine renewable energy projects (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014), particularly for commercial-scale developments. However, marine renewable energy projects that are owned by a tribe could possibly be permitted within the OCNMS ([15 CFR Part 922](#)). Tribes must still go through all applicable federal permit processes.

While the southern half of the MSP Study Area may be more technically suitable for marine renewable energy development (including the proximity of support and grid infrastructure), this area is also subject to heavy ocean use from marine industries including

shipping and non-tribal fisheries (Map 40 and Map 17). This may be a significant limiting factor for marine renewable energy development in the southern half of the MSP Study Area.

Experts have expressed mixed views with regards to commercial and small-scale projects. Some experts feel that small-scale, community-based projects may be possible within the MSP Study Area, particularly for tribal or other local communities looking to increase their energy reliability (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). However, technology challenges and current high energy costs associated with small-scale projects limit the economic feasibility of local community projects. While commercial-scale projects may reduce the cost of energy, other factors such as limited experience in the U.S., significant initial investments in grid infrastructure and support infrastructure, conflicts with users, and other market factors limit the commercial-scale potential along Washington's Pacific coast over the next 20 years (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014).

Of the marine renewable energy resources discussed, offshore wind was reported by Industrial Economics, Inc. (2014) to have the highest likelihood for development within the MSP Study Area over the next 20 years. The primary reason for this assessment was the advanced state of offshore wind technology, relative to wave and tidal current devices. Locations near Grays Harbor, a deepwater port, may be particularly favorable for offshore wind (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). Floating offshore wind is possibly the most likely technology type (A. Weinstein, personal communication, May 15th, 2015). Despite the abundant offshore wind resource, areas with potentially high technical suitability, and the relatively advanced stage of offshore wind technology development, Industrial Economics, Inc. (2014) reported that the likelihood of offshore wind development along Washington's Pacific coast over the next 20 years is still limited.

Past project proposals for small-scale community wave projects as well as the wave device testing sites in Oregon exemplify the interest in wave technology within the Pacific Northwest. However, given that the technology is still in its infancy, it is highly unlikely that commercial-scale wave energy projects will be developed within the next 20 years (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). There is more possibility for small-scale projects, especially for remote communities.

Tidal current energy has limited technical suitability within the MSP Study Area (Van Cleve et al., 2013) and the technology is still quite new. Therefore, tidal energy development in the MSP Study Area is highly unlikely within the next 20 years (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014).

Key barriers

Cost

Cost has been identified as a primary barrier to marine renewable energy development in Washington, the U.S., and around the world (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014; Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). Stakeholders are also concerned about how these projects will influence the cost of energy to consumers. In Washington, offshore wind, wave, and tidal current energy are currently not cost-competitive with other sources of energy (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014; Musial & Ram, 2010; Renewable Northwest, 2007). The Pacific Northwest currently has relatively low electricity prices due to an abundance of hydropower dams in the region (Musial & Ram, 2010). In 2013, Washington had the lowest residential electricity prices in the nation (U.S. Energy Information Administration, 2014).

Many factors influence the life-cycle costs of marine renewable energy, such as initial and operating costs and the cost of capital. (Musial & Ram, 2010; SI Ocean, 2013). Operation

and maintenance costs also represent a significant portion of cost due to the logistics of operating in the marine environment (SI Ocean, 2013). Other factors that influence the cost of energy include the price of conventional energy (particularly natural gas), demand for power (i.e. increased demand from decommissioning coal power), and competition with industries that use similar resources (e.g. offshore oil and gas construction and manufacturing) (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014).

Significant investments in technology, transmission infrastructure, and other development factors are needed within the marine renewable energy sector. Investment risk is also relatively high, due to the novelty of the industry. Marine renewable energy currently requires incentives to be competitive with other energy sources, as many utility districts will likely be unwilling to pay higher premium prices. Costs are expected to decrease over time as technology advances and experience is gained (Augustine et al., 2012; Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014; Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2013a, 2014).

Ultimately, the cost-competiveness (or current lack thereof) is the primary challenge to U.S. offshore wind development. U.S. federal and state incentive programs, such as research development grants and renewable portfolio standards, are currently needed to stimulate the industry (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). Some stakeholders are concerned about possible energy price increases due to marine renewable energy development, and are skeptical of investing public dollars for initial investments and accepting risk with perceived limited local benefit. Local PUDs may be unwilling to pay the premium prices associated with marine renewable energy development in the near term (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014).

Infrastructure requirements

Support and transmission infrastructure requirements to support marine renewable energy are another major barrier (Musial & Ram, 2010; Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014), particularly for rural coastal Washington (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). All device types (offshore wind, wave, and tidal) will require existing onshore substations to be updated and adapted to serve as “on-ramps” for energy integration into the grid (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). Current integration of land-based wind indicates that integration of marine renewable resources is possible.

Support infrastructure will be required to install and service marine renewable energy projects. These requirements will depend on technology type. Offshore wind requires deepwater ports (channels deeper than 30 feet) (Van Cleve et al., 2013), as well as large assembly areas, and sufficient offloading equipment⁹ (Musial & Ram, 2010). Washington currently does not have existing facilities to support offshore wind, yet there are potential locations where infrastructure could be updated (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). Navigant Consulting, Inc. (2014) suggests that public investment in port infrastructure could significantly support offshore wind development, benefit other water transportation industries, and decrease long-term costs of renewable energy.

Marine renewable energy will require integration into the electricity grid. It is a variable resource, meaning energy generation is not constant throughout time. This creates challenges for integration into the grid. The Northwest electricity industry¹⁰ has adapted its grid infrastructure to be able to integrate approximately 11,500 MWs of land-based wind resources as of 2015 (Northwest PowerPool, 2015). This indicates the capability to integrate marine renewable energy

⁹ Construction and equipment requirements will vary between offshore wind foundation technology types.

¹⁰ The Northwest electricity industry includes organization such as BPA, Puget Sound Energy, and other major local, state, and regional utility organizations.

resources, particularly in light of greater capacity factors being observed for offshore wind than for terrestrial wind (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014; Northwest Power and Conservation Council, 2010).

The majority of the Washington coast is relatively rural and may not be able to absorb additional quantities of new offshore-generated electricity through existing infrastructure. Therefore, updates to transmission infrastructure will be required to connect energy generated in the ocean into local PUDs and the larger transmission grid¹¹ (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2014). This will add to the initial costs of marine renewable energy development and will ultimately be reflected in the electricity rate (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2013a). Some stakeholders are skeptical as to whether the investment into these updates will benefit local communities, and are concerned about the ability of offshore transmission technology and grid connections to be successful and efficient.

Regulatory uncertainty

Regulatory uncertainty is a primary barrier for marine renewable energy development in the U.S. (Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014). Multiple agencies are involved in the complex permitting process. The timeframe, specific authorities and requirements, siting process, and other conditions are continuously being adjusted as agencies learn about this new ocean use. This creates a lengthy, costly, and uncertain process for developers. BOEM is currently working to improve their Outer Continental Shelf leasing process (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2014), and several agencies have entered into formal agreements with each other to outline authorities, responsibilities, and cooperation protocols (i.e. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012a; Federal Energy Regulatory Commission & State of Washington, 2009; FERC and U.S. Department of Interior, 2009). As more projects are proposed and permitted, the regulatory process will likely improve. Also, the MSP may serve to reduce some uncertainty by providing a framework for permit coordination.

Conflicts with current uses

Spatial conflict with current ocean uses is another barrier to marine renewable energy in Washington. As described in the section on potential human use conflicts, marine renewable energy may directly conflict with several key marine industries, such as fishing, recreation, and shipping (Industrial Economics, Inc., 2012, 2014). These industries are frequent and important users of the Washington coast (Section 2.4, Section 2.6, and Section 2.7, respectively). This may lead to economic stress and significant impacts to these industries and the surrounding communities. Recommendations within the MSP are based on avoiding and minimizing conflicts with existing ocean uses. These recommendations may influence the location, extent, and process for marine renewable energy development. It is a goal of this Marine Spatial Plan to protect existing sustainable uses while encouraging economic opportunities that recognize the aspirations of coastal communities.

Environmental concerns

As described in the “Potential environmental impacts” section, there are many possible yet uncertain effects to the marine environment from marine renewable energy projects. This uncertainty may affect public perception and influence regulatory review of proposed projects, such as an increased likelihood of additional environmental studies and monitoring requirements.

¹¹ Transmission updates are often necessary for the incorporation of land-based wind energy as well, and have been performed with the expansion of this industry.

There are also unknown mitigation requirements and uncertainties around the effectiveness of mitigation measures. Environmental uncertainty can increase cost and time for developers and increase resistance from stakeholders and environmental regulatory agencies. Environmental research at field test sites, in laboratories, and through models are filling in the many data gaps, yet many unknowns will remain until full-scale projects are deployed and monitored for several years (Bergstrom et al., 2014; Boehlert et al., 2008; Copping et al., 2013; Navigant Consulting, Inc., 2014; Polagye et al., 2011).

References

Laws [Source type 5]

Revised Code of Washington (RCW)

Energy Independence Act of 2006, RCW 19.265

Marine Waters Planning and Management, RCW 43.372

United States Code (USC)

National Historic Preservation Act, Title 54 USC Section 106

Regulations [Source type 7]

Code of Federal Register (CFR)

Federal Power Act, 18 CFR Parts 4 and 5

Federal Power Act, 33 CFR Part 221.1(f)(1) National Marine Sanctuary Program Regulations, 15 CFR Part 922

Renewable Energy and Alternate Use of Existing Facilities on the Outer Continental Shelf, 30 CFR 585.204

NOAA Implementing Regulations, 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508

Reports, Journals, etc.

Augustine, C., Bain, R., Chapman, J., Denholm, P., Drury, E., Hall, D. G., ... Young, K. (2012). *Volume 2: Renewable electricity generation and storage technologies* (Renewable Electricity Generation and Storage Technologies. Vol 2. of Renewable Electricity Futures Study No. NREL/TP-6A20-52409-2). Golden, CO: National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Retrieved from <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy12osti/52409-2.pdf> [Source type 11].

Benjamins, S., Harnois, V., Smith, H. C. M., Johanning, L., Greenhill, L., Carter, C., & Wilson, B. (2014). *Understanding the potential for marine megafauna entanglement risk from marine renewable energy developments* (Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report No. 791). Scottish National Heritage. Retrieved from <http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/SNH-2014-Report791.pdf> [Source type 11].

Bergstrom, L., Kautsky, L., Malm, T., Ohlsson, H., Wahlberg, M., Rosenberg, R., & Capetillo, N. A. (2012). *The effects of wind power on marine life* (No. 6512). Swedish Environmental Protection Agency and Vindval. Retrieved from <http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Bergstrom%20et%20al.%202012.pdf> [Source type 11].

Bergstrom, L., Kautsky, L., Malm, T., Rosenberg, R., Wahlberg, M., Capetillo, N. A., & Wilhelmsson, D. (2014). Effects of offshore wind farms on marine wildlife—a generalized impact assessment. *Environmental Research Letters*, 9, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/3/034012>. [Source type 1].

Boehlert, G. W., McMurray, G. R., & Tortorici, C. E. (editors). (2008). *Ecological effects of wave energy in the Pacific Northwest* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-92). U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved from <http://hmssc.oregonstate.edu/files/main/waveenergynoatm92.pdf> [Source type 11].

- Buck, B. H., Ebeling, M. W., & Michler-Cieluch, T. (2010). Mussel cultivation as a co-use in offshore wind farms: Potential and economic feasibility. *Aquaculture Economics & Management*, 14(4), 255–281. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13657305.2010.526018> [Source type 1].
- Buck, B. H., Krause, G., Michler-Cieluch, T., Brenner, M., Buchholz, C. M., Busch, J. A., ... Zielinski, O. (2008). Meeting the quest for spatial efficiency: progress and prospects of extensive aquaculture within offshore wind farms. *Helgoland Marine Research*, 62, 269–281.
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2012a). BOEM/FERC guidelines on regulation of marine and hydrokinetic energy projects on the OCS (Version 2, July 19, 2012). Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved from <http://www.ferc.gov/industries/hydropower/gen-info/licensing/hydrokinetics/pdf/mms080309.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2012b). *Outer continental shelf oil and gas leasing program: 2012-2017 final programmatic environmental impact statement*. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved from http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/BOEM/Oil_and_Gas_Energy_Program/Leasing/Five_Year_Program/2012-2017_Five_Year_Program/2012-2017_Final_PEIS.pdf [Source type 4].
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2014). *Wind energy commercial leasing process* (Fact Sheet). Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved from <http://www.boem.gov/Commercial-Leasing-Process-Fact-Sheet/> [Source type 11].
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2016). *Assessment of potential impact of electromagnetic fields from undersea cable on migratory fish behavior* (Final Technical Report No. OCS Study BOEM 2016-041). Retrieved from <https://www.boem.gov/2016-041/> [Source type 9].
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2017). *Renewable energy on the outer continental shelf*. Retrieved from <https://www.boem.gov/BOEM-Overview-Renewable-Energy/> [Source type 11].
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (n.d.). State activities. Retrieved May 24, 2017, from <https://www.boem.gov/Renewable-Energy-State-Activities/> [Source type 11].
- Carlson, T. J., Gear, M., Copping, A. E., Halvorsen, M., Jepsen, R., & Metzinger, K. (2014). *Assessment of strike of adult killer whales by an OpenHydro tidal turbine blade* (Final Report No. PNNL-22041). Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy. Retrieved from http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OpenHydro_Whale_Strike_Assessment_Final.pdf. [Source type 9].
- Clark, S., Schroeder, F., & Baschek, B. (2014). *The influence of large offshore wind farms on the North Sea and Baltic Sea- a comprehensive literature review* (HZG Report No. 2014–6). Germany: Helmholtz-Zentrum Geesthacht. Retrieved from http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Clark_et_al_2014.pdf
- Copping, A., Hanna, J., Whiting, J., Geerlofs, S., Gear, M., Blake, K., ... Battey, H. (2013). *Environmental effects of marine energy development around the world for the OES Annex IV* (Annex IV Final Report No. PNNL-22176). Richland, WA: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Retrieved from <http://mhk.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Final%20Annex%20IV%20Report%202013%20v2.pdf>

- Copping, A., Sather, N., Hanna, L., Whiting, J., Zydlewski, G., Staines, G., ... Masden, E. (2016). *Annex IV 2016 state of the science report: environmental effects of marine renewable energy development around the world*. Retrieved from <https://tethys.pnnl.gov/publications/state-of-the-science-2016> [Source type 11].
- Department of Energy. (2012, January 20). Increasing energy security. Retrieved March 23, 2015, from <http://energy.gov/articles/increasing-energy-security> [Source type 11].
- Department of Energy. (2014, May 7). Advanced offshore wind tech: Accelerating new opportunities for clean energy. Retrieved May 18, 2015, from <http://www.energy.gov/eere/articles/advanced-offshore-wind-tech-accelerating-new-opportunities-clean-energy>. [Source type 11].
- Diamond, K. E. (2012). Extreme weather impacts on offshore wind turbines: Lessons learned. *Natural Resources & Environment*, 27(2). Retrieved from <https://www.lowenstein.com/files/Publication/23b0d113-b158-4a06-a140-9c2e76fa6b25/Presentation/PublicationAttachment/a677f0c5-52bc-4af4-b09c-9d183737da5a/Extreme%20Weather%20Impacts%20on%20Offshore%20Wind%20Turbines.pdf> [Source type 1].
- Ecology and Environment, Inc. (2014). *Development of mitigation measures to address potential use conflicts between commercial wind energy lessees/grantees and commercial fishermen on the Atlantic outer continental shelf: Report on best management practices and mitigation measures*. (OCS Study BOEM 2014-654). Herndon, VA: A final report for the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Office of Renewable Energy Programs. Retrieved from <http://www.boem.gov/OCS-Study-BOEM-2014-654/>. [Source type 11].
- EPRI. (2011). *Mapping and assessment of the United States ocean wave energy resource* (Technical Report No. 1024637). Electric Power Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://www1.eere.energy.gov/water/pdfs/mappingandassessment.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. (2006). *Preliminary draft environmental assessment* (Draft Environmental Assessment). Washington D.C.: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Retrieved from <http://www.marinerenewables.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Preliminary-Draft-Environmental-Assessment-Makah-Bay-Offshore-Wave-Energy-Pilot-Project.pdf>
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. (2007, December 21). Order issuing conditioned original license project no. 12751-000. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Retrieved from <https://www.ferc.gov/whats-new/comm-meet/2007/122007/H-1.pdf>
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. (2009, April 21). Order accepting surrender of license project no. 12750-006. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission [Source type 11].
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, & State of Washington. (2009). Memorandum of understanding between the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the State of Washington by and through its Departments of Ecology, Fish & Wildlife, Natural Resources, Community Trade and Economic Development, and State Parks and Recreation Commission, and the Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance. Retrieved from <http://www.ferc.gov/legal/mou/mou-wa.pdf> [Source type 11].
- FERC and U.S. Department of Interior. (2009, April 9). Memorandum of understanding between the U.S. Department of the Interior and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. U.S. Department of the Interior and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Retrieved from http://www.boem.gov/Renewable-Energy-Program/DOI_FERC_MOU.aspx [Source type 11]/

- Flowers, J., Albertani, R., Harrison, T., Polagye, B., & Suryan, R. M. (2014). Design and initial component tests of an integrated avian and bat collision detection system for offshore wind turbines. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Marine Energy Technology Symposium*. Seattle, WA. Retrieved from http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Flowers_et_al_2014.pdf. [Source type 11].
- Global Wind Energy Council. (2015). *Global wind report: annual market update 2015*. Retrieved from http://www.gwec.net/wp-content/uploads/vip/GWEC-Global-Wind-2015-Report_April-2016_22_04.pdf [Source type 11].
- Industrial Economics, Inc. (2012). *Identification of outer continental shelf renewable energy space-use conflicts and analysis of potential mitigation measures* (OCS Study BOEM No. 2012-083). Herndon, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved from http://seagrant.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/faculty-docs/download/boem_ocean_space_use_final_report_oregon_and_washington.pdf [Source type 11].
- Industrial Economics, Inc. (2014). *Marine sector analysis report: Marine renewable energy* (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://www.msp.wa.gov/msp-projects/> [Source type 11].
- King, J., Gill, A., He, H., Sigray, P., Beutel, D., & Donovan, P. (in progress). *Electromagnetic field impacts of elasmobranch and American lobster movement migration from direct current cables* (Research Study Annex IV). Tethys. Retrieved from <http://tethys.pnnl.gov/annex-iv-research/electromagnetic-field-impacts-elasmobranch-and-american-lobster>. [Source type 11].
- Kropp, R. K. (2013). *Biological and existing data analysis to inform risk of collision and entanglement hypotheses* (No. PNNL-22804). Richland, WA: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Retrieved from <http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/PNNL%20Entanglement%20Report%202013.pdf>. [Source type 11].
- Lopez, A., Roberts, B., Heimiller, D., Blair, N., & Porro, G. (2012). *U.S. renewable energy technical potentials: A GIS-based analysis* (Technical Report No. NREL/TP-6A20-51946). National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Retrieved from <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy12osti/51946.pdf>
- Mercador Media. (2014, December 2). Wave energy generator for fishfarms. *World Fishing & Aquaculture*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldfishing.net/news101/industry-news/wave-energy-generator-for-fishfarms>. [Source type 1].
- Miller, I. M., Shishido, C., Antrim, L., & Bowlby, C. E. (2013). *Climate change and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary: interpreting potential futures* (Marine Sanctuaries Conservation Series No. ONMS-13-01). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. Retrieved from http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/science/conservation/cc_ocrnms.html [Source type 11].
- Musial, W., & Ram, B. (2010). *Large-scale offshore wind power in the United States: Assessment of opportunities and barriers* (No. NREL/TP-500-40745). National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Retrieved from <http://www.nrel.gov/wind/pdfs/40745.pdf> [Source type 11].

- Navigant Consulting, Inc. (2013a). *Offshore wind market and economic analysis* (No. DE-EE0005360). Prepared for the United States Department of Energy. Retrieved from <http://tethys.pnnl.gov/publications/offshore-wind-market-and-economic-analysis>
- Navigant Consulting, Inc. (2013b). *U.S. offshore wind manufacturing and supply chain development* (No. DE-EE0005364). Prepared for the United States Department of Energy. Retrieved from http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/US_Offshore_Wind_Manufacturing_and_Supply_Chain_Development.pdf [Source type 11].
- Navigant Consulting, Inc. (2014). *Offshore wind market and economic analysis: 2014 annual market assessment* (No. DE-EE0005360). Prepared for the United States Department of Energy. Retrieved from <http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2014/09/f18/2014%20Navigant%20Offshore%20Wind%20Market%20%26%20Economic%20Analysis.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Normandeau Inc., Exponent Inc., Tricas, T., & Gill, A. (2011). *Effects of EMF from undersea power cables on elasmobranchs and other marine species* (OCS Study BOEMRE 2011-09). Camarillo, CA.: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation, and Enforcement, Pacific OCS Region. Retrieved from <http://www.boem.gov/Environmental-Stewardship/Environmental-Studies/Pacific-Region/Studies/2011-09-EMF-Effects.aspx>. [Source type 11].
- Northwest Power and Conservation Council. (2010). Appendix I: Generating resources-background information. In *Sixth northwest conservation and electric power plan*. Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Retrieved from <http://www.nwcouncil.org/energy/powerplan/6/plan/>. [Source type 11]
- Northwest Power and Conservation Council. (2016). Appendix H: Generating resources-background information. In *Seventh Northwest Conservation and Electric Power Plan*. Retrieved from <https://www.nwcouncil.org/energy/powerplan/7/plan/> [Source type 11].
- Northwest PowerPool. (2015). *Northwest Power Pool Area assessment of reliability and adequacy: 2015 summer operating conditions*. Northwest PowerPool. Retrieved from <http://www.nwpp.org/documents/Seasonal-Assessments/Summer-Assessment-2015.pdf/> [Source type 11].
- Nova Innovation Ltd. (2016). Shetland Tidal Array. Retrieved from <https://www.novainnovation.com/tidal-array> [Source type 11].
- Oregon State University. (2015). Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center. Retrieved March 19, 2015, from <http://nnmrec.oregonstate.edu/> [Source type 11].
- Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. (2015). *Tethys knowledge database*. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy. Retrieved from <http://tethys.pnnl.gov/> [Source type 11].
- Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. (2017). Map Viewer. Retrieved from [https://tethys.pnnl.gov/map-viewer-marine-energy?f\[0\]=type%3Aannex_iv_site](https://tethys.pnnl.gov/map-viewer-marine-energy?f[0]=type%3Aannex_iv_site) [Source type 11].
- PNNL. (2013, September 10). The Roosevelt Island tidal energy project. Retrieved April 1, 2015, from <http://tethys.pnnl.gov/annex-iv-sites/roosevelt-island-tidal-energy-project>. [Source type 11].
- PNNL. (2014, June 20). Admiralty Inlet Pilot Tidal Project. Retrieved March 19, 2015, from <http://tethys.pnnl.gov/annex-iv-sites/admiralty-inlet-pilot-tidal-project>. [Source type 11].

- Polagye, B., Copping, A. E., Suryan, R. M., Kramer, S., Brown-Saracino, J., & Smith, C. (2014). *Instrumentation for monitoring around marine renewable energy converters: Workshop final report* (PNNL-23110). Seattle, WA: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Retrieved from [http://depts.washington.edu/nnmrec/instrumentation/docs/Polagye,%20Copping,%20et%20al.%20\(2014\)%20-%20Instrumentation%20for%20monitoring%20around%20marine%20renewable%20energy%20converters%20-%20workshop%20final%20report.pdf](http://depts.washington.edu/nnmrec/instrumentation/docs/Polagye,%20Copping,%20et%20al.%20(2014)%20-%20Instrumentation%20for%20monitoring%20around%20marine%20renewable%20energy%20converters%20-%20workshop%20final%20report.pdf) [Source type 9].
- Polagye, B., Van Cleve, B., Copping, A., & Kirkendall, K. (editors). (2011). *Environmental effects of tidal energy development: Proceedings of a Seattle workshop* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-116). U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved from <http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Tidal%20Energy%20Workshop%20Proceedings%202011.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Principle Power, Inc. (2013, May 14). Unsolicited application for an outer continental shelf renewable energy commercial lease under 30 CFR 585.230: Principle Power WindFloat Pacific Pilot Project. Submitted to: U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved from <http://www.boem.gov/Wind-Float-Lease-Report/>
- Reinhall, P. G., & Dahl, P. H. (2011). Underwater Mach wave radiation from impact pile observation: Theory and observation. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 130(3), 1209–1216. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1121/1.3614540> [Source type 1].
- Renewable Energy Magazine. (2012, May 3). Offshore wind farms = seaweed = biofuel. *Renewable Energy Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.renewableenergymagazine.com/biomass/offshore-wind-farms--seaweed--biofuel> [Source type 11].
- Renewable Northwest. (2007). Wave and tidal energy in the northwest. Renewable Northwest. Retrieved from <http://www.rnp.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/Wave%20Tidal%20FactSheet%2007April4.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Schultz, I. R., Woodruff, D. L., Marshall, K. E., Pratt, W. J., & Roesijadi, G. (2010). *Effects of electromagnetic fields on fish and invertebrates. Task 2.1.3: effects on aquatic organisms-fiscal year 2010 progress report* (No. PNNL-19883). Richland, WA: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Retrieved from http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-19883.pdf [Source type 9].
- Schwartz, M., Heimiller, D., Haymes, S., & Musial, W. (2010). *Assessment of offshore wind energy resources for the United States* (Technical Report No. NREL/TP-500-45889). National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Retrieved from http://apps2.eere.energy.gov/wind/windexchange/pdfs/offshore/offshore_wind_resource_assessment.pdf [Source type 11].
- SI Ocean. (2013). *Ocean energy: Cost of energy and cost reduction opportunities*. Strategic Initiative for Ocean Energy. Retrieved from http://si-ocean.eu/en/upload/docs/WP3/CoE%20report%203_2%20final.pdf [Source type 11].
- Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1. (2014, September 30). Press release: PUD tidal project not to advance. Snohomish County Public Utility District No. 1. Retrieved from <http://www.snopud.com/PowerSupply/tidal/tidalpress.ashx>

- Sotta, C. (2012). *Documentary summary of the environmental impact of renewable marine energy*. Report by IFREMER and MERiFIC. Retrieved from http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/3-2-1_Documentary_summary_EN-MERiFIC-web.pdf [Source type 11].
- U.S. Energy Information Administration. (2014, July). Washington state profile and energy estimates. Retrieved March 30, 2015, from <http://www.eia.gov/state/?sid=wa#tabs-5>. [Source type 11].
- Van Cleve, F. B., Judd, C., Radil, A., Ahmann, J., & Geerlofs, S. H. (2013). *Geospatial analysis of technical and economic suitability for renewable ocean energy development on Washington's outer coast* (No. PNNL-22554). Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/PNNL_EnergySuitability_Final-Report.pdf [Source type 11].
- Washington Coast Marine Advisory Council. (2015). Washington Coast Marine Advisory Council meeting summary for Wednesday, February 25th, 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/pdf/Feb2015MtgSummaryFinal.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington Coast Marine Advisory Council. (2016). Washington Coast Marine Advisory council meeting summary for Wednesday, September 28, 2016. Retrieved from <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/ocean/pdf/Nov16MeetingMaterials.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Commerce. (2014). *2014 renewable energy for Washington qualifying utilities*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Commerce, State Energy Office. Retrieved from <http://www.commerce.wa.gov/Documents/EIA-2014-Report-Summary-and-Detail-REV20140924.pdf>. [Source type 11].
- Washington State Department of Commerce. (2016). *2017 Biennial energy report and state energy strategy update: Issues, analysis & updates* (Report to the legislature). Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Commerce. Retrieved from <http://www.commerce.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Commerce-Biennial-Energy-Report-2017.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Woodruff, D. L., Cullinan, V. I., Copping, A. E., & Marshall, K. E. (2013). *Effects of electromagnetic fields on fish and invertebrates. Task 2.1.3: Effects on aquatic organisms fiscal year 2012 progress report* (No. PNNL-22154). Richland, WA: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Retrieved from http://tethys.pnnl.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Woodruff_et_al_2013_Progress_Report.pdf. [Source type 9].
- Yee, A. (2015, April 22). Catching waves and turning them into electricity. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/23/business/energy-environment/catching-waves-and-turning-them-into-electricity.html?_r=0. [Source type 11].

2.10.2 Offshore Aquaculture

A potential new use of Washington's Pacific coastal waters is offshore aquaculture. Aquaculture is the culture or growing of fish, shellfish, or other aquatic plants and animals, and has been a part of Washington's landscape for thousands of years. Existing aquaculture activities provide important sources of food and livelihood for many Washingtonians, including native peoples.

No aquaculture activities are currently taking place in the MSP Study Area outside of the estuaries. The potential expansion of aquaculture activities into ocean waters beyond the estuaries becomes increasingly possible with technological advancements. The expansion of aquaculture into deeper, offshore waters is driven by the ever-increasing demand for high quality protein and the limited area and suitability of coastal waters (Lovatelli, Aguilar-Manjarrez, & Soto, 2013; Rubino, 2008). Whether there is a future for offshore aquaculture will depend upon several factors, including feasibility of locations, technological advancements, economic potential, compatibility with existing uses, and ability to address environmental impacts.

In Washington, the future for offshore finfish aquaculture is limited. The 2018 state legislature prohibited commercial non-native finfish aquaculture in state marine waters, and required the phase-out the existing Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) facilities located in Puget Sound (Chapter 79.105, Chapter 77.125, and Chapter 90.48 RCW).

Summary of History and Current Use

Offshore Aquaculture

There are different ways to define offshore aquaculture. Some definitions use specific depth, distance, and exposure ranges (Lovatelli et al., 2013), while others use jurisdictional boundaries (e.g. federal waters). For the purposes of the MSP, the term 'offshore aquaculture' will be used to describe any new aquaculture operation within the designated Study Area yet outside of the coastal estuaries. Regardless of distance from shore, the exposure of Washington's Pacific coast to waves, storms, swells, and currents would pose challenges to offshore aquaculture, and require technologies that can withstand these conditions.

Coastal Aquaculture

Coastal aquaculture is highly prevalent in Washington. Coastal aquaculture along Washington's Pacific coast can be defined as aquaculture within estuaries, including Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor. As a state, Washington is ranked first by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in sales of aquaculture products. Coastal aquaculture on Washington's Pacific Coast produces mainly Pacific Oysters (*Crassostrea gigas*) and Manila Clams (*Venerupis philippinarum*) (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). These shellfish are cultured using methods such as bottom culture, longlines, flip bags, and racks. For more information about coastal aquaculture operations along Washington's Pacific coast, please see Section 2.5 of the Marine Spatial Plan, as well as the Aquaculture Sector Analysis (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014) and economic analysis report (Taylor, Baker, Waters, Wegge, & Wellman, 2015).

In general, coastal aquaculture has many economic and logistical advantages over offshore aquaculture, including limited exposure to storms, continuous access for operations, and close proximity to facilities (processing, storage, etc.) (Lovatelli et al., 2013). However, the potential for better water quality and more space for larger operations at offshore sites make offshore aquaculture a future opportunity for the aquaculture industry (Knapp, 2013).

Current and Emerging Offshore Technologies

Offshore aquaculture is still in its infancy and operations around the world currently employ a limited number of technologies and techniques. However, there are examples of offshore commercial production facilities as well as prototypes being tested for a variety of aquaculture species (Forster, 2008; Lovatelli et al., 2013).

While hundreds of species are currently raised in freshwater, land-based, and coastal aquaculture facilities, only a few have the potential to be produced offshore on a commercial scale (Lovatelli et al., 2013). Each species has its own specific husbandry techniques and technology needs. The following sections briefly describe current and emerging technologies for three species categories: finfish, shellfish, and marine plants. It provides context what offshore aquaculture could look like in the MSP Study Area.

Finfish

Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) have been commercially cultivated in net pens in Puget Sound since the 1970's (Ladenburg & Sturges, 1999). Maine also has had a robust Atlantic salmon net-pen industry since the 1970s (Maine Department of Marine Resources, 2018). British Columbia also has a major Atlantic salmon net-pen industry (Fisheries & Ocean Canada, 2013) and the species also is raised in deep water and weather-exposed sites in Norway and Chile (Holmer, 2013).

Public concern exists about the potential impact of Atlantic salmon on threatened or endangered native Pacific salmon that pass through state and federal waters, and possible harm to water quality and ecosystem health. This public concern heightened following the August 2017 collapse of a commercial facility near Cypress Island. The 2018 state legislature's prohibition of Atlantic salmon and other non-native commercial finfish aquaculture in state waters and phasing out the remaining facilities (Chapter 79.105, Chapter 77.125, and Chapter 90.48 RCW) reflects this heightened concern. It also underscores the State's commitment to Pacific salmon recovery.

However, commercial marine production using native fish also poses genetic and disease risks that are of concern to state fisheries managers. In the same legislation banning non-native finfish aquaculture, the 2018 legislature directed state agencies to complete state guidance related to commercial marine finfish net-pen aquaculture and report back on November 1, 2019 with recommendations for oversight of this use (HB 2957, Section 5(1) and (2)).

A few current and emerging cage designs may be suitable for offshore finfish cultivation, utilizing various materials and structural systems. The following is a brief discussion of two main types of cage designs for finfish: surface and submersible cages.

Surface cages

Surface cages, or net pens, have continuous surface exposure and cannot be submerged underwater. These cages are often composed of flexible netting attached to a floating collar at the water's surface. This flexible collar will float and bend to adapt to rough waves (Forster, 2008). Many exposed offshore sites have used floating net cages but there are limitations on their use. The strength and endurance of these cages are limited, and there are issues with volume loss, worker safety, and other operational limitations (Ladenburg & Sturges, 1999). It is anticipated that nearshore net pen technology will continue to evolve and be adapted for offshore operations.

Other cages use rigid platforms with surface access that are designed to resist waves through the strength of the structure (Forster, 2013). Another design is to have mobile platforms utilizing a barge or ship system, but this is quite costly and would need to be immense in size (Ladenburg & Sturges, 1999).

While surface cages are more exposed to rough sea surface conditions than submersible cages, they are highly attractive because they provide easy surface access for operations (Ladenburg & Sturges, 1999).

Submersible cages

Submersible and semi-submersible cages are designed so that the surface of the fish cage is submerged for extended periods of time or during rough sea conditions. These designs are intended to minimize exposure to storms. There are several operational designs for submersible cages, some with rigid outer structures and some with nets and a central spar (Ladenburg & Sturges, 1999). The cages are brought to the surface for servicing operations such as harvesting and cleaning. Ocean Spar Technologies, a company based in Washington, has designs for nearshore and offshore submersible finfish culture cages. A Russian cage technology called the Sadco-Shelf Submersible Cage has been used up to 50 miles offshore (Ladenburg & Sturges, 1999).

An advantage of a submersible cage design is that it can withstand an increasing range of exposed, rough sea conditions. It has been speculated that as technology for remote monitoring and operations improves, submerged cage methods may dominate offshore aquaculture in the future (Forster, 2008), as long as they are cost effective at commercial scales.

Shellfish

Shellfish culture in coastal Washington currently consists mainly of Pacific Oysters (*Crassostrea gigas*) and Manila Clams (a.k.a. Japanese carpet shell) (*Venerupis philippinarum* also referenced as *Ruditapes philippinarum*). Small amounts of blue mussels (*Mytilus edulis* and other subspecies) and Kumamoto Oysters (*Crassostrea sikamea*) have also been cultivated in Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay in recent years (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014).

Blue mussels and other mussel species have been tested at offshore sites in the Mediterranean, Atlantic Canada, New Zealand, and the northeastern United States (Lovatelli et al., 2013). Mussels and scallops are cultured using longlines. Floating submersible longlines are moored to the bottom, and the shellfish are attached to the lines or grown in net bags (Forster, 2008, 2013). Several longline techniques have been adapted to a variety of offshore conditions (Forster, 2013; Lovatelli et al., 2013).

Technology is currently more advanced for offshore shellfish aquaculture than for finfish aquaculture. Shellfish extract food from the water column, which facilitates the option of growing them in harsh environments. However, shellfish aquaculture is not without challenges.

The weight of the shellfish as they grow can influence the appropriate depth of the lines and vertical motion can cause mussel detachment (Lovatelli et al., 2013).

Marine Plants

Marine plants dominate the global aquaculture industry by tons produced, but fall beneath both finfish and crustacean aquaculture in unit value (Lovatelli et al., 2013). Offshore seaweed culture methods are similar to those for shellfish. Seaweed is attached to submerged longlines with floats that are moored to the bottom. Because of light requirements, however, the surface area required to grow seaweed in the ocean is likely greater than for finfish and shellfish, which adds to the challenge of cultivating seaweed offshore (Forster, 2013).

Potential Benefits and Use Compatibilities

Seafood Demand and Food Security

In 2012, commercial aquaculture contributed half of the world's seafood. The United States imports about 80-90% (by value) of its seafood, and half of that is from international aquaculture (Interagency Working Group on Aquaculture, 2014). Domestic marine aquaculture supplies about 1.5% of American seafood (Rubino, 2008). The overall seafood trading deficit in 2012 was about \$11 billion (Interagency Working Group on Aquaculture, 2014).

Offshore aquaculture presents an opportunity to expand domestic aquaculture to meet increasing domestic and global demand for seafood. The growing world population combined with the recommendations of health experts about the benefits of seafood consumption will continue to increase the demand for seafood, and wild capture fisheries will be unable to meet this rising demand (Rubino, 2008). Aquaculture increases seafood supply and reduces supply uncertainty. An expanded domestic aquaculture industry can provide Americans with healthy, consistent, and affordable seafood products (Interagency Working Group on Aquaculture, 2014; Rubino, 2008). Offshore aquaculture may have greater potential to meet this demand than coastal aquaculture, as space limitations and competing uses are more pronounced in coastal and estuarine waters (Rubino, 2008).

Food Health and Environmental Health

Offshore aquaculture products grown in the U.S. could help meet the increasing demand by American consumers for access to safe, local, and sustainable seafood products. Just as with current coastal aquaculture operations, offshore aquaculture products would be subject to U.S. and Washington State health and environmental regulations and enforcement, whereas other countries have varying levels of health and environmental regulations and oversight.

Offshore aquaculture is usually located in deep waters, generally with well-mixed water and currents which can dilute nutrients and particles generated by finfish. In addition, because operations are located further from shore, they are subjected to reduced exposure to land-based pollutants compared to coastal aquaculture (Holmer, 2013; Knapp, 2008a). The Pacific Northwest coast has clean, naturally productive water, which is advantageous to growing healthy seafood and healthy products for consumers (Langdon, 2008). Offshore sites may also pose a reduced risk of transmitting diseases and parasites to native fish populations, especially if sited

away from major migration, feeding, and spawning areas (Holmer, 2013). However, future impacts on productivity in offshore aquaculture from ocean acidification and climate change will need to be evaluated.

Economic Benefits

Offshore aquaculture in Washington has the potential to contribute to the local, state, and national economy. Even though offshore aquaculture is trending more toward remotely operated facilities, employees will still be needed for site operations, husbandry, maintenance, monitoring, transportation, and seafood processing. The Pacific Northwest, especially Washington State, has a strong history of coastal aquaculture (Anderson & Forster, 2008; Industrial Economics Inc., 2014), and therefore may be well suited to provide local and regional expertise to offshore operations. Local shellfish and salmonid husbandry knowledge may be advantageous for successful offshore operations (Rust, Langan, & Goudey, 2008). There are also potential opportunities for commercial fishermen to become involved with offshore aquaculture, such as jobs in navigation utilizing current vessel ownership and knowledge of ocean conditions. For example, the commercial offshore finfish operations in Hawaii and Puerto Rico were started by individuals with commercial fishing backgrounds (Rubino, 2008; Valderrama & Anderson, 2008).

Offshore aquaculture also has the potential to support working waterfronts and other industry-related facilities (Valderrama & Anderson, 2008). Washington's coast has seafood processing and distribution systems in place which may benefit from increases in seafood product. There are also local and regional feed and deep water cage suppliers (Anderson & Forster, 2008; Ladenburg & Sturges, 1999). In addition, the West Coast has a strong seafood demand, which adds to a competitive advantage over producers in other locations (Anderson & Forster, 2008).

The overall economic impact of upstream and downstream products and services (e.g. cage manufacturing, juvenile supply, processing, restaurants) may be five to ten times greater than the jobs and wages at an offshore facility. This would include local, statewide, and national economic benefits (Knapp, 2008b). With a strong history of aquaculture and commercial fishing as well as existing infrastructure to support aquaculture activities, Washington's Pacific coast may be well positioned to realize many potential local and regional economic benefits associated with offshore aquaculture.

Potential Use Compatibilities

Offshore aquaculture has the potential to be compatible or have limited conflict with some established and potential future uses in the MSP Study Area. As mentioned above, the aquaculture industry, as well as existing ports, processing facilities, and other marine infrastructure may benefit from offshore aquaculture along Washington's coast (Anderson & Forster, 2008). Another potential compatible use is the co-location of offshore aquaculture with Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) or other protected sanctuaries. Finfish cages have been documented to act as fish aggregation areas for wild fish seeking either the feed from the operation or refuge from predators (Holmer, 2013; Price & Morris, 2013). Some studies have shown that wild fish presence at finfish cages helps to reduce benthic impacts (Price & Morris, 2013). There may be an opportunity to place these cages in locations already under fishing restrictions (L. E. Buck, 2012), provided there is no significant negative impact to the

surrounding habitats or organisms. MPAs and offshore aquaculture may also be conflicting uses, which is discussed further in the section on potential impacts.

A potential compatible use is marine renewable energy. Combining renewable energy structures with mussel and seaweed aquaculture may be feasible (Holmer, 2013), but further exploration and testing is necessary.

As offshore aquaculture operations are located further from shore, it is expected that fewer space and use conflicts will occur (Knapp, 2008a). The decreased visual impact from facilities with increasing distance from shore is but one example of this (Ladenburg & Sturges, 1999).

Potential Environmental Impacts

Potential environmental concerns include impacts on water quality and interactions between the aquaculture structures and marine organisms, such as sharks, pinnipeds, seabirds, and wild fish.

Water Quality

Many of the environmental concerns associated with marine aquaculture relate to finfish aquaculture specifically, and some impacts are predicted to decline when locating aquaculture at deeper, offshore sites. Water quality impacts such as increased levels of phosphorus, nitrogen, and turbidity are generally not detected at offshore sites (Price & Morris, 2013). In general, water quality impacts have been greatly reduced at coastal finfish aquaculture sites over the past 20 years due to increases in feeding efficiency and food composition. Well-flushed, offshore sites in deep water are expected to have no observable impact to water quality (Price & Morris, 2013).

One of the main concerns with finfish aquaculture is the effect of excess food particles and feces accumulating on the seafloor. Changes in benthic chemistry and community composition have been observed beneath and adjacent to coastal finfish cages. However, this effect may be reduced by appropriate siting in well-flushed, erosional areas and remediated through fallowing practices. Offshore sites are expected to exhibit lesser changes in sediment, yet appropriate siting to minimize changes to the sediment is highly recommended (Holmer, 2013; Price & Morris, 2013). Offshore sites should also avoid sensitive deep-sea habitats, as they may take longer to recover (Holmer, 2013). Larger and more numerous aquaculture facilities may also have an impact as there may be a potential for benthic effects from cumulative nutrient loading, especially in poorly-flushed areas (Price & Morris, 2013).

Chemical contaminants such therapeutants,¹ antibiotics, and antifoulants² are consistently identified as concerns for marine aquaculture, but the use of these products has drastically declined over the last 20 years (Price & Morris, 2013). Experts predict that the use of therapeutants will be further decreased in offshore aquaculture (Holmer, 2013). While the risk from these chemicals is considered to be lower than in the past, further research is recommended on impacts to non-target organisms (Price & Morris, 2013). Heavy metals and pesticides from feed and antifoulants can also accumulate under cages. Studies show that heavy metal concentrations are low and typically bound to the sediment (Price & Morris, 2013).

¹ Therapeutants are medications used to treat parasitic, viral, fungal, and bacterial infections as well as to treat aquaculture facilities (Price & Morris, 2013).

² Antifoulants are treatments used to control or eliminate the growth of marine organisms on aquaculture cages, ropes, and structures. (Price & Morris, 2013).

Marine Mammals

There are very few verified instances of marine mammals being injured or entangled in aquaculture gear. However, entanglement, habitat exclusion, marine debris, underwater noise disturbance, and behavioral alterations have been identified as potential impacts to marine mammals (Price et al., 2016).

It is generally believed that marine mammals that can echolocate (toothed whales, dolphins, and porpoises) can identify offshore aquaculture structures and navigate around them. Baleen whales that do not echolocate are likely at a higher risk of entanglement because they rely on visual and audio cues to identify structures in the water (Price et al., 2016). Management strategies to avoid impacts can include selecting locations for aquaculture facilities that minimize the likelihood of overlap with migration routes or critical habitats (Price et al., 2016).

There are no reported interactions of pinnipeds with offshore shellfish farms, likely because they do not commonly feed on shellfish (Price et al., 2016). However, there are reports of negative interactions between pinnipeds and finfish farms. Pinnipeds can cause financial losses to the fish facilities through direct predation, or by causing stress to fish and escapement due to predator attacks (Price & Morris, 2013). Farm management practices designed to decrease pinniped interactions include net tensioning, adding false bottoms to avoid predation from below, removing dead fish, and using antipredator nets (Price et al., 2016).

Sea Turtles

The main concern for interactions between sea turtles and offshore aquaculture is the threat of entanglement with nets, lines, or other floating equipment. There have been a few documented instances of sea turtles being entangled in shellfish aquaculture gear. Potential management recommendations for the reduction of negative interactions include using rigid netting material for the cage, keeping mooring lines taut, and removing any loose lines or floating equipment (Price et al., 2016).

Fish

Wild fish may aggregate around fish cages. They may be attracted by the feed or use the structure for protection from predators. Escape of cultured fish and the potential for disease and parasite transmission from cultured fish to wild fish are concerns (Holmer, 2013; Leonard, Kent, & Banks, 2008).

State and federal regulations are in place to prevent novel diseases from entering Washington's waters, as well as to prevent the spread of disease in the event of an outbreak ([RCW 77.60](#); [RCW 77.115](#); [WAC 220-370](#); [9 CFR 53.10](#); [9 CFR 71.2](#); [9 CFR 93.900-906](#)). Pathogens and parasites can be transferred between farms and wild fish in both directions in open production systems, and disease can also be transferred from farm to farm (Holmer, 2013). Offshore sites are also expected to have a reduced risk of transmitting diseases and parasites because of the potential increased distance between operations. However, the risk would also depend on distance to major migration routes, distance to feeding and spawning grounds, and the attraction of wild fish to the cages (Holmer, 2013).

Cultured strains of fish like salmon have lower fitness in the wild, so escape and interbreeding with wild populations can reduce the overall fitness of natural populations

(Holmer, 2013). The interactions between wild and cultured populations can be exacerbated by a number of factors. For example, if salmon escape at the same time that wild populations are migrating to their spawning grounds, this could have significant direct effects through interbreeding and indirect effects through ecological competition with the wild fish (Holmer, 2013).

Birds

The entanglement of seabirds at shellfish farms is a concern. At nearshore farms birds are observed using the area for perching or feeding on epifauna growing on above-water structures. At an offshore mussel farm neither of these activities would be expected, as the structures are submerged (Price et al., 2016). At marine finfish farms seabirds are reported to congregate nearby, but are not a significant predatory threat as they typically only scavenge mortalities or take fish during transfer or harvest. The biggest risk to the seabirds is entanglement in the cage or in anti-predator nets (Price et al., 2016). Some of the management options to avoid negative impacts to seabirds are to select sites carefully to avoid critical breeding and foraging habitats and migration routes (Price et al., 2016).

Economic Impacts

One of the economic concerns associated with offshore aquaculture is the market effect on wild capture fisheries. Certain aquaculture products will directly compete in the wild capture fisheries market. This effect has already been seen with global Atlantic salmon coastal aquaculture competing with wild capture salmon fisheries. Increases in Atlantic salmon availability may reduce overall salmon prices, which benefits the consumer but negatively impacts wild capture salmon fishermen. This impact is expected to be temporary (Knapp, 2008b). It has been hypothesized that cultured Atlantic salmon may create niche markets for wild caught salmon, which may increase demand and create a premium price for wild capture fish (Knapp, 2008b; Valderrama & Anderson, 2008). As seafood becomes more readily available, consumers may be more receptive to seafood, which will increase overall demand. As demand increases, including demand from a growing population, the effects of higher supply from aquaculture will likely be partially offset and, therefore, reduce the decline in fish prices (Knapp, 2008b).

Regardless of Washington's participation in offshore aquaculture or aquaculture operations in general, global demand for seafood is increasing. Other countries will likely boost aquaculture production to meet this demand, and the competition with wild capture fishermen will then occur regardless of whether cultured seafood is domestic or international. Experts speculate that the specific economic effects of domestic aquaculture on domestic fishermen will be relatively small compared to the larger effects of the growing global aquaculture industry (Knapp, 2008b).

Potential Use Conflicts

Offshore aquaculture has the potential to conflict with current and potential future uses of Washington's ocean. Some concerns related to spatial conflicts include competition with commercial fisheries, recreational fisheries, recreational activities (e.g. boating, aesthetics),

shipping, military uses, cable installation, marine animal migration routes, mining, dredging, and dredge disposal (L. E. Buck, 2012; Hildenbrand & Feldner, 2008). Cages, longlines, and moorings create space and safety conflicts for navigation, fishing equipment, and SCUBA diving. An offshore operation in Hawaii has established restrictions on these types of activities within the site (Sims, 2013).

Offshore aquaculture may also pose a space conflict with marine renewable energy (Hildenbrand & Feldner, 2008), in the event that aquaculture and energy operations are not compatible. However, offshore aquaculture and marine renewable energy may be compatible due to the potential for these uses to occupy the same spatial footprint by utilizing shared support infrastructure (B. H. Buck, Ebeling, & Michler-Cieluch, 2010).

Potential environmental conflicts are most often associated with finfish aquaculture. These include conflicts with marine reserves, sensitive habitats, and marine animal migration routes. Potential impacts to benthic communities and possible negative interactions with fish and other marine species may conflict with the goals of marine reserves. In addition, mooring lines from cages and longlines may pose a risk of animal entanglement. Interactions with seabirds, pinnipeds, and other marine mammals may pose conflicts, particularly along major migration routes and aggregation sites (Price & Morris, 2013).

Future Trends and Factors

Currently, no offshore aquaculture exists along Washington's Pacific coast. The potential for offshore finfish aquaculture is limited in state waters due to prohibition on new non-native finfish facilities. There is potential for other types of offshore aquaculture proposals in the future – in state or federal waters.

At the direction of the 2018 legislature, state agencies are completing guidance for oversight of Atlantic salmon net pens and for commercial net pens of native species (Black cod, steelhead, Coho and Chinook salmon) (HB 2957, Section 5(1)). This guidance will provide a summary of the state-of-the-science and best practices most applicable to Washington's conditions, and a spatial suitability screening tool housed within Ecology's Coastal Atlas. The guidance will be available in November 2019 to inform local, state and federal oversight of the existing Atlantic salmon net pens until they are phased out in 2022, and for review of commercial native finfish proposals (Cedar Bouta, personal communication, June 13, 2018).

Washington currently has coastal shellfish and finfish commercial aquaculture operations, ports and other marine infrastructure, and oceanographic conditions generally favorable to support offshore aquaculture (Anderson & Forster, 2008; Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). However, the realization of offshore operations largely depends upon economic feasibility and the availability of technology to support safe and quality aquaculture operations (Forster, 2013; Knapp, 2013). Whether and where offshore aquaculture facilities are located along the Washington coast will depend upon factors including cost-effective technological feasibility, environmental considerations, and social acceptance. Some key factors to consider include:

- **Depth:** Depth is a limiting factor for where offshore aquaculture can be located. Mooring technology is available for up to 100 m (Kapetsky, Aguilar-Manjarrez, & Jenness, 2013) and most sites may be restricted to 75 m or shallower due to prohibitive mooring costs (Forster, 2013). On the other hand, deeper water generally indicates fewer environmental impacts. Depending upon the size and intensity of the operation, minimum depth thresholds may be encouraged to minimize environmental conflict (Price & Morris, 2013).

- **Space conflicts:** As mentioned above, space conflicts with existing and potential future uses may occur. Therefore, locating offshore aquaculture at locations that will avoid significant conflict with established uses such as commercial fisheries and recreational activities is an important factor to consider.
- **Conditions suitable to culture a selected species:** The oceanographic and physical conditions of a site must be suitable to successfully culture a commercially profitable species.
- **Access to ports, processing facilities and markets:** Access to ports and existing marine infrastructure is critical for commercial success. It will be more profitable, and therefore feasible, for offshore aquaculture to build off of existing structures than to create new ports, facilities, and transport to markets. Offshore operations are unlikely to be located more than 25 nautical miles from existing ports (Jin, 2008; Kapetsky et al., 2013).
- **Proximity to sensitive habitats:** Finfish aquaculture may have an impact on sensitive habitats directly below or down drift of the cages. Therefore, locating these sites to avoid particularly sensitive habitats such as corals or seagrass is an important environmental factor (Holmer, 2013; Price & Morris, 2013). Offshore shellfish or marine plant growing operations should also avoid any shade impact to light sensitive habitats such as seagrass (Holmer, 2013).
- **Well-flushed, erosional sediments (finfish):** Environmental impacts are expected to be minimal at well-sited offshore locations. Siting for offshore finfish aquaculture should be in areas with deep, well-flushed waters over erosional sediments to avoid environmental impacts (Price & Morris, 2013).

A forum was hosted in 2008 by Oregon State University to discuss the potential of offshore aquaculture in the Pacific Northwest. Some of the advantages identified by participants for offshore aquaculture in the Pacific Northwest include optimal water temperatures, suitable substrate for moorings, and naturally productive waters. Advantages of this region related to services include salmonid hatchery and husbandry experience, local and regional feed and deep water cage suppliers, and existing seafood processing and distribution systems. The forum also referenced the strong seafood market demand in the Pacific Northwest (Anderson & Forster, 2008).

While participants recognized that there is real potential in Pacific Northwest waters, some challenges exist such as the number of stormy days along this coast, competition concerns from the commercial fishing industry, and environmental concerns from the public (Anderson & Forster, 2008). Participants indicated the need for access to cost-effective technology (Rust et al., 2008) and a better understanding of potential disease transmission and animal interactions with offshore aquaculture operations (Leonard et al., 2008).

The availability of culture technology that can withstand the conditions off the Washington coast at a cost-effective price is a main determinant of commercial offshore aquaculture feasibility. Safe and consistent access for workers is also a key factor, as are clear state and federal regulations for offshore operations (L. E. Buck, 2012; Forster, 2013; Rubino, 2008). As technology continues to evolve, materials become more reliable and affordable, coastal sites become limited, and seafood demand increases, it becomes more likely that aquaculture will expand into offshore waters (Knapp, 2008a, 2013).

References

Laws [Source type 5]

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 77.115 [Source type 5].

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 77.60 [Source type 5].

Regulations [Source type 7]

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 220-370 [Source type 7].

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 220-77 [Source type 7].

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 9, Chapter I, Subchapter B, Part 53 [Source type 7].

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 9, Chapter I, Subchapter C, Part 71 [Source type 7].

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 9, Chapter I, Subchapter D, Part 93, Subpart I [Source type 7].

Reports, Journals, etc.

Anderson, J., & Forster, J. (2008). Why the Pacific Northwest? In C. Langdon (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the Pacific Northwest (ORESU-W-08-001)* (p. 8). Corvallis, OR: Oregon Sea Grant. Retrieved from <http://seagrant.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/sgpubs/onlinepubs/w08001.pdf> [Source type 11].

Buck, B. H., Ebeling, M. W., & Michler-Cieluch, T. (2010). Mussel cultivation as a co-use in offshore wind farms: Potential and economic feasibility. *Aquaculture Economics & Management*, 14(4), 255–281. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13657305.2010.526018> [Source type 1].

Buck, L. E. (2012). *U.S. Development of offshore aquaculture: Regulatory, economic, and political factors* (Thesis). University of Washington [Source type 11].

Fisheries & Ocean Canada. (2013). *Facts and figures 2013 aquaculture in Canada* (Brochure). Ottawa, Canada. [Source type 9].

Forster, J. (2008). Emerging technologies in marine aquaculture. In M. Rubino (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the United States: Economic considerations, implications & opportunities (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/SPO-103)* (pp. 51–72). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aquaculture/> [Source type 11].

Forster, J. (2013). A review of opportunities, technical constraints and future needs of offshore mariculture-temperate waters. In A. Lovatelli, J. Aguilar-Manjarrez, & D. Soto (Eds.), *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Proceedings No. 24* (pp. 77–99). Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [Source type 11].

Hildenbrand, K., & Feldner, J. (2008). Fishing industry and other offshore interests. In C. Langdon (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the Pacific Northwest (ORESU-W-08-001)* (p. 14). Corvallis, OR: Oregon Sea Grant. Retrieved from <http://seagrant.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/sgpubs/onlinepubs/w08001.pdf> [Source type 11].

- Holmer, M. (2013). Sustainable development of marine aquaculture off-the-coast and offshore-A review of environmental and ecosystem issues and future needs in temperate zones. In A. Lovatelli, J. Aguilar-Manjarrez, & D. Soto (Eds.), *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Proceedings No. 24* (pp. 135–171). Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [Source type 11].
- Industrial Economics Inc. (2014). *Marine sector analysis report: Aquaculture* (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/AquacultureSectorAnalysis.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Interagency Working Group on Aquaculture. (2014). *National strategic plan for federal aquaculture research (2014-2019)*. Washington D.C.: Office of Science and Technology Policy. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/NSTC/aquaculture_strategic_plan_final.pdf [Source type 4].
- Jin, D. (2008). Economic models of potential U.S. offshore aquaculture operations. In M. Rubino (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the United States: Economic considerations, implications & opportunities* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/SPO-103) (pp. 117–140). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aquaculture/> [Source type 11].
- Kapetsky, J. M., Aguilar-Manjarrez, J., & Jenness, J. (2013). *A global assessment of potential for offshore mariculture development from a spatial perspective*. (FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Technical Paper No. 549). Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [Source type 11].
- Knapp, G. (2008a). Economic potential for U.S. offshore aquaculture: An analytical approach. In M. Rubino (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the United States: Economic considerations, implications & opportunities* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/SPO-103) (pp. 15–50). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aquaculture/> [Source type 11].
- Knapp, G. (2008b). Potential economic impacts of U.S. offshore aquaculture. In M. Rubino (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the United States: Economic considerations, implications & opportunities* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/SPO-103) (pp. 161–188). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aquaculture/> [Source type 11].
- Knapp, G. (2013). The development of offshore aquaculture: An economic perspective. In A. Lovatelli, J. Aguilar-Manjarrez, & D. Soto (Eds.), *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Proceedings No. 24* (pp. 201–244). Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [Source type 11].
- Ladenburg, C., & Sturges, S. (1999). *Potential offshore finfish aquaculture in the state of Washington* (Technical Report). Olympia, WA: Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Aquatics Resources Division [Source type 11].
- Langdon, C. (2008). Introduction. In C. Langdon (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the Pacific Northwest* (ORES-U-W-08-001) (pp. 5–7). Corvallis, OR: Oregon Sea Grant. Retrieved from <http://seagrant.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/sgpubs/onlinepubs/w08001.pdf> [Source type 11].

- Leonard, C., Kent, M., & Banks, M. (2008). Environmental impacts. In C. Langdon (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the Pacific Northwest (ORESU-W-08-001)* (pp. 11–12). Corvallis, OR: Oregon Sea Grant. Retrieved from <http://seagrant.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/sjpgpubs/onlinepubs/w08001.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Lovatelli, A., Aguilar-Manjarrez, J., & Soto, D. (Eds.). (2013). Annex 1- Expanding mariculture farther offshore: A synthesis of the technical, environmental, spatial and governance issues and opportunities. In *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Proceedings No. 24* (pp. 12–60). Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [Source type 11].
- Maine Department of Marine Resources. What is Aquaculture? Retrieved from: <http://www.maine.gov/dmr/aquaculture/whatis.html>. [Source type 11]
- Price, C. S., Keane, E., Morin, D., Vaccaro, C., Bean, D., & Morris, J. A. (2016). *Protected species & longline mussel aquaculture interactions* (NOAA Technical Memorandum No. NOS NCCOS 211). Retrieved from <https://coastalscience.noaa.gov/research/docs/2017%20Protected%20Species%20and%20Marine%20Aquaculture%20Interactions.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Price, C. S., & Morris, J. A. (2013). *Marine cage culture and the environment: Twenty-first century science informing a sustainable industry* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 164). Beaufort, NC: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://www.noaanews.noaa.gov/stories2013/pdfs/2013_PriceandMorris_MarineCageCultureandTheEnvironment%285%29.pdf [Source type 11].
- Rubino, M. (2008). Introduction. In M. Rubino (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the United States: Economic considerations, implications & opportunities* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/SPO-103) (pp. 1–13). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aquaculture/> [Source type 11].
- Rust, M., Langan, R., & Goudey, C. (2008). Technical and scientific issues. In C. Langdon (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the Pacific Northwest (ORESU-W-08-001)* (pp. 9–10). Corvallis, OR: Oregon Sea Grant. Retrieved from <http://seagrant.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/sjpgpubs/onlinepubs/w08001.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Sims, N. A. (2013). Kona Blue Water Farms case study: Permitting, operations, marketing, environmental impacts, and impediments to expansion of global open ocean mariculture. In A. Lovatelli, J. Aguilar-Manjarrez, & D. Soto (Eds.), *FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Proceedings No. 24* (pp. 263–296). Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [Source type 11].
- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). *Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington*. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSA_2015_small.pdf [Source type 11].
- Valderrama, D., & Anderson, J. (2008). Interactions between capture fisheries and aquaculture. In M. Rubino (Ed.), *Offshore Aquaculture in the United States: Economic considerations, implications & opportunities* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS F/SPO-103) (pp. 189–206). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aquaculture/> [Source type 11].

2.10.3 Dredging and Dredged Material Disposal

Dredging and dredged material disposal are essential activities that are ongoing in the MSP Study Area. They are included in this section of the MSP to address the potential for expansion of this use in the future. The MSP provides an opportunity to guide state and federal regulatory authorities in locating future disposal sites to avoid conflict with existing uses and maximize beneficial use of dredged material.

Summary of History and Current Use

Dredging is essential for port and harbor access and navigational safety. Navigation channels and harbors naturally fill with sand and mud over time. Dredging removes this material, which is then disposed of at in-water or upland locations. Without dredging, navigation channels and harbors can become unsafe for navigation or inaccessible altogether. The commerce brought in through shipping and access to ports and marinas is an important part of the Washington Pacific coast region and statewide economy (Dredged Material Management Program, 2012). Therefore, dredging plays a critical role among the established and expanded uses of Washington's marine waters.

Dredging and dredged material disposal have a long history along Washington's Pacific coast. Congress first authorized jetty construction and maintenance dredging for federal navigation channels in Grays Harbor and the Mouth of the Columbia River in the late 1800s. These navigation channels have been deepened over time to accommodate large, deep-water cargo vessels. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is responsible for maintenance dredging of the navigation channels in Grays Harbor (Map 52) and at the Mouth of the Columbia River (Map 53). The navigation channel in Grays Harbor supports the Port of Grays Harbor marine terminals and associated facilities, and the marina in Westport. The Mouth of the Columbia River navigation channel supports several ports along the Columbia River.¹

Several small ports with harbors and marinas along the MSP Study Area also require dredging to maintain boat access for commercial and recreational fisheries, aquaculture, and other uses. There are five small port facilities within Willapa Bay (Map 54). The Port of Willapa Harbor owns and operates Raymond Port Dock, Bay Center Marina, Tokeland Marina, and South Bend. The Port of Peninsula operates the marina at Nahcotta. Two tribal-owned facilities also exist within the MSP Study Area, the Quinault Marina² in Ocean Shores and the Quileute Marina in La Push (Map 31).

The disposal of dredged material is a critical component of dredging activities. Dredged material is disposed at in-water or upland sites. Current federal policies make disposal of material at in-water sites generally the economically preferred alternative for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. However, there is an expressed interest by agencies and communities to keep clean sand in our active coastal littoral systems (i.e. placing sandy dredged material on the beach or as close to the beach as possible). Sediments determined to be unsuitable for in-water disposal, such as those from chemically contaminated sites, are disposed of at approved upland locations (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a).

¹ Ports along the Columbia River are outside of the MSP Study Area.

² The Quinault Marina in Ocean Shores is currently closed to public access due to needed repairs.

The Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR) manages four in-water disposal sites within the MSP Study Area, two for Grays Harbor (Map 52) and two for Willapa Bay (Map 54). These sites are all categorized as dispersive, meaning that dredged material will eventually disperse and leave the immediate site rather than staying in place. Actively used sites are monitored by the Dredged Material Management Program (DMMP) agencies regularly for volume capacity and other parameters (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a).

Beneficial use sites are disposal locations where dredged material is deposited for some specific beneficial purpose or reuse of the material.³ Beneficial use projects are important because they offer a natural alternative to protect vulnerable coastal areas from the effects of natural hazards (e.g. erosion and flooding), help maintain beaches and dunes, and maintaining/enhancing habitat. Beach nourishment, done properly, can also increase recreational and subsistence use of these areas. There are a few beneficial use sites within the MSP Study Area, including two nearshore DNR/Corps managed sites at Grays Harbor (South Beach and Half Moon Bay disposal sites) and a few on-shore beneficial use projects (Quillayute River and Half Moon Bay). State and federal regulatory agencies as well as regional sediment management teams such as the Lower Columbia Solutions Group encourage the beneficial use of dredged material over deep water disposal (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a; Oregon Solutions, Cogan Owens Cogan, & Oregon State University Institute of Natural Resources, 2011).

Flow lane disposal is an alternative in-water disposal method for approved dredged material. Flow lane disposal sites are located within natural scour channels, allowing the sediment to disperse from the site. This alternative is generally used within the Columbia River and, since 2009, for some dredged material disposal in Willapa Bay (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a). Portions of the Westport Marina project in Grays Harbor have also been approved for in-water disposal and may pursue flow lane disposal.

Three in-water disposal sites are established within or directly adjacent to the Study Area, at the Mouth of the Columbia River. Two of these sites, including a deep-water site, are managed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The third is managed by the Corps and authorized for use through the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology).

The State of Washington recognizes the importance of dredging and properly managed disposal of dredged material. Policy recommendations made by the Washington State Ocean Policy Work Group in Washington's Ocean Action Plan (Office of the Governor, 2006) include: requiring the beneficial use of dredged materials where appropriate to deal with chronic erosion, minimizing impacts to navigation and other marine resources, regional coordination and planning, and using best available science to make decisions.

Grays Harbor

The federal government first authorized navigation improvements to the Grays Harbor navigation channel in 1896. The Corps constructed the North and South Jetties and began dredging activities in the early 1900s (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1982, 2014b). The Corps continues to be responsible for annual navigation channel maintenance in Grays Harbor. In October 2016, dredging began to deepen the navigation channel from -36 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) to -38 feet MLLW, the legislatively authorized depth, and is expected to be

³ Upland beneficial uses of dredged material are not discussed within the MSP as they are not related to the MSP Study Area.

completed in late 2018 (see the Future Trends section below). Dredged material from the deepening will be placed in either the South Jetty or shifted Point Chehalis disposal sites. Material unsuitable for open water disposal will be placed in a suitable upland site (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2016).

The Corps uses six sites for disposal of the Grays Harbor navigation channel maintenance dredged material (Map 52). Four of these sites are in-water disposal sites. The DNR-managed Point Chehalis open water disposal site is the most heavily used site for dredged material disposal. It is located north of Point Chehalis and includes part of the navigation channel (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b). The second DNR-authorized open water disposal site is the South Jetty site, located directly north of the South Jetty's western portion (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a). Material dredged from the inner harbor is generally placed here. Material is diverted to the Point Chehalis site when the South Jetty site reaches capacity or when marine conditions make disposal at South Jetty too dangerous (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b).

Two nearshore beneficial use sites are managed by DNR and the Corps in Grays Harbor. The South Beach beneficial use site receives sediment from the bar and entrance reaches, in an attempt to slow erosion along South Beach and the south side of the South Jetty. The second nearshore beneficial use site is the Half Moon Bay site (Map 52). The purpose of this site is to maintain a stable beach profile in the high-energy conditions of Half Moon Bay (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b).

The fifth in-water disposal site is the 3.9 Mile Southwest Ocean Dredged Material Disposal site (ODMDS) managed by the EPA (Map 52). This offshore deep-water site is used very infrequently and is listed as inactive in the 2016 DMMP user manual (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a). Another ODMDS, the 8-mile site, is located to the northwest of the mouth of Grays Harbor. EPA is currently in the process of withdrawing this site, because it was specifically designated for single project use, and was only used for that one project -- disposal of 2.8 million cy of dredged material in 1990 from the original Grays Harbor navigation improvement project. The site has not been used since. EPA hopes to complete the withdrawal process in 2018-2019.

The sixth site is the Point Chehalis revetment extension mitigation site, which is an upland shore site just above Mean Higher High Water (MHHW) managed by the Corps. Dredged material is placed to cover the Point Chehalis revetment extension and is predicted to erode over time to contribute sediment to the local nearshore system (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b). Opportunities for placement at this site are limited due to lack of equipment. Periodically, sediment has been excavated from this site to nourish the dune along the Half Moon Bay and South Beach shorelines to address the risk of a breach at the South Jetty (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b).

The Port of Grays Harbor is responsible for dredging the terminals and marina boat basin. The terminals are currently dredged every year by a contractor. The dredged material is disposed at the Point Chehalis DNR disposal site. The Westport Marina was last dredged during its expansion in 1980 (M. Horton, personal communication, October 22, 2014). It has received a suitability determination and is scheduled to be dredged within the next two years (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2017). The Corps is also planning on dredging the two federally authorized entrance channels into Westport Marina in 2018. The material will be disposed at the current Grays Harbor DNR-managed in-water disposal sites (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September 29, 2014).

Mouth of the Columbia River

Congress first authorized the federal navigation channel at the Mouth of the Columbia River (MCR) in 1884. The Corps maintains three jetties to stabilize the navigation channel. The navigation channel is maintained at -55 feet MLLW on the north side of the channel and -48 feet MLLW on the south side. The bar at the MCR is considered the second most dangerous bar crossing in the world. The jetties and surrounding areas are subject to frequent and intense storms, and chronic erosion of the area has occurred since completion of jetty construction in 1939 (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

The Corps dredges approximately four million cubic yards of sand every year. This material is disposed of at four in-water disposal sites nearby. Two are nearshore sites within Washington waters, which include the Shallow Water Ocean Disposal Site managed by the EPA located two miles offshore from the MCR, and the North Jetty Site (a Corps-designated site) located about 200 feet south of the North Jetty.

An EPA managed Deep Water Site is located about six miles offshore from the MCR. About one third of the dredged material from the MCR was disposed at the Deep Water Site between 2005 and 2011 (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014a). Material is placed at the Deep Water Site when the other sites have reached capacity or when weather conditions or operational constraints preclude the use of the nearshore sites. Dredged material disposed at the Deep Water Site is effectively removed from the nearshore and, therefore, is considered an unsustainable use of sand material in an eroding system (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

Concerns for long-term erosion of the MCR jetties, spits, and nearby beaches prompted a 2011 Regional Sediment Management Plan (RSMP) that proposed an expanded network of nearshore disposal sites. The Lower Columbia Solutions Group (LCSG), a bi-state collaboration of public and private parties, drafted the plan. Proposed locations included sites on the Washington and Oregon Pacific coasts (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). The MCR navigation channel dredging and current dredged material disposal sites are outside of the MSP Study Area. However, the 2011 RSMP identified two locations within the Study Area as potential sites to be a part of an expanded sediment management network (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

To date, on-shore placement at Benson Beach is the only 2011 RSMP-proposed beneficial use site within the MSP Study Area to receive dredged material from the MCR. Benson Beach is located directly north of the North Jetty (Map 53). The 2011 RSMP recommended Benson Beach because this location was expected to have the greatest benefits to beach and drift restoration in the area. In 2010, a project placed approximately 400,000 cubic yards of dredged material from the MCR onto the Benson Beach intertidal area. Funding for the project came from the State of Washington (\$1.69 million) and the Corps (\$1.8 million) (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). Disposal at Benson Beach has not occurred since the 2010 project as it requires additional incremental funds for use. Costs and safety concerns are barriers to the future use of this site.

However, the Corps, in cooperation with other members of the interstate/interagency Lower Columbia Solutions Group, is in the process of identifying the location of a new nearshore dredged material placement area located in the Pacific Ocean off of the North Head, north of the MCR in Pacific County, Washington (US Army Corps of Engineers: Portland District, 2017). Surveys are planned in the approximately 5.25 nmi² (18 km²) study area. Water

depths in the study area range from 30 to 65 ft (9 to 20 m). Based on recent hydrosurveys and knowledge of the site, the predominant substrate is likely sand; no rocky reefs are anticipated within the study area.

This proposed site near the North Head is referred to as the North Head Site (NHS). The addition of a nearshore disposal site within the MCR's current disposal network will:

1. Provide additional long-term dredged material disposal options for the MCR dredged material disposal site network;
2. Increase the efficiency of dredging operations by utilizing sites closer to the federal navigation channel;
3. Protect the existing jetties that are a part of the MCR navigation system;
4. Beneficially use dredged material by keeping it within the MCR nearshore littoral zone.

Small Port Dredging and Disposal along the Washington Coast

Small ports are a vital part to ocean activities and prosperity of the Washington coast. Small ports contribute hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the economy (Pacific County Economic Development Council, 2013). The maintenance dredging of small harbors is an economic and political issue, and to a great degree influenced by federal funding and decisions. It is not within the scope or power of the MSP to address federal funding for small harbors. However, context for small port funding, as well as descriptions of WA's small coastal ports within and directly adjacent to the MSP Study Area are provided recognizing their importance to the coast and for their influence on dredging and dredged material disposal activities.

Federal funding for small ports

The Corps dredges pursuant to the Rivers and Harbors Act ([33 U.S.C. § 403, et. seq.](#)). Appropriated funds for federal navigation projects are filled by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund. For the past several years, small coastal harbors have had to compete directly with larger coastal ports across the nation for federal funding from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September, 2014). This has resulted in variable and uncertain funding for small port dredging (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September, 2014). The extensive costs of equipment and operation can create a significant challenge for small ports in securing adequate funding for maintaining access channels to their harbors (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014).

Small ports face consequences when harbor entrance channel maintenance dredging is delayed or discontinued. In some small harbors, up to 100% of harbor activities have been reported to be dredge dependent. Significant consequences such as the relocation or closure of businesses, loss of jobs, and impacts to fisheries and recreation industries are expected if dredging for small harbors was to cease or be delayed (Pacific County Economic Development Council, 2013).

Additional discussion of ports and marinas can be found in Section 2.4: State and Tribal Fisheries and Section 2.7: Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure.

Port of Willapa Harbor

Formed in 1928, the Port of Willapa Harbor developed port facilities for shipping lumber and other forest products as well as for fishing and oyster vessels. The Port owns and operates three water access facilities within Willapa Bay that require dredging at various frequencies for navigation maintenance: Tokeland Marina, Bay Center Marina, and the Raymond Port Dock (Map 54) (“Port of Willapa Harbor,” n.d.).

The Corps historically dredged a federal navigation channel and harbor entrance channels in Willapa Bay, first authorized in 1892, and worked with the Port to keep the Port facilities dredged for shipping and boat access. The Corps has delayed dredging the main channel over the bar at the mouth of the Bay to the Willapa River since 1975 due to funding restrictions. Since then, commercial ocean vessels have not been able to access the ports of Willapa Bay. The Corps continued to dredge the entrance channels connecting the marinas to the naturally deep channel of Willapa Bay until the early 2000s (Ott, 2011).

The Port of Willapa Harbor secured a grant and loan to purchase a small hydraulic suction dredge in 2009. The Port has used this dredge to maintain the boat basin at Tokeland Marina, as well as the entrance channel which connects Tokeland to the deep-water channel. The long-term plan is to dredge once about every four years. The most recent dredging activity at Tokeland was in the 2014-15 season (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014).

The Bay Center boat basin is located within the federally authorized channel at the Palix River in Willapa Bay (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014). Bay Center was last dredged by the Corps in 2002 (Coast & Harbor Engineering, 2011). Dredging at Bay Center using the Port’s dredge occurred in the 2013-14 season, and the Port anticipates that it will be dredged approximately every four years (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014). The Port is also looking into dredging at the Raymond Port Dock. Funding for dredging comes from the Port of Willapa Harbor budget. The Port is planning to work with local partners to utilize the Port’s dredge at city, Port, and private docks throughout Willapa Bay (Coast & Harbor Engineering, 2011; R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014).

When the Corps was actively dredging in Willapa Bay, two DNR in-water sites were used, Cape Shoalwater and Goose Point (Map 54) (Coast & Harbor Engineering, 2011). Both of these sites are open-water dispersive sites (Dredged Material Management Office, 2013). In addition, an upland disposal site at Tokeland was historically utilized, but this site has reached capacity (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014). The Port now uses flow lanes to dispose of dredged material from the boat basins and entrance channels. The flow lanes are directly adjacent to the project areas, located in deep water with natural scour and sediment transport. The use of flow lanes is beneficial to the Port because transport of material to the DNR sites is either infeasible or impractical for the small dredging equipment (Coast & Harbor Engineering, 2011). Flow lanes are also much more cost effective than upland disposal (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014).

Work has been started by the Port to identify flow lanes near other city, Port, and private water-dependent facilities throughout Willapa Bay for future maintenance dredging operations (Coast & Harbor Engineering, 2011). The only recent funding from the Corps has been for sediment characterization of potential dredge locations throughout the Bay (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014).

Port of Peninsula

The Port of Peninsula owns a commercial facility in Nahcotta located on the Willapa Bay side of the Long Beach Peninsula (Map 54). The Port of Peninsula shares a similar history with the Port of Willapa Harbor in regards to Corps support for dredging. Dredging of the Willapa Bay bar and main channel has not occurred since 1975, and the Corps has delayed dredging of the Ports' entrance channels since the early 2000s due to budget constraints (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014). The Port of Peninsula was last dredged in 2005. Historically, the Corps has disposed of dredged material at the Goose Point open-water DNR site or at an upland location at Nahcotta.

An analysis for suitability of a future flow lane disposal site near the Port has been conducted (Coast & Harbor Engineering, 2011). Due to the increased significance of the shellfish and fish landings at the port, the Port of Peninsula hopes to work with the Corps on future dredging needs. The Port or Corps may work with the Port of Willapa Harbor or the Port of Ilwaco to utilize their small dredges for future maintenance dredging operations at Nahcotta (Cook, 2012; M. Delong, personal communication, October 8, 2014).

Quinault Marina

The Quinault Tribe owns the marina at Ocean Shores near the north side of the mouth of Grays Harbor. The marina is currently closed due to needed dredging and infrastructure repairs, although some small vessels still use it (J. Schumacker, personal communication, November 11, 2016).

Quileute Harbor Marina

The Quileute Tribe owns a harbor in La Push, located in the northern section of Washington's Pacific coast at the mouth of the Quillayute River (Map 55). The U.S. Coast Guard operates Station Quillayute River out of the harbor. The Quileute Tribal Council works with the Corps for maintenance dredging of the navigation channel and harbor. The channel and harbor are generally dredged by the Corps about every two years, and the most recent dredging activity was in 2017. The federal funding for dredging is similar to that of other small ports (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September, 26, 2014).

Dredged material from the outer channel is placed at several upland locations. The material from the inner channel and harbor is placed on the ocean side of Rialto Beach Spit for beneficial use for smelt spawning habitat (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September, 26, 2014). It is also occasionally placed near the jetty near First Beach to stabilize erosion and for jetty maintenance and protection.

Significant ports outside of the MSP Study Area

The Port of Ilwaco, Port of Chinook, and Port of Neah Bay are located outside of the MSP Study Area, yet provide critical services to important uses within the Study Area and contribute significantly to the coastal economy. Each of these ports rely on dredging to maintain their activities and services to support the local and regional communities of Washington's Pacific coast. However, because the dredging and dredged material disposal for these ports do not occur within the MSP Study Area they are not discussed further here. Each of these ports is included in Section 2.7: Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure.

Related Infrastructure

Dredging and dredged material disposal methods and equipment

Material is removed from navigation channels and harbors by hopper, hydraulic pipeline, or clamshell dredging. The material is then transported by hopper dredges, pipeline, or barge and placed directly at the placement location (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b). Various methods can be used to release dredged material into a disposal site such as bottom-dump disposal, dispersed spraying, and pump-ashore disposal.

Bottom-dump disposal

Barges and hopper dredges are designed to be able to release dredged material from the hull, otherwise known as bottom-dump disposal. Bottom-dump barges and hopper dredges release the material within the boundaries of in-water disposal sites. This method of disposal can be performed at open-water and nearshore beneficial use sites. However, safely navigating vessels at the shallow beneficial use sites can be a challenge (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b).

The bottom-dump disposal method at shallow, beneficial use sites can cause mounding of the material if conditions are not dispersive, which can result in significant wave amplification. Mound height is influenced by vessel speed, water depth, and discharge technique (open or partially open bottom doors) (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). Thin-layer dispersal (also referred to as enhanced dumping) using the bottom-dump disposal method can be achieved by moving the vessel during disposal, thereby reducing the mounding of sediment on the seafloor. The Lower Columbia Solutions Group recommended thin-layer dispersal of no more than 12 cm mound depth at the MCR proposed nearshore shallow sites (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

Pump-ashore disposal

Pump-ashore disposal is the placement of material directly onshore. Onshore placement can be achieved by a barge and conveyance or material can be directly pumped from a hydraulic pipe. To pump from a hydraulic pipe, the sediment is mixed with water to create a slurry and the slurry is pumped through a pipeline to the onshore site (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b). While pump-ashore disposal has many benefits, including replenishing eroding beaches, protecting jetties, and avoiding in-water mounding and associated wave-amplification, there are significant operational and financial challenges compared to traditional (bottom-dump) disposal approaches (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

Dispersed spraying of reliquified sand

Dispersed spraying of reliquified sand, also known as rainbow spray or pump-off disposal, is a method which mixes the dredged sediment from a hopper dredge with water to create a slurry. The slurry is then sprayed over a disposal area. This method has been recognized by the LCSG as minimizing the mounded layer of sediment at nearshore disposal sites, thereby reducing the risk to benthic species and navigational safety. However, the time it takes to dispose of dredged material through this method is significantly longer than a traditional bottom-dump approach, and it is therefore much costlier. There is also limited dredge equipment capable of this spray disposal method. Therefore the practical use of reliquified sand is limited (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

Jetties

River outlets along the Washington coast often consist of areas with very shallow, shifting sands. Before manmade alterations to Grays Harbor and the MCR there was no defined channel suitable for safe, consistent navigation. Jetties were built to focus a defined, deep water channel for navigation access at the Mouth of Grays Harbor and the MCR. The MCR has three jetties (north, south, and jetty “A”), Grays Harbor has two (north and south), and Quillayute has one (south).

Jetties are hard structures, built on shallow shoals and extending like fingers out into the water. They work by restricting the entrance and exit for the flow of water, increasing water velocity and creating a dispersive effect. Because of these narrowed zones, the constricted water flow flushes out the shallow sand bars. This induced, deeper channel increases suitability for navigation. Maintenance requirements include repairing the jetties over time if they become damaged from storms or erosion, as well as dredging any shoals that may form despite the presence of the jetties.

Jetties at the MCR, Grays Harbor, and Quillayute have impacted sediment movement along the Washington coast. It can be difficult to determine the exact magnitude of these changes, simply because little was known about the geomorphology of this area before the jetties were constructed. However, it is clear that the presence of some of these jetties has facilitated coastal land accretion which now supports infrastructure, such as the Cities of Ocean Shores and Westport. Therefore, jetty maintenance is not only critical for navigation, but also to communities that rely on the jetty’s physical alteration of coastal landforms (G. Kaminsky, personal communication, September 10, 2014).

Groins look similar to jetty structures, but serve a different function. Groins are structures perpendicular to the shore that are intended to affect sediment migration along the shore. They improve sediment retention in some areas along the coast, but can increase erosion in other areas. Unlike jetties, they are not intended to focus water flow for a navigation channel. Other structures such as revetments, sea dikes, and wave diffraction structures can be associated with jetties and harbors, and essentially serve to protect these areas from waves, storm damage, and erosion.

Beneficial use disposal sites

Beneficial use of dredged material is the placement of material at a site for a productive purpose (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a). There are a broad range of uses for beneficial placement, such as erosion control, dune reconstruction, beach nourishment, and other purposes. Alternatively, disposal of dredged material at offshore, deep-water disposal sites, such as the EPA-designated Deep Water Ocean Disposal Site at the MCR, effectively removes the sediment from the nearshore system. This removal of natural sediment from a system can “starve” coastal beaches and nearshore areas of sand. It can reduce protection from erosion, coastal storms, and flooding, and impact marine habitat (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

Nearshore and onshore beneficial use sites are intended to keep the sediment within the nearshore system. For some projects, such as MCR, Grays Harbor, and Quillayute, a network of sites is used to optimize the opportunities for beneficial placement of material and to minimize the use of deep-water sites. Beneficial sites are typically chosen with the goal of maximizing benefits to beach erosion protection, habitat improvements, and jetty protection while also minimizing the conflicts to users of the area, all while remaining cost effective (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2012b, 2014b). Dredging projects may

also use beneficial placement for beach nourishment or other local projects (e.g. Rialto Spit) (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2009). Beneficial placement in support of beach habitat and beach erosion mitigation may also positively influence recreational users (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2012a).

Depending upon the location and disposal methods, placement of material at beneficial use sites can be more time consuming, require additional equipment, and have timing constraints, safety and logistical considerations, and higher costs. Site capacity, weather, and user conflicts also create additional challenges to nearshore and onshore beneficial placement compared to deep water placement. User conflicts for nearshore beneficial use sites include wave amplification due to mounded material in shallow water and concerns related to impacts on Dungeness Crab (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b)(see Human use conflicts with disposal).

Onshore beneficial use sites, such as Benson Beach, have added benefits of avoiding user conflicts for navigation and minimizing potential impacts to Dungeness Crab and the associated fishery. Onshore projects, however, are typically estimated to have higher costs and time requirements and different equipment needs than nearshore projects. This creates additional challenges for the consistent and effective use of onshore sites (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2012a).

Disposal site capacity and sediment dispersal

Dredged material disposal sites utilized by the Corps are actively monitored and managed for capacity. Open water sites in the MSP Study Area are designed to be dispersive, meaning that the sediment placed there will disperse over time, ideally allowing for the continued long-term use of the site for annual dredged material disposal (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014a). The amount of dredged material that can be placed in an open-water placement site is limited by the site's capacity to accumulate and disperse the material without adversely affecting the environment or navigation. Capacity is assessed using a number of parameters, including historical baseline data, wave models, and present conditions. The natural environment (e.g. waves, storms) can influence dispersion rates on short-term and long-term scales as well as be variable within site boundaries (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014a).

Flow lane disposal

Flow lane disposal is the spreading of dredged material in relatively deep-water locations with natural scour. Sediment disposed in flow lanes is dispersed and is intended to have no measurable impact to bathymetry or the environment (Coast & Harbor Engineering, 2011). Therefore, issues related to sediment mounding are typically not a concern for flow lane sites. Considerations for flow lane sites include depth, bathymetry, flow velocity data, bottom sediment characteristics, and the volume of dredged material to be disposed (Coast & Harbor Engineering, 2011). Along the Pacific coast of Washington, flow lanes are used for projects with relatively small volumes of dredged material, such as harbor and entrance channel dredging in Willapa Bay and port entrance channel dredging in the Columbia River (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a, R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September, 2014).

Impacts from Dredged Material Disposal⁴

Environmental impacts from dredged material disposal

The study of dredged material disposal impacts to ocean habitat and species has a long history on the Washington coast. The Lower Columbia Solutions Group (LCSG) compiled over a decade of research and findings from policy workshops related to environmental disposal concerns in the Mouth of the Columbia River region. Their key findings as presented in the Mouth of the Columbia River Regional Sediment Management Plan (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011) are summarized below. Additional environmental details from other Washington Pacific coast dredged material disposal sites are included when available.

Dungeness Crab

Dungeness Crab (*Metacarcinus magister*) is the species of primary concern from both biological and economic perspectives (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). The MCR and Grays Harbor are important breeding and nursery habitats for Dungeness Crab, which is an important and valuable fishery in the region (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b).⁵

Concerns highlighted in the 2011 MCR Regional Sediment Management Plan (RSMP) include: direct burial, loss of refuge for immature crab, loss of stable mature food supply for 'harvest ready' crab, fragmentation of fishing grounds, and any large reductions in production over time (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). Laboratory studies have been conducted to determine mortality from the direct burial of crabs by disposed material. The 2011 RSMP described the results of a laboratory study where younger crabs (age 2) had a higher mortality (47% female; 20% male) than older crabs (age 3; nearly 0%). The 2011 RSMP indicated that laboratory experiments can be difficult to extrapolate to the field, and it is expected that crab survival will be higher due to effects from surge currents and variations in sediment deposition rates (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). Commercial size and breeding adults are of the most concern, so the 2011 RSMP recommended that crab population monitoring efforts at potential disposal sites focus on these age groups (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

The LCSG acknowledged limitations to the currently available data as well as incomplete scientific data on crab, but felt that there is enough information to recommend proceeding with the identified disposal activities within the RSMP (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). Benthic video surveys are being conducted in the proposed North Head Site region to observe the presence of Dungeness Crab and other benthic and epibenthic organisms.

In addition, there are ongoing studies to monitor Dungeness Crab mortality and behavior during disposal events at a nearshore beneficial use site on the Oregon side of the MCR. These studies include video surveys of crab in response to disposal events, monitoring of the deposition of the dredged material, and acoustic tagging of crab to track crab survivability and behavioral responses. This information will be used to ground-truth laboratory tests on the effects of dredged material disposal on Dungeness Crab. It will inform disposal methods and future

⁴ The plan address a set of potential "new" ocean uses including the siting of new dredged material disposal locations. Therefore, the plan focuses on identifying information about the range of potential impacts of the disposal. This plan is not intended to focus on impacts generated by existing ocean uses, such as ongoing dredging operations. More information on the potential impacts from dredging can be found in environmental documents for proposed dredging operations.

⁵ The Dungeness Crab fishery is discussed below in the section on human use conflicts with disposal.

locations, including the proposed North Head Site (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September, 25, 2014).

The Regional Sediment Management Plan for the MCR also included recommended management practices for reducing the risk to Dungeness Crab such as: dispersing materials with a low percentage of fine sediment; dispersing sediment that is highly compatible with native sediment; avoiding “hot spots” of very high aggregations of crabs; using thin layer dispersal practices; and minimizing multiple applications over short periods of time. The LCSG encourages the use of an adaptive management plan that utilizes baseline and ongoing crab monitoring data to inform disposal in the MCR network of sites (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

Razor Clams and other benthic species

Within the LCSG, some participants raised concerns about the effects of dredged material disposal on Razor Clams (*Siliqua patula*). Concerns were related to subtidal Razor Clams because they have limited ability to move horizontally (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). A study by Vavrinec, Kohn, Hall, & Romano (2007) testing adult Razor Clam mortality from dredged material burial showed 100% Razor Clam survival in sediment burial up to 12 cm (~4.7 inches). This study also indicated that limiting disposal to 12 cm every 24 hours would minimize the impacts to Razor Clams (Vavrinec et al., 2007). A 2009 science and policy workshop reported that intertidal Razor Clams on eroding beaches may benefit from onshore dredged material disposal that provides additional sand for habitat (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

The LCSG mentioned some concern within the RSMP for a little known clam *Tresuspajaroana*, as there is a potential occurrence of this clam in the proposed MCR nearshore disposal sites (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

Science and policy workshops summarized by the LCSG in the 2011 report indicated that because benthic species distributions are patchy and variable, sediment disposal would likely have a minor effect on benthic species. They did emphasize, however, that sediment should be similar in size to the naturally occurring sediment to minimize impacts (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

The Corps reports that effects from disposal impacts on benthic invertebrates such as polychaetes, mollusks, and echinoderms are temporary. These effects are of low concern for current disposal activities because of the invertebrates’ ability to rapidly recolonize. The Corps expects the expansion in disposal material volume due to deepening of the Grays Harbor channel to have a minor additional impact (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b).

The Corps indicated that there may be some impact to slow and immobile benthic organisms at the Half Moon Bay Beach and South Beach sites during sand placement to address a South Jetty breach risk. The Corps, however, does not expect impacts to Razor Clams or Dungeness Crab due to low abundances in this area and the location of material placement in the high intertidal zone (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2012b).

Marine fish, birds, and mammals

Not much is known about the behavioral or direct effects of sediment disposal on Washington migratory fish such as juvenile salmon and Green Sturgeon. The LCSG (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011) anticipated that the potential impacts to these fish are likely low as they can move away from the affected area. The 2011 RSMP recommends monitoring for salmon and other species like flatfish and bottomfish. Due to the variability of these populations in specific areas, the effects of dredged material disposal may be difficult to determine. Effects on fish from

turbidity in the MCR areas are not expected to be significant because the grain size of the disposal material is similar to the natural sediment material (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

The 2011 RSMP indicated that direct impacts to marine bird species, such as the ESA listed Marbled Murrelet, or other birds such as the Common Murre, cormorants, and others are expected to be limited and not significant. The main concern stems from losses of prey in foraging grounds. Dune-dependent species such as the ESA-listed Snowy Plover and Streaked-horned Lark may benefit from nearshore disposal placement in the MCR region (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

Not much is known or anticipated about potential impacts of dredged material disposal on marine mammals. The RSMP anticipated a low potential impact to marine mammals from dredged material disposal at MCR locations, and simply recommended that disposal activities be timed to avoid Gray Whale migrations (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

Human Use Conflicts with Disposal

Dungeness Crab fishery

The Dungeness Crab fishery is well-established and contributes tens of millions of dollars annually to Washington's coastal economy (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014). Heavy use by the Dungeness fishing fleet occurs in the southern portion of the MSP Study Area in water depths generally less than 150 feet, between Grays Harbor and the MCR region.

The uncertainty surrounding the effects of dredged material disposal on Dungeness Crab in shallow water has driven concerns about dredged material disposal in areas heavily used by crab fishermen. Representatives of the Dungeness Crab fishing industry have voiced strong concerns about the potential effects of dredged material disposal from the MCR at the proposed North Head site. While the Lower Columbia Solutions Group identified the North Head site as a beneficial use area (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011), the disposal site has not been established due to concerns from representatives from the Dungeness Crab industry (R. Mraz, personal communication, September 10, 2014; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September 25, 2014).

The Lower Columbia Solutions Group Regional Sediment Management Plan identified Dungeness Crab research and monitoring as a key priority (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). As described in the Environmental Impacts section, there are several ongoing studies related to monitoring Dungeness Crab responses to dredged material disposal. The Corps will use these results to better understand what impacts disposal operations have on Dungeness Crab in the ocean (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September 25, 2014).

Concerns over the impacts of dredging and dredged material disposal on Dungeness Crab have also influenced management decisions in Grays Harbor. To help determine which disposal site is used, the Corps has conducted pre-disposal crab surveys in the past at the two beneficial use sites; South Beach and Half Moon Bay. Results of these studies have been used to implement management practices that mitigate impacts of disposal in areas with high concentrations of crab and to avoid interference with the crab fishery. The Corps also considers the presence of crab pots in the South Beach area when planning and conducting dredging and disposal activities (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b).

Navigational safety

Wave amplification, which can be caused by the mounding of dispersed dredged material, has occurred historically at MCR sites. Navigational safety is a key priority in disposal site capacity management and can be negatively impacted by changes in wave height (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). The joint EPA/Corps Site Management and Monitoring Plan for Lower Columbia dredging and disposal activities requires avoiding dredged material mounding that could cause excessive wave amplification. Results from science and policy workshops summarized in the MCR Regional Management Plan recommended that a maximum threshold of 10% wave amplification over baseline conditions resulting from mounded disposed material should not be exceeded (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

The EPA and the Corps, through the Site Management and Monitoring Plan and Annual Use Plans, requires bathymetry and disposal location monitoring and reporting for managing disposal activities. The Corps coordinates their Annual Use Plan with state agencies and the public, and notifies key crab fisherman who routinely fish in the disposal sites two weeks in advance of dredged material disposal work (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011).

To address navigational safety at an expanded network of disposal sites (current and proposed disposal sites) for the MCR, the Regional Sediment Management Plan (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011) outlined a research and monitoring program. Strategies for the program include bathymetric surveys, assessing mound-induced wave amplification, using rainbow spray, monitoring shoaling in the navigation channel, and conducting wind and wave modeling and monitoring.

These recommendations were created to facilitate the use of nearshore beneficial use sites, such as the proposed North Head site, while limiting the risk to navigational safety (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). The 2011 RSMP stated that there was general agreement that onshore placement of dredged materials would avoid mounding and wave amplification. No navigational safety concerns were mentioned in the literature specific to onshore beneficial placement or flow lane disposal.

Recreation and tourism

The 2012 Environmental Assessment produced by the Corps for the onshore Benson Beach site did indicate that there may be temporary impacts to recreational uses of Cape Disappointment State Park during dredged material disposal activities. The construction site will likely include a number of restrictions and park users may be negatively impacted by construction noise. During this time, recreational activity may be reduced and there may be an impact on tourism income to nearby communities. The Corps indicates that this impact would be temporary and that recreation and tourism would benefit in the long term by reducing long-term erosion impacts (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2012a).

Permitting Dredged Material Disposal

The management of dredged material disposal is important for human and environmental health and safety in Washington's waters. Between 2000 and 2016, 28.1 million cubic yards of dredged material were disposed at the Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay disposal sites (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016b). Between 2000 and 2012 about 48.6 million cubic yards of dredged material were disposed at the MCR sites (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014a).

Disposal sites in Washington waters are identified and managed by: the EPA, the Corps, and/or DNR. EPA designates ocean disposal sites in Washington under Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA). Dredged material disposal sites in inland waters, and within 3 nm of the coast depending on the project purpose, may be advance identified by the Corps and EPA under the Clean Water Act (CWA).⁶ Regardless of the type of site, state and federal agencies work together to evaluate and manage dredged material disposal. The specific process for disposal permits and authorizations varies slightly depending on whether the site is a designated MPRSA site or CWA Section 404(b)(1) identified site, and whether the project proponent is the Corps or a private entity. However, the sediment testing and environmental review requirements are the same, and are met by all dredging proponents. Environmental review for water quality⁷, physical effects, and ESA consultations are always performed, regardless of the disposal project.

To help coordinate the various agencies involved in managing, permitting, and authorizing disposal sites, two interagency teams have been developed in Washington to evaluate sediment suitability for in-water disposal and help streamline disposal regulations. The Washington Dredged Material Management Program (DMMP) includes experts from the Corps, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Ecology, and DNR and reviews dredge projects involving in-water disposal in Washington (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a). The Portland Sediment Evaluation team, which is similar to the DMMP, evaluates and coordinates sites at the MCR (L. Inouye, personal communication, October 9, 2014). These teams require sediment evaluation which generally includes a site history analysis, and possibly chemical and biological testing of the material to be dredged to determine suitability for in-water disposal. Sediment evaluation requirements must be met prior to obtaining any permits (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a).

Regardless of who designates the disposal site, dredging and disposal operations require approval from various federal, state, and local authorities. Federal permits include Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 permits and Clean Water Act Section 404 permits issued through the Corps. The project proponent must also conduct an Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation with NOAA Fisheries and possibly the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. For dredged material disposal from maintenance dredging activities performed by the Corps, such as for the Grays Harbor navigation channel and MCR, the Corps does not issue itself permits, but does comply with all public notice, federal consultation, and state requirements (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a).

Several state agencies play a regulatory and policy role in dredged material disposal. In addition to participating on the DMMP and the Portland Sediment Evaluation Team, Ecology issues a 401 Water Quality Certification, a Coastal Zone Management Act consistency determination, a Sediment Management Standards anti-degradation policy evaluation, and reviews any relevant local permits that may apply under the local Shoreline Master Program (SMP). The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) may require a Hydraulic Permit Approval. DNR requires project proponents to obtain a disposal Site Use Authorization prior to disposal, if utilizing a DNR-authorized site. Local governments, through their local SMP, may require a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, Exemption Letter, or a

⁶ Under specific provision of the CWA 404(b)(1) guidelines per 40 CFR Section 230.80

⁷ In-water disposal of dredged material must adhere to federal and state water quality standards. These water quality parameters include dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and contaminants [WAC-173-201(A)].

Conditional Use Permit (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a; Office of the Governor, 2006).

Once all appropriate permits and authorizations are issued, the Corps requires submission of a dredging and disposal quality assurance plan. The Corps may hold a pre-dredge conference with the applicant and other regulatory agencies to review the final disposal plans (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a). For the Corps' dredging operations at the MCR, Ecology and the EPA require the Corps to submit their Annual Use Plan prior to disposal (L. Randall, personal communication, October 14, 2014). Regulatory agencies must issue all required permits and authorizations before dredging and disposal begins (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a).

Flow lane disposal permitting is slightly different from other disposal methods. Ecology does require 401 Water Quality Certifications for flow lanes. Other required permits depend upon whether it is a Corps project or a port/private operation (L. Randall, personal communication, October, 14, 2014). In either circumstance, project-specific analysis is mandatory for flow lane disposal and agencies must approve of this alternative during project review (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a). Consultation with the DMMP or Portland Sediment Evaluation Team is also required, and may include a turbidity simulation for the flow lane disposal (Dredged Material Management Office, 2016a). Project proponents can be responsible for monitoring for increases in turbidity outside of an established mixing zone (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014).

Dredged material disposal on tribal land also requires a tribal authority nexus. In the MSP Study Area, the Corps works with the Quileute Tribe for dredging of the Quillayute River at La Push and for dredged material disposal at designated locations at Rialto and First Beaches. The tribe issues a yearly permit to the Corps to authorize disposal locations (Quileute Tribe, 2014).

Site selection

Selecting and managing disposal sites is a complex process with many human use and environmental considerations. As described above, several agencies are involved in identifying, designating, and managing disposal sites, and each agency has its own authority and considerations. For example, DNR uses various environmental considerations when selecting and authorizing disposal sites such as avoiding unique habitats; utilizing sites with similar substrate to that being disposed; protecting known fish nursery, migration, and harvest areas; and protecting aquaculture installations [WAC 332-30-166]. Despite differences in agency authority and mandates, human use and environmental concerns are often addressed, although occasionally through different mechanisms depending upon the relevant authorities.

Future Trends

Grays Harbor

The Port of Grays Harbor requested that the Corps deepen the navigation channel from -36 feet MLLW to the legislatively authorized depth of -38 feet MLLW. In 2015, the Corps approved construction, which began in October 2016. This dredging will improve navigation for deep-draft vessels by reducing tidal delays and tidally-related draft restrictions experienced by vessel traffic (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2016). It is not the intention of the MSP to address

deepening activities in the Grays Harbor navigation channel. However, the MSP may play a role in any suggested changes to dredged material disposal sites within the Study Area.

Dredging for maintenance and deepening will produce approximately 3.5 million cubic yards of material. Suitable dredged material from the deepening will be placed in either the South Jetty or shifted Point Chehalis disposal sites. Approximately 22,000 cubic yards of material that has been deemed unsuitable for open water disposal will be placed in a suitable upland location (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2016).

To accommodate the additional amount of dredged material from the 2-foot deepening of the Grays Harbor channel, the Corps is undertaking a one-time 1,000 foot north-northwestern shift in the Point Chehalis open-water disposal site. Dredged material from the initial deepening activities will be placed within the shifted disposal site. This shift is intended to take advantage of deeper water and more favorable hydrodynamics for the additional capacity needed during the channel deepening construction year. Additionally, dredged material disposal from the deepening will take place over a period of three years and four separate work windows, allowing time between the work windows for the disposal site to flush. Dredged material from subsequent annual maintenance dredging will be placed in the regularly designated Point Chehalis DNR DMMP in-water site (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014b).

The DNR is also considering shifting the South Jetty disposal site slightly north to keep it within the scour channel. DNR will evaluate use of the shifted site prior to the next shoreline permit application (C. Barton, personal communication, March 24, 2017).

Another potential small change in dredged material disposal locations within the Grays Harbor area is related to actions to control erosion and reduce the risk of a breach at the east end of the South Jetty between South Beach (Pacific Ocean) and Half Moon Bay. A breach first occurred during a winter storm at this location in 1993. Since then, the Corps has maintained a land connection between the shoreline and the South Jetty by placing sand on the dune between Half Moon Bay and South Beach. This sand placement is performed whenever certain threshold criteria are triggered. The Corps monitors this area, and when it is determined that sand must be added to avoid a breach, the material is taken either from the Point Chehalis revetment extension mitigation site (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2012b) or sand is purchased for the addition (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September 29, 2014). Due to recent increase in erosion, Westport is exploring options for beneficial use of dredge materials (Washington Department of Ecology, 2017).

In 2012, the Corps proposed a long-term management plan to address the ongoing risk of a breach at the South Jetty. This included building a modified diffraction structure at the eastern terminus to the South Jetty and continuing to place sand on the dune area between Half Moon Bay and South Beach, similar to the current activities performed by the Corps. If this proposed alternative moves forward, the location of dredged material disposal will change slightly within the Half Moon Bay and South Beach location relative to current activities (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2012b). The proposed long-term management strategy for the South Jetty is still under review.

Mouth of the Columbia River

In the draft 2011 Regional Sediment Management Plan for the Mouth of the Columbia River (MCR), the LCSG identified two nearshore beneficial use sites for dredged material disposal that are within the MSP Study Area (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). The first, Benson

Beach, was used in 2010 as an onshore project (Map 53) (see Summary of History and Current Uses: Mouth of Columbia River). Benson Beach is currently permitted by Ecology for use by the Corps for dredged material disposal, but it has not been used since the 2010 demonstration project. Onshore placement of dredged material requires more equipment, logistics, and time than traditional bottom-dump disposal methods. These considerations increase the cost of disposal (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). Safety concerns for the dredge operators were also raised during the 2010 demonstration.

The Corps operates under a least cost alternative policy. Because of the increased cost associated with onshore placement, an outside source must provide the incremental increased cost incurred for using the Benson Beach site (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2012a). The State of Washington provided \$1.69 million in addition to the Corps \$1.8 million for the 2010 demonstration project (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). The future use of Benson Beach as an onshore beneficial disposal site is dependent upon additional funding (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2012a).

The second site, named the North Head Nearshore Site, is a nearshore subtidal site located generally north of the North Jetty and off North Head in Cape Disappointment State Park. The 2011 RSM identified this site for its potential to minimize erosion at Benson Beach and Peacock Spit and to contribute to beach accretion (Oregon Solutions et al., 2011). The Dungeness Crab fishery historically avoided this area and representatives of the fishery initially identified it as a potentially acceptable beneficial use dredged material disposal site. However, the crabbing fleet now uses the North Head nearshore area frequently. Therefore, concerns about the effects to the Dungeness Crab fishery and navigational safety from disposal material mounding have led to strong opposition from some for the use of this site for dredged material disposal (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, personal communication, September 25, 2014; R. Mraz, personal communication, September 10, 2014) (See sections on human use conflicts and environmental impacts). Several studies are currently being conducted in the North Head nearshore area. A test disposal event was planned for 2014-2015 to evaluate burial effects on invertebrates, currents, and sediment transport (R. Schwartz, personal communication, October 21, 2014). In September 2017, the Corps plans to conduct baseline benthic and epibenthic surveys for the proposed North Head Site (US Army Corps of Engineers: Portland District, 2017)).

In the event the Corps decides to pursue adding a North Head site to the sediment management network of disposal sites at the MCR, the site would need to go through a designation and permitting process. The site would be designated for use either by the Corps through their Section 404 authority, or by the EPA. As a part of the permitting process, the lead agency would conduct a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process including environmental studies and consultations with NOAA Fisheries. The Corps would then apply for an Ecology 401 Water Quality Certification. After thorough review, Ecology may authorize the use of this site by issuing a 401 Certification and a Coastal Zone Management Act consistency determination (L. Randall, personal communication, October 14, 2014).

Small Ports

Small ports are likely to continue to use a mix of flow lanes, small-scale beneficial use sites, and DNR authorized sites for dredged material disposal. No significant alterations are anticipated. Expanded activities include the possible addition of a few flow lanes within Willapa Bay (R. Chaffee, personal communication, October 1, 2014).

With regards to future trends in funding, it is difficult to predict what the future federal funding will be for small ports within the Study Area. The [Water Resources Development Act of 2016](#), which is Title I of the [Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act](#) (WIIN Act), passed in 2016. Section 1103 permanently authorizes emerging harbors to receive at least 10% of the Harbor Maintenance Tax funds that were provided in each fiscal year. Implementation guidance is pending. It is very likely that small ports will continue to seek federal funds to keep their ports open and accessible due to their economic and social importance to the coastal communities of Washington.

References

Laws and regulations

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 173-201(A) [Source type 7].

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 332-30-166 [Source type 7].

Water Resources and Reform Development Act of 2014. House Bill 3080. [Source type 5]

Reports, journals, articles, etc.

Coast & Harbor Engineering. (2011). *Willapa Bay flow lane disposal sites feasibility study* (Technical memorandum). [Source type 9].

Cook, W. M. (2012). *Port of Peninsula comprehensive scheme of harbor improvements & parks and recreation plan update*. Nahcotta, WA: Port of Peninsula. Retrieved from <http://www.portofpeninsula.org/> [Source type 11].

Dredged Material Management Office. (2013). *Dredged material evaluation and disposal procedures user manual*. Seattle, WA: Dredged Material Management Office, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District. Retrieved from <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/civilworks/dredging/UM%202013/UM%20Final%20131118.pdf> [Source type 11].

Dredged Material Management Office. (2016a). *Dredged material evaluation and disposal procedures user manual*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District. Retrieved from <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Missions/Civil-Works/Dredging/User-Manual/> [Source type 11].

Dredged Material Management Office. (2016b). *Dredged Material Management Program biennial report dredging years 2014/2015*. Prepared by the Dredged Material Management Office for the DMMP Agencies. Retrieved from http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/civilworks/dredging/BR%20DY14-15%20DMMP_Final_rev1.pdf [Source type 11].

Dredged Material Management Program. (2012). *Focus on Washington's Dredged Material Management Program*. Dredged Material Management Program. Retrieved from http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/civilworks/dredging/DMMP-Fact-Sheet-Sep-2012-final_2013-corr.pdf [Source type 11].

Industrial Economics Inc. (2014). *Marine sector analysis report: Non-tribal fishing* (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/FishingSectorAnalysis.pdf> [Source type 11].

Office of the Governor. (2006). *Washington's Ocean Action Plan: Enhancing management of Washington State's ocean and outer coasts. Volume 2: Final report of the Washington State Ocean Policy Work Group*. Olympia, WA: Office of the Governor. [Source type 11].

Oregon Solutions, Cogan Owens Cogan, & Oregon State University Institute of Natural Resources. (2011). *Mouth of the Columbia River Regional Sediment Management Plan*. Prepared for Lower Columbia Solutions Group [Source type 11].

Ott, J. (2011). Port of Willapa Harbor holds its first commission meeting on May 1, 1928. (Essay 9500). In *Online Encyclopedia of Washington State History*. HistoryLink.org. Retrieved

- from http://www.historylink.org/index.cfm?DisplayPage=output.cfm&file_id=9500 [Source type 11].
- Pacific County Economic Development Council. (2013). *Pacific County channel and harbor maintenance and economic impact assessment*. (White paper). Pacific County Economic Development Council. [Source type 11].
- Port of Willapa Harbor. (n.d.). Retrieved November 19, 2014, from www.portofwillipaharbor.com [Source type 11].
- Quileute Tribe. (2014). Quileute limited land use permit for disposal site. [Source type 11].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (1982). *Final Environmental Impact Statement*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District. Retrieved from <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/Navigation/06%20Final%20Environmental%20Impact%20Statement.pdf> [Source type 4].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2009). *Final environmental assessment. Shoalwater Bay shoreline erosion, Washington*. Seattle, WA: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District. Retrieved from <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/civilworks/projects/Shoalwater%20Bay%20FINAL%20EA%20July%202009.pdf> [Source type 11].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2012a). *Environmental assessment: Proposed nearshore disposal Locations at the Mouth of the Columbia River federal navigation project, Oregon and Washington* (Environmental Assessment). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District. Retrieved from http://www.nwp.usace.army.mil/Portals/24/docs/announcements/MCR_Final_EA_12July2012.pdf [Source type 11].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2012b). *Long-term management strategy for the south jetty, Grays Harbor, Washington. Draft letter report and integrated Environmental Assessment*. Seattle, WA: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District. Retrieved from http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/Navigation/GH_LTMS_ltr_report_EA_March2012.pdf [Source 11].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2014a). *2014 Annual use plan: Management of open water dredged material placement sites, Mouth of the Columbia River, OR and WA*. Portland, OR: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District. [Source type 11].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2014b). *Grays Harbor, Washington navigation improvement project general investigation feasibility study DRAFT limited evaluation report, Appendix C: DRAFT Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement*. Seattle, WA: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District [Source type 11].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2016, September 29). Army Corps dredging Grays Harbor to deeper depths beginning October 3. Retrieved from <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Media/News-Releases/Article/959276/army-corps-dredging-grays-harbor-to-deeper-depths-beginning-october-3/> [Source type 11].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2017). *Determination regarding the suitability of proposed dredged material from the Port of Grays Harbor, Westport Marina, Westport, Washington, for placement at the Pt. Chehalis or South Jetty dispersive open-water disposal sites, or at an approved upland site* (No. CENWS-OD-TS-NR). Retrieved from <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/civilworks/dredging/Suitability%20Determinations/2017/WEB-Final%20Westport%20Marina%20SD.pdf?ver=2017-01-16-180810-283> [Source type 11].

- US Army Corps of Engineers: Portland District. (2017). *Benthic/Epibenthic Survey Plan: Mouth of the Columbia River, North Head Dredge Material Placement Site Study Area Pacific Ocean, Pacific County, Washington*. Portland, OR.
- Vavrinec, J., Kohn, N. P., Hall, K. D., & Romano, B. A. (2007). *Effects of burial by the disposal of dredged materials from the Columbia River on Pacific Razor Clams (Siliqua patula)* (PNNL No. 16350). Richland, WA: Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Retrieved from http://www.pnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-16350.pdf [Source type 11].
- Washington Department of Ecology. (2017). *Grays Harbor Resilience Coalition: Project Report* (No. Publication number 17-06-018). Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/SummaryPages/1706018.html> [Source type 11]

2.10.4 Marine Product Extraction

A potential new use of Washington's Pacific coast is the extraction of marine organisms for commercial industries¹ such as cosmetics, pharmaceuticals, and biomedical research. Information on the history and current use, potential conflicts and compatibilities with other uses, permitting, and future potential in the MSP Study Area for these activities are discussed below.

Summary of History and Current Use

Marine product extraction is the practice of harvesting marine plants and animals to develop non-food-related goods. Examples of products derived from marine organisms around the world include anti-viral, anti-cancer, and anti-tumor agents used in medical treatments; anti-inflammatory agents used in cosmetic skin cream, chemicals used in biomedical and cell biology research, and fatty amino acids in nutritional supplements (Arrieta, Arnaud-Haond, & Duarte, 2010; Baerga-Ortiz, 2009; Bruckner, 2002; Pomponi, 1999).

Researchers, universities, government agencies, and private companies engage in marine bioprospecting to search for compounds that can be used for human health and well-being products (Bruckner, 2002). Marine bioprospecting methods for compound identification include SCUBA diving, manned submersible vehicles, remotely operated vehicles, and the collection of organisms from intertidal areas (Arrieta et al., 2010; Pomponi, 1999).

Once a potential compound has been identified, it must go through a series of product testing and clinical trials before it can be released on the market. Identifying compounds, testing them, performing clinical trials, and selling products commercially require various quantities of the target organism. Often compounds discovered within marine organisms are only available in small amounts per organism. Therefore, it may be necessary to harvest vast amounts of an organism to get the required quantity for testing and making a product available on the market. Alternatives to mass wild harvesting are the use of aquaculture or the use of biotechnology to synthesize the newly discovered compounds in a lab (Arrieta et al., 2010; Pomponi, 1999).

For each newly discovered product, the potential intensity of harvest from natural populations in the ocean will depend upon the demand for the target product as well as the ability to replicate it in the lab or through aquaculture. In the case of DNA sequence discovery, a one-time extraction may be all that is needed, as DNA replication techniques can be used in the lab. For natural products, however, additional and perhaps extensive collection may be required (Arrieta et al., 2010). Methods for supplying natural products are influenced by the availability and reproductive biology of the host organism, the quantity of the target compound per biomass unit, the complexity of the biosynthetic pathway, and suitable environmental conditions for biochemical synthesis (Pomponi, 1999).

Several target products discovered in marine organisms have been successfully synthesized using biotechnology. However, many of these processes are quite complex and may not be cost effective for industrial-scale production (Baerga-Ortiz, 2009; Pomponi, 1999). Ongoing research aims to increase the understanding of biosynthetic pathways to sustainably and

¹Marine product extraction, as discussed here, does not include any extraction or harvest performed by the tribes.

cost-effectively supply marine extracted chemicals for pharmaceutical treatments (Baerga-Ortiz, 2009).

Land-based and in-water aquaculture have also been used to grow host organisms. For example, the mangrove sea squirt (*Ecteinascidia turbinata*), from which an anti-tumor compound has been successfully isolated, has been cultured on a commercial scale (Arrieta et al., 2010; Pomponi, 1999). A deep-water sponge in New Zealand (*Lissodendoryx* sp.), identified for another anti-tumor compound, has been successfully cultured in shallow water while maintaining the anti-tumor compound. This indicates the potential for shallow-water culture of deep-water sponges. However, other target compounds from deep-water host organisms may require a specific pressure, temperature, or other deep-water conditions to form. So, the use of aquaculture to supply target compounds from deep-water organisms may be limited (Pomponi, 1999).

Wild harvest of marine organisms to meet the quantity demands for clinical testing and commercial supply may not be sustainable for many organisms. Monitoring and evaluation of harvest impacts can help determine the sustainability of wild collection, before large-scale harvest commences. For example, a feasibility survey found that the New Zealand deep-water sponge could only sustain small quantities of harvest, despite rapid recovery from extraction by dredging (Arrieta et al., 2010). Sustainable harvest of marine organisms for marine product extraction is, however, possible for some species. A Gorgonian coral in the Bahamas that is harvested for an anti-inflammatory compound used in a cosmetic skin cream has been harvested for over 15 years by utilizing a sustainable harvest management plan (Arrieta et al., 2010; Bruckner, 2002). Sustainability remains a key issue for marine product extraction (Arrieta et al., 2010; Bruckner, 2002; Pomponi, 1999).

Potential Use Compatibilities

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and marine product extraction have the potential to be compatible uses. MPAs have been recognized as a way to protect marine genetic reserves and provide sources for future discoveries (Arrieta et al., 2010). The ecological impact from the initial phase of marine bioprospecting is likely to be minimal, due to the limited amount of harvest required to identify a compound or perform DNA sequencing. It is the potential for more intense harvest for clinical trials and commercial supply that sparks concern over the sustainability and habitat impacts of marine product extraction. Conservation measures are recommended to ensure the sustainability of marine product extraction (Arrieta et al., 2010; Bruckner, 2002). Possible measures include harvest feasibility studies (Pomponi, 1999), monitoring (Bruckner, 2002), sustainable collection methods, and export regulations (Arrieta et al., 2010).

Potential Use Conflicts

No information was found on conflicting uses, with the exception of potential environmental conflicts in cases of unsustainable or habitat-altering harvest practices (Arrieta et al., 2010; Bruckner, 2002; Pomponi, 1999). Spatial conflicts with other uses are difficult to forecast because extraction may be very temporary (initial bioprospecting) or may involve a continued, large-scale commercial harvest. Even in circumstances where a sustained harvest

would occur, it is difficult to generalize conflicts as they would depend upon the organism harvested, the method used, the intensity and frequency of harvest, and other factors.

Permitting Marine Product Extraction

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has the permitting authority for scientific exploration and harvesting of marine organisms, including plants and animals. State regulations require a scientific collection permit for collection of organisms for research or education ([WAC 220-200-150](#)). This permit would likely apply to researchers or universities engaging in bioprospecting (discovery and sampling) of marine organisms.

The harvest of marine organisms for commercial activity (selling the organism) must also be permitted through WDFW. Extracting marine organisms to sell to entities like processors or research labs would fall under a harvesting permit. If there is no established commercial fishery for the target organism, the WDFW director could establish an emerging commercial fishery, which would include a permit process. This would be either a trial fishery or an experimental fishery permit (M. Culver, personal communication, November 10, 2014). Trial fisheries, by statute, cannot be limited. Experimental fisheries are limited and require WDFW to convene an advisory board with representatives from the fishing industry to make recommendations to the WDFW director on fishery management ([RCW 77.70.160](#)). Within five years, the WDFW director would submit a report to the Washington Senate and House with recommendations relating to the establishment of a permanent commercial fishery license, fee, and/or limited harvest program ([RCW 77.70.180](#)).

WDFW has the authority to regulate harvest in both the state and federal waters off Washington's coast, and to permit the transport and/or sale of organisms harvested in state or federal waters into Washington. States have the authority to manage the harvest of marine organisms in federal waters in the absence of a federal management plan for the target species (Magnuson-Stevens Act of 2006). If there was an interest in marine product extraction in federal waters off the Washington coast, WDFW would likely have a role in permitting and management.

Within the tribal usual and accustomed areas (U&As) off the coast, any extraction of marine animals must involve consultation with the appropriate treaty tribe (depending on the location of the extraction and that tribe's treaty area) and the development of a management plan between the state and tribe (See Section 1.6 for more details on tribes and tribal treaty rights).

Under [RCW 79.105](#) and [WAC 332-30](#), the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has the authority to manage 2.6 million acres of state-owned aquatic lands as a public trust. The statute requires DNR to manage these lands to promote uses and protect resources of statewide value. Any person or organization interested in the extraction of marine organisms for commercial products from state-owned aquatic lands must apply for use authorization from DNR.

Future Trends and Factors

Globally, new discoveries of unique chemicals and DNA sequences from marine organisms are occurring at a rapid pace. The rate of new natural products reported from marine organisms is growing at a rate of 4% per year, which is faster than the rate of species discovery. About 18,000 natural products have been described from marine organisms since the 1950s (Arrieta et al., 2010). Marine organisms from which new products have been discovered include sponges, microalgae, coral, deep-sea hydrothermal vent bacterium, bioluminescent jellyfish, red algae, a snail, and a sea hare (Bruckner, 2002; Pomponi, 1999). The potential for novel chemicals from marine organisms is estimated to be about 300 to 500 times higher than that for discovery from terrestrial sources (Arrieta et al., 2010; Bruckner, 2002). Marine product extraction presents a considerable economic and business opportunity; the marine biotechnology industry is currently a multibillion dollar industry and growing (Arrieta et al., 2010; Bruckner, 2002).

It is impossible to know when and where a new compound may be discovered, but it is predicted that high biodiversity habitats such as coral reefs and seamounts and extreme habitats such as hydrothermal vents and polar habitats have the greatest economic potential for new chemical discovery (Arrieta et al., 2010). The potential for marine product extraction along Washington's Pacific coast is unclear. Based on the literature, it does not seem likely that the Washington coast is a primary target for marine bioprospecting. However, Washington does have unique environments including hydrothermal vents, seamounts, and deep sea corals. Therefore, as new marine species are discovered and technology expands the depths to which the ocean is explored, it is entirely possible that novel chemicals and DNA sequences could be discovered within the MSP Study Area.

References

Laws [source type 5]

- Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 77.80.160. [Source type 5].
Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 77.70.180. [Source type 5].
Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 79.105. [Source type 5].
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 2006, United States Code (U.S.C.) Title 16 Section 1856. [Source type 5].

Regulations [source type 7]

- Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 220-20-045. [Source type 7].
Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 332-30. [Source type 7].

Reports, journals, etc.

- Arrieta, J. M., Arnaud-Haond, S., & Duarte, C. M. (2010). What lies underneath: Conserving the oceans' genetic resources. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(43), 18318–18324.
<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0911897107> [Source type 1].
- Baerga-Ortiz, A. (2009). Biotechnology and biochemistry of marine natural products. *Puerto Rico Health Sciences Journal*, 28(3), 251–257. [Source type 1].
- Bruckner, A. W. (2002). Life-saving products from coral reefs. *Issues in Science and Technology*. Retrieved from http://issues.org/18-3/p_bruckner/ [Source type 1].
- Pomponi, S. A. (1999). The potential for the marine biotechnology industry. In *Trends and future challenges for U.S. national ocean and coastal policy* (pp. 101–104). U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Retrieved from http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/websites/retiredsites/natdia_pdf/17pomponi.pdf [Source type 11].

2.10.5 Mining

A potential new use of Washington's Pacific coast is mining within marine waters for sand, gravel, or gas hydrates. This section provides context about operations, environmental impacts, use conflicts, and future trends for sand/gravel and gas hydrate mining in Washington. Gold mining, a current recreational use within the MSP Study Area, is covered in Section 2.6: Recreation and Tourism.

Sand and Gravel Mining

Sand and gravel are mined more than any other material in the world, and worldwide demand is increasing. Declining land-based sand and gravel resources have shifted mining for these resources into marine waters. Globally, marine sand and gravel are used mainly for construction and land reclamation (Peduzzi, 2014).

In the United States, marine sand mining is used to supply material for beach nourishment along the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts. Several states mine marine sand for beach nourishment projects and some have partnered with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) to extract sand from offshore sites in federal waters. State and local governments use this sand to nourish public beaches, restore coastal habitats, and build nature-based infrastructure to protect against coastal storms and erosion. In the United States, demand for marine sand is increasing due to coastal erosion, increasing coastal storms, and sea level rise. BOEM works with state and local partners and is updating evaluations for sand resources within BOEM lease blocks (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2017).

Most in-water sand and gravel mining in Washington is currently limited to rivers. Much of the sand removed from rivers is for navigation or flood control. Very little mining is currently performed strictly to obtain and sell sand (M. Rechner, personal communication, November 20, 2014). There are a few mining companies that mine sand on the Washington side of the Columbia River to sell for construction and other uses (L. Randall, personal communication, November 25, 2014).

Shoalwater Bay Project

The Shoalwater Bay Shoreline Erosion Protection project used sandy material dredged for a purpose other than navigation similar to sand mining activities conducted for beach nourishment on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts. The Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation has important subtidal and tidal lands for the tribe's shellfish harvesting within North Cove in northern Willapa Bay (a.k.a. Graveyard Spit). The tribe also has important infrastructure on a narrow strip of reservation land along the coast in this area. A natural dune system on Graveyard and Empire Spits historically protected North Cove from flooding and storm events. Due to changes in adjacent shoreline geomorphology, the dunes are no longer accreting sand and are now eroding. The dune system was breached and the Shoalwater Reservation flooded from storm and tidal events in 1999, 2006, and 2007 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2009).

To protect the Shoalwater Bay Indian Reservation land, shellfish habitat, and adjacent areas from future flood damage, the Corps funded a project to rebuild the protective dune system. This involved dredging just north of the Willapa Channel offshore from North Cove using a large pipeline dredge. The dredged material was placed on the dune system to add height

and close the breach areas. The plan called for about 600,000 cubic yards of material during construction to be placed on a total of 47 acres. According to the project plan, maintenance of this project is expected to occur about every five years by removing about 250,000 cubic yards of material dredged just offshore in the Willapa Bay channel and adding to the dune (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2009). The project began in 2012, took two years to complete construction, and is currently being monitored. The USACE is proposing renourishment of 700,000 cy of material on 71 acres in 2018.

Other Uses of Sand

Within the MSP Study Area, the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission (Parks) maintains public beach access along ocean beaches within the Washington State Seashore Conservation Area by occasionally removing accreted sand at access points. Parks is authorized to sell permits to cranberry growers to use this sand within their bogs. This use of sand is allowed, if Parks finds it to be reasonable and not generally harmful or destructive to the character of the land ([RCW 79A.05.630](#)). This activity is currently exercised by a few growers in the Long Beach area. Cranberry growers use sand to improve productivity within their nearby cranberry bogs. The volume of sand from the Seashore Conservation Area used for this purpose is relatively small, and growers often find acquiring the sand from other sources to be an easier option. This use is not anticipated to expand in the near future (L. Lantz, personal communication, December 11, 2014).

Marine Sand and Gravel Mining Equipment and Infrastructure

The equipment and infrastructure for sand and gravel mining is very similar to that used for navigation dredging and disposal. Mining for sand and gravel in marine waters is generally performed with a trailing suction hopper dredge or a cutterhead dredge. When trailing suction hopper dredges are used to mine sand for beach nourishment, the material is typically stored within hoppers on the ship and transported to a pump-out station near the placement site. The dredge is then hooked up to a pipeline at a pump-out station and material is pumped to shore via pipeline laid on the seabed. Occasionally for beach nourishment projects, the material is placed at a temporary nearshore holding and rehandling site near the nourishment project site. The material is then dredged again and transported by pipeline. Temporary storage and nearshore rehandling areas are becoming more frequently used on the Gulf and East Coasts, especially when using offshore sites long distances from the placement sites (Michel, Bejarano, Peterson, & Voss, 2013).

Cutterhead dredges are typically used closer to shore, and the dredged material is transferred directly from the dredge to the placement site using a pipeline. Cutterhead dredges often require barges, multiple anchors, support boats, survey boats, and crew boats. Pump-out of the material through a pipeline requires a lot of equipment, including but not limited to tugs, buoys, cranes, support crew boats, and floating and submerged pipelines. Transport pipelines are assembled using barges with cranes. Multiple tugs then position the line before it is flooded into place on the seafloor. These pipelines are temporary structures which can be repositioned and disassembled once the project is complete (Michel et al., 2013).

Marine mining equipment may also have dump valves on the intake pipe to dump unsuitable material overboard before it enters the hopper (Tomlinson et al., 2007). The ships may also have sorting and screening equipment to release unwanted fine sediments (Michel et al.,

2013). Sand and gravel mining activities selling material for land-based uses also require shore-based facilities for storage, handling, and distributing the material.

Potential Use Benefits and Compatibilities

Sand and gravel mining is compatible with beach nourishment and coastal protection projects. Depending upon the location and the amount and type of material needed for a coastal defense project, mining may be the most practical and cost-effective alternative for providing the needed material. Climate change and associated sea level rise and increased frequency of coastal storms may increase the need for beach and dune nourishment to protect recreational beaches and coastal infrastructure. The dune reconstruction at Shoalwater Bay is a good example of a current sand mining project to protect coastal infrastructure and intertidal habitat for tribal shellfish beds from coastal flooding and storms (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2009) (See Section 2.10.3: Dredging and Dredge Disposal).

Sand and gravel mining may be partially compatible with fisheries and other navigational and recreational uses, because the mining is seasonal in nature. However, when overlapping in time and space these activities may not be compatible. More information is discussed in the potential use conflicts section below.

Environmental Concerns

The Shoalwater Bay Project provides some specific information on environmental impacts for that project. Broader impact analyses for sand mining have not been conducted in Washington to-date, as this is currently the only project of its type in the MSP Study Area. The summary below describes the available information on observed and potential environmental impacts from offshore sand and gravel mining along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts, as well as general environmental considerations from navigation dredging in Grays Harbor.

Benthic species and habitats

Immobile and slow-moving benthic species could be directly removed by sand and gravel mining (dredging) and drawn into the suction dredge. The amount of time needed for benthic species recovery is variable. Studies on the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts report that biomass and abundance recovery times range from 3 months to 2.5 years after offshore dredging. Species diversity recovery can take more than 3-5 years after offshore dredging. Monitoring at U.S. sand mining sites has not been long enough to determine times for complete community recovery (Michel et al., 2013). For navigation dredging at estuarine sites in Washington, studies at the Ports of Tacoma and Seattle show that benthic invertebrates recolonize disturbed sediments in substantial numbers within months (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014). Studies from the East Coast report that recolonization of dredged areas is similar to successional colonization from other disturbances (Michel et al., 2013).

Benthic organisms may also be impacted by pipelines used to transmit sand. Pipelines can directly displace and crush benthic invertebrates. These impacts may also be worsened by the movement of the pipeline during storms if it is not securely positioned. Hard-bottom habitats are expected to experience the greatest impacts from pipelines, while soft-bottom habitats are expected to quickly recover after pipeline removal (Michel et al., 2013).

Mining can create pits along the seafloor. Observations in South Carolina have shown that finer material such as mud can accumulate in these pits, which can lead to changes in the benthic community composition (Michel et al., 2013). Levels of oxygen could also be reduced within these pits. Recommended mitigation measures to assist in rapid recovery of benthic habitats have included using rotational dredging, dredging areas expected to rapidly refill, avoiding the creation of deep pits, and leaving some areas undredged. These methods have yet to be tested (Michel et al., 2013).

Turbidity and deposition of sediments on the seafloor may also affect benthic invertebrates. Turbidity and deposition of finer materials like silt and mud can be caused by the drill head, but also by fine materials washed overboard. Studies from dredging on the outer continental shelf on the East Coast indicate that turbidity concerns are generally low when mining clean sand. In addition, dynamic, offshore habitats are generally acclimated to natural sedimentation. Turbidity and sedimentation effects are of greatest concern to coral reef and hard-bottom habitats and spawning areas (Michel et al., 2013).

It is unclear whether benthic community composition changes will be beneficial or detrimental to predatory species such as fish and crabs. These effects will depend upon the specific predator-prey relationship, species life histories, and the timing of dredging activities (Michel et al., 2013).

The impacts of noise on benthic invertebrates remain largely unknown (Michel et al., 2013).

Fish and other mobile species

Sand and gravel mining (dredging) may directly or indirectly impact bottom and pelagic fishes and other mobile species such as crabs. The South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, researchers, and other institutions have expressed concerns about the effects of offshore dredging on the ecological services sand shoals provide for fishery resources (Michel et al., 2013). Adult fish and mobile bottom-dwelling fish species are expected to be able to swim away from dredging activities. However, dredge equipment can suck in, or entrain, some species and cause injury or death. Higher risks to fish may be associated with the smothering of eggs on spawning grounds, or the entrainment of eggs, juveniles, or benthic species by the suction dredge. It is also possible that pelagic eggs could be impacted by turbidity. Possible indirect impacts include alteration of prey availability for bottomfish and loss of habitat (Michel et al., 2013).

There are many concerns surrounding impacts to fish and other mobile species from offshore sand and gravel mining, yet several data gaps exist regarding this topic. Most of the assessments of entrainment rates for fish and mobile invertebrates have been for shallow-water and estuarine dredging activities. A literature review summarized by Michel et al. (2013) reported that Dungeness Crab entrainment rates by hopper suction dredges in estuarine and river settings range from 0.040 to 0.592 adult crabs per cubic yard of dredged material, with juvenile crabs entrained at 0.32 to 10.78 crabs per cubic yard. Mortality was reported to increase with increasing crab size from 5% for smaller crabs (7-10 mm) to 86% for larger crabs (>75 mm) (Michel et al., 2013).

In Grays Harbor, A Dredge Impact Model is used by the Corps to estimate the number of Dungeness Crab losses for navigational dredging (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014). However, it is unknown what the entrainment and subsequent survival rates for Dungeness Crab or fish would be at an offshore sand borrow site. Existing information from other locations suggest that eggs deposited on the seafloor and bottom-dwelling fish are the most sensitive to

entrainment. Entrainment rates and the subsequent impact on fishery resources remains a data gap (Michel et al., 2013).

In Washington, dredging could entrain Lingcod, flatfish, and possibly rockfish. However, the likelihood and rates of entrainment will depend upon the mining location and life history of the fish species (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014).

The redistribution of sediment from sand and gravel mining activities could pose risks of smothering eggs in bottom-dwelling fish spawning grounds and burying crabs. While species with eggs attached to the seafloor are considered to be sensitive to this potential impact, the specific quantitative effects are unknown. Bottom-dwelling species are expected to have some tolerance to natural sedimentation (Michel et al., 2013). Spawning could be disrupted if spawning periods overlap with dredging operations (Tomlinson et al., 2007). Seasonal work windows have been recommended for mining in the United Kingdom, but their effectiveness in reducing impacts has not been confirmed. Early life stages of fish that use hard-bottom habitats may also potentially be impacted by sediment deposition over those habitats. Site-specific buffers around hard-bottom habitats are used to reduce impacts of offshore sand mining along the East Coast (Michel et al., 2013).

Water quality may decrease in deep dredge pits where water exchange and oxygen levels are reduced. This may stress organisms unable to move to more oxygenated locations. Noise from dredging operations may also have a temporary and limited impact on fish populations. Potential effects from noise could include changes in behavior and loss of hearing (Michel et al., 2013). A study in the North Sea found that fish migrations to spawning areas were altered during dredge activity (Tomlinson et al., 2007). Specific effects from noise will be species dependent, and more research is needed to assess the hearing abilities of fishes at various life stages (Michel et al., 2013).

Birds

No direct information was available assessing impacts from offshore sand mining activities on the East Coast. Potential impacts predicted to have the largest effects include indirect impacts to foraging seabirds from repeated dredging of sand shoals, flight path avoidance, and flock disturbance if dredging or associated navigation occurs near areas with dense flocks. It is unknown to what extent seabirds would experience any of these impacts (Michel et al., 2013). The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Grays Harbor navigation dredging suggests that dredge vessels and turbidity may temporarily displace foraging seabirds and waterfowl (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 2014). The effects of offshore sand and gravel mining (dredging) on seabirds represents a large data gap (Michel et al., 2013).

Marine mammals

Marine mammals could potentially be impacted by sand and gravel mining operations (dredging) through pressures such as vessel interactions (vessel strikes), noise, and changes in water quality. Vessel strikes can cause injury or mortality to whales, meaning mining may pose some increased risk to whales. However, dredge vessels are often slow moving, and East Coast dredging operations use mitigation measures to reduce risks to marine mammals. There have been no reports of marine mammal strikes from dredging or support vessels during dredging operations (Michel et al., 2013).

Noise from dredging and vessel operations has the potential to alter marine mammal behavior. Specific effects and severity will depend on the actual noise generated by the dredge and the marine mammal species. There are few studies which document the reactions of marine

mammals to dredging. Direct injury to marine mammals from the sound produced from offshore dredging operations is estimated to be unlikely based on NOAA noise threshold criteria, although behavior disturbance and harassment are possible. Potential impacts to marine mammals are assessed for individual projects through Section 7 consultations (Michel et al., 2013).

It is unknown if or how marine mammals are impacted by disturbance of bottom habitats, turbidity, and deposition of fine sediments onto the seafloor from dredging (Michel et al., 2013).

Sea turtles

The main concern for East Coast offshore dredging is the entrainment and mortality of sea turtles. Loggerhead, Kemp's Ridley, and Green Sea Turtles are considered to have the highest risk of entrainment due to their benthic foraging habitat preferences. Several mitigation measures have been developed to reduce entrainment and mortality of sea turtles (Michel et al., 2013). There is little to no information available on other potential impacts, such as alteration of benthic habitat, noise, turbidity, vessel strikes, and increased sediment deposition. A review of biological impacts from offshore dredging indicated that most impacts will likely be specific to a given sea turtle species' life history, prey and habitat preferences, and behavior (Michel et al., 2013).

Ecosystem effects

As mentioned above, sand and gravel mining directly impacts bottom habitats and benthic species. However, the degree of these impacts on trophic systems and ecological interactions remains uncertain. Ecosystem impacts are difficult to measure. Food web models and other ecosystem models have been used to try to examine direct and indirect impacts of sand mining in marine systems, yet there is currently high uncertainty due to limited information (Michel et al., 2013).

Another area of uncertainty is the potential cumulative impacts from sand and gravel mining and current and historical fishing activities, particularly bottom-disturbing fisheries. The impacts from bottom-disturbing fishing can serve as a proxy for examining the potential ecosystem impacts of sand and gravel mining, although a few key differences exist. These differences include intensity of the activity, as sand mining may have a greater direct disturbance to the bottom habitat than bottom disturbance fishing. Spatial extent of the activity may also differ, because sand mining will likely be located at fewer sites and be smaller in scale than bottom disturbance fishing (Michel et al., 2013).

Ecosystem and food chain effects from sand and gravel mining activities remain a data gap of significant interest to those with interests in ecosystem based management, fishery commissions, and other groups (Michel et al., 2013).

Potential Use Conflicts

Commercial and recreational fisheries

Sand and gravel mining activities have the potential to conflict with current and potential new uses in the MSP Study Area. Conflicts with commercial and recreational fisheries have been studied for sand and gravel mining activities along the East Coast and in the United Kingdom. Based on literature reviews and case studies in Florida, common spatial conflicts between commercial and recreational fisheries and sand and gravel mining include: loss of fishing gear (particularly crab pots), changes to navigation routes, reduced access to fishing grounds, and

increased boat traffic (Tomlinson et al., 2007). Case studies indicate that the severity of these spatial conflicts varies by project location and fishery (Tomlinson et al., 2007).

The loss and damage of gear due to dredging operations, particularly fixed gear such as crab pots, is a contentious issue voiced by fisherman in the U.S. Gear can be directly damaged or buoys can be severed, interfering with equipment retrieval. This may lead to economic impacts to fishers due to the costs of replacement gear and loss of catch (Tomlinson et al., 2007).

Dredging activities and equipment may require fishers to alter navigation routes to their traditional fishing grounds, depending upon the location of material borrow and placement sites. This may increase time and costs for fishers, including increased fuel costs. Dredging operations may also directly restrict access or displace fishers from traditional fishing grounds. This conflict will depend upon the location, season, and longevity of the dredging (Tomlinson et al., 2007).

Sand and gravel mining activities may also increase boat traffic. This can increase risk of collisions or inconveniences to fishers avoiding large dredge vessels. Effective communication and standard operating procedures regulated by the U.S. Coast Guard can mitigate these risks (Tomlinson et al., 2007).

Fishers in Florida (sand mining) and the United Kingdom (gravel mining) have also expressed concerns related to the impacts of dredging on fish and crab ecology and how it may influence stock availability and catch.

Conflicts with other uses

Sand and gravel mining operations may also potentially conflict with other current and future uses, particularly those that involve permanent or semi-permanent infrastructure. Sand and gravel mining is generally not suitable in areas with offshore oil and gas infrastructure, including platforms and pipelines. Therefore, we can predict that other similar infrastructure, such as that for marine renewable energy or methane hydrate mining, will also not be compatible. Dredging activities could also uncover and transfer unexploded and discarded munitions. Historical munitions disposal sites are marked on nautical charts and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers requires searching historical records of sites to prevent this issue (see Map 41) (Michel et al., 2013).

Dredging activities also directly conflict with prehistoric sites and shipwrecks. The dredge equipment and ground tackle for moorings can directly damage these sites. In the U.S., shipwreck remains have been damaged by dredging activities and prehistoric artifacts have been pumped ashore as a result of nourishment projects. Indirect impacts include the uncovering or burial of historical resources. BOEM is required by the [National Historic Preservation Act](#) to protect historical resources (16 U.S.C. 470). Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and sonar technology are used to survey potential borrow sites for historical resources. Buffers around U.S. historic sites in which no dredging or anchoring can occur have ranged from 98 feet (30 meters) to about 1811 feet (360 meters) (Michel et al., 2004).

Based on the nature of sand and gravel mining activities and conflicts described in the literature, we can assume that dredging activities will also conflict with uses such as shipping, offshore aquaculture, marine cables, and other marine infrastructure.

Permitting Sand and Gravel Mining

The permitting requirements for sand and gravel mining are comparable to those for dredging and dredge disposal.¹ Permitting sand and gravel mining will involve both state and federal agencies. Ecology issues a 401 Water Quality Certification, a Coastal Zone Management Act consistency determination, and reviews any relevant local permits that may apply under the local Shoreline Master Program (SMP). For projects occurring on tribal reservations, either the tribe or EPA will issue 401 certifications, depending on whether the tribe has treatment as a State for purposes of the CWA. For mining activities in state waters, DNR would be required to authorize the footprint for the activity and would charge fees based on the volume of material extracted. WDFW may require a Hydraulic Permit Approval. Local governments, through their local SMPs, may require a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, Exemption Letter, or Conditional Use Permit (Dredged Material Management Office, 2013; Office of the Governor, 2006).

BOEM is the federal agency responsible for managing offshore non-energy minerals (primarily sand and gravel) on the outer continental shelf (OCS). They typically permit projects through noncompetitive lease agreements (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, n.d.). BOEM must use the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process to review environmental impacts using an environmental assessment (EA) or environmental impact statement (EIS). As a result of the analysis, BOEM may include measures in the lease or Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to protect physical, biological, and cultural resources (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2017). The Corps will also need to issue federal permits under the Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 and Water Quality Act Section 404. As with dredging operations, the permittee must coordinate with the DMMP or Portland Sediment Evaluation Teams, and will be required to conduct sediment suitability testing.

Future Trends and Factors

The potential for sand and gravel mining along Washington's Pacific coast is still unknown and BOEM has not yet done a suitability analysis. Overall, current sand demand is relatively low, but this could change due to increases in population and climate change impacts. There may be increased demand for sand to protect coastal communities, as these communities experience increases in the occurrence and magnitude of storms and sea level rise resulting from climate change. However, there is also the potential to use material already dredged for channel maintenance, potentially decreasing the demand for mined materials.

¹ See Section 2.10.3: Dredging and Dredged Material Disposal for more information on permitting requirements.

Gas Hydrate Mining

Gas hydrates are mixtures of gas and water that forms a solid ice-like structure under low temperature and high pressure conditions. The primary type of gas in hydrates is methane (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012a). In marine systems, methane gas is produced by organic decomposition deep within the sediment. As the methane migrates up through the sediment column, it begins to cool (P. Johnson, personal communication, December 3, 2014). Under the cooler conditions and high pressures within the sediment, the methane combines with water to form the hydrate (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012a).

The depth, temperature, and pressure range at which hydrates form is termed the hydrate stability zone (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013). On the Washington margin, the hydrate stability zone begins at a water depth of about 500 meters (1650 feet). Hydrates can occur on the surface of the seafloor and can be distributed within the sediment column down to 200 meters (656 feet) (P. Johnson, personal communication, December 3, 2014). At depths too shallow or too warm, the hydrate stability zone ends, gas hydrates will “dissociate” and the methane will dissolve into the surrounding water (Hautala, Solomon, Johnson, Harris, & Miller, 2014). Methane hydrates of a sufficient size may be brought up to the surface of the ocean, where they will continue to dissociate into gas and water.

Methane is a natural gas and can be used as an energy source. Methane hydrate resources are estimated by BOEM, the Department of Energy, and other sources to be the one of the largest sources of organic carbon on earth (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013; Hautala et al., 2014). This has been a primary driver in the interest in using gas hydrates for energy production. In the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000, Congress projected a shortfall in natural gas supply by 2020. The Act identified the potential for methane hydrates to help alleviate the projected shortfall, and authorized federal funding for a methane hydrate research program. Since 2000, significant U.S. funding has been invested in exploring gas hydrates for natural gas resources (Boswell, 2009).

While there is currently no commercial-scale production of methane from gas hydrates, ongoing research continues to advance understanding of the gas hydrate system and the potential for methane recovery. Two exploration and production studies have been recently conducted in the U.S., one on the continental slope of northern Alaska and the other in the Gulf of Mexico. Production testing in land-based locations in Alaska and Canada and offshore testing in Japan indicate that natural gas can be produced from methane hydrates using existing oil and gas production technology (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013).

Gas Hydrate Mining Equipment and Infrastructure

Based on preliminary extraction tests, it appears that oil and gas infrastructure can be easily adapted to gas hydrate extraction (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013). The summary that follows provides context for potential gas hydrate exploration and production activities. It briefly describes the main tools currently used to explore for methane hydrates, and details some of the main components of offshore oil and gas equipment and supporting infrastructure.

Tools that have been used to characterize gas hydrate resources include seismic and electromagnetic surveying, shallow and deep coring, well logging, and logging while drilling (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013). Seismic surveys send shock waves through the water and sediment, which refract back to either a floating or submerged receiver. The most common

technology used for offshore oil and gas exploration are airguns, which transmit acoustic energy through the water column and into the subsurface. Seismic data is generally collected using multiple vessels (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2013).

Well logging and logging while drilling use drilling and coring methods to take samples of the material within the well. Exploratory wells for offshore oil and gas are often drilled utilizing a mobile offshore drilling unit. These units can be fixed, semi-submersible, or a floating drill ship (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). Floating vessels are held over a well by either a mooring system or a dynamic positioning system. Fixed platform structures are grounded on the seafloor, utilizing lower support legs to stabilize the rig. Each of these structures often requires the use of several support vessels and support aircraft (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2013).

Production and storage facilities are similar to exploration platforms, with different designs capable of operating in various water depths. Fixed structures, semi-submersible structures, and floating facilities are used throughout the world. Floating platforms are moored with line systems and anchors, while fixed structures have support legs attached to the seafloor. Facilities have been moored in water over 7,000 feet deep (Office of Ocean Exploration and Research, 2010). Offshore processing facilities may also be located on or float next to the platforms. Underwater pipelines and coastal support infrastructure such as pipeline landfalls, processing facilities, and pipe yards (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b) may also accompany exploration for and commercial production of methane hydrates.

Potential Use Compatibilities

There are likely no potential use compatibilities with gas hydrate mining in the MSP Study Area. Offshore oil and gas structures in the Gulf of Mexico do attract both pelagic and reef-associated fish species, so the structures could be attractive for recreational fishing (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Environmental Impacts

Environmental impacts specific to gas hydrate mining are unknown. However, since the infrastructure and production technology for gas hydrate extraction is anticipated to be similar to that for oil and gas (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013), environmental effects from offshore oil and gas production can be extrapolated for gas hydrate mining. Offshore drilling consists of multiple stages of activity including exploration, development, operation, and decommissioning. Each of these phases will have different impacts depending upon specific activities. Some activities may be temporary, while others may occur throughout each phase, although at varying intensities (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

The following is a brief summary of the general environmental concerns and impacts related to the physical presence of and activities associated with offshore oil and gas production. This summary is primarily compiled from information available in the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) produced by BOEM for the 2012-2017 offshore oil and gas lease block plans for Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) sites in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). Information from other sources is included when available. The effects of any proposed gas hydrate mining on water quality, habitat, and species within Washington OCS waters will depend upon specific activities and intensities.

Effects will be directly assessed in an EIS for any proposed lease block plans and individual leases.

Water quality

Activities that can affect water quality include disturbance of bottom sediments, waste disposal, vessel traffic, well drilling, and operational discharges. During offshore oil and gas drilling, drilling muds are used to lubricate and cool the drill bit and pipe. Some water- and synthetic-based muds are permitted for ocean discharge, while others are required to be disposed of onshore. Offshore disposal of muds and drill cuttings can have localized environmental impacts and are regulated by National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). While drill cuttings and muds can cause some impacts to benthic species in the immediate vicinity of the discharges, it is unclear whether this has a significant impact at the community scale (California Coastal Commission, 2013).

The largest discharge from oil and gas extraction is from produced water (water that is brought to the surface from an oil-bearing formation). Produced water can have elevated concentrations of hydrocarbons, metals, and salts. Hydrocarbons in produced water discharges are a major environmental concern. Produced water is generally treated and must meet NPDES standards before discharge. Water and sediment quality may be degraded in the immediate area of discharge (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). In California, studies have indicated that sublethal effects to invertebrates could occur from the produced water concentrations that would be expected up to 100 meters from discharge locations. It is unclear, however, if these sublethal effects translate to population effects (California Coastal Commission, 2013).

The construction and placement of drilling units, wells, platforms, anchoring systems, and moorings may result in bottom disturbance and temporary increases in turbidity. Pipeline trenching may also result in bottom disturbance and increased turbidity. This is an unavoidable impact, but is expected to be temporary (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Accidental spills and other discharge events can occur. With regards to methane, it is possible that decreased oxygen levels could occur during a discharge event due to microbial activity. However, evidence from the Deepwater Horizon spill event indicates that natural gas released from a well is rapidly broken down by bacterial activity (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Air quality

Emissions from oil and gas drilling operations may affect air quality. Emissions are produced from a variety of activities. Air quality effects from offshore oil and gas operations and accidental spills within the Gulf of Mexico are expected to be minor to moderate with temporary effects. Catastrophic discharge events may result in air emissions lasting for days or months, although levels would eventually return to pre-event levels after the well is capped. Adverse effects on humans and wildlife resulting from exposure may have long-term consequences (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). Air quality effects from methane hydrate mining can be difficult to compare, since some of the emissions may be different from conventional oil and gas. Other emissions, such as those from supporting vessels, engines, or cargo transport vessels, may be similar.

Noise

Several routine offshore oil and gas operations produce unavoidable impacts from noise. These activities include exploration; construction activities such as pile driving and trenching; operational noise from platforms, ships, and aircraft; and demolition activities (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). A study by BOEM determined that seismic surveys may have a potentially adverse effect on marine mammals, sea turtles, fish, and commercial and recreational fisheries. Other survey activities were found to have negligible or no measurable noise impacts. Construction noises may disturb fish, sea turtles, marine mammals, and birds in the direct vicinity of the operation.

Gas eruption resulting from a loss of well control may also be significant enough to harass or injure marine mammals, depending upon their proximity to the well. Marine mammals, sea turtles and fish could be affected by the noise and shock waves from explosives during demolition. Specific effects from noise depend upon a species' hearing capabilities and the type, frequency, and intensity of noise generated (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Habitats

Benthic habitat can be disturbed by well drilling, anchors, bottom-fixed platform structures, pipeline trenching, and seabed equipment. Movement of anchors and mooring lines from floating platforms and support vessels may have a more chronic impact on the seafloor. In the Gulf of Mexico, anchor scars were detected up to two miles from a well location. Sediment contamination from discharges and temporary increases in turbidity may also impact seafloor habitat. Essential fish habitat could be affected by these same activities (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Pelagic habitat can be affected by platform and pipeline placement, drilling activity, seismic surveys, platform lighting, aircraft and vessel traffic, and discharges. Discharges can affect water quality, although this impact has been estimated to be minimal in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska. Offshore platforms can act as artificial reefs. They can be colonized by sessile organisms and attract mobile organisms, shifting the normal habitat of the open ocean. Overall, in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska pelagic habitat impacts are expected to be negligible to minor (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Coastal and estuarine habitats could be impacted by the construction of coastal support infrastructure, increased vessel traffic to offshore platforms, and the possible installation of pipelines. The habitat types affected and degree of impacts will depend upon the specific activity, location, and support infrastructure needs. Federal, state, and local permits will be required and are expected to minimize impacts through mitigation and appropriate siting (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Marine mammals

Specific potential effects on marine mammals will depend upon the species and level of activity. Some general potential effects listed in the 2012-2017 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b) include: collisions with support vessels; injury and disruption of normal behavior from seismic exploration; behavior disruption from construction, operation, and support vessels; physical disturbance or reduced habitat quality from onshore and offshore construction; toxicity from produced water and drilling muds; ingestion of or entanglement with solid wastes and debris; and toxicity from spills. Predicted impacts to marine mammals in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska lease block areas are

expected to range from negligible to moderate (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). Impacts to marine mammals specific to the Washington coast from any offshore drilling activities will be assessed during an environmental impact statement as a part of the permitting process.

Birds

Offshore oil and gas activities that may negatively impact birds include offshore structure placement and pipeline trenching, offshore structure removal, operational discharges and wastes, vessel and aircraft traffic, onshore construction, and noise. These activities may impact birds by affecting their habitat, life stages, or behavior.

Collisions with vessels, platforms, and aircraft, exposure to discharges, ingestion of trash or debris, loss or degradation of habitat, and behavioral disturbance are potential impacts listed within the Programmatic EIS for the 2012-2017 BOEM leasing program (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). Collisions with platforms in the northern Gulf of Mexico are estimated to occur at a rate of at least 50 birds per platform a year; this is likely an underestimate. While these activities may impact individual birds, population effects from routine operations in the Gulf of Mexico are not likely. Platforms in the Gulf of Mexico have been observed to be used by overwintering birds as a rest point. Impacts to birds in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska are estimated to be negligible to moderate (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Fish

Routine offshore oil and gas operational activities that have the potential to impact fish species include platform lighting, increased ship traffic, vessel discharge, and miscellaneous discharges. BOEM indicates that impacts on fish populations are expected to be minimal. Exploration and site development activities that could impact fish include noise from seismic surveys, drilling, platform placement, and pipeline activities. Discharges of drilling muds and cuttings could impact fish by contaminating food resources. Although these activities can directly impact bottomfish, impacts are expected to be localized in the immediate vicinity of the activity. BOEM has estimated no population-level impacts to fish communities in the northern Gulf of Mexico and Alaska as a result of their 2012-2017 block leasing plan (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Benthic invertebrates that prefer hard habitat could colonize platforms and exposed pipelines. Fish can also be attracted to oil and gas platforms to feed on colonizing organisms and other fish that have been attracted to the structures. This represents a change in community structure and fish behavior. The positive and negative effects of these fish aggregations will depend upon the life history of the fish species and fisheries management in other areas (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Environmental impact statements for any proposed offshore methane mining activity in Washington waters will address fish species specific to the region, including listed endangered and threatened species.

Sea turtles

Sea turtles may potentially be impacted by offshore oil and gas noise, collisions with vessels, and toxicity from discharges. Noise from seismic surveys, construction of platforms and pipelines, and platform demolition using explosives can kill, injure, or disrupt the behavior of turtles near the activity (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). Disturbance effects to

sea turtles from any proposed offshore methane mining in Washington will be evaluated in an environmental impact statement.

Invertebrates

Activities that can impact invertebrates include vessel and other discharges, offshore lighting, noise from seismic surveys and bottom disturbance activities, and the release of drilling muds and cuttings. Invertebrates can be killed, injured or displaced by drilling, platform construction, pipeline trenching, and disturbance from anchors. Disturbed sediments may also resettle and bury or damage the gills of some benthic invertebrates. Recolonization of these areas by invertebrates may be relatively rapid, but the return of community composition to pre-disturbance levels may require more time (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Drilling muds may contain chemicals toxic to marine invertebrates, but these effects may be species dependent. This may change the composition of the benthic community around the well. Toxic effects from produced water discharges are not anticipated because of the NPDES permit requirements for discharge of this material (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

As mentioned earlier, invertebrates that prefer hard-bottom substrates may colonize platform and pipeline structures. These structures may become habitat for native and introduced species (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Safety Hazards

Methane hydrates can be associated with both naturally occurring geohazards and those caused by human activities like drilling (Collett et al., 2015; Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013). Naturally occurring geohazards include slope instability and wide-scale gas venting, both of which can result from methane hydrate dissociation. When methane hydrate dissociates, it replaces the rigid component of the sediment with free gas and excess pore water, which can reduce sediment stability (Collett et al., 2015; Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013).

Site destabilization can also be caused by drilling or the installation of infrastructure on the seafloor. Methane hydrates occur at relatively shallow depths compared to most hydrocarbons, and therefore pose more of a hazard to shallow drilling and wells (Collett et al., 2015; Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013). Disturbance or heating of reservoirs can cause hydrates to dissociate. Overall, there is a lack of understanding of the risks of geohazards because there has been very limited field experience with methane hydrates. A small number of recent methane hydrate drilling programs were able to manage these risks by controlling drilling parameters (Collett et al., 2015; Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013).

Compared to the information available for oil and other gases, the literature did not include much information about the potential environmental effects of a catastrophic methane mining event.

Methane Releases and Climate Change

Methane hydrates form within a stability zone that is dependent upon temperature and pressure. When pressure decreases or temperature increases, hydrates can dissociate and release methane into the water column. Global climate change is influencing the temperature of some of

the world's oceans, and could lead to increased releases of methane gas into the water column and possibly into the atmosphere. Studies performed on the Washington coastal margin suggest a substantial volume of methane gas has the potential to be released from hydrates due to contemporary climate change (Hautala et al., 2014).

Methane seeps are a natural occurrence along the Washington coastal margin, and are currently a focus of study (Hautala et al., 2014; Johnson, Solomon, Harris, Salmi, & Berg, 2014; Salmi, Johnson, Leifer, & Keister, 2011). The estimated amount of methane emitted from these seeps is 0.1 metric tons per year, which is approximately equivalent to the amount of gas emitted from the 2010 Deepwater Horizon spill. Predicted changes to bottom water temperatures from climate change could shift the hydrate stability zone, and could increase methane emissions by a factor of four by 2100 (Hautala et al., 2014).

Methane is a hydrocarbon and a greenhouse gas. Methane dissolved into the water column could influence ocean acidification (Hautala et al., 2014), while methane released into the air could contribute to further global climate change (Collett et al., 2015; Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013; Ruppel & Noserale, 2012). While these factors are important to understand, the natural methane seeps and potential zone for increased methane dissociation from climate change are not the methane sources currently targeted for energy mining. Methane hydrates targeted for mining are located deeper within the hydrate stability zone.

A given volume of methane causes 15 to 20 times more greenhouse gas warming than the equivalent volume of carbon dioxide (Collett et al., 2015; Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013). However, most methane hydrates would require sustained warming over thousands of years to trigger dissociation (Collett et al., 2015; Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013).

Potential Use Conflicts

Methane hydrate mining is currently not a commercial use in any part of the world, yet there are several potential use conflicts that could arise if the industry were proposed off Washington's Pacific coast. The infrastructure and production technology for gas hydrate extraction is anticipated to be similar to that for offshore oil and gas (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013). To help inform the potential use conflicts that may arise from gas hydrate mining, known and potential use conflicts described in the BOEM 2012-2017 PEIS for offshore oil and gas lease block plans in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b) are summarized below. Specific use conflicts along the Washington coast will depend upon the nature and intensity of this potential new activity.

In addition to the potential conflicts discussed below, other spatial conflicts could include shipping, dredge disposal, sand and gravel mining, and possibly military practices.

Commercial and recreational fisheries

Commercial fishers may be affected by offshore oil and gas operations that cause changes in the distribution or abundance of fishery resources, reduce the catchability of fish, preclude fishers from accessing viable fishing areas, or cause losses of or damage to equipment or vessels (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). Impacts will depend upon the fishery, fishing method or year, and nature of the particular structure. Structures may disturb access to fishing grounds and navigation. For deep-water oil and gas structures in the Gulf of Mexico, a safety zone may be established for vessels longer than 100 feet that extends up to 1,640 feet

around each production platform. This would encompass up to approximately 198 acres of surface area per platform (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

When structures are decommissioned, federal law requires that all wellheads, casings, pilings, and other obstructions are removed to a depth of at least 15 feet below the mud line or other approved depth. Therefore, the components left after decommissioning would not affect longlining, but would decrease the area allowable for trawl fishing (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

The impacts to recreational fisheries are expected to be relatively minor with the potential for beneficial impacts. Species that live on the bottom around the structures may experience temporary effects during construction activities. However, fish return to the disturbed areas. Offshore platforms do have a positive effect as well, as these structures are known to aggregate pelagic and reef-associated species (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

In Alaska, there has been a history of conflicts between commercial fisheries and seismic exploration vessels. Conflicts have included the loss of gear including crab pots and longlines, which could result in the exclusion vessels from normal fishing grounds to avoid this conflict. Some studies have found a temporary reduction in fisheries catch during or following seismic surveys. This could be avoided by conducting the studies during closed fishing periods (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b). Recreational fisheries can experience disruptions to fishing ground access, lost gear, and reductions in catch following seismic surveys (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Recreation and tourism

The impacts to recreation and tourism in the Gulf of Mexico and Alaska are predicted to be either temporary or related to aesthetics. Temporary effects will primarily be experienced during construction of new facilities and could include increased noise and vessel traffic and spatial conflicts with recreational fishers. In the Gulf of Mexico, the aesthetic impacts are expected to be minor and result from increased vessel traffic and aircraft traffic. In Alaska, there would be potential adverse aesthetic impacts on sightseeing, boating, fishing, and hiking activities. The possible effects on scenic quality in Alaska include debris and trash washing up on shore (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Cultural and historic resources

Cultural and historic resources may be impacted by mining and drilling activities. Potential affected sites include historic shipwrecks and inundated prehistoric sites offshore. In many areas, the locations of most of these sites are unknown. If any are discovered during offshore activities, they are subject to archaeological surveys and other mitigation requirements. Effects on cultural resources can be determined on a case-by-case basis using project-specific surveys to identify cultural resources. If a survey finds evidence of a possible archaeological resource in a lease area, they must either move the activity or conduct further investigations. If an archaeological resource is present at a location and cannot be avoided, BOEM requires consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office to develop mitigation measures (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012b).

Permitting Gas Hydrate Mining

Gas hydrate mining in the MSP Study Area is unlikely to occur, as the average saturation level is low and other areas have more significant resources. Gas hydrates are also unlikely to occur within state waters. In addition, there is a ban in place preventing offshore oil and gas drilling in federal waters off the coast of Washington.

It is unclear at the time of writing exactly what the permitting and leasing procedures would be for gas hydrate mining in the MSP Study Area. If this were to happen in state waters, DNR would need to authorize the activity and would likely charge a royalty. Ecology would likely require a 401 Water Quality Certification, a Coastal Zone Management Act consistency determination, and review any relevant local permits that may apply under the local SMP. Federal leasing and permitting of commercial production of gas from gas hydrates would likely be handled under BOEM through the same process currently used for production of conventional oil and gas from the OCS.

Future Trends and Factors

High concentrations of gas hydrates in sand are currently the primary targets for exploration, as conventional oil and gas technology favors methane extraction from sand-dominated reservoirs. In addition, gas hydrates can occur at various saturation levels within marine sediments. The Gulf of Mexico, for example, has an estimated 50-90% gas hydrate saturation (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013). By comparison, the Washington coastal margin has an estimated 5% gas hydrate saturation (Hautala et al., 2014). Based on resource assessments and the status of methane hydrate research, the U.S. Department of Energy and the Consortium for Ocean Leadership identified the Gulf of Mexico and the New Jersey coastal margin as top priorities for scientific methane hydrate drilling (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013).

Production of methane from gas hydrates is currently in the development stage; no commercial operations exist. Field-scale tests for methane production from gas hydrates have been of limited duration (less than one month). A six-day offshore field test in Japan established that methane gas production is feasible. However, the methane produced was one to two orders of magnitude lower than a typical commercial rate for gas accumulation. Initial production rates are expected to be low because it may take years before a well reaches its maximum production rate. Longer tests are needed before commercial viability of this resource can be established (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013).

The United States federal government continues to provide significant investments in and coordinated research plans for assessing gas hydrates and developing production technologies (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013; National Energy Technology Laboratory, 2012). It is possible that commercial scale production of methane from gas hydrates in Alaska and offshore Japan could begin within the next 10 to 20 years (Boswell, 2009; Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013). Since conventional oil and gas equipment can be used to mine methane from gas hydrates, the roadblocks to commercial-scale production relate more to the economics of hydrate extraction (Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2013).

BOEM has produced estimates of gas hydrate resources within the Washington coastal margin. These are modeled estimates of in-place gas hydrates and do not assess technically recoverable resources (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 2012a). Although gas hydrate

volumes within the Washington margin are estimated to be quite substantial, the average gas hydrate saturation is assumed to be 5% (Hautala et al., 2014). Therefore, methane hydrate mining within the MSP Study Area is not likely to be a primary target, given the presence of methane-rich and highly concentrated sands in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic margin.

Other Mining Activities

Preliminary research was conducted to understand the potential for uranium extraction and deep seabed mineral resource mining activities with the MSP Study Area. Uranium extraction refers to the extraction of uranium from seawater for energy purposes. Deep seabed mineral resource mining is the mining of polymetallic nodules, ferromanganese crusts, and massive sulfides from the seafloor. Literature and other resources indicated that uranium extraction and deep seabed mineral mining activities are generally in the early stages of development and are not targeting Washington waters (International Seabed Authority, 2014; G. Gill, personal communication, November 20th, 2014). As a result, we determined that these potential activities are highly unlikely to occur in the MSP Study Area in the near future, and therefore are not described further within the Marine Spatial Plan.

References

Laws [Source type 5]

- National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470w
Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000 United States Code (U.S.C.) Title 30, Chapter 32, Sections 2001-2006. [Source type 5].
Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 79A.05.630. [Source type 5].
National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. 16 U.S.C. 470 et seq. [Source type 5].

Reports, journals, etc.

- Boswell, R. (2009). Statement of Dr. Ray Boswell, National Energy Technology Laboratory before the Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, U.S. House of Representatives. Retrieved from <http://www.energy.gov/fe/articles/status-doe-research-efforts-gas-hydrates> [Source type 11].
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2012a). *Assessment of in-place gas hydrate resources of the lower 48 United States outer continental shelf* (BOEM Fact Sheet RED-2012-01). Bureau of Ocean Energy Management [Source type 11].
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2012b). *Outer continental shelf oil and gas leasing program: 2012-2017 final programmatic environmental impact statement*. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved from http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/BOEM/Oil_and_Gas_Energy_Program/Leasing/Five_Year_Program/2012-2017_Five_Year_Program/2012-2017_Final_PEIS.pdf [Source type 4].
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (2017). *Marine Minerals Program fact sheet* (Fact Sheet). Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved from <https://www.boem.gov/MMP-General-Fact-Sheet/> [Source type 11].
- Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. (n.d.). Obtaining marine minerals. Retrieved April 4, 2017, from <https://www.boem.gov/Obtaining-Marine-Minerals/> [Source type 11].
- California Coastal Commission. (2013). *Staff report: Federal consistency determination for EPA general National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for offshore oil and gas* (Consistency Determination No. CD-001-13). California Coastal Commission. [Source type 11].
- Collett, T., Bahk, J.-J., Baker, R., Boswell, R., Divins, D., Frye, M., ... Torres, M. (2015). Methane hydrates in nature- current knowledge and challenges. *Journal of Chemical & Engineering Data*, 60, 319–329.
- Consortium for Ocean Leadership. (2013). *Marine methane hydrate field research plan* (Topical report, Award No. DE-FE0010195). Washington D.C.: Prepared for the United States Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory. Retrieved from http://oceanleadership.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/MH_Science_Plan_Final.pdf [Source type 11].

- Dredged Material Management Office. (2013). *Dredged material evaluation and disposal procedures user manual*. Seattle, WA: Dredged Material Management Office, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District. Retrieved from <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/civilworks/dredging/UM%202013/UM%20Final%20131118.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Hautala, S. L., Solomon, E. A., Johnson, H. P., Harris, R. N., & Miller, U. K. (2014). Contemporary ocean warming dissociates Cascadia margin gas hydrates. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *41*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014GL061606> [Source type 1].
- International Seabed Authority. (2014). Retrieved January 15, 2015, from <http://www.isa.org.jm/>
- Johnson, H. P., Solomon, E. A., Harris, R., Salmi, M., & Berg, R. (2014). A geophysical and hydrogeochemical survey of the Cascadia subduction zone. *GeoPRISMS Newsletter*, (32 [Source type 1].).
- Michel, J., Bejarano, A. C., Peterson, C. H., & Voss, C. (2013). *Review of biological and biophysical impacts from dredging and handling of offshore sand* (OCS Study BOEM 2013-0119). Herndon, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Retrieved from <http://www.boem.gov/Non-Energy-Minerals/Marine-Mineral-Studies.aspx> [Source type 11].
- Michel, J., Watts, G., Nairn, R., Kenny, T., Maravan, F., Pearson, C., & Faught, M. (2004). *Archaeological damage from offshore dredging: recommendations for pre-operational surveys and mitigation during dredging to avoid adverse impacts* (OCS Study MMS 2004-005). Herndon, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service. Retrieved from <http://www.boem.gov/Non-Energy-Minerals/2004-005.aspx> [Source type 11].
- National Energy Technology Laboratory. (2012). DOE's FY2012 gas hydrate program continues focus on resource and environmental issues. *Fire-In-The-Ice Methane Hydrate Newsletter, National Energy Technology Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy*, *12*(2), 18–21. [Source type 11].
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. (2013). *Effects of oil and gas activities in the Arctic Ocean supplemental draft environmental impact statement*. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved from http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/eis/arctic_sdeis.pdf [Source type 11].
- Office of Ocean Exploration and Research. (2010). Types of offshore oil and gas structures. Retrieved December 9, 2014, from http://oceanexplorer.noaa.gov/explorations/06mexico/background/oil/media/types_600.html [Source type 11].
- Office of the Governor. (2006). *Washington's Ocean Action Plan: Enhancing management of Washington State's ocean and outer coasts. Volume 2: Final report of the Washington State Ocean Policy Work Group*. Olympia, WA: Office of the Governor. [Source type 11].
- Peduzzi, P. (2014, March). Sand, rarer than one thinks. Retrieved November 13, 2014, from https://na.unep.net/geas/getUNEPPageWithArticleIDScript.php?article_id=110 [Source type 11].
- Ruppel, C., & Noserale, D. (2012). Gas hydrates and climate warming: Why a methane catastrophe is unlikely. *United States Geological Service*. Retrieved from http://www.usgs.gov/blogs/features/usgs_science_pick/gas-hydrates-and-climate-warming/ [Source type 11].

- Salmi, M., Johnson, H. P., Leifer, I., & Keister, J. E. (2011). Behavior of methane seep bubbles over a pockmark on the Cascadia continental margin. *Geosphere*, 7(6), 1273–1283. <https://doi.org/10.1130/GES00648.1> [Source type 1].
- Tomlinson, B. N., Petterson, J. S., Glazier, E. W., Lewis, J., Selby, I., Nairn, R., ... Cooke, R. L. (2007). *Investigation of dredging impacts on commercial and recreational fisheries and analysis of available mitigation measures to protect and preserve resources* (OCS Report MMS 2006-0065). Herndon, VA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service. Retrieved from <http://www.boem.gov/Non-Energy-Minerals/2006-065.aspx> [Source type 11].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2009). *Final environmental assessment. Shoalwater Bay shoreline erosion, Washington*. Seattle, WA: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District. Retrieved from <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/civilworks/projects/Shoalwater%20Bay%20FINAL%20EA%20July%202009.pdf> [Source type 11].
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. (2014). *Grays Harbor, Washington navigation improvement project general investigation feasibility study Final limited reevaluation report, Appendix C: Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement*. Seattle, WA: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District. Retrieved from <http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/Portals/27/docs/Navigation/GHNIPAppendixCSEIS.pdf> [Source type 4].

2.11 Climate Change

Climate change is a global phenomenon that will impact the MSP Study Area in a variety of ways. While future effects can be projected based on the best available science, the precise magnitude, duration, and frequency of those effects are not certain. In the MSP Study Area, current and potential uses, coastal populations, habitats, and wildlife are likely to experience changes. This section provides information on the potential impacts of global climate change on the MSP Study Area. Scientific research into the effects of climate change continues to provide improved information on what can be expected. However, real-life impacts will depend on how significant the changes in conditions are, the degree of vulnerability of resources and their responses to those changes, and the effects of any cumulative impacts.

Climate change modeling provides projections based on varied scenarios that lead to a range of results. These ranges of projected impacts can be used for planning purposes. This section provides a review of potential impacts of climate change informed by projections from climate change models. However, both the models and expected impacts may shift as our understanding of the issue becomes more refined. More detailed information and in-depth analysis can be found in many scientific reports. Climate change has the potential to greatly alter the physical, ecological, economic, and social environment of the MSP Study Area and should be considered with any potential new uses of the area.

Summary of Climate Change

Climate change can be defined as any substantial change in a component of climate, such as temperature or precipitation, which lasts for decades or longer. Historically, this change has been attributed to natural factors, but the rapid changes being observed now are primarily the result of human activities (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a). Shifting climate has the potential to drive significant changes in the air, land, and sea that will in turn influence the human and ecological communities that rely on them. This section includes an explanation of the forces driving global climate changes, as well as the range of impacts that are projected to result in the MSP Study Area.

Greenhouse Gases

The primary driver of human-caused climate change is the addition of significant amounts of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere by processes such as the burning of fossil fuels for electricity generation and transportation (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a). The major greenhouse gases are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and fluorinated gases¹ (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a). They are called greenhouse gases because they trap heat in the lower part of the atmosphere, and as the volume of gases increases, so does the amount of heat trapped. The extra heat trapped in the atmosphere leads to higher air temperatures near the surface of the Earth, higher water temperatures in the oceans, and altered weather patterns. Humans have added significant quantities of greenhouse gases to

¹ Fluorinated gases are gases that contain fluorine including hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a).

the atmosphere by burning fossil fuels and clearing forests (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a).

Many of the major greenhouse gases can remain in the atmosphere for tens to thousands of years after being released. Some substances have shorter atmospheric lifetimes but still affect the climate. Carbon dioxide is not destroyed over time, but rather moves between the atmosphere, ocean, and land. Therefore, some CO₂ may remain in the atmosphere for thousands of years while some is absorbed quickly into the ocean. Greenhouse gases all mix together in the lower part of the atmosphere and are distributed globally so that concentrations of the gases are similar across the planet. The resulting climate change impacts from these greenhouse gases are also global. One exception to this is in areas that are large sources or sinks of a specific gas, where the concentration varies from the global concentration (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a).

Climate Change Impacts

Increases in greenhouse gas emissions and the resulting climate change have already impacted atmospheric conditions and are projected to continue to do so. Some of these impacts are discussed below including changes in air temperature, precipitation, and air circulation patterns.

Air temperature

The annual mean temperature in the Pacific Northwest (PNW) increased by 1.3°F between 1895 and 2011. During the same time period, the frost-free season lengthened by 35 days (±6 days) (Snover, Mauger, Whitely Binder, Krosby, & Tohver, 2013). Scientists project the annual average temperature in the PNW to rise by 5.8°F by the 2050s for a high greenhouse gas emissions scenario when compared to the average temperature from 1950-1999. Extreme heat events are projected to become more frequent while extreme cold events become less frequent (Snover et al., 2013).

Precipitation

There has been no long-term trend of wetter or drier conditions in Pacific Northwest precipitation from 1895-2011 (Snover et al., 2013). In the PNW, annual precipitation is projected to have relatively small changes, with models projecting a change of -4% to +14% during the 2050s as compared to the average for 1950-1999 (Snover et al., 2013). Projections for seasonal changes are also mixed, with most models projecting drier summers and a majority of models projecting increases in precipitation for the rest of the year (Snover et al., 2013). Scientists project an increase in the number of heavy rainfall events (Snover et al., 2013) and less snow accumulation (Climate Impacts Group, 2009).

El Niño-Southern Oscillation and Pacific Decadal Oscillation

Two important climate patterns that impact climate variability along the Pacific Coast of Washington are the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO). More detail on ENSO and PDO is available in Section 2.1: Ecology of Washington's Pacific Coast. Although ENSO and PDO are unique from the climate change discussed in this section, they affect similar components of the climate system. Both ENSO and PDO alter regional surface winds, air temperatures, and precipitation and are distinguished by warm and

cold phases. A typical ENSO event will last for 6-18 months and a typical PDO event will last for 20-30 years (Moore, Mantua, Hickey, & Trainer, 2010). It can be challenging to distinguish between long-term climate change trends and climate cycles like these that occur on annual to decadal time scales. It is still unclear what impacts climate change will have on ENSO and PDO, and whether it will force changes in either frequency or intensity (I. M. Miller, Shishido, Antrim, & Bowlby, 2013; Vecchi & Wittenberg, 2010).

Ocean and Coastal Impacts

Climate change resulting from human-related increases in greenhouse gases influences many components of marine ecosystems. Increased CO₂ in the atmosphere directly causes increases in ocean temperatures and acidity (Doney et al., 2012). Increases in ocean temperatures drive additional changes including rising sea level, increased ocean stratification, decreases in sea-ice extent, and altered patterns of ocean circulation, precipitation, and freshwater input (Doney et al., 2012). Ocean warming and changes in circulation also lead to reduced subsurface oxygen (O₂) concentrations (Doney et al., 2012). Projected changes in ocean temperatures, dissolved oxygen, sea level rise, flooding, erosion, storms, ocean acidification, and harmful algal blooms are briefly discussed in this section.

Ocean temperatures

Ocean temperature can be broken down into two categories: sea surface temperature and ocean heat content. Water has a higher heat capacity than air, therefore the ocean can absorb large amounts of heat with only a slight increase in temperature. The ocean has not warmed as much as the atmosphere, even though the ocean has absorbed a majority of the Earth's extra heat (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a). The ocean has absorbed approximately 80% of the heat in the climate system associated with greenhouse gas emissions during the last fifty years (P. W. Mote, Petersen, Reeder, Shipman, & Whitely Binder, 2008). The upper layer of the ocean is generally expected to absorb heat most rapidly and warm the fastest due to its proximity to the atmosphere. It will take longer, likely centuries, for the deep ocean to warm as global circulation patterns mix the warmer surface water with the deeper colder water (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

Global sea surface temperature has increased at an average rate of 0.13°F per decade between 1901 and 2015 (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a). Mote and Salathe (2010) projected sea surface temperature increases of about 2.2°F for the coast of the Pacific Northwest in 2030-2059 compared to the 1970-1999 average annual cycle.

Changes in ocean temperature influence sea level because water expands slightly as it warms, in a process known as thermal expansion. The heat in ocean surface waters also provides energy for storms, influences weather patterns, and can change ocean currents (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a). Increases in sea surface temperature and the resulting changes in ocean circulation patterns can affect which species are present in marine ecosystems, alter migration and breeding patterns, threaten corals, and change the frequency and intensity of harmful algal blooms (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a).

Increasing sea surface temperatures could weaken the circulation patterns responsible for the upwelling of water and nutrients from the deep sea to surface waters. In turn, this may contribute to declines in fish populations which may ultimately lead to decreases in seafood

supply and jobs within the fishing industry (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a). Effects on local species are discussed in the below section on environmental impacts.

Another driver of sea surface temperature change in the MSP Study Area has been the Blob (a.k.a. North Pacific Mode or marine heat wave). In 2013-2015, the Blob resulted in surface waters 1.8°-7.2°F warmer than usual off the West Coast (Kintisch, 2015). During this time, scientists documented a decrease in copepod populations off the Oregon coast, thousands of seabird deaths, and the starvation of thousands of sea lions in California, all potentially associated with the Blob (Di Lorenzo & Mantua, 2016; Kintisch, 2015). The Blob is believed to result from natural variability and not human-caused climate change. However, the high-pressure atmospheric ridge that produced the Blob may be more likely to occur under future climate conditions, and the associated ecological effects from the Blob may provide a preview of potential future impacts from climate change (Kintisch, 2015).

Hypoxia and anoxia

Changes in climate are expected to impact the concentration of dissolved oxygen in the ocean. Hypoxia is a state of low dissolved oxygen concentrations that causes stress to aquatic animals, and anoxia occurs when there is no dissolved oxygen in water. Hypoxia is associated with large-scale ocean circulation and productivity as well as local upwelling. In the MSP Study Area, upwelling of water that is low in dissolved oxygen and high in nutrients promotes increased primary productivity. Large phytoplankton blooms in turn support the food web, leading to increased waste products. As waste products sink through the water, they are broken down by bacteria. These bacteria respire and use dissolved oxygen in the process, further decreasing the amount of dissolved oxygen available in the water (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

The Washington coast regularly experiences a seasonal cycle of dissolved oxygen concentrations. In the winter, waters at depth have relatively high dissolved oxygen concentrations due to decreased biological productivity and increased frequency of storms that produce winds favorable to downwelling. In the summer, waters at depth have decreased dissolved oxygen levels that often reach hypoxic levels. This is due to prevailing winds that are favorable to upwelling as well as high biological productivity. Increases in the severity and frequency of hypoxia are projected to reduce species diversity, decrease organism size, and decrease the efficiency of energy transfer between trophic levels (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

Global climate models project that dissolved oxygen concentrations in the ocean will decline. As ocean temperatures increase, the solubility of oxygen will decrease. The stratification of the ocean will increase as a result of increased sea surface temperatures or decreased salinity (due to increasing freshwater input). The combination of these factors will reduce dissolved oxygen concentrations in subsurface waters as the deeper, denser water is less apt to mix with surface waters and experiences longer periods of respiration at depth (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

Sea level rise and flooding

Sea level and the temperature of the Earth are connected in multiple ways. As discussed above, when water warms it expands slightly. This becomes significant when measured over the entire depth of the oceans. Additionally, the volume of the water in the oceans can change based on changes in the volume of water and ice on land. As glaciers and ice sheets melt due to increasing temperatures, the volume of water in the oceans will increase. Sea level rise is a threat to coastal communities through shoreline erosion, contributions to coastal flooding, and inundation of low-lying land. Higher sea levels can also threaten coastal infrastructure, as higher storm surges increase the likelihood of flooding (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a).

Since 1993, global average sea level has risen at a rate of 0.11 to 0.14 inches per year (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016a). Global average sea level is projected to increase by 11 to 38 inches by 2100 compared to the average level for 1986-2005 (Snover et al., 2013).

Although global sea levels are rising and predicted to continue to do so, there are local and regional factors that influence the amount of sea level rise that is predicted for the MSP Study Area. This variability in sea level rise is greatly influenced by the fact that the Northwest is a geologically active area with an active subduction zone. The subduction of the Juan de Fuca Plate beneath the North American Plate forces vertical land motion that can either increase or decrease the overall rate of regional sea level rise (Dalton, Mote, & Snover, 2013; I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

Absolute sea level change refers to the change in the height of the ocean surface regardless of nearby land motion. Relative sea level change is measured in reference to land elevation, which may have risen or fallen (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2016b). On the Olympic Peninsula, the northwest coast has experienced vertical uplift at the same rate as sea level rise, and there is the potential for a net decrease in local observed sea level.² In other locations, subsidence of land may contribute to higher relative sea level rise (Dalton et al., 2013).

Changing wind stress patterns may also impact sea level rise along the coast.³ Since approximately 1980, the North Pacific has been experiencing PDO warm phase conditions. The associated predominant wind stress patterns have regionally moderated sea level rise trends that were otherwise seen globally. If there is a shift to PDO cold phase conditions, there may be higher rates of sea level rise along the West Coast (Dalton et al., 2013).

A number of coastal impacts can result from sea level rise and affect the MSP Study Area. Some low-lying areas will become permanently inundated depending on shoreline characteristics and the rate of sea level rise. Higher sea level may exacerbate flooding of coastal rivers. Both the extent and depth of flood waters may increase, as it will be harder for flood waters in rivers to drain into the ocean. High river flows are also expected to increase in size and frequency due to climate change. Similarly, high tide and storm surge events will be amplified as sea level increases. This in turn will expose more areas to erosion and potentially threaten coastal infrastructure (Snover et al., 2013).

Storms and erosion

Scientists project storms to increase in both intensity and frequency on a global scale as a result of climate change. Storms can directly impact the coast of the MSP Study Area, but even storms that are further offshore can still impact the area by increasing wave heights and causing changes in wave direction. These can cause erosion or redistribute sediment, which alters shallow marine and intertidal habitats (I. M. Miller et al., 2013). Global climate models project that storm tracks in the PNW will drive northward over time and there will be an increase in the intensity of the precipitation associated with these storms. Other associated impacts are likely to include increasing wave heights and the potential for large storm surges which could increase coastal erosion (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

² For the NW Olympic Peninsula coast, projected sea level rise ranges from -5" to 14" by 2050 and -9" to 35" by 2100. For the central and southern coast, projected sea level rise ranges from 1" to 18" by 2050 and 2" to 43" by 2100 (P. W. Mote, Petersen, Reeder, Shipman, & Whitely Binder, 2008).

³ Changes in atmospheric circulation can result in changes to wind stress.

Overall, the erosion along the beaches in southwest Washington is influenced by reduced sediment supply, gradual sea level rise, and a northward shift in Pacific winter storm tracks. The sandy ocean beaches and dunes are shaped by a high-energy system with waves that shift seasonally in both energy and direction. Beach erosion occurs when large waves meet the beach at a steeper angle from the south. This is enhanced during El Niño conditions when sea level is higher in the winter. As climate change continues to shift conditions, it is likely that these erosion events will continue or increase due to increasing sea level rise and winter storms. In addition to the erosion occurring, sediment supply to the coast has been reduced due to the construction of mainstem dams on the Columbia River, limiting the sediment available to replenish beaches. Washington's Pacific coast has several areas of high erosion, including Washaway Beach which has the fastest erosion rate on the Pacific coast. On average, Washaway Beach has been losing 65 ft. of beach annually since the 1880s (Climate Impacts Group, 2009).⁴

Ocean acidification

Ocean acidification is a reduction in the pH of the ocean for an extended period of time that is primarily caused by the uptake of carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the atmosphere. The ocean absorbs approximately one-third of atmospheric CO₂ generated through human activities (Chan et al., 2016). Additional sources driving acidification in Washington include upwelling, hypoxia, and local input of nutrients, nitrogen oxides, and sulfur oxide gases. Since the mid-1700s, open ocean surface waters have become approximately 30% more acidic (Chan et al., 2016; R. Feely, Klinger, Newton, & Chadsey, 2012). By 2100, Washington's coastal waters are projected to increase in acidity by 38% to 109% compared to the average level from 1986-2005 (Snover et al., 2013). This correlates to an increase of roughly 150% to 200% when compared to pre-industrial levels (Snover et al., 2013).

As ocean water becomes more acidic, the concentration of carbonate ion (CO₃²⁻) decreases. Carbonate ions are required by many marine animals and some plants to build shells, skeletons, and other hard parts formed with calcium carbonate. Calcium carbonate, usually in the form of calcite or aragonite, is also susceptible to acidification as the water becomes more chemically corrosive (R. A. Feely, Doney, & Cooley, 2009; Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012). Aragonite is about twice as susceptible to dissolution as calcite (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012). Pteropods, corals, and most larval bivalves use aragonite to build their shells, making them vulnerable to negative impacts from ocean acidification. In the northeast Pacific Ocean, aragonite-corrosive conditions are expanding much more rapidly than calcite-corrosive conditions (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012).

Scientists predict ocean acidification will have a significant impact on shellfish populations. By 2100, ocean acidification is projected to reduce the rate at which mollusks form shells by 40% globally (Kroeker et al., 2013). It is also projected to cause a 17% decline in growth and a 34% decline in survival for mollusks (Kroeker et al., 2013). In general, scientific studies have found that heavily calcified organisms including calcified algae, corals, mollusks, and the larval stages of echinoderms are the most negatively impacted by ocean acidification (Kroeker et al., 2013).

⁴ Attempts to mitigate erosion at Washaway Beach are discussed in Section 2.10.3: Dredging and Dredged Material Disposal.

Organisms that are not impacted by reduced calcification are still experiencing other negative consequences from ocean acidification. Some species experience decreased growth, reproductive issues, behavioral changes, and increased mortality. These negative impacts are felt throughout the ecosystem as these species normally provide habitat, shelter, and food for other organisms (Chan et al., 2016; Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012). One example is the food web effects that may result from impacts to pteropods. In some locations, more than 50% of the population of these planktonic marine snails are showing signs of shell dissolution (Bednarsek et al., 2014; Chan et al., 2016). Many West Coast fisheries species like herring, mackerel, and salmon rely on pteropods as an important food source and are therefore indirectly vulnerable to ocean acidification (Chan et al., 2016).

While the direct effects on finfish in Washington may be unknown, studies elsewhere have shown that some fish are susceptible to increasing acidification of ocean conditions. Fish have been found to experience impacts on their otoliths, bony structures that they use to sense orientation and acceleration. Fish grown in seawater with high levels of CO₂ had significantly larger otoliths than fish grown in present-day conditions (Checkley Jr. et al., 2009).

While ocean acidification due to absorption of CO₂ from the atmosphere is a global phenomenon, there are local factors that increase the occurrence of regional acidification. Upwelling, nutrient and organic carbon input from land, and absorption of other acidifying gases from the atmosphere all contribute to ocean acidification on Washington's Pacific coast (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012). Acidified waters are most prominent in the Northwest during the spring through late summer, due to upwelling of corrosive waters driven by seasonally shifting winds. The acidified waters are transported up to the continental shelf, reaching surface waters in some places, and entering the estuaries. When acidified waters enter estuaries, they can combine with inputs of nutrients and organic matter and create conditions that are even more corrosive than the waters off the coast. This acidification of coastal waters, especially within the estuaries, is a threat to shellfish aquaculture in the region (Dalton et al., 2013).

Harmful algal blooms

Harmful algal blooms (HABs) are blooms of algae that can produce natural toxins that cause illness or death in humans and other animals. The algae can become concentrated in the flesh of filter feeding shellfish and fish. Human and animal exposure may occur through consumption of contaminated fish and shellfish, inhalation, or skin contact with contaminated water. Two of the main HABs of concern in Washington are paralytic shellfish poisoning (PSP) caused by dinoflagellates in the genus *Alexandrium*, and amnesiac shellfish poisoning caused by domoic acid created by diatoms in the genus *Pseudo-nitzschia* (Climate Impacts Group, 2009; Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015).

HABs on the Washington coast are considered a natural event. However, HAB magnitude, frequency, and duration are influenced by climate change through sea surface temperature and upwelling. In general, phytoplankton growth is determined by temperature, light, and the availability of nutrients. However, all HAB species will not respond in the same way to shifts in climate change factors. Marine HAB dinoflagellates are expected to have an advantage as climate changes, because they are able to swim and therefore reach nutrients in the deeper parts of the water column that other phytoplankton cannot reach (Climate Impacts Group, 2009).

Over the last 30 years, the frequency and distribution of HABs has increased. There has also been a resulting increase in human illness due to algal sources (Climate Impacts Group, 2009). The high sea surface temperatures associated with The Blob in 2015 resulted in the largest HAB ever recorded, which stretched from southern California to southeast Alaska. The HAB caused shellfish fishery closures due to contaminated shellfish in Washington, Oregon, and California and had significant socio-economic consequences (Di Lorenzo & Mantua, 2016; Gentemann, Fewings, & Garcia-Reyes, 2017). There were also significant delays to the opening of the commercial and recreational crab fishing season along the West Coast (Gentemann et al., 2017). The HABs associated with The Blob may be a precursor of the impacts due to climate change. The rising air and sea surface temperatures that are predicted with climate change may promote earlier and longer lasting HABs.

In addition to increasing temperatures, HABs may be influenced by wind-driven upwelling and nutrients supplied by land runoff. Runoff into coastal estuaries may shift due to changes in the timing of snowmelt and freshwater inputs (Climate Impacts Group, 2009). HABs in the MSP Study Area are also related to the Juan de Fuca Eddy. The eddy serves as a source of toxic cells and blooms that can be transported to Washington's coastal waters by currents, winds, and shifts in upwelling and downwelling trends (Trainer et al., 2009; Trainer, Hickey, & Horner, 2002). Climate change impacts on factors including winds can impact the frequency or transport of blooms from the eddy to the coastal waters of the MSP Study Area.

Ecological Impacts

While it is challenging to project the responses of different species to the effects of climate change, certain types of responses are expected to occur. The physical and chemical changes in the ocean that result from climate change have a strong impact on the physiology and behavior of marine organisms. These effects are both direct and indirect and can also drive population- and community-level changes that alter the structure and functions of an ecosystem (Doney et al., 2012). Changes in the environment due to climate change could alter the structure and relationships between predators, prey, parasites, and competitors in a community, and therefore impact the productivity of the community (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

Another result of changes to the physical environment may be changes in the phenology of organisms. Changes to the physical environment may drive changes to the seasonal timing of certain phases of organisms' life cycles (I. M. Miller et al., 2013; Poloczanska et al., 2016). These shifts in life cycles will not only impact the organisms themselves, but may alter predator and prey relationships and lead to larger changes at the ecosystem scale (Brander, 2010). Scientists have already documented shifts in timing of phytoplankton blooms, which can impact organisms up the food web (Edwards & Richardson, 2004). Organisms at higher trophic levels, such as migrating juvenile salmon, are highly dependent on phytoplankton blooms and often rely on them during certain stages in their life cycle (Doney et al., 2012).

These changes in timing have previously caused negative impacts in the MSP Study Area. In 2005, a delay in the start of upwelling in the PNW caused a delay in phytoplankton production (Schwing et al., 2006). Associated impacts were low survival of some salmon species, recruitment failure of many rockfish species, and nesting failure and mortality in seabirds (Peterson & Schwing, 2008). Intertidal invertebrates like barnacles and mussels also showed unprecedented low recruitment during the early upwelling season, which could have consequences for predators higher in the food web (Barth et al., 2007).

Species shift the areas in which they live, also referred to as their range, as climate and local conditions change (Pinsky, Worm, Fogarty, Sarmiento, & Levin, 2013; Poloczanska et al., 2016). If conditions become too extreme, some species will be able to shift to locations with more favorable conditions. Studies have documented shifts in species ranges due to changes in temperature. Fish species have been documented to respond to warming ocean temperatures by moving north to cooler waters or moving to deeper waters (Perry, Low, Ellis, & Reynolds, 2005). During the warm waters conditions associated with the Blob in 2013-2014, dramatic range shifts of a variety of fish species were reported off the West Coast, Alaska, and British Columbia. This included unusual distributions of juvenile salmon in Alaska and more northerly sockeye returns in BC (Bond, Cronin, Freeland, & Mantua, 2015). As a result of shifting ranges, some non-native species may move into new territories as they respond to changing conditions. These non-native species have the potential to cause significant impacts through ecological impacts to the food web (I. M. Miller et al., 2013; Poloczanska et al., 2016).

While the same basic climate forces will be changing everywhere in the MSP Study Area and adjacent areas, each region will respond differently. The substrate, slope, and surrounding conditions will influence the impacts of climate change. Changes in climate will be experienced in different ways on the steep rocky shores of the coast north of Point Grenville, along the sandy beaches with shallow slopes and high energy waves south of Point Grenville, and in the estuaries, which have shallow water and protected bays and mudflats (Climate Impacts Group, 2009; Dalton et al., 2013). Some specific ecological impacts related to the various habitats of the MSP Study Area are discussed below.⁵

Pelagic habitats

Pelagic habitats and the organisms that occupy them are expected to experience changes due to climate change factors including acidification, reduced oxygen events, shifts in metabolism due to ocean temperature changes, and changes in patterns of storminess or waves (I. M. Miller et al., 2013). Increasing surface water temperatures may increase stratification in the water column and, therefore, decrease primary productivity by reducing mixing with nutrient-rich waters (King et al., 2011). However, increases in upwelling winds could increase mixing and counteract the stratification (King et al., 2011). Shifts in primary productivity related to changes in upwelling can impact the entire food web. Some plankton that need calcium carbonate to build their shells, like larval oysters and pteropods, will experience negative impacts from ocean acidification. Other plankton like euphausiids may benefit from increasing water temperatures (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

Copepod communities have also been impacted by increasing water temperatures. Cold water “northern” copepod species are lipid-rich and therefore a good food source for fish. Warm water “southern” copepod species are lipid-poor and provide a poor food source for small fish, which are then prey for juvenile salmon. As water temperatures increased on the Oregon shelf in 2015-2016, the zooplankton community was observed to be dominated by warm water copepod species (McClatchie et al., 2016). This has the potential to have a negative impact on the fish species relying on copepods for food, and further impacts on the food web.

Pelagic fish will likely be impacted by any changes in the zooplankton communities discussed above. However, the specific impacts are unclear since pelagic fish species rely on different varieties of zooplankton. It is unknown how changes in prey availability will impact

⁵ More information on the habitats discussed here are available in Section 2.1: Ecology of Washington’s Pacific Coast.

them, as some fish may benefit from the changes while others may suffer from a decrease in their food source. Most pelagic fishes do experience reductions in population due to reduced oxygen in the California Current. The cumulative impacts of potential reductions in prey and oxygen could have serious consequences for pelagic fish (I. M. Miller et al., 2013). Pelagic fish are also expected to shift their ranges in response to increasing ocean temperatures, and local fish communities will shift toward warm water species. In turn, this could lead to shifts in commercial fishery catch compositions and shifts in fishing grounds (Cheung, Brodeur, Okey, & Pauly, 2015).

Seafloor habitats

Seafloor and deep-water habitats are likely to be impacted by the changes in ocean temperature, ocean acidification, hypoxia, and surface productivity that are associated with climate change. The deep-sea corals found in the MSP Study Area may be especially impacted by changes in water temperature and acidification, as they use aragonite to form their skeletons (I. M. Miller et al., 2013; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). Any decline in the quality or extent of deep-sea coral ecosystems would have an impact on the many species of fish and invertebrates that utilize them for habitat (I. M. Miller et al., 2013; Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). The seafloor is also habitat for many shellfish species that are likely to be harmed through slower growth rates, thinner shells, and higher mortality rates caused by climate change and ocean acidification (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012). Commercially significant impacts are discussed in the fisheries section below.

Deep-water fish may suffer losses of suitable habitat and decreased populations if hypoxic or anoxic zones expand, or if the frequency of events increases (Koslow, Goericke, Lara-Lopez, & Watson, 2011). While benthic fish populations may decrease as a result of changes in primary productivity, species ranges, zooplankton community structure, acidification, and hypoxia, other organisms may experience population increases. Ecological models of food webs predict increases in biomass of benthic and pelagic invertebrates as the biomass of benthic fish decreases (Ainsworth et al., 2011). For example, modeling for cumulative impacts of fishing effects and ocean acidification impacts found declines of up to 20-80% in abundance of commercially important groundfish including English Sole, Arrowtooth Flounder, and Yellowtail Rockfish. These declines are attributed to the loss of shelled prey items from their diet as a result of ocean acidification (Kaplan, Levin, Burden, & Fulton, 2010).

Kelp forests

Kelp forests are an important biogenic habitat in the MSP Study Area and support a variety of organisms. Increasing ocean temperatures are likely to impact kelp physiology, growth, reproduction, and competitive interactions. The exact impacts depend on the timing and duration of temperature changes. Some non-native species may be able to move north into MSP Study Area waters as a result of increasing temperatures. All marine algae species may experience benefits from ocean acidification, as an increase in available CO₂ could benefit their productivity. There is even work underway in Puget Sound to study whether large, healthy kelp forests could mitigate increases in CO₂ by absorbing the extra input (Hance, 2016). However, it is unclear if the benefits of increasing CO₂ would exceed any of the consequences caused by increasing ocean temperatures (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

Increasing storm intensity has the potential to impact kelp forest habitats by shifting the availability of large hard substrates needed for attachment and by damaging seagrasses through wave action (Byrnes et al., 2011; Cavanaugh, Siegel, Reed, & Dennison, 2011; Ebeling, Laur, &

Rowley, 1985). Increases in the frequency and intensity of storms also decrease the diversity and complexity of kelp forest food webs (Byrnes et al., 2011).

Rocky shores

Climate change is likely to cause stress to intertidal organisms that have limited vertical ranges. Stresses include those from heat and exposure above, and from predators below. The suitable ranges for these organisms may get even narrower as higher air temperatures force them lower into the intertidal zone, and as some predators become able to move higher into the intertidal zone due to sea level rise (I. M. Miller et al., 2013). Intertidal organisms will also be threatened by increasing storms and wave energy, erosion, and increased sediment delivery from rivers. Ocean acidification also threatens many intertidal organisms that may have declining survival rates due to their inability to form shells. This could lead to a shift in the intertidal community structure as other organisms, like algae, can thrive with increasing CO₂ in the water (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

The ochre sea star, a keystone predator in the rocky shores, has suffered from sea star wasting disease (SSWD) in recent years. Sea stars have experienced high mortality rates, which scientists have tied to the spread of densovirus. The high rates of disease progression and mortality have been linked to warm temperature anomalies (Eisenlord et al., 2016), leading to concerns about potential recurrences due to climate change impacts.

Sandy beaches

As discussed above, sandy beaches are likely to experience many physical impacts from climate change. Sandy beaches offer habitat that supports prey for foraging birds, spawning habitat for forage fish, and haul-out areas for marine mammals. This habitat may be lost if erosion causes beach areas to coarsen and steepen due to increasing erosion, storm intensity and storm frequency (I. M. Miller et al., 2013). The impacts of storm surges and high waves on the coast will be magnified by sea level rise, and the net result of storms and sea level rise is coastline retreat (National Research Council, 2012).

Large coastal estuaries

Many of the key factors that drive the functioning of estuaries are affected by climate change. Changes in annual precipitation, sea level, winds, and seasonal runoff will all impact estuaries. Flooding, erosion, coastal inundation, and saltwater intrusion into freshwater aquifers are predicted to occur as the climate changes (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). Reductions in estuarine habitats like tidal flats, coastal wetlands, and beaches will impact associated animals like forage fish and shorebirds (Dalton et al., 2013).

Some of the plant and animal life dependent on estuaries, such as wild and farmed shellfish, will be harmed by acidifying waters. Other habitat-forming species, such as eelgrass and kelp, will potentially experience good conditions for growth such as increases in temperature and CO₂, but poor conditions related to increased storm events and changes in benthic nutrient cycling (Skewgar & Pearson, 2011). Increases in the occurrence of hypoxic or anoxic conditions in the estuaries would impact the distribution, abundance, and community composition of zooplankton. As sea level rise causes inundation, estuaries will likely experience habitat changes such as migration, loss, or expansion of certain habitats, thus impacting the overall composition of habitats within estuaries. For example, loss of intertidal habitat due to sea level rise would impact Dungeness Crab populations. Dungeness Crab rely on estuaries as nursery areas for

juveniles and foraging grounds for subadults, and are also susceptible to changes from ocean acidification and hypoxia (I. M. Miller et al., 2013).

Existing Uses

The impacts of climate change on the environment and ecological resources of the MSP Study Area are likely to affect current uses like fisheries, recreation and tourism, aquaculture, transportation, and tribal uses. The section below highlights some of the possible effects; however, projections are limited due to uncertainty about the degree of climate change expected and degree of vulnerability, as well as adaptability. For more information about these current uses please see Sections 2.4-2.7.

State and tribal fisheries

Climate change and the associated changes in oceanic conditions are potential threats to commercial, recreational, and tribal fishing in the MSP Study Area. Ocean acidification is particularly concerning for shellfish populations, such as Dungeness Crab, clams, oysters, and shrimp. As the ocean chemistry changes, shellfish experience slower growth rates, thinner shells, and higher mortality rates (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012). Shellfish have also been found to be more vulnerable when they are young. For example, in lab experiments testing more acidic ocean conditions, crab larvae experienced lower survival and slower development (J. J. Miller, Maher, Bohaboy, Friedman, & McElhany, 2016) and juvenile crab experience higher mortality (Welch, 2013). Fisheries that rely on crab, oysters, and other shellfish could potentially experience great consequences as a result of ocean acidification (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014a). The availability of these organisms for harvest may also be reduced if harmful algal blooms become more prevalent.

Ocean acidification impacts not only fisheries that rely on organisms that are directly affected, but also other organisms that are indirectly affected through the food web. For example, juvenile salmon rely on pteropods as an important source of food, and pteropods experience reduced shell-building and growth rates due to ocean acidification (Bednarsek et al., 2014; Industrial Economics Inc., 2014a; Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012). A decrease in an important food source could reduce salmon populations and, in turn, impact salmon fisheries.

Finfish fisheries are likely to experience varied seasons as ocean conditions shift, although the specific impacts are unclear at this time. As the ocean temperature rises, it will impact the distribution and availability of commercial fish species. Fish populations may shift their range due to changing temperatures and availability of prey species. Shifting population numbers and ranges can have a significant impact on the fisheries that rely on them (Taylor, Baker, Waters, Wegge, & Wellman, 2015). Research in the northeastern U.S. shows a variety of impacts of increasing ocean temperatures on fisheries in the area. Researchers found that northward shifts in species distributions were matched by corresponding northward shifts in fisheries. However, fisheries shifted only 10-30% as much as their target species. They also found that the proportion of warm-water species caught in most states also increased through time (Pinsky & Fogarty, 2012).

In the short term, travel time and costs for fishermen may increase as fishing grounds shift. In the long term, there may be increased costs and challenges for fishermen and the fishing industry, such as those associated with adapting gear and infrastructure to harvest and process new species (Pinsky & Fogarty, 2012).

Recreation and tourism

Recreation and tourism in the MSP Study Area also has the potential to be impacted by some aspects of climate change. Increasing storms and erosion are concerns for coastal locations, particularly along the southern Washington coast. Increased erosion can damage or destroy recreational facilities and areas. State parks and other recreational beaches and facilities in southwest Washington are already experiencing erosion and losses of facilities (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014b).

Another potential issue for the recreation and tourism industry could result from an increase in HABs due to climate change. Recreational shellfish fisheries have great economic benefits for coastal communities and the state (Taylor et al., 2015). Occurrences of HABs are projected to shift in frequency, intensity, and duration as a result of rising temperatures and changes in upwelling (Climate Impacts Group, 2009). An increase in HABs could lead to more closures of recreational shellfish harvesting to protect human health, resulting in negative economic consequences (Dyson & Huppert, 2010). As discussed above, in 2015 the largest HAB ever recorded caused shellfish fishery closures due to contaminated shellfish in Washington, Oregon, and California (Di Lorenzo & Mantua, 2016; Gentemann et al., 2017).

Aquaculture

Shellfish aquaculture is vulnerable to the effects of climate change in a variety of ways. Increased sea surface temperature has the potential to negatively impact shellfish growth, reproduction, distribution, and health (Climate Impacts Group, 2009). Ocean acidification is already impacting the aquaculture industry and is projected to continue to worsen. Commercial shellfish species suffer under conditions that are corrosive and decrease organisms' ability to form, build, and maintain their shells. Shellfish farmers are already experiencing increased costs as they deal with acidifying coastal waters and associated increases in larval oyster mortality (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012).

Shellfish farmers have adapted hatchery operations to try to avoid issues by monitoring water conditions and changing the time that they draw water into the hatcheries. Some have developed hatchery operations in Hawaii, where the water is less corrosive. These hatcheries raise larvae until they're big enough to tolerate the conditions in Washington (The Columbian, 2013).

Sea level rise may also negatively affect shellfish aquaculture by shifting habitat types and increasing water coverage of growing areas. This is a concern for shellfish growers, especially those that operate directly on intertidal substrate, as it may result in reduced access to shellfish beds, unless the beds move landward. If the shellfish beds remain in the same location, increased water coverage would reduce the time available for harvest as the beds would be submerged for a greater part of the day. If sea level rise causes beach profiles to shift landward, there is no guarantee that a grower will have access to the property with the preferred beach profile, as it may shift off their property or leased area. This will become a property rights issue to be addressed as sea level rise occurs and intertidal areas shift (Climate Impacts Group, 2009).

The impact of climate change on the occurrence of HABs and the relationship to shellfish is discussed above. If HAB outbreaks increase as predicted due to climate change, there is potential for commercial shellfish operations to experience more closures or restrictions to prevent human health impacts (Climate Impacts Group, 2009).

Transportation, navigation, and infrastructure

Ports and marinas will likely experience impacts to their infrastructure and operations due to sea level rise associated with climate change. Ports and marinas may need to adjust or reconstruct piers and structures to address sea level rise. Land-based port facilities may also be impacted by sea level rise and erosion, and adaptation may be required to maintain full functioning of the facilities. The transportation systems that surround and support ports may also experience negative consequences to their infrastructure that impact port operations (Climate Impacts Group, 2009). Sediment loading from upstream erosion has the potential to affect ports and marinas by restricting boat access to and from the ocean. This may be overcome with increased dredging, requiring additional effort and expenditures by the port (Industrial Economics Inc., 2014b).

Tribal uses

Projected climate change impacts discussed throughout this section threaten tribal lands, resources, economies, homelands, ceremonial sites, burial sites, traditions, and cultural practices (Dalton et al., 2013). Tribal economies, traditions, and treaties are heavily reliant on place-based natural resources, which makes them disproportionately susceptible to the negative consequences of climate change (P. Mote, 2015). Tribal members rely on the marine ecosystem of the MSP Study Area for food, employment, and cultural, social, and health benefits (Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, 2016).

Climate change impacts on the environment threaten the loss of traditional resources from historical and established fishing, gathering, and hunting areas (Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, 2016). Shifts in species distribution may move important resources to areas that where tribes no longer have access, either physically or legally (Dalton et al., 2013). Warming ocean temperatures can cause salmonids and other animals to alter their ranges, potentially shifting them out of areas available to the tribes (Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, 2016).

Climate change issues related to sea level rise, heavy rain events, and peak stream flows may potentially damage tribal infrastructure. Residences, historical sites, and community and government buildings are all vulnerable. Economic impacts could result from damage to infrastructure (Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, 2016). Some tribes may lose part of their reservations due to inundation along the coast (Dalton et al., 2013).

In a study conducted through interviews with members of three Northwest tribes (Quinault Indian Nation, Confederated Tribes of Salish and Kootenai, and Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians), Mote (2015) found that climate change may cause a shift in cultural traditions. Some aspects of tribal culture including songs, stories, prayers, and dances include natural resources that may be affected by climate changes. Additionally, the study found that seasonal changes due to climate change are impacting traditional activities as most are tied to an environmental cue rather than a specific date. A cue based on weather, plants, or animals would signal the beginning of a new season or the appropriate timing of an event or tradition. It can be challenging to rely on traditionally-held information about environmental factors that influence cultural activities as they change. However, all the tribes that participated in the study were continuing with their traditional cultural ways but had adapted with changes or alterations when necessary (P. Mote, 2015).

Tribes are engaged in climate assessments, adaptation and mitigation planning, research, monitoring, outreach, and education. Many tribes in the PNW have been engaged in or are beginning to consider climate change adaptation planning to address potential impacts on tribal

culture, resources, and economies. Tribes are also engaged in research and monitoring and often partner with universities, agencies, and other entities (Dalton et al., 2013).

Economic Impacts

The various uses of the MSP Study Area are likely to experience a range of economic impacts due to climate change. As discussed throughout this plan, the areas adjacent to the MSP Study Area receive great economic benefits from marine resources and their associated uses and industries. The combined effects of sea level rise, ocean acidification, and an increased likelihood of extreme weather events are likely to have very costly consequences for coastal systems and communities. Communities that are highly dependent on marine resources, like those adjacent to the MSP Study Area, are going to be challenged to adapt to a changing climate (Dalton et al., 2013). It is complex to consider quantifying the economic impacts of climate change in and adjacent to the MSP Study Area. A few examples of potential economic impacts are included in this section.

Coastal uses that rely on shellfish populations are especially vulnerable to climate change, particularly the impacts of ocean acidification. Washington is the country's leading producer of farmed oysters, clams, and mussels with total annual farmed shellfish sales of over \$107 million. Shellfish growers in Washington directly or indirectly employ more than 3,200 people (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012). One grower has moved hatchery operations to Hawaii to avoid the impacts of ocean acidification on oyster larvae. The associated costs are obviously great and not all growers will have the means to relocate hatcheries. Growers that do not own a hatchery but instead purchase oyster spat will still likely face increased costs passed down from hatchery owners (Taylor et al., 2015).

Shellfish growers may also experience economic impacts as a result of sea level rise. As discussed above, additional water coverage of growing areas will decrease available harvest time and reduce workdays for growers (Taylor et al., 2015). In addition to the aquaculture industry, ocean acidification threatens recreational shellfish harvesting and the economic benefits it brings to coastal communities. Recreational clam and oyster harvests account for \$27 million in annual impacts to coastal economies as well as \$3 million in state revenue from licensing (Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, 2012).

Increasing HABs will likely lead to an increase in recreational and commercial shellfish fishery closures. This would reduce or eliminate related visitor spending during the closures. Dyson and Huppert (2010) conducted a study to measure changes in the local economy of Pacific and Grays Harbor Counties due to reduced visitor expenditures during recreational shellfish fishery closures due to HABs. They found a single beach closure for an average opening (typically 2-5 days) of all beaches to be associated with an expenditure reduction of \$4 million dollars (2008 dollars). The authors found a whole season closure (October through April) to be associated with an expenditure reduction of \$20.4 million dollars (2008 dollars) (Dyson & Huppert, 2010). The impacts of a HAB closure may be more complex than this, as tourists may shift their vacation to a different coastal community or alter their spending in other ways. However, this does indicate that HABs could have a significant economic impact on coastal communities (Dyson & Huppert, 2010).

Commercial and recreational fisheries are also predicted to experience economic consequences due to climate change. However, the specific effects are challenging to assess as different species will vary in their responses to climate change with changes in distribution,

abundance, and productivity. This will in turn impact the level, composition, and value of landings (Dalton et al., 2013). Shellfish, such as Dungeness Crab and Pink Shrimp, are expected to be affected by ocean acidification. Dungeness Crab is one of the main commercial fisheries in Washington, providing the highest ex-vessel value per weight landed, so the economic impacts could be severe. A study of the impacts of ocean acidification on California Current fisheries projects that Dungeness Crab will suffer a 30% decline in biomass and catch by the year 2063 (Marshall et al., 2017). Salmon fisheries could also be impacted as water temperatures increase and become inhospitable to species that prefer cooler water (Taylor et al., 2015).

Summary

Climate change and the resulting shifts in oceanic and atmospheric conditions are likely to have widespread impacts on the MSP Study Area. Scientists predict that climate change will bring changes in air temperature, precipitation, water temperature, sea level, ocean pH, storminess, harmful algal blooms, and hypoxia. However, it becomes more challenging to accurately predict the magnitude of the impacts as it depends on the interplay of many different factors. Interactions between these stressors and their cumulative impacts add to the complexity of understanding and adapting to climate change. The physical environment, plant and animal life, human communities, economies, and existing uses of the MSP Study Area are all likely to experience changes as climate shifts.

As climate change continues and the impacts are felt throughout the MSP Study Area and beyond, demand for the new ocean uses addressed in this MSP may be affected. New uses may be seen as a way to offset the impacts of climate change. Offshore renewable energy could be one method of meeting increasing energy demands while decreasing emissions of greenhouse gases. Offshore aquaculture may be used to address climate change impacts on shore-based aquaculture. Dredge disposal and sand and gravel mining may be used to address erosion issues along the shoreline through beach restoration. The effects of climate change on the ecological and human communities and existing uses of the MSP Study Area will need to be considered and addressed as any new uses for the area are considered.

References

- Ainsworth, C. H., Samhuri, J. F., Busch, D. S., Cheung, W. W. L., Dunne, J., & Okey, T. A. (2011). Potential impacts of climate change on Northeast Pacific marine foodwebs and fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 68(6), 1217–1229.
- Barth, J. A., Menge, B. A., Lubchenco, J., Chan, F., Bane, J. M., Kirincich, A. R., ... Washburn, L. (2007). Delayed upwelling alters nearshore coastal ocean ecosystems in the northern California current. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(10), 3719–3724.
- Bednarsek, N., Feely, R. A., Reum, J. C. P., Peterson, B., Menkel, J., Alin, S. R., & Hales, B. (2014). *Limacina helicina* shell dissolution as an indicator of declining habitat suitability due to ocean acidification in the California Current Ecosystem. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 281(1785). Retrieved from <http://rspb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/281/1785/20140123.short> [Source type 1].
- Bond, N. A., Cronin, M. F., Freeland, H., & Mantua, N. (2015). Causes and impacts of the 2014 warm anomaly in the NE Pacific. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *accepted manuscript*. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1002/2015GL063083>. [Source type 1]
- Brander, K. (2010). Impacts of climate change on fisheries. *Journal of Marine Systems*, 79, 389–402.
- Byrnes, J. E., Reed, D. C., Cardinale, B. J., Cavanaugh, K. C., Holbrook, S. J., & Schmitt, R. J. (2011). Climate-driven increases in storm frequency simplify kelp forest food webs. *Global Change Biology*, 17, 2513–2524.
- Cavanaugh, K. C., Siegel, D. A., Reed, D. C., & Dennison, P. E. (2011). Environmental controls of giant-kelp biomass in the Santa Barbara Channel, California. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 429, 1–17.
- Chan, F., Boehm, A. B., Barth, J. A., Chornesky, E. A., Dickson, A. G., Feely, R. A., ... Whiteman, E. A. (2016). *The West Coast Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Science Panel: Major findings, recommendations, and actions*. Oakland, CA: California Ocean Science Trust [Source type 11].
- Checkley Jr., D. M., Dickson, A. G., Takahashi, M., Radich, J. A., Eisenkolb, N., & Asch, R. (2009). Elevated CO₂ enhances otolith growth in young fish. *Science*, 324(5935), 1683.
- Cheung, W. W. L., Brodeur, R. D., Okey, T. A., & Pauly, D. (2015). Projecting future changes in distributions of pelagic fish species of Northeast Pacific shelf seas. *Progress in Oceanography*, 130, 19–31.
- Climate Impacts Group. (2009). *The Washington climate change impacts assessment*. Seattle, WA: Center for Science in the Earth System, Joint Institute for the Study of the Atmosphere and Oceans, University of Washington. Retrieved from <http://www.cses.washington.edu/db/pdf/wacciareport681.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Dalton, M. M., Mote, P. W., & Snover, A. K. (Eds.). (2013). *Climate change in the Northwest: implications for our landscapes, waters, and communities*. Washington D.C.: Island Press [Source type 11].
- Di Lorenzo, E., & Mantua, N. (2016). Multi-year persistence of the 2014/15 North Pacific marine heatwave. *Nature Climate Change*, 6, 1042–1047.
- Doney, S. C., Ruckelshaus, M., Duffy, J. E., Barry, J. P., Chan, F., English, C. A., ... Talley, L. D. (2012). Climate change impacts on marine ecosystems. *Annual Review of Marine Science*, 4, 11–37 [Source type 1].

- Dyson, K., & Huppert, D. D. (2010). Regional economic impacts of razor clam beach closures due to harmful algal blooms (HABs) on the Pacific coast of Washington. *Harmful Algae*, 9, 264–271 [Source type 1].
- Ebeling, A. W., Laur, D. R., & Rowley, R. J. (1985). Severe storm disturbances and reversal of community structure in a southern California kelp forest. *Marine Biology*, 84, 287–294.
- Edwards, M., & Richardson, A. J. (2004). Impact of climate change on marine pelagic phenology and trophic mismatch. *Nature*, 430, 881–884.
- Eisenlord, M. E., Groner, M. L., Yoshioka, R. M., Elliott, J., Maynard, J., Fradkin, S., ... Harvell, C. D. (2016). Ochre star mortality during the 2014 wasting disease epizootic: role of population size structure and temperature. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 371(1689). Retrieved from <http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/371/1689/20150212> [Source type 1].
- Feely, R. A., Doney, S. C., & Cooley, S. R. (2009). Ocean acidification. Present conditions and future changes in a high-CO₂ world. *Oceanography*, 22(4), 36–47.
- Feely, R., Klinger, T., Newton, J. A., & Chadsey, M. (eds). (2012). *Scientific summary of ocean acidification in Washington state marine waters* (NOAA OAR Special Report). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of Ocean of Atmospheric Research. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1201016.pdf>. [Source type 11].
- Gentemann, C. L., Fewings, M. R., & Garcia-Reyes, M. (2017). Satellite sea surface temperatures along the West Coast of the United States during the 2014-2016 northeast Pacific marine heat wave. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44, 312–319.
- Hance, J. (2016, August 12). Could kelp forests keep ocean acidification at bay? Retrieved from <https://news.mongabay.com/2016/08/could-kelp-forests-keep-ocean-acidification-at-bay/> [Source type 11].
- Industrial Economics Inc. (2014a). *Marine sector analysis report: Non-tribal fishing* (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/FishingSectorAnalysis.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Industrial Economics Inc. (2014b). *Marine sector analysis report: Recreation and Tourism* (Sector Analysis Report; Washington Department of Natural Resources Contract No. SC 14-327). Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from <http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/RecreationSectorAnalysis.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Kaplan, I. C., Levin, P. S., Burden, M., & Fulton, E. A. (2010). Fishing catch shares in the face of global change: a framework for integrating cumulative impacts and single species management. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 67, 1968–1982.
- King, J. R., Agostini, V. N., Harvey, C. J., McFarlane, G. A., Foreman, M. G. G., Overland, J. E., ... Aydin, K. Y. (2011). Climate forcing and the California Current ecosystem. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 68(6), 1199–1216.
- Kintisch, E. (2015). “The Blob” invades Pacific, flummoxing climate experts. *Science*, 348(6230). Retrieved from <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/348/6230/17> [Source type 1].
- Koslow, J. A., Goericke, R., Lara-Lopez, A., & Watson, W. (2011). Impact of declining intermediate-water oxygen on deepwater fishes in the California Current. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 436, 207–218.

- Kroeker, K. J., Kordas, R. L., Crim, R., Hendriks, I. E., Ramajo, L., Singh, G. S., ... Gattuso, J.-P. (2013). Impacts of ocean acidification on marine organisms: quantifying sensitivities and interaction with warming. *Global Change Biology*, *19*, 1884–1896.
- Marshall, K. N., Kaplan, I. C., Hodgson, E. E., Hermann, A., Busch, D. S., McElhany, P., ... Fulton, E. A. (2017). Risks of ocean acidification in the California Current food web and fisheries: ecosystem model projections. *Global Change Biology*. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcb.13594/full> [Source type 1].
- McClatchie, S., Goericke, R., Leising, A., Auth, T. D., Bjorkstedt, E., Robertson, R. R., ... Jahneke, J. (2016). State of the California Current 2015-1016: Comparisons with the 1997-1998 El Nino. *CalCOFI Reports*, *57*. Retrieved from http://calcofi.org/publications/calcofireports/v57/Vol57-SOTCC_pages.5-61.pdf [Source type 1].
- Miller, I. M., Shishido, C., Antrim, L., & Bowlby, C. E. (2013). *Climate change and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary: interpreting potential futures* (Marine Sanctuaries Conservation Series No. ONMS-13-01). Silver Spring, MD: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. Retrieved from http://sanctuaries.noaa.gov/science/conservation/cc_ocnms.html [Source type 11].
- Miller, J. J., Maher, M., Bohaboy, E., Friedman, C. S., & McElhany, P. (2016). Exposure to low pH reduces survival and delays development in early life stages of Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*). *Marine Biology*, *163*(118). Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00227-016-2883-1> [Source type 1].
- Moore, S. K., Mantua, N. J., Hickey, B. M., & Trainer, V. L. (2010). The relative influences of El Nino-Southern Oscillation and Pacific Decadal Oscillation on paralytic shellfish toxin accumulation in Pacific Northwest shellfish. *Limnology and Oceanography*, *55*(6), 2262–2274. <https://doi.org/doi:10.4319/lo.2010.55.6.2262> [Source type 1].
- Mote, P. (2015). *Assessing climate change effects on natural and cultural resources of significance to Northwest Tribes*. Oregon State University [Source type 11].
- Mote, P. W., Petersen, A., Reeder, S., Shipman, H., & Whitely Binder, L. (2008). *Sea level rise in the coastal waters of Washington State*. University of Washington Climate Impacts Group and the Washington Department of Ecology [Source type 11].
- National Research Council. (2012). *Sea-level rise for the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington: Past, present, and future*. National Academy of Sciences. Retrieved from <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/13389/sea-level-rise-for-the-coasts-of-california-oregon-and-washington> [Source type 11].
- Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission. (2016). *Climate change and our natural resources. A report from the treaty tribes in western Washington*. Retrieved from http://nwifc.org/w/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2017/01/CC_and_Our_NR_Report_2016-1.pdf [Source type 11].
- Perry, A. L., Low, P. J., Ellis, J. R., & Reynolds, J. D. (2005). Climate change and distribution shifts in marine fishes. *Science*, *308*, 1912–1915.
- Peterson, W., & Schwing, F. (2008). California Current Ecosystem. In *Climate impacts on U.S. living marine resources: National Marine Fisheries Service concerns, activities, and needs* (K.E. Osgood, editor). U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved from <http://aquaticcommons.org/15026/> [Source type 11].

- Pinsky, M. L., & Fogarty, M. (2012). Lagged social-ecological responses to climate and range shifts in fisheries. *Climatic Change*, *115*, 883–891.
- Pinsky, M. L., Worm, B., Fogarty, M. J., Sarmiento, J. L., & Levin, S. A. (2013). Marine taxa track local climate velocities. *Science*, *341*, 1239–1242.
- Poloczanska, E. S., Burrows, M. T., Brown, C. J., Garcia Molinos, J., Halpern, B. S., Hoegh-Guldberg, O., ... Sydeman, W. J. (2016). Responses of marine organisms to climate change across oceans. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *3*(62). Retrieved from <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmars.2016.00062/full> [Source type 1].
- Schwing, F. B., Bond, N. A., Bograd, S. J., Mitchell, T., Alexander, M. A., & Mantua, N. (2006). Delayed coastal upwelling along the U.S. West Coast in 2005: A historical perspective. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *33*(22). Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2006GL026911/full> [Source type 1].
- Skewgar, E., & Pearson, S. F. (Eds.). (2011). State of the Washington coast: Ecology, Management, and Research Priorities. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Retrieved from <http://dfw.wa.gov/publications/01198/> [Source type 11].
- Snover, A. K., Mauger, G. S., Whitely Binder, L. C., Krosby, M., & Tohver, I. (2013). *Climate change impacts and adaptation in Washington State: technical summaries for decision makers* (State of knowledge report prepared for the Washington State Department of Ecology). Climate Impacts Group, University of Washington. Retrieved from <http://ces.washington.edu/db/pdf/snoveretalsok816.pdf> [Source type 11].
- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). *Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington*. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSPP_2015_small.pdf [Source type 11].
- The Columbian. (2013, October 19). Ocean acidification drives oyster farm to Hawaii. Carbon dioxide levels in Willapa Bay prompt move of family's business far from home. *The Columbian*. Retrieved from <http://www.columbian.com/news/2013/oct/19/ocean-acidification-oyster-farm-hawaii/> [Source type 11].
- Trainer, V. L., Hickey, B. M., & Horner, R. A. (2002). Biological and physical dynamics of domoic acid production off the Washington coast. *Limnology and Oceanography*, *47*(5), 1438–1446.
- Trainer, V. L., Hickey, B. M., Lessard, E. J., Cochlan, W. P., Trick, C. G., Wells, M. L., ... Moore, S. K. (2009). Variability of Pseudo-nitzschia and domoic acid in the Juan de Fuca eddy region and its adjacent shelves. *Limnology and Oceanography*, *54*(1), 289–308.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2016a). *Climate change indicators in the United States, 2016. Fourth Edition*. Retrieved from www.epa.gov/climate-indicators [Source type 1].
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2016b). Climate change indicators: Sea level. Retrieved from <https://www.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-sea-level> [Source type 11].
- Vecchi, G. A., & Wittenberg, A. T. (2010). El Nino and our future climate: where do we stand? *WIREs Climate Change*, *1*(2), 260–270 [Source type 1].
- Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification. (2012). Ocean acidification: From knowledge to action, Washington State's strategic response. (H. Adelman & L. W. Binder, Eds.). Washington Department of Ecology. Retrieved from <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/documents/1201015.pdf> [Source type 11].

- Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2015). Olympic regional harmful algal blooms. Retrieved May 26, 2015, from http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/research/projects/algal_bloom/index.html. [Source type 11].
- Welch, C. (2013, September 12). Sea change: lucrative crab industry in danger. *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved from <http://apps.seattletimes.com/reports/sea-change/2013/sep/11/alaska-crab-industry/> [Source type 11].

Chapter 3: Spatial Analyses

As part of the marine spatial planning process, the interagency team¹ commissioned several analyses to provide additional information relevant to present and potential future conditions in the Study Area. Analyses were selected to fill known data gaps and to fulfill several of the requirements outlined in RCW 43.372.040(6)(c). Results of these analyses include data products previously not available through empirical datasets alone. These products inform and support many of the spatial and management recommendations outlined in the plan.

This chapter will not provide specific recommendations, which are described in detail in the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) Management Framework presented in Chapter 4. Rather, it briefly describes the data, tools, and methods used to perform analyses that have contributed to the development of those recommendations and the planning process as a whole. In addition, each section also provides a brief overview of important results, and highlights some of the products from three projects completed to support the marine spatial planning process in Washington:

1. Ecological modeling of seabird and marine mammal distributions by NOAA
2. Ecologically Important Areas (EIA) analysis by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
3. A use analysis comparing the location and intensity of existing uses with technical suitability for offshore renewable energy

Due to a lack of comparable spatial data, the estuaries in the Study Area were excluded from these analyses. While the maps and other information provided here do not include data for these areas, estuaries are known and considered in the plan to be highly ecologically important and heavily used by many existing use sectors. For additional information on how estuaries are addressed by the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP), please see the discussions of this topic in Sections 3.2 and 4.3.3, as well as Appendix C: Data Sources, Methods, and Gaps.

3.1 Seabird and Marine Mammal Modeling

The National Centers for Coastal and Ocean Science (NCCOS) at NOAA conducted several analyses for the state planning process, including developing ecological models of predicted seabird and marine mammal distributions within the Study Area. It is important to note that this process did not predict abundance, but rather relative density. The resulting maps show where in the Study Area one would expect to find the highest density of each species, rather than predicting the number of animals actually present in the planning area or comparing abundance numbers across species.

NCCOS produced ecological models for eight species of birds and six species of marine mammals. Species were selected for analysis by WDFW because they are either of management concern (such as threatened or endangered species), or are representative of groups of species with important life history strategies or ecological functions. Seabird species included the Marbled Murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*), Tufted Puffin (*Fratercula cirrhata*), Common Murre (*Uria aalge*), Black-footed Albatross (*Phoebastria nigripes*), Northern Fulmar (*Fulmarus*

¹Interagency team refers to the State Ocean Caucus, as described in [RCW 43.372.020](#).

glacialis), Pink-footed Shearwater (*Puffinus creatopus*), Sooty Shearwater (*Puffinus griseus*), and Rhinoceros Auklet (*Cerorhinca monocerata*). An analysis for Short-tailed Albatross, also a listed species, could not be completed because of insufficient data.

Maps of marine mammals included two species of pinniped, the Steller sea lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*) and harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina*), and four species of cetaceans: the humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*), harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) and Dall's porpoise (*Phocoenoides dalli*). Insufficient observations were available to produce models for the Sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*), blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*), fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*), Southern Resident killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) or sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*).

This section summarizes the data and general methods used to create the relative density maps, and highlights some key results. Reports from NCCOS covering additional technical details and maps for all species are available on the state's MSP website² (Menza et al., 2016).

Data Sources

NCCOS staff and other contributors synthesized information from eleven existing monitoring programs that have collected data on sightings of species within the Study Area (Table 3.1). While all of these programs overlap with the Study Area, they vary in geographic extent and years of operation. For the NCCOS study, data collected between 2000 and 2013 within or just beyond the Study Area boundary was used. All observations were made at sea from ships or aircraft, typically along transects ranging in length from 25 kilometers to several hundred kilometers.

² <http://www.msp.wa.gov/>

Table 3.1: Summary of seabird and mammal survey data compiled by NCCOS for the distribution analysis.

Survey name	Data collectors	Data category
Harbor porpoise surveys	Cascadia Research Collective, NOAA Alaska Fisheries Science Center	Mammals
Leatherback turtle aerial survey	NOAA Southwest Fisheries Science Center	Mammals (incidentally collected during turtle surveys)
Pacific Continental Shelf Environmental Assessment (PaCSEA)	USGS Western Ecological Research Center, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM)	Birds and Mammals
California Current Ecosystem Surveys (includes ORCAWALE and CSCAPE surveys)	NOAA Southwest Fisheries Science Center	Birds and Mammals
Northwest Fisheries Science Center Northern California Current Seabird Surveys	NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center	Birds
Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary Seabird and Marine Mammal Surveys	Cascadia Research Collective, Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (OCNMS), NOAA Southwest Fisheries Science Center	Birds and Mammals
Pacific Coast Winter Sea Duck Survey	Sea Duck Joint Venture, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	Birds
Pacific Orcinus Distribution Survey (PODS)	NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center	Mammals
Large whale surveys off Washington and Oregon	Cascadia Research Collective, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife	Mammals
Northwest Forest Plan Marbled Murrelet Effectiveness Monitoring Program (Raphael, M.G. et al., 2007)	US Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife	Birds and Mammals
Seasonal Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary seabird surveys	NOAA Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary	Birds

Figure 3.1 provides an overview of the spatial coverage of bird, cetacean, and pinniped surveys used in modeling. Through additional analysis of the location and timing of transects, NCCOS also identified seasonal patterns in survey effort for the study period. Effort per square kilometer was more concentrated in the northern section of the Study Area for birds and mammals during the summer, whereas winter bird survey effort was more evenly distributed from north to south.




Figure 3.1: Spatial distribution of the 11 surveys used in bird and mammal models. The gray line in each frame indicates the boundaries of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Additional details on this figure and its source data provided in the final NCCOS report (Menza et al., 2016).

Numerous datasets describing environmental and temporal parameters were used as predictor variables in the modeling process. Environmental predictors included geographic, topographic, oceanographic, and biological information, either collected as part of survey data or acquired by NCCOS from other sources. Table 3.2 summarizes the full list of predictor variables assessed. For the analysis, all spatial datasets were averaged or extrapolated to a resolution of three km. Additional details about data sources, data selection, and processing steps for individual predictor variables are provided in the final report (Menza et al., 2016).

Table 3.2: Summary of predictor variables incorporated into distribution models.

Geographic variables	Topographic variables	Temporal variables	Oceanographic variables	Survey variables
Coordinates (X,Y)	Depth	Julian Day	Probability of cyclonic and anticyclonic eddy rings	Survey platform
Distance to key habitats like colonies or haul-outs for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tufted Puffin • Common Murre • Marbled Murrelet • Steller sea lion • Harbor seal 	Bathymetric position indices	Year	Sea surface salinity	Beaufort Sea State (marine mammals only)
	Profile curvature	Upwelling index	Sea surface temperature	Survey ID
	Planform curvature	Indices for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Niño-Southern Oscillation • North Pacific Gyre Oscillation • Pacific Decadal Oscillation 	Probability of sea surface temperature front	Transect ID
	Slope		Surface chlorophyll <i>a</i>	
			Frequency of chlorophyll peaks index	

Methods

In order to standardize and synthesize information from programs with diverse procedures for recording and collecting observations, datasets were first processed using a series of steps outlined in detail in the final project report (Menza et al., 2016). Data was grouped into summer (April to October) or winter (November to March) seasons based on the assumption that distribution patterns are affected by seasonal differences in environmental conditions or animal behavior. Statistical modeling was used to identify the ecological variables from Table 3.2 that best predict density for each species and season combination. To account for variations in observations due to survey methods and timing, the models also incorporated variables related to survey methods and conditions. These included weather and whether a survey was done from a boat or from an aircraft.

For most species, sufficient data was not available to conduct analysis for the winter period. Models and maps were produced for the Common Murre, Rhinoceros Auklet, and Black-footed Albatross for both seasons, and for summer only for all other bird and mammal species.

NCCOS produced multiple models for each species and season, and then used various diagnostic tools to assess and compare model performance before making a final selection. After

identifying the best available model, further diagnostic steps included identifying limitations and caveats applicable to the results for each species.

After selecting a final model for each season and species combination, the outputs of each model were mapped to illustrate the areas of highest and lowest long-term relative predicted density as well as where the coefficient of variation is highest. These latter set of maps provide a sense of uncertainty. Areas with higher coefficients had a greater amount of variability in results, and therefore have a higher amount of uncertainty associated with how well model predictions align with the actual distribution of species. For detailed performance results and uncertainty information for each model, please see Appendix C of the NCCOS report (Menza et al., 2016).

Results

The output maps from NCCOS provide general predictions for areas of highest and lowest density of the selected species at a broad scale. However, all models have inherent uncertainties and limitations. While each model was assessed to ensure that it provides the best possible representation of relative density at the planning scale based on available data, all maps should be considered in the context of uncertainty and other available data and expertise.

Figures 3.2 and 3.3 provide examples of maps produced for each species and season combination. The species discussed in this section are of particular interest because of their conservation status, or because they represent datasets that are particularly robust or can be representative of patterns seen in other species. Figure 3.2 illustrates the best long-term density prediction for Tufted Puffin, a nearshore species, in summer. This best prediction model represents the median of predicted values.³ It is shown with an overlay depicting uncertainty and an inset showing survey coverage and species density for actual field observations. Uncertainty varied greatly by species. Any interpretation of distribution information from a specific model should include careful consideration of areas with high coefficients of variation (a measure of uncertainty used in this analysis), particularly if assessing a specific site.

In addition to the best prediction median map (a), Figure 3.3 presents a spatial representation of uncertainty based on the coefficient of variation (b), and two quantile maps (c and d). The quantile maps show two additional potential distributions based on different levels of statistical confidence. These results could be of interest in cases where a more or less conservative approach to predictions is desired.

Nearshore species such as the Tufted Puffin and Marbled Murrelet (Figures 3.2 - 3.4) were generally predicted to be concentrated within 10 to 15 km from shore during summer, but with greater variation in north to south distribution than pelagic species. The predicted relative density of pelagic species was generally highest in the northern part of the Study Area. Patterns for pelagic species tended to be associated with the continental shelf or other geological features, such as submarine canyons. Models for some species, such as the gray whale (Figure 3.5), may have been affected by the relationship between survey timing and migration patterns. Possible anomalies of note for several specific species are discussed in the full NCCOS report (Menza et al., 2016).

³ The median provides the midpoint, or central tendency. In this case, the middle value of a frequency distribution of the predicted values. It means half of the numbers predicted by the model are lower, and half are higher. Median is generally a preferred measure (over average, or mean) for these analyses to address datasets with skewed distribution (datasets that have a few very high or low values).

Tufted Puffin (*Fatercula cirrhata*): April to October




Figure 3.2: Long-term predicted relative density for Tufted Puffin, summer. White cross-hatching indicates areas where the model has a coefficient of variation greater than 0.5 (relatively higher uncertainty). Gray line indicates the boundary of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, and inset shows observed density from surveys. Original figure and additional detail provided in the NCCOS final report (Menza et al., 2016).

Tufted Puffin (*Fratercula cirrhata*): April to October




Figure 3.3: Predicted long-term relative density for Tufted Puffin, summer, based on a) the median of predictions, c) a 5% quantile, and d) a 95% quantile. b) a spatial illustration of coefficients of variation for the model (a measure of uncertainty). Gray line indicates the boundary of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary. Original figure and additional explanation of quantiles provided in the NCCOS final report (Menza et al., 2016).

Marbled Murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*): April to October




Figure 3.4: Predicted long-term relative density for Marbled Murrelet, summer. White cross-hatching indicates areas where the model has a coefficient of variation greater than 0.5 (relatively higher uncertainty). Gray line indicates the boundary of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, and inset shows observed density from surveys. Original figure and additional detail provided in the NCCOS final report (Menza et al., 2016).




Figure 3. 5: Predicted long-term relative density for Gray Whale, summer. White cross-hatching indicates areas where the model has a coefficient of variation greater than 0.5 (relatively higher uncertainty). Gray line indicates the boundary of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, and inset shows observed density from surveys. Original figure and additional detail provided in the NCCOS final report (Menza et al., 2016).

Areas of high predicted density are often associated with known patterns of upwelling and high productivity, or located near breeding colonies or haul-outs. The MSP provides additional detail on productivity patterns and the locations of bird colonies and mammal haul-outs in the Study Area in Section 2.1: Ecology of Washington’s Pacific Coast.

For species with sufficient data available to model both summer and winter, areas of greatest density were further offshore in the winter than in the summer. Figure 3.6 provides an example of this pattern as seen in the results for the pelagic Black-footed Albatross. While insufficient data was available to model predictions for Short-tailed Albatross in the Study Area, the maps for Black-footed Albatross can provide an indication of likely areas for greatest Short-tailed density due to similarities in the ranges and life history traits of these two species.




Figure 3.6: Predicted long-term relative density for Black-footed Albatross, summer (left) and winter (right). White cross-hatching indicates areas where the model has a coefficient of variation greater than 0.5 (relatively higher uncertainty). Gray line indicates the boundary of the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, and insets show observed density from surveys. Original figure and additional detail provided in the NCCOS final report (Menza et al., 2016).

The full research report by NCCOS also provides detailed results from evaluations of each final species model. This includes an in-depth statistical analysis of model performance and visual representations of fit and potential bias using marginal and residual plots. A comparison of variable importance between models shows that some predictor variables, such as depth and surface chlorophyll *a* concentration, were relatively more important in final models for many species. Full discussion of model fit and performance is available in Appendix E of the NCCOS technical report (Menza et al., 2016). Cases where the highest relative importance was assigned to random variables, such as transect ID number, indicate that models may benefit from the inclusion of additional ecological predictor variables which more strongly correlate with that species' distribution.

Overall, performance was strong for all models, though it was variable across species and seasons. While the strength of a model represents how well it fits the input data, it does not necessarily describe the quality of the original data, fully assess the accuracy of results, or give a clear indication of how well the model predicts density in areas far from all input data points. As shown in Figure 3.1, there are also known gaps in survey coverage for modeled species, particularly in offshore areas. This may have a particular effect on the results for pelagic species which frequent these areas (Menza et al., 2016).

It is also important to note that because of data limitations, NCCOS could not analyze the full list of species identified by WDFW as priorities for ecological modeling. In some cases, the models discussed here highlight areas that may also contain a higher density of species that were not modeled, thereby illustrating general patterns common to many birds, cetaceans, or pinnipeds. However, a lack of available data for a species does not imply that it plays a less important ecological role in the Study Area. The previously mentioned species with insufficient data are all listed as threatened or endangered at the state or federal level. Therefore, they may be of interest when prioritizing future monitoring and modeling projects. Despite not being included in these results, these species are important to consider in any finer-scale assessments of a specific site within the Study Area.

Output layers from the NCCOS marine mammal and bird distribution analyses were used in combination with other ecological datasets to support the Ecologically Important Areas (EIA) assessment described in Section 3.2.

3.2 Ecologically Important Areas

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's (WDFW) Ecologically Important Areas (EIA) project was completed to contribute to the series of maps required by RCW 43.372.040(6)(c). The statute requires the series of maps to among other things, summarize available data on:

“The key ecological aspects of the marine ecosystem, including on its biological characteristics and on areas that are environmentally sensitive or contain unique or sensitive species or biological communities that must be conserved and warrant protective measures.” 43.372.040(6)(c)

The EIA analysis contributes to the summary of key ecological aspects of the Study Area in two main ways. First, the project analyzed and produced 39 maps of the ecological distribution of various species, species groups, and habitat features. These individual maps, or “layers,” provide a substantial summary of how biological communities are distributed throughout the Study Area. The interagency team considered these maps when developing various components of the plan, such as designating Important, Sensitive, and Unique (ISU) areas, discussed in the MSP Management Framework (Section 4.3).

The project's second main contribution involved combining, or “overlying,” the individual maps to explore broader ecological patterns in the Study Area. Due to data limitations, the individual EIA maps can only cover a subset of the biological communities in the Study Area. Therefore, one goal of the analysis was to use the patterns seen in their combined distribution to differentiate some regions of the Study Area as being more ecologically important than others.

This section provides an overview of the individual maps that were produced in the EIA analysis and the methods used to overlay them. Further discussion of how various combinations of EIA layers were incorporated into the Use Analysis is provided in Section 3.3. Full details on the individual map layers and the project will be available in a separate report (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a).

Data Sources: Individual Map Layers

WDFW used a variety of data sources and methods to produce the individual EIA maps. These included the results of the NCCOS models described in Section 3.1, survey data, and fisheries logbooks. Many maps, particularly those for wildlife species, were based on surveys conducted by WDFW. Others were based on data provided by outside groups. Table 3.3 lists all the individual layers or layer groups for which maps were completed. This table describes the species within each layer, the data source or methodology used to collect or synthesize the data, the data timespan, and the zones that the species or group inhabits, as described by the Coastal and Marine Ecological Classification Standard (CMECS). Further description of CMECS zones can be found in WDFW’s EIA report (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a).

For some layer groups, individual maps were produced for all species in the group (e.g. groundfish), while other layers may include multiple species (e.g. seabird colonies) in one map. Due to the availability of data for certain species or species groups among years or areas, some layers were combined. For additional detail on individual sources, please see WDFW’s final report (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a) and Appendix C of the MSP (Data Sources, Methods and Gaps).

Table 3.3: EIA Layers

Layer title	Species included	Methods	Timespan	CMECS zone(s) ⁴	Data source
<i>Wildlife layers</i>					
Snowy Plover	Snowy Plover	Transects and nest searches	2006-2013	Beach	WDFW
Streaked Horned Lark	Streaked Horned Lark	Transects and nest searches	2006-2013	Beach	WDFW
Seabird colonies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient Murrelet • Arctic Tern • Black Oystercatcher • Caspian Tern • Cassin’s Auklet • Common Murre • Cormorants • Gulls • Storm Petrels • Pigeon Guillemot • Rhinoceros Auklet • Tufted Puffin 	Colony counts	1970s-2013	Beach, Nearshore	WDFW

⁴ Coastal and Marine Ecological Classification Standard. Further description of CMECS zones can be found in Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a)

Layer title	Species included	Methods	Timespan	CMECS zone(s) ⁴	Data source
<i>Wildlife layers (continued)</i>					
Seal and sea lion haul-outs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harbor seal • California sea lion • Steller sea lion • Northern elephant seal 	Aerial observations	1998-2013	Beach, Nearshore	WDFW
Nearshore seabirds and marine mammals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cassin's Auklet • Ancient Murrelet • Rhinoceros Auklet • Brandt's Cormorant • Double-Crested Cormorant • Pelagic Cormorant • Pigeon Guillemot • Harbor Seal • Harbor Porpoise 	Boat-based line transects	2009-2013	Nearshore	WDFW
Sea otter	Sea otter	Aerial observations	2012-2013	Nearshore	WDFW
Seabird abundance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black-footed Albatross (winter/summer) • Northern Fulmar (summer) • Sooty Shearwater (summer) • Common Murre (winter/summer) • Tufted Puffin (summer) • Marbled Murrelet (summer) 	Modeled abundance surface using environmental variables and results from boat and aerial surveys	1996-2013	Nearshore, Offshore, Oceanic	Modelling by NCCOS, see Section 3.1 for detail on data sources.
Marine mammal abundance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steller Sea Lion • Harbor Seal • Humpback Whale • Gray Whale • Harbor Porpoise • Dall's porpoise 	Modeled abundance using a compilation of at-sea observations from multiple survey programs. Each program collected spatially-explicit observations of pinnipeds, and/or cetaceans within a sampling domain which overlapped, and in some cases extended well beyond the Study Area.	Data time series ranged from 11-22 years; 1995 to 2014	All zones and strata	Modelling by NCCOS, see Section 3.1 for detail on data sources.

Layer title	Species included	Methods	Timespan	CMECS zone(s) ⁴	Data source
<i>Fish and habitat layers</i>					
Razor Clams	Razor Clams	Beach survey locations	1997-2014	Beach, Nearshore	WDFW
Dungeness Crab	Dungeness Crab	Fishery logbooks	2009/10 - 2012/13	Nearshore, Oceanic, Offshore	WDFW
Groundfish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Darkblotched Rockfish • Dover Sole • Greenspotted Rockfish • Longspine Thornyhead • Pacific Ocean Perch • Petrale Sole • Sablefish • Shortspine Thornyhead • Yelloweye Rockfish 	Modeled abundance or probability of occurrence using bottom trawl survey information with covariates.	2003-2012	Offshore, Oceanic	Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) and NCCOS
Pacific Whiting	Pacific Whiting	Fishery logbooks and observer records	2001-2014	Oceanic, Offshore	NOAA Fisheries, WDFW, Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife
Pink Shrimp	Pink Shrimp	Fishery logbooks	2003-2012	Oceanic, Offshore	WDFW
Intertidal spawning forage fish spawning sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surf Smelt • Night Smelt • Pacific Sand Lance 	Locations of beach spawning surveys	2003-2012	Oceanic, Offshore	WDFW
Deep-sea coral	Any species in the taxonomic orders Antipatharia or Scleractinia or the suborders Alcyoniina, Calcaxonia, Filifera, Holaxonia, Scleraxonia, Stolonifera.	Maxent species distribution model	Several	Oceanic, Offshore	(Guinotte, J.M. & Davies, A.J., 2014)
Rocky reefs/hard benthic substrate types	Rocky reefs/hard benthic substrate types	Various	Several	Nearshore, Oceanic, Offshore	Oregon State University
Kelp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bull kelp • Giant kelp 	Polygons representing floating kelp beds derived from annual aerial photos.	1989-2012	Nearshore	Washington Dept of Natural Resources (DNR)

Methods

The source data for the EIA maps was measured in a variety of different ways. Approaches include counts of animals present, the probability of occurrence as estimated by a model, or total commercial fisheries catch in weight as reported in logbooks. Many of the EIA source datasets have different spatial resolutions and formats. Some datasets use grids of varying cell sizes (e.g. 500 square meters), while others use precise point coordinates.

To attain a common spatial resolution, WDFW analysts created a 1 square mile hexagonal grid across the entire project area. For each individual map, EIA scores were assigned to all relevant hexagons. To determine the EIA score for each hexagon, the score for the aggregated data was converted from original measurement units and assigned a relative ranking using a quantile method. If the original spatial resolution of a map layer was finer than that of the EIA grid, it was possible to have multiple scores per hexagon. In such cases, the hexagon score was based on the highest use value for all data within the hexagon.

Within each layer, scores were assigned on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing the areas of greatest relative ecological importance and 5 the lowest. Table 3.4 shows the quantile values that correspond to each ranking.

Table 3.4: EIA scoring metrics.

EIA score	1 (Greatest importance)	2	3	4	5 (Lowest importance)
Quantile	> 0.90	0.75-0.90	0.25-0.75	0.10-0.25	< 0.10

As one example of how this quantile method was applied, consider the Black-footed Albatross EIA layer. This layer was based on modeled abundance values from the NCCOS model described in Section 3.1. For this layer, each hexagon was associated with a modeled abundance value. To calculate an EIA score, this value was compared to that of all other hexagons in the map and assigned a relative ranking. For example, a hexagon with a modeled relative abundance value greater than 80% of the values in all hexagons within the project area would fall within the 0.75-0.90 quantile, and would be assigned a rank of 2 based on Table 3.4. More details on this process are available in WDFW’s final EIA report (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a).

Not every map layer was scored using the quantile approach. Some map layers, such as those for kelp and rocky areas, simply describe whether a feature is present or absent from an area. In these cases, hexagons were assigned EIA scores of 1 when features were present.

In general, care should be taken when interpreting the EIA scores. The scores are not precise, quantitative measures of ecological quality. They are instead intended more as qualitative relative measures of importance (i.e. ordinal ranks). To best understand the significance of the EIA analyses, individual scores should be interpreted by closely assessing the source data and methods for each map, as well as other relevant information.

Furthermore, the EIA scoring uses a “binning” approach where clear distinctions are drawn between categories (i.e. “bins”). For example, the difference between a score of 2 and 3 is the difference between information being included in the hotspot map (Figure 3.8, described below) or not. For example, in an individual species map, the difference between a 2 and a 3 could be as minor as a difference between a score in the 74.9th percentile and a score in the 75th

percentile. The latter would be a score of “2” and the former a score of “3.” However, on the original measurement scale, the difference between the two could be very small and not ecologically meaningful. This issue is not a major one in the context of the EIA project’s aim of exploring broad patterns in the Study Area, but could be a flaw if EIA outputs are used for a different purpose.

The EIA analysis team also produced relative uncertainty scores for many of the individual maps on a scale from 1 to 3, with 3 representing the highest level of uncertainty. The meaning of these uncertainty scores differs for each map, and they are meant to qualitatively show the relative confidence in the importance score. For instance, WDFW analysts have more confidence in the importance score assigned to a hexagon if the associated uncertainty score is a 1 than if the uncertainty score is a 2 or a 3. More detail on uncertainty is given in the final EIA report (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a).

Results and Discussion

The overall goal of the EIA analysis was to analyze the relative ecological distribution of individual species and habitats and to evaluate the combined “overlay” patterns throughout the Study Area. There are several different ways to combine layers, and no one result can provide a single “best” view of ecological importance. This section provides examples and interpretations of some of the main maps considered in the analysis. Other examples and interpretations are further described in the full EIA report (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a).

The EIA scores provide a unit of measure that can be compared across all individual layers. For each layer, an EIA score of 1 conveys the highest importance (>90% quantile) or presence of an important feature (e.g. rocky areas), and a score of 2 indicates lower but still above average importance (75-90% quantile).

Figure 3.7 shows one of the overlays produced in the EIA analysis. This map evaluates which parts of the Study Area received high importance scores in at least one of the individual EIA maps. In other words, this map shows the greatest importance score across all data layers for each hexagon. The result shows that most of the Study Area has a high importance value (1 or 2) for at least one of the data layers that were examined. This map further highlights the general ecological importance of the Study Area and the necessity of site-specific evaluation of the ecological characteristics any potential project area.

Figure 3.8 (the “hotspot map”) shows the number of layers in each hexagon that were assigned scores of 1 or 2. Hexagons that are important to many individual EIA layers may indicate areas of higher ecological activity than those that are important to just a few. Consistent with the marine ecology literature, the hotspot map shows the highest scores along the continental shelf break and at the heads of submarine canyons, particularly in the Juan de Fuca Canyon area off northern Washington. Further interpretations of the patterns seen in the hotspot map are given in WDFW’s EIA report (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a).




Figure 3.7: Greatest relative ecological importance score assigned to each hexagon in the Study Area, across all data layers. 1 represents greatest ecological importance and 5 represents lowest ecological importance.




Figure 3.8: Hotspots for all combined EIA layers. Each hexagon’s value is the number of layers with an importance score of 1 or 2 in that location (the scores which indicate greatest ecological importance).

Figure 3.9 is similar to the above hotspot map, but only includes species of high conservation concern (e.g. threatened or endangered species), or layers that have a presumed sensitivity to the physical displacement that might accompany renewable energy development. Sensitive species and habitats include kelp, rocky areas, Snowy Plover nesting areas, Marbled Murrelet, and all large whales, among others (see caption on Figure 3.9 for complete list).






Figure 3.9: Hotspots for sensitive species and habitats. Each hexagon's value is the number of layers with an importance score of 1 or 2 in that location (the scores indicating greatest ecological importance). This included data on birds (Marbled Murrelet, Snowy Plover, Streaked Honed Lark, Tufted Puffin, seabird colonies); marine mammals (Dall's Porpoise, gray whale, harbor porpoise, harbor seal, humpback whale, marine mammal haul-outs, sea otter, Steller sea lion); fish (forage fish and Yelloweye Rockfish); and habitats (coral, kelp, and rocky areas).

The interagency team selected the sensitive species map and a modified version of the hotspot map to represent ecological uses in the Use Analysis (see Section 3.3 for further detail). However, this does not mean that they are the only outputs worth investigating. For example, Figures 3.10 and 3.11 show hotspots for fish and wildlife, respectively. While the fish hotspot map shows the greatest importance scores clustered along the shelf break and the Juan de Fuca Canyon area (similar to the overall hotspot map), the wildlife hotspots tend to be found in the northern part of the Study Area, including in the nearshore.

Alternatively, a “coldspot” map shows the number of layers that scored a 4 or 5 (below average importance scores) in each hexagon (Figure 3.12). While these areas may have a large proportion of layers that are ranked relatively lower in importance, the underlying individual layers may contain certain species or habitats with scores of 1 or areas of great importance. For example, the southeast portion of the planning area contains a concentration of “coldspots,” but is ranked as highly important habitat for Dungeness Crab, one of the most important commercial fisheries in Washington.

Many other analysis outputs are discussed in the final EIA report (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a). Again, the intent of the overlay maps is to explore high-level patterns of ecological importance in the Study Area. Further interpretation requires looking to the individual maps and the data that supports them in the context of the question being evaluated.






Figure 3.12: Fish and wildlife coldspots. Each hexagon’s value is the number of layers with an importance score of 4 or 5 in that location (the scores indicating least relative ecological importance).

Limitations, Data Gaps, and the Treatment of Estuaries

The primary goal of the EIA analysis was to summarize available data on key biological aspects of the Study Area's marine ecosystem using maps. The approach used here is just one of several that could achieve this goal. While the EIA analysis methods selected by WDFW make a strong contribution toward this goal, WDFW's summarization of the available data does not constitute definitive mapping of the ecology of the Study Area.

The perfect EIA analysis would involve knowing the full "time budget" of, at a minimum, a set of key species that are representative of greater ecological activity. This "time budget" would describe which parts of the Study Area each species uses and how often. To be comprehensive, it would need to account for the changes that happen over seasonal, annual, and long-term time scales in the highly dynamic California Current marine ecosystem.

Such perfection is, of course, not possible. Survey work in the Study Area's coastal and marine environment is logistically challenging and expensive. In addition, resources for ecological surveys are limited. As an example, most of the surveys in the Study Area occur during the spring and summer, when conditions such as visibility and wave height are more conducive to research. As a result, there are many unknowns about how the species included in the EIA analysis use the Study Area in the winter. In general, limited survey resources mean that the EIA maps are biased towards the species that are of highest conservation and management interest to the mandates of WDFW and partner agencies. Therefore, many species that live in the Study Area are not surveyed regularly, if at all.

Even for the species included in the EIA project, the maps and associated scores have uncertainty. Many of the surveys conducted in the Study Area are used to monitor population abundance. Monitoring abundance is a different objective than monitoring for the "time budget" of a species. The abundance of a species can be reliably estimated by only partially sampling the area that the species occupies. Statistical techniques, such as the ones described in Section 3.1, can be used to extrapolate survey observations to un-surveyed areas. However, these methods are inherently limited in the certainty they can provide. More information on the caveats associated with each map is provided in the final EIA report, including discussion of using commercial fisheries data as a proxy for the ecological distribution of fish species (Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2017a).

The quality of data needed to estimate spatial patterns is so high that even for relatively well-studied species, there is insufficient data to statistically estimate their use of the Study Area. This includes species of high conservation interest like Chinook Salmon, Guadalupe and northern fur seals, Green Sturgeon, and leatherback sea turtles, among others. Within the Study Area, the latter two species even have Critical Habitat designated under the Endangered Species Act. The Critical Habitat for leatherback sea turtles covers the entire Study Area, yet there is insufficient information available to identify areas that are of lesser and greater importance.

Another limitation is that the EIA analysis primarily describes where animals use the Study Area. This is because to some extent, ecological importance is proportional to where these animals spend their time. However, the word "ecological" can have a much broader meaning. It can encompass many interacting physical, chemical, and biological features. The marine ecosystem of the Study Area is a product of all these interacting features, some of which occur over broad areas and may even occur far from the Study Area. Therefore, the EIA project's view of the key ecological aspects of this area should be considered in conjunction with information on these key features.

Lastly, one major data gap in the EIA analysis involves the estuaries, particularly the two large estuaries in the Study Area: Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor. While some individual EIA maps cover features inside the estuaries (e.g. marine mammal haul-outs), there is not enough data to perform the same EIA overlay method used in the open ocean regions of the Study Area. Despite being unable to produce EIA overlay maps for the estuaries, the EIA analysis recognized the high ecological importance of estuaries.

As with kelp and rocky areas, scientific evidence has well established the importance of estuaries. It is well known that estuaries provide important habitat to juvenile Pacific salmon, Dungeness Crab, Green Sturgeon, migrating shorebirds and waterfowl, and many other species. However, like with the leatherback sea turtle data, available spatial data is not adequate to differentiate which areas within the estuaries are relatively more important than others. An EIA-type project for the estuaries would likely require using a finer-scale spatial approach (i.e. a grid using cells of less than one square mile in area) as well as new survey and mapping efforts to fill key data gaps. Additional discussion of how estuaries are considered in the Marine Spatial Plan is provided in Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework (see Section 4.3.3).

3.3 Use Analysis

Through the planning process, the State collected and created map layers that represent the best available understanding of human and ecological uses of the Study Area (see Appendix A). The Use Analysis described here was the interagency team’s primary effort to synthesize the information in those layers. Coordinated by the interagency team and implemented by WDFW staff, the Use Analysis was structured to improve understanding of the general planning issues that may accompany proposals for renewable energy production in the Study Area.

Specifically, the state marine planning law requires the MSP to include a “series of maps” that serves to, among other things, “summarize available data on ... appropriate locations with high potential for renewable energy production with minimal potential for conflicts with other existing uses or sensitive environments” (RCW 43.372.040(6)(c)). To meet this analytical mandate, the Use Analysis compared the extent and intensity of existing uses and Ecologically Important Areas within the Study Area to the potential for renewable energy production in the region. To facilitate this comparison, analyses were conducted at various scales and using information about different energy types and technologies. The outputs showed areas that have relatively higher renewable energy potential, but contain fewer uses or less heavily used areas. The analyses do not show preference for wind energy development and the map outputs should not be used for siting. Chapter 4, the management framework, describes the substantive mandates and criteria for project review, which applicants should use to inform project planning and evaluation of effects.

In particular, the Use Analysis:

- Provides well-accepted and objective methods, together with the best available scientific, spatial data to develop a series of maps that meet the requirement of RCW 43.372.040(6)(c).
- Uses spatial extent and intensity data (where available) for existing uses to identify the spatial overlaps between existing uses and potential new uses. Specifically, the analysis can:

- Identify areas that have the most or more existing uses (including areas that are used more frequently than other areas), versus areas that have fewer existing uses (including areas that are relatively less frequently used).
- Explore complex spatial relationships between existing use and ecological data and information on renewable energy potential through map scenarios.
- Provide a method for visualizing complex data and relationships.
- Use a series of maps to inform discussions regarding spatial recommendations for the MSP.

The Use Analysis relied on several important assumptions that are critical to interpreting the outputs:

- No one map scenario can be used on its own to make a decision about a particular use.
- All uses were assumed to have equal potential for conflict. Since the Use Analysis only focuses on spatial overlap, it does not account for varying degrees of conflict or compatibility. In reality, some existing uses may be more compatible with new uses or more susceptible to conflict with development than others.
- Specific scenarios can explore particular spatial relationships or overlaps, but not trade-offs.
- Existing use data and analyses cannot assess the degree of impact from a new use. This type of assessment would be project-specific.
- Areas of fewer existing uses and areas with “low” intensity of uses do not indicate no or low impact, or a lack of conflict.
- Existing use data does not represent the value of areas, but rather potentially where and how heavily they are used.
- The confidence in model outputs is dependent on the amount and quality of data.

The Use Analysis outputs reveal large-scale patterns and are sufficient to conclude that proposals for large-scale renewable energy projects would likely pose complex considerations for planners, project proponents, and stakeholders to work through. However, the outputs cannot provide detailed answers to questions about conflict or impact. While the conclusions of the Use Analysis are limited in their specificity, the interagency team views the effort as a substantial advancement in the understanding of use patterns in the Study Area. The interagency team used the results to inform certain recommendations outlined in Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework.

Data Sources

Two major categories of data were used as inputs in the Use Analysis: 1) data on existing uses in the Study Area, including outputs from the Ecologically Important Areas analysis (see Section 3.2), and 2) technical suitability models for potential future development of renewable energy.

Existing use data

Existing uses in the Study Area were represented by a variety of data layers falling into five categories: cultural and archaeological uses, shipping, fisheries (non-tribal), recreation, and

ecological uses (fish, wildlife, and habitat). No data on tribal uses was included in these analyses. Table 3.5 lists all the data layers used in each of these categories, though every layer was not used in all analysis scenarios.

Table 3.5: Data layers used to represent existing uses and Ecologically Important Areas. For more information about individual uses or data layers, please refer to the referenced MSP chapter and maps, or information in Appendix C.

Data category	Layers	Data source
Cultural and archaeological uses <i>Section 2.2</i>	Cultural risk model	Washington Dept of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
Shipping <i>Section 2.6</i> <i>Maps 36 – 39</i>	Density of shipping activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cargo vessels • Passenger vessels • Tanker vessels • Tug and tow vessels Location of tug and tow lanes	NOAA/Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, Washington Sea Grant (tow lanes)
Non-tribal fisheries <i>Section 2.4</i> <i>Maps 17 – 29</i>	Commercial fishing intensity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albacore Tuna • Dungeness Crab • Sablefish (fixed gear) • Groundfish (bottom trawl) • Pacific Whiting • Pink Shrimp • Salmon • Pacific Sardine Recreational fishing intensity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Albacore Tuna • Bottomfish and Lingcod • Pacific Halibut • Salmon 	WDFW
Fish and wildlife / ecological uses <i>Sections 2.1 (Ecology), 3.1 (Sea bird and marine mammal modeling), and 3.2 (Ecologically Important Areas analysis)</i> <i>Maps 5, 8, 9, 12</i>	Ecologically Important Areas (EIA) analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall ecological hotspots, showing combined high use information from various “subsectors” (groups of layers), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine mammals • Pinniped haulouts • Habitats • Shorebird areas • Seabird abundance • Seabird colonies • Invertebrates • Fish Abundance • Hotspots for selected sensitive species and habitats 	WDFW
Recreation <i>Section 2.6</i> <i>Map 33</i> Also see report by Point 97 & Surfrider Foundation (2015)	Participatory recreation data for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diving Activities • Shore-Based Activities • Surface Water Activities • Wildlife Viewing & Sightseeing 	Surfrider Foundation and Point 97

After considering several of the EIA overlays described in Section 3.2, the interagency team chose two for inclusion in the Use Analysis: a hotspot map and a sensitive species map. However, the hotspot data incorporated into the Use Analysis differed slightly from that shown in Section 3.2 (Figure 3.8). When all 39 individual EIA layers were incorporated into the Use Analysis, the data for other existing uses (e.g., fishing, shipping) was overwhelmed by the large number of ecological layers. To address this issue, the hotspot map included in the Use Analysis combined scores from several “subsectors” composed of key layers or groups of layers (e.g. marine mammals, fish), rather than including all 39 layers individually. The overall patterns of ecologically important hotspots remain very similar using this “subsector” approach.

Some additional data layers discussed elsewhere in the Marine Spatial Plan were considered or used to illustrate some specific scenarios, but ultimately not included in the later stages of the Use Analysis. For example, aquaculture occurs primarily within estuaries (which were not included in the Use Analysis) and is associated with other data limitations. Military uses also were not included. Available data indicates that the entire Study Area is a low-intensity use area for military operations, so this data would not have provided any contrast within the Use Analysis process. As noted in Section 1.7, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (Sanctuary) has additional management and permitting authority within the MSP Study Area. Therefore, the Sanctuary boundary was also used in some phases of analysis to assess whether including or excluding the area would affect results. However, it is not represented in the outputs provided in this chapter.

Renewable energy data

Spatial models describing renewable energy suitability in the planning area were provided by the Department of Energy’s Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL). In a 2013 study, PNNL produced models of expected relative technical suitability off the Washington coast using three categories of information: site quality, grid connection, and shore-side support. These categories incorporated data related to depth, energy resource potential, benthic substrate, and distance to relevant infrastructure.

PNNL completed analyses for three types of offshore wind technology, four types of wave technology, and one type of tidal energy technology. The PNNL models were based on technology at the time of analysis, and do not account for advancements in science, the industry, or technology that have occurred since that time. Please see Appendix A: Maps 43 - 49 for examples of the final outputs from these analyses. More detail on methods and data for the modeling process are provided in Section 2.10.1 and Appendix C. Further details are also available in the final report from PNNL (Van Cleve, Judd, Radil, Ahmann, & Geerlofs, 2013).

Analysis Methods and Results

Renewable Energy Data

Methods

In the Use Analysis, the interagency team focused primarily on the wind energy models provided by PNNL, rather than on tidal or wave energy technologies. Wind is a more established industry and therefore, more information is available about the technical requirements and viability of offshore wind development. The interagency team expected wind to be the most likely proposed use of the three renewable energy types in the near term.

The PNNL models calculated an overall Suitability Index (SI) for each analysis unit. The SI score was calculated from a combination of factors, including the estimated level of energy that could be produced at a site, the distance of a site from the existing power grid, and logistical factors or constraints associated with the different energy types and associated technologies (Van Cleve et al., 2013). For the Use Analysis, WDFW analysts aggregated the PNNL data into the same 1 square mile hexagons that were used to calculate human and ecological use scores. The maximum SI score within each hexagon was applied as the energy value for that hexagon.

The PNNL models identified many areas as relatively more suitable for more than one type of energy, particularly for both wind and wave energy. This is due in part to correlation between the availability of these resources in marine environments, as well as the similarities in technical requirements such as access to transmission infrastructure and ports. Assessment of the specific interactions between wave or tidal energy models and existing uses would need to be done separately, but the Use Analysis outputs can provide a general understanding of potential conflicts. The PNNL models provide more information on the variation in technical suitability for tidal and wave energy technologies. Maps 43-50 in Appendix A provide the outputs of these technical suitability models (see Section 2.10.1 and PNNL's report (Van Cleve et al., 2013)).

Overlay analysis

Methods

WDFW conducted two different types of use analyses. The first analysis produced a series of overlay maps that evaluate and visualize broad spatial patterns. It is a simpler method than the second, more complex, optimization analysis using Marxan software (described below).

To aid with visual evaluation, the input data for the overlay maps were further aggregated into relative categories. Energy Suitability Index (SI) scores include all three types of wind energy and were divided into three levels of suitability: high (H; 90-100 SI), medium (M; 75-90 SI), and low (L; < 75 SI).

For the use intensity data, the overlay analysis focused on the number of high intensity uses in each hexagon out of a possible total of 16 high uses. Hexagons in the "low" category had between one and four high intensity uses, those ranked as "medium" had between five and seven, and the category ranked "high" had between eight and 14 high intensity uses. While the intensity scores do not equate to impact or conflict, the idea is that the potential for conflict is proportional to use intensity and the number of uses. That is, one may expect greater challenges to permitting or siting where there are many high intensity uses than where there are few.

Overlay output

Figure 3.13 shows the output of the basic overlay analysis. This output shows a simple count of the existing number of uses categorized as "high-intensity uses" in each hexagon, and how this compares with the overall wind energy potential throughout the Study Area. Figure 3.13 uses both color and shade to display relative potential for conflict. The areas colored with the darkest red are those where energy suitability and use intensity are both scored as high. These are the areas where planning challenges would be presumed to be greatest. At the other end of the spectrum, the darkest green hexagons show areas identified as having the fewest number of high intensity existing uses, and the greatest amount of wind energy potential. Table 3.6 provides a breakdown of the number of hexagons in each of the nine categories. While there is potential for conflict even in the case of one existing use, the red hexagons show areas that may present

particular planning or permitting challenges due to a greater number of high-intensity existing uses that would need to be addressed for a proposed project.




Figure 3.13: Overlay analysis showing a comparison of renewable energy potential and the number of high intensity uses (out of a possible total of 16) in each hexagon of the planning area. Please note that Use Analysis maps do not identify areas recommended for development, or areas with a lack of potential conflict. Analysis outputs represent theoretical scenarios and any potential development would require project- and site-specific analysis.

Table 3.6. Summary of overlay analysis (total hexagons = 7,792)

Energy suitability	Number of high intensity uses	Color in Figure 3.13	Number of hexagons
High	High	Dark red	571
High	Medium	Dark orange	559
High	Low	Dark green	24
Medium	High	Medium red	359
Medium	Medium	Light orange	878
Medium	Low	Medium green	399
Low	High	Light pink	1,002
Low	Medium	Yellow	2,349
Low	Low	Light green	1,651

Visual patterns in the overlay analysis

One of the most prominent patterns is the clustering of reds and oranges in the inner- to mid-continental shelf areas off Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay. These are areas where both wind energy suitability and the number of high-intensity uses are medium or high, and the presumed potential for conflict is the highest.

Another pattern that can be clearly seen is that there are very few hexagons falling into the darkest green category (i.e. high wind energy potential and low existing use rank). There are only 24 hexagons in the Study Area with this combination and they are widely spread out. Therefore, it would not be possible to fit an industrial-scale wind energy development of the size explored in the Marxan analysis scenarios in these hexagons alone (Table 3.6). This suggests that wind energy development would likely need to address multiple high-intensity uses when attempting to site a project.

Very few areas have "high potential for renewable energy production with minimal potential for conflicts" (RCW 43.372.040(6)(c)). The challenge for planners and others is to "minimize" the potential conflict, rather than being able to find areas where conflict would be "minimal" in the absolute sense.

In general, one can also see both in Figure 3.13 and Table 3.6 that the areas of best wind energy potential are relatively infrequent. The yellow hexagons (low energy potential, medium use) comprise the largest category in the overlay analysis, followed by the other two low energy suitability categories. The yellows, light greens, and light pinks predominate in the deeper and more northerly parts of the Study Area. Together, they comprise 64.2% of the total area. The high energy suitability hexagons are roughly one-fourth as common as those ranked as low energy suitability (1,154 compared to 5,002). Adding the hexagons with high energy potential to those with those medium energy potential (1,636) still only brings the total to 2,790 out of 7,792 hexagons.⁵

There is some question about which would be more attractive for wind energy development: the dark orange areas (high energy potential, medium use rank), or the medium

⁵ This is a smaller number than the total number of hexagons in the Study Area, since not all hexagons contain a high use.

green hexagons (medium energy potential, low number of high uses). Therefore, it is difficult to visualize where developments would most likely be proposed with much precision. Figure 3.13 illustrates several areas of clumped dark and light oranges and medium greens, mostly found in the intermediate continental shelf area extending out to the 100-fathom curve. The largest clumps lie between Grays Harbor and the general vicinity of Cape Elizabeth. However, several such clumped areas that could accommodate the ~50 square mile footprint of the development scenarios considered in the Marxan analysis appear in Figure 3.13 south of Grays Harbor.

A final pattern at the mouth of Willapa Bay underscores the need for careful interpretation of the results. A dark green hexagon appears surrounded by a clump of hexagons with medium energy potential and a low number of high uses. Common knowledge of this area indicates that this area is important for small vessel traffic, which would exclude it as being an area of relatively low conflict for wind energy development.

This emphasizes that interpretations of both the overlay analysis and the Marxan analysis are limited by which uses are measured and how they are measured. For example, which areas pose greater or less potential concern: high energy suitability and medium use intensity areas, or medium energy suitability and low use intensity areas? Combining the data into categories involves the loss of some details. These limitations highlight that the overlay analysis provides only a first-level analysis to guide further investigation. Additional data and information will need to be applied to advance understanding of possible use conflicts, especially when a proponent is evaluating siting options.

Marxan Analysis

Methods

For the second type of Use Analysis, WDFW used Marxan, a decision-support tool designed for marine planning applications. This tool allows the user to set a series of targets and limitations, and generates potential spatial solutions which optimize each scenario's goals within a given set of parameters. For this project, the interagency team explored several different scenarios illustrating the relationship between renewable energy suitability (as represented by PNNL's technical suitability analysis), and the number and frequency of existing uses (as represented by the data in Table 3.5). Each scenario provided a look at how analysis results might change if certain existing uses or energy targets were prioritized.

Decision to use Marxan

The State's main purpose for using Marxan was to fulfill the marine planning law's requirement to produce a series of maps (RCW 43.372.040(6)(c)). Producing maps to meet this requirement is a complex challenge, as complications arise from the vast number of possible area configurations. However, this is the type of task that Marxan was developed specifically to tackle. The primary reason the interagency team used Marxan was to address the map requirements in a technically rigorous way.

Given the uncertainties in the data and assumptions involved with the Marxan analysis, results indicated that there is not one single solution that best defines an optimal location for wind energy development, nor was that the intent of analysis. Rather, the use of Marxan was exploratory in nature and meant to address the Legislature's mandate for a series of maps in a more rigorous manner than is possible using spatial overlay methods alone.

One of the results of the analysis was the demonstration that there is clearly no place within the Study Area that has a minimal potential for conflict with existing uses. On the

contrary, the results from all scenarios suggest that there would be multiple potential conflicts in all areas, especially if development were to use the more nearshore-oriented monopile wind technology rather than offshore technology.

Data complexities

The Marxan analysis can be described as a maximum coverage problem, where the goal is to find a set of solutions that: 1) meet an energy target (in terms of potential energy production), and 2) minimize the overlap with existing uses. Given the size of the Study Area, there are an extraordinary number of alternative spatial configurations to consider. The wind energy development scenarios considered by the State would cover 50-70 square miles of surface area in the MSP Study Area. With 7,835 hexagonal units in the Study Area, this equates to over 1.4×10^{130} possible different combinations of 50 hexagons, or over 2.3×10^{172} combinations of 70 hexagons.

Because of how areas of relatively higher suitability were concentrated in the results of PNNL's renewable energy models and how the interagency team set energy target parameters in Marxan, fewer potential combinations were involved in the scenarios analyzed by the interagency team (likely ranging from a few hundred thousand to a few million). Yet, the number of possible combinations remains large enough to be skeptical of conclusions drawn only from visual inspection of the overlay analysis. The Marxan analysis brings additional confidence to the Use Analysis. It rigorously compares wind energy potential and existing use intensities for this multitude of area combinations.

Marxan outputs

WDFW's analysis consisted of a series of "scenarios," each of which incorporated different goals and parameters. Marxan software provides two types of solutions per scenario: the "best solution" and "frequency solutions." For each scenario, the software performed a set of 1,000 runs (as selected by the interagency team). For each run, an algorithm searches through possible alternative combinations of hexagons, or area configurations. Marxan then identifies one area configuration that meets the energy target with the lowest existing use "score."

In this application of Marxan, the total existing use intensity within each hexagon was represented by a score. This score was defined by the use intensity ranks and the relative weighting they were assigned in each scenario. The "selection frequency" solutions identify the exact number of runs in which a hexagon was part of the selected area configuration. The "best solution" is the area configuration with the smallest total score (summed across all hexagons in the configuration), for all the iterations. However, "best solution" does not mean that the result provides a precise location for future energy projects.

Those familiar with optimization techniques may be used to the goal of finding the single, best "optimal" solution. Unlike these other techniques, Marxan's focus is, instead, on finding many "near optimal" or "feasible" solutions. This is central to Marxan's design and important to understand when interpreting the results.

As noted in the Marxan Best Practices Handbook, "Marxan is a decision support tool...its output should never be interpreted as "The Answer." Whilst each set of Marxan runs will produce a mathematically "best" solution, there is no single best solution to most of the conservation planning problems that Marxan is used to address, and likely many good solutions contingent upon factors not necessarily in the analysis (e.g., human use preferences, etc.)" (Ardron, J.A., Possingham, H.P., & Klein, C.J. (eds.), 2010).

Application of Marxan in the Use Analysis process

To learn about the potential for spatial conflict between future wind energy development and existing uses and resources, the State chose to configure Marxan to identify renewable energy generation targets (measured in MW) that minimized overlap with existing uses and resources. There are many possible ways of configuring Marxan. Each use can be weighted differently, resulting in innumerable possibilities. The interagency team explored various scenarios described below. Basic sensitivity analysis shows that the results did not differ substantially when weighting was altered for different scenarios.

During development of the Use Analysis, the interagency team worked through several scenarios that combined various energy goals, degrees of clumping desired in a solution (i.e., how spread out a renewable energy project could be), and weighting scores for existing uses. Each individual dataset was weighted based on factors including the goal of the scenario, the relative intensity of a given use, the number of layers being incorporated for that category of use, stakeholder input, and review by experts familiar with each sector. Scenarios were refined through an iterative process that included several workshops with the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) and other stakeholders.

After being weighted, each of the various data layers from Table 3.5 were summed for each hexagon to create input maps for Marxan. These input maps were used to direct Marxan in determining which hexagons were included in the final solution for each run. WDFW then produced output maps for many of these different scenarios. To produce the outputs for each scenario, Marxan attempts to select areas that meet energy targets while minimizing the number and intensity of existing uses, based on the sum of the weights in each hexagon. Note that this approach only accounts for the amount of use occurring in an area, not use value or potential for conflict with new uses. An example is shown in Figure 3.14, which presents a weighted map incorporating all the uses described in Table 3.5.

While scenarios representing both community- and industrial-scale wind energy projects were analyzed, community-scale projects are not shown in the Chapter 3 results. This is because the small size of these projects resulted in too many potential combinations for analysis. The interagency team determined that these projects were better assessed on a project-by-project basis.

Instead, industrial-scale energy projects equating to an energy target of 500 MW were established as the goal for Marxan solutions.⁶ The size of industrial-scale solutions was based on the number of one square mile hexagons these projects would need to cover to produce a certain amount of energy. These footprint targets were calculated based on knowledge of renewable energy technology at the time of the analysis, parameters of comparable renewable energy projects proposed or constructed in other states, and consultation with industry and state energy policy experts and planners on the potential future need for renewable energy capacity to meet state energy policies and growth in energy demand. Furthermore, based on feedback from the

⁶ This was converted for use in Marxan by estimating approximately 5 MW per wind turbine (from the PNNL report) and about 2 turbines per hexagon, for a total of about 50 hexagons. To calibrate Marxan to select about 50 hexagons, the state used an energy equivalent goal of 50,000. The energy equivalent score was determined by multiplying the average PNNL energy score (ranging from 7.25 – 10 m/s) for a hexagon by the average suitability index for the hexagon, and summing across all hexagons in a Marxan run. This equivalent score product averaged ~1,000 per hexagon across all non-zero hexagons in the project area. The energy equivalent score varied for each hexagon. Marxan was configured to run until the energy goal was reached. In some cases, this resulted in less than 50 hexagons being selected, and in some cases more than 50 hexagons were selected.

energy industry, dispersed solutions were not included, as this design is not considered economically feasible. Parameters were set in Marxan to produce a “clumped” solution.⁷




Figure 3.14: Combined map of weighted existing uses incorporated into Use Analysis (see Table 3.5 for list). Please note that Use Analysis maps do not identify areas recommended for development, or areas with a lack of potential conflict.

⁷ This involved applying a 20,000 boundary length modifier parameter in Marxan. This parameter penalizes the ratio of the perimeter length to area of the Marxan solution. The result is that outputs favor solutions that are clumped over those that are dispersed.

To illustrate how different weighting choices would affect the outcome of the Use Analysis, many other scenarios were assessed in which certain categories of uses were weighted more heavily. These included (but were not limited to) prioritizing avoiding:

- Areas with species, habitats, and cultural resources known to be particularly vulnerable to disturbance, such as endangered and threatened species (as discussed in Section 3.2).
- Important Dungeness Crab areas, including fishing grounds and habitats.
- The boundaries of regions with special concerns including the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, tug and tow lanes, and Special Management Areas for fisheries.

The next section discusses the results of a scenario that included all existing uses with extra weighting applied for sensitive species, crabber/tug and tow lanes, and Ecologically Important Areas (Figure 3.15). This scenario should not be seen as the final or recommended scenario, but provides an example of where Marxan may identify a solution based on assigning certain uses or species as higher priority.

In this scenario, sensitive species were defined as species listed as threatened or endangered (e.g. Marbled Murrelet or humpback whale), commercially or recreationally important fish species (e.g. Dungeness Crab and Yelloweye Rockfish), or discrete habitats that are crucial for fish and wildlife (e.g. rocky areas and kelp). Avoidance of these species and habitats was given the highest priority among all the layers. Crabber/tug and tow lanes were ranked similarly to the sensitive species, as these lanes are specifically negotiated between the Dungeness Crab and shipping industries to avoid gear conflicts. Other use layers were assigned a weight based on the intensity score, with high-intensity scores having weights of up to 10 times more than lower-intensity scores.

For some scenarios, WDFW performed analyses based on an existing use “threshold.” That is, Marxan was directed not to select any areas that exceeded a certain level of existing uses, based on the input data representing existing uses and resources. In these scenarios, Marxan was not able to identify an area that met the energy goal for an industrial-scale project. With the use threshold, the results identified relatively fewer areas that were scattered more broadly across the Study Area, with more areas identified for floating platform than for tripod or monopile technologies. As a result of the scattered nature of these solutions, maps of these outputs are not included in this chapter. This result indicates that although Marxan can find some areas that include relatively fewer existing uses than others, many high-intensity uses occur throughout the Study Area. No area identified by Marxan is entirely free from impacts from or potential conflict with future development.

As discussed in Section 3.2, estuaries were not included in the Use Analysis scenarios because of challenges associated with the scale of available data and the density of existing uses in these areas. Estuaries are known to be highly important areas for many human and ecological uses, and are addressed more fully in Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework (see Section 4.3.3).

Marxan Outputs

Clumped industrial-scale outputs and “best” solutions

Figure 3.15 displays the Marxan outputs for monopile, tripod, and floating platform technologies as clumped groups of hexagons (outlined areas) that would fulfill the expected energy requirements (see Section 2.10.1 for more information on the differences between these technologies).

These outputs are examples that produced the lowest overall interaction with existing uses and resources while still achieving the renewable energy goal in a clumped configuration out of all the Marxan iterations (or runs). As shown in Table 3.7, these outputs included different numbers of hexagons, with monopile resulting in the largest footprint.

Table 3.7 Hexagon footprints of “best” solutions shown in Figure 3.15.

Turbine Technology	Number of Hexagons
Monopile	74
Tripod	52
Floating platform	52

Selection frequency

As discussed above, the “best” solution is not as useful as Marxan’s ability to identify a range of potential outputs. During each analysis, the software performs hundreds of runs, creating many possible solutions. The selection frequencies in Figure 3.15 are displayed as broader areas of shaded gradients for each type of wind technology. Darker areas were more frequently selected by Marxan, while lighter areas were selected less often. The scores for different solutions may not vary greatly. This may be due to small differences between the use intensity and weighting scores of different hexagons. For example, in the floating platform scenario, the use intensity and weighting scores for the top forty solutions are within 1 percent of that for the best solution.

The total area over which candidate solutions appear for each technology provides information on the use patterns and energy suitability. If there are many different hexagons appearing in the frequency solutions, then we expect them to be chosen fewer times compared to scenarios where not as many hexagons are chosen. The floating platform analyses showed many more hexagons appearing at least once in the selection frequency results than those for monopile or tripod. This meant there were more options for floating platform than for the other technologies, and the number of times a particular hexagon was chosen (median or maximum) was far less than for the other technologies.

Table 3.8. Selection frequency results for different wind technologies.

Marxan results	Monopile	Tripod	Floating Platform
Total number of hexagons selected once	293	618	1917
Median number of times a hexagon was selected	196	88	25
Maximum number of times a hexagon was selected	559	179	79
“Best” solution - median selection frequency	428	65	142
“Best” solution - minimum selection frequency	120	44	24




Figure 3.15: Use Analysis outputs for clumped, industrial-scale wind energy (three types). Note that these results do not represent recommended areas for development, or areas with a lack of potential conflict. Analysis outputs represent theoretical scenarios and any potential development would require project- and site-specific analysis.

Figure 3.16 graphs the full distributions of the number of times different hexagons were selected in Marxan runs for each type of wind technology. A hexagon selected just once is likely not among those included in the “best solutions” mapped in Figure 3.15.

The shape of the distributions among the three technology scenarios provides interesting contrast in the use patterns where each technology is most suitable. The monopile distribution illustrates that there are fewer choices for minimizing interaction with existing uses, as a relatively smaller number of hexagons were repeatedly selected (over 400 times for certain hexagons). On the other hand, the floating platform distribution reveals a wider range of areas and combination of areas that could minimize interaction with existing uses, as demonstrated by fewer hexagons repeatedly being selected in results (fewer than 100 times for those chosen most frequently).




Figure 3.16: Number of times hexagons were selected in Marxan frequency solutions (zeros excluded) for the three wind energy technology scenarios.

Selection frequency intersection with existing uses and resources

While the Marxan tool was set up to find areas that minimized the uses or resources present, the results still contained areas of high uses and resources. Table 3.9 provides some examples of high uses and resources in the selected hexagons for each type of technology. Figure 3.17 shows the “best” solutions from Marxan on top of the number of high uses occurring in each hexagon. This shows that hexagons selected by Marxan still contain heavily used areas and important resources. This demonstrates the many potential conflicts that would need to be better understood and addressed should a project be proposed for any area illustrated by these analyses.

Table 3.9. Examples of Selection frequency outputs overlapping with high-intensity existing uses or resources.

Marxan results	Monopile	Tripod	Floating platform
Selection frequency: total number of hexagons selected at least once	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 291 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 618 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1917
Number of selected hexagons with particular types of high-intensity uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 289: High-intensity use by at least one fishery • 288: Recreational salmon fishing • 272: Sooty Shearwater • 227: Crab fishing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 618: Recreational salmon fishing • 601: Sooty Shearwater • 496: Commercial salmon fishing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1917: High-intensity use by at least one fishery • 550: Rocky reefs • 336: Cargo vessel traffic
Selections contained a large share of other high uses such as:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harbor porpoise, rocky reefs, Common Murre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Common Murre, rocky reefs, crab fishing, military uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than half of results high for commercial or recreational salmon.




Figure 3.17: Number of high-intensity existing uses and resources (out of a possible total of 16), with Marxan clumped results. Use Analysis maps do not identify areas recommended for development, or areas with a lack of potential conflict. Analysis outputs represent theoretical scenarios and any potential development would require project- and site-specific analysis.

Discussion and Comparison of Analyses

Use Analysis results and interpretations

Overall, the results of both the overlay and Marxan analyses provide a spatial illustration of the great number and intensity of existing uses occurring in the Study Area, and show how these relate to areas of renewable energy potential. There is no single final solution in this type of analysis, as each scenario prioritizes different factors and produces different outputs. The interagency team considered many different outputs and results from the use analysis when developing the recommendations and guidelines presented in Chapter 4: MSP Management Framework, which also defines the distinction between industrial- and community-scale projects for the purposes of the Marine Spatial Plan (see Section 4.3.4).

As discussed in the project assumptions, it is important to highlight that while the output maps offer a way to visualize existing uses and potential future uses, this type of analysis does not assess potential conflict or impacts that could occur from the introduction of new uses such as renewable energy production. The input layers give a measure of the current number of existing uses in a given area and the intensity of those uses relative to other areas based on recent data. However, this does not imply that fewer or less frequent existing uses would equate to less conflict in an area, or mean that any area is less valuable than another. In addition, changes in the environment or regulations may lead to changes in existing use patterns. Any evaluation of conflict or value would need to be done on a case-by-case basis for any potential projects.

The outputs described in this chapter, including those developed using Marxan, are not meant to be recommendations for areas where renewable energy projects should be sited. The outputs are simply the product of the knowledge of existing uses, our understanding of current renewable wind technology, and the data limitations associated with both.

Additionally, the technical suitability analysis conducted by PNNL and the Use Analysis outputs do not address any of the broader market or energy policy factors that may impact the feasibility or desirability of the Study Area for renewable energy development. There are many measures of potential impact that would need to be considered for any proposed projects. Advances in technology or other changes in the industry would affect the suitability or desirability of development in a particular area. Rather than siting recommendations, these results provide quantitative and visual representations of the overlap with existing uses that any offshore renewable energy development in the Study Area would encounter, based on current knowledge. The outputs displayed in this chapter and many other iterations and scenarios examined by the interagency team throughout the Use Analysis process guided the development of the recommendations in Section 4.3.4.

Comparison of overlay and Marxan results

The two analyses complement one another. The overlay analysis allows for quick visual evaluation of broad patterns, but fails to reveal obvious distinctions about where wind energy development would be most suitable for the least conflict. Comparing their results reveals more about the potential for conflict among uses than if only considered alone. The main conclusion drawn from the two analyses is that planning for wind energy development involves complex considerations of impacts to existing human and ecological uses of the Study Area.

One can compare the location of the Marxan best solutions in Figure 3.15 to the overlay scores for those same areas provided in Figure 3.14. Table 3.10 breaks down the specific overlay analysis scores for each of the Marxan best solutions. Given that the Marxan algorithm is

instructed to achieve the energy target, many of the best solution hexagons fall into the high energy suitability category.

Table 3.10. Count of overlay analysis scores for the three Marxan best solutions

Overlay score (energy, existing use)	Number of hexagons included in Marxan best solutions		
	Floating platform	Monopile	Tripod
H, H	7	7	35
H, M	25	22	12
H, L	9	0	0
M, H	0	12	3
M, M	5	28	2
M, L	6	0	0
L, H	0	0	0
L, M	0	2	0
L, L	0	3	0

The monopile technology scenario selected areas with more medium energy suitability scores than high suitability scores. It is also the only scenario that contains any low energy suitability scores. Only three of the 74 hexagons in the monopile footprint are found in hexagons ranked as having a low number of high-intensity uses in the overlay analysis. This contrasts with 52 medium use ranks and 19 high use ranks.

The majority of the tripod scenario best solutions hexagons (38 out of a total of 52) are ranked as having a high number of high-intensity uses by the overlay analysis. In contrast, the floating platform scenario best solution has 7 of its 52 hexagons ranked as having a high number of high-intensity uses. This reflects the deeper water needed by floating platform technology. It also reflects the pattern of a decreasing number of high-intensity uses moving from the mid- to outer continental shelf area.

A comparison to the Marxan selection frequency solutions is summarized in Figure 3.18. This figure shows the total sum of selection frequencies by technology type and overlay analysis score. In general, hexagons with high selection frequencies should be those that have favorable ratios of energy potential to use intensity (i.e. high energy potential and low use intensity).

The patterns seen in Figure 3.18 generally match those seen in the Marxan best solutions and so are not summarized in detail. The monopile technology scenario has a clear correlation to hexagons scored as medium for both energy and use in the overlay analysis, whereas the other two technologies favor the high energy potential hexagons. It is somewhat striking that very few of the Marxan solution frequencies appear in the high energy, low use category from the overlay analysis. Yet, there are only 24 total hexagons with this score combination.

Some of the differences in the results between the overlay and Marxan analyses may be explained by the fact that the Marxan analysis seeks to minimize all use scores, whereas the overlay analysis scores only take into account high-intensity uses. Likewise, the two analyses treat the energy scores differently. The comparisons here illustrate how these first-level analyses could be used to further investigate the information contained in the individual use layers. When

a need arises, the individual layers can be evaluated in much more detail and combined with additional sources of expertise and information.




Figure 3.18: Total count of Marxan selections by overlay analysis score and wind technology type.

Data Limitations and Uncertainty

Spatial analyses are often accompanied by concerns about misinterpretation. Maps convey information in a convincing and intuitive manner. Yet maps, like statistical or mathematical models, are often approximations of reality that can only represent features of interest subject to uncertainty. Given that it can be difficult to display uncertainty on a map effectively, a key concern is that maps will be viewed as providing more definitive answers than warranted by the input data and assumptions. This is related to a concern that the maps could then be used to guide decisions that they were not originally designed to inform, without proper regard for the uncertainty they contain.

Members of the interagency team and the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) expressed these concerns throughout development of the Use Analysis. The Marxan best solution maps, discussed above, were the most frequent target of concern. Viewed without the appropriate context or an understanding of this method’s strengths and weaknesses, maps might be interpreted as providing the definitive answer on where wind energy development should be sited. These Marxan solutions are not definitive. Ideally, maps should be able to stand alone and be interpretable with only the information provided in the map legend. Proper interpretation of information derived using complex methods like Marxan involves nuances that can be challenging or unintuitive to non-experts.

Concerns about uncertainty also apply to the individual maps used as inputs to the Use Analysis. The strength and specificity of conclusions that can be drawn from the Marxan and

overlay analyses ultimately trace back to these inputs. Marxan is a well-regarded tool and uses a state-of-the-art optimization algorithm. But, it can only optimize what it is given. To understand what is being minimized, one must look to the individual map layers and the accuracy with which they represent particular uses and ecological features. Likewise, it is important to understand what the “number of high intensity uses” means (in terms of how the use layers were ranked and aggregated) before attempting to draw specific conclusions from the overlay analysis.

The MSP already contains many examples of the individual map layers and descriptions of uncertainty. However, a layer-by-layer discussion of uncertainty would be too extensive to provide here. Those interested in using the maps should consult source documents and with map creators to better understand the limitations of each map (see Appendix C: Data Sources, Methods, and Limitations). The methods used to produce these maps are diverse, as are their approaches to handling uncertainty. Many were produced using advanced statistical models, and while some have formal measures of uncertainty, others only provide qualitative measures of uncertainty that express relative confidence in model estimates. Some maps, including several of the fisheries maps, were produced based on expert judgement and have no measures of uncertainty at all (Maps 17 – 29). It should be emphasized again that uncertainty matters in terms of the questions being asked. A map based on expert judgement may be limited in the questions it can answer. At the same time, it could be as accurate, or more so, than statistical models for answering general questions about where a use occurs and the relative importance of various areas.

Uncertainty arises from many sources, and can be classified in various ways. Several key issues related to uncertainty are discussed briefly below.

Measurement methods

Much of the uncertainty in the maps of existing uses stems from the nature of measurements and observations. To rank relative importance or intensity of use, it would be ideal to have continuous monitoring of where and when these uses are taking place. This is rarely achieved, with the exception of certain fishery and commercial shipping sectors. However, even when this ideal is not achieved, sufficient observations are still needed to understand use patterns. Because it is difficult and costly to do survey work in much of the Study Area, the monitoring and survey programs that produced the needed observations are limited.

Where programs do exist, sampling and statistical expansion are needed to produce estimates except in the rarest of cases. By definition, such statistical estimates are uncertain. Additionally, few survey programs exist to monitor fine-scale spatial patterns. Instead, the monitoring priority is typically tracking trends in the size of populations in aggregate over a relatively large area. This is, in part, why many of the maps require supplementary data (e.g. environmental covariates) and advanced statistical methods to make inferences about spatial importance.

Number and distribution of observations

All else equal, uncertainty will be lower where the number of observations are higher. This general pattern can be seen in many of the maps. For example, the NCCOS seabird and marine mammal maps (Section 3.1) involved a considerable effort to bring together data from a number of surveys. As seen in Figure 3.1 above, there were fewer surveys available in the offshore areas of the Study Area. The effect of this can be seen in the maps for Tufted Puffin and Marbled Murrelet (Figures 3.3 and 3.4). In these results, the areas highlighted as having higher uncertainty tend to be farther offshore.

Variability

Another key source of uncertainty is variability. Some features may be relatively stable, like commercial shipping activities. However, the broader California Current and Washington's Pacific coast are dynamic ecosystems with high variability seen on seasonal, annual, and decadal scales. Social, economic, political conditions are also causes of variability. The more uses or features differ between seasons and years, the more observations are needed to identify the relative importance of different areas. When maps are produced using data collected over a relatively short timespan, confidence in estimates of relative spatial importance should be lower.

Forecast uncertainty

Variability also raises questions of forecast uncertainty. Often, patterns seen in current data are used to make predictions about future patterns. Yet, if the dynamics that led to the current patterns change, the data may be of little use in understanding future patterns. Change may happen abruptly based on unforeseen ecological, economic, or social conditions. Or, change could be happening as gradual long-term trends that are difficult to separate from uncertainty created by naturally occurring variability, or due to observations. Both abrupt and gradual changes are relevant to the California Current, with increasing attention being paid to them due to climate change and ocean acidification.

Insufficient data and changing conditions

It is also important to consider uncertainty in the form of maps that could not be produced. Leatherback sea turtles, Green Sturgeon, and Short-tailed Albatross are three examples of species that are of high conservation concern and known to occupy the Study Area, but for which the available data was insufficient to produce maps of relative importance. In addition to these three, there are many other species that could not be mapped at all, including some of substantial ecological importance such as krill, copepods, anchovies, and benthic invertebrates.

Much of the discussion here has focused on the existing human and ecological use layers. Yet, uncertainty also affects the energy suitability data, as documented by the authors of those maps (Van Cleve et al., 2013). Marine renewable energy technologies are still in the early phases of technological development. Even over the course of developing the MSP, different studies about the economic feasibility of marine renewable energy have come to different conclusions. Changes in technology, economic conditions, or political support for alternative energy could all change the understanding of where energy potential is highest in the Study Area.

With these many sources of uncertainty in mind, the interagency team was cautious about offering more than broad patterns and general conclusions from the Use Analysis. Looking ahead, however, one can envision the individual use maps being used in attempts to answer a variety of questions. One can also envision these questions reaching for conclusions of increasing specificity. As these types of questions become more specific and the area of interest smaller, the demands on the data grow and uncertainty should be increasingly scrutinized to evaluate if an attempt should even be made to answer these types of questions.

References

- Ardron, J.A., Possingham, H.P., & Klein, C.J. (eds.). (2010). *Marxan Good Practices Handbook, Version 2* (p. 165 pages.). Victoria, BC, Canada: Pacific Marine Analysis and Research Association. Retrieved from <http://www.pacmara.org> [Source type 11]
- Guinotte, J.M., & Davies, A.J. (2014). Predicted Deep-Sea Coral Habitat Suitability for the U.S. West Coast. *PLoS ONE*, 9(4), e93918 [Source type 1].
- Menza, C., Leirness, J., White, T., Winship, A., Kinlan, B., Kracker, L., ... Antrim, L. (2016). *Predictive mapping of seabirds, pinnipeds and cetaceans off the Pacific Coast of Washington* (NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 210). Retrieved from http://www-stage.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Final_Report_NCCOS_MarineMammals_Birds.pdf [Source type 11].
- Point 97, & Surfrider Foundation. (2015). *An economic and spatial baseline of coastal recreation in Washington*. Prepared for Washington Department of Natural Resources. Retrieved from <http://publicfiles.surfrider.org/P97SurfriderWACoastalRecreationReport.pdf>. [Source type 9].
- Raphael, M.G., Baldwin, G.A., Falxa, M.H., Lance, M., Miller, S.L., Pearson, S.F., ... Thompson, C. (2007). *Regional population monitoring of the marbled murrelet: field and analytical methods*. (No. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-716.). Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. Retrieved from [Source type 4]
- Van Cleve, F. B., Judd, C., Radil, A., Ahmann, J., & Geerlofs, S. H. (2013). *Geospatial analysis of technical and economic suitability for renewable ocean energy development on Washington's outer coast* (No. PNNL-22554). Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/PNNL_EnergySuitability_Final-Report.pdf [Source type 11].
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. (2017a). *An Approach for Mapping Ecologically Important Areas Off the Washington Coast*. (Unpublished report).

Chapter 4: Marine Spatial Plan Management Framework

4.1 Existing Policies and Authorities

4.1.1 Introduction to the Management Framework

The Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) for Washington’s Pacific Coast provides data, information, analyses, and recommendations to address new potential ocean uses¹ in Washington’s marine waters such as marine renewable energy, offshore aquaculture, mining for sand and gravel or methane hydrates, new dredge disposal locations, or bioextraction. The MSP does not address or alter requirements for existing marine uses such as shellfish aquaculture, commercial or recreational fishing, recreation, shipping or navigation.² The MSP Study Area covers Washington’s marine waters³ along the Pacific Ocean from Cape Flattery to Cape Disappointment, from ordinary high water out to offshore waters. The Study Area extends to a distance offshore that follows the continental shelf at a water depth of 700 fathoms. The Study Area also includes the estuaries along the coast (Appendix A: Map 1).

The MSP Management Framework provides overall guidance and recommendations for applicants, agencies and third parties on using the plan in practice. The MSP also contains new enforceable policies that state and local agencies will use in their regulatory processes, and that the Department of Ecology will use to review federal actions under the Coastal Zone Management Act and the Washington Coastal Zone Management Program. The MSP should be used throughout the development of new ocean use proposals along Washington’s Pacific coast and in all stages of decision-making to protect the resources⁴ and current uses in the Study Area from adverse impacts arising from potential new uses. The MSP does not confer any state jurisdiction in federal waters and does not change any planning or regulatory programs for federal waters (see Section 4.1.5 and Appendix E for more details).

The State of Washington and tribal governments are legal co-managers of marine resources within the Study Area. Projects will benefit from early tribal consultations and the state highly recommends and encourages early tribal consultations. Some of the coastal tribes have adopted ocean policies or tribal marine spatial plans that establish resource protection standards as well as formal consultation procedures. Project proponents should also review and use those tribal policies and procedures at the earliest stages of project planning.

The information and processes outlined in the Management Framework are essential to assist agencies in evaluating whether a new ocean use project satisfies compliance with the

¹ Ocean uses is defined by WAC 173-26-360(3). See specific definitions for example uses in Appendix B. The term “new” is intended to distinguish future ocean use proposals from those uses that are currently permitted or that are undergoing permitting prior to the adoption of the final MSP.

² See WAC 173-26-360(4), which describes exemptions for fisheries, recreation and other existing commercial uses of renewable marine or ocean resources.

³ “Marine waters” is defined in [RCW 43.372.010\(9\)](#). Scoping further refined the study area for this specific plan.

⁴ For purposes of the MSP, the term “resources” includes important biotic and abiotic features of the environment, such as species, habitats, aesthetics, and chemical, physical, and biological functions and processes (e.g. upwelling) of the marine ecosystem.

Ocean Resources Management Act and its regulations.⁵ They may also support tribal government review in determining whether a new ocean use project may have any direct, indirect or cumulative adverse impacts to Treaty protected resources. Various state and local authorizations, such as city or county Shoreline Master Programs, have more specific requirements and regulations that may apply and that applicants will need to consult – depending on project location (see Section 4.1.4 for more details).

In particular, applicants need to follow the processes for coordination and engagement in Section 4.2.1, and need to demonstrate that their project complies with the spatial designations and recommendations in Section 4.3. They also must provide all information listed in Sections 4.4, 4.5, and 4.7, and address their compliance with the applicable standards in Sections 4.6 and 4.8. Applicants who also require federal permits, licenses or leases should also note Section 4.2.1.5, which discusses the state’s review under the Coastal Zone Management Act.

The development of the Management Framework was informed by recommendations from the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC), including concerns about the effects of new ocean uses on existing uses, coastal communities, and the environment. Actions that relate to specific WCMAC recommendations are referenced throughout the management framework. For complete WCMAC concerns and recommendation language, please see Chapter 5. The Management Framework contains the following major sections:

- [Section 4.1](#) - Information on existing policies, authorities and requirements that guide implementation of the MSP.
- [Section 4.2](#) - Process for reviewing and consulting on ocean use proposals and other state implementation activities.
- [Section 4.3](#) - Spatial designations and information to understand spatial limitations, potential conflicts and interactions; to inform project siting, development and design; and to identify appropriate parties to consult regarding potential proposals.
- [Section 4.4](#) – Project- and site-specific information requirements.
- [Section 4.5](#) - Contents of a written effects evaluation.
- [Section 4.6](#) – Review standards and design considerations.
- [Section 4.7](#) – Project construction and operation plans.
- [Section 4.8](#) – Standards specific to new use type.

4.1.2 Requirements to Implement the Final MSP

Washington’s marine waters planning and management law ([RCW 43.372](#)) requires state and local agencies to make decisions consistent with the final Marine Spatial Plan.⁶ At the same time, this law limits the state and local agencies to using their existing authorities to implement the plan, does not create any new authorities, and does not affect projects existing prior to nor

⁵ Depending on the project, other information may be required to process other permits or authorizations (see Section 4.1.4 for relationship to other state and local authorities). The Management Framework primarily focuses on the processes and specific information required for assessing compliance with the Ocean Resources Management Act and its regulations.

⁶ Upon the adoption of the marine management plan under [RCW 43.372.040](#), each state agency and local government must make decisions in a manner that ensures consistency with applicable legal authorities and conformance with the applicable provisions of the marine management plan to the greatest extent possible. ([RCW 43.372.050\(1\)](#))

during the development of the plan.⁷ As discussed in Section 1.6, tribes also maintain treaties ratified by the United States.⁸ The MSP and state law are not intended to and do not alter nor affect tribal treaty rights.

4.1.3 Existing State Ocean Policies, Permit Criteria and Regulations

The Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA) outlines state policies and regulations that specifically apply to policy, planning and permitting of ocean uses on Washington's Pacific coast ([RCW 43.143](#)).⁹

1. General policies:

When the State of Washington and local governments develop plans for the management, conservation, use, or development of natural resources in Washington's coastal waters, the following policies shall guide the decision-making process ([RCW 43.143.030\(1\)](#)).

- a. When conflicts arise among uses and activities, priority shall be given to resource uses and activities that will not adversely impact renewable resources over uses which are likely to have an adverse impact on renewable resources. ([RCW 43.143.010\(3\)](#))
- b. Recreational uses or currently existing commercial uses involving fishing or other renewable marine or ocean resources are not required to meet the planning and review criteria set forth in RCW 43.143.030. ([RCW 43.143.010\(5\)](#))
- c. The state shall participate in federal ocean and marine resource decisions to the fullest extent possible to ensure that the decisions are consistent with the state's policy concerning the use of those resources. ([RCW 43.143.010\(6\)](#))
- d. There shall be no leasing of state tidal waters or submerged lands¹⁰ for oil or gas exploration, development or production ([RCW 43.143.010\(2\)](#)).
- e. Actively encourage the conservation of liquid fossil fuels, and to explore available methods of encouraging such conservation. ([RCW 43.143.010\(4\)](#))

⁷ No authority is created under this chapter to affect in any way any project, use, or activity in the state's marine waters existing prior to or during the development and review of the marine management plan. No authority is created under this chapter to supersede the current authority of any state agency or local government. ([RCW 43.372.060](#))

⁸ See U.S. Constitution: Article VI, Section 2, which provides that the Constitution, federal laws and treaties are the supreme law of the land.

⁹ In January 2017, the Washington State Supreme Court ruled in *Quinault Indian Nation, et al v. Imperium Terminal Svcs., et al.* No. 92552-6 that ORMA's permit criteria applies two proposed crude oil export facilities located on the shoreline of Grays Harbor.

¹⁰ Applies specifically from mean high tide seaward and from Cape Flattery south to Cape Disappointment, in Grays Harbor, in Willapa Bay, and the Columbia River downstream from the Longview bridge.

2. Ocean uses planning and project review criteria

Uses or activities that require federal, state, or local government permits or other approvals and that will adversely impact renewable resources, marine life, fishing, aquaculture, recreation, navigation, air or water quality, or other existing ocean or coastal uses, may be permitted only if the criteria below are met or exceeded ([RCW 43.143.030\(2\)](#)):¹¹

- a. There is a demonstrated significant local, state, or national need for the proposed use or activity;
- b. There is no reasonable alternative to meet the public need for the proposed use or activity;
- c. There will be no likely long-term significant adverse impacts to coastal or marine resources or uses;
- d. All reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize adverse environmental impacts, with special protection provided for the marine life and resources of the Columbia River, Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor estuaries, and Olympic National Park;
- e. All reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize adverse social and economic impacts, including impacts on aquaculture, recreation, tourism, navigation, air quality, and recreational, commercial, and tribal fishing;
- f. Compensation is provided to mitigate adverse impacts to coastal resources or uses;
- g. Plans and sufficient performance bonding are provided to ensure that the site will be rehabilitated after the use or activity is completed; and
- h. The use or activity complies with all applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations.

Further regulations implementing the Ocean Resources Management Act are provided in [WAC 173-26-360](#), including the permit criteria listed above (WAC 173-26-360(6)), general use requirements (WAC 173-26-360(7)), and requirements for specific types of ocean uses (WAC 173-26-360(8)-(14)). Since these existing regulations apply to various phases of project review, they are integrated and referenced throughout the relevant sections of the MSP Management Framework, including: project- and site-specific information, effects evaluation, general review standards, and specific use review standards.

4.1.4 Relationship of the Marine Spatial Plan to Other Existing State and Local Authorities and Plans

Washington state law requires the MSP to be: 1) consistent with applicable state laws and programs and 2) implemented through existing state and local authorities ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(b\)](#) and [RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(d\)](#)). The law does not create new authority for state agencies nor does it affect projects or activities permitted prior to or during the development of the plan ([RCW 43.372.060](#)). The Marine Spatial Plan does not create new regulations. All state and local agencies are responsible for implementing and adhering to the plan through existing

¹¹ This includes applicability of ORMA's permit criteria to pending shoreline permits for crude oil transport facilities proposed in the shoreline of Grays Harbor, as ruled by the Washington State Supreme Court in January 2017.

regulatory and decision-making processes (see also interagency coordination in Section 4.2.2 and project and site-specific information in Section 4.4).

The MSP does contain new enforceable policies that state and local agencies will use in their regulatory processes, and that the Department of Ecology will use to review federal actions under the Coastal Zone Management Act and the Washington Coastal Zone Management Program (See Section 4.1.5 and Appendix E for more details). Additional federal permits, licenses, leases, authorizations or consultations may also be required depending on the type and location of the ocean use activity.¹² This section does not list out nor does it pertain to federal requirements.

1. State permits and authorizations

Most state and local authorities apply only within state waters between 0 and 3 nautical miles (nm) offshore.¹³ The Marine Spatial Plan provides the following key benefits to existing state and local authorities:

- a. Compiles inventory of baseline conditions and trends of uses and resources of the marine environment (Chapter 2).
- b. Provides data analyses to fulfill plan requirements and support plan designations and recommendations (Chapter 3).
- c. Provides recommendations on siting; site-specific information and assessments; effects analysis and monitoring and adaptive management for new ocean uses (Chapter 4).
- d. Improves process for agency review, consultation and coordination. (Chapter 4).
- e. Clarifies and further details the information needed to support the application of existing state laws and policies to potential new ocean uses (Chapter 4).

The tables below provide more specific information on the existing state and local authorizations that may apply to projects in marine waters. The following state authorizations may be required for projects in marine environments, depending on the specific project type and location.

State laws establish prohibitions on certain uses in Washington's marine waters. Leasing of state waters is prohibited for oil and gas exploration, development, and production (RCW 43.143.010). In addition, the 2018 state legislature prohibited new, commercial non-native finfish aquaculture in state marine waters, and phased-out the existing Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) facilities located in Puget Sound (RCW 79.105, 77.125, and 90.48).¹⁴

¹² Examples of these federal authorizations include: Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary authorizations, US Army Corps of Engineers Section 10 permits, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licenses, and consultations required under the Endangered Species Act.

¹³ See Washington State Constitution Article XXIV, Section 1 and Title 43 US Code 1312.

¹⁴ See Engrossed House Bill 2957, Chapter 179, Laws of 2018. Effective June 7, 2018.

Table 4.1.4-1: State permits or authorizations for aquatic projects.

State action¹⁵	Agency	Primary authority	Location	Focus area/purpose
Section 401 Certification	WA Department of Ecology (Ecology)	Federal Clean Water Act – delegated by EPA to Ecology. In some areas EPA or tribes issue permits.	State waters	Certifies that the project will comply with state water quality standards and other appropriate state laws.
CZMA Federal Consistency Decision	Ecology	Federal Coastal Zone Management Act WA’s approved Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP)	State and federal waters	Evaluates federal actions to ensure consistency with CZM Program’s approved enforceable policies. Allows state to evaluate federal actions that will affect state’s coastal resources.
NPDES Construction Stormwater General Permit ¹⁶	Ecology	Federal Clean Water Act - Section 402 delegated to Ecology In some areas EPA or tribes issue permits.	State waters	Prevents or minimizes sediment, chemicals, and other pollutants from entering surface water as a result of clearing, grading, and excavation activities.
Aquatic Use Authorization	WA Dept of Natural Resources	Public Lands Act RCW 79.105	State-owned aquatic lands	Administers leases, easements, and rights-of-entry to authorize use of the seabed and Washington’s marine waters.
Hydraulic Project Approval	WA Dept of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)	Hydraulic Code RCW 77.55	State waters	Allows for hydraulic projects in state waters; applies to any project that includes construction in state waters. Evaluates adequacy of protection of fish life.

¹⁵ Actions may be a permit, lease, easement, or other authorization. As a part of these various processes there are formal and informal consultations among various federal, state, local, and tribal authorities. The coordination process will vary by permit and lead agency.

¹⁶ This permit is triggered if more than 1 acre of upland lands is disturbed.

Table 4.1.4-1 (continued): State permits or authorizations for aquatic projects.

State action ¹⁷	Agency	Primary authority	Location	Focus area/purpose
Scientific Collection Permit	WDFW	RCW 77.12.047	State waters	Allows for collection of fish, shellfish, wildlife, or birds for scientific investigation (i.e. not commercial sale or personal consumption). Specific requirements on methods and amounts may apply.
Trial Commercial Fishery Permit	WDFW	RCWs: 77.12.047 , 77.50.050 , 77.60 , and 77.70	State waters	Allows for trial harvest of newly classified species, or harvest of previously classified species in a new area or by new means, but no need to limit participation.
Experimental Fishery Permit	WDFW	RCWs: 77.12.047 , 77.50.050 , 77.60 , and 77.70	State waters	Allows for harvest in an emerging commercial fishery or expanding commercial fishery (need to limit participation).
Marine Finfish Aquaculture	WDFW	RCW 77.12.047 , 77.15.030 , 77.125	State marine waters	Allows for an aquatic farmer to possess any species, stock or race of marine finfish in net pens, cages or other rearing vessels. Must have escape prevention, reporting and recapture plan. No transgenic fish are allowed.
Shellfish Aquaculture Transfer	WDFW	RCWs: 77.12.047	State waters	Allows for transfer of shellfish, shellfish aquaculture products, aquaculture equipment or any marine organisms adversely affecting shellfish.
Right of Way Permit	WA State Parks	Seashore Conservation Area (SCA) RCW 79A.05.600 to 79A.05.695	Coastal beaches in the SCA	Protects conservation areas for public recreation, cultural, and educational experiences.

¹⁷ Actions may be a permit, lease, easement, or other authorization. As a part of these various processes there are formal and informal consultations among various federal, state, local, and tribal authorities. The coordination process will vary by permit and lead agency.

2. Local Authorizations or Plans

Washington's local governments (cities and counties) have a variety of authorizations and permits that may apply to ocean use projects, depending on the specific project type and location (see Table 4.1.4-2). In particular, under the Shoreline Management Act, local governments (cities or counties) develop Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs) that regulate local permit decisions over shoreline development. For all counties and a few cities on the Pacific coast, this local jurisdiction also extends to 3 nm.¹⁸ Applicants will need to consult the applicable local jurisdiction(s)' SMP for their proposed project area for applicable local shoreline designations, permitted uses, and other regulations.

The Marine Spatial Plan provides information, analyses and recommendations for local governments to consider and incorporate in these processes, particularly in updating and revising their local SMP. To be consistent with the MSP, local governments on Washington's Pacific coast will need to update their local programs and incorporate information, analyses, and recommendations from the final, adopted plan.¹⁹ Other management plans may exist that would benefit by incorporating the MSP.

The Table 4.1.4-2 does not include tribal requirements. Areas under tribal jurisdiction or in tribal waters may be subject to additional tribal requirements.

¹⁸ This includes Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor and Pacific counties and the cities of Westport, Ocean Shores, Long Beach and Ilwaco (Ilwaco has a small ocean facing parcel).

¹⁹ [RCW 43.372.040\(10\)](#): the plan must identify any provisions of existing management plans that are substantially inconsistent with the plan.

Table 4.1.4-2: Local permits and other authorities for aquatic projects.

Action²⁰	Agency	Primary Authority	Location	Focus Area/Purpose
Shoreline Master Program Permits ²¹	Local county or city	Shoreline Management Act RCW 90.58 and WAC 173-27 (Ocean Use Guidelines – WAC 173-26-360). Local Shoreline Master Program	State shorelines, including state marine waters	Protects shoreline natural resources and public access while encouraging water dependent uses.
Critical Areas Ordinance Permits	Local county or city	Growth Management Act RCW 36.70A	County/city lands and waters	Protects locally-designated critical areas such as wetlands, habitat conservation areas, and frequently flooded areas.
Floodplain Development Permit	Local county or city	Floodplain Management RCW 86.16	County/city floodplains	Reduces social and economic loss caused by flood events. Project may not increase potential for damage from flood waters.
SEPA	State agency or local (depends on project) ²²	State Environmental Policy Act RCW 43.21C	State (land or water) State or local review of project or plan	Requires state and local agencies to review proposals to identify environmental impacts.

²⁰ Formal and informal consultations among various federal, state, local, and tribal governments occur as part of these processes. The process varies by permit and lead agency.

²¹ Permits may include Exemptions, Shoreline Substantial Development Permits, Conditional Use Permits, or Variances.

²² Federal projects/plans may trigger NEPA regardless of location.

4.1.5 Coastal Zone Management Act, Federal Consistency, and How the MSP Builds Upon Washington’s Existing Coastal Zone Management Program

Under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), the “federal consistency” provision²³ gives a coastal state a strong voice that it would not otherwise have in federal agency decision-making for activities that may affect the coastal uses or resources of a state’s coastal zone. Generally, federal consistency requires that federal actions,²⁴ within and outside the coastal zone, which have reasonably foreseeable effects on any coastal use (land or water) or natural resource of the coastal zone be consistent with the enforceable policies²⁵ of a state’s federally-approved Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP).

For activities within and outside state marine jurisdiction proposed by federal agencies or activities that require federal permits or licenses, compliance will be determined based on consistency with the enforceable policies in the NOAA-approved Washington’s CZMP and through the CZMA federal consistency review process in NOAA’s CZMA regulations (see [15 CFR Part 930](#)).

Whether a particular federal license or permit activity proposed in federal waters is subject to Washington review depends on whether the state has, pursuant to [15 CFR § 930.53](#), (1) listed the federal authorization in the Washington Coastal Zone Management Program, and (2) the proposed listed activity falls within a NOAA-approved “Geographic Location Description” (GLD). If Washington has not listed the activity and does not have a NOAA-approved GLD, the state can seek NOAA approval to review a project on a case-by-case basis as an “unlisted activity” pursuant to [15 CFR § 930.54](#). If a federal action, including the issuance of any federal authorizations, is subject to Washington CZMA review, it shall be supported by the information required in NOAA’s regulations at either 15 CFR §§ [930.39](#), [930.58](#) or [930.76](#).

For federal waters, and for projects proposed in federal waters and reviewed by the state through the CZMA federal consistency provision, the MSP cannot contain requirements, areas for protection, or preferred uses or outcomes. However, the data and maps in the MSP contain a substantial amount of environmental, ecological, geologic, and human use information for state and federal waters. This information will be useful for environmental reviews (including reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act and coastal effects analyses under the CZMA), and other planning and regulatory decisions. The state may use the data and maps for federal waters to assess coastal effects. However, Washington’s CZMA federal consistency concurrence or objection must be based on enforceable policies contained in the NOAA-approved Washington CZMP.

The Marine Spatial Plan for Washington’s Pacific Coast contains information, policies and recommendations that build upon and further refine Washington’s existing CZMP, which is administered by the Department of Ecology (See section 4.2.1.5 for information on necessary data and information, and Appendix E for a description of enforceable policies under the MSP).

²³ See Section 307 of the CZMA (16 U.S.C. Section 1456).

²⁴ This includes actions that require federal licenses or permits and federal agency activities or projects.

²⁵ Washington’s CZMP maintains a list of existing, NOAA-approved enforceable policies. Proposed new enforceable policies identified in the MSP management framework are listed in Appendix E. These are still subject to subsequent review and approval by NOAA.

The enforceable policies of Washington’s CZMP include provisions from the following state laws and their implementing regulations:

- Shoreline Management Act (SMA)²⁶
- State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)
- State Water Pollution Control Act and Water Quality Standards
- Clean Air Washington Act
- Ocean Resource Management Act (ORMA)

In particular, ORMA requires state approvals for ocean uses to meet a number of broad policies and permit criteria including avoiding and minimizing significant adverse impacts to the environment, economy, and society. The MSP assists implementation of ORMA’s requirements by identifying and analyzing important ocean resources and uses upfront. It also assists by further detailing the data, information, analyses, and processes needed to apply the policies and standards in ORMA and its regulations to permits, licenses or leases for new ocean uses in coastal waters.²⁷

This, in turn, provides the information needed for the Department of Ecology (Ecology) to evaluate whether a federal action may have reasonably foreseeable effects on the state’s coastal uses or resources, including effects from a proposed project in federal waters. As noted above, the MSP also ensures information and analyses are provided for federal actions to help the state determine whether a federal action is consistent with the state’s enforceable policies.

4.2 State Plan Implementation

The state will undertake a number of activities to implement the Marine Spatial Plan. These activities primarily fall into two categories: 1) reviewing proposals for new ocean uses and 2) other activities that assist in monitoring, evaluation, adaptation, and revision of the plan.

[Section 4.2.1](#) provides an overview of the state process for reviewing proposed new ocean uses. Sections 4.3 - 4.8 provide spatial designations, standards, requirements, and recommendations that apply to proposed new ocean uses during different phases of the process. The following roadmap generally describes activities during these different phases of the process and sections of the Management Framework that apply to those phases.

New Ocean Uses Roadmap

Application Phase:

- Applicant consults MSP, reviews management framework, spatial designations, etc. and uses them to shape potential project ideas. (Entire MSP, Chapter 4, and Section 4.3)
- Applicant conducts pre-application meetings with agencies, affected tribal governments, and stakeholder groups. Applicant continues to receive feedback from and respond to

²⁶ State-approved, local Shoreline Master Programs are the local expression of these enforceable policies. While local programs are not submitted as “enforceable policies”, a federal action’s conformance with the applicable local program informs Washington’s federal consistency reviews and responses.

²⁷ After adoption of the final plan, the MSP should be used as guidance for any future projects determined to trigger ORMA’s permit criteria, including such projects in shorelines directly adjacent to the MSP Study Area. The federal consistency review process described in this section only applies to state review of federal actions.

requests of agencies, tribal governments, and others to refine proposed project. (Section 4.2.1)

- Applicant develops and submits required project and site-specific data and information through Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA), SEPA checklist, and other mechanisms. (Section 4.4)
- Applicant submits additional project information, including construction/operation, mitigation, and other plans. (Section 4.7)

Review Phase:

- Lead agency assesses effects of and potential adverse impacts from project.
- Applicant submits written effects evaluation to Ecology. (Sections 4.5, 4.6 and 4.8)
- State agencies review project for consistency with existing laws and policies.

[Section 4.2.2](#) outlines the other activities the state will take to implement the Marine Spatial Plan, such as monitoring and adapting the plan.

4.2.1 Implementation: Process for Reviewing Ocean Uses

1. State agency coordination of review of renewable energy and other new ocean uses

As noted in section 4.1, state and local agencies are required to implement the MSP consistent with their authorities ([RCW 43.372.050](#)). Tribal governments should be consulted with beginning at the earliest possible stage of a new proposed project, and a review of tribal ordinances, policies, and consultation procedures should be initiated at the earliest possible stage of project planning. In addition, state and local agencies are required to follow the planning and project review criteria for ocean uses ([RCW 43.143.030](#)).

State law requires the interagency team to develop a framework for coordinating state agency and local government review of proposed renewable energy developments and to provide for timely review and action upon renewable energy development proposals while ensuring protection of sensitive resources and minimizing impacts to other existing or projected uses in the area ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(f\)](#)). State agencies will actively monitor the potential for and status of renewable energy project proposals in federal waters off Washington. When potential projects are considered likely, state agencies will request that the Governor seek the establishment of a taskforce with the Bureau of Energy Management (BOEM).

State and local agencies will coordinate their roles and review of new ocean use proposals, including the following:

- a. Pre-application Meetings – Agencies request that applicants hold meetings for potential project proposals with state and local agencies prior to submitting any applications for leases, licenses or permits. During the pre-application stage, state agencies will work together to:
 - i. Encourage applicants to use the Marine Spatial Plan to understand potential use and resource conflicts, including having applicants review the baseline data, maps, analyses, and management framework. This information can assist applicants in avoiding and minimizing impacts to resources and uses through project siting and design.

- ii. Ensure applicants provide required data and information about the project, and that they identify and coordinate with stakeholder groups as well as other governments, including local, tribal, and federal government entities.
 - iii. Communicate state and local policies, procedures, and requirements, including those referenced in the Marine Spatial Plan.
- b. Inventory – Review adequacy of site-specific inventory and coordinate on their requests for additional data or studies.
- c. Effects Analysis – Review adequacy of effects evaluation, proposed mitigation measures, and best management practices.
- d. Plans – Review proposed construction and operation plans, including adequacy of prevention, monitoring, and response plans.

The interagency team (State Ocean Caucus) will assess needs to further specify how best to coordinate on individual, proposed projects and to create more detailed agreements for the review process, as needed.

2. Government coordination (local governments, tribes, federal agencies)

Tribes, local governments and federal agencies also play important roles in reviewing proposed ocean uses. The State is committed to collaborating and communicating with other government entities on the review of proposed ocean uses, including:

- a. Ensuring government entities receive early notification of proposed projects and activities. State agencies will share information regarding potential projects with other government entities and assist applicants in identifying other government entities to contact.
- b. Discussing and determining how best to communicate and coordinate given a proposed project’s type, location and scale. This may include convening a government coordination and review team to streamline communication and coordination between the applicant and government entities.
- c. Understanding one another’s interests, needs, and concerns regarding proposed ocean uses.
- d. Recommending best available scientific information and other information to evaluate potential impacts of a proposed ocean use.

3. Stakeholder input

- a. Applicants should involve stakeholders and the public in all aspects of project development and review, including:
 - i. Working collaboratively with stakeholders, including but not limited to stakeholders representing fishing, aquaculture, maritime commerce, conservation, tourism, and recreation interests, and the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC).

- ii. Providing timely and effective notice, including early notification to WCMAC.²⁸ WCMAC is a forum that can facilitate information sharing about proposed projects and the status of decision-making processes among agencies and stakeholders. For state permitting purposes for any project that includes any proposed structure (temporary or permanent), a pre-application notice should be provided to WCMAC to ensure effective communication and coordination with coastal stakeholder interests.

Applicants shall provide notice to WCMAC once a federal application has been submitted. This notice shall be necessary data and information required for federal consistency reviews for the purposes of starting the CZMA six-month review period for federal license or permit activities under [15 C.F.R. Part 930](#), Subpart D, and OCS Plans under [15 C.F.R. Part 930](#), Subpart E, pursuant to 15 C.F.R. § [930.58\(a\)\(2\)](#) (see Section 4.2.1.5).

- iii. Initiating both formal and informal pre-application discussions between stakeholders and applicants (see Chapter 5: WCMAC recommendations 3.1.1 and 3.1.3).
- b. Applicants and agencies should provide stakeholders and the public with early notice and opportunity to review and comment at key stages on various studies and assessments produced for the project, including social, economic, and environmental impact assessments. Applicants or agencies should provide response to comments and third party review of economic assessments (see Chapter 5: WCMAC recommendations 1.1.1 and 1.3.2).

4. Fisheries groups

The marine spatial planning law requires that: “Any provision of the marine management plan that does not have as its primary purpose the management of commercial or recreational fishing but that has an impact on this fishing must minimize the negative impacts on the fishing. The team must accord substantial weight to recommendations from the director of the department of fish and wildlife for plan revisions to minimize the negative impacts.” ([RCW 43.372.040\(8\)](#)).

As noted in WCMAC’s recommendations (see Chapter 5, including problem statements), Washington’s Pacific coast has unique conditions related to potential conflicts and impacts to fisheries. In particular, there are concerns about interactions with fishing gear, as well as access to and reduction in fishing areas posed by new structures in the ocean. Therefore, the following process is set out for new ocean use projects to identify potential adverse impacts²⁹ to state commercial and recreational fisheries and opportunities to avoid, minimize or mitigate those impacts (Chapter 5: WCMAC 3.1.2, and [RCW 43.143.030\(2\)](#)).

- a. Applicants will notify the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife’s (WDFW) Intergovernmental Ocean Policy office regarding a potential project proposal, as early as possible, including likely location(s) of the project.

²⁸ Applicants may provide notice to WCMAC either via the chair or Department of Ecology staff that administer WCMAC, who will forward the notice to WCMAC members.

²⁹ As noted in Section 4.5, this includes direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts.

- b. The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife will then provide timely notice to affected stakeholders, which may include established fishing advisory groups³⁰ and license holders, for potentially affected commercial and recreational fisheries.
- c. Applicants will coordinate with WDFW and commercial and recreational fisheries on an effective process and schedule to identify and discuss potential adverse impacts on commercial and recreational fisheries and opportunities to avoid, reduce, or minimize impacts, which may require multiple meetings. For state-permitting purposes for any project that includes any proposed structure (temporary or permanent),³¹ a pre-application meeting must be scheduled and held in a timely manner with WDFW to ensure effective communication and coordination. WDFW will include affected fishery stakeholders in the meeting (See Section 4.2.1.5).

The meeting shall be necessary data and information required for federal consistency reviews for purposes of starting the CZMA six-month review period for federal license or permit activities under 15 C.F.R. Part 930, Subpart D, and OCS Plans under 15 C.F.R. Part 930, Subpart E, pursuant to 15 C.F.R. § [930.58\(a\)\(2\)](#) and WDFW will reasonably accommodate an applicant's request for a meeting so that the start of the CZMA review period is not delayed. Unless the applicant requests a later timeframe, WDFW will schedule the meeting to occur within 30 days of receiving the request (See Section 4.2.1.5).

- d. WDFW's Intergovernmental Ocean Policy office will provide recommendations on ways to minimize impacts to fishing to Ecology's Coastal Zone Management Program Manager during the project review process ([RCW 43.372.040\(8\)](#)).

5. Necessary data and information for the State's review of federal license or permit activities under the CZMA:

In reviewing a federal license or permit activity or an outer continental shelf (OCS) plan under the CZMA § 307(c)(3)(A) and (B) and NOAA's regulations at 15 CFR Part 930, Subpart D and Subpart E, the Washington Coastal Zone Management Program (administered by Department of Ecology) will review the consistency certification together with the required necessary data and information to ensure the project is consistent with the approved enforceable policies of the Washington Coastal Zone Management Program. The phrase "necessary data and information" has a specific meaning under 15 CFR § [930.58](#) and refers to the information needed to start a state's six-month CZMA review period. It does not refer to all information a state may need to make its CZMA decision.

³⁰ For many different fisheries, WDFW coordinates with formally established and informal fishery advisory groups. These groups are typically fishery-specific and set up for specific target species, gear types, or areas. Fisheries with advisory groups include: coastal Dungeness crab, ocean salmon, groundfish, at-sea Pacific whiting, highly migratory species (e.g., albacore tuna), coastal pelagic species (e.g., sardine, mackerel), recreational halibut, and recreational bottomfish.

³¹ As noted above and in WCMAC's recommendations (Chapter 5), adverse impacts could occur, if structures are placed in certain areas – regardless of the size or scale of the project.

Specifically, 15 CFR part [930.58](#) describes that applicants for federal license or permit activities must provide the Washington Coastal Zone Management Program with the consistency certification and:

- A detailed description of the proposed activity, its associated facilities and coastal effects, and comprehensive data and information to support the applicant’s consistency determination.
- Maps, diagrams, technical data, and other relevant material, when a written proposal alone will not adequately describe the proposal.
- A copy of the federal application and all supporting material provided to the federal agency.
- An evaluation that includes a set of findings related to the coastal effects of the proposal and its associated facilities to the relevant enforceable policies of the management program.

This Marine Spatial Plan Management Framework provides guidance to applicants on information that the State believes will satisfy the State’s information requirements and enable the state to complete the consistency review process for a new ocean use project. This includes: the fisheries process in Section 4.2; the spatial designations and recommendations in Section 4.3; information listed in Sections 4.4, 4.5, and 4.7; and compliance with applicable standards in Sections 4.6 and 4.8. Applicants will need to provide all of this information in a timely manner during the state’s CZMA six-month review period to enable the state to complete the consistency review process for a new ocean use project. Applicants that fail to provide this information in a timely manner impede the state’s ability to review the project and will face potential state objection to the applicant’s consistency certification.³²

Additionally, for federal permit, license or lease applicants, NOAA’s regulations allow a state to identify additional necessary data and information a state believes is needed to start the CZMA six-month review period. The Marine Spatial Plan identifies the following as Necessary Data and Information³³ for purposes of starting the CZMA 6-month review period for federal license or permit activities under [15 CFR Part 930](#), subpart D, and OCS Plans under [15 CFR Part 930](#), subpart E, pursuant to 15 CFR [930.58\(a\)\(3\)](#):

- a. A copy of the notice provided to the WCMAC³⁴ chair and membership (see Section 4.2.1.3(a)(ii)).
 - o Applicants shall provide notice to WCMAC once a federal application has been submitted. This notice shall be required information to start CZMA review.

³² Under the CZMA federal consistency provision, if a state objects to an applicant’s consistency certification under 15 CFR Part 930, Subparts D, E or F, the applicable federal agency cannot authorize the activity unless the state removes its objection or the applicant appeals the objection to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary overrides the state’s CZMA objection.

³³ Other existing necessary data and information is described in Washington’s approved Coastal Program document.

³⁴ The Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) was established in the office of the governor by [RCW 43.143.050](#) with duties outlined in [RCW 43.143.060](#). WCMAC has 26 gubernatorial-appointed seats, including a wide range of coastal stakeholder interests, ocean user groups, and state agencies. Ecology provides staff support for WCMAC through the state’s Coastal Zone Management Program. Applicants may provide notice to WCMAC via the chair or Ecology’s CZMP staff. The WCMAC chair or Ecology staff will forward the notice to WCMAC members.

- Applicants may provide notice to WCMAC either via the chair or Ecology staff that administer WCMAC, who will forward the notice to WCMAC members.
 - For state permitting purposes for any project that includes any proposed structure (temporary or permanent), a pre-application notice should be provided to WCMAC to ensure effective communication and coordination with coastal stakeholder interests.
- b. A copy of the sign-in and summary from a meeting with WDFW and affected fisheries stakeholders (see also Section 4.2.1.4(c)).
- Applicants will notify the WDFW Intergovernmental Ocean Policy office regarding a potential project proposal as early as possible, including likely location(s) of the project.
 - WDFW will then provide timely notice to affected stakeholders, which may include established fishing advisory groups³⁵ and license holders, for potentially affected commercial and recreational fisheries.
 - For state-permitting purposes for any project that includes any proposed structure (temporary or permanent),³⁶ a pre-application meeting must be scheduled and held in a timely manner with WDFW to ensure effective communication and coordination. WDFW will include affected fishery stakeholders in the meeting.
 - The meeting shall be required necessary data and information to start the CZMA review. WDFW will reasonably accommodate an applicant’s request for a meeting so that the start of the CZMA review period is not delayed. Unless the applicant requests a later timeframe, WDFW will schedule the meeting to occur within 30 days of receiving the request.

6. Recommendations for federal agencies and federal waters

The state will follow the processes outlined above for reviewing new proposals for ocean uses. Furthermore, the state recommends federal agencies use the data, information, processes, and recommendations in the Marine Spatial Plan to guide their planning and review of proposed ocean uses, including in federal waters adjacent to Washington’s Pacific Coast (as required by [RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(d\)](#)). Other sections that include references to federal activities or federal waters include Sections 4.1.5, 4.2.1.5, 4.2.2, and 4.3.1.

³⁵ For many different fisheries, WDFW coordinates with formally established and informal fishery advisory groups. These groups are typically fishery-specific and set up for specific target species, gear types, or areas. Fisheries with advisory groups include: coastal Dungeness crab, ocean salmon, groundfish, at-sea Pacific whiting, highly migratory species (e.g., albacore tuna), coastal pelagic species (e.g., sardine, mackerel), recreational halibut, and recreational bottomfish.

³⁶ As noted above and in WCMAC’s recommendations, adverse impacts could occur, if structures are placed in certain areas – regardless of the size or scale of the project.

4.2.2 Implementation: Other State Activities and Recommendations

Plan implementation by state agencies depends on available resources, capacity, priorities, and opportunities to leverage outside expertise and resources. To account for these factors and variations, the interagency team will seek input on and further develop more detailed work plans that specify roles, tasks, timelines and processes for implementing these activities.

1. Finalize ecosystem indicators

Ecosystem indicators provide important context for decision-making. Ecosystem-level ecological integrity indicators provide important insights into the big picture of ecosystem health. The current list of ecological and social indicators developed for the MSP is too long to be an effective management tool or to be operationalized (Andrews, Coyle, & Harvey, 2015; Poe, Watkinson, Trosin, & Decker, 2015). While the economic indicators report provides a list of the top 5 economic indicators, the economic indicators report lists other potential economic indicators (Decker, 2015).³⁷ More work is needed to refine and select key indicators for monitoring ecosystem health for Washington's Pacific coast as required by [RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(a\)](#).

In implementing the plan, state agencies will work with federal agencies, tribes, WCMAC, and others to refine the current list of ecosystem indicators using the steps outlined below.

The state interagency team will leverage existing expertise and seek additional resources, where necessary, to follow through on these process steps to finalize ecosystem (ecological, social, and economic) indicators:

- a. Establish management priorities:** Convene state, federal and tribal resource managers to narrow the large pool of potential ecosystem indicators to a manageable list. Identify key priority indicators using conceptual models to refine why they are meaningful to various managers/management actions. Identify baselines and targets, where able.
- b. Enlist experts to perform sensitivity assessments:** Use models to test sensitivity of key indicators to management actions and scenarios. Evaluate effectiveness of current monitoring strategies.
- c. Monitor indicators:** Create list of indicators for monitoring and pursue funding or adjustment in current monitoring efforts to address any gaps.
- d. Evaluate and adapt indicators:** Revisit indicators on regular basis and revise list of indicators as needed to target most effective set of monitoring for management needs.

³⁷ From this report, suggested top economic indicators include: Gross Regional Product; Month-to-Month Unemployment, Per Capita Income, Job Diversity, and Poverty Rate.

2. Science and research agenda

The interagency team will develop and implement a Pacific Coast Science and Research Agenda using an inclusive process with researchers, tribal, federal, state and local governments, WCMAC, and others, to improve scientific information available for managing ocean resources. The Science and Research Agenda will allow the state to:

- a. Continue to learn about Washington’s Pacific coastal resources and activities;
- b. Better understand potential effects of future developments and other human impacts; and
- c. Increase understanding of projected impacts of climate change and other changes occurring in the marine system.

Building off work begun in the marine spatial planning process, the state will bring together key scientists, ocean users, government agencies, and others to help the state identify data gaps, short- and long-term research priorities, potential partners, and potential funding sources. Along with the efforts to finalize ecosystem indicators, the Science and Research Agenda provides a process to identify additional data gaps and to work to acquire new scientific data to strengthen plans ([RCW 43.372.005\(3\)\(b\)](#)) as well to determine how best to maintain, manage, and update existing datasets, including enabling assessment of status and trends (Chapter 5: WCMAC 4.1.1).

3. List substantially inconsistent existing management plans and provide recommendations on aligning plans (if needed, as required by [43.372.040\(10\)](#)).

4. Incorporate the MSP into Washington’s Coastal Zone Management Program.

As required by [RCW 43.372.040\(12\)](#), Ecology plans to submit the final MSP to NOAA to be incorporated into its federally-approved Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP). Once NOAA approves of the incorporation of any information and enforceable policies within the MSP into Washington’s CZMP,³⁸ they are applicable to those federal actions that affect the uses or resources of Washington’s coastal zone and are subject to the federal consistency requirements of the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). (See Section 4.1.5 for more details on CZMA authorities, federal consistency review process, and Washington’s CZMP.)

5. Sediment management planning and coastal erosion monitoring

Keeping sand in our coastal littoral systems (i.e. placing the sand on the beach or as close to the beach as possible) protects vulnerable coastal areas from the effects of coastal storms, helps maintain beaches and dunes, maintains and enhances important habitat, and supports public access to and use of shorelines.

³⁸ According to NOAA regulations and guidance, to be incorporated and approved into Washington’s CZMP, the spatial designations, recommendations, and other standards included in the MSP and applied to ocean uses should be based on coastal effects and substantive evidence. They should not discriminate against a particular use, user or activity.

- a. As state funding allows, state agencies will continue to monitor shoreline change on the Washington coast and provide technical assistance to help communities understand the implications of data. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.4)
- b. State agencies will continue to support and advance implementation of the Mouth of the Columbia River Regional Sediment Management Plan and other local plans aimed at addressing navigation safety and beneficial use of dredge materials. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.2)
- c. Through their permitting and authorizations, state agencies will work in partnership to evaluate new dredge disposal sites to ensure they are consistent with these other plans.

6. Government coordination

Washington State is committed to coordination and communication with local governments, tribes, federal agencies and other states on Washington’s Marine Spatial Plan on an ongoing basis. The interagency team will pursue mechanisms that foster recognition of and implementation of one another’s plans. Such efforts can:

- a. Continue to improve our understanding and management of ocean and human uses through ongoing data collection, maintenance, and prioritization.
- b. Foster greater collaboration and communication among government entities in an efficient and strategic manner.
- c. Assist in Marine Spatial Plan implementation and adaptation, including integration with tribal plans and federal recognition and use of Washington’s Marine Spatial Plan.

7. Adaptive management of plan and plan updates (Chapter 5: WCMAC 4.1.2)

Since conditions change over time, plans benefit from having a regular process to review and adapt the plan as needed. Recognizing this need, this section addresses adaptive management, which is also required by the MSP law.³⁹ Using the processes described in the plan implementation section:

- a. The interagency team will address minor revisions to update information and clarify plan processes on an ongoing basis, as needed.
- b. The interagency team will identify new information and update data on the website, as resources allow. The mapping application is designed to automatically receive updated data from many, but not all, data sources.

Using the Plan Performance Monitoring and Ecosystem Indicator Monitoring processes, WCMAC and others will be involved in regularly reviewing implementation of and identifying potential revisions to the Marine Spatial Plan. The interagency team recommends reviewing the entire plan at least every 8 years and that funding be provided for the plan review process. The

³⁹ In addition, the plan should incorporate existing adaptive management strategies underway by local, state, or federal entities and provide an adaptive management element to incorporate new information and consider revisions to the plan based upon research, monitoring, and evaluation. ([RCW 43.372.0040\(6\)\(a\)](#))

interagency team will evaluate if conditions warrant a more major revision to the plan prior to the suggested review period.

8. Plan monitoring and reporting measures

The agencies will monitor plan performance to assess progress on implementation (as required by [RCW 43.372.005\(3\)\(g\)](#)), including the following monitoring activities:

- a. Regularly engage WCMAC, the public, and others in discussions and reviews of implementation of the Marine Spatial Plan including:
 - o Exchanging new research findings, information and data.
 - o Discussing strategies to strengthen implementation, including identifying any existing management plans that are inconsistent with the Marine Spatial Plan⁴⁰.
 - o Identifying emerging issues and potential plan revisions.
- b. On an ongoing basis, the state agencies will assess progress of the Marine Spatial Plan including the following activities:
 - i. Establishing and monitoring ecosystem indicators.
 - ii. Other activities implementing the plan described in this section.
 - iii. Plan effectiveness and governance, including decisions, policy implementation, lessons-learned and adaptations.

This information will be conveyed on the website and formally reported to the public annually.

- c. Four years following the adoption of the Marine Spatial Plan, Ecology, in coordination with the interagency team, will report to the State Legislature (i.e. marine waters committees in the House and Senate) on provisions of existing management plans that are substantially inconsistent with the Marine Spatial Plan, and will make recommendations for eliminating the inconsistency per [RCW 43.372.050\(3\)](#) (see Section 4.1.5).

4.3 Spatial Data, Designations and Recommendations

This section provides spatial designations and recommendations regarding the use of spatial data developed in the plan. These spatial designations and recommendations are designed to provide early guidance on criteria for avoiding significant adverse impacts to important marine resources⁴¹ and uses through initial site selection ([RCW 43.143.030\(2\)](#)). While this section can assist applicants in identifying impacted resources and users and in the early elimination of potential sites and scales of projects, using the spatial designations below does not guarantee that a project will satisfy state or local permit criteria.

⁴⁰ This will assist with reporting required four years after adoption of the plan per [RCW 43.372.050\(3\)](#).

⁴¹ As noted earlier, this definition includes resources (living and non-living) and ecosystem functions and processes.

4.3.1 Federal Waters and MSP Maps

Washington State's Constitution and state and federal laws establish Washington's regulatory jurisdiction out to 3 nautical miles (nm).⁴² Therefore, state plans, enforceable policies, and Important Sensitive and Unique areas (ISUs) must only apply to areas of state jurisdiction. States do not have permitting authority in federal waters, and the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) does not confer such authority.

As discussed in Section 4.2.2.4, the Washington Marine Spatial Plan will be incorporated into the NOAA-approved Washington Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP). Under the CZMA, Washington has the opportunity to review federal activities outside of state waters that have reasonably foreseeable effects on coastal resources and uses of the state (see Section 4.1.5 and Appendix E for more details on CZMA authorities and review process). Any enforceable policies, ISUs and other designations in this MSP that are ultimately approved by NOAA would be applicable to this process (see Section 4.2.2.4).

The MSP maps (see Appendix A, data is also available on the MSP website) accompany the plan's enforceable policies to spatially represent where certain areas and resources are located in both state and federal waters. The data and maps pertaining to federal waters are not enforceable elements of the Marine Spatial Plan for Washington's Pacific Coast (see Sections 4.1.5, 4.2.1.5, 4.2.2.4 and Appendix E for more details on the connection to the state's federally-approved CZMP).

4.3.2 Marine Spatial Planning Data and Analyses

The data and analyses contained in the MSP provide important context to enable the state to review and influence projects in federal waters. They also provide important information for federal agencies to use when reviewing proposals for leases, licenses, or permits and for applicants to consider when proposing ocean uses. The plan's information provides applicants and governments with the ability to:

- View other known activities, resources, interests, designations, and authorities that may conflict with or complement a proposal.
 - Identify potential ways to avoid, minimize, and mitigate adverse impacts to marine resources or existing ocean uses prior to submitting an application, including alternative locations and configurations of projects.
 - Identify appropriate parties with which to discuss the proposal prior to submitting an application.
1. For projects in federal or state waters, applicants and agencies should use data presented in the Washington Marine Spatial Plan to understand and evaluate potential impacts to existing uses and resources, including any updated data available. These data and analyses can also inform project siting alternatives that protect existing uses and resources and avoid and minimize impacts. Additional site-specific analyses will be needed to further evaluate potential impacts from a particular proposal. Major data sources associated with the plan that should be reviewed and considered include:

⁴² See Washington State Constitution Article XXIV, Section 1 and Title 43 US Code 1312.

- a. Baseline information on Washington’s Pacific coast, including maps of existing uses and resources (see Chapter 2).
 - b. Spatial analyses that aggregate and illustrate this information in various ways and convey key findings (see Chapter 3). This includes a number of outputs that assist in understanding the predicted distribution of certain species of seabirds and marine mammals, broad patterns of Ecologically Important Areas (EIA) and sensitive resources, and aggregated information on existing uses and ecological areas compared with modeled areas of marine renewable energy resource potential. As with other maps, these outputs assist applicants in identifying and considering potential impacts and conflicts in different areas, appropriate parties to consult, and project alternatives.
 - c. Spatial designations, recommendations, and approaches that identify areas that are important for protection in state waters (Chapter 4).
 - d. The online Marine Spatial Planning [mapping application](#)⁴³ provides a reference to access and view baseline information on existing human uses and ocean resources, including any updated data available after adoption of the plan.
2. Other ocean uses: The Marine Spatial Plan provides baseline information and analyses that can assist applicants and agencies in evaluating potential impacts from other potential new ocean uses such as offshore aquaculture, mining (sand/gravel, methane hydrate), bioextraction, and new dredge disposal sites. There is limited spatial data available on the areas of interest for these potential uses and the spatial scale of some uses is too small for some of the plan’s analyses (see Chapter 3) to be helpful in guiding specific siting.

4.3.3 Important, Sensitive and Unique Areas (ISUs)

State law requires the Marine Spatial Plan to identify environmentally sensitive and unique resources that warrant protective measures ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(c\)](#)). Therefore, the plan is designating Important, Sensitive and Unique Areas (ISUs) in state waters that have high conservation value, high historic value, or key infrastructure. The ISUs include standards to maintain the high values of these areas and to protect the ISUs from adverse effects of offshore development,⁴⁴ while allowing existing compatible uses such as fishing. Designation of an ISU, like the MSP itself, is not intended to and does not alter nor affect tribal treaty rights.

As part of the Marine Spatial Plan, the state is developing maps of ISUs based on available information and data. However, it is important to note that the designation of ISUs and the application of the enforceable protective standards is habitat- and resource-based, wherever these habitats or resources occur within state waters. The enforceable protective standards would apply to any designated ISU, whether mapped or not. The ISU maps are not part of the

⁴³ Available via the MSP website at www.msp.wa.gov.

⁴⁴ Development under the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Management Act is defined at RCW 90.58.030(3)(a) as “a use consisting of the construction or exterior alteration of structures; dredging; drilling; dumping; filling; removal of any sand, gravel, or minerals; bulkheading; driving of piling; placing of obstructions; or any project of a permanent or temporary nature which interferes with the normal public use of the surface of the waters overlying lands subject to this chapter at any state of water level.” For purposes of the MSP, “offshore development” means any development occurring in the plan study area that also meets the definition of a new ocean use.

enforceable standards. Rather, ISU maps are intended to assist the state, local governments and applicants by showing known locations of ISUs.

1. ISU definitions

ISUs are specific areas in state waters that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- a. Areas that are environmentally sensitive, or contain unique or sensitive species or biological communities that must be conserved and warrant protective measures ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(c\)](#)).
- b. Areas with known sensitivity and where the best available science indicates the potential for offshore development to cause irreparable harm to the habitats, species, or cultural resources.
- c. Areas with features that have limited, fixed, and known occurrence.
- d. Areas with inherent risk or infrastructure incompatibilities (e.g. buoys or cables).

2. ISU designations

The following ISUs are established using current knowledge and available data developed through the MSP process.

a. Ecological ISUs

- i. Biogenic habitats: aquatic vegetation, corals, and sponges.
- ii. Rocky reefs.
- iii. Seabird colonies: islands and rocks used for foraging and nesting by seabirds.
- iv. Pinniped haul-outs.
- v. Forage fish spawning areas: intertidal areas used for spawning by herring, smelt or other forage fish.

b. Historic, cultural, and infrastructure ISUs

- i. Historic and archaeological sites: structures or sites over 45 years old that are listed or eligible for listing in local, state or national preservation registers (e.g. shipwrecks or lighthouses); or artifacts or other material evidence of tribal or historic use or occupation (e.g. burials, village sites, or middens).
- ii. Buoys and submarine cables: fixed infrastructure such as navigation or monitoring buoys, fiber optic cables, electrical transmission cables, other fixed monitoring equipment in the marine environment (e.g. hydrophones), and any associated mooring lines, anchors or other equipment.

Coastal estuaries, including Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay, are important ecological areas and are heavily used by existing uses and their associated infrastructure. They are home to critical saltwater habitats⁴⁵ and Priority Habitats and Species,⁴⁶ such as spawning and juvenile rearing areas, aquatic habitats (e.g. eelgrass, kelp, mudflats, and shellfish beds), state-listed or candidate species, vulnerable aggregations, and species of commercial, recreational, or tribal

⁴⁵ “Critical Saltwater Habitat” is defined in Shoreline Management Regulations at: WAC 173-26-221(2)(c)(iii)(C).

⁴⁶ Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife identifies and maintains information about “Priority Habitats and Species”, more information at: <http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/phs/>.

importance. While estuaries themselves are not designated as an ISU, many ISUs occur within estuaries. Yet, the availability and resolution of current data is inadequate to aid in detailed siting within estuaries. Therefore, a more detailed and finer-scale analysis for proposed projects will be required to “provide special protection to the marine life and resources of the estuaries and to ensure all reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize impacts to the habitats, species, and uses in estuaries” ([RCW 43.143.030\(2\)\(d\)](#) and [RCW 43.143.030\(2\)\(e\)](#)).

The state has developed maps of ISUs using the best available data as of the publication of the MSP (see Appendix A: Maps 59-74). These maps are intended to assist applicants in identifying where ISUs exist. However, ISU protection standards will apply to any ISU, wherever it is identified in state waters. It is the responsibility of applicants to verify whether ISUs exist in their proposed project area and to demonstrate that protection standards will be met. As finer resolution or updated data becomes available, the state may update the ISU maps, which may include adding, deleting or updating the distribution of an ISU.

Additional buffers may be appropriate to protect ISU resources from adverse effects. Prior to filing application materials with local or state agencies, project developers shall consult with WDFW on recommended buffers for ecological ISUs associated with their proposed project. Project developers shall consult with the Washington Department of Archaeological and Historical Preservation and tribal preservation officers on further identification and protection of cultural or historical artifacts.

3. ISU protection standards and enforceable policies

Once the state designates an ISU under this Marine Spatial Plan ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(c\)](#)), state agencies and local governments must apply the following ISU adverse effects and protection standards in their decisions for new ocean use developments to the greatest extent possible.

a. Protection standard for ISUs

An applicant for proposed new ocean uses involving offshore development, as defined in the Shoreline Management Act ([RCW 90.58.030\(3\)\(a\)](#)), must demonstrate that the project will have no adverse effects on an ISU located at the project site or to off-site ISUs potentially affected by the project.

An applicant may overcome the ISU protection standard using site-specific surveys, scientific data, and analysis, which demonstrate either:

- i. The current ISU maps do not accurately characterize the resource or use, or the project area (mapped or not mapped) does not contain an ISU resource or use; or
- ii. The weight of scientific evidence clearly indicates that the project will cause no adverse effects to the resources of the ISU.

b. Adverse effects standards for ecological ISUs:

Adverse effects for ecological ISUs is defined as either:

- i. Degradation of ecosystem function and integrity, including, but not limited to, direct habitat damage, burial of habitat, habitat erosion, and reduction in biological diversity.

- ii. Degradation of living marine organisms, including, but not limited to, abundance, individual growth, density, species diversity, and species behavior.

c. Adverse effects standards for historic, cultural or fixed-infrastructure ISUs:

Adverse effects for historic, cultural or fixed-infrastructure ISUs is defined as any of the following:

- i. Direct impact by dredging, drilling, dumping, or filling.
- ii. Alteration, destruction, or defacement of historic, archaeological, or cultural artifacts.
- iii. Direct impacts from placement or maintenance of new, temporary or permanent structures in areas with existing infrastructure or historic, archaeological, or cultural artifacts.

4.3.4 Spatial Recommendations

1. Case-by-case analysis

Further evaluation of proposed projects in state waters should occur on a case-by-case basis. Projects still need to provide information, meet criteria and statutory requirements, and follow the process described in the MSP. When proposing any projects, applicants should seek to avoid adverse impacts to existing uses and ecological areas in state waters. A greater number of existing uses and ecologically important areas or a greater intensity of uses or ecologically important areas will likely result in a more difficult permitting process.

2. Specific to renewable energy:

Where particular uses have similar coastal effects (e.g. structures or cables), applicants should use the criteria, information, and process described for renewable energy as a starting point.

Analyses produced for the MSP illustrate the large footprint required for projects designed to produce wind energy at a scale matching potential needs for renewable energy in the regional power grid in the next 10-15 years (See Chapter 3 for details on analyses and findings). In state waters on Washington's Pacific coast, these analyses indicate that projects of this scale require large footprints that occupy a large proportion of the total area of state waters and intersect with many existing ocean uses and resources. Therefore, in state waters, industrial-scale renewable energy projects will likely have a very difficult time demonstrating that they can avoid significant adverse impacts to existing uses and resources. Community-scale renewable energy facilities proposed for state waters may find it easier to demonstrate consistency with state policies, plans, and authorities through existing permitting processes. The following definitions apply:

- a. **Industrial-scale renewable energy facilities** are those projects designed to provide energy at a scale for the regional power grid. Their size and energy generation is larger than those described as community-scale facilities and, therefore, would result in a larger footprint for development.

- b. **Community-scale Renewable Energy Facilities** are those projects designed to provide energy at scale for a local community, subset of a community, or group of communities. Community-scale energy projects have:
- i. A smaller size and energy generation levels more suited to the needs of a community than production and distribution to the regional grid and, therefore, a smaller footprint for development than an industrial-scale facility.
 - ii. Strong local participation in and support for the project, including the community(s) directly adjacent to and affected by the project. Support may be demonstrated by the elected officials of the affected local government(s) such as a letter from a city's Mayor, or from a majority of city council members or county commissioners.
 - iii. Demonstrated economic benefit for the local community.

4.4 Project and Site-specific Data and Information

Applicants shall provide information listed below to regulating agencies at the earliest stage to assist with local and state required processes, permit, and leases (see WACs [197-11-100](#), [197-11-315](#), and [197-11-960](#)). This information enables evaluation of the magnitude of a project, the likelihood of effects from a project, and the significance of resources and uses that the project may affect. Applicants for construction and development activities in state marine waters can complete a Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA), which consolidates the initial information needed for multiple local, state, and federal permits and provides information on the status of SEPA review.

The list of project- and site-specific data and information below is consistent with these existing application requirements ([WAC 197-11-315](#)). It provides specific details supporting agency implementation of existing state ocean policies and regulations, and of the MSP. In addition, applicants shall produce a written effects evaluation that addresses the requirements with any review standards that apply (see Sections 4.5, 4.6, and 4.8).

Table 4.4-1. Project- and site-specific data and information requirements.

Type of Information	Including, but not limited to:	Specific types of data and information
Project information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project purpose, need (i.e. local, state, or national need) and anticipated benefits • Location of alternative sites considered and why they were rejected (RCW 43.143.030(2)(b)) • Total project footprint: number and sizes of equipment, structures, and anchors • Methods, techniques and activities • Transportation and transmission systems for service and support • Onshore facilities • Utility corridors used or created • Materials to be disposed and methods • Physical and chemical properties of any hazardous materials used or produced • Proposed time schedule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternatives considered should be commensurate with the proposed need of project (e.g. national need requires, national alternatives) (WAC 173-26-360(7)(d)).
Physical and chemical conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water depth • Wave regime • Current velocities • Mixing characteristics (horizontal transport, vertical mixing and dispersal) • Meteorological conditions • Water quality - chemical and physical properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survivability assessment for structures based on physical and geological conditions at the site and expected in the future. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.6) • Adjacent area affected by physical changes in currents, waves, or sediment transport caused by project. (WAC 173-26-360(10)(a))
Bathymetry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bottom topography (bathymetry) • Shoreline topography 	
Geologic structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bottom substrate type (rock, mud, sand) • Faults • Submarine landslides • Other geologic hazards • Mineral deposits • Hydrocarbon resources 	
Historical, cultural or archaeological resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic or culturally significant sites, including any archaeological sites or objects. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(1)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For new uses that will impact the ocean floor, conduct a high-resolution seafloor archeological assessment. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.3)
Tribal uses ⁴⁷	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Usual and Accustomed Areas • Tribal fishing and other uses 	

⁴⁷ U.S. Constitution, Article VI, Section 2, which provides that treaties are the highest law of the land. See Section 1.6 of the MSP, which describes coastal tribes, treaties and references to court decisions upholding those treaties.

Table 4.4-1 (continued). Project- and site-specific data and information requirements.

Type of Information	Including, but not limited to:	Specific types of data and information
Biological features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical and sensitive habitats: wetlands; sea stacks; estuaries, etc. • Areas used for breeding, spawning, nursery, foraging and areas of high productivity areas for marine biota: upwelling and estuaries. • Bird colonies • Marine species migration routes • Fish and shellfish stocks and other biologically important species • Endangered and threatened species or their habitats • Recreationally or commercially important finfish or shellfish • Scientific preserves, sanctuaries, parks, refuges, and other protected areas • (WAC 173-26-360(7)) and Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.3.1) 	
Economic, social and cultural uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquaculture operations (private and public lands), oyster reserves, shellfish growing areas • Commercial and recreational fishing • Coastal communities economy • Designated dredge disposal sites • Ports • Navigation (vessel traffic patterns and designated vessel lanes) • Recreation, including parks and designated recreation areas ((WAC 173-26-360(7)(k))) and shellfish harvest areas • Scientific research • Military uses • Tourism • Aesthetic resources • Existing aquatic land leases • Local shoreline master program environment designation (Chapter 5: WCMAC 3.1.4) • Waste water or other discharge • (WAC 173-26-360(7)(t)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where applicable, inventory should include information on established, traditional, and recognized times of uses. • Current information on uses, including data covering multiple years and seasons, when available (Chapter 5: WCMAC 4.1.3) • Conceptual site drawings of visual impacts (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.5)
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing infrastructure: navigation aids, cables, buoys or other fixed structures. • Utility or pipeline corridors and transmission lines • (WAC 173-26-360(7)(t)) 	

Regulating agencies may determine and request other information from applicants to enable the evaluation of the effects of a proposed project ([\(WAC 197-11-335\)](#)).

4.5 Effects Evaluation

To enable evaluation of compliance with the state’s ocean use policies and regulations, including the criteria of [RCW 43.143.030\(2\)](#), applicants must provide a written effects evaluation that complies with the contents of Section 4.5 and the applicable Review Standards (Sections 4.6 and 4.8).⁴⁸ The evaluation must include the reasonably foreseeable adverse effects on Washington State’s coastal resources or uses associated with the development, placement, operation, and decommissioning of a proposed new ocean use.⁴⁹ This section does not provide the full list of other state laws and policies or requirements with which an applicant will have to demonstrate compliance (see Section 4.1.4 and 4.1.5). This information may also be used to evaluate tribal effects under applicable tribal laws. WCMAC’s problem statements and recommendations also informed the development of the listed effects. Applicants should review these for more detailed information on stakeholder concerns about impacts (see Chapter 5).

The processes set out in Section 4.2.1 will assist applicants in identifying potentially adverse impacts to Washington’s coastal resources and uses. Both SEPA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes may also assist in evaluating the effects listed below.⁵⁰ For purposes of the evaluation, the submittal shall base the determination of “reasonably foreseeable adverse effects”⁵¹ on best available scientific evidence (Office for Coastal Management, 2009). Applicants should use up-to-date data that is adequate to evaluate the project and its potential effects. If new data collection is required, it should be done at the applicant’s expense. When it exists, data should include multiple years and multiple seasons within those years (Chapter 5: WCMAC 4.1.3).

In addition, applicants shall provide information that addresses their compliance with the applicable review standards (Sections 4.6 and 4.8). The evaluation shall describe the potential short-term and long-term effects of the proposed new ocean use on marine resources, and on the uses of Washington’s marine waters, continental shelf, onshore areas, and coastal communities based on the required project- and site-specific data (Section 4.4) and the following considerations:

1. Ecological effects

Ecological effects include those on critical marine habitats, other habitats, and the species those habitats support. The evaluation shall determine the probability of exposure and the magnitude of exposure and response, as well as the level of confidence (or uncertainty) in those determinations. The evaluation need not discuss highly speculative consequences. However, the evaluation shall discuss catastrophic environmental effects of low probability.

⁴⁸ As noted previously, this includes any future projects determined to trigger ORMA’s permit criteria ([RCW 43.143.030\(2\)](#)), including such projects in shorelines directly adjacent to the MSP Study Area.

⁴⁹ This includes direct, indirect and cumulative effects, as described below.

⁵⁰ The applicability of these laws depends on the project type and location.

⁵¹ For purposes of federal consistency under CZMA’s regulations, reasonably foreseeable coastal effects are determined based on a number of factors, including direct and indirect effects to resources and uses. See cited publication for more detailed guidance.

Factors to consider include, but are not limited to:

- The time frames/periods over which the effects will occur;
- The maintenance of ecosystem structure, biological productivity, biological diversity, and representative species assemblages;
- Maintaining populations of threatened, endangered, or sensitive species;
- Vulnerability of the species, population, community, or the habitat to the proposed actions; and
- The probability of exposure of biological communities and habitats to adverse effects from operating procedures or accidents.

The following additional factors should be specifically evaluated and addressed:

- a. Impacts to habitats and species, including:
 - i. Impacts on migration routes and habitat areas of species listed as endangered or threatened; environmentally critical and sensitive habitats such as breeding, spawning, nursery, foraging areas, bird colonies, sea stacks, and wetlands; and areas of high productivity for marine biota such as upwelling and estuaries. ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(j\)\(n\)](#) and Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.3.1)
 - ii. Impacts to sensitive and important habitat of commercially, recreationally and ecologically valuable species. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.3.1)
 - iii. Potential for direct injury or harm to species, including Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed and commercially valuable species (e.g. strikes, entanglement, etc.), or indirect injury related to exposure to noise, light, vibration, electromagnetic fields or other related stressors associated with the new use. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.3.1)
 - iv. Risk for invasive species introductions and impacts, if applicable. (Chapter 5L WCMAC 1.3.1 and 1.3.4)
- b. Effects to air and water quality ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(t\)](#)), including potential degradation of water quality (e.g. chemicals, petroleum products, nutrients, oxygen, temperature, acidification). (WCMAC 1.3.1)
- c. Effects to physical and ecological processes, including, but not limited to, currents and waves, sediment processes, coastal erosion and accretion, upwelling, primary productivity, electromagnetic fields, acoustics, and wave amplification. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.3.1)
 - i. For marine renewable energy projects, assess effects on upwelling oceanographic, ecosystem processes, beach accretion or erosion, and wave processes. ([WAC 173-26-360\(10\)\(a\)\(b\)](#))
- d. Effects of projected coastal erosion, future sea-level rise, and other climate change impacts on the proposed project over the anticipated life of the project (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.4)
- e. Unintended impacts, including, but not limited to, impacts to the food chain, changes to physical processes, introduction of disease or genetic pollution, and access to existing resources. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.3.1)

2. Current uses

Evaluate the effects of the project on current uses and the continuation of a current use of ocean resources such as fishing, recreation, navigation, military, and port activities. Factors to consider include, but are not limited to:

- a. Social and economic impacts to local and regional economies and communities, including tourism, recreation, fishing, aquaculture, navigation, transportation, public infrastructure, public services, and community culture ([WAC 173-26-360\(t\)](#)). The assessment should address:
 - i. Short- and long-term economic and social costs and benefits to the affected community, including social costs to vulnerable ocean users (e.g. new and future entrants to commercial fisheries such as those with high debt loads) and potential impacts on taxpayers. The costs and benefits to larger economy (state, regional, national). Assessment of various scenarios, including full project footprint and scenarios where the new use fails, is abandoned, or is decommissioned. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.1.1)
 - ii. The risk posed by proposed structures for entangling fishing gear or other debris (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.7)
 - iii. Established, traditional, and recognized times of renewable ocean resource uses and site-specific impacts to current uses, including, but not limited to, fishing, aquaculture, and recreation. ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(m\)](#) and Chapter 5: WCMAC 3.1.4)
- b. Recreational activities and experiences such as public access, aesthetics, and views ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(s\)](#) and Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.5)
- c. Archeological and historical resources ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(l\)](#)); and
- d. Transportation safety and navigation, including
 - i. A vessel traffic risk assessment or a risk-based modeling to evaluate navigational safety risks. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.1)
 - ii. Military activities, including training and testing.

3. Natural and other hazards

Evaluate the potential risk to the new ocean use, in terms of its vulnerability to certain hazards and the probability that those hazards may cause loss, dislodging, or drifting of structures, buoys, or facilities. Consider both the severity of the hazard and the level of exposure it poses to the renewable marine resources and coastal communities. Hazards to be considered shall include:

- a. Based on the characteristics of the use and the environment, risk of and potential impact from a probable disaster, including explosions, spills, and other disasters, on the environment, adjacent uses, and communities. ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(o\)](#) and Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.3.1)
- b. Risk posed to existing and future infrastructure by current and future ocean conditions and other natural hazards, including wave and storm conditions, erosion, earthquakes, tsunamis, and flooding, including sea-level rise. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.4)

4. Cumulative Effects

Evaluate the cumulative effects of a new ocean use project, including the shoreland components, in conjunction with effects of any prior phases of the project, past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects.⁵² The evaluation shall analyze the biological, ecological, physical, and socioeconomic effects⁵³ of the new ocean use project and of other projects along the Washington coast, while also taking into account the effects of existing and future human activities, environmental baseline and variability, the regional effects of global climate change, and potential to reach tipping points of harm for existing uses or ocean resources (Chapter 5: WCMAC 3.1.5).

In conducting the cumulative effects analysis, the applicant shall focus on the specific resources and uses that may be affected by the incremental effects of the proposed project and other projects in the same geographic area. The evaluation shall include but not be limited to consideration of whether:

- a. The resource and uses are especially vulnerable to incremental effects;
- b. The proposed project is one of several similar projects in the same geographic area;
- c. Other developments in the area have similar effects on the resources and uses;
- d. These effects have been historically significant for the resource and uses; and
- e. Other analyses in the area have identified a cumulative effects concern.

⁵² Under NEPA, “cumulative impact” means “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.” 40 CFR. § 1508.7

⁵³ “Effects” and “impacts” include: (a) Direct effects, which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place. (b) Indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.

“Effects” and “impacts” as used in NEPA regulations are synonymous. Effects includes ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. Effects may also include those resulting from actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on balance the agency believes that the effect will be beneficial. However, “Impacts” and “effects to uses or resources of the coastal zone under the CZMA” are not synonymous. An impact to a coastal use or resource may not necessarily be an effect for CZMA purposes.

4.6 Review Standards

This section provides the detailed review standards for applicants and for agencies to consider in determining possible significant adverse effects⁵⁴ from an ocean use project⁵⁵ on coastal uses and resources (see [WAC 173-26-360\(7\)](#)). An applicant’s written effects evaluation (Section 4.5) must address compliance with the standards noted in this section and any specific standards that apply to the particular type of new use (Section 4.8). The regulating agencies shall use best available maps and data and may consider new information that is sufficient and applicable. Furthermore, the processes outlined in Section 4.2.1 will further assist applicants in identifying approaches that will prevent, avoid, and minimize impacts.

4.6.1 Siting and Development Standards for the Construction, Deployment, or Maintenance of an Ocean Use Facility.

1. For marine renewable energy, be located, constructed, and operated in a manner that has no detrimental effects on beach accretion or erosion and wave processes. (WAC 173-26-360(10)(a))
2. Be located to avoid adverse impacts on proposed or existing environmental and scientific preserves and sanctuaries, parks, and designated recreation areas. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(k)).
3. In locating mining facilities or oil and gas facilities, avoid and minimize impacts on shipping lanes or routes traditionally used by commercial and recreational fishermen to reach fishing areas. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(x))
4. In regards to routing, ocean uses and their distribution, service, and supply vessels and aircraft should be:
 - a. Located, designed, and operated in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts on fishing grounds, aquatic lands, or other renewable resource ocean use areas during the established, traditional, and recognized times they are used or when the resource could be adversely impacted. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(m))
 - b. Routed to avoid environmentally critical and sensitive habitats such as sea stacks and wetlands, preserves, sanctuaries, bird colonies, and migration routes, during critical times those areas or species could be affected. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(n))
5. In locating and designing associated onshore facilities:
 - a. Special attention should be given to the environment, the characteristics of the use, and the impact of a probable disaster, in order to assure adjacent uses, habitats, and communities adequate protection from explosions, spills, and other disasters. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(o))
 - b. Minimize impacts on existing water-dependent businesses and existing land transportation routes to the maximum extent feasible. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(p))

⁵⁴ In applying ORMA’s policies, “significant adverse impacts” must be consistent with the SEPA rules and process. [WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(e\)](#): “The determination of significant adverse impacts should be consistent with [WAC 197-11-330\(3\)](#) and [197-11-794](#). The sequence of actions described in [WAC 197-11-768](#) should be used as an order of preference in evaluating steps to avoid and minimize adverse impacts.”

⁵⁵ This section details the general ocean use standards contained in [WAC 173-26-360\(7\)](#), which specifically apply to ocean uses that require a shoreline permit. Development under the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Management Act is defined at [RCW 90.58.030\(3\)\(a\)](#).

- c. Be located in communities where there is adequate sewer, water, power, and streets. Within those communities, if space is available at existing marine terminals, the onshore facilities should be located there. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(q))
 - i. For marine renewable energy projects, locate distribution facilities and lines in existing rights of way and corridors, whenever feasible (WAC 173-26-360(10)(c))
6. Construction and operation
- a. Use methods and scheduling of construction activities that minimizes impacts on tourism, recreation, commercial fishing, local communities, and the environment (WAC 173-26-360(7)(r)).
 - b. Use methods and designs that prevent, avoid, and minimize adverse impacts such as noise⁵⁶, light, temperature changes, turbidity, water pollution, and contaminated sediments on the marine, estuarine, or upland environment. Such attention should be given particularly during critical migration periods and life stages of marine species and critical oceanographic processes. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(u))
 - c. For mining, marine renewable energy, or oil and gas uses, be designed, constructed, and operated in a manner that minimizes environmental impacts on the coastal waters environment, particularly the seabed communities, and minimizes impacts on recreation and existing renewable resource uses such as fishing. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(w))
7. Compensation for impacts
- a. Impacts on commercial resources such as the crab fishery, on non-commercial resources such as environmentally critical and sensitive habitats, and on coastal uses such as loss of equipment or loss of a fishing season should be considered in determining compensation to mitigate adverse environmental, social, and economic impacts to coastal resources and uses. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(f))
 - b. Allocation of compensation to mitigate adverse impacts to coastal resources or uses should be based on the magnitude and/or degree of impact on the resource, jurisdiction, and use. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(g))

4.6.2 Additional State Standards and Recommended Approaches to Protect Specific Coastal Resources and Uses of the State⁵⁷

Table 4.6.2-1 provides additional state standards and recommended approaches for new ocean uses⁵⁸ designed to protect state coastal resources and uses. Additional state standards apply to offshore aquaculture, disposal, and mining (see Section 4.8).

⁵⁶ Please note, in 2017, the United Nations' Convention on Migratory Species adopted guidelines on Environmental Impact Assessments for Marine Noise-generating Activities (see UNEP/CMS/COP12/Doc.24.2.2, May 2017), which may be a useful resource for addressing marine noise.

⁵⁷ This does not include comprehensive requirements affiliated with every state or local permit. This section does not address any requirements related to tribal or federal governments and authorities.

⁵⁸ Requirements of [WAC 173-26-360\(7\)](#) apply to ocean uses that require a shoreline permit.

Table 4.6.2-1. Goals, additional standards, and approaches to protect Washington State coastal uses and resources

Key Washington Ocean Resource Policies ⁵⁹ & MSP Objectives	Standards	Approaches include, but are not limited to:
Ecological		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foster healthy and resilient marine ecosystem functions, biodiversity and habitats. (MSP Objective 3) ORMA RCW 43.143.030(2)(d). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevent, avoid, and minimize adverse impacts on migration routes and habitat areas of species listed as endangered or threatened, environmentally critical and sensitive habitats such as breeding, spawning, nursery, foraging areas and wetlands, and areas of high productivity for marine biota such as upwelling and estuaries (WAC 173-26-360(7)(j)). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and use alternative deployment and placement of structures in proximity to the proposed project area that would have less adverse impact on identified ecological resources. Schedule construction to avoid critical migration times, vulnerable life stages of species, and important oceanographic processes. Use designs and methods that prevent, avoid and minimize disturbance to species, habitats, water quality, and ecological and physical processes.
Historic or Cultural Resources		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustain diverse traditional uses and experiences to ensure continuity of WA’s coastal identity, culture, and high quality of life. (MSP Objective 2) Provide recommendations for uses that protect and enhance the aesthetic quality of marine environment, maritime activities, marine culture and sense of place. (MSP actions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid and minimize adverse impacts on historic or culturally significant sites in compliance with chapter 27.34 RCW. Permits in general should contain special provisions that require permittees to comply with chapter 27.53 RCW if any archaeological sites or archaeological objects such as artifacts and shipwrecks are discovered. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(l)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct high-resolution seafloor surveys for historic or archaeological resources. Consult with state historic preservation officer and tribal preservation officers on cultural resources that may be present or impacted.

⁵⁹ This list is not exhaustive and is intended to highlight particular policies that are relevant to particular state coastal resources and uses.

Table 4.6.2-1 (continued). Goals, additional standards and approaches to protect Washington State coastal uses and resources

Key Washington Ocean Resource Policies ⁶⁰ & MSP Objectives	Standards	Approaches include, but are not limited to:
Coastal Uses: Existing uses such as aquaculture, fishing, navigation, recreation and tourism		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and preserve healthy existing natural resource- based economic activity on the Washington Coast. (MSP Objective 1). • ORMA RCW 43.143.030(2)(e). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize impacts on existing water dependent businesses and existing land transportation routes to the maximum extent feasible. • Avoid and minimize adverse social and economic impacts, including detrimental effects to tourism, recreation, fishing, aquaculture, navigation, transportation, public infrastructure, public services, and community culture. (WAC 173-26-360(7)(p)(t)). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and use alternative deployment and placement of structures in proximity to the proposed project area that would have less adverse impact on identified ocean and coastal uses, including social and economic impacts to coastal communities. • Space structures to maximize compatibility with existing uses. • Minimize project footprint. • Schedule construction activities to minimize impacts to existing users. • Mitigate possible hazards to navigation and, provide practicable opportunities for vessel transit, at the project location.

⁶⁰ This list is not exhaustive and is intended to highlight particular policies that are relevant to particular state coastal resources and uses.

4.6.3 Fisheries Use Protection Standards

The marine spatial planning law requires: “Any provision of the marine management plan that does not have as its primary purpose the management of commercial or recreational fishing but that has an impact on this fishing must minimize the negative impacts on the fishing.” ([RCW 43.372.040\(8\)](#)). To accomplish this, the MSP sets forth a requirement for consulting with WDFW and individuals participating in affected commercial and recreational fisheries to identify a proposed project’s potential adverse effects to fisheries and opportunities to avoid, reduce, or minimize impacts (see section 4.2.1.4). The MSP also establishes additional protection standards for fisheries that align with this requirement to minimize impacts on fisheries and with other existing state requirements to protect fisheries ([RCW 43.143.030\(2\)](#)). Applicants must also consult with each of the coastal tribes to understand the proposed project’s potential adverse effects to tribal uses, including fishing ([RCW 43.372.040\(2\)\(a\)](#)).

a. Protection standards for fisheries

Applicants for proposed new ocean uses involving offshore development, as defined in the Shoreline Management Act ([RCW 90.58.030\(3\)\(a\)](#)), must demonstrate that their project meets the following standards to protect fisheries located at the project site and nearby from adverse effects, including:

- i. There are no likely long-term significant adverse effects to fisheries. ([RCW 43.143.030\(2\)\(c\)](#))
- ii. All reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize social and economic impacts to fishing. ([RCW 43.143.030\(2\)\(e\)](#))

In addition to consulting with WDFW and individuals participating in affected commercial and recreational fisheries, the following must be considered in determining the possible adverse effects on commercial and recreational fisheries and whether all reasonable steps have been taken to avoid and minimize adverse effects to fisheries. The following considerations are applicable to all proposals for new ocean use developments, in all use areas, unless otherwise noted, and will assist agencies in assessing compliance with (i) and (ii) above.

- Avoid adverse social and economic impacts to fishing through proposed project location, design, construction, and operation, such as avoiding heavily used fishing areas. Where adverse impacts to fishing cannot be reasonably avoided, demonstrate how project has minimized impacts.
- Minimize the number of and size of anchors. Space structures for greater compatibility with existing uses and bury cables in the seafloor and through the shoreline. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.10)
- Minimize risk of entangling fishing gear from new structures installed in the seafloor or placed in the water.
- Minimize the displacement of fishers from traditional fishing areas, and the related impact on the travel distance, routing, and navigation safety in order to fish in alternative areas.

- Minimize the compression of fishing effort caused by the reduction in the areas normally accessible to fishers.
- Minimize the economic impact resulting from the reduction in area available for commercial and recreational fishing for the effected sectors and ports.
- Limit the number and size of projects located in an area to minimize the impact on a particular port, sector, or fishery.
- Consider the distribution of projects and their cumulative effects.
- Other reasonable and relevant considerations as determined by the fisheries consultation process and specifics of the proposed project.

b. Definition of adverse effect for fisheries:

Adverse effects can be direct, indirect or cumulative. Adverse effects for commercial or recreational fisheries is defined as any of the following:

- i. A significant reduction in the access of commercial or recreational fisheries to the resource used by any fishery or a fishing community(s).
- ii. A significant increase in the risk to entangle fishing gear.
- iii. A significant reduction in navigation safety for commercial and recreational fisheries.
- iv. Environmental harm that significantly reduces quality or quantity of marine resources available for harvest.

4.6.4 Recommended Additional Approaches to Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Coastal Uses

In addition to the goals, standards, and approaches noted above, the following provides a list of specific approaches for applicants to consider in project siting, design, engineering, construction, and operation. These approaches may contribute toward addressing Washington’s ocean use standards to avoid and minimize adverse impacts to particular coastal uses. Use of any or all of these recommended approaches does not guarantee issuance of state or local permits or authorizations.

1. Aquaculture

- a. Minimize impacts to existing shellfish aquaculture growing areas and operations.
- b. Minimize disruption to physical processes and water quality of estuaries.

2. Navigation

- a. Minimize disruption to traditional and heavily-used vessel transit routes, particularly those navigation lanes that are federally-designated or negotiated with other users.

3. Recreation

- a. Minimize restrictions on public access, particularly in areas with high intensity of use or with a community of historical users.
- b. Minimize impacts to areas with unique or special qualities, including the natural environment and aesthetics, associated with recreational use relative to the state or region.
- c. Include measures that ensure protection of public health and safety.

4.7 Project Construction and Operation Plan

Under existing state law, applicants for certain projects must submit a construction and operation plan as a condition of approval for a state permit, license, lease, or other authorization. The construction and operation plan must describe the procedures and methods the operator will employ to ensure facility compliance with standards and other conditions of the permit or license to address effects on the environment, safety, and coastal uses. Under the state Water Pollution Control Act, the following plan components can be required for holders of 401 permits:

1. **Facility development plan**, which describes the detailed physical and operational components of the proposed facility and includes technical information on the installation and deployment activities and methods, structures, easements, vessels, and construction schedule.
2. **Contingency plan**, which describes how facility operator will respond to emergencies caused by a structural or equipment failure due to human error, weather, geologic or other natural event.
3. **Inspection plan**, which describes the routine inspection program to ensure mechanical, structural and operational integrity of facilities.

4. Monitoring plan

Applicants must provide pre-project environmental baseline inventories and assessments and monitoring of ocean uses when little is known about the effects on marine and estuarine ecosystems, renewable resource uses, and coastal communities, or when the technology involved is likely to change. ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(v\)](#))

A monitoring plan provides for a standardized program to assess for potential impacts identified by the inventory and effects evaluation and the performance of measures designed to minimize impacts (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.10). Impacts of particular concern to address, where applicable, include:

- An invasive species prevention, monitoring, and control plan for projects that pose a risk for invasive species introductions. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.3.4)
- A plan to monitor structures for fishing gear and other debris entanglement, and a plan to mitigate impacts. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.7 and WCMAC 1.2.10)
- For aquaculture facilities: prevention, monitoring, and response plans that address escapement, disease, and nutrient pollution. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 2.1.1)

Monitoring shall be sufficient to accurately document and quantify the short-term and long-term effects of the actions on the affected resources and uses. At a minimum, monitoring plans shall describe:

- a. Specific study objectives and methods, including collection of baseline data, hypotheses tested, field sampling and data analysis, and controls (such as control sites).
- b. Documentation that study design is scientifically appropriate and adequate to address objectives.

- c. Methods for reporting and delivering data and analyses to agencies and for public involvement in review of monitoring activities.

5. Adaptive management plan, which provides a mechanism for incorporating new information and findings into the operation and management of the project. The plan shall describe processes for applying adaptive measures. When monitoring results indicate standards are not being met, adaptive measures designed to bring the operation into compliance will be applied to operation of the project (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.10).

6. Decommissioning plan

An applicant must demonstrate that “plans and sufficient performance bonding are provided to ensure that the site will be rehabilitated after the use or activity is completed” ([RCW 43.143.030\(2\)\(g\)](#)). The decommissioning plan⁶¹ must include:

- a. A proposed schedule and description of removal methods.
- b. Plans for disposing of the removed facilities.
- c. The resources, conditions, and uses that could be affected by the decommissioning activities and methods for minimizing impacts to renewable ocean uses such as fishing ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(y\)](#)).
- d. Mitigation to protect sensitive resources during decommissioning
- e. Use of new information and new technologies about environmental impacts to ensure state-of-the-art technology and methods are used ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(h\)](#)).
- f. Methods to survey area after removal to determine any effects on marine life and habitats.
- g. Rehabilitation measures to restore seabed to original state to the maximum extent feasible ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(y\)](#)).

7. Financial assurance plan

The applicant shall provide a financial assurance compliance plan that describes how the holder will comply with the state requirements for financial assurance. The plan must assure insurance, bonds or other financial securities are adequate to address:

- a. Decommissioning and rehabilitation of the site.
- b. Compensatory mitigation for adverse environmental effects of the project.
- c. “the effects of planned and unanticipated closures, completion of the activity, reasonably anticipated disasters, inflation, new technology, and new information about the environmental impacts to ensure that state of the art technology and methods are used” (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.9 and [WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(h\)](#)).

When applicable, the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has authority to require financial security based on the cost of enforcing terms and conditions for leases of state-owned aquatic lands ([RCW 79.105.330](#) and [WAC 332-30-122](#)).

⁶¹ Discontinuance or shutdown of oil and gas, mining or energy producing ocean uses should be done in a manner that minimizes impacts to renewable resource ocean uses such as fishing, and restores the seabed to a condition similar to its original state to the maximum extent feasible. ([WAC 173-26-360\(7\)\(y\)](#))

4.8 State Standards Specific to New Use Type⁶²

Since different uses may generate different impacts, this section provides the additional existing state requirements, standards, and recommendations that are specific to particular types of new ocean uses⁶³ based on their potential effects to specific coastal resources or uses, including offshore aquaculture, energy production, ocean mining, and ocean disposal. The list in Table 4.8-1 does not include federal authorizations or requirements for these activities.

⁶² This does not include comprehensive requirements affiliated with every state or local permit. This section does not address any requirements related to tribal or federal governments and authorities.

⁶³ Existing ocean use regulations in WAC 173-26-360 provide standards specific to uses such as ocean research, ocean salvage, transportation and oil and gas activities. While the MSP does not examine these particular activities in detail, the Management Framework provides initial guidance to assist with evaluating the effects of any new ocean use that may trigger ORMA and its regulations. As noted earlier, this may include projects in the shorelines directly adjacent to the MSP Study Area.

Table 4.8-1: Additional state requirements specific to new use type

Ocean Use	Definition	Effects Evaluation	Use-Specific Standards	Other related recommendations or requirements
Offshore aquaculture	Any new aquaculture operation within the MSP Study Area, yet outside of the coastal estuaries. ⁶⁴	Assess the risk of pesticide controls (Ch.5: WCMAC 2.1.4) Assess the risk of species escapement.	Avoid and minimize impacts to pinnipeds, cetaceans, sharks and other species through facility design, siting and operation. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 2.1.2)	Deny permits for offshore aquaculture facilities with species that pose a significant risk of introducing disease, impairing fish health, or potentially introducing genetic pollution into the area, in accordance with WAC 220-370-100 . ⁶⁵ (Ch. 5: WCMAC 2.1.3)
Ocean mining	Ocean mining includes such uses as the mining of metal, mineral, sand, and gravel resources from the sea floor. (WAC 173-26-360(9))	Assess effects on beach and sediment processes.	Located and operated to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid detrimental effects on ground fishing or other renewable resource uses. • Avoid detrimental effects on beach erosion or accretion processes. (WAC 173-26-360(9)(a)(b)) 	Consider habitat recovery rates in reviewing permits. (WAC 173-26-360(9)(c))
Energy production	Energy production uses involve the production of energy in a usable form directly in or on the ocean, rather than extracting a raw material that is transported elsewhere to produce energy in a readily usable form. (WAC 173-26-360(10))	Assess effects on upwelling and other oceanographic and ecosystem processes. (WAC 173-26-360(10)(b))	Located, constructed, and operated in manner that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has no detrimental effects on beach accretion or erosion and wave processes • Located in existing utility rights of way and corridors whenever feasible, rather than creating new corridors (associated distribution facilities)(WAC 173-26-360(10)(c)) 	

⁶⁴ Such new offshore operations may involve cultivation of marine organisms such as fish, shellfish, or aquatic vegetation using platforms, nets, lines, cages, or other structures. Please note: the 2018 state legislature effectively prohibited commercial non-native finfish aquaculture in state marine waters, and phased-out the existing Atlantic salmon facilities located in Puget Sound (RCW 79.105, 77.125, and 90.48). See also Engrossed House Bill 2957, Chapter 179, Session Laws of 2018.

⁶⁵ [WAC 220-370-100](#): A permit may be denied based on the determination by the director (of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife) of significant genetic, ecological or fish health risks of the proposed fish rearing program on naturally occurring fish and wildlife, their habitat or other existing fish rearing programs.

Ocean Use	Definition	Effects Evaluation	Use-Specific Standards	Other related recommendations or requirements
Ocean disposal	Ocean disposal uses involve the deliberate deposition or release of material at sea, such as solid wastes, industrial waste, radioactive waste, incineration, incinerator residue, dredged materials, vessels, aircraft, ordnance, platforms, or other man-made structures. (WAC 173-26-360(11))	Habitat enhancement.	Sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located and designed to prevent, avoid, and minimize adverse impacts on environmentally critical and sensitive habitats, coastal resources and uses, or loss of opportunities for mineral resource development. • Sites for which the primary purpose is habitat enhancement may be located in a wider variety of habitats. (WAC 173-26-360(11)(c)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Storage, loading, transporting, and disposal of materials shall be done in conformance with local, state, and federal requirements for protection of the environment. • Allowed only in sites that have been approved by Ecology, DNR, US EPA, and US Army Corps of Engineers, as appropriate. (WAC 173-26-360(11)(b)) • Sited in areas where the (dredge) disposal will provide beneficial use to the greatest extent possible. (Chapter 5: WCMAC 1.2.2)
Ocean salvage	Ocean salvage uses share characteristics of other ocean uses and involve relatively small sites occurring intermittently. Historic shipwreck salvage, which combines aspects of recreation, exploration, research, and mining, is an example of such a use. (WAC 173-26-360(14))		Non-emergency ocean salvage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts to the coastal waters environment and renewable resource uses such as fishing. • Not be conducted in areas of cultural or historic significance unless part of a scientific effort sanctioned by appropriate governmental agencies. (WAC 173-26-360(14)(a)(b)) 	

Ocean Use	Definition	Effects Evaluation	Use-Specific Standards	Other related recommendations or requirements
Oil and gas uses and activities	Oil and gas uses and activities involve the extraction of oil and gas resources from beneath the ocean. ⁶⁶ (WAC 173-26-360(8))		<p>Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When feasible, facilities located and designed to permit joint use in order to minimize adverse impacts to coastal resources and uses and the environment. • Upland disposal of oil and gas construction and operation materials and waste products such as cuttings and drilling muds should be allowed only in sites that meet applicable requirements. (WAC 173-26-360(8)(a)(f)) <p>Facilities including pipelines should be located, designed, constructed, and maintained in conformance with applicable requirements, but should at a minimum ensure adequate protection from geological hazards such as liquefaction, hazardous slopes, earthquakes, physical oceanographic processes, and natural disasters. (WAC 173-26-360(8)(e)).</p>	<p>Special attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The availability and adequacy of general disaster response capabilities in reviewing ocean locations for oil and gas facilities. • The response times for public safety services such as police, fire, emergency medical, and hazardous materials spill response services in providing and reviewing onshore locations for oil and gas facilities. • Adequacy of plans, equipment, staffing, procedures, and demonstrated financial and performance capabilities for preventing, responding to, and mitigating the effects of accidents and disasters such as oil spills. If a permit is issued, it should ensure that adequate prevention, response, and mitigation can be provided before the use is initiated and throughout the life of the use. (WAC 173-26-360(8)(c))

⁶⁶Note: [RCW 43.143.010\(2\)](#) prohibits leasing of Washington’s state waters for oil or gas exploration, development or production.

Ocean Use	Definition	Effects Evaluation	Use-Specific Standards	Other related recommendations or requirements
Transportation	Ocean transportation includes such uses as: shipping, transferring between vessels, and offshore storage of oil and gas; transport of other goods and commodities; and offshore ports and airports. Addresses transportation activities that originate or conclude in Washington's coastal waters or are transporting a nonrenewable resource extracted from the outer continental shelf off Washington. (WAC 173-26-360(12))	Assess impact on renewable resource activities such as fishing and on environmentally critical and sensitive habitat areas, environmental and scientific preserves and sanctuaries. (WAC 173-26-360(12)(a))	Siting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When feasible, hazardous materials such as oil, gas, explosives and chemicals, should not be transported through highly productive commercial, tribal, or recreational fishing areas. If no such feasible route exists, the routes used should pose the least environmental risk. Located or routed to avoid habitat areas of endangered or threatened species, environmentally critical and sensitive habitats, migration routes of marine species and birds, marine sanctuaries and environmental or scientific preserves to the maximum extent feasible. (WAC 173-26-360(12)(b)(c))	
Ocean research	Ocean research activities involve scientific investigation for the purpose of furthering knowledge and understanding. ⁶⁷ (WAC 173-26-360(13))		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located and operated in a manner that minimizes intrusion into or disturbance of the coastal waters environment consistent with the purposes of the research and the intent of the general ocean use guidelines Completed or discontinued in a manner that restores the environment to its original condition to the maximum extent feasible, consistent with the purposes of the research. (WAC 173-26-360(13)(c)(d)).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complies with scientific collection requirements per RCW 77.12.047, if relevant. Encourage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordination with other ocean uses occurring in the same area to minimize potential conflicts. Public dissemination of ocean research findings. (WAC 173-26-360(13)(a)(e))

⁶⁷ [WAC 173-26-360](#) also states: “Investigation activities involving necessary and functionally related precursor activities to an ocean use or development may be considered exploration or part of the use or development. Since ocean research often involves activities and equipment, such as drilling and vessels, that also occur in exploration and ocean uses or developments, a case by case determination of the applicable regulations may be necessary.” Furthermore, [RCW 43.143.010\(2\)](#) prohibits leasing of state waters for oil or gas exploration, development or production.

References

Washington State Constitution Article XXIV, Section 1 (2017). [Source type 11].

Laws [Source type 5]

Revised Code of Washington (RCWs)

Fish and Wildlife: Scope of commission's authority, RCW: [77.12.047](#); Fish and wildlife enforcement code, RCW 77.15, Limitations on certain commercial fisheries, RCW [77.50](#); Shellfish, RCW [77.60](#), License limitation programs, RCW [77.70](#); Marine finfish aquaculture programs, RCW 77.125. (2017). [Source type 5]

Floodplain Management, [RCW 86.16](#) (2017). [Source type 5]

Growth Management Act, [RCW 36.70A](#) (2017). [Source type 5]

Hydraulic Code, [RCW 77.55](#) (2017). [Source type 5]

Marine waters planning and management act, [RCW 43.372](#) (2017). [Source type 5]

Ocean resources management act, [RCW 43.143](#) (2017). [Source type 5]

Public Lands Act, [RCW 79.105](#) (2017). [Source type 5]

Seashore Conservation Area, [RCW 79A.05.600-79A.05.695](#) (2017). [Source type 5]

Shoreline Management Act, [RCW 90.58](#) (2017). [Source type 5]

State Environmental Policy Act, [RCW 43.21C](#) (2017). [Source type 5]

United States Code (U.S.C.)

Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1465 (2017). [Source type 5]

Submerged Lands Act, Seaward boundaries of States, 43 U.S.C. § 1312 (2017). [Source type 5]

Regulations

Washington Administrative Code (WACs) [Source type 7]

State Master Program Approval/Amendment Procedures and Master Program Guidelines, WACs [173-26-221](#), [173-26-360](#) (2017). [Source type 7]

Shoreline management permit and enforcement procedures, WAC [173-27](#) (2017). [Source type 7]

SEPA rules, WACs [197-11-100](#), [197-11-315](#), [197-11-960](#), [197-11-335](#), [197-11-330](#), [197-11-794](#), [197-11-768](#) (2017). [Source type 7]

Aquatic Land Use Authorization, WAC [332-30-122](#) (2017). [Source type 7]

Code of Federal Register [Source type 7]

Federal Consistency with Approved Coastal Management Programs, [15 C.F.R. § 930](#), 930.39, 930.53, 930.54, 930.58, 930.76, 930.123 (2017). [Source type 7]

Marine finfish aquaculture – approval permit, [WAC 220-370-100](#) (2017). [Source type 7]

Washington State Supreme Court. *Quinault Indian Nation, et al v. Imperium Terminal Svcs., et al.* No. 92552-6, January 2017. [Source type 6]

Reports, Journals, Etc.

- Andrews, K. S., Coyle, J. M., & Harvey, C. J. (2015). *Ecological indicators for Washington State's outer coastal waters*. Seattle, WA: Northwest Fisheries Science Center. Report to the Washington Department of Natural Resources. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/NWFSC_EcosystemIndicatorReport.pdf [Source type 11].
- Decker, K. (2015). *Economic Indicators Report* (Prepared for: The Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council by Washington Sea Grant). Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/SeaGrant_EconomicIndicatorReport.pdf [Source type 11]
- Office for Coastal Management. (2009). *CZMA Federal Consistency Overview: Section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972*. Silver Spring, MD. [Source type 11]: National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, United State's Department of Commerce. Retrieved from <https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/consistency/media/federal-consistency-overview.pdf>
- Poe, M. R., Watkinson, M. K., Trosin, B., & Decker, K. (2015). *Social indicators for the Washington coast integrated ecosystem assessment* (A report to the Washington Department of Natural Resources; Interagency Agreement No. IAA 14-204). Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/SeaGrant_SocialIndicatorsReport.pdf [Source Type 11]

Chapter 5: Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council Recommendations

MSP POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Updated February 15, 2017

Recommendations from the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) are intended to support and reinforce statutory requirements, including but not limited to [The Ocean Resources Management Act \(RCW 43.143\)](#) and [The Marine Waters Planning and Management Act \(RCW 43.372\)](#)

Specific sections of the Marine Waters Planning and Management Act that guided the development of these recommendations include:

RCW 43.372.040 (4) (a-h):

- (4) The marine management plan must be developed and implemented in a manner that:
 - (a) Recognizes and respects existing uses and tribal treaty rights;
 - (b) Promotes protection and restoration of ecosystem processes to a level that will enable long-term sustainable production of ecosystem goods and services;
 - (c) Addresses potential impacts of climate change and sea level rise upon current and projected marine waters uses and shoreline and coastal impacts;
 - (d) Fosters and encourages sustainable uses that provide economic opportunity without significant adverse environmental impacts;
 - (e) Preserves and enhances public access;
 - (f) Protects and encourages working waterfronts and supports the infrastructure necessary to sustain marine industry, commercial shipping, shellfish aquaculture, and other water-dependent uses;
 - (g) Fosters public participation in decision making and significant involvement of communities adjacent to the state's marine waters; and
 - (h) Integrates existing management plans and authorities and makes recommendations for aligning plans to the extent practicable.

Specific sections of the Ocean Resources Management Act that guided the development of these recommendations include:

RCW 43.143.010

- (1) The purpose of this chapter is to articulate policies and establish guidelines for the exercise of state and local management authority over Washington's coastal waters, seabed, and shorelines.
- (2) There shall be no leasing of Washington's tidal or submerged lands extending from mean high tide seaward three miles along the Washington coast from Cape Flattery south to Cape Disappointment, nor in Grays Harbor, Willapa Bay, and the Columbia river downstream from the Longview bridge, for purposes of oil or gas exploration, development, or production.

- (3) When conflicts arise among uses and activities, priority shall be given to resource uses and activities that will not adversely impact renewable resources over uses which are likely to have an adverse impact on renewable resources.
- (4) It is the policy of the state of Washington to actively encourage the conservation of liquid fossil fuels, and to explore available methods of encouraging such conservation.
- (5) It is not currently the intent of the legislature to include recreational uses or currently existing commercial uses involving fishing or other renewable marine or ocean resources within the uses and activities which must meet the planning and review criteria set forth in RCW 43.143.030. It is not the intent of the legislature, however, to permanently exclude these uses from the requirements of RCW 43.143.030. If information becomes available which indicates that such uses should reasonably be covered by the requirements of RCW 43.143.030, the permitting government or agency may require compliance with those requirements, and appeals of that decision shall be handled through the established appeals procedure for that permit or approval.
- (6) The state shall participate in federal ocean and marine resource decisions to the fullest extent possible to ensure that the decisions are consistent with the state's policy concerning the use of those resources.

RCW 43.143.030

- (1) When the state of Washington and local governments develop plans for the management, conservation, use, or development of natural resources in Washington's coastal waters, the policies in RCW 43.143.010 shall guide the decision-making process.
- (2) Uses or activities that require federal, state, or local government permits or other approvals and that will adversely impact renewable resources, marine life, fishing, aquaculture, recreation, navigation, air or water quality, or other existing ocean or coastal uses, may be permitted only if the criteria below are met or exceeded:
 - (a) There is a demonstrated significant local, state, or national need for the proposed use or activity;
 - (b) There is no reasonable alternative to meet the public need for the proposed use or activity;
 - (c) There will be no likely long-term significant adverse impacts to coastal or marine resources or uses;
 - (d) All reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize adverse environmental impacts, with special protection provided for the marine life and resources of the Columbia river, Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor estuaries, and Olympic national park;
 - (e) All reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize adverse social and economic impacts, including impacts on aquaculture, recreation, tourism, navigation, air quality, and recreational, commercial, and tribal fishing;
 - (f) Compensation is provided to mitigate adverse impacts to coastal resources or uses;
 - (g) Plans and sufficient performance bonding are provided to ensure that the site will be rehabilitated after the use or activity is completed; and
 - (h) The use or activity complies with all applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations.

1. Issues Related to All New Uses

1.1 Economic Recommendations

Problem Statement

New uses (including significant expansion of existing uses) may have acute and cumulative impacts on the local economy, both positive and negative. There is concern that some new uses could have short-term economic gains followed by long-term economic loss due to displacement of current uses by short-term projects (such as pilot projects or abandoned or failed projects). Additionally, a new use could result in national or global economic gain, but a significant economic loss at the local level. Local stakeholders and affected parties would like a clear understanding of the potential economic impacts of new uses, and a clear understanding of the interactions with existing uses, prior to the use being permitted.

Recommendations

1.1.1. Prior to permitting new uses or expansions of existing uses which may cause impacts to either existing uses or to the local economy, an economic assessment should be completed. The purpose of this assessment is to provide agencies, the proponent, and stakeholders with information on economic impacts for consideration in conjunction with established review and permitting processes. When appropriate, the economic assessment should build on the baseline information of available economic and social studies.¹

The assessment should include:

a) Process

- Early stakeholder notice, including a detailed description of the project proposal.

¹ Baseline studies include but are not limited to:

- Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). *Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington*. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council.
- Industrial Economics, Inc. (October 2014). *Marine Sector Analysis Reports: Aquaculture, Commercial and Recreational Fishing, and Recreation and Tourism*. Prepared for Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council.
- BST Associates. (August 2014). *Washington Coast Marine Spatial Planning Assessment of Shipping Sector: Final Sector Assessment*. Prepared for Washington State Department of Natural Resources.
- Butler, K., Fryday, C., Gordon, M., Ho, Y., McKinney, S., Wallner, M., & Watts, E. (2013). *Washington's working coast: An analysis of the Washington Pacific coast marine resource-based economy* (Keystone Project). University of Washington Environmental Management Certificate Program.
- Radtke, H. (2011) *Washington State Commercial Fishing Industry Total Economic Contribution*. Prepared for Seattle Marine Business Coalition.
- Martin Associates (October 2014) *The 2013 Economic Impact of the Port of Grays Harbor*. Prepared for the Port of Grays Harbor.
- Resource Dimensions (2015) *Economic Impacts of Crude Oil Transport on the Quinault Indian Nation and the Local Economy*.
- National Marine Fisheries Service (2013). *Fisheries of the United States 2012*. Office of Science and Technology, Fisheries Statistics Division. Alan Lowther, editor.
- Point 97 and the Surfrider Foundation. (May 2015). *An Economic and Spatial Baseline of Coastal Recreation in Washington*. Prepared for Washington Department of Natural Resources.

- A designated time period for review and comment that provides time for stakeholder input at key stages throughout the assessment.
- A clear timeframe for response to comments.
- Independent third party expert review of the assessment and the stakeholder comments. The project proponent will be given an opportunity to review and respond to the assessment, stakeholder comments, and the independent review.

b) Content

- An assessment of the short-term and long-term economic costs and benefits to the affected community, including social costs and benefits. The assessment should specifically address the social costs to vulnerable ocean users, and the potential impacts on taxpayers (and, if appropriate, ratepayers). The determination of costs and benefits should not be completed without input from local stakeholders and affected parties.
- As appropriate, an assessment of the costs and benefits to the larger economy (state, national, global).
- An assessment of various scenarios which include the full project footprint, and scenarios where the new use fails and is abandoned or decommissioned.
- A discussion of how the project complies with all legal requirements, including but not limited to RCW 43.143.030 (e): *All reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize adverse social and economic impacts, including impacts on aquaculture, recreation, tourism, navigation, air quality, and recreational, commercial, and tribal fishing;*

1.2 Infrastructure and Technology Recommendations

Problem Statement

New ocean² infrastructure presents many concerns to coastal communities, ranging from loss of views and aesthetics to safety concerns. New infrastructure may pose an increased risk to the navigational safety of all vessel types and sizes. Impacts may be both direct impacts (including but not limited to collision, damage to or loss of fishing gear, and reduction or elimination of existing fishing operations and maritime commerce) and indirect impacts (such as impacts from changes in ocean conditions or traffic patterns). New uses that disturb the seafloor could harm or bury cultural or historic resources, habitat for marine species, and fishing grounds. New uses could also create hazardous ocean conditions that endanger existing uses and infrastructure.

Some types of fishing gear are "mobile" some are "fixed". On the Washington Coast even "fixed gear" (especially crab pots) moves during storm events. New infrastructure in the ocean presents an increased risk for entangling fishing gear. Gear entanglement results in lost and derelict gear, negative impacts on fishing opportunities and economies, and unintended mortality or harm to marine life.

Harsh coastal conditions on the Washington Coast, including storms and tsunamis, may harm or destroy infrastructure. If a structure becomes obsolete, is destroyed, or is abandoned, there are concerns about the ongoing impacts of leaving unmaintained structures in place, the impacts of the removal process, associated debris, and footprint scars.

² The terms "ocean" and "offshore" throughout this document include estuaries
Chapter 5: WCMAC MSP Policy Recommendations

Recommendations

1.2.1. Navigational Safety

WCMAC recommends that a vessel traffic risk assessment or a risk-based modelling analysis be presented or prepared prior to permitting to evaluate navigational safety. WCMAC recommends that permitting agencies deny permits that have an adverse impact on navigational safety.

1.2.2. Dredge Disposal and Wave Amplification

WCMAC recommends implementation of recommendations established by the updated Mouth of the Columbia River Regional Sediment Management Plan and local Shoreline Master Programs that address navigation safety and dredge disposal. WCMAC recommends that dredge disposal should be sited in areas where the disposal will provide beneficial use to the greatest extent possible.

1.2.3. Historic and Cultural Resources

WCMAC recommends that, for new uses that will impact the ocean floor, a high-resolution seafloor archeological assessment be conducted prior to permitting, and that the project be sited and mitigated to avoid and preserve historic and cultural resources.

1.2.4. Coastal Erosion and Sea-Level Rise

WCMAC recommends that state agencies continue to monitor erosion and sea-level rise on the Washington coast. The effects of projected coastal erosion, future sea-level rise, and other climate change impacts should be evaluated to determine the long-term suitability of a proposed new use prior to permitting.

1.2.5 Aesthetics

WCMAC recommends that the environmental review process require conceptual site drawings of visual impacts and assess the effect new infrastructure will have on views, aesthetics, and public access.

1.2.6 Structure Survivability

WCMAC recommends that a survivability assessment be required for all new ocean structures. Permit conditions should include requirements that comply with RCW 43.143.030(2)(g): *Plans and sufficient performance bonding are provided to ensure that the site will be rehabilitated after the use or activity is completed.*

1.2.7 Entangled Fishing Gear

WCMAC recommends that prior to permitting a new applicant include an assessment of the potential for gear entanglement and, if permitted, require a plan for monitoring for entangled fishing gear or other debris, including a plan to mitigate impacts.³

1.2.8 New Structures

WCMAC recommends that, at a minimum, proposals for any new structures (including the creation of artificial reefs) consider the information in the Marine Spatial Plan, follow the MSP recommendations, and comply with the criteria described in RCW 43.143.030(2).

³ Revised at the 11/9/16 WCMAC meeting.

1.2.9. Performance Bonding

WCMAC recommends that when decision-makers calculate amounts for performance bonding, including applying the criteria required by RCW 43.143.030 (g), the amount should be adequate to fully remove the project and return the site to pre-project condition, and should include costs to cover projected inflation and a contingency amount.⁴

1.2.10. Design, Engineering and Construction Methods

WCMAC recommends that applicants use design, engineering, and construction methods that avoid adverse impacts on fishing and other existing uses such as the potential for entangling fishing gear. Methods may include, but are not limited to, minimizing the number of and size of anchors, spacing structures to allow for greater compatibility with existing uses, and burying cables in the seafloor and through the shoreline. Applicant's monitoring plans should address whether any of the measures used in the project are performing as desired and response plans should provide remedies for any failures.⁵

1.3. Ecological Recommendations

Problem Statement

New uses raise ecological concerns, including impacts to species and habitats; changes to migration routes and physical processes; degradation of water quality; impacts to the food web; and introduction of invasive species. In addition, offshore uses are often supported by on-shore infrastructure, and it is important to understand and assess the positive and negative impacts of changes to infrastructure on local coastal communities.

Recommendations

1.3.1 WCMAC recommends that, prior to permitting new uses or expansions of existing uses, an environmental assessment should be completed. Environmental assessments required under SEPA or NEPA should thoroughly address:

- Degradation of sensitive and important habitat for representative important species, including, but not limited to, ESA listed and commercially, recreationally and ecologically valuable species.
- Potential for direct injury or harm to species, including ESA listed and commercially valuable species (e.g. strikes, entanglement, etc.), or indirect injury related to exposure to noise, light, vibration, electromagnetic fields or other related stressors associated with the new use.
- Alteration or impairment of existing animal migration routes.
- Degradation of water quality (chemicals, petroleum products, nutrients, oxygen, temperature, acidification, etc.).
- Changes in physical processes, including, but not limited to, currents and waves, sediment processes, coastal erosion and accretion, electromagnetic fields, acoustics and wave amplification.
- Unintended impacts, including, but not limited to, impacts to the food chain, changes to physical processes, introduction of disease or genetic pollution, and access to existing resources.
- Inadvertent introduction of invasive species, organisms, etc.

⁴ This recommendation was adopted at the 2/15/17 WMCAC meeting.

⁵ This recommendation was adopted at the 2/15/17 WMCAC meeting

- Comparison of alternatives and best-available technologies, if appropriate.
- Evaluation of impacts and demands on existing infrastructure, both on and offshore.

If environmental review is not required by SEPA or NEPA, WCMAC recommends that state and local agencies ensure that these concerns are addressed by applicants for new uses.

1.3.2. WCMAC recommends that all environmental assessments include a process for stakeholder input, including scoping, review of draft assessments, and a period for public comment. Agencies should establish adequate time for notice and public comment based on the complexity of the project.

1.3.3. WCMAC recommends applicants be held liable for damages and provide mitigation of adverse impacts to coastal resources, coastal uses, or both, consistent with existing law.

1.3.4. For projects that pose risk for invasive species introduction, WCMAC recommends applicants be required to provide a risk assessment for potential invasive species impacts and, if permitted, be required to prepare a prevention, monitoring and control plan.⁶

2. Additional Issues Related to Specific New Uses

2.1. OFFSHORE AQUACULTURE ISSUES

Problem Statement

Offshore aquaculture presents unique concerns. The infrastructure and activities from offshore aquaculture could harm other species, particularly predators such as pinnipeds, cetaceans, and sharks. The infrastructure could also alter habitat and food sources for marine species. Offshore aquaculture may introduce new species, genetic mixing, and diseases into the environment, potentially harming existing populations and ecosystems. Fin-fish aquaculture could have economic, ecological and spatial impacts on existing fishing, and there is currently no feasible recovery method for escaped fin-fish from net-pen aquaculture.

Recommendations

2.1.1. WCMAC recommends that applicants for offshore aquaculture prepare prevention, monitoring and response plans that address escapement, disease, and nutrient pollution.

2.1.2. WCMAC recommends that applicants for offshore aquaculture avoid and minimize impacts to pinnipeds, cetaceans, sharks and other species through facility design, siting and operation.

2.1.3. WCMAC recommends that agencies deny permits for offshore aquaculture facilities with species that pose a significant risk of introducing disease, impairing fish health, or potentially introducing genetic pollution into the area, in accordance with WAC 276.76.100: *A permit may be denied based on the determination by the director of significant genetic, ecological or fish health risks of the proposed*

⁶ Revised at the 11/9/16 WCMAC meeting.

fish rearing program on naturally occurring fish and wildlife, their habitat or other existing fish rearing programs.

2.1.4. WCMAC recommends that pesticide controls used in off-shore aquaculture should undergo risk assessment before their use is allowed.

3. Additional Issues Related to Protecting and Preserving Existing Sustainable Uses

Problem Statement

New uses could irrevocably change coastal communities. While some new uses may bring positive changes, there are concerns that new uses could also harm communities in ways that are difficult to repair. There is a concern that harmful changes are likely to occur without adequate stakeholder involvement and input during all aspects of the decision-making process for new development. The Washington coast is the shortest coast line of the three Pacific Coast states⁷, and has unique limitations on usage, including the Olympic National Park, the Coastal Islands National Wildlife Refuges, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, areas of tribal sovereignty and off-shore treaty rights, restrictions by the US military, and severe weather. Ocean space is limited and already hosts multiple uses. Additional spatial displacement along the Washington coast could place an undue burden on existing uses, including fishing. New uses could preempt existing fishing space, resulting in smaller fishing areas. Smaller fishing areas may lead to overcrowded and dangerous fishing activities as well as reduced catch and negative socio-economic impacts.

There is concern that new uses could degrade or alter existing sustainable uses in the marine waters, including fisheries and aquaculture, in a variety of ways (impairment of estuary functions, degradation of water quality, impacts to fish and wildlife habitat, etc.). This could result in reduced harvest or reduced profitability for existing uses. New uses could also degrade recreational opportunities, public access, and aesthetics.

Recommendations

3.1.1. WCMAC recommends public and stakeholder involvement in all aspects of project development and review, including:

- Working collaboratively with stakeholders, including but not limited to fishing, aquaculture, maritime commerce, conservation, tourism and recreation interests;
- Providing timely and effective notice; and
- Initiating both formal and informal pre-application discussions between stakeholders and applicants.

⁷ Washington's Pacific Coastline is 157 miles (136 nautical miles), Oregon's is 296 (257 n.m.), and California's is 840 (730 nm). Source: NOAA Office for Coastal Management, General Coastline and Shoreline Mileage of the United States. The coast of Willapa Bay is 129 miles (112 n.m.) and the coast of Grays Harbor is 89 miles (77 n.m.). Source: T. Swanson. February 2001. "Managing Washington's Coast: Washington's Coastal Zone Management Program." Washington State Department of Ecology, publication 00-06-029. Olympia, WA. The Marine Spatial Planning study area covers approximately 375 miles (325 n.m.) of Washington's marine and estuarine shoreline.

3.1.2. WCMAC recommends a project review process that includes existing uses, appropriate agencies, and project proponents. The process should involve established fishing advisory groups, and should identify potential adverse impacts on commercial and recreational fisheries and opportunities to avoid, reduce, or mitigate impacts. Fishing advisory boards comprised of representatives of the affected fisheries could also be created for specific projects or sites.

3.1.3. WCMAC recommends that project proponents use WCMAC as a forum for early notification and discussion of potential proposals, including impacts to habitat, impacts on existing uses, project location and maximum size, etc.

3.1.4. WCMAC recommends that through the permitting and review process, applicants prepare site specific impact assessments addressing impacts to current uses, including, but not limited to, fishing, recreation, and aquaculture. The assessment should also describe how the project will comply with local Shoreline Master Programs.

3.1.5. WCMAC recommends that cumulative impacts⁸, environmental baseline and variability, and potential tipping points for harm to existing uses be considered when applying the planning and project review criteria required by RCW 43.143.030.⁹

4. Adaptive Management and Data Gathering

Problem Statement

As conditions change or as new information is gathered, it is important to update baseline information, apply adaptive management, and update the MSP.

Recommendations

4.1.1. WCMAC recommends that state agencies identify a systematic process to update existing datasets, gather new data to keep baseline information current, and fill data gaps.

⁸ The following definitions, taken from the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) are recommended for the MSP: **“Cumulative impact”** is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

“Effects” or “impacts” include:

(a) Direct effects, which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place.

(b) Indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.

Effects and impacts as used in these regulations are synonymous. Effects includes ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. Effects may also include those resulting from actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on balance the agency believes that the effect will be beneficial.

⁹ This recommendation was adopted at the 11/9/16 WMCAC meeting.

4.1.2. WCMAC recommends that, based on new information or changing conditions, state agencies identify areas of the MSP’s recommendations where changes may be needed, and recommend changes to the MSP or to existing implementation activities.

4.1.3. WCMAC recommends that project applicants be required to use up-to-date data that is adequate to evaluate the project and its potential effects. If new data gathering is required, it should be done at the applicants’ expense. When it exists, data should include multiple years and multiple seasons within those years.¹⁰

NOTES:

1. A definitions section will be added to the MSP to define key terms in these recommendations.
2. Cross-references to relevant sections of the full MSP will be added as appropriate (e.g. references to Olympic National Park, the Coastal Islands National Wildlife Refuges, the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, etc.)
3. Staff will research the miles of shoreline for WA, OR and CA and add a footnote with these numbers the problem statement in section 3.

¹⁰ This recommendation was adopted at the 9/28/16 WCMAC meeting.
Chapter 5: WCMAC MSP Policy Recommendations

Appendix A. Plan Maps

Appendix A contains maps that provide context for the Study Area, baseline conditions of ecological resources and existing uses, select outputs from models and analyses, and best available information on Important, Sensitive, and Unique areas (ISUs). There are varying underlying data sources and methods used for the different plan maps contained in this appendix. Those interested in using the maps should consult source documents and with map creators to better understand the limitations of each map (see Appendix C: Data Sources, Methods, and Limitations). The methods used to produce these maps are diverse using field surveys, advanced statistical models, expert judgement, or a combination of approaches. The data sources vary in spatial coverage, but attempts were made to use data that covered the extent of the activity or resource within the MSP Study Area. Some maps include data from decades or more of observations, while others are based on shorter time periods.

The approaches to handling uncertainty for these data sources vary as well. Some data included in the plan have formal measures of uncertainty, others only provide qualitative measures of uncertainty that express relative confidence in model estimates. Some maps, including several of the fisheries maps, were produced based on expert judgement and have no measures of uncertainty at all.

***Accommodation Requests:** To request ADA accommodation including materials in a format for the visually impaired, call Ecology at 360-407-6600. Persons with impaired hearing may call Washington Relay Service at 711. Persons with speech disability may call TTY at 877-833-6341.*

Plan Maps - Table of Contents

Map 1	MSP Study Area, Government and Conservation Areas
Map 2	Cities, Coastal Tribal Reservations, and Combined Tribal Usual and Accustomed Areas (U&As)
Map 3	Modeled Bottom Types and Featured Canyons
Map 4	Kelp, Eelgrass, and Saltmarsh
Map 5	Ecologically Important Areas for Fish
Map 6	Forage Fish Survey Results
Map 7	Designated Critical Habitat for Bull Trout and Green Sturgeon
Map 8	Ecologically Important Areas for Marine Mammals
Map 9	Ecologically Important Areas for Humpback Whales
Map 10	Sea Otter Concentration Areas and Pinniped Haulouts
Map 11	Seabird Colonies from the Washington Seabird Catalog
Map 12	Ecologically Important Areas for Seabirds

Plan Maps - Table of Contents

Map 13	Modeled Paleoshorelines and Predictive Model for Risk to Upland Archaeological Resources
Map 14	Historic Registered Properties, Districts, and Shipwrecks
Map 15	Offshore Facilities Viewshed
Map 16	County Boundaries and City Populations
Map 17	All Commercial and Recreational Fishing Activity (Non-Tribal)
Map 18	Commercial Fishing: Sablefish (Fixed Gear)
Map 19	Commercial Fishing: Groundfish (Bottom Trawl)
Map 20	Commercial Fishing: Pacific Whiting (Mid-Water Trawl)
Map 21	Commercial Fishing: Salmon (Troll)
Map 22	Commercial Fishing: Albacore Tuna
Map 23	Commercial Fishing: Pacific Sardine
Map 24	Commercial Fishing: Dungeness Crab
Map 25	Commercial Fishing: Pink Shrimp
Map 26	Recreational Fishing: Salmon
Map 27	Recreational Fishing: Bottomfish and Lingcod
Map 28	Recreational Fishing: Pacific Halibut
Map 29	Recreational Fishing: Albacore Tuna
Map 30	Recreational Shellfish Beaches and Hardshell Clam Beaches
Map 31	Ports and Marinas
Map 32	High Value Areas for Shellfish Aquaculture
Map 33	Tourism and Recreational Use Density
Map 34	Recreational Vessel Density
Map 35	Public Access Points
Map 36	Cargo Vessel Density
Map 37	Passenger Vessel Density
Map 38	Tanker Vessel Density
Map 39	Tug and Tow Vessel Density
Map 40	Shipping Lanes, Federal Navigation Channels, and Navigation Agreement Lines

Plan Maps - Table of Contents

Map 41	Northwest Training Range Complex and Coast Guard Stations
Map 42	Permanent and Temporary Research and Monitoring Stations
Map 43	Renewable Energy Wind Turbine Suitability (Jacket-Tripod Foundation)
Map 44	Renewable Energy Wind Turbine Suitability (Monopile Foundation)
Map 45	Renewable Energy Wind Turbine Suitability (Floating Foundation)
Map 46	Renewable Energy Wave Device Suitability (Nearshore Energy Device)
Map 47	Renewable Energy Wave Device Suitability (Nearshore M3 Energy Device)
Map 48	Renewable Energy Wave Device Suitability (Mid-Depth Energy Device)
Map 49	Renewable Energy Wave Device Suitability (Deepwater Energy Device)
Map 50	Renewable Energy Tidal Turbine Suitability (Columbia River)
Map 51	Marine Infrastructure
Map 52	Dredged Material Disposal and Federal Navigation Lanes: Grays Harbor
Map 53	Navigation Channel and Dredge Disposal Sites: Mouth of the Columbia River
Map 54	Dredged Disposal Sites, Dune Restoration Project, and Ports: Willapa Bay
Map 55	Quillayute River Navigation Channel and Quileute Tribe Marina
Map 56	Total Number of Existing High Intensity Uses in the MSP Study Area
Map 57	Number of Existing Use Sectors in the MSP Study Area
Map 58	Relative Cultural Risk to Known Historic and Archaeological Sites
Map 59	Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Aquatic Vegetation
Map 60	Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Observations of Deep-sea Corals and Sponges in the MSP Study Area (1 of 3)
Map 61	Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Observations of Deep-sea Corals and Sponges in the MSP Study Area (2 of 3)
Map 62	Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Observations of Deep-sea Corals and Sponges in the MSP Study Area (3 of 3)
Map 63	Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Observations of Deep-sea Corals and Sponges in the MSP Study Area (by type)
Map 64	Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Ecologically Important Areas for Corals
Map 65	Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Rocky Reefs and Forage Fish Areas (1 of 4)
Map 66	Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Rocky Reefs and Forage Fish Areas (2 of 4)
Map 67	Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Rocky Reefs and Forage Fish Areas (3 of 4)

Plan Maps - Table of Contents

Map 68 Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Rocky Reefs and Forage Fish Areas (4 of 4)

Map 69 Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas:
Ecologically Important Areas Analysis Results for Rocky Reefs

Map 70 Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Pinniped Haulouts and Seabird Colonies


Map 71 Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Historic Sites, Buoys, and Cables (1 of 4)

Map 72 Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Historic Sites, Buoys, and Cables (2 of 4)

Map 73 Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Historic Sites, Buoys, and Cables (3 of 4)

Map 74 Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas: Historic Sites, Buoys, and Cables (4 of 4)



Map 1: MSP Study Area, Government and Conservation Areas










- | | | |
|--|---|--|
|  National Park Service Lands (NPS) |  National Forest Service Lands (USDA) |  MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus) |
|  State Park Seashore Conservation Areas (DNR) |  National Wildlife Refuges and Acquisition Areas (USFWS) |  State Boundary (NOAA) |
|  National Marine Sanctuary (NOAA) |  State DNR Conservation Areas (DNR) |  County Boundary (DNR) |
| | |  Latitude and Longitude (ESRI) |

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 2: Cities, Coastal Tribal Reservations, and Combined Tribal Usual and Accustomed Areas (U&As)




-  Washington Coastal Tribal Reservations (DNR)
-  Incorporated City (WSDOT)
-  County Boundary (DNR)
-  Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

-  Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
-  WA State Boundary (NOAA)
-  Combined Tribal U+As (NOAA Fisheries)

** This represents the combined U&A footprints, within the MSP Study Area only, for the Quileute, Quinault, and Makah tribes. Each tribe's U&A varies within this area.*

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 3: Modeled Bottom Types and Featured Canyons




Modeled Bottom Types
(The Nature Conservancy, modeled using data from various sources from late 1800s to 2007)

- | | | | |
|---------|--------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Sand | Gravel | Rocky Reefs | MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus) |
| Canyons | Mud | Latitude and Longitude (ESRI) | WA State Boundary (NOAA) |
| | | | Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU) |

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 4: Kelp, Eelgrass, and Saltmarsh




Marine Vegetation
(DNR, ShoreZone Inventory based on surveys 1994 - 2000)


- | | | | |
|--------------|--|-------------------|---|
| Kelp | Eelgrass (both native and non-native species) | Salt Marsh | MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus) |
| — Continuous | — Continuous | — Continuous | — WA State Boundary (NOAA) |
| — Patchy | — Patchy | — Patchy | |

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 5: Ecologically Important Areas for Fish



**Estuary data was not included in this analysis, due to inadequate comparable data across sectors. Estuaries are of high ecological importance and are heavily used by sectors such as aquaculture, which currently occurs only in these areas. Please consult other maps for available estuary data.*



Ecological Importance (WDFW, 2016)




Analysis includes data from varying periods between 2001 and 2014 for:
 Darblotched Rockfish, Dover Sole, Greenspotted Rockfish, Longspine Thornyhead,
 Pacific Ocean Perch, Petrale Sole, Sablefish, Shortspine Thornyhead,
 Yelloweye Rockfish, Pacific Whiting, Surf Smelt, Night Smelt, and Pacific Sand Lance.

- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Estuaries*
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 6: Forage Fish Survey Results



Forage Fish Survey Results (WDFW, based on surveys from 2012-2014)


Present indicates 2 or more eggs of Surf Smelt (*Hypomesus pretiosus*), Night Smelt (*Spirinchus starksi*) or Pacific Sand Lance (*Ammodytes hexapterus*)

- Present
- Absent

- Herring Spawning Area (WDFW, based on data through 1991)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


Map 7: Designated Critical Fish Habitat in the MSP Study Area




- Green Sturgeon Critical Habitat (NOAA Fisheries)
- Bull Trout Critical Habitat (USFWS)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- WA MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 8: Ecologically Important Areas, Marine Mammals



*Estuary data was not included in this analysis, due to inadequate comparable data across sectors. Estuaries are of high ecological importance and are heavily used by sectors such as aquaculture, which currently occurs only in these areas. Please consult other maps for available estuary data.




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Analysis includes data collected over varying periods between 1995 and 2014 for: Harbor seal, California sea lion, Steller sea lion, northern elephant seal, harbor porpoise, sea otter, humpback whale, gray whale, and Dall's porpoise.

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 9: Ecologically Important Areas, Humpback Whale



Ecological Importance (WDFW, 2016)




Analysis includes data from ecological modeling by NCCOS, based on sightings from various surveys conducted between 1995 and 2014.

- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- ▨ Estuaries
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 10: Sea Otter Concentration Areas and Pinniped Haulouts




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Northern Sea Otter Summer Concentration Areas (WDFW, surveys 2012 and 2013)










- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Haulout Locations for Harbor seal, California Sea Lion Stellar Sea Lion, and Northern Elephant Seal (WDFW, surveys 1998 - 2013)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 11: Seabird Colonies from the Washington Seabird Catalog




Seabird Colony Size (WDFW, Catalog of Washington's Seabird Colonies 2016)

- | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|--------------|---|--------|---|--|
|  | 0 - 50 |  | 1001 - 5000 |  | >20000 |  | Latitude and Longitude (ESRI) |
|  | 51 - 100 |  | 5001 - 20000 | | |  | WA State Boundary (NOAA) |
|  | 101 - 1000 | | | | |  | Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus) |



Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 12: Ecologically Important Areas, Seabirds



Ecological Importance (WDFW, 2016)




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- ▨ Estuaries
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Analysis includes data from ecological models by NCCOS, based on survey information collected between 2000 and 2013 for: Black-footed Albatross, Common Murre, Marbled Murrelet, Northern Fulmar, Pink-footed Shearwater, Sooty Shearwater, and Tufted Puffin.

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 13: Modeled Paleoshorelines and Predictive Model for Risk to Upland Archaeological Resources



Paleoshorelines (BOEM)
kya = thousand years ago

- 8 kya
- 11 kya
- 14 kya
- 17 kya
- 9 kya
- 12 kya
- 15 kya
- 18 kya
- 10 kya
- 13 kya
- 16 kya
- 19 kya


..... Washington MSP Study Area
(State Ocean Caucus)








Modeled risk to archaeological resources based on environmental factors (DAHPR)



Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


Map 14: Historic Registered Properties, Districts, and Shipwrecks



- | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
|  | National and/or State Register Listed Historic Properties (DAHP) |  | Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus) |
|  | Historic Registered Districts (DAHP) |  | Washington State Boundary (NOAA) |
|  | Wrecks and Obstructions (NOAA) |  | Latitude and Longitude (ESRI) |
| | |  | Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU) |

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 15: Offshore Facilities Viewshed



Viewshed Assessment (Olympic Natural Resources Center, 2016)





Onshore Observer Height	10m Device	90m Device	120m Device
35 ft			
25 ft			
6 ft			

- WA MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 16: County Boundaries and City Populations



City Populations (WSDOT, 2001)


- 1-1500
- 1501-4000
- 4001-8000
- 8001-12000
- 12001-16000

- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- ▭ County Boundary (DNR)




Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 17
Fishing Activity: All Commercial and Recreational



Intensity rankings reflect the best available information on the relative use of the Study Area by each fishery. They do not include tribal activity, or reflect estimates of potential conflict or impact from new uses. Conflict and substantial adverse impacts to a fishery could occur in areas ranked as "low," and depending on the circumstances, new uses could be compatible with fishing in areas ranked as "high." Rankings were made relative to the activity within each particular fishery, and the scale of activity can differ greatly between fisheries. An area ranked as "low" or "medium" for a large fishery may represent more fishing activity overall than a "high" area in a smaller, less active fishery.



Commercial and Recreational Fishing Intensity* (WDFW)

0-5	11-12	17-19
6-8	13-14	20-26
9-10	15-16	

*Sum of intensity scores from all individual fisheries maps, where:
 1 = Low intensity
 2 = Med intensity
 3 = High intensity

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)


Includes: Pacific Whiting, groundfish, Salmon, Albacore Tuna, Pacific Sardine, Dungeness Crab, Pink Shrimp, Bottomfish, and Pacific Halibut.

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.



Map 18

Commercial Fishing: Sablefish (Fixed Gear)



Commercial Sablefish Fishing Intensity (Fixed Gear)
(WDFW 2016, compiled based on industry interviews)

- Medium
- High


- Pt. Chehalis (46° 53.30' N.)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)




Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 19
Commercial Fishing: Groundfish (Bottom Trawl)



Intensity rankings reflect the best available information on the relative use of the Study Area by each fishery. They do not include tribal activity, or reflect estimates of potential conflict or impact from new uses. Conflict and substantial adverse impacts to a fishery could occur in areas ranked as "low," and depending on the circumstances, new uses could be compatible with fishing in areas ranked as "high." Rankings were made relative to the activity within each particular fishery, and the scale of activity can differ greatly between fisheries. An area ranked as "low" or "medium" for a large fishery may represent more fishing activity overall than a "high" area in a smaller, less active fishery.



Commercial Groundfish Fishing Intensity (Bottom Trawl)

- Low
- Medium
- High

(WDFW 2016, Based on 12 years of trawl logbooks, 2003 - 2014)


- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)




Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 20

Commercial Fishing: Pacific Whiting (Mid-Water Trawl)



Intensity rankings reflect the best available information on the relative use of the Study Area by each fishery. They do not include tribal activity, or reflect estimates of potential conflict or impact from new uses. Conflict and substantial adverse impacts to a fishery could occur in areas ranked as "low," and depending on the circumstances, new uses could be compatible with fishing in areas ranked as "high." Rankings were made relative to the activity within each particular fishery, and the scale of activity can differ greatly between fisheries. An area ranked as "low" or "medium" for a large fishery may represent more fishing activity overall than a "high" area in a smaller, less active fishery.



Commercial Pacific Whiting Fishing Intensity

- Low
- Medium
- High

(WDFW 2016, Based on 12 years of logbook data, 2003 - 2014)


- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)



Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 21

Commercial Fishing: Salmon (Troll)



Commercial Salmon Troll Intensity

- Low
- Medium
- High


(WDFW 2016, Based on industry and fishery manager interviews)

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)



Map 22

Commercial Fishing: Albacore Tuna



Commercial Albacore Fishing Intensity

- Low
- Medium
- High


(WDFW 2016, based on 20 years of logbook data, 1995 - 2014, and criteria-based definitions)

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)


Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 23

Commercial Fishing: Pacific Sardine



Intensity rankings reflect the best available information on the relative use of the Study Area by each fishery. They do not include tribal activity, or reflect estimates of potential conflict or impact from new uses. Conflict and substantial adverse impacts to a fishery could occur in areas ranked as "low," and depending on the circumstances, new uses could be compatible with fishing in areas ranked as "high." Rankings were made relative to the activity within each particular fishery, and the scale of activity can differ greatly between fisheries. An area ranked as "low" or "medium" for a large fishery may represent more fishing activity overall than a "high" area in a smaller, less active fishery.




Commercial Pacific Sardine Fishing Intensity
 Low Medium High

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- - - - Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

(WDFW 2016, Based on 13 years of logbook data, 2002 - 2014, and criteria-based definitions)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 24
Commercial Fishing: Dungeness Crab




- Commercial Crabbing Intensity**
- Low
 - Medium
 - High
- WDFW 2016, based on 5 seasons of logbook data (2009/2010 - 2013/2014 seasons).
- Tribal Special Management Areas (WDFW, 2013)
 - Towboat Lanes (WSG)
 - WA State Boundary (NOAA)
 - Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
 - Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
 - Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)


Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 25

Commercial Fishing: Pink Shrimp



Intensity rankings reflect the best available information on the relative use of the Study Area by each fishery. They do not include tribal activity, or reflect estimates of potential conflict or impact from new uses. Conflict and substantial adverse impacts to a fishery could occur in areas ranked as "low," and depending on the circumstances, new uses could be compatible with fishing in areas ranked as "high." Rankings were made relative to the activity within each particular fishery, and the scale of activity can differ greatly between fisheries. An area ranked as "low" or "medium" for a large fishery may represent more fishing activity overall than a "high" area in a smaller, less active fishery.




Commercial Pink Shrimp Trawl Intensity
 Low Medium High
 (WDFW 2016, based on four years of logbook data 2011-2014)

— WA State Boundary (NOAA)
 - - - Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
 — Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
 Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)




Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 26
Recreational Fishing: Salmon



Intensity rankings reflect the best available information on the relative use of the Study Area by each fishery. They do not include tribal activity, or reflect estimates of potential conflict or impact from new uses. Conflict and substantial adverse impacts to a fishery could occur in areas ranked as "low," and depending on the circumstances, new uses could be compatible with fishing in areas ranked as "high." Rankings were made relative to the activity within each particular fishery, and the scale of activity can differ greatly between fisheries. An area ranked as "low" or "medium" for a large fishery may represent more fishing activity overall than a "high" area in a smaller, less active fishery.




Recreational Salmon Fishing Intensity
 Medium High
(WDFW 2016, Based on industry and fishery manager interviews)

WA State Boundary (NOAA)
 Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
 Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
 Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 27

Recreational Fishing: Bottomfish and Lingcod



Recreational Bottomfish and Lingcod Fishing Intensity

Medium High

(WDFW 2016, Based on industry and fishery manager interviews)

WA State Boundary (NOAA)


Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)

Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)



Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.



Recreational Pacific Halibut Fishing Intensity


- Medium
- High

(WDFW 2016, Based on industry and fishery manager interviews)


- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)



Map 29
Recreational Fishing: Albacore Tuna



Intensity rankings reflect the best available information on the relative use of the Study Area by each fishery. They do not include tribal activity, or reflect estimates of potential conflict or impact from new uses. Conflict and substantial adverse impacts to a fishery could occur in areas ranked as "low," and depending on the circumstances, new uses could be compatible with fishing in areas ranked as "high." Rankings were made relative to the activity within each particular fishery, and the scale of activity can differ greatly between fisheries. An area ranked as "low" or "medium" for a large fishery may represent more fishing activity overall than a "high" area in a smaller, less active fishery.



Recreational Albacore Tuna Fishing Intensity


- Low
- Medium
- High

(WDFW 2016, Based on 9 years of logbook data, 2006-2014, and criteria-based definitions)

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.



Map 30: Recreational Shellfish Beaches and Hardshell Clam Beaches



- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
 - Recreational Shellfish Beaches (DOH, 2014)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
 - Hardshell Clam Beaches (NPS)
 - Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 31: Ports, Fishing Infrastructure, and Marinas





- Ports (US Army Corps of Engineers and US Geological Survey)
- Marinas (Department of Ecology)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)



Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


Map 32: High Value Areas for Aquaculture



- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Oyster Reserves (DNR, Aquatic Parcel Dataset)
- Aquaculture Districts (WDFW)
- Oyster Tracts (DNR, Aquatic Parcel Dataset)
- Commercial Harvest Locations (DOH, 2012)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 33: Tourism and Recreational Use Density



----- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)

Recreational Use Density (Surfrider Foundation Survey and Study, 2015)




— WA State Boundary (NOAA)

— Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)


— Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.





Map 34: Recreational Vessel Density



Recreational Vessel Density




(Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, based on AIS tracking data 2013-2014)

-  WA State Boundary (NOAA)
-  Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
-  Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
-  Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


Map 35: Public Access Points



- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Public Access Locations (Department of Ecology, Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program, 2010)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 36: Cargo Vessel Density



Cargo Vessel Density




(Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, Based on AIS Vessel Tracking Data from 2013-2014)

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)



Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 37: Passenger Vessel Density



Passenger Vessel Density




(Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, Based on AIS Vessel Tracking Data from 2013-2014)


Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)

Map 38: Tanker Vessel Density




Tanker Vessel Density



- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 39: Tug and Tow Vessel Density



Tug and Tow Vessel Density




(Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary, Based on AIS Vessel Tracking Data from 2013-2014)

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 40: Shipping Lanes, Federal Navigation Channels, and Navigation Agreement Lines




Marine Transportation, Navigation, and Infrastructure

- Shipping Lanes (NOAA)
- Federal Navigation Channels (USACE)
- Towboat Lanes (WA Sea Grant)
- Fishing Area (WA Sea Grant)
- ATBA (NOAA)
- Ports (USACE)
- WA MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


Map 41: Pacific Northwest Operating Area and Coast Guard Stations



- Pacific Northwest Operating Area (US Dept of the Navy 2017)
- Quinault Range Site (US Dept of the Navy 2017)
- Coast Guard Station (US Coast Guard)
- Olympic Military Operations Areas (US Dept of the Navy 2017)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Warning Area 237 (W-237) (US Dept of the Navy 2017)
- Unexploded Ordnances (NOAA 2014)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


Map 42: Permanent and Temporary Research Stations



- Water Quality Monitoring Stations (For fecal coliform, DOH)
- Fixed Research Structures (IOOS, NANOOS)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- Long-term Monitoring Sites (NOAA)
- Marine Debris Monitoring Stations (NOAA)
- WA MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

**Map 43: Renewable Energy Wind Turbine Suitability (Jacket-Tripod Foundation)
 Analysis by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Department of Energy**



Relative Technical Suitability for Tripod Foundation Wind Technology




Relative technical suitability score by percentile, based on various attributes related to site quality, grid connection, and shore-side support. (PNNL, 2013)

- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

**Map 44: Renewable Energy Wind Turbine Suitability (Monopile Foundation)
 Analysis by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Department of Energy**



Relative Technical Suitability for Monopile Foundation Wind Technology




Relative technical suitability score by percentile, based on various attributes related to site quality, grid connection, and shore-side support. (PNNL, 2013)

- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)



**Map 45: Renewable Energy Wind Turbine Suitability (Floating Foundation)
 Analysis by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Department of Energy**



Relative Technical Suitability for Floating Foundation Wind Technology




Relative technical suitability score by percentile, based on various attributes related to site quality, grid connection, and shore-side support. (PNNL, 2013)

- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

**Map 46: Renewable Energy Wave Device Suitability (Nearshore Energy Device)
 Analysis by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Department of Energy**



Relative Technical Suitability for Nearshore Technology




Relative technical suitability score by percentile, based on various attributes related to site quality, grid connection, and shore-side support. (PNNL, 2013)

- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 47: Renewable Energy Wave Device Suitability (Nearshore M3 Energy Device)
Analysis by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Department of Energy



Relative Technical Suitability for Nearshore Technology




Relative technical suitability score by percentile, based on various attributes related to site quality, grid connection, and shore-side support. (PNNL, 2013)

- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 48: Renewable Energy Wave Device Suitability (Mid-Depth Energy Device)
Analysis by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Department of Energy




Relative Technical Suitability for Mid-Depth Wave Technology

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

Relative technical suitability score by percentile, based on various attributes related to site quality, grid connection, and shore-side support. (PNNL, 2013)

- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map 49: Renewable Energy Wave Device Suitability (Deepwater Energy Device)
Analysis by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Department of Energy



Relative Technical Suitability for Deepwater Wave Technology


0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

Relative technical suitability score by percentile, based on various attributes related to site quality, grid connection, and shore-side support. (PNNL, 2013)

- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 50: Renewable Energy Tidal Turbine Suitability (Columbia River)
Analysis by the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Department of Energy



Relative Technical Suitability for Nearshore Technology





Relative technical suitability score by percentile, based on various attributes related to site quality, grid connection, and shore-side support. (PNNL, 2013)

- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


Map 51: Marine Infrastructure



- Transmission Lines and Substations (Bonneville Power Administration)
- Charted Submarine Cables (NOAA)
- Fixed Research Structures (IOOS, NANOOS)
- Rail Lines (DNR)
- WA MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- Beacons (NOAA)
- Buoys (NOAA)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 52: Dredged Material Disposal and Federal Navigation Lanes, Grays Harbor




- Disposal locations (Ecology, DNR, USACE)
- Federal Navigation Channel (USACE)
- Ports* (USACE)

**Ports are defined differently by different agencies. Some markers may indicate the location of individual structures within port areas, such as docks or wharfs.*

- - - - Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Marinas (USACE)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 53: Columbia River Dredged Material Disposal, Federal Navigation Lanes, and Ports



- Disposal locations (Ecology, DNR, USACE)
- Federal Navigation Channel (USACE)
- Ports (USGS)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- ⋯ Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


Map 54: Willapa Bay Dredged Material Disposal Sites, Dune Restoration Project, Ports and Marinas



- Ports (Ecology, USACE)
- Disposal Sites (DNR)
- Dune Restoration Project (DNR data source)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 55: Quillayute River Navigation Channel and Quileute Marina




- Ports (USGS)
- Federal Navigation Channel (USACE)

- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 56: Total Number of Existing High Intensity Uses in the MSP Study Area




Note: the Makah Tribe's U&A extends into the Strait of Juan de Fuca, which is not shown on this map.




*Estuary data was not included in this map, due to inadequate comparable data across sectors. Estuaries are of high ecological importance and are heavily used by sectors such as aquaculture, which currently occurs only in these areas. Please consult other maps for available estuary data.

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 57: Number of Existing Use Sectors in the MSP Study Area



*Estuaries were not included in this map, due to inadequate comparable data across sectors. Estuaries are of high ecological importance and are heavily used by sectors such as aquaculture, which currently occurs only in these areas. Please consult other maps for available estuary data.



Number of Use Sectors




Estuaries* (WDFW)
WA MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)

This map represents the number of the following categories of uses occurring at any level in a given area: Fishing, Military, Recreation, Archaeology/Historical Sites, Ecologically Important Areas, Shipping

WA State Boundary (NOAA)
Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Map 58: Relative Cultural Risk



Cultural Risk
(WA Dept of Archaeology & Historic Preservation)


High Moderate Low

Based on the relative density of known cultural sites, including archaeological, historic registered, submerged/tidal, land based, and shipwreck sites. Does not account for undiscovered sites

- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

**Map 59: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Biogenic Habitats: Aquatic Vegetation**




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Washington State Boundary (NOAA)

Kelp (DNR 2001)

- Continuous
- Patchy

Eelgrass (DNR 2001)

- Continuous
- Patchy




Important, Sensitive and Unique Area Maps (ISUs)

State law requires the Marine Spatial Plan to identify environmentally sensitive and unique resources that warrant protective measures ([RCW 43.372.040\(6\)\(c\)](#)). Therefore, the plan is designating Important, Sensitive and Unique Areas (ISUs) **in state waters** that have high conservation value, high historic value, or key infrastructure. The ISUs include standards to maintain the high values of these areas and to protect the ISUs from adverse effects of offshore development, while allowing existing compatible uses such as fishing. Designation of an ISU, like the MSP itself, is not intended to and does not alter nor affect tribal treaty rights.

As part of the Marine Spatial Plan, the state is developing maps of ISUs based on available information and data. However, it is important to note that the designation of ISUs and the application of the enforceable protective standards is habitat- and resource-based, wherever these habitats or resources occur within state waters. The enforceable protective standards would apply to any designated ISU, whether mapped or not. The ISU maps are not part of the enforceable standards. Rather, ISU maps are intended to assist the state, local governments and applicants by showing known locations of ISUs.

For more information on the ISU designations, definitions, and protection standards, please see Section 4.3.3 of the Marine Spatial Plan.

**Map 60: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Observations of Deepsea Corals in the MSP Study Area (1 of 3)**




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)


Observed Locations

- ▲ Demosponges and Unspecified Sponges
- Black Corals and Stony Corals
- Glass Sponges
- Gorgonian Corals, Sea Pens, and Soft Corals

(NOAA National Database for Deep-Sea Corals and Sponges, Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program, 2015. Database is a compilation of data from many sources.)



**Map 61: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Observations of Deep-sea Corals and Sponges in the MSP Study Area (2 of 3)**




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)


Observed Locations

- ▲ Demosponges and Unspecified Sponges
- Black Corals and Stony Corals
- Glass Sponges
- Gorgonian Corals, Sea Pens, and Soft Corals

(NOAA National Database for Deep-Sea Corals and Sponges, Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program, 2015. Database is a compilation of data from many sources.)



**Map 62: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Observations of Deep-sea Corals and Sponges in the MSP Study Area (3 of 3)**




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Observed Locations


- ▲ Demosponges and Unspecified Sponges
- Black Corals and Stony Corals
- Glass Sponges
- Gorgonian Corals, Sea Pens, and Soft Corals

(NOAA National Database for Deep Sea Corals and Sponges, Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program, 2015. Database is a compilation of data from many sources.)



Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

**Map 63: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Observations of Deep-sea Corals in the MSP Study Area (by type)**




- Gorgonian Corals, Sea Pens, and Soft Corals
 - Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
 - WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Black Corals and Stony Corals
 - Lace Coral
 - Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
 - Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- ▲ Demosponges and Unspecified Sponges
 - Glass Sponges

(Observation data acquired from NOAA National Database for Deep Sea Corals and Sponges, Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program, 2015. Database is a compilation of data from many sources.)



**Map 64: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Ecologically Important Areas for Deep-sea Coral**



Ecological Importance (WDFW, 2016)



Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)



Estuaries



WA State Boundary (NOAA)




Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

WDFW's analysis is based on the results of two predictive habitat suitability models by Guinotte and Davis (2014) for species of the orders Antipatharia and Scleractinia, and the suborders Alcyoniina, Calcaxonia, Filifera, Holaxonia, Scleraxonia, and Stolonifera.

Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

**Map 65: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Rocky Reefs and Forage Fish Spawning Survey Results (1 of 4)**



- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)


Forage Fish Survey Results ● Present
 (WDFW, based on surveys from 2012-2014. Includes Surf Smelt (*Hypomesus pretiosus*), Night Smelt (*Spirinchus starksi*), and Pacific Sand Lance (*Ammodytes hexapterus*).

■ Herring Spawning Area (WDFW, based on data through 1991)


Rocky Reefs (OSU, NOAA Fisheries, and BOEM 2016)

- | Mixed Substrates | Hard Substrates |
|------------------------------|-----------------|
| ■ Bedrock/Granule+Pebble Mix | ■ Bedrock |
| ■ Bedrock/Sand | ■ Hard |
| ■ Bedrock/Shell Hash | |
| ■ Boulder/Mud | |
| ■ Boulder/Sand | |
| ■ Mixed | |

Classifications based on the Coastal and Marine Ecological Classification Standard.



**Map 66: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Rocky Reefs and Forage Fish Spawning Survey Results (2 of 4)**



- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)


Forage Fish Survey Results ● Present
 (WDFW, based on surveys from 2012-2014. Includes Surf Smelt (*Hypomesus pretiosus*), Night Smelt (*Spirinchus starksi*), and Pacific Sand Lance (*Ammodytes hexapterus*).

■ Herring Spawning Area (WDFW, based on data through 1991)

Rocky Reefs (OSU, NOAA Fisheries, and BOEM 2016)


- | Mixed Substrates | | Hard Substrates | |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--------|
| ■ Bedrock/Granule+Pebble Mix | ■ Bedrock | ■ Bedrock | ■ Hard |
| ■ Bedrock/Sand | | | |
| ■ Bedrock/Shell Hash | | | |
| ■ Boulder/Mud | | | |
| ■ Boulder/Sand | | | |
| ■ Mixed | | | |

Classifications based on the Coastal and Marine Ecological Classification Standard.



Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

**Map 67: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Rocky Reefs and Forage Fish Spawning Survey Results (3 of 4)**



Forage Fish Survey Results ● Present
(WDFW, based on surveys from 2012-2014. Includes Surf Smelt (*Hypomesus pretiosus*), Night Smelt (*Spirinchus starksi*), and Pacific Sand Lance (*Ammodytes hexapterus*).

■ Herring Spawning Area (WDFW, based on data through 1991)


Rocky Reefs (OSU, NOAA Fisheries, and BOEM 2016)

Mixed Substrates


- Bedrock/Granule+Pebble Mix
- Bedrock/Sand
- Bedrock/Shell Hash
- Boulder/Mud
- Boulder/Sand
- Mixed

Hard Substrates

- Bedrock
- Hard
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)



**Map 68: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Rocky Reefs and Forage Fish Spawning Survey Results (4 of 4)**



Forage Fish Survey Results ● Present
(WDFW, based on surveys from 2012-2014. Includes Surf Smelt (*Hypomesus pretiosus*), Night Smelt (*Spirinchus starksi*), and Pacific Sand Lance (*Ammodytes hexapterus*).

■ Herring Spawning Area (WDFW, based on data through 1991)

Rocky Reefs (OSU, NOAA Fisheries, and BOEM 2016)


Mixed Substrates

- Bedrock/Granule+Pebble Mix
- Bedrock/Sand
- Bedrock/Shell Hash
- Boulder/Mud
- Boulder/Sand
- Mixed


Hard Substrates

- Bedrock
- Hard

- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)



**Map 69: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Ecologically Important Areas Analysis Results for Rocky Reefs**




**Ecologically Important Areas Analysis Results
(WDFW 2017)**

- Rocky Substrate Present
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Estuaries
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)

WDFW's analysis is based on habitat maps and a predicted rocky outcrop model produced by the OSU Active Tectonics and Seafloor Mapping Lab and collaborators, as well as the results of WDFW's hook and line rockfish surveys.

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


Map 70: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas Seal and Sea Lion Haulouts and Bird Colonies




- Seabird Colony (WDFW, Catalog of Washington's Seabird Colonies 2016)
- Haulout Locations for Harbor seal, California Sea Lion, Stellar Sea Lion, and Northern Elephant Seal (WDFW, surveys 1998 - 2013)
- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)

Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.


**Map 71: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Historic Sites, Buoys, and Cables (1 of 4)**




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Bounday (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- National and/or State Register Listed Historic Properties (DAHP)
- Historic Registered Districts (DAHP)
- ▲ Wrecks and Obstructions (NOAA)
- Charted Submarine Cables (NOAA)
- ◇ Beacons (NOAA)
- ◇ Buoys (NOAA)




**Map 72: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Historic Sites, Buoys, and Cables (2 of 4)**




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Bounday (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- National and/or State Register Listed Historic Properties (DAHP)
- Historic Registered Districts (DAHP)
- ▲ Wrecks and Obstructions (NOAA)
- Charted Submarine Cables (NOAA)
- ◇ Beacons (NOAA)
- ◇ Buoys (NOAA)



Map 73: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas Historic Sites, Buoys, and Cables (3 of 4)




- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- National and/or State Register Listed Historic Properties (DAHP)
- Historic Registered Districts (DAHP)
- ⚓ Wrecks and Obstructions (NOAA)
- Charted Submarine Cables (NOAA)
- ◇ Beacons (NOAA)
- ◇ Buoys (NOAA)




Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

**Map 74: Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas
Historic Sites, Buoys, and Cables (4 of 4)**



- Washington MSP Study Area (State Ocean Caucus)
- WA State Boundary (NOAA)
- Latitude and Longitude (ESRI)
- Depth Contour in Fathoms (OSU)
- National and/or State Register Listed Historic Properties (DAHP)
- Historic Registered Districts (DAHP)
- ▲ Wrecks and Obstructions (NOAA)
- Charted Submarine Cables (NOAA)
- ◇ Beacons (NOAA)
- ◇ Buoys (NOAA)



Map coordinate system: North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83), Washington South State Plane Coordinate System, meters. Not to be used for legal purposes.

Appendix B. Definitions

The following definitions apply throughout the Marine Spatial Plan for Washington's Pacific Coast. Definitions provided here do not supplant legal definitions in state laws or regulations.

A

Aquatic lands - All tidelands, shorelands, harbor areas, and the beds of navigable waters, and must be construed to be coextensive with the term "aquatic lands" as defined in RCW [79.105.060](#). RCW 43.372.010(1)

Bioextraction – synonymous with marine product extraction, defined below.

C

Coastal counties - Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, and Pacific counties. RCW 43.143.020(1)

Coastal waters - The waters of the Pacific Ocean seaward from Cape Flattery south to Cape Disappointment, from mean high tide seaward two hundred miles. RCW 43.143.020(2)

Cumulative impact - The impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. 40 CFR. § 1508.7

D

Development - A use consisting of the construction or exterior alteration of structures; dredging; drilling; dumping; filling; removal of any sand, gravel, or minerals; bulkheading; driving of piling; placing of obstructions; or any project of a permanent or temporary nature which interferes with the normal public use of the surface of the waters overlying lands subject to this chapter at any state of water level. RCW 90.58.030(3)(a).

E

Ecosystem services – The types of benefits humans receive from functioning ecosystems. Examples of ecosystem services include providing food and clean water; controlling climate and disease; and supporting primary production and nutrient cycling.

Effects or impacts – Terms used in regulations for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) which include:

(a) Direct effects, which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place.

(b) Indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect effects may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density

or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems.

Effects and impacts as used in these regulations are synonymous. Effects includes ecological (such as the effects on natural resources and on the components, structures, and functioning of affected ecosystems), aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, or health, whether direct, indirect, or cumulative. Effects may also include those resulting from actions which may have both beneficial and detrimental effects, even if on balance the agency believes that the effect will be beneficial.

Energy production - Uses that involve the production of energy in a usable form directly in or on the ocean rather than extracting a raw material that is transported elsewhere to produce energy in a readily usable form. Examples of these ocean uses are facilities that use wave action or differences in water temperature to generate electricity. [WAC 173-26-360(10)]. For purposes of the MSP, energy producing uses and the term “marine renewable energy” are synonymous.

Exclusive economic zone waters – The marine waters from the offshore state boundary to the boundary of the exclusive economic zone, over which the United States government has primary jurisdiction. RCW 43.372.010(2)

Existing uses – Uses or activities in Washington’s coastal waters such as recreational or commercial uses (e.g. fishing, shellfish aquaculture, and shipping) that exist in the Study Area prior to final adoption of the Marine Spatial Plan for Washington’s Pacific Coast.

G

Gas hydrates - Gas hydrates are mixtures of gas and water that forms a solid ice-like structure under low temperature and high pressure conditions in marine sediment. The primary type of gas in hydrates is methane. Hence, they are often also referred to as methane hydrates.

I

Impacts - synonymous with “effects”, above

Important, Sensitive, and Unique Areas (ISUs) – Areas in state waters that are environmentally sensitive and contain unique resources that warrant protective measures. These areas have high conservation value, high historic value, or key infrastructure. The ISUs include standards to maintain the high values of these areas and to protect the ISUs from adverse effects of offshore development, while allowing existing compatible uses such as fishing. See Section 4.3.3 for complete list of ISUs and definitions.

M

Marine counties - Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, Wahkiakum, San Juan, Whatcom, Skagit, Island, Snohomish, King, Pierce, Thurston, Mason, Kitsap, and Pacific counties. RCW

43.372.010(3). Under state law, comprehensive marine plans may be developed for marine waters within these counties boundaries.

Marine ecosystem - The physical, biological, and chemical components and processes and their interactions in marine waters and aquatic lands, including humans. RCW 43.372.010(4)

Marine interagency team or team - The marine interagency team created under RCW [43.372.020](#). RCW 43.372.010(5) Washington State used an interagency team called the State Ocean Caucus for purposes of developing the Marine Spatial Plan for Washington’s Pacific Coast.

Marine management plan and marine waters management plan - Any plan guiding activities on and uses of the state's marine waters, and may include a marine spatial plan or element. (RCW 43.372.010(6))

Marine product extraction – Harvest of marine organisms for non-food commercial industries such as cosmetics, pharmaceuticals, and biomedical research. This definition does not include any extraction or harvest performed by tribes.

Marine renewable energy – Generating energy, especially electricity, from the marine environment using renewable resources such as wind, wave, tidal, or current action. Synonymous with the term “energy production,” above.

Marine resources committees - Those committees organized under RCW [36.125.020](#) or by counties within the Northwest straits marine conservation initiative. RCW 43.372.010(7)

Marine spatial planning - A public process of analyzing and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities in marine areas to achieve ecological, economic, and social objectives. Often this type of planning is done to reduce conflicts among uses, to reduce environmental impacts, to facilitate compatible uses, to align management decisions, and to meet other objectives determined by the planning process. RCW 43.372.010(8)

Marine waters – The aquatic lands and waters under tidal influence, including saltwaters and estuaries to the ordinary high water mark lying within the boundaries of the state. This definition also includes the portion of the Columbia river bordering Pacific and Wahkiakum counties, Willapa Bay, Grays Harbor, the Strait of Juan de Fuca, and the entire Puget Sound. RCW 43.372.010(9)

Mitigation – Actions taken to address potential impacts from a project, including:

- (1) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
- (2) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, by using appropriate technology, or by taking affirmative steps to avoid or reduce impacts;
- (3) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
- (4) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action;

- (5) Compensating for the impact by replacing, enhancing, or providing substitute resources or environments; and/or
- (6) Monitoring the impact and taking appropriate corrective measures. WAC 197-11-768

New ocean use – See below for definition of ocean use. The term “new” is intended to distinguish future ocean use proposals from those uses that are currently permitted or that are undergoing permitting prior to the adoption of the final MSP.

R

Resources or Ocean Resources - The biotic and abiotic features of the environment, such as species, habitats, aesthetics, and chemical, physical and biological functions and processes (e.g. upwelling) of the marine ecosystem.

O

Ocean disposal – The deliberate deposition or release of material at sea, such as solid wastes, industrial waste, radioactive waste, incineration, incinerator residue, dredged materials, vessels, aircraft, ordnance, platforms, or other man-made structures. WAC 173-26-360(11)

Ocean mining - Uses such as the mining of metal, mineral, sand, and gravel resources from the sea floor. WAC 173-26-360(9)

Ocean research – activities that involve scientific investigation for the purpose of furthering knowledge and understanding. WAC 173-26-360(13)

Ocean resources – same as “resources”, above.

Ocean salvage – A use that shares characteristics of other ocean uses and involves relatively small sites occurring intermittently. Historic shipwreck salvage, which combines aspects of recreation, exploration, research, and mining, is an example of such a use. WAC 173-26-360(14)

Ocean uses - Activities or developments involving renewable and/or nonrenewable resources that occur on Washington's coastal waters and includes their associated off shore, near shore, inland marine, shoreland, and upland facilities and the supply, service, and distribution activities, such as crew ships, circulating to and between the activities and developments. Ocean uses involving nonrenewable resources include such activities as extraction of oil, gas and minerals, energy production, disposal of waste products, and salvage. Ocean uses which generally involve sustainable use of renewable resources include commercial, recreational, and tribal fishing, aquaculture, recreation, shellfish harvesting, and pleasure craft activity. WAC 173-26-360(3)

Offshore aquaculture - Any new aquaculture operation within the MSP Study Area, yet outside of the coastal estuaries (e.g. Grays Harbor or Willapa Bay). Such new offshore operations may involve cultivation of marine organisms such as fish, shellfish, or aquatic vegetation using platforms, nets, lines, cages, or other structures.

Offshore development – any development (see definition above) proposed for or occurring in the MSP Study Area that also meets the definition of a new ocean use.

Oil and gas uses and activities – activities that involve the extraction of oil and gas resources from beneath the ocean. WAC 173-26-360(8)

S

Significant - a reasonable likelihood of more than a moderate adverse impact on environmental quality. Significance involves context and intensity (WAC 197-11-330) and does not lend itself to a formula or quantifiable test. The context may vary with the physical setting. Intensity depends on the magnitude and duration of an impact. The severity of an impact should be weighed along with the likelihood of its occurrence (per the State Environmental Policy Act, or SEPA). An impact may be significant if its chance of occurrence is not great, but the resulting environmental impact would be severe if it occurred. WAC 197-11-794. The SEPA rules specify a process, including criteria and procedures, for determining whether a proposal is likely to have a significant adverse environmental impact. WAC 197-11-330.

Significant adverse impacts - Chapter 197-11 WAC (SEPA rules) provides guidance in the application of the permit criteria and guidelines for WAC 173-26-360 (Ocean Management Guidelines). The range of impacts to be considered should be consistent with WAC 197-11-060 (4)(e) and 197-11-792 (2)(c). The determination of significant adverse impacts should be consistent with WAC 197-11-330(3) and 197-11-794. The sequence of actions described in WAC 197-11-768 should be used as an order of preference in evaluating steps to avoid and minimize adverse impacts.

T

Transportation - includes such uses as: shipping, transferring between vessels, and offshore storage of oil and gas; transport of other goods and commodities; and offshore ports and airports. Addresses transportation activities that originate or conclude in Washington's coastal waters or are transporting a nonrenewable resource extracted from the outer continental shelf off Washington. WAC 173-26-360(12).

Trophic levels - A class of organisms that occupy the same position in a food chain. Primary production is the bottom of the food chain, typically made of plants (e.g. phytoplankton). Primary consumers are those organisms that eat those plants (e.g. zooplankton) and secondary consumers eat primary consumers (e.g. fish that eat zooplankton), etc. Upper trophic levels refer to organisms that are higher up on the food chain.

U

Usual and Accustomed Area (U&A) – Areas that many Northwest tribes reserved the right to continue to fish, hunt, and gather in through treaties with the United States. Boundaries of each tribes' U&A are unique that tribe, but U&As may overlap with each other.

Appendix C. Data Sources, Methods, and Limitations

This appendix describes the spatial data used in the MSP and other major studies completed to support the planning process. A full list of sources of information consulted for each topic is available within each section of the plan. For each type of data, this appendix includes which maps use the data, the source, methods and limitations, and references. Section 4.2.2 of the MSP outlines an ongoing process to update data, prioritize science and research needs, and fill data gaps.

Contents

Ecological Data	C-2
Cultural and Historical Data	C-7
Economic Data	C-9
Fisheries Data	C-11
Aquaculture Data	C-13
Recreation and Tourism Data	C-14
Shipping Data	C-16
Renewable Energy Data	C-18
Additional Designations and Boundaries	C-19

Summary of data limitations

While the MSP maps provide important baseline data useful for planning-scale purposes, they have limitations in their utility for detailed or fine-scale analyses. The data sets included in the MSP vary widely in how, when, and for how long the data were collected and at what frequency and scale measurements were taken. Some features represented by data sets are dynamic and can vary widely from year to year, while others remain relatively stable over time. Many data sets lack long-term monitoring efforts, which is needed to more accurately represent the full range of variability for more dynamic uses or resources. Some data sets use statistical models to fill data gaps in monitoring effort. Changing conditions may alter future patterns from those represented in current data sets. These factors mean that data provided in the MSP have limitations and different levels of data quality and accuracy.

Ecological Data: The Marine Spatial Plan provides information about the ecology of the MSP study area, including its physical, biological, chemical, and geological characteristics. Some information was acquired from existing programs or studies, while other data was collected or analyzed specifically for the MSP. These data sources and other sources of ecological information relevant to the study area are discussed in Sections 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 of the MSP.

Data subject	Source	Methods and Limitations	References
Shoreline Biology: Kelp, Seagrass, Salt Marshes (Map 4)	DNR	<p>ShoreZone Inventory files were provided by DNR’s Nearshore Habitat Program. Program staff compiled these maps from comprehensive aerial photography and videography surveys completed during low tides between 1994 and 2000. Surveys incorporated the observations of a geomorphologist and a marine ecologist and were conducted from a helicopter traveling at approximately 60 knots and 300 feet (approx. 90 meters) above the ground. The inventory divides the shoreline into homogenous physical segments, with an average linear segment length of 0.5 miles.</p> <p>While annual kelp data showing extent (rather than just presence or absence) is available from DNR, these data were not provided in the plan due to a high amount of annual variability.</p> <p>Detailed methods are provided in the Washington State ShoreZone Inventory User’s Manual. The manual also includes a full description of data limitations and usage guidelines (p. 15 – 16). The inventory is a regional characterization and screening tool. It is not site specific, and it should not replace site-specific surveys. However, it can complement site-specific surveys by providing a regional context.</p>	<p>For more information: http://www.dnr.wa.gov/programs-and-services/aquatics/aquatic-science/nearshore-habitat-inventory</p> <p>Nearshore Habitat Program. 2001. The Washington State ShoreZone Inventory. Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, WA.</p> <p>Data user manual: Berry, H.D., J.R. Harper, T.F. Mumford, Jr., B.E. Bookheim, A.T. Sewell, and L.J. Tamayo. 2001. The Washington State ShoreZone Inventory User’s Manual. Nearshore Habitat Program, Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, WA. http://file.dnr.wa.gov/publications/aqr_nrsh_szusermanual.pdf</p>
Forage Fish Surveys (Map 6)	WDFW	<p>Over two years (October 2012 – October 2014), WDFW performed surveys, in collaboration with staff from four tribal governments to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify possible spawning habitat sites in six zones throughout the MSP study area; • Collect monthly sediment samples from the upper third of the intertidal range of sites, following a protocol used previously in Puget Sound spawning surveys. (Some modifications were made to accommodate differences in scale and features between study area sites and Puget Sound sites.); • Process samples to remove substrate material and assess the presence/absence of Surf Smelt (<i>Hypomesus pretiosus</i>), Night Smelt (<i>Spirinchus starksi</i>), or Pacific Sand Lance (<i>Ammodytes hexapterus</i>) eggs; and • Geo-reference results to provide a map of spawning survey sites and results. <p>When zero eggs or only a single egg were detected at a location, processing was repeated with an additional sample from that location. Maps provided in the plan illustrate the 40 sites where 2 or more eggs (live or dead) were identified in a sample. Surf Smelt and Night Smelt eggs cannot be distinguished without genetic analysis, but eggs were retained for possible future analysis.</p> <p>Poor weather conditions and the remote nature of select sites limited sampling efforts at some locations. Detailed methods, including field protocols and sampling frequency in specific areas, are described in WDFW’s report .</p>	<p>Langness, M, P Dionne, D Masello, and D Lowry. Summary of coastal intertidal forage fish spawning surveys: October 2012 – October 2014. Report to the Washington Department of Natural Resources. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, 2015.</p> <p>Available at: http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/ForageFishReport.pdf</p>
Herring Spawning Areas (Map 68)	WDFW	<p>This data provides the known distribution for pacific herring (<i>culpa harengus pallasi</i>) spawning areas. Blank areas either have none of this resource or have not been inventoried for it. Generally, information in this database is highly variable regarding source: some of it is based on field surveys, while others are based on</p>	<p>WDFW GeoLib Database. To request data layers, contact WDFW.</p>

		<p>"best professional judgement" of the biologist involved. This information has been generalized for release to the general public.</p> <p>Polygons in Puget Sound showing locations of documented Pacific Herring (<i>culpa harengus pallasi</i>) spawning areas through 1991. The polygons were later edited by Kurt Stick, and digitized by Dale Gombert, both WDFW, 12/2003. Polygons show documented pacific herring spawning areas at specific sites throughout Puget Sound and Washington coastal areas and bays. Along the Washington coast, small populations spawn in Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor, and some spawning has been reported in the Columbia River estuary (Monaco et al. 1990). Larval and juvenile herring have also been found in Grays Harbor (Monaco et al. 1990). Herring deposit their eggs on marine vegetation: eelgrass and various algae, in the shallow subtidal and intertidal zone generally at tidal elevations from +3 feet to -20 feet Mean Low Low Waterline (MLLW).</p>	
Catalog of Washington's Seabird Colonies (Map 11)	WDFW	<p>This map is based on the catalog originally published by Steven Speich and Terrence Wahl in 1989. WDFW staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created a spatial database from the catalog Entered and updated information about colony locations collected between the original publication date and 2015. <p>Data collection methods for the catalog include a combination of aerial photography, boat-based surveys, colony counts, and estimates. The database includes data ranging from the late 1800s to 2015. Species of birds surveyed include: black oystercatcher (<i>Haematopus bachmani</i>), Brandt's cormorant (<i>Phalacrocorax penicillatus</i>), Caspian tern (<i>Hydroprogne caspia</i>), Cassin's auklet (<i>Ptychoramphus aleuticus</i>), common murre (<i>Uria aalge</i>), double-crested cormorant (<i>Phalacrocorax auritus</i>), fork-tailed storm petrel (<i>Oceanodroma furcata</i>), glaucous-winged gull (<i>Larus glaucescens</i>), Leach's storm petrel (<i>Oceanodroma leucorhoa</i>), pelagic cormorant (<i>Phalacrocorax pelagicus</i>), pigeon guillemot (<i>Cepphus columba</i>), rhinoceros auklet (<i>Cerorhinca monocerata</i>), ring-billed gull (<i>Larus delawarensis</i>), and tufted puffin (<i>Fratercula cirrhata</i>).</p> <p>Additional details on methods are available in WDFW's report, Coastal Washington Marine Mammal and Bird Geodatabases.</p>	<p>Speich, S.M., and T.R. Wahl. 1989. Catalog of Washington seabird colonies. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report. 88(6).</p> <p>Duff, A, J. Jenkerson, L. Salzer, S. Jeffries, and S. Pearson. 2014. Coastal Washington marine mammal and bird geodatabases. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. Available at: http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/WDFW_BirdMammalReport.pdf</p>
Pinniped Haulouts and Sea Otter Concentrations (Map 10)	WDFW	<p>WDFW conducted 11 aerial surveys to identify seal and sea lion haulouts and sea otter areas. These flights were 3.1 – 7.6 hours in duration and occurred between April 2014 and March 2015. WDFW staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surveyed and counted different species depending on season <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steller sea lions and California sea lions: summer, fall, and winter Sea otters: fall and winter Harbor seals: pupping season (summer) Used sighting results to create a map of generalized concentration and haul out areas. <p>Additional details on are available in WDFW's report, Aerial Surveys for Pinnipeds and Sea Otters on the Washington Coast and in the WDFW Seal and Sea Lion Haulout Atlas.</p>	<p>Jeffries S, J Oliver and L Salzer. 2015. Aerial Surveys for Pinnipeds and Sea Otters on the Washington Coast. Final report to the Washington Department of Natural Resources. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington, USA. 9pp. http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/WDFW_SeaOtterSurveyReport.pdf</p> <p>Seal and Sea lion Haulout Atlas http://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/00427/wdfw00427.pdf</p>
Critical habitat for Green sturgeon (Map 7)	NOAA Fisheries	<p>These data identify (in general) the areas where critical habitat for the green sturgeon (<i>Acipenser medirostris</i>) occurs. In 2006, NOAA listed green sturgeon as a threatened and designated critical habitat in 2009.</p> <p>Critical habitat is a federal designation defined by the Endangered Species Act; these data layers were acquired from NOAA Fisheries. More information about critical habitat designation processes and the data presented in the MSP is available from NOAA's Office of Protected Resources.</p>	<p>For more information on critical habitat designation please see: http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/criticalhabitat.htm</p> <p>http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/protected_species/green_sturgeon/grn_sturg_critical_habitat.html</p>

Critical habitat for Bull trout (Map 7)	USFWS	<p>These data identify (in general) the areas where critical habitat for the bull trout (<i>Salvelinus confluentus</i>) occur. In 1998, the USFWS designated bull trout as threatened, and most recently designated critical habitat in 2010.</p> <p>Critical habitat is a federal designation defined by the Endangered Species Act; these data layers were acquired from US Fish and Wildlife Service. More information about critical habitat designation processes and the data presented in the MSP is available from NOAA’s Office of Protected Resources.</p> <p>The GIS files and their associated coordinates are not the legal source for determining the critical habitat boundaries of species described within this dataset. These data are to be used only in the context of the definition and purpose of critical habitat and may be used for planning and land management purposes.</p>	<p>For more information on critical habitat designation please see: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/report/table/critical-habitat.html http://www.habitat.noaa.gov/pdf/201505_15PROJECTS-FINAL.pdf</p>
Ecological Indicators	NWFSC (NOAA)	<p>NOAA’s Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC) developed conceptual models for describing key ecological components of the Study Area and identified 110 potential ecological indicators to support marine spatial planning in Washington. This project described physical drivers, habitats, human pressures, and biological factors that are important to characterizing the ecology in the study area. The NWFSC developed the initial list of potential indicators that may provide measures of the health and status of Washington’s coastal waters using the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the ecological models characterizing the Study Area, • a review of scientific information on indicators; and • input from scientists and managers on criteria for evaluating indicators. <p>The NWFSC also produced a status and trends report for these potential ecological indicators where data was available to report on those indicators.</p> <p>This work provides a starting point for identifying helpful and scientifically-sound ecological indicators. The indicators suggested in the final report are only an initial list, which must be further assessed and refined into a shorter list to maximize their usefulness. See Section 4.2.2 of the MSP for more information on future refinement and use of the ecosystem indicators for plan implementation.</p>	<p>Andrews, K.S., J.M. Coyle, and C.J. Harvey. 2015. Ecological indicators for Washington State’s outer coastal waters. Report to the Washington Department of Natural Resources. http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/NWFSC_EcosystemIndicatorReport.pdf</p>
Seafloor Mapping Prioritization	NCCOS (NOAA)	<p>The NOAA National Centers for Coastal and Ocean Science (NCCOS) led a seafloor mapping prioritization process to identify data needed to map and assess key physical and biological resources within Washington’s offshore marine ecosystem. This process also captured the underlying drivers and management needs associated with the priorities.</p> <p>NCCOS carried out the prioritization process in four phases:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NCCOS compiled existing seafloor information within the area of interest into a web-based data viewer that allows users to assess the information and to support identification of mapping priorities. To improve the consistency of display and querying, the feature information collected from various data sources were translated into standardized attributes and categories. Additionally, a data was categorized by quality and age using a qualitative assessment. 2. NCCOS held a first spatial prioritization planning workshop with coastal managers at tribal, federal and state agencies to receive input on the prioritization tool and products needed to support marine planning. 3. Tribal, federal and state agency representatives completed a spatial prioritization exercise using the web-based data viewer and online spatial prioritization tool. 4. NCCOS compiled the results of the spatial prioritization exercise and held a second workshop with managers. Participants modified and consolidated results, clarified management needs in high priority areas, and developed action items for high priority areas. <p>The results of the prioritization process encouraged NOAA to conduct new seafloor mapping in the study area in 2016 and 2017.</p>	<p>NCCOS. Summary Report for Spatial Prioritization Seafloor Mapping for Washington’s Pacific Coast (Phase II and IV). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Ocean Service, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science, 2015.</p> <p>http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/NCCOS_SeabirdAndSeafloorEvalReport.pdf</p> <p>http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/NCCOS_SeafloorMappingReport.pdf</p> <p>https://maps.coastalscience.noaa.gov/wasp/wasp.html</p>

Seafloor Modeling (Map 3)	TNC	<p>As part of the Pacific Northwest Marine Ecoregional Assessment completed in 2013, the Nature Conservancy produced maps classifying marine benthic habitats in the Pacific northwest region.</p> <p>These data layers were produced based on three types of variables: depth, substrate, and geomorphology. These three variables were described using the following classes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bathymetry: inner shelf, mid-shelf, mesobenthic, and bathybenthic • Geomorphology: flats, canyon, ridge, and middle slope • Substrate: soft, mud, sand, gravel, and rock <p>Bathymetry data was acquired from the National Ocean Services Hydrographic Database, and substrate information from the Active Tectonics and Seafloor Mapping lab at Oregon State University.</p> <p>Section 2.1.1 of the Ecoregional Assessment report provides additional detail on the characterization and mapping process.</p>	<p>Vander Schaaf, D., K. Popper, D. Kelly and J. Smith. 2013. Pacific Northwest Marine Ecoregional Assessment. The Nature Conservancy, Portland, Oregon.</p> <p>Available for download at: https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationPlanning/SettingPriorities/EcoregionalReports/Pages/ecoregional-reports.aspx https://www.conservationgateway.org/ConservationPlanning/SettingPriorities/EcoregionalReports/Documents/PNW%20Marine%20EA%20Report%202013.pdf</p>
Seafloor Mapping and Atlas	OSU / OCNMS (NOAA)	<p>OCNMS worked with OSU to develop a Washington State Outer Coast Seafloor Atlas based on data from 31 sidescan and multibeam sonar surveys between 2000 and 2013. OSU compiled the raw data from these surveys, re-imaged them and mosaic them as a single file, applied the existing ground-truthing data and reclassified the sediments/habitats.</p>	<p>Active tectonics and seafloor mapping lab. Sanctuary Seafloor Atlas Report. Corvallis, OR. Oregon State University, College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences, June 30, 2015.</p> <p>http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/OSU_SeafloorReport.pdf https://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/science/habitatmapping/habitatmapping.html</p>
Shallow Water Surveys	Ecology / USGS	<p>The Washington Department of Ecology, with several partners, conducted high resolution multibeam bathymetric, single beam bathymetric, and topographic lidar mapping in the shallow intertidal and subtidal coastal areas and around river mouths on Washington's Pacific coast.</p>	<p>http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/ECY_NCoastNearshoreWaverunnerandBeachProfiles_FinalReport.pdf http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/ECY_SCoastNearshoreWaverunnerandBeachProfiles_FinalReport.pdf http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/ECY_MultibeamSurveys_CoastWahkiakumColumbiaMouth_FinalReport.pdf http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/ECY_NearshoreBathymetry_QuinaultQuileute.pdf</p>
Ecologically Important Areas (additional maps provided in Section 3.2 of the MSP)	WDFW	<p>WDFW developed maps that aimed to identify regions of relatively greater ecological importance in the study area, as represented by available data on the distribution of selected species and habitats. Input data for this analysis varied widely in format and scope, but included information from fisheries logbooks, fish and wildlife surveys, and predictive models. Data was acquired both from WDFW projects and monitoring programs, and from various external federal, state, and academic sources. For each species and habitat, WDFW used a</p>	<p>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. An Approach for Mapping Ecologically Important Areas Off the Washington Coast. Unpublished report, 2017a.</p>

<p>Maps 5, 8, 9 12, 69</p>		<p>quantile approach to assign a relative importance score to each 1-square mile hexagon within the planning area. These scores allowed analysts to compare results across species and to combine multiple data layers into “hotspot” maps. Hotspots show areas that are expected to be relatively more important to a greater number of species or groups.</p> <p>Please see Section 3.2 of the Marine Spatial Plan for more information about the data, methods, results, and limitations associated with the EIA analyses. Table 3.3 in Section 3.2 lists all species, species groupings, and data sources for the EIA analysis. WDFW’s final report also provides detailed technical and source information.</p> <p>Estuaries were not included in the EIA analysis owing to data availability and resolution issues, but the Marine Spatial Plan recognizes that they are known to be of high ecological importance.</p>	<p>http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/WDFW_EIAReport.pdf</p>
<p>Bird and Marine Mammal Predictive Modeling (Maps provided in Section 3.1 of the MSP) Maps 11, 12</p>	<p>NCCOS (NOAA)</p>	<p>NCCOS synthesized data from 11 existing survey programs and a wide variety of ecological datasets. The results of this analysis were a series of statistical models and maps showing areas where relatively higher abundances of 8 bird species and 6 marine mammal species would be expected, based on field observations and relevant environmental predictor variables. Model outputs were incorporated into the EIA analysis.</p> <p>Please see Section 3.1 of the Marine Spatial Plan for more detail on the input data (Table 3.1), methods, results and limitations associated with these models. The final report by NCCOS includes additional technical details and information on individual survey data sources.</p>	<p>Menza, C., J. Leirness, T. White, A. Winship, B. Kinlan, L. Kracker, J. E. Zamon, L. Ballance, E. Becker, K. A. Forney, J. Barlow, J. Adams, D. Pereksta, S. Pearson, J. Pierce, S. Jeffries, J. Calambokidis, A. Douglas, B. Hanson, S. R. Benson and L. Antrim (2016). Predictive Mapping of Seabirds, Pinnipeds and Cetaceans off the Pacific Coast of Washington. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 210. Silver Spring, MD. 96 pp.</p> <p>http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Final_Report_NCCOS_MarineMammals_Birds.pdf</p>
<p>Rocky Reefs Map 69</p>	<p>OSU / NOAA / BOEM</p>	<p>This dataset was created by the Oregon State University’s Active Tectonics & Seafloor Mapping Lab, NOAA Northwest Fisheries Science Center, and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Additional contributions and map products were provided by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, NOAA Biogeography Branch, The Nature Conservancy, the Seafloor Mapping Lab of California State University Monterey Bay, the Center for Habitat Studies at Moss Landing Marine Labs, and the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary.</p>	<p>See CMECS Substrate data at: http://geo.nwifc.org/ocean/</p>
<p>Deep Sea Coral and Sponges (Observation points) Maps 60-64</p>	<p>NOAA</p>	<p>These data represent the observed locations of corals and sponges within the study area and were acquired from the online database maintained by NOAA’s Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program in the Office of Habitat Conservation.</p> <p>NOAA’s Deep-Sea Coral Research and Technology Program (DSC-RTP) is compiling a national geodatabase of the known locations of deep-sea corals and sponges in U.S. territorial waters and beyond. The database will be comprehensive, standardized, quality controlled, and networked to outside resources. The database schema accommodates both linear (trawls, transects) and point (samples, observations) data. The structure of the database is tailored to occurrence records of all the azooxanthellate corals, a subset of all corals, and all sponge species. Records shallower than 50 meters are generally excluded in order to focus on predominantly deep-water species – the mandate of the DSC-RTP. The intention is to limit the overlap with light-dependent (and mostly shallow-water)</p> <p>As with other compilations of data from various sources, users should be aware of the limitations of individual data records, certain data sets, and the database as a whole. Metadata are made available at the individual record and data set level to provide information on the history and quality of the information. The database does not include ‘observations of absence’ for corals or sponges. Few areas have been surveyed for deep-sea corals or sponges, so areas showing no observations in the database should not be interpreted as lacking these taxa.</p>	<p>More details available: https://deepseacoraldata.noaa.gov/</p> <p>Hourigan, T. F., P. J. Etnoyer, R. P. McGuinn, C. Whitmire, D.S. Dorfman, M. Dornback, S. Cross, D. Sallis. 2015. An Introduction to NOAA’s National Database for Deep-Sea Corals and Sponges. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 191. 27 pp. Silver Spring, MD.</p> <p>http://data.nodc.noaa.gov/coris/library/NOAA/CRCP/other/other_crpc_publications/DeepSeaCoralsRT/Intro_Natl_DB_for_DSCS.pdf</p>

Remaining ecological data gaps and general limitations

Ecologically Important Areas (EIA) and species distributions: Because of the complexity of several of the analyses conducted for the MSP and the number and diversity of datasets used to represent different species and habitats, there are various limitations and uncertainties associated with modeled ecological data and results. The EIA maps provide a way to summarize available data on some key biological aspects of the study area, and show broad trends in species and habitat distribution throughout the region. However, these maps cannot fully account for other important factors such as ecological interactions or differences in ecological hotspots over different seasons and time scales. For both the EIA and species distribution analyses, each input dataset is also associated with its own challenges depending on data coverage and collection methods, and insufficient data led to an inability account for certain important species, including some which are endangered or threatened. All analysis outputs must be carefully assessed alongside other available information, including the evaluations of uncertainty provided by both studies. Please see Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the Marine Spatial Plan for further discussion of NCCOS and EIA data gaps and limitations, and a comprehensive list of the data sources incorporated into these analyses.

Seafloor data: Collecting bathymetric and other seafloor data is often logistically challenging and costly. In some cases, modeling approaches can provide indications of where certain seafloor features or sediment types are likely to be located based on various environmental factors and known features. However, the usefulness of this kind of data can be limited without studies that can validate models using mapping technology in the field. The seafloor data prioritization process led by NCCOS identified areas that may prove particularly valuable for both marine spatial planning and other ongoing efforts to understand the physical characteristics of Washington’s coastal and marine waters. These locations do not represent the only oceanographic and bathymetric data gaps in the study area. They give an indication of areas that have shared management priorities for filling data gaps and, therefore, where future mapping efforts could maximize their benefit for multiple purposes and groups.

Cultural and Historical Data: The following data sources provided information about cultural and historical resources in and around the study area. For more description of these resources, please see Section 2.2 of the MSP.

Data subject	Source	Methods and Limitations	Reference
Registered historic properties (Map 14)	DAHP	This dataset is an inventory of National and/or State Register listed Historic properties with the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (http://www.dahp.wa.gov) and the National Park Service (http://www.nps.gov). Sites not listed on either register are not included. These data are a work in progress and are constantly being updated. Data displayed in the plan was acquired in 2015.	Please visit http://www.dahp.wa.gov/historic-register to learn more about state and national historic registers and sites in Washington, or contact DAHP with questions about sites.
Wrecks and obstructions (Map 14)	NOAA	These data represent locations of reported wrecks and obstructions that are considered navigational hazards by NOAA’s National Ocean Service in U.S. coastal waters. Data points have been reported through the Automated Wreck and Obstruction Information System (AWOIS) beginning in 1981 and this file was provided in 2013 by the Office of Coast Survey. These records emphasize known features which pose concerns for navigation and are not considered comprehensive, as these features may differ from those noted in certain navigation charts or other databases. Features which have been salvaged or disproved after reporting are not included.	Additional information and a User Guide for the AWOIS system are available from NOAA: https://www.nauticalcharts.noaa.gov/hsd/wrecks_and_obstructions.html
Cultural Risk Map (Map 58)	DAHP	To represent the presence and approximate location of cultural sites within the MSP Study Area, DAHP provided a Cultural Risk Map that shows the relative density of all cultural sites, including archaeological, historic registered, submerged/tidal, land based, and shipwreck sites within and directly adjacent to the Study Area. This map identifies areas that have a higher density of known cultural site locations, and therefore are assumed to be at a higher risk for cultural resource site disturbance from any construction activities. Each area was categorized based on the number of adjacent cells (500m x 500m) that exhibited more than 50% coverage by one or more cultural sites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Density: 0-3 adjacent grid cells • Moderate Density: 4-6 adjacent grid cells • High Density: 7-9 adjacent grid cells 	Additional details available: https://www.wecc.biz/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/Reliability/Cultural-Resources-Data-Sharing-Agreement.docx&action=default

		<p>This data was not produced specifically for the Marine Spatial Planning process; however, DAHP transferred results to the 1-square mile hexagons used for the MSP. This data layer was incorporated into the Use Analysis to represent cultural uses (see Section 3.3 of the MSP).</p> <p>This map does not account for undiscovered sites. There is a relatively moderate potential for currently undiscovered, preserved, submerged prehistoric sites throughout the Study Area – see below (ICF International et al., 2013).</p>	
Modeled Paleoshorelines (Map 13)	BOEM	<p>Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) aimed to identify the location of known and reported submerged cultural resources, potential inundated prehistoric sites, coastal properties that are listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), or traditional cultural properties. To achieve this, BOEM contracted with ICF International to accomplish multiple tasks. First, ICF was directed to assess areas of the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf (POCS) for submerged prehistoric site potential, to develop a GIS-based model for where submerged prehistoric sites might be expected, and to suggest areas most likely to have survived marine transgressive processes. Second, ICF was tasked with identifying coastal properties that could be adversely impacted by alteration of the adjacent seascape. Finally, ICF was directed to identify known, reported, and potential historic shipwrecks on the POCS.</p>	<p>ICF International, Southeastern Archeological Research, & Davis Geoarchaeological Research. (2013). Inventory and analysis of coastal and submerged archaeological site occurrence on the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf (OCS Study BOEM 2013-0115). Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. https://www.boem.gov/ESPIS/5/5357.pdf</p>
Probability of upland archaeological features (Map 13)	DAHP	<p>DAHP provided the results of a Statewide Archaeological Predictive Model completed in 2009 in order to aid planners and archaeologists in Washington with evaluating the potential for archaeological resources early in construction projects. This large-scale model predicts the probability of upland archaeological sites only. Historical sites and submerged archaeological sites are not included.</p> <p>The predictive model uses Bayesian statistical analysis to combine environmental information with information acquired from known and possible archaeological sites, Government Land Office records of cultural and natural features, and field surveys. Environmental data included information describing elevation, slope, aspect, distance to water, geology, soils, and landforms. Based on this information, the model identifies environmental conditions that are expected to coincide with archaeological sites in unsurveyed areas. The results identify locations across the state with high, moderate, low and unknown probabilities for discovering an archaeological site. These probabilities were categorized as:</p> <p>Very Low / Low: Archaeological survey contingent upon project parameters Moderate: Archaeological survey recommended High / Very High: Archaeological survey required</p> <p>The final report on the predictive model notes that, as with all models, the results are dependent on the limitations and assumptions associated with input data. See the 2009 Washington Statewide Archaeology Predictive Model Report for more details on input data and limitations, processing methods, or results.</p>	<p>Model data can be viewed on DAHP's online database, Wisaard, at: http://www.dahp.wa.gov/learn-and-research/find-a-historic-place</p> <p>GeoEngineers. Washington Statewide Archaeology Predictive Model Report. 2009.</p>
Viewshed Assessment (Map 15)	UW ONRC	<p>Some historic resources and traditional cultural properties may also be subject to various levels of visual disturbance sensitivity from new ocean uses, such as offshore wind.</p> <p>University of Washington's Olympic Natural Resources Center (ONRC) analyzed how far offshore different height objects would be visible from shore (Map 15) using different heights of observers (at shore) and three different heights of potential development above the surface of the water (10, 90, and 120 meters). Analyses took into account the curvature of the earth and the effects of humidity on visibility.</p> <p>This coarse assessment is useful to understand what may be visible from the coast, yet specific assessments for individual projects will be needed to evaluate the full potential visual impact to historic or cultural resources.</p>	<p>Bennett, K. Determining Line of Sight Distances: Shoreline to Offshore Power Generation Facilities. University of Washington: Olympic Natural Resources Center. http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Viewshed_Final_Report_ONRC.pdf</p> <p>Map available at: http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/CoastalViewshedSummaryMap.pdf</p>

Additional information from DAHP regarding inadvertent discovery of archaeological materials: Should archaeological materials (e.g. bones, shell, stone tools, beads, ceramics, old bottles, hearths, etc.) be observed during project activities, all work in the immediate vicinity will stop. The State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (360-586-3065), the County planning office, and the affected Tribe(s) must be contacted immediately in order to help assess the situation and determine how to preserve the resource(s). Compliance with all applicable laws pertaining to archaeological resources (RCW 27.53, 27.44 and WAC 25-48) is required. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in criminal or civil penalties. If federal funds or permits are involved in the project, notification to the appropriate federal agency and the Advisory Council must occur in addition to the above-listed parties, per 36 CFR Sec. 800.12.

However, if ground disturbing activities encounter human skeletal remains, then all activity will cease that may cause further disturbance to those remains. The area of the find will be secured and protected from further disturbance. The finding of human skeletal remains will be reported to the county medical examiner/coroner and local law enforcement in the most expeditious manner possible. The remains will not be touched, moved, or further disturbed. The county medical examiner/coroner will assume jurisdiction over the human skeletal remains and make a determination of whether those remains are forensic or non-forensic. If the county medical examiner/coroner determines the remains are non-forensic, then they will report that finding to the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) who will then take jurisdiction over the remains. The DAHP will notify any appropriate cemeteries and all affected tribes of the find. The State Physical Anthropologist will make a determination of whether the remains are Indian or Non-Indian and report that finding to any appropriate cemeteries and the affected tribes. The DAHP will then handle all consultation with the affected parties as to the future preservation, excavation, and disposition of the remains. (RCWs 68.50.645, 27.44.055, and 68.60.055)

Remaining cultural/historic data gaps and general limitations

- Data only describes known cultural/historic sites or areas that likely contain these resources within the Study Area.
- Other cultural uses or resources (e.g. cultural landscapes) may not be fully captured in this type of data. (see Section 2.2 for qualitative descriptions of cultural and historic significance of the Study Area)
- Does not include spatial data for tribal cultural resources.
- Site-specific assessments will be necessary to evaluate the visual impact to historic or cultural resources.

Economic Data: These non-spatial data sources provided information about Washington’s coastal economy, the economics of existing use sectors discussed in the plan, and the potential economic impacts of some new uses. Section 2.3 of the MSP provides more information on the socioeconomics of the study area, as well as throughout discussions of various existing uses.

Data subject	Source	Methods and Limitations	Reference
Sector Analyses	Industrial Economics	<p>In 2014, Industrial Economics produced profiles of five major sectors important to the state’s marine economy and the Marine Spatial Planning process. Each profile discusses the current status of the sector, available data, relevant existing laws and policies, and issues facing the sector. General types of sources consulted by sector included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aquaculture • Non-tribal commercial and recreational fishing • Marine renewable energy • Recreation and tourism • Shipping <p>Please see individual sector analysis descriptions and documents for further detail on specific sources consulted in the production of these reports.</p>	<p>Aquaculture: http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/AquacultureSectorAnalysis.pdf</p> <p>Fishing: http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/FishingSectorAnalysis.pdf</p> <p>Renewable Energy: http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/EnergySectorAnalysis.pdf</p> <p>Recreation and Tourism: http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/RecreationSectorAnalysis.pdf</p> <p>Shipping: http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/ShippingSectorAnalysis.pdf</p>

Social and Economic Indicators	Washington Sea Grant	<p>Washington Sea Grant economic and social scientists analyzed potential indicators of social and economic health, gathered input from coastal stakeholders on potential indicators, and provided reports summarizing the status of these indicators on Washington’s Pacific coast.</p> <p>This work provides a starting point for identifying helpful and scientifically-sound ecosystem indicators. The indicators suggested in the final reports are only an initial list, which must be further assessed and refined into a shorter list to maximize their usefulness. See Section 4.2.2 of the MSP for more information on future refinement and use of the ecosystem indicators for plan implementation.</p>	<p>Social indicators: http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/SeaGrant_SocialIndicatorsReport.pdf</p> <p>Economic indicators: http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/SeaGrant_EconomicIndicatorReport.pdf</p>
Economic Analysis to Support MSP in Washington	Cascade Economics	<p>In 2015, Cascade Economics provided an analysis describing economic profiles of Washington’s tribal and non-tribal coastal communities, and research efforts to complete a social impact survey. The final report also analyzes key topic areas including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial fishing (tribal and non-tribal) • Recreational fishing • Shellfish aquaculture • Recreation and tourism • Ecosystem services <p>The report also provides qualitative assessments of the risk and vulnerability associated with these sectors, and a general qualitative assessment of the potential impacts of six types of new uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine product extraction • Offshore aquaculture • Dredge disposal (new sites) • Mining of gas hydrates • Mining of marine sand and gravel • Marine renewable energy <p>This analysis was completed after a scoping process with the interagency team, the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC), and the MSP Science Advisory Panel. The final topic areas and methods for the analysis were developed based on part on a list of initial content suggestions from WCMAC, a public workshop, written input from WCMAC members and others, and a review by the science panel.</p>	<p>Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). <i>Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington</i>. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_smaII.pdf</p>

Remaining Economic Data Gaps and General Limitations

Economic data gaps and limitations are discussed throughout the plan in Section 2.3 as well as in sections describing various sectors from Sections 2.4 – 2.10. Economic models such as input-output models yield important information, but only provide a snapshot of economic impacts of various sectors. Accuracy of outputs depend on the accuracy and availability of the underlying data for that sector. In some cases, such as shellfish aquaculture, available data has known accuracy and reporting issues.

As noted in Chapter 4, economic impacts of specific projects will vary based on the location, type, and scale of the project. Therefore, these economic impacts will need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis with updated information at the time a project is proposed.

Fisheries Data: The following sources provide information related to commercial and recreational fishing activity within the MSP study area. For a description of the fisheries occurring in and their importance to the communities of the MSP study area, please refer to Section 2.4 of the MSP. More details about the fisheries maps will also be provided in a separate report, which are available at msp.wa.gov.

Data subject	Source	Methods and Limitations	Reference
Fisheries Intensity Data (Maps 17 - 29)	WDFW	<p>The fisheries use maps used in the Plan were developed by WDFW to summarize available information on areas of high importance to fisheries, as required by RCW 43.372.040(6)(c). Identifying the footprint of each fishery was the primary goal. The areas within each footprint, which represent the area where fishing has occurred or has the potential to occur, should be considered to be of potential importance to fishing. The next step—identifying areas of high importance within each footprint—is a more difficult task given limitations in the available spatial information. WDFW used three general approaches to identify areas of relatively high, medium, and low use intensities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Fishery logbook data and percentile rankings:</i> Each hexagon was ranked based on the number of intersecting fishing sets or tows and scored using three bins: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. “High”- Top 25% of hexagons b. “Medium”- Middle 50% of hexagons c. “Low”- Bottom 25% of hexagons 2. <i>Logbook data with criteria-based intensity definitions:</i> Due to limited location and effort data presented in logbooks for some fisheries, each hexagon was evaluated based on available effort data and other criteria that correlates with high activity in the particular fishery (e.g. depth, distance from shore) 3. <i>Interviews with fishery participants and managers:</i> Some fisheries have no logbook or other data recording the locations of fishing. In such cases, WDFW consulted with fishery participants and managers to determine intensity levels and footprints of select fisheries. <p>More specific details for the methods behind producing each map can be found in WDFW 2017 (<i>in progress</i>, unpublished). WDFW considers the maps produced by all three methods as advancing public knowledge of where fisheries use the Study Area. At the same time, the maps are subject to uncertainty stemming from limitations in the source data as from variability in the fisheries themselves. Data limitations aside, fishing patterns change for a variety of reasons. Changes in regulations, the environment, economic conditions, and more can all change the level and location of fishing effort. Area of high importance may shift from one year to the next. Furthermore, as with many things, past patterns may not be reflective of future conditions.</p> <p>In addition, WDFW emphasizes that the maps’ intensity rankings do not represent conflict or impact. Although impact would be expected to be proportional to fishing intensity, conflicts in areas ranked as “low” intensity could still cause unacceptable harm to a fishery. Conversely, potential conflicts in areas ranked as “high” intensity might be avoidable or otherwise mitigated. While the fisheries use maps will be helpful in assessing which fisheries may be affected by future project proposals, understanding potential conflict and impact will require consideration of all available information.</p>	<p>www.msp.wa.gov</p> <p>https://fortress.wa.gov/dnr/managementgis/msp/default.aspx</p>
Location of recreational shellfish beaches and hard-shell clam beaches	Washington State Department of	These data display public, recreational shellfish harvest beaches that are monitored by the Shellfish Biotoxin Program at the Washington State Department of Health (2013).	<p>www.doh.wa.gov</p> <p>www.msp.wa.gov</p>

(Map 30)	Health and Olympic National Park	Olympic National Park monitors populations of hard-shell clams on park beaches. These data represent areas where hard-shell clams may be found.	https://fortress.wa.gov/dnr/managementgis/msp/default.aspx#
Sector Analysis	Industrial Economics	In 2014, Industrial Economics produced profiles of five major sectors important to the state's marine economy and the Marine Spatial Planning process, including fisheries. The profile discusses the current status of the sector, available data, relevant existing laws and policies, and issues facing the sector.	http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/FishingSectorAnalysis.pdf
Economic Analysis to Support MSP in Washington	Cascade Economics	In 2015, Cascade Economics provided an analysis describing economic profiles of Washington's tribal and non-tribal coastal communities, and research efforts to complete a social impact survey. The final report also analyzes key topic areas including tribal and non-tribal commercial fishing.	Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). <i>Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington</i> . Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_small.pdf

Remaining fisheries data gaps and general limitations

Information on the location and intensity of fishing activity should be recognized as uncertain. In general, identifying the footprint of a fishery is a simpler task than accurately ranking intensity of use. Intensity information is particularly uncertain, especially at a fine spatial resolution.

Uncertainty arises from the quality of the data and from the nature of fisheries themselves. Logbook records are not available for every fishery. When available, records may be subject to inaccurate reporting, reported at an imprecise spatial resolution, available for only a few years, or associated with other uncertainties. Fisheries are also inherently variable. The location and amount of fishing effort each year will vary in response to changes in regulations, economic conditions, the marine environment, and other factors. The areas of highest importance to a fishery should be expected to vary from year to year and may shift over time. While the footprints are thought to reflect areas of fishing with reasonable accuracy, they too may vary.

WDFW emphasizes that while the maps provide valuable information about where fishing occurs, on their own they cannot be used to assess the impact or conflict that would occur from new uses in these areas. Relative intensity rankings do not equate to the amount of impact (such as economic loss) that a new use could have on a fishery. Conflict in an area identified as "low" intensity could still cause significant adverse impacts to a fishery and fishing communities. Similarly, development in a "high" intensity area could be of a type that is compatible with certain fishing methods and create no significant adverse impact. Assessment of conflict and impact would require careful study and examination of all available information on a case-by-case basis.

While information on tribal fishing activity and its economic value is provided both in the Cascade Economics study and the Marine Spatial Plan, spatial data regarding tribal fishing intensity was not available nor included in these fisheries maps. Section 2.4 of the MSP provides an overview of tribal fishing activities.

Additionally, in some cases the data used in economic analyses had confidentiality restrictions. Some datasets were also only available at a scale that can be difficult to apply to the planning area, specific communities, or segments of the commercial or recreational fishing sectors.

Aquaculture Data: Data from the following sources provides information related to aquaculture activities within the MSP study area. Currently, these operations consist of shellfish aquaculture located primarily within the Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor estuaries. For more detail on aquaculture in the study area, please refer to Section 2.5 of the MSP.

Data subject	Source	Methods and Limitations	Reference
Aquaculture districts Map 32	WDFW	These data show the aquaculture district boundaries that are used by the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife and farmers of commercial aquatic species for daily administration and regulation of the program. Districts were established by law (WAC 220-22-510) in 2003. This layer was created by following the text definitions and locating points from aerial imagery and/or nautical charts. Ambiguities in particular exist in Willapa Bay, where centerlines of "channels" (referred to in the text) were visually assessed from aerial imagery, and it is known that most of these lines do not match with an original WDFW map of Aquaculture Districts.	www.wdfw.wa.gov
Oyster Reserves and Oyster Tracts Map 30	DNR	Oyster Reserves are special aquatic oyster lands whose locations and permitted uses are designated by the legislature. RCW 77.60.010. Oyster Tracts are aquatic lands purchased under the Bush and Callow Acts (passed in 1895) where oysters have been planted.	www.msp.wa.gov
Commercial Shellfish Harvest Locations Map 30	DOH	This data displays locations that DOH approved for commercial shellfish harvest with a commercial harvest site certification as of 2012.	https://www.doh.wa.gov/CommunityandEnvironment/Shellfish/CommercialShellfish/HarvestSite
Commercial Growing Areas	DOH	Department of Health maps indicate the location of commercial shellfish growing areas. DOH also performs sanitary surveys in both commercial and recreational growing areas in order to classify their suitability for harvest.	Current information on shellfish growing area classifications can be found at: http://www.doh.wa.gov/CommunityandEnvironment/Shellfish/GrowingAreas
Sector Analysis	Industrial Economics	In 2014, Industrial Economics produced profiles of five major sectors important to the state's marine economy and the Marine Spatial Planning process, including aquaculture. The profile discusses the current status of the sector, available data, relevant existing laws and policies, and issues facing the sector.	http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/FishingSectorAnalysis.pdf
Economic Analysis to Support MSP in Washington	Cascade Economics	In 2015, Cascade Economics provided an analysis describing economic profiles of Washington's tribal and non-tribal coastal communities, and research efforts to complete a social impact survey. The final report also analyzes key topic areas including aquaculture.	Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). <i>Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington</i> . Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_sma11.pdf

Remaining aquaculture data gaps and general limitations

Some aquaculture datasets used in economic studies, including information from WDFW regarding shellfish farm acreage and harvest volume, have known reporting limitations and are considered to some extent incomplete and inaccurate. This makes assessing the amount of aquaculture actively occurring in the study area difficult. For this and other reasons addressed in more detail in final reports for the economic studies completed for the MSP, data on total harvest value is limited and potentially underrepresented. Additionally, some other datasets used in economic and sector analyses were only available at the statewide or local scale, rather than at the county or planning area scale.

General information is provided in Section 2.10.2 of the MSP regarding conditions that tend to be suitable for various types of offshore aquaculture, including water depth and access to shore facilities. However, limited information is available on more specific attributes that pertain to detailed site suitability for offshore aquaculture. As a result, no detailed analysis has been done to identify where in the study area these types of activities might be proposed in the future.

Recreation and Tourism Data: Data from the following sources provided information related to recreational and tourism activities within the MSP study area. Section 2.6 of the MSP describes this topic in more detail. Note that recreational fishing data is described in the fisheries data table (above) and in Chapter 2.4.

Data subject	Source	Methods and Limitations	Reference
Recreational Study Map 33	Surfrider Foundation	<p>A study by the Surfrider Foundation on ocean and coastal recreation in Washington provided data describing the economic impacts of recreational activities on Washington’s coast and the geographic distribution and intensity of recreational uses in four categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diving activities: SCUBA diving and free diving/snorkeling • Shore-based activities: Beachcombing, beach going, beach driving, biking & hiking, camping, hang gliding & parasailing, horseback riding, sea-life collecting & harvesting, tide pooling • Surface water activities: Boating & sailing, kayaking, kiteboarding, skimboarding, surfing, windsurfing, swimming & body surfing • Wildlife viewing and sightseeing activities: Photography, sightseeing, scenic drives, and wildlife viewing from boats or shore <p>To provide baseline data on the extent, intensity, and economic impacts of recreation and tourism in coastal Washington, the Surfrider Foundation, in collaboration with Point 97, conducted an online survey that asked respondents to map locations where they had participated in recreational activities within the study area, and to provide information on expenditures associated with trips to coastal Washington. Two sampling approaches were used, the first of which acquired data from a random sample representing all Washington residents about their coastal recreational activities in the last 12 months. The second approach was an opt-in survey about respondents’ most recent coastal trip that allowed anyone to participate, with the goal of reaching a more targeted group of coastal users. This method helped provide a complete picture of activities occurring in the study area, including some activities which are important to the region and its economy but have a smaller number of users that may not have been represented using only statewide random sampling.</p> <p>Spatial and statistical analyses were used to display activity results as “heat maps” showing areas of highest intensity for individual uses and groups of uses. Surfrider also provided a map showing overall use intensity based on the results (Map 33), and a final report describing important trends, popular uses, and estimations of the economic value of recreation and tourism to the coast.</p> <p>For the recreation study, over 17,000 data points were entered by respondents using an online mapping application. All points were included in the final analysis because even if a few individual points were associated with minor user input errors, they provide valuable information about overall trip expenditures and the total numbers of users participating in each activity. The final report by Surfrider and Point 97 provides a detailed explanation of survey and analysis methods.</p>	<p>Point 97, & Surfrider Foundation. (2015). An economic and spatial baseline of coastal recreation in Washington. Prepared for Washington Department of Natural Resources. Retrieved from http://publicfiles.surfrider.org/P97SurfriderWACoastalRecreationReport.pdf</p>
Public Access Map 35	Ecology	<p>The Shoreline Public Access Project is a geographic information systems (GIS) project to identify the location, length, and degree of public access to Washington State's marine shorelines. Before the project, it was unknown how much of Washington's 3068 miles of shoreline was public. The information was scattered throughout various government agencies and the data quality was variable. Through the Shoreline Public Access Project, the best available information has been summarized into a single data set, used to answer questions about our shoreline's ownership and public accessibility. The ultimate purpose of this data is to give shoreline managers and planners another tool to assist them in making important shoreline decisions.</p>	<p>http://www.ecy.wa.gov/services/gis/data/oceans/beachaccess.jpg</p>

<p>Recreational Vessel Density Map 34</p>	<p>OCNMS (NOAA)</p>	<p>OCNMS compiled and processed spatial data on the location and density (vessels per square mile) of ship traffic passing through the study area in 2013 and 2014.</p> <p>Types of ships and their movement through the study area were identified by analyzing satellite-derived automatic identification system (AIS or SAIS) data from exactEarth.com. AIS is a tracking system used to identify and locate vessels; the Coast Guard requires that AIS systems be carried by large commercial ships in the United States, though they are also used by some smaller and/or private vessels.</p> <p>OCNMS sorted reported vessel positions into six categories, including recreational vessels. Density of positions was calculated and displayed using ArcGIS mapping software. Recreational vessel data includes personal craft like sailboats, and motorboats. Fishing vessels were not included in this data, but small personal fishing vessels were considered recreational vessels when using the study area for purposes other than fishing. The resulting maps show where AIS data indicates that vessel traffic is occurring at low, moderate, or high intensity in the study area.</p> <p>Automated Identification System data is not available for all small vessels. OCNMS consulted multiple sources to identify and track recreational ship transits in the study area, but some small vessels may not be represented in this data.</p> <p>Low, moderate, and high intensity of recreational vessel use were defined as follows. Values represent density in positions recorded per 1 sq-mile hexagon.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Low Intensity</th> <th>Moderate Intensity</th> <th>High Intensity</th> <th>Total # recorded positions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 - 3</td> <td>4- 9</td> <td>10 – 10,361</td> <td>16,325</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Low Intensity	Moderate Intensity	High Intensity	Total # recorded positions	1 - 3	4- 9	10 – 10,361	16,325	<p>https://olympiccoast.noaa.gov/</p>
Low Intensity	Moderate Intensity	High Intensity	Total # recorded positions								
1 - 3	4- 9	10 – 10,361	16,325								
<p>Remaining tourism and recreation data gaps and general limitations</p>											
<p>Surfrider results only include expenditure and activity information for Washington State residents, and additional surveys would be necessary to provide comparable information for those visitors coming to the area from out of state. However, Cascade economics was able to include estimates of spending for outdoor recreation on the Washington Coast by out-of-state visitors.</p>											

Shipping Data: Data from the following sources used in the MSP provides information related to the transit of commercial waterborne cargo and passengers to, from, and through the study area, including navigational information relevant to the shipping industry. More information on marine transportation, navigation, and infrastructure is available in Section 2.7 of the MSP.

Data subject	Source	Methods and Limitations	Reference																														
Vessel Intensity Data Maps 36 - 39	OCNMS (NOAA)	<p>OCNMS compiled and processed spatial data on shipping activity. This information represents the location and density (vessels per square mile) of ship traffic passing through the study area in 2013 and 2014.</p> <p>Types of ships and their movement through the study area were identified by analyzing satellite-derived automatic identification system (AIS or SAIS) data from exactEarth.com. AIS is a tracking system used to identify and locate vessels; the Coast Guard requires that AIS systems be carried by large commercial ships in the United States, though they are also used by some smaller and/or private vessels.</p> <p>OCNMS sorted reported vessel positions into six categories which include both shipping data (cargo, tanker, and tug & tow vessels) and data on other types of vessels (recreational, military, and passenger ships). Density of positions was calculated and displayed using ArcGIS mapping software. The resulting maps show where AIS data indicates that vessel traffic is occurring at low, moderate, or high intensity in the study area.</p> <p>Low, moderate, and high intensity of shipping use were defined as follows. Values represent density in positions recorded per 1 sq-mile hexagon.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Low Intensity</th> <th>Moderate Intensity</th> <th>High Intensity</th> <th>Total # recorded positions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Cargo ships</td> <td>1 – 16</td> <td>17 – 51</td> <td>52 - 6054</td> <td>27, 959</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tankers</td> <td>1 – 5</td> <td>6 – 15</td> <td>16 – 724</td> <td>13,318</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tug & tow vessels</td> <td>1 – 6</td> <td>7 – 23</td> <td>24 – 6726</td> <td>11, 564</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Passenger vessels</td> <td>1 - 3</td> <td>4- 10</td> <td>11 - 282</td> <td>3,859</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recreational vessels</td> <td>1 - 3</td> <td>4- 9</td> <td>10 – 10,361</td> <td>16, 325</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>AIS data is not available for all small vessels. OCNMS consulted multiple sources to identify and track recreational and other small ship transits in the study area, but some small vessels may not be represented in this data.</p>		Low Intensity	Moderate Intensity	High Intensity	Total # recorded positions	Cargo ships	1 – 16	17 – 51	52 - 6054	27, 959	Tankers	1 – 5	6 – 15	16 – 724	13,318	Tug & tow vessels	1 – 6	7 – 23	24 – 6726	11, 564	Passenger vessels	1 - 3	4- 10	11 - 282	3,859	Recreational vessels	1 - 3	4- 9	10 – 10,361	16, 325	Find the data at www.msp.wa.gov .
	Low Intensity	Moderate Intensity	High Intensity	Total # recorded positions																													
Cargo ships	1 – 16	17 – 51	52 - 6054	27, 959																													
Tankers	1 – 5	6 – 15	16 – 724	13,318																													
Tug & tow vessels	1 – 6	7 – 23	24 – 6726	11, 564																													
Passenger vessels	1 - 3	4- 10	11 - 282	3,859																													
Recreational vessels	1 - 3	4- 9	10 – 10,361	16, 325																													
Towboat/Crabber Lanes Map 40	Washington Sea Grant	<p>Coordinates for this data layer were provided by Washington Sea Grant and are the result of agreements defining navigable towboat and barge lanes through crabbing grounds between Cape Flattery, Washington and San Francisco. Lane locations were determined through discussion and negotiation between representatives of the crabbing and shipping industries, facilitated by Washington Sea Grant. The state acquired coordinates for the lanes displayed in the MSP in 2015.</p> <p>For information on the meetings associated with these agreements, downloadable charts, and other updates, please visit Washington Sea Grant’s website.</p>	https://wsg.washington.edu/brokering-lane-agreements-between-crabbers-and-towboat-operators/																														

Shipping Sector Analysis	Industrial Economics	<p>In 2014, Industrial Economics produced profiles of five major sectors important to the state's marine economy and the Marine Spatial Planning process. The shipping industry profile discusses the current status of the sector, available data, relevant existing laws and policies, and issues facing the sector. Types of sources consulted by analysts included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic analyses of port operations completed by several individual ports in Washington and Oregon • Economic impact analyses previously conducted by various Washington counties to address specific proposed facilities such as coal and bulk terminals • Reports estimating the statewide economic impacts of the maritime industry • Reports on the significance of international trade and maritime commerce to Washington State <p>Please see the full sector analysis for further detail on specific sources consulted for this report.</p>	<p>http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/ShippingSectorAnalysis.pdf</p>
Economic Analysis to Support MSP	Cascade Economics	<p>In 2015, Cascade Economics included analyses of economic impacts of shipping and ports in the Study Area.</p>	<p>Taylor, M., Baker, J. R., Waters, E., Wegge, T. C., & Wellman, K. (2015). <i>Economic analysis to support marine spatial planning in Washington</i>. Prepared for the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/WMSP_2015_small.pdf</p>
Remaining shipping data gaps and general limitations			
<p>Vessel transit information is readily available for international trade and the domestic transportation of petroleum products. However, available data on the tonnage of domestic non-petroleum products being transported is more limited. It is also unknown how future shipping patterns may change in the future. Additionally, information on how shipping conditions could be impacted by potential new uses remains limited, including potential economic impacts.</p>			

Renewable Energy Data: Data from the following sources provides information relevant to potential future offshore wind, wave, and tidal energy development within the MSP study area. Data was collected about existing infrastructure relevant to renewable energy facilities, as well as the technical suitability of Washington’s marine waters for energy production. For more information on renewable energy, please refer to Section 2.10.1 of the MSP.

Data subject	Source	Methods	Reference
Technical Suitability Analysis Maps 43-50	PNNL (NOAA)	<p>The Department of Energy’s Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) modeled offshore energy suitability off the coast of Washington for three types of wind technology, four types of wave technology, and one type of tidal energy technology. Suitability was determined based on factors including available energy resources, distance to shore support and electrical transmission infrastructure, water depth, and bottom sediment type. Results were calculated and mapped in ArcGIS. For this analysis, PNNL acquired technical specifications for renewable energy devices from industry advisors and the U.S. Department of Energy’s Marine and Hydrokinetic Technology Database. Various federal, state, and academic sources provided spatial datasets describing existing conditions in the study area. A full list of data sources is available in the final project report on the MSP website.</p> <p>The final report provided by PNNL cites known uncertainty issues related to substrate information and data collected in shallow water, such as wave resource data. PNNL’s analysis also focused only on technical requirements for development and did not incorporate detailed information related to the cost of planning, installing, or operating offshore energy facilities.</p>	<p>Van Cleve, F. B., Judd, C., Radil, A., Ahmann, J., & Geerlofs, S. H. (2013). <i>Geospatial analysis of technical and economic suitability for renewable ocean energy development on Washington’s outer coast</i> (No. PNNL-22554). Pacific Northwest National Laboratory. Retrieved from http://www.msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/PNNL_EnergySuitability_Final-Report.pdf</p>
Line of Sight Analysis	ONRC	<p>Line of sight was calculated for 90 meter and 10 meter offshore structure heights, and from 6 ft, 25 ft, and 35 ft on-shore observer heights. The line of sight analysis used standard calculations to account for the curvature of the earth and effects of humidity on visibility of offshore structures.</p>	<p>http://www.onrc.washington.edu/</p>
Sector Analysis	Industrial Economics	<p>In 2014, Industrial Economics produced profiles of five major sectors important to the state’s marine economy and the Marine Spatial Planning process. The marine renewable energy profile discusses the current status of the sector, available data, relevant existing laws and policies, and issues facing the sector. Types of sources consulted by analysts included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expert interviews with representatives from private industry, government, and research • Technical suitability analyses completed by PNNL specifically for the MSP • Other suitability studies conducted throughout the US • Information on past research and development projects for marine renewable energy in Washington • Studies on potential economic and employment impacts of offshore renewable energy development in the US <p>Please see the full sector analysis for further detail on specific sources consulted for this report.</p>	<p>http://msp.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/EnergySectorAnalysis.pdf</p>

Remaining renewable energy data gaps and general limitations

Marine renewable energy development is still a relatively new sector. No projects have been constructed in the Study Area to-date. As a result, while information related to the renewable energy industry is available for other locations and at broader scales, Cascade Economics’ report notes that quantitative information specific to the Study Area is limited. There are also unknowns related to some of the broader market and energy policy influences that could affect where renewable energy projects may actually be of interest to developers in the future.

It is also unclear how rapidly renewable energy technology may advance in coming years, but future changes in technology will affect assessments of the technical suitability and desirability of the Study Area for both pilot- and full-scale development, as well as the potential effects of development. Information described in the MSP is based on current knowledge and technology.

Additional Designations and Boundaries			
Data subject	Source	Description	Reference
Tribal U&As (Map 2)	NOAA Fisheries	These data illustrate the combined, adjudicated boundaries of the Usual and Accustomed Areas (U&As) of the Hoh, Makah, and Quileute tribes and the Quinault Indian Nation.	http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/
Tribal Reservations (Map 2)	DNR	The Washington State Non-Department of Natural Resources Major Public Lands (NDMPL) data are used primarily to create map products for general planning and management. The NDMPL dataset contains ownership parcels for Federal, State (excluding WA DNR), County and City lands within the State of Washington. It also includes Tribal administrative boundaries. The NDMPL data layer is a polygon dataset and does not contain arc attribute information for ownership boundaries. This data is not connected to WA DNR's Cadastre layers (these data include WA DNR ownership, Public Land Survey System and other cadastral data). As updates are made to Cadastre layers, they may not be reflected in NDMPL.	http://data-wadnr.opendata.arcgis.com/
Shipping Lanes (Map 40)	NOAA (Office of Coast Survey)	Shipping zones delineate activities and regulations for marine vessel traffic. Traffic lanes define specific traffic flow, while traffic separation zones assist opposing streams of marine traffic. Precautionary areas represent areas where ships must navigate with caution, and shipping safety fairways designate where artificial structures are prohibited. Recommended routes are predetermined routes for shipping adopted for reasons of safety. Areas to be Avoided are within defined limits where navigation is particularly hazardous or it is exceptionally important to avoid casualties and should be avoided by all ships or certain classes of ships. Shipping Lanes and Regulations layer was created by extracting ENC (.000) files published by Marine Chart Division, OCS, NOAA.	https://marinecadastre.gov/data/
Federal Navigation Channels (Maps 52, 53, 55)	USACE	This layer shows coastal channels and waterways that are maintained and surveyed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). These channels are necessary transportation systems that serve economic and national security interests. The possibility of silting is always present. Local authorities should be consulted for the controlling depth. NOS Charts frequently show controlling depths in a table, which is kept current by the US Coast Guard Local Notice to Mariners. These data are intended for coastal and ocean use planning.	https://marinecadastre.gov/data/
Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary (Map 1)	NOAA	The National Marine Sanctuary Program manages a system of sanctuaries and other managed areas around the country. These data are based on the legal definition of each national marine sanctuary as defined in the Code of Federal Regulations, at 15 C.F.R. Part 922 and the subparts for each national marine sanctuary. The GIS compatible digital boundary files for each national marine sanctuary are representations of those legal boundaries and are based on the best available data. These digital files are not intended and should not be relied upon for use in navigation or legal purposes. For legal questions relating to the data, please contact the NMSP.	https://marinecadastre.gov/data/
Olympic National Park (Map 1)	NPS	These data represent the boundaries of the Olympic National Park.	www.nps.gov
State Park Seashore Conservation Areas (Map 1)	State Parks	These data display the ocean beaches that were established in 1967 as part of the State Seashore Conservation Area. The Seashore Conservation Area is managed by the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission to provide the public with opportunities for recreational activities, outdoor sports, observation of nature and relaxation.	www.parks.wa.gov
State DNR Conservation Areas (Map 1)	DNR	These data display the boundaries of Natural Area Preserves and Natural Resource Conservation Areas managed by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources.	www.dnr.wa.gov http://data-wadnr.opendata.arcgis.com/
National Wildlife Refuges and Acquisition Areas (Map 1)	USFWS	These data depict the boundaries of lands and waters that are designated National Wildlife Refuges or are approved for acquisition by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in North America, U.S. Trust Territories and Possessions. The primary source for this information is the USFWS Realty program.	https://www.fws.gov/gis/data/national/index.html

Military: Pacific Northwest Operating Areas, Coast Guard Stations (Map 41)	Navy Coast Guard NOAA	These data depict the areas where various military activities occur, primarily by the Navy for training and testing, but also the location of Coast Guard stations.	www.dnr.wa.gov
---	-----------------------------	---	--

Appendix D. Marine Waters Planning and Management Act

Appendix D provides the complete statutory language for Washington's Marine Waters Planning and Management Act, Chapter 43.372 Revised Code of Washington (RCW), as of June 2017. Please consult the official version of the RCW published by the Statute Law Committee and the Code Reviser for any future amendments to the law.

Chapter 43.372 RCW

MARINE WATERS PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

43.372.005

Findings—Purpose.

(1) The legislature finds that:

(a) Native American tribes have depended on the state's marine waters and its resources for countless generations and continue to do so for cultural, spiritual, economic, and subsistence purposes.

(b) The state has long demonstrated a strong commitment to protecting the state's marine waters, which are abundant in natural resources, contain a treasure of biological diversity, and are a source of multiple uses by the public supporting the economies of nearby communities as well as the entire state. These multiple uses include, but are not limited to: Marine-based industries and activities such as cargo, fuel, and passenger transportation; commercial, recreational, and tribal fishing; shellfish aquaculture; telecommunications and energy infrastructure; seafood processing; tourism; scientific research; and many related goods and services. These multiple uses as well as new emerging uses, such as renewable ocean energy, constitute a management challenge for sustaining resources and coordinating state decision making in a proactive, comprehensive and ecosystem-based manner.

(c) Washington's marine waters are part of a west coast-wide large marine ecosystem known as the California current, and the Puget Sound and Columbia river estuaries constitute two of the three largest estuaries that are part of this large marine ecosystem. Puget Sound and the Columbia river are estuaries of national significance under the national estuary program, and the outer coast includes the Olympic national marine sanctuary.

(d) Washington is working in cooperation with the states of Oregon and California and federal agencies on ocean and ocean health management issues through the west coast governors' agreement on ocean health, and with the government of British Columbia on shared waters management issues through the British Columbia-Washington coastal and ocean task force.

(e) Washington has initiated comprehensive management programs to protect and promote compatible uses of these waters. These include: The development of a comprehensive ecosystem-based management plan known as the Puget Sound action agenda; shoreline plans for shorelines around the state; management plans for state-owned aquatic lands and their associated waters statewide; and watershed and salmon recovery management plans in the upland areas of Puget Sound, the coast, and the Columbia river. Data and data management tools have also been developed to support these management and planning activities, such as the coastal atlas

managed by the department of ecology and the shore zone database managed by the department of natural resources.

(f) For marine waters specifically, Washington has formed several mechanisms to improve coordination and management. A legislatively authorized task force formed by the governor identified priority recommendations for improving state management of ocean resources through Washington's ocean action plan in 2006. The governor further formed an ongoing interagency team that assists the department of ecology in implementing these recommendations. There is an extensive network of marine resources committees within Puget Sound and on the outer coast and the Columbia river to promote and support local involvement identifying and conducting local priority marine projects and some have been involved in local planning and management. Through the Olympic coast intergovernmental policy council, the state has also formalized its working relationship with coastal tribes and the federal government in the management of the Olympic coast national marine sanctuary.

(g) Reports by the United States commission on oceans policy, the Pew oceans commission, and the joint oceans commission initiative recommend the adoption of a national ocean policy under which states and coastal communities would have a principal role in developing and implementing ecosystem-based management of marine waters. Acting on these recommendations, the president of the United States recently formed an interagency ocean policy task force charged with developing a national ocean policy and a framework for marine spatial planning that involves all governmental levels, including state, tribal, and local governments. To further develop and implement such a planning framework, it is anticipated that federal cooperation and support will be available to coastal states that are engaged in marine and coastal resource management and planning, including marine spatial planning.

(2) The purpose of this chapter is to build upon existing statewide Puget Sound, coastal, and Columbia river efforts. When resources become available, the state intends to augment the marine spatial component of existing plans and to improve the coordination among state agencies in the development and implementation of marine management plans.

(3) It is also the purpose of this chapter to establish policies to guide state agencies and local governments when exercising jurisdiction over proposed uses and activities in these waters. Specifically, in conducting marine spatial planning, and in augmenting existing marine management plans with marine spatial planning components, the state must:

(a) Continue to recognize the rights of native American tribes regarding marine natural resources;

(b) Base all planning on best available science. This includes identifying gaps in existing information, recommend a strategy for acquiring science needed to strengthen marine spatial plans, and create a process to adjust plans once additional scientific information is available;

(c) Coordinate with all stakeholders, including marine resources committees and nongovernmental organizations, that are significantly involved in the collection of scientific information, ecosystem protection and restoration, or other activities related to marine spatial planning;

(d) Recognize that marine ecosystems span tribal, state, and international boundaries and that planning has to be coordinated with all entities with jurisdiction or authority in order to be effective;

(e) Establish or further promote an ecosystem-based management approach including linking marine spatial plans to adjacent nearshore and upland spatial or ecosystem-based plans;

(f) Ensure that all marine spatial plans are linked to measurable environmental outcomes;

- (g) Establish a performance management system to monitor implementation of any new marine spatial plan;
 - (h) Establish an ocean stewardship policy that takes into account the existing natural, social, cultural, historic, and economic uses;
 - (i) Recognize that commercial, tribal, and recreational fisheries, and shellfish aquaculture are an integral part of our state's culture and contribute substantial economic benefits;
 - (j) Value biodiversity and ecosystem health, and protect special, sensitive, or unique estuarine and marine life and habitats, including important spawning, rearing, and migration areas for finfish, marine mammals, and productive shellfish habitats;
 - (k) Integrate this planning with existing plans and ongoing planning in the same marine waters and provide additional mechanisms for improving coordination and aligning management;
 - (l) Promote recovery of listed species under state and federal endangered species acts plans pursuant to those plans; and
 - (m) Fulfill the state's public trust and tribal treaty trust responsibilities in managing the state's ocean waters in a sustainable manner for current and future generations.
- [[2010 c 145 § 1.](#)]

43.372.010

Definitions.

The definitions in this section apply throughout this chapter unless the context clearly requires otherwise.

(1) "Aquatic lands" includes all tidelands, shorelands, harbor areas, and the beds of navigable waters, and must be construed to be coextensive with the term "aquatic lands" as defined in RCW [79.105.060](#).

(2) "Exclusive economic zone waters" means marine waters from the offshore state boundary to the boundary of the exclusive economic zone, over which the United States government has primary jurisdiction.

(3) "Marine counties" includes Clallam, Jefferson, Grays Harbor, Wahkiakum, San Juan, Whatcom, Skagit, Island, Snohomish, King, Pierce, Thurston, Mason, Kitsap, and Pacific counties.

(4) "Marine ecosystem" means the physical, biological, and chemical components and processes and their interactions in marine waters and aquatic lands, including humans.

(5) "Marine interagency team" or "team" means the marine interagency team created under RCW [43.372.020](#).

(6) "Marine management plan" and "marine waters management plan" means any plan guiding activities on and uses of the state's marine waters, and may include a marine spatial plan or element.

(7) "Marine resources committees" means those committees organized under RCW [36.125.020](#) or by counties within the Northwest straits marine conservation initiative.

(8) "Marine spatial planning" means a public process of analyzing and allocating the spatial and temporal distribution of human activities in marine areas to achieve ecological, economic, and social objectives. Often this type of planning is done to reduce conflicts among uses, to

reduce environmental impacts, to facilitate compatible uses, to align management decisions, and to meet other objectives determined by the planning process.

(9) "Marine waters" means aquatic lands and waters under tidal influence, including saltwaters and estuaries to the ordinary high water mark lying within the boundaries of the state. This definition also includes the portion of the Columbia river bordering Pacific and Wahkiakum counties, Willapa Bay, Grays Harbor, the Strait of Juan de Fuca, and the entire Puget Sound.

[[2010 c 145 § 2.](#)]

43.372.020

Marine interagency team.

(1) The office of the governor shall chair a marine interagency team that is composed of representatives of each of the agencies in the governor's natural resources cabinet with management responsibilities for marine waters, including the independent agencies. A representative from a federal agency with lead responsibility for marine spatial planning must be invited to serve as a liaison to the team to help ensure consistency with federal actions and policy. The team must assist state agencies under RCW [43.372.030](#) with the review and coordination of such planning with their existing and ongoing planning and conduct the marine management planning authorized in RCW [43.372.040](#).

(2) The team may not commence any activities authorized under RCW [43.372.030](#) and [43.372.040](#) until federal, private, or other funding is secured specifically for these activities.

[[2012 c 252 § 1](#); [2010 c 145 § 3.](#)]

43.372.030

Marine spatial data and marine spatial planning elements—Inclusion in planning—Joint plans and planning frameworks—Integration with comprehensive marine management plan.

(1) Subject to available federal, private, or other funding for this purpose, all state agencies with marine waters planning and management responsibilities are authorized to include marine spatial data and marine spatial planning elements into their existing plans and ongoing planning.

(2) The director of the Puget Sound partnership under the direction of the leadership council created in RCW [90.71.220](#) must integrate marine spatial information and planning provisions into the action agenda. The information should be used to address gaps or improve the effectiveness of the spatial planning component of the action agenda, such as in addressing potential new uses such as renewable energy projects.

(3) The governor and the commissioner of public lands, working with appropriate marine management and planning agencies, should work cooperatively with the applicable west coast states, Canadian provinces, and with federal agencies, through existing cooperative entities such as the west coast governor's agreement on ocean health, the coastal and oceans task force, the Pacific coast collaborative, the Puget Sound federal caucus, and the United States and Canada cooperative agreement working group, to explore the benefits of developing joint marine spatial plans or planning frameworks in the shared waters of the Salish Sea, the Columbia river estuary,

and in the exclusive economic zone waters. The governor and commissioner may approve the adoption of shared marine spatial plans or planning frameworks where they determine it would further policies of this chapter and chapter [43.143 RCW](#).

(4) On an ongoing basis, the director of the department of ecology shall work with other state agencies with marine management responsibilities, tribal governments, marine resources committees, local and federal agencies, and marine waters stakeholders to compile marine spatial information and to incorporate this information into ongoing plans. This work may be integrated with the comprehensive marine management plan authorized under RCW [43.372.040](#) when that planning process is initiated.

(5) All actions taken to implement this section must be consistent with RCW [43.372.060](#).
[[2012 c 252 § 2](#); [2010 c 145 § 5](#).]

43.372.040

Comprehensive marine management plan.

(1) Upon the receipt of federal, private, or other funding for this purpose, the marine interagency team shall coordinate the development of a comprehensive marine management plan for the state's marine waters. The marine management plan must include marine spatial planning, as well as recommendations to the appropriate federal agencies regarding the exclusive economic zone waters.

(2) The comprehensive marine management plan may be developed in geographic segments, and may incorporate or be developed as an element of existing marine plans, such as the Puget Sound action agenda. If the team exercises the option to develop the comprehensive marine management plan in geographic segments, it may proceed with development and adoption of marine management plans for these geographic segments on different schedules.

(3) The chair of the team may designate a state agency with marine management responsibilities to take the lead in developing and recommending to the team particular segments or elements of the comprehensive marine management plan.

(4) The marine management plan must be developed and implemented in a manner that:

- (a) Recognizes and respects existing uses and tribal treaty rights;
- (b) Promotes protection and restoration of ecosystem processes to a level that will enable long-term sustainable production of ecosystem goods and services;
- (c) Addresses potential impacts of climate change and sea level rise upon current and projected marine waters uses and shoreline and coastal impacts;
- (d) Fosters and encourages sustainable uses that provide economic opportunity without significant adverse environmental impacts;
- (e) Preserves and enhances public access;
- (f) Protects and encourages working waterfronts and supports the infrastructure necessary to sustain marine industry, commercial shipping, shellfish aquaculture, and other water-dependent uses;
- (g) Fosters public participation in decision making and significant involvement of communities adjacent to the state's marine waters; and
- (h) Integrates existing management plans and authorities and makes recommendations for aligning plans to the extent practicable.

(5) To ensure the effective stewardship of the state's marine waters held in trust for the benefit of the people, the marine management plan must rely upon existing data and resources, but also identify data gaps and, as possible, procure missing data necessary for planning.

(6) The marine management plan must include but not be limited to:

(a) An ecosystem assessment that analyzes the health and status of Washington marine waters including key social, economic, and ecological characteristics and incorporates the best available scientific information, including relevant marine data. This assessment should seek to identify key threats to plan goals, analyze risk and management scenarios, and develop key ecosystem indicators. In addition, the plan should incorporate existing adaptive management strategies underway by local, state, or federal entities and provide an adaptive management element to incorporate new information and consider revisions to the plan based upon research, monitoring, and evaluation;

(b) Using and relying upon existing plans and processes and additional management measures to guide decisions among uses proposed for specific geographic areas of the state's marine and estuarine waters consistent with applicable state laws and programs that control or address developments in the state's marine waters;

(c) A series of maps that, at a minimum, summarize available data on: The key ecological aspects of the marine ecosystem, including physical and biological characteristics, as well as areas that are environmentally sensitive or contain unique or sensitive species or biological communities that must be conserved and warrant protective measures; human uses of marine waters, particularly areas with high value for fishing, shellfish aquaculture, recreation, and maritime commerce; and appropriate locations with high potential for renewable energy production with minimal potential for conflicts with other existing uses or sensitive environments;

(d) An element that sets forth the state's recommendations to the federal government for use priorities and limitations, siting criteria, and protection of unique and sensitive biota and ocean floor features within the exclusive economic zone waters consistent with the policies and management criteria contained in this chapter and chapter [43.143 RCW](#);

(e) An implementation strategy describing how the plan's management measures and other provisions will be considered and implemented through existing state and local authorities; and

(f) A framework for coordinating state agency and local government review of proposed renewable energy development uses requiring multiple permits and other approvals that provide for the timely review and action upon renewable energy development proposals while ensuring protection of sensitive resources and minimizing impacts to other existing or projected uses in the area.

(7) If the director of the department of fish and wildlife determines that a fisheries management element is appropriate for inclusion in the marine management plan, this element may include the incorporation of existing management plans and procedures and standards for consideration in adopting and revising fisheries management plans in cooperation with the appropriate federal agencies and tribal governments.

(8) Any provision of the marine management plan that does not have as its primary purpose the management of commercial or recreational fishing but that has an impact on this fishing must minimize the negative impacts on the fishing. The team must accord substantial weight to recommendations from the director of the department of fish and wildlife for plan revisions to minimize the negative impacts.

(9) The marine management plan must recognize and value existing uses. All actions taken to implement this section must be consistent with RCW [43.372.060](#).

(10) The marine management plan must identify any provisions of existing management plans that are substantially inconsistent with the plan.

(11)(a) In developing the marine management plan, the team shall implement a strong public participation strategy that seeks input from throughout the state and particularly from communities adjacent to marine waters. Public review and comment must be sought and incorporated with regard to planning the scope of work as well as in regard to significant drafts of the plan and plan elements.

(b) The team must engage tribes and marine resources committees in its activities throughout the planning process. In particular, prior to finalizing the plan, the team must provide each tribe and marine resources committee with a draft of the plan and invite them to review and comment on the plan.

(12) The director of the department of ecology shall submit the completed marine management plan to the appropriate federal agency for its review and approval for incorporation into the state's federally approved coastal zone management program.

(13) Subsequent to the adoption of the marine management plan, the team may periodically review and adopt revisions to the plan to incorporate new information and to recognize and incorporate provisions in other marine management plans. The team must afford the public an opportunity to review and comment upon significant proposed revisions to the marine management plan.

[[2012 c 252 § 3](#); [2010 c 145 § 6](#).]

43.372.050

Marine management plans—Compliance—Consistency—Review—Report and recommendations.

(1) Upon the adoption of the marine management plan under RCW [43.372.040](#), each state agency and local government must make decisions in a manner that ensures consistency with applicable legal authorities and conformance with the applicable provisions of the marine management plan to the greatest extent possible.

(2) The director of the department of ecology, in coordination with the team, shall periodically review existing management plans maintained by state agencies and local governments that cover the same marine waters as the marine management plan under RCW [43.372.040](#), and for any substantial inconsistency with the marine management plan the director shall make recommendations to the agency or to the local government for revisions to eliminate the inconsistency.

(3) Not later than four years following adoption of the marine management plan under RCW [43.372.040](#), the department of ecology, in coordination with the team, shall report to the appropriate marine waters committees in the senate and house of representatives describing provisions of existing management plans that are substantially inconsistent with the marine management plan under RCW [43.372.040](#), and making recommendations for eliminating the inconsistency.

(4) All actions taken to implement this section must be consistent with RCW [43.372.060](#).
[[2010 c 145 § 7](#).]

43.372.060

Authority limited.

No authority is created under this chapter to affect in any way any project, use, or activity in the state's marine waters existing prior to or during the development and review of the marine management plan. No authority is created under this chapter to supersede the current authority of any state agency or local government.

[[2010 c 145 § 8.](#)]

43.372.070

Marine resources stewardship trust account.

(1) The marine resources stewardship trust account is created in the state treasury. All receipts from income derived from the investment of amounts credited to the account, any grants, gifts, or donations to the state for the purposes of marine management planning, marine spatial planning, data compilation, research, or monitoring, and any appropriations made to the account must be deposited in the account. Moneys in the account may be spent only after appropriation.

(2) Expenditures from the account may only be used for the purposes of marine management planning, marine spatial planning, research, monitoring, and implementation of the marine management plan.

(3) Except as provided in subsection (5) of this section, until July 1, 2016, expenditures from the account may only be used for the purposes of:

(a) Conducting ecosystem assessment and mapping activities in marine waters consistent with RCW [43.372.040](#)(6) (a) and (c), with a focus on assessment and mapping activities related to marine resource uses and developing potential economic opportunities;

(b) Developing a marine management plan for the state's coastal waters as that term is defined in RCW [43.143.020](#); and

(c) Coordination under the west coast governors' agreement on ocean health, entered into on September 18, 2006, and other regional planning efforts consistent with RCW [43.372.030](#).

(4) Expenditures from the account on projects and activities relating to the state's coastal waters, as defined in RCW [43.143.020](#), must be made, to the maximum extent possible, consistent with the recommendations of the Washington coastal marine advisory council as provided in RCW [43.143.060](#). If expenditures relating to coastal waters are made in a manner that differs substantially from the Washington coastal marine advisory council's recommendations, the responsible agency receiving the appropriation shall provide the council and appropriate committees of the legislature with a written explanation.

(5) During the 2015-2017 fiscal biennium, the legislature may transfer from the marine resources stewardship trust account to the aquatic lands enhancement account such amounts as reflect the excess fund balance of the account.

[[2016 sp.s. c 36 § 938](#); [2013 c 318 § 3](#); [2012 c 252 § 4](#); [2011 c 250 § 2](#); [2010 c 145 § 10.](#)]

NOTES:

Effective date—2016 sp.s. c 36: See note following RCW [18.20.430](#).

Findings—2011 c 250: "(1) The legislature finds that the states of Washington, Oregon, and California have a common interest in the management and protection of ocean and coastal resources. This common interest stems from the many ocean and coastal resources that cross jurisdictional boundaries including winds, currents, fish, and wildlife, as well as the multijurisdictional reach of many uses of marine waters. These shared resources provide enormous economic, environmental, and social benefits to the states, and are an integral part of maintaining the high quality of life enjoyed by residents of the west coast.

(2) The legislature finds that the shared nature of ocean and coastal resources make coordination between the states of Washington, Oregon, and California essential in order to achieve effective ocean and coastal resource management and support sustainable coastal communities.

(3) The legislature recognizes the west coast governors' agreement on ocean health, entered into on September 18, 2006, as an important step towards achieving more coordinated management of these ocean and coastal resources.

(4) Ocean and coastal resource planning processes and funding opportunities recently initiated by the federal government contemplate action at the regional level. Early action on the part of Washington, Oregon, and California to collaboratively define and implement such planning efforts and projects will increase the states' ability to determine the course of federal planning processes for the west coast and receive nonstate support for the planning efforts, resource preservation and restoration projects, and projects to support ocean health and sustainable coastal communities.

(5) Therefore, collaboration on ocean and coastal resource management between Washington, Oregon, and California should be continued and enhanced through the respective legislatures, as well as through the respective executive branches through the west coast governors' agreement on ocean health." [[2011 c 250 § 1.](#)]

Appendix E. CZMA Federal Consistency

Introduction

This Appendix provides context on the provisions of the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) for Washington's Pacific Coast for federal consistency purposes under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) and federal consistency regulations at 15 CFR Part 930. This includes standards that are in the MSP that are also enforceable policies for CZMA review and necessary data and information for certain CZMA federal consistency reviews. Parts of this Appendix are taken verbatim from relevant parts of the main body of the MSP.

This Appendix does not alter, nor duplicate, the already approved list of NOAA-approved enforceable policies for Washington's Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP). For the list of already approved enforceable policies, please contact Washington's Coastal Zone Management Program.¹

The CZMA requires that certain federal activities² that affect coastal uses or resources be conducted in a manner consistent with the enforceable policies of a state's federally-approved Coastal Zone Management Program. Once NOAA approves the incorporation of the new enforceable policies into the Washington Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP), the Department of Ecology will apply the new enforceable policies listed below when reviewing federal activities for new ocean uses³ on Washington's Pacific Coast for consistency with the Washington CZMP.

Washington's Marine Waters Planning and Management Act, or marine planning law (RCW 43.372), provides the authority and directive for the state to create plans, including new enforceable policies, and the requirement to implement the plan via existing processes. The proposed, new enforceable policies contained in the MSP include:

1. Important, Sensitive and Unique areas (ISUs) and associated protection standards
2. Fisheries protection standards

The MSP also provides information and procedural requirements to support Ecology's evaluation of whether the enforceable policies of Washington's CZMP have been met. This includes new, proposed enforceable policies as well as existing approved enforceable policies, including those contained within the Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA) (RCW 43.143) and the Ocean Management Guidelines (WAC 173-26-360). Since these existing regulations

¹ Information on Washington's Coastal Management Program is available at: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/czm/index.html>

² Under the CZMA and federal regulations, federal activities includes activities by federal agencies, federally permitted or licensed activities, and federally funded projects.

³ Ocean uses is defined by WAC 173-26-360(3). See specific definitions for example uses in Appendix B. The term "new" is intended to distinguish future ocean use proposals from those uses that are currently permitted or that are undergoing permitting prior to the adoption of the final MSP. WAC 173-26-360(4) describes exemptions for fisheries, recreation, and other existing commercial uses of renewable marine or ocean resources.

apply to various phases of project review, they are integrated and referenced throughout the relevant sections of Chapter 4 – MSP Management Framework, including:

- Project and site-specific information requirements – Section 4.4, particularly table 4.4-1
- Effects evaluation – Section 4.5
- General review standards – Section 4.6
- Plans - Section 4.7
- Specific use review standards – Section 4.8, particularly table 4.8-1

The MSP provides recommendations on: ways to avoid and minimize impacts; procedures for coordination and consultation (Section 4.2.1); spatial data considerations (Section 4.3); and project siting, design, engineering, construction and operation (Section 4.6.3). The MSP contains further guidance on the information, effects, plans, and processes that will assist local governments in implementing the existing Ocean Management Guidelines.

The following sections of this Appendix provide more information on:

- The authority provided in state law for developing enforceable policies.
- How the MSP will be implemented (also referred to as the enforceable mechanism).
- The new proposed enforceable policies, including a summary table and the complete text of the proposed enforceable policies.

Washington’s Authority to Develop and Implement Policies in the Marine Spatial Plan

The state’s marine planning law (RCW 43.372) outlines the purpose, authority and intent for creation and implementation of state marine plans, also referred to as Marine Spatial Plans or plan(s). This state law creates the authority and directive for the state to create and use the plan via existing processes. The state law directs state agencies to use the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) for Washington’s Pacific Coast to develop policies that can guide the review of and decisions about new ocean uses which can be implemented through existing state and local authorizations and processes.

Specifically, this law:

- Directs the state to use the MSP to guide state and local decisions among uses for marine waters. (RCW 43.372.005(3)).
- Directs the state to use existing state and local authorities and *additional management measures* (e.g. policies) to implement the plan. The law also requires state and local governments to make decisions consistent with the final, adopted MSP (through their various existing authorities – e.g. permits, leases, rights of way, and use authorizations).

Relevant legal citations:

- **RCW 43.372.005(3)** It is also the purpose of this chapter to establish policies to guide state agencies and local governments when exercising jurisdiction over proposed uses and activities in these waters.
- **RCW 43.372.040(6)** The marine management plan must include but not be limited to:
 - (b) Using and relying upon existing plans and processes and additional management measures to guide decisions among uses proposed for specific geographic areas of the state's marine and estuarine waters consistent with applicable state laws and programs that control or address developments in the state's marine waters;
 - (e) An implementation strategy describing how the plan's management measures and other provisions will be considered and implemented through existing state and local authorities; and
 - (f) A framework for coordinating state agency and local government review of proposed renewable energy development uses requiring multiple permits and other approvals that provide for the timely review and action upon renewable energy development proposals while ensuring protection of sensitive resources and minimizing impacts to other existing or projected uses in the area.
- **RCW 43.372.050(1)** Upon the adoption of the marine management plan under RCW 43.372.040, each state agency and local government must make decisions in a manner that ensures consistency with applicable legal authorities and conformance with the applicable provisions of the marine management plan to the greatest extent possible.
- Ensures state and local governments use their existing authorities to apply provisions of the MSP. This means, for example, the MSP should not create a new, separate permit. Rather, existing state and local permit processes must incorporate and adapt to be consistent with the MSP. The law also protects existing permitted uses and projects from the MSP requirements. This, in turn, means that the marine planning law intended that future projects comply with the MSP.

Relevant legal citation:

 - **RCW 43.372.060** No authority is created under this chapter to affect in any way any project, use, or activity in the state's marine waters existing prior to or during the development and review of the marine management plan. No authority is created under this chapter to supersede the current authority of any state agency or local government.
- Establishes policies for development and implementation of the final adopted MSP. This includes policy statements requiring (1) protection of sensitive and unique marine life and habitats and (2) recognizing and stewarding the important economic, social, historic, and cultural uses with a specific focus on fisheries and shellfish aquaculture.

Relevant legal citations:

- **RCW 43.372.005(3)** It is also the purpose of this chapter to establish policies to guide state agencies and local governments when exercising jurisdiction over proposed uses and activities in these waters.
- **RCW 43.372.005(3)** purpose lists the specific policies for the state to address in a plan, including:
 - (h) Establish an ocean stewardship policy that takes into account the existing natural, social, cultural, historic, and economic uses;
 - (i) Recognize that commercial, tribal, and recreational fisheries, and shellfish aquaculture are an integral part of our state's culture and contribute substantial economic benefits;
 - (j) Value biodiversity and ecosystem health, and protect special, sensitive, or unique estuarine and marine life and habitats, including important spawning, rearing, and migration areas for finfish, marine mammals, and productive shellfish habitats;
- **RCW 43.372.040(4)** The marine management plan must be developed and implemented in a manner that:
 - (b) Promotes protection and restoration of ecosystem processes to a level that will enable long-term sustainable production of ecosystem goods and services;
 - (c) Addresses potential impacts of climate change and sea level rise upon current and projected marine waters uses and shoreline and coastal impacts;
 - (d) Fosters and encourages sustainable uses that provide economic opportunity without significant adverse environmental impacts;
 - (e) Preserves and enhances public access;
 - (f) Protects and encourages working waterfronts and supports the infrastructure necessary to sustain marine industry, commercial shipping, shellfish aquaculture, and other water-dependent uses;
 - (m) Fulfill the state's public trust and tribal treaty trust responsibilities in managing the state's ocean waters in a sustainable manner for current and future generations.

How MSP Policies will be Implemented by the State

Given the purpose, authority, and intent of the marine planning law, all state and local agencies are required to implement and adhere to the adopted Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) through existing regulatory and decision-making processes at the state and local level. This section summarizes how the MSP policies will be implemented by state and local governments.

State agencies

MSP policies will be incorporated, where applicable, through various authorizations issued by a number of state agencies, such as: aquatic land leases (i.e. use authorizations); right-of-way easements for the Seashore Conservation Area; hydraulic project approvals; and water quality permits. More information on these state authorizations can be found in the MSP Management Framework [see sections 4.1.4 and 4.1.5].

Local governments

The MSP provides information, analyses, recommendations, and policies that must be incorporated in local plans, regulations, and permit processes, particularly through local Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs) under the Shoreline Management Act. Local SMPs on Washington's Pacific Coast are also responsible for incorporating the Ocean Management Guidelines (WAC 173-26-360), which implement the Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA) (RCW 43.143) into their SMPs. As stated in the marine planning law (RCW 43.372.050(1)), to make decisions consistent with the MSP, local governments on Washington's Pacific Coast will need to:

1. Update their local programs and incorporate information, analyses, recommendations, and policies from the final, adopted MSP.
2. Once incorporated, issue shoreline permits for new ocean uses involving development (as defined in RCW 90.58.030(3)(a)) that are consistent with the updated SMP and, therefore, the MSP.

Compliance with the MSP

The marine planning law also requires Ecology, with the interagency team, to monitor compliance with the plan, identify any substantial inconsistencies, and make recommendations to the state agency or local government for resolving inconsistencies (RCW 43.372.050(2)). This includes Ecology reporting on inconsistencies to the Legislature no later than four years after the adoption of the plan.

Relevant legal citations:

- **RCW 43.372.050 (2)** The director of the department of ecology, in coordination with the team, shall periodically review existing management plans maintained by state agencies and local governments that cover the same marine waters as the marine management plan under RCW 43.372.040, and for any substantial inconsistency with the marine management plan the director shall make recommendations to the agency or to the local government for revisions to eliminate the inconsistency.

(3) Not later than four years following adoption of the marine management plan under RCW 43.372.040, the department of ecology, in coordination with the team, shall report to the appropriate marine waters committees in the senate and house of representatives describing provisions of existing management plans that are substantially inconsistent with the marine management plan under RCW 43.372.040, and making recommendations for eliminating the inconsistency.

New Enforceable Policies for Purposes of Federal Consistency

Table E-1 below identifies the new enforceable policies for Washington’s Coastal Zone Management Program that were developed as part of the MSP for Washington’s Pacific Coast, including a summary of each policy, relevant legal language regarding authority to develop the enforceable policy, and the legal citation. The full text of each enforceable policy is included below the table. The enforceable policy text is the same language included in the plan.

Table E-1 – Summary of Proposed New Enforceable Policies		
Name/Description of Enforceable Policy	Policy Citation	Enforceable Mechanisms
<p>Establishes Important Sensitive and Unique (ISUs) Areas and Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defines criteria for Important, Sensitive and Unique areas. • Designates a list of Ecological and Historic, Cultural, and Infrastructure ISUs and provides maps of best available data on ISU locations. <p>Creates a protection standard and definition for adverse effects for ISUs.</p>	<p>Washington Marine Spatial Plan, Section <u>4.3.3 Important, Sensitive and Unique Areas (ISUs)</u></p>	<p>Washington Marine Planning Law - RCW 43.372</p> <p>Specifically 43.372.040(6)(c):</p> <p>The plan must include, but not be limited to...</p> <p>(c) A series of maps that, at a minimum, summarize available data on: The key ecological aspects of the marine ecosystem, including physical and biological characteristics, as well as areas that are environmentally sensitive or contain unique or sensitive species or biological communities that must be conserved and warrant protective measures; human uses of marine waters, particularly areas with high value for fishing, shellfish aquaculture, recreation, and maritime commerce; and appropriate locations with high potential for renewable energy production with minimal potential for conflicts with other existing uses or sensitive environments;</p> <p>-also-</p> <p>Washington Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA) – RCW 43.143</p> <p>Specifically RCW 43.143.030(2):</p> <p>(2) Uses or activities...that require permits...may be permitted only if the criteria below are met or exceeded:</p> <p>(c) There will be no likely long-term significant adverse impacts to coastal or marine resources or uses;</p> <p>(d) All reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize adverse environmental impacts, with special protection provided for the marine life and resources of the Columbia river, Willapa Bay and Grays Harbor estuaries, and Olympic National Park.</p>

Table E-1 – Summary of Proposed New Enforceable Policies		
Name/Description of Enforceable Policy	Policy Citation	Enforceable Mechanisms
<p>Establishes a Fisheries Protection Standard</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterates the existing state protection standards for fisheries in state law (contained in ORMA and marine planning laws). • Defines adverse effects to fisheries. • Lists criteria to minimize impacts to fishing. 	<p>Washington Marine Spatial Plan, (Section TBD), <u>Fisheries Use Protection Standards</u></p>	<p>Washington Marine Planning Law - RCW 43.372</p> <p>Specifically RCW 43.372.040(8):</p> <p>(8) Any provision of the marine management plan that does not have as its primary purpose the management of commercial or recreational fishing but that has an impact on this fishing must minimize the negative impacts on the fishing. The team must accord substantial weight to recommendations from the director of the department of fish and wildlife for plan revisions to minimize the negative impacts.</p> <p>-also-</p> <p>Washington Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA) – RCW 43.143</p> <p>Specifically RCW 43.143.030(2):</p> <p>(2) Uses or activities...that require permits...may be permitted only if the criteria below are met or exceeded:</p> <p>(c) There will be no likely long-term significant adverse impacts to coastal or marine resources or uses.</p> <p>(e) All reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize adverse social and economic impacts, including impacts on aquaculture, recreation, tourism, navigation, air quality, and recreational, commercial, and tribal fishing.</p>

Necessary Data and Information

For federal permit, license or lease applicants, NOAA’s regulations allow a state to identify additional necessary data and information a state believes is needed to start the CZMA six-month review period. The MSP Management Framework at 4.2.1.5 identifies and describes the Necessary Data and Information⁴ by Washington’s CZMP for purposes of starting the CZMA 6-month review period for federal license or permit activities under [15 C.F.R. part 930](#), subpart D, and OCS Plans under [15 C.F.R part 930](#), subpart E, pursuant to 15 C.F.R. [930.58\(a\)\(3\)](#). The table below summarizes the Necessary Data and Information and, once approved by NOAA, which will be incorporated into Washington’s CZMP.

Summary of Necessary Data and Information	
Necessary Data and Information	Specific process requirements detailed in Management Framework (Chapter 4) of Marine Spatial Plan for Washington’s Pacific Coast
A copy of the notice provided to Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council.	See Section 4.2.1.3
A copy of the sign-in and summary from meeting with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and affected fisheries stakeholders.	See Section 4.2.1.4

Enforceable Policy Language: excerpt from MSP Management Framework

4.3.3 Important, Sensitive and Unique Areas (ISUs)

State law requires the Marine Spatial Plan to identify environmentally sensitive and unique resources that warrant protective measures (RCW 43.372.040(6)(c)). Therefore, the plan is designating Important, Sensitive and Unique (ISU) Areas in state waters that have high conservation value, historic value or areas with key infrastructure. The ISUs include standards to maintain the high values of the areas and protect the ISUs from adverse effects of offshore development,⁵ while allowing existing compatible uses such as fishing.

As part of the Marine Spatial Plan the state is developing maps of ISU areas based on the available information and data. However, it is important to note that the designation of ISUs and the application of the enforceable protective standards is habitat and resource based, wherever

⁴ Other existing Necessary Data and Information is described in Washington’s approved Coastal Program document.

⁵ Development under the jurisdiction of the Shoreline Management Act is defined at RCW 90.58.030(3)(a) as “a use consisting of the construction or exterior alteration of structures; dredging; drilling; dumping; filling; removal of any sand, gravel, or minerals; bulkheading; driving of piling; placing of obstructions; or any project of a permanent or temporary nature which interferes with the normal public use of the surface of the waters overlying lands subject to this chapter at any state of water level.” For purposes of the MSP, “offshore development” means any development occurring in the plan study area that also meets the definition of a new ocean use.

these habitats or resources occur within state waters. The enforceable protective standards would apply to any designated ISU whether mapped or not. The ISU maps are not part of the enforceable standards; rather the ISU maps are intended to assist the state, local governments and applicants by showing known locations of ISU areas.

1. ISU Definitions

ISUs are specific areas in state waters that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- a. Areas that are environmentally sensitive or contain unique or sensitive species or biological communities that must be conserved and warrant protective measures [RCW 43.372.040(6)(c)].
- b. Areas with known sensitivity and where the best available science indicates the potential for offshore development to cause irreparable harm to the habitats, species, or cultural resources.
- c. Areas with features that have limited, fixed and known occurrence.
- d. Areas with inherent risk or infrastructure incompatibilities (e.g. buoys or cables).

2. ISU Designations

The following ISUs are established using current knowledge and available data developed through the MSP process.

a. Ecological ISUs

- i. Biogenic Habitats: Aquatic vegetation, corals, and sponges
- ii. Rocky Reefs
- iii. Seabird colonies: islands and rocks used for foraging and nesting by seabirds.
- iv. Pinniped haul-outs
- v. Forage fish spawning areas: intertidal areas used for spawning by herring, smelt or other forage fish.

b. Historic, Cultural and Infrastructure ISUs

- i. Historic and archaeological sites:
Structures or sites over 45 years old that are listed or eligible for listing in local, state or national preservation registers (e.g. shipwrecks or lighthouses); or
Artifacts or other material evidence of tribal or historic use or occupation (e.g. burials, village sites, or middens).
- ii. Buoys and submarine cables:
Fixed infrastructure such as navigation or monitoring buoys, fiber optic cables, electrical transmission cables, other fixed monitoring equipment in the marine

environment (e.g. hydrophones) and any associated mooring lines, anchors or other equipment.

Coastal estuaries, including Grays Harbor and Willapa Bay, are important ecological areas and are heavily used by existing uses and their associated infrastructure. They are home to critical saltwater habitats⁶ and Priority Habitats and Species,⁷ such as spawning and juvenile rearing areas, aquatic habitats (e.g. eelgrass, kelp, mudflats, and shellfish beds), state-listed or candidate species, vulnerable aggregations, and species of commercial, recreational or tribal importance. While estuaries themselves are not designated as an ISU, many ISUs occur within estuaries. Yet, the resolution and availability of current data is inadequate to aid in detailed siting within estuaries. Therefore, a more detailed and finer-scaled analysis for proposed projects will be required to “provide special protection to the marine life and resources of the estuaries and to ensure all reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize impacts to the habitats, species, and uses in estuaries” (RCW 43.143.030(2)(d) and RCW 43.143.030(2)(e)).

The state has developed maps of ISUs using the best available data at the time of this Plan (see Appendix A: Maps 59-74). These maps are intended to assist applicants in identifying where ISUs exist. However, ISU protection standards will apply to any ISU, wherever it is identified in state waters. It is the responsibility of applicants to verify whether ISUs exist in their proposed project area and to demonstrate protection standards will be met. As finer resolution or updated data becomes available, the state may update the ISU maps, which may include adding, deleting or updating the distribution of an ISU.

Additional buffers may be appropriate to protect ISU resources from adverse effects. Project developers shall consult with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife on recommended buffers for Ecological ISUs associated with their proposed project prior to filing application materials with local or state agencies. Project developers shall consult with the Washington Department of Archaeological and Historical Preservation and tribal preservation officers on further identification and protection of cultural or historical artifacts.

3. ISU Protection Standards and Enforceable Policies

Once the state designates an ISU under this Marine Spatial Plan (RCW 43.372.040(6)(c)), state agencies and local governments must apply the following ISU adverse effects and protection standards in their decisions for new ocean use developments to the greatest extent possible.

a. Protection Standard for ISUs

An applicant for proposed new ocean uses involving offshore development, as defined in the Shoreline Management Act ([RCW 90.58.030\(3\)\(a\)](#)), must demonstrate that the project will have no adverse effects on an ISU located at the project site and to off-site ISUs potentially affected by the project.

An applicant may overcome the ISU protection standard, using site-specific surveys, scientific data and analysis, which demonstrate either:

⁶ “Critical Saltwater Habitat” is defined in Shoreline Management Regulations at: WAC 173-26-221(2)(c)(iii)(C).

⁷ Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife identifies and maintains information about “Priority Habitats and Species”, more information at: <http://wdfw.wa.gov/conservation/phs/>.

- i. The current ISU maps do not accurately characterize the resource or use or the project area (mapped or not mapped) do not contain an ISU resource or use; or
- ii. The weight of scientific evidence clearly indicates that the project will cause no adverse effects to the resources of the ISU.

b. Adverse effects standards for Ecological ISUs:

Adverse effects for ecological ISUs is defined as either:

- i. Degradation of ecosystem function and integrity, including, but not limited to, direct habitat damage, burial of habitat, habitat erosion, and reduction in biological diversity.
- ii. Degradation of living marine organisms, including, but not limited to, abundance, individual growth, density, species diversity, and species behavior.

c. Adverse effects standards for historic, cultural or fixed infrastructure ISUs:

Adverse effects for historic, cultural or infrastructure resources ISUs is defined as any of the following:

- i. Direct impact by dredging, drilling, dumping, or filling.
- ii. Alteration, destruction or defacement of historic, archaeological or cultural artifacts.
- iii. Direct impacts from placement or maintenance of new, temporary or permanent structures in areas with existing infrastructure or historic, archaeological or cultural artifacts.

4.6.3 Fisheries Use Protection Standards

The marine spatial planning law requires: “Any provision of the marine management plan that does not have as its primary purpose the management of commercial or recreational fishing but that has an impact on this fishing must minimize the negative impacts on the fishing.” ([RCW 43.372.040\(8\)](#)). To accomplish this, the plan sets forth a requirement for consulting with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and individuals participating in affected commercial and recreational fisheries to identify a proposed project’s potential adverse effects to fisheries and opportunities to avoid, reduce or minimize impacts (See section 4.2.1.4). The plan also establishes additional protection standards for fisheries that align with this requirement to minimize impacts on fisheries and with other existing state requirements to protect fisheries (RCW 43.143.030(2)). Applicants must also consult with each of the coastal tribes to understand the proposed project’s potential adverse effects to tribal uses, including fishing (RCW 43.372.040(2)(a)).

a. Protection Standards for Fisheries

Applicants for proposed new ocean uses involving offshore development, as defined in the Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58.030(3)(a)), must demonstrate their project meets the following standards to protect fisheries located at the project site and nearby from adverse effects, including:

- i. There are no likely long-term significant adverse effects to fisheries. (RCW 43.143.030(2)(c))
- ii. All reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize social and economic impacts to fishing. (RCW 43.143.030(2)(e))

In addition to consulting with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and individuals participating in affected commercial and recreational fisheries, the following must be considered in determining the possible adverse effects on commercial and recreational fisheries and whether all reasonable steps have been taken to avoid and minimize adverse effects to fisheries. The following considerations are applicable to all proposals for new ocean use developments, in all use areas, unless otherwise noted, and will assist agencies in assessing compliance with (i) and (ii) above.

- Avoid adverse social and economic impacts to fishing through proposed project location, design, construction, and operation, such as avoiding heavily used fishing areas. Where adverse impacts to fishing cannot be reasonably avoided, demonstrate how project has minimized impacts.
- Minimize the number of and size of anchors. Space structures for greater compatibility with existing uses and bury cables in the seafloor and through the shoreline. [WCMAC 1.2.10]
- Minimize risk of entangling fishing gear from new structures installed in the seafloor or placed in the water.
- Minimize the displacement of fishers from traditional fishing areas, and the related impact on the travel distance, routing and navigation safety in order to fish in alternative areas.
- Minimize the compression of fishing effort caused by the reduction in the areas normally accessible to fishers.
- Minimize the economic impact resulting from the reduction in area available for commercial and recreational fishing for the effected sectors and ports.
- Limit the number and size of projects that are located in an area to minimize the impact on a particular port, sector, or fishery.
- Consider the distribution of projects and their cumulative effects.
- Other reasonable and relevant considerations as determined by the fisheries consultation process and specifics of the proposed project.

b. Definition of Adverse Effect for Fisheries:

Adverse effects can be direct, indirect or cumulative. Adverse effects for commercial or recreational fisheries is defined as any of the following:

- i. A significant reduction in the access of commercial or recreational fisheries to the resource used by any fishery or a fishing community(s).
- ii. A significant increase in the risk to entangle fishing gear.
- iii. A significant reduction in navigation safety for commercial and recreational fisheries.
- iv. Environmental harm that significantly reduces quality or quantity of marine resources available for harvest.

Appendix F. References

This publication is part of a significant agency action under RCW 34.05.272 (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/publications/supportingliterature.html>). To meet the law, the sources of information used to support this action are identified. The required 11 types of sources are listed below by number. Each reference is followed by a bracketed number which indicates the source. Reference lists are provided throughout the Marine Spatial Plan, at the end of each chapter and, for Chapter 2, at the end of each section.

1. Peer review is overseen by an independent third party.
2. Review is by staff internal to Department of Ecology.
3. Review is by persons that are external to and selected by the Department of Ecology.
4. Documented open public review process that is not limited to invited organizations or individuals.
5. Federal and state statutes.
6. Court and hearings board decisions.
7. Federal and state administrative rules and regulations
8. Policy and regulatory documents adopted by local governments.
9. Data from primary research, monitoring activities, or other sources, but that has not been incorporated as part of documents reviewed under other processes.
10. Records of best professional judgment of Department of Ecology employees or other individuals.
11. Sources of information that do not fit into one of the other categories listed.

Examples:

Adamus P.R., L.T. Stockwell, E.J. Clarain, M.E. Morrow, L.P. Rozas, and R.D. Smith. 1991. Wetland Evaluation Technique (WET); Volume I: Literature Review and Evaluation Rationale. Technical Report WRP-DE-2, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg MS. [Source type 4]

Adamus, P., J. Morlan, and K. Verble. 2010. Manual for the Oregon Rapid Wetland Assessment Protocol (ORWAP). Version 2.0.2. Oregon Dept. of State Lands, Salem, OR. [Source type 4]

Aravena, R. M.L. Evans, and J.A. Cherry. 1993. Stable isotopes of oxygen and nitrogen in source identification of nitrate from septic systems. *Ground Water* 31:180-186. [Source type 1]

Asplund, T.R. 2000. The Effects of Motorized Watercraft on Aquatic Ecosystems Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources PUBL-SS-948-00. [Source type 9]