

## Appendix A: Scoping Documents

---



## **Notice of Scoping Letter**





## Department of Energy

Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, Colorado 80401-3393

April 27, 2010

**TO:** Distribution List

**SUBJECT:** Notice of Scoping – Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center/Oregon State University  
Mobile Ocean Energy Test Berth Project  
Newport, Oregon

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is proposing to provide funding to the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC)/Oregon State University (OSU), in Corvallis, Oregon for their proposed project to construct and operate a wave energy test facility, known as the "Mobile Ocean Test Berth" (MOTB). Pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), and DOE's implementing procedures for compliance with NEPA (10 CFR Part 1021), DOE is preparing a draft Environmental Assessment (EA) to:

- Identify any adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided should this proposed action be implemented.
- Evaluate viable alternatives to the proposed action, including a no action alternative.
- Describe the relationship between local short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity.
- Characterize any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources that would be involved should this proposed action be implemented.

### **Project Location and Proposed Action**

NNMREC/OSU has proposed to construct, deploy, and operate up to two MOTBs off the Oregon coast, approximately 2.0 miles off the coast of the city of Newport, Oregon. Each MOTB would be connected to a Wave Energy Conversion (WEC) device under test. An Underwater Sub-station Pod (USP) may also be included in the overall design and would serve to connect the



MOTB/WEC Devices. The MOTBs, WEC devices, and USP are referred to as the “proposed project.”

The MOTBs would be operated within a one square-mile section of the Project Area shown in Figure 1. The Project Area would consist of a six square mile area, measuring 2 miles from east to west and 3 miles from north to south<sup>1</sup>. The MOTBs would serve as an integrated, standardized test facility for U.S. and international developers of wave energy, provide the critical infrastructure required to test and validate WEC devices, and allow developers to demonstrate the commercial viability of their technology. The MOTBs would provide WEC device developers with a resource to perform ocean testing of subscale and full-scale devices. The MOTBs would not be connected to the electrical grid on land, but instead would dissipate the energy generated by the testing of WEC devices through resistor load banks.

Each MOTB consists of a Power Analysis/Data Acquisition (PADA) device and an Adjustable Load Bank (ALB) contained on a standalone vessel on the order of 30- to 40-foot long. The MOTB hull design is based on the evaluation and analysis of ABS-approved materials and shapes. The design uses a composite hull with a boat shape, similar to the proven Navy Oceanographic Meteorological Automatic Device (NOMAD) style buoy used in the United States and Canada. The mooring system for each MOTB would consist of up to three anchors. The anchors would be either standard Danforth anchors or dead-weight anchors.

The PADA measures the WEC device’s output voltage and current with respect to time at high sampling rates. The ALB dissipates the power generated from the WEC device. The NEPA analysis will also consider the use of an USP which would enable the power take-off cables from multiple test berth modules or WEC devices to be connected, and would enable the power to be delivered back to shore via a single subsea cable in future applications. The USP would either sit on the ocean bottom or float on the surface, depending on design specifics.

A variety of WEC devices could be tested with the MOTBs, but designs currently contemplated for testing fall into the general category of “point absorbers” or “oscillating water column” devices that can operate in the range of 150 feet of water.” Each WEC device to be tested would include the device itself and a mooring system consisting of up to three anchors of variable configuration.

---

<sup>1</sup> GPS coordinates for the corners of the Project area: NW = 44.697764, 124.148319; NE = 44.699034, 124.108056; SW = 44.65403, 124.145677; SE = 44.655299, 124.105439.

To support the MOTBs, associated monitoring equipment would also be deployed. This equipment may include Acoustic Wave and Current Profilers (AWAC), Acoustic Doppler Current Profilers (ADCP), Waveriders, acoustic hydrophones, plankton collection plates, water quality monitoring devices (dissolved oxygen, temperature, salinity, etc.), fish tag receivers, electromagnetic frequency monitoring equipment, etc.

The MOTBs and future Underwater Sub-station Pod would be designed for a maximum uninterrupted service life of 12 months.

### **Development of a Reasonable Range of Alternatives**

DOE is required to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed action during the environmental review. The definition of alternatives is governed by the “rule of reason.” An EA must consider a reasonable range of options that could accomplish the agency’s purpose and need and reduce environmental effects.

The proposed action consists of DOE’s decision to provide funding for the proposed project. NNMREC/OSU would reduce environmental effects through “applicant committed measures” incorporated into the proposed action. The no action alternative will also be addressed.

### **Probable Environmental Effects/Issues Scoped for the Environmental Analysis (EA)**

The EA will address direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed action, as well as the no action alternative. The EA will describe the potentially affected environment and the impacts that may result to:

- Air Quality/Meteorology
- Biological Resources
  - Benthic Habitat
  - Marine Vegetation and Algae
  - Plankton
  - Invertebrates
  - Fish and Reptiles
  - Marine Mammals
  - Birds
  - State Special-Status Aquatic Species
  - Threatened and Endangered Species

- Essential Fish Habitat.
- Water Resources
  - Water Quality
  - Wave Characteristics
  - Wind and Current
- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Marine Navigation
- Noise and Vibration
- Socioeconomics
- Recreational Resources

### **Public Scoping**

This letter will be available to all interested state, local, and federal agencies to supply input on issues to be discussed in the EA. Agencies should identify the issues, within their statutory responsibilities, that should be considered in the EA. The general public and Native American Tribes are also invited to submit comments on the scope of the EA. As part of the process related to determining the scope of issues related to the Proposed Action, we request your comments or other information by May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2010. Please send your comments to:

**Department of Energy  
Golden Field Office  
c/o Laura Margason  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, CO 80401**

Or via email to: [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov)

### **Public Scoping Meeting**

DOE also invites all interested state, local, and federal agencies, Native American Tribes, and the general public to participate in a public scoping meeting to learn more about the project and provide comments. This meeting will be held in the **Hennings Auditorium at Hatfield Marine Science Center from 6:30pm - 8:30pm on Wednesday, May 5th at 2030 SE Marine Science Dr. Newport, OR 97365.**

This letter and the draft EA, when available, will be posted to the Golden Field Office electronic reading room for further reference:

[http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/reading\\_room.aspx](http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/reading_room.aspx).

Thank you for your participation in the NEPA process.

Sincerely,


A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'S. Blazek', with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Steve Blazek  
NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachments:

Figure 1: Mobile Ocean Test Berth Project Area

Figure 1 – Mobile Ocean Test Berth Project Area



## Public Notices





## NOTICE OF SCOPING

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is requesting public input on the scope of environmental issues and alternatives to be addressed in the:

**Environmental Assessment  
Mobile Ocean Energy Test Berth Project  
Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center/OSU  
Newport, Oregon**

Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center at Oregon State University is proposing to use funding from DOE to construct and operate a wave energy test facility, known as the "Mobile Ocean Test Berth". An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared by DOE pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The notice of scoping, description of the proposed project is available for review at the DOE Electronic Public Reading Room at

[http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading\\_Room.aspx](http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading_Room.aspx).

A public scoping meeting will be held on May 5, 2010 at Hennings Auditorium at Hatfield Marine Science Center from 6:30pm - 8:30pm located at 2030 SE Marine Science Dr Newport, OR 97365.

Public comments on the NEPA process, proposed action and alternatives, and environmental issues will be accepted until **May 28, 2010**. Please send comments to Laura Margason, Department of Energy's Golden Field Office, 1617 Cole Blvd, Golden, CO 80401 or by email to [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov).

## PUBLIC NOTICES

CLASSIFICATION 8

### Public Notices 8

#### METRO METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION

1:00 pm, Tues. May 4, 2010

#### METRO COUNCIL MEETING

5:00 pm, Thurs. May 6, 2010

Meetings are in the council chamber at Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Ave., Portland, unless otherwise noted. Please view agendas online at: [www.oregonmetro.gov](http://www.oregonmetro.gov).

You're invited at 6 p.m. the first Wed. of each month to the Metro Committee for Citizen Involvement. Information: 503-797-1539

**CLASSIFIED ADS  
GET RESULTS! 503-221-8000**

### Public Notices 8

**REQUEST FOR COMMENTS**  
A 120-foot FCC licensed wireless communication tower is to be constructed at 2660 NW Division St., Gresham, Oregon. The FCC is seeking public comment on the proposed project as part of the review process by the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office. Please respond within 30 days of this publication to: Adept Engineering Inc., 10725 SW Barbur Blvd., Suite 350, Portland, OR 97219 Attn: Bella Vista

**PUBLIC STORAGE AUCTION  
PORTLAND SELF STORAGE**  
5803 SE 122nd St, 503-761-2843  
May 7, 2010 at 11:30am  
#4072 Mary Couch

★  
**THINKING OF SELLING  
YOUR COMPUTER?  
GIVE US A CALL!**

The Oregonian 'Classifieds'

In the Portland area  
call 503-221-8000.  
Toll free in Oregon  
1-800-221-4488  
In Vancouver call 896-5710

### NOTICE OF SCOPING

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is requesting public input on the scope of environmental issues and alternatives to be addressed in the:

**Environmental Assessment Mobile Ocean  
Energy Test Berth Project, Northwest National  
Marine Renewable Energy Center/OSU Newport, Oregon.**

The Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center at Oregon State University is proposing to use funding from DOE to construct and operate a wave energy test facility, known as the "Mobile Ocean Test Berth". An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared by DOE pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The notice of scoping, description of the proposed project is available for review at the DOE Electronic Public Reading Room at: [http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading\\_Room.aspx](http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading_Room.aspx).

A public scoping meeting will be held on May 5, 2010 at Hennings Auditorium at Hatfield Marine Science Center from 6:30pm - 8:30pm located at 2030 SE Marine Science Dr Newport, OR 97365.

The purpose of the meeting is to: 1) Inform the public about the project, 2) provide an overview of the DOE NEPA process, and 3) obtain feedback on what impacts should be considered by the NEPA process for the project.

Public comments on the NEPA process, proposed action and alternatives, and environmental issues will be accepted until May 28, 2010. Please send comments to:

Laura Margason, Department of Energy's Golden Field Office,  
1617 Cole Blvd, Golden, CO 80401  
or by email to [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov).

# PUBLIC NOTICES

**LEGAL DEADLINES:**  
**WEDNESDAY EDITION: 5:00pm**  
**Thursday**  
**FRIDAY EDITION: 12:00pm**  
**Tuesday**

### NOTICE

Siletz Fire Protection District is selling the following surplus vehicles by sealed bid with no minimum bid required. Bids must be received by Friday, May 7, 2010 to the Siletz Fire Protection District, P.O. Box 380, Siletz, OR 97380, or delivered to the fire station in Siletz by 4:00 pm that day. The bid must include your name, address, phone number and what truck you are bidding on. Bids must be in a sealed envelope with which vehicle the bid is for on the outside of the envelope. Separate bids must be made for each vehicle. Payment must be made in full with possession of vehicle. If the highest bidder does not claim the vehicle within 10 days (May 20, 2010), then the second highest bidder will be contacted, and on down until the vehicle is sold. Bids will be opened at the Fire Department Board of Directors meeting on Monday, May 10, 2010 at 7:30 pm. All bidders are welcome to attend. 1994 Chevrolet Suburban 1500: It does not run, has good tires and new brakes, sold "AS IS." 1981 Ford 750 diesel truck with 1800 gallon steel water tank plumbed for pump. Pump is NOT included, new batteries, sold "AS IS." 1979 Ford C8000 diesel fire truck: Truck runs, pump does not work. 750 gallon steel water tank, tires have less than 500 miles on them, new batteries, sold "AS IS." The Siletz Fire Protection District reserves the right to reject any and all bids. A-28, 30, M-5, 7 (95-07)

### NOTICE OF SCOPING

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is requesting public input on the scope of environmental issues and alternatives to be addressed in the Environmental Assessment Mobile Ocean Energy Test Berth Project, Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center/OSU Newport, Oregon. The Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center at Oregon State University is proposing to use funding from DOE to

construct and operate a wave energy test facility, known as the "Mobile Ocean Test Berth". An Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared by DOE pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The notice of scoping, description of the proposed project is available for review at the DOE Electronic Public Reading Room at: [www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading\\_Room.aspx](http://www.eere.energy.gov/golden/Reading_Room.aspx). A public scoping meeting will be held on May 5, 2010 at Hennings Auditorium at Hatfield Marine Science Center from 6:30pm - 8:30pm located at 2030 SE Marine Science Dr Newport, OR 97365. The purpose of the meeting is to: 1) inform the public about the project, 2) provide an overview of the DOE NEPA process, and 3) obtain feedback on what impacts should be considered by the NEPA process for the project. Public comments on the NEPA process, proposed action and alternatives, and environmental issues will be accepted until May 28, 2010. Please send comments to Laura Margason, Department of Energy's Golden Field Office, 1617 Cole Blvd, Golden, CO 80401 or by email to [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov). A-30, M-5 (17-05)

### NOTICE OF BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING

A public meeting of the Budget Committee of the Linn Benton Lincoln ESD, Linn County, State of Oregon, to discuss the fiscal year July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011, will be held at 905 4th Avenue SE Albany, Oregon. The meeting will take place on the 12th day of May, 2010 at 6:00 P.M. The purpose of the meeting is to receive the budget message and to receive comment from the public on the budget. A copy of the budget document may be inspected or obtained on or after May 12, 2010 at 905 4th Avenue SE, Albany, Oregon 97321, between the hours of 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. This is a public meeting where deliberation of the budget committee will take place. Any person may appear at the meeting and discuss the proposed programs with the Budget Committee. A-16, M-5 (65-05)

### CITY OF TOLEDO NOTICE OF BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING

A public meeting of the Budget Committee of the

City of Toledo, Lincoln County, State of Oregon, to discuss the budget for the fiscal year July 1, 2010, to June 30, 2011, including the expenditure of State revenue sharing funds, will be held at Toledo City Hall Council Chambers, 206 N. Main Street. The meeting will take place on Monday, May 17h, 2010, at 5:30 p.m. The purpose of the meeting is to receive the budget message and to receive comment from the public on the budget. A copy of the budget document may be inspected or obtained on or after May 11th at City Hall, between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. This is a public meeting where deliberation of the Budget Committee will take place. Any person may appear at the meeting and discuss the proposed programs with the Budget Committee. The Toledo City Hall Council Chambers is handicapped accessible. Please contact the City Recorder if you will need other assistance. /s/ Michelle Amberg, Budget Officer. PUBLISH: NEWS-TIMES, April 23rd & May 5th, 2010 (93-05)

### TRUSTEE'S NOTICE OF SALE

Loan No.: 1117010556  
 T.S. No.: 7100378  
 Reference is made to that certain deed made by Jeffery D. McNelly and Diana K. Thomas, not as tenants in common, but with the Right of Survivorship as Grantor to Pacific Northwest Company of Oregon, Inc., as Trustee, in favor of Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. as Beneficiary, dated 12/13/2006, recorded 12/19/2006, in the official records of Lincoln County, Oregon in book/reel/volume No. xx at page No. xx, fee/instrument/microfilm/reception No. 200619173 covering the following described real property situated in said County and State, to wit: Real property in the County of Lincoln, State of Oregon, described as follows: That portion of the Northeast 1/4 of the Northwest 1/4 of Section 33, Township 6 South, Range 10 West, Willamette Meridian, in Lincoln County, Oregon, described as follows: Beginning 460 feet West of the Southeast corner of the Northeast quarter of the Northwest quarter in Section 33 above described; thence North 660 feet; thence West 330 feet; thence South 660 feet; thence East 330 feet to the point of



## Scoping Responses





# United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office  
2600 SE 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 100  
Portland, Oregon 97266  
Phone: (503) 231-6179 FAX: (503) 231-6195

Reply To: 7971.0081  
File Name: OSU Wave Energy Test Project  
TAILS: 13420-2010-CPA-0112  
TS Number: 10-940  
DOC Type: Comment

**MAY 27 2010**

Laura Margason  
Department of Energy  
Golden Field Office  
1607 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, CO 80401

**Subject:** Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office comments on Notice of Scoping for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy/Oregon State University Mobile Ocean Energy Test Berth Project

The Fish and Wildlife Service's Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office (OFWO) has reviewed the Department of Energy's (DOE) April 27, 2010 "Notice of Scoping for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy/Oregon State University Mobile Ocean Energy Test Berth Project" regarding the proposal to provide funding to the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy (NNMREC)/Oregon State University (OSU) in Corvallis, Oregon for their proposed project to operate a wave energy test facility, known as the "Mobile Ocean Energy Test Berth" (MOTB).

We submit the following comments and recommendations under the authority of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended (MBTA; 16 U.S.C. § 703), the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA; 16 U.S.C. § 1531 *et seq.*), the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401), as amended (16 U.S.C. § 661 *et seq.*), and the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. § 791a, *et seq.*).

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS

### **Project Description**

NNMREC/OSU has proposed to construct, deploy and operate up to two MOTBs, approximately 2.0 miles off of the coast near the city of Newport, OR. Each MOTB consists of a Power Analysis/Data Acquisition device and an Adjustable Load Bank contained on a stand alone vessel approximately 30 to 40 feet long, along with associated monitoring equipment. Each MOTB would be connected to a Wave Energy Conversion (WEC) device under test, and both the MOTB and the WEC would be independently moored to the ocean floor by up to three

Printed on 100 percent chlorine free/60 percent post-consumer content paper.



anchors. An underwater substation pod (USP) may also be included in the project and would connect multiple MOTB/WEC sets with each other. This pod would either sit on the ocean bottom or float on the surface, depending on design specifics. A variety of WEC devices could be tested with the MOTBs. The MOTBs and USP would be designed for a maximum uninterrupted service life of 12 months.

### **Fish and Wildlife Resources**

As part of the environmental analysis required for this process, we encourage the DOE to consider the effects of this project on several fish and wildlife resources of special interest to the OFWO. Species to consider include (but are not limited to) the ESA listed marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphys marmoratus*) and short-tailed albatross (*Phoebastria (=Diomedea) albatrus*), as well as the recently delisted brown pelican (*Pelicanus occidentalis*) and northern bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*). Potential adverse impacts and concerns from development and operation of wave energy test facilities include, but are not limited to, wildlife entrapment or direct mortality, and disruption or impairment of essential behavior patterns.

### **Recommendations**

1. Marbled murrelet, a threatened species, nest in older forests near the ocean off the California, Oregon, and Washington coasts. Murrelets are currently in decline. Murrelets forage just offshore in the water column, and depend on these foraging sites year round. Much is still not known about their feeding behavior although it is thought they forage in exclusive areas in proximity to their nest sites during the nesting season ([www.reo.gov/monitoring/10yr-report/marbled-murrelet/final-report.html](http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/10yr-report/marbled-murrelet/final-report.html)). Wave energy MOTB construction and operation needs to insure that foraging areas for this species are not disrupted and direct mortality is avoided.

Note: If the DOE, based on a Biological Assessment or evaluation, determines that the marbled murrelet or any other threatened and endangered species and/or critical habitat may be affected by activities authorized by the requested preliminary permit, we recommend that the DOE consult with the OFWO following the requirements of 50 CFR 402 which implements the ESA.

2. The Fish and Wildlife Service administers the rocks, reefs and islands along the Oregon coast, including those in Lincoln County, as part of Oregon Islands National Wildlife Refuges and Wilderness. Project design, construction and operation should incorporate measures that prevent direct impacts to the Refuge and indirect impacts (disturbance) to the seabird and pinniped populations using the Refuge. The most effective avoidance measure for any project of this type is to maintain maximal distance away from any rocks, reefs, and islands.
3. Oregon's near shore (Territorial Sea) waters serve as a foraging area for migratory seabirds that nest on the Refuge. In addition, these waters also serve as a major migration corridor for millions of seabirds, waterfowl, shorebirds and waterbirds annually. Much of this migration occurs at low altitude, just above the surface of the sea, therefore, wave energy MOTBs design, construction, and operation needs to insure that migration routes


are not disrupted and direct mortality (collision with above water surface project features) is minimized.

4. The gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*) is a coastal whale that may also frequent the coastline of Lincoln County. Gray whale pods and individuals may be seen off the Oregon coast at any time. The gray whale feeds in shallow water near shore during summer and fall, migrates in deeper water to the south for breeding and calving during the winter, and migrates north in the spring. Southbound pods pass the Oregon coast from December through early February. Northbound pods pass in late February through early June. Wave energy MOTB design, construction and operation needs to insure that gray whale migration routes and feeding areas are not disrupted.

#### SUMMARY COMMENTS

While the OFWO is supportive of the testing and development of environmentally-sound, alternative energy technologies, the aforementioned environmental issues should be addressed during the NEPA process to prevent unnecessary delays in this test project. If you have any questions regarding these comments please contact Ann Gray or Doug Young of my staff at 503-231-6179.

Sincerely,



Paul Henson, PhD  
for State Supervisor

cc:

Mead, USFWS

Sleeger, DOI

Enright, ODOE



May 28, 2010

Department of Energy  
Golden Field Office  
C/o Laura Margason  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, CO 80401

Re: Comments on Department of Energy's Scoping of the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center/Oregon State University Proposed "Mobile Ocean Test Berth" Wave Energy Test Facility

Dear Ms. Margason,

Pursuant to 18 CFR 5.4(d)(2)(iv), the Oregon Chapters of the Surfrider Foundation (Surfrider) submit these comments on the proposed "Mobile Ocean Test Berth" Wave Energy Test Facility (Mobile Ocean Test Berth or MOTB). Surfrider appreciates the interest of the Department of Energy (DoE) and the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center/Oregon State University (NNMREC/OSU) in substantively addressing potential environmental, recreational, and other impacts of the proposed MOTB. Listed below are Surfrider's comments regarding: 1) the proposed size and location of the MOTB, 2) the MOTB's environmental impacts, such as electromagnetic field generation, marine mammal entanglement, and habitat disturbance, 3) DoE and NNMREC/OSU's recognition of Oregon's coastal recreational community and interests as stakeholders, and 4) its support of incorporating and employing adaptive management and robust in-situ monitoring throughout the process.

Comment One: The Proposed Size and Location of the MOTB and its potential affect on wave dynamics:

The proposed MOTB will be located in the State's territorial waters, within the three nautical mile jurisdictional boundary, bordering the federal jurisdictional waters. The project elements sit directly in the Pacific Ocean, adjacent to an area with a number of high quality surf breaks that attract a large number of year-round recreational uses. The area's characteristics are attributable to the unique coastal topography, prevailing wind direction, currents, and resulting sand accretions. Every effort should be made to anticipate and consider the effects of the MOTB on these characteristics and the environmental factors that create and perpetuate them. Additionally, every effort should be made to preserve the area's value as a coastal recreation destination.

Even very minute alterations in substrate composition and character can have dramatic effects on wave characteristics. The proposed MOTB's impact, even if limited through careful site selection and mitigation, could result in permanent dramatic effects on the site's unique wave character and the recreational resource it

represents. Therefore, Surfrider requests that the particular location, configuration, and substrate characteristics and movement, which contribute to the proposed site's unique characteristics be given due consideration with non-consumptive coastal recreation in mind. Please do not give short shrift to the complex confluence of environmental conditions that make the proposed project site such a unique recreational resource for the region's surfing community.

Surfrider has determined that wave height reduction associated with hydrokinetic energy development and generation correlates with a project's reduced distance from the shoreline. Surfrider requests the project proponents give the myriad aspects making up the site's unique wave character great consideration, and study the proposed projects likely effects on wave quality. Moreover, Surfrider requests that all available measures be implemented to minimize sand substrate disturbance and wave energy attenuation to preserve the area's recreational resource in its current condition and quality.

Comment Two: The MOTB May Impact the Near-Shore Environment Through Electromagnetic Field Generation, Migration Corridor Overlap or Interference, and Substrate and Habitat Disturbance and Disruption:

The MOTB will likely affect the proposed project area's fish, crustacean, marine mammal, and other marine biotic resources through electromagnetic field generation, migration corridor overlap and interference, and habitat disturbance.

Hydrokinetic wave energy generation is known to emit electromagnetic fields (EMFs). Surfrider believes that shark behavioral response to these EMFs, and other wave energy operations, is an important public safety issue. Sharks detect and are adapted to respond to electric fields at low frequencies. They can detect a millivolt (1/1000 of a volt) at distances of up to 100 meters under water. Skate, ray, and shark species with heightened sensitivity to EMF may be located in or near the area affected by the proposed project. The Oregon coast provides habitat for as many as fifteen shark species, many of which commonly occupy near-shore areas. Past studies and anecdotal evidence indicate that aggressive shark species can be expected to be present in the vicinity of the project at various times of the year depending on the species' mating and migration patterns and environmental conditions. For example, Great White Sharks have been documented close to shore off the central Oregon coast. How these sharks may respond to EMF generated by a development like the MOTB is as-yet a largely unanswered question. There is a dearth of clear evidence indicating whether sharks will acclimate to, be attracted by, or be repulsed by EMF. While magnetic frequency ranges of wave and tidal energy technology may be outside the range of shark sensitivity, more research is required to assess behavioral impacts of EMFs on sharks and potential risks to surfers, swimmers, divers, windsurfers, and other in-the-water coastal recreationalists. Thus, DoE and NNMREC/OSU should consider generation of abnormal EMFs prior to implementation of the MOTB.

Also, as many as eleven cetacean species are known to navigate by echolocation in, through, or near the area affected by the proposed project. Of these species, gray whales and harbor porpoises are most likely to be found in the closest proximity to the project area. In addition to considering the effects of EMFs on these species, DoE and NNMREC/OSU should consider risks posed to whale migration from entanglement and/or collision into the MOTB mooring and transmission infrastructure.

Surfrider requests that DoE and NNMREC/OSU consider and incorporate all relevant studies of both EMF and entanglement risks to sharks, whales and other species, preferably from comparable study areas, into the MOTB development process. This should include assessments of the impacts posed by comparably moored projects beyond hydrokinetic developments.

Similarly, DoE and NNMREC/OSU should consider the effect of the MOTB's mooring equipment on other benthic species, and the environmental impacts of any proposed measures to keep the MOTB and its infrastructure free of accumulated biotic growth or debris.

Additionally, pre-development assessments should not preclude careful research and monitoring throughout the development and operation lifecycles of the MOTB. The weight of evidence regarding ecological safety is limited with respect to sharks, whales, and other local and migratory marine species. Wave energy is a nascent technology. Using existing limited data sets to speculate on the likelihood of potential impacts over time sets poor precedent for large-scale testing and development of renewable ocean energy. The Hawaii and Cape Wind assessments are helpful but certainly not exhaustive or comprehensive on this topic.

The recent Collaborative Offshore Wind Research into the Environment (COWRIE) reports include more extensive literature reviews and compilations regarding the effects of EMF. COWRIE asserts that a greater understanding of the environmental impact of EMF emissions is urgently required for offshore wind development, owing to the lack of current knowledge. COWRIE has identified a broad set of studies to investigate the potential effects of EMF. Surfrider recommends the project proponents consider and incorporate these studies.

Considering the variety of technologies likely to be used in association with the MOTB, Surfrider recommends that DoE and NNMREC/OSU consider monitoring and further quantification of frequencies and field levels of EMF as a necessary component of any permitting conditions for the proposed project. DoE and NNMREC/OSU should be required to focus research to monitor for attraction and other changes in faunal behavior. Fauna should not be limited to sharks. The NEPA process should give due consideration to impacts on other species similarly likely to be affected by EMF through identification of species of concern and development of a scientifically sound monitoring plan to assess impacts.

Surfrider recommends that the MOTB development and implementation process incorporate regular monitoring of the condition of the permanent infrastructure as well as any turbines, generators, and undersea cable, including ongoing monitoring of all elements for EMF. Such monitoring should include adaptive management mechanisms, such as triggers for corrective actions. Consideration should be given to any and all conditions under which the MOTB or its components could fail. Development conditions should establish contingencies for unexpected results or outcomes with respect to EMF and undersea cable. Careful consideration should be given to the COWRIE studies on EMF in developing monitoring and research programs for the MOTB. Draft monitoring and research plans should be available for public review throughout the process. Similarly, straightforward public access to monitoring results, such as through a project website, should be readily available.

**Comment Three: Recognize and Involve Oregon's Coastal Recreation Community and Interests as Stakeholders and Thoroughly Consider Impacts On and To Them:**

DoE's May 5<sup>th</sup> Community Scoping Meeting presentation mentioned DoE and NNMREC/OSU's intent to consider impacts to Oregon's coastal recreational community, as well as Oregon's coastal cultural and socioeconomic resources. Surfrider recommends that DoE and NNMREC/OSU take additional steps to actively involve Oregon's coastal recreational community as stakeholders and partners in the development of the MOTB. DoE and NNMREC/OSU should look to past efforts regarding licensing and permitting of wave energy development off of Coos Bay and Reedsport for resource materials and stakeholder analyses to supplement its own analysis. The Coos Bay Notice of Intent/Pre-Application Document (NOI/PAD) for the FERC Project No. 12749, the Coos Bay Ocean Power Technology (OPT) Wave Park, filed with FERC by the Oregon Wave Energy Partners I, LLC (OWEP) on March 7, 2008 provides an example of such analysis. Specifically, the Coos Bay NOI/PAD mentions the private developer's intent to implement an adaptive management plan for the Coos Bay OPT Wave Park. As with the similar Reedsport project, continued work with previously identified and engaged stakeholders will better facilitate identification of the DoE/NNMREC/OSU MOTB's potential impacts and alternatives.

Surfrider hopes that any forthcoming EA will give sufficiently thorough treatment to surfing and other near-shore water-based non-consumptive recreational pursuits, and adequately consider impacts thereon. Notably, while surfing does commonly occur near headlands, jetties, and the like, it is not uncommon for Oregon's surfers to recreate along open stretches of coastline in the shore break or at offshore breaks. The Yaquina Head area is home to a number of high quality and heavily utilized surf breaks. Surfrider requests that DoE and NNMREC/OSU give great consideration to the region's surfers and other members of the recreational community and their wave dependent and near-shore-based-recreation uses, including, but not limited to surfing, kayaking, boogie-boarding, skim-boarding, stand-up-paddling, surf-skiing, and body surfing. Such consideration should also be supplemented and enhanced by thorough consideration of commercial and

recreational fishing and crabbing, sightseeing, and other land-based recreational uses that may be impacted by a large near-shore development of this sort.

Comment Four: Employ Adaptive Management and Robust Monitoring Through All Phases of the MOTB's Permitting, Development, Installation, Use, and Future Decommissioning:

Finally, the need to employ adaptive management throughout this process cannot be over-emphasized. This is important to ensure that new information is applied to assess needs for modification, mitigation, and/or removal as conditions change and knowledge develops. Other projects being developed on the Oregon Coast may help aid in the understanding of the challenges that may be faced when deploying wave energy devices in Oregon's Territorial Sea. An example of this would be the sinking of the Finevera Buoy off of Yaquina Head in November of 2007. Unfortunately, this buoy wasn't removed from the seafloor until the summer of 2008 because an adequate emergency response plan was not in place at the time of sinking. There is no excuse for a similar event to occur with the MOTB. Similarly, DoE and NNMREC/OSU should consider and incorporate Oregon's ongoing efforts to revise and update its Territorial Sea Plan with regard to ocean-based hydrokinetic energy development and its impacts on other uses of Oregon's Territorial Sea.

Surfrider appreciates your timely consideration of these comments, requests and recommendations. Surfrider eagerly anticipates DoE's response to the foregoing, the forthcoming EA, and continued involvement in the permitting and development of the MOTB.



FW Ocean Wave Energy Test Berth - Newport OR

-----Original Message-----

From: Yvonna Weiland [mailto:wldpt01@yahoo.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 8:17 PM

To: Margason, Laura

Subject: Ocean Wave Energy Test Berth - Newport, OR

Dear Laura:

I attended the meeting held in Newport in early May. Thank you for the time and effort involved to bring this meeting to our community.

I would ask that careful consideration be made as to the location of the Test Berth. It is my understanding that currently you are looking at a site almost directly off shore from Yaquina Head. As you know, Yaquina Head and its lighthouse is one of the most popular tourist destinations on the central Oregon coast. I am concerned that a Test Berth would interfere with the view of the magnificent horizon from the lighthouse, and might negatively impact the revenue generated by Yaquina Head itself and the local hospitality businesses.

Perhaps a location to the south of the jetty would cause less of an impact to the tourist industry in and around Newport.

Thank you.

Yvonna Weiland

P.S. Please add me to your distribution list.



# Scoping Meeting Transcript



NEPA hrg

1

2

3

4

NEPA PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

5

6

7

Energy

Northwest National Marine Renewable

8

Center/Oregon State University's

9

Installation

Mobile Ocean Test Berth Deployment and

10

Environmental Assessment

11

12

13

At

14

Hatfield Marine Science Center

15

South Beach, Oregon

16

May 5, 2010

17

6:30 PM

18

NEPA hrg

19

20

21

22

23

Lee Blackwood

24

Blackwood Court Reporting

25

PO Box 536, Newport, Oregon 97365

2

1

APPEARANCES

2

Mel eah Ashford:

Program Manager

3

Northwest National

Marine

4

Renewable Energy

Center

5

204 Rogers Hall

6

Corvallis, OR

97331-6001

7

8

Laura Margason:

NEPA Specialist

9

U. S. Department of

Energy

10

Golden Field Office

NEPA hrg

11 1617 Col e Boul evard  
12 Gol den, CO  
80401-3393  
13  
14 John P. Horst: Publ ic Affai rs  
Speci al i st  
15 U. S. Department of  
Energy  
16 Gol den Fi el d Offi ce  
17 1617 Col e Boul evard  
18 Gol den, CO  
80401-3393  
19  
20 Ti m Ramsey: Proj ect Offi cer  
21 U. S. Department of  
Energy  
22 Gol den Fi el d Offi ce  
23 1617 Col e Boul evard  
24 Gol den, CO  
80401-3393  
25

3

1 Chri stopher Moel ter: Seni or Associ ate

NEPA hrg

2  
3  
Ste. 800  
4  
5  
6 Kaety Hi l denbrand:  
Extensi on  
7  
8  
Uni versi ty  
9  
Extensi on Offi ce  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

ICF Internati onal  
317 SW Alder Street,  
Portl and, OR 97204  
Mari ne Fi sheri es  
Facul ty  
Oregon State  
Li ncol n County  
29 SE Second Street  
Newport, OR 97365

NEPA hrg

22

23

24

25

4

1

I N D E X

Page 5

2 Opening comments by Laura Margason

Page 6

3 NEPA Process Overview by Laura Margason

Page 16

4 DOE Water Power Program Overview by Tim Ramsey

Page 23

5 Proposed Project Overview by Mel eah Ashford

Page 21

6 Comments and Questions from Audience:

7

John Lavrakas

Page 35

8

Chuck Pavl i k

Page 38

9

Mi ke Donnel l an

Page 39

10

Stephen Webster

Page 40

11

John Lavrakas

NEPA hrg

Page 41	12	Dani el I e Asson
Page 43	13	Dani el I e Heston
Page 45	14	Wi I Bl ack
Page 47	15	Mi ke Donnel I an
Page 48	16	Di ck Bri m
Page 50	17	Sarah Henkel
Page 50	18	Cl osi ng comments
Page 51	19	Court Reporter' s Certi fi cate
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

NEPA hrg

2

3 LAURA MARGASON: I think we will get  
started here.

4 Welcome, everyone.

5 So I'd like to welcome everyone. This  
is a

6 Department of Energy Scoping Meeting for, umm,  
the

7 Environmental Assessment that is going to be  
conducted for

8 the Northwest National Marine Energy, umm,  
Renewable Energy

9 Center, part of OSU. And their project is the  
Mobile Ocean

10 Test Berth.

11 I want to introduce myself. My name is  
Laura

12 Margason. I'm a NEPA specialist with the  
Department of

13 Energy. I'm based at the Golden Field Office  
in Golden,

14 Colorado, and I'm going to be conducting a  
little bit of a

15 NEPA overview and some explanation about our  
process and

16 what we do.

17 I have Kaety Hildenbrand here. She is  
here to help

NEPA hrg

18 facilitate, and she is with OSU Sea Grant.

19 My coworker is here today. His name is  
Tim Ramsey.

20 He's going to get up and speak a little more  
about the

21 program and -- the Water Power Program and its  
purpose and

22 its mission.

23 We are going to have a brief question  
section right

24 after Tim's discussion where if you have any  
questions on

25 the NEPA process or the Water Program's  
mission, then that

6

1 will be an opportunity for you to ask a  
specific question

2 on the process at that point.

3 And, umm, then afterwards we will have  
Mel eah

4 Ashford. She is with the National Marine  
Renewable --

5 Northwest National Renewable Energy Center,  
just to

6 clarify. It's kind of a mouthful, so we're

NEPA hrg

going to call

7 it NNMREC from here on out. But Meleah will  
get up and

8 discuss a little bit more about NNMREC and give  
us an

9 overview of the project itself.

10 Did you have anything to add?

11 KAETY HILDENBRAND: And then we will  
open it up for

12 public comments. And a few of you did sign in  
that you

13 wanted to comment. If you change your mind  
during this

14 time, that's fine. We will start with people  
on the list,

15 and then we will ask for any more.

16 And there's also public comment forms  
inside your

17 envelope. You can either leave it here  
tonight, or the

18 address is on there if you want to mail it to  
us.

19 LAURA MARGASON: Okay. Thank you,  
Kaety.

20 I'm going to dive in now to the NEPA  
process

21 overview. This is pretty general, a very quick  
overview.

NEPA hrg

22 Some people may know more, some people may know  
very little  
23 about this process, so I thought I would just  
give us a  
24 brief overview to let you know how DOE is going  
to be  
25 conducting this process, and the purpose and  
why we are

7

1 here today.

2 So what is NEPA? For those who don't  
know, it

3 stands for the National Environmental Policy  
Act. It was

4 signed by President Nixon in 1969 and enacted  
as federal

5 law effective in early 1970. It applies to  
federal

6 agencies only. So sometimes we will get a  
state or someone

7 in a private industry asking why, you know, do  
they have to

8 do NEPA? And, really, it is no unless this is  
a federal

9 action triggering the need for NEPA. It was  
one of the

NEPA hrg

the 10 first national charters for the protection of  
11 environment.

12 And part of NEPA has a mandate that any  
13 environmental information that is collected  
during the NEPA  
14 process must be shared to any and all public  
officials and  
15 citizens prior to that NEPA decision being  
made.

16 So in order for NEPA to apply, there  
has to be some

17 type of federal action. In this case the  
Department of

18 Energy is proposing to fund the Northwest  
National Marine

19 Renewable Energy Center, NNMREC, for their  
proposed

20 project, which is to construct, deploy, and  
operate a wave

21 energy test facility which they call the Mobile  
Ocean Test

22 Berth. Funding underneath NEPA constitutes a  
federal NEPA

23 action, so that is what triggers the need for  
NEPA

24 compliance.

25 There are just some basic NEPA  
objectives. It is a

NEPA hrg

8

1        deci si on-maki ng process.  It helps the agency  
understand  
2        all the envi ronmental consequences that could  
come about  
3        based on thei r proposed action.  Umm, it helps  
i mpl ement  
4        and for the federal agencies to take actions in  
order to  
5        protect the shore and enhance the envi ronment  
in which the  
6        proposed action will take place.

7                    NEPA is supposed to focus truly on  
si gni fi cant  
8        i ssues.  This is important because a lot of  
peopl e ask, you  
9        know, why aren't you looking at this topic?  
Why aren't you  
10       looking at this topic?  It really is a concise  
and -- a  
11       concise document that wants to focus on  
si gni fi cant i ssues  
12       and potenti ally si gni fi cant impacts related to  
that  
13       proposed action, in this case the project.

14 process is there

And it's really there -- The NEPA

15 and for

to promote an agency's decision making process

16 programs.

better planning overall within that agency's

17

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: A quick question.

18

LAURA MARGASON: Yes.

19

whether

UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Who determines

20 That's kind

something is potentially significant or not?

21

of subjective.

22 subjective,

LAURA MARGASON: It is. It is very

23 specifically

and, you know, case law has helped dictate

24 with DOE's

what is deemed significant. A lot of times

25 various

decision making process we're going to rely on

9

1 significant.

agencies to help us figure out what is  
We are

2 and state

going to work with local and state -- federal

NEPA hrg

3 level agencies in order to help us understand.  
You know,  
4 we are not biologists, so we are going to work  
with them in  
5 order to have them provide expertise in what is  
signi fi cant  
6 and what isn' t.

7 We also have a third party consultant  
that has been  
8 hired to write our document. They are, you  
know, experts  
9 in their field of compiling documents,  
compiling  
10 information, and conducting analyses, but in  
the end the  
11 decision is still up to the DOE officials. But  
there is a  
12 lot that goes into making that final decision.  
Does that  
13 answer your question?

14 UNIDENTIFIED PERSON: Yes, it does.

15 LAURA MARGASON: Okay. So we will make  
the  
16 determination to do an environmental assessment  
for this  
17 project. An EA is basically an analysis of a  
potential  
18 impact that may occur from your actions on the

human and

19 the natural environment. Umm, and I'll often  
refer to it

20 as a proposed action, but in this specific  
instance we are

21 talking about the construction and deployment  
of the -- and

22 the operation of the Mobile Ocean Test Berth.

23 Umm, part of the EA describes the  
purpose and need

24 for this proposed action, and so that is a  
chapter in

25 itself; just on why we are doing it, and the  
purpose of the

10

1 project. And it's going to identify all the  
potential

2 impact and any mitigation that needs to go  
along with

3 those. So part of that is identifying any  
significant

4 impact that is applying mitigation to reduce  
those to what

5 is generally deemed less than significant.

6 We are going to look at -- Part of the  
analysis is

NEPA hrg

7 also on alternatives, so mitigation often looks  
at various  
8 alternatives that can be applied; location,  
size. It  
9 really depends on the project. But we are  
going to look at  
10 various alternatives, and kind of at the end of  
the  
11 analysis we go ahead and look at the short-term  
and  
12 long-term impacts, accumulative impacts to, you  
know, the  
13 surrounding area, and any commitments of  
resources that can  
14 result from implementing the proposed action.  
15 Most importantly, it really describes  
how the  
16 public concerns were addressed in the document.  
NEPA is a  
17 public involved, umm -- It's a process that's  
very heavy in  
18 public involvement, and so we take all --  
consider all  
19 comments and concerns, and they are  
incorporated into our  
20 analyses.  
21 So I want to make it clear to everyone,  
this is a

NEPA hrg

22 scoping meeting. And so I -- In this slide  
I've tried to

23 kind of describe what the scoping process  
really is about

24 and why we are here today.

25 Umm, public notice in general for NEPA,  
you know,

11

1 is to inform and update the public where the  
agency and

2 Department of Energy is in the EA process. It  
helps us

3 finalize the scope. The scope is all the items  
of concern

4 that we are going to look at in the EA. So we  
have a

5 general idea right now of what we are going to  
look at in

6 the EA, and we are inviting you folks today to  
help us

7 finalize that scope. Perhaps we are missing  
something, and

8 so we want to hear your concerns. This is an  
opportunity

9 to, not so much to ask questions, but to tell  
us your

NEPA hrg

10 concerns and any comments that you would like  
us to address

11 within the document and our analyses.

12 So it's big on, umm, -- This really is  
your

13 opportunity to provide some input prior to us  
doing our

14 review and our analyses and all the research  
that goes into

15 the document itself.

16 So Public Scoping. This is the first  
phase of

17 public involvement. We do have another phase.  
I'll

18 discuss that a little bit later, but this truly  
is the

19 first phase, and we're going to engage the  
public, and we

20 are going to ask for your input.

21 Umm, things that we are looking for  
from you today

22 is any input that you have or information on  
our proposed

23 action, which is the project; any alternatives  
you think we

24 should address and include in the document;  
umm, any

25 possible like mitigation measures that maybe  
should be

NEPA hrg

12

1 thought of or implemented in order to help  
reduce any  
2 potential impacts from our project. And if you  
have any  
3 data, you know, all that kind of information is  
what we are  
4 looking for today.

5 So this is what we have come up with.  
We have  
6 worked with our environmental consultant, who  
has been  
7 brought in to do the analysis and write the  
document for  
8 us. They have been working in conjunction with  
DOE, and  
9 especially OSU, and NNMREC in order to come up  
with this.

10 This is kind of our generalized outline for the  
11 Environmental Assessment. These are all the  
speci fic  
12 things that we are looking at potentially, umm,  
and  
13 analyzing, some obviously in more detail than  
others.

14  
this list for

So we are looking for you to enhance

15 us. Anything that we are missing, anything  
that you think,

16 Okay, it's on here, but, you know, you really  
think we

17 should take a closer look at, this is your time  
to tell us

18 that.

19 I'll leave that up for a little bit  
longer. It

20 really speaks to the bulk of what this project  
is really

21 all about, what you are looking at. If you  
have any

22 questions, umm, at the end of this, after  
Mel eah's

23 discussion, we can revisit this slide and maybe  
go into

24 what some of these things mean.

25 So this is about you, really, Public  
comments.

13

1 What do you need to know about commenting? We  
are here for

2 a reason, which is because we know that the

NEPA hrg

communi ty,

3 especially in Newport, is very proud of their  
communi ty,

4 very proud of the environment in which they  
live, and we

5 want you to have a say in what we are doing  
here. So your

6 comments and concerns are very important to us.

7 We do have a court reporter here today  
that will be

8 getting all the comments. And anything that is  
said today,

9 either in this meeting or, umm, via comments  
later on, will

10 be addressed in some form in the environmental  
assessment.

11 We have several ways for you to provide  
comments on

12 the scoping tonight: Obviously, at this  
meeting, or we

13 have comment cards which are in your packets  
right now.

14 There's comment cards. You are welcome to fill  
them out

15 and turn them in today, or you can mail them in  
to us, or

16 you can e-mail them to us.

17 Currently, we are about a week into our  
publ ic

NEPA hrg

18 scoping period. It is 30 days long. We're  
about a week

19 into it, so we are going to take comments on  
public scoping

20 -- on the scoping, as we discussed, up until  
May 27th. At

21 that point, then we are working on the  
document. We are

22 actually conducting the analyses, writing it,  
doing all our

23 consultations and so forth.

24 The comment cards, as I mentioned, are  
in the

25 information folder. We're going to have some  
more at the

14

1 sign-in table if need be. And, umm, this right  
here, that

2 is my mailing address, so all your comments are  
directly

3 coming to me. I will make sure they get to the  
right

4 people for the analyses, and I do share them  
with OSU and

5 our consultant and numerous people throughout  
DOE, but they

NEPA hrg

6 are, you know, they are part of our record, and  
like I

7 said, you can send them to me. There is my  
address and my

8 e-mail address.

9 A lot of people like to know what's  
next. Okay.

10 You provided us some comments; great. Umm,  
like I said, we

11 are going to incorporate them as appropriate  
into the draft

12 EA. Umm, and a lot of people don't like that  
"as

13 appropriate." What I mean by that is truly if  
they are

14 applicable to the project. You know, if  
something miles

15 from here is going on and it is not truly  
applicable to

16 this project, we will definitely take your  
comment into

17 consideration, but we are looking for things  
very specific

18 to this region and this project.

19 Once all comments, the comment period,  
and the

20 draft review -- we do a lot of internal review  
-- and once

21 the draft EA is ready for what we call public  
review again,

22 we anticipate that to be out in early  
September, and we

23 have a current list of stakeholders. Some of  
you might

24 have received our postcards already. Those of  
you not on

25 it, I believe our sign-up sheet should have an  
area where

15

1 you put your address. If not, definitely send  
us a

2 comment. Include it in your comment card.

3 So this next comment period that will  
happen will

4 be really on the bulk of information. It will  
answer many

5 of the questions that you probably have tonight  
that we're

6 not going to be able to answer because we are  
still in the

7 early phases. But the EA is going to provide  
the analysis

8 and give you the information on the project and  
activity

NEPA hrg

9 and what the analysis will be on the various  
topics.

10 Once we receive all your comments on  
the draft EA,

11 those also get incorporated into the final EA.  
We

12 anticipate that coming out in early November.  
At that

13 point, once the public has provided all their  
comments and

14 we've consulted with various local and state  
agencies, as

15 well as federal agencies, and complied with the  
various

16 acts that NEPA is, umm, required to look at, we  
then take

17 the information, and it goes to the powers that  
be, so to

18 speak. And in this case it's my boss, the  
Golden Field

19 Office's NEPA's compliance officer, and the  
Golden Field

20 Office's manager, and they will make the  
determination

21 either of a finding of no significant impact,  
or they will

22 make the determination to proceed with the  
environmental

23 impact statement.

24 background on that. I'll give you a little bit of

25 Uh, a finding of no significant impact, that's typically

16

1 after there has been quite a bit of coordination and

2 mitigation already incorporated into the EA. So there is a

3 lot that comes up to that, umm, you know, finding at that

4 point. It's not just, Okay, looks good; We're going to

5 issue a FONSI, an acronym that we use. But there is some

6 thought and mitigation and applicant committed measures

7 that are incorporated into the document. And if we feel

8 that that has met everyone's needs, the public, the various

9 agencies, and ourselves, then we will issue a FONSI.

10 If for some reason we cannot mitigate our way

11 through any of the potential impacts, then that will

NEPA hrg

12 elevate the project into an environment impact  
statement,

13 which is a much higher level, umm, thorough  
review of the

14 project and potential impacts. I'm not going  
to get into

15 EIS's tonight, but we do have more information  
on our

16 website about those.

17 So that's it for kind of the NEPA  
overview.

18 My coworker, Tim Ramsey, is going to  
come up and

19 speak very briefly about the Water Power  
Program. We are

20 very proud of the program, and we want to share  
a little

21 bit of this program with you. And after he  
speaks, then we

22 will have a really brief process question  
section, so I'll

23 let Tim here take it over. Thank you, Tim.

24 TIM RAMSEY: Okay. Thank you, Laura.

25 My name is Tim Ramsey. I work for the  
Department

17

## NEPA hrg

1 of Energy, the DOE field office. I'm just  
going to do a

2 very, very, very quick, 5-minute overview of  
the DOE Water

3 Power Program, and then we will talk about the  
project

4 specifics.

5 So the Golden Field Office is one of  
two field

6 offices that support the Department of Energy  
headquarters

7 in Washington D.C. The other field office is  
the National

8 Energy Technology Laboratory, and that's in  
Pittsburgh,

9 Pennsylvania.

10 The Golden Field Office is the only one  
dedicated

11 solely to EERE activities. And you can see in  
the slide

12 how it funnels down from the Department of  
Energy, down to

13 Secretary Chu, down through EERE. The Wind and  
Water Power

14 Program is one of the programs in the Golden  
Field Office.

15 So there are ten programs within EERE.  
EERE, you

NEPA hrg

16 can think of it as kind of two parts. There is  
EE, which  
17 is Energy Efficiency, and those are the sort of  
programs  
18 that try to take existing industries and make  
them more  
19 efficient. And then there is the RE side, the  
Renewable  
20 Energy side, and that's the typical energies  
from renewable  
21 resources that you think of, solar power,  
biomass, and  
22 geothermal. And then, of course, what we are  
covering  
23 tonight, the Wind and Water Power Program.  
24 You can see here just the Organization  
and the  
25 Vision Statement of the Wind and Water Power  
Program. The

18

1 Resources up there, there's three links.

2 Uh, the Department of Energy has a  
great website.

3 All the programs are outlined there, and you  
can do some

NEPA hrg

4 reading on each of the programs individually,  
and some of  
5 the technologies that the programs use, and  
just get some  
6 background information on the programs.

7 The Water Power Program specifically  
started  
8 because of an act of Congress in 2007 called  
the Energy  
9 Independent and Security Act. That was  
developed in 2007.

10 And basically it's a mandate from Congress to  
the  
11 Department of Energy to look at Marine and  
Hydrokinetic  
12 technology. And in that act they define marine  
and  
13 hydrokinetic as energy from ocean, current,  
tides, and  
14 ocean thermal energy conversion without  
building new dams  
15 or diversionary structure. And EISA also  
mandated the  
16 department to establish national renewable  
energy centers  
17 where developers can come and test their  
technologies.

18 So in 2008 Congress actually gave us  
our first

NEPA hrg

19 budget to elicit this project, and we received  
10 million  
20 dollars. We went out, and our first funding  
opportunity  
21 covered three topic areas, so we decided to  
look at our  
22 resource assessment and kind of try to begin  
figuring out  
23 what the potential is all there, what type of  
energy we  
24 could get from marine and hydrokinetic, from  
water power.  
25 Another topic area was to fund  
technology.

19

1 Developers can use their technology just a  
little bit  
2 further across the path of commercialization.  
3 And then the third one was to actually  
establish  
4 the marine centers where they could go and test  
their  
5 technologies. And Oregon State was one of  
those that was  
6 selected. We selected the two national marine  
centers.

7 The other was the University of Hawaii.

8 Since that time our budget has grown  
steadily over

9 the next couple of years. In 2009 we received  
40 million

10 dollars, and now for the second round of  
funding

11 opportunities for 22 projects. And then we  
also received

12 32 million in Recovery Act funds, known as the  
Stimulus

13 Funds from the Recovery Act Bill. And all of  
those

14 projects were selected. Seven projects were  
selected and

15 all that went to conventional hydro type  
projects. We were

16 going into checking facilities, dams, and  
upgrading

17 facilities. That's what we did in 2009.

18 We are now in 2010, and our budget grew  
a little

19 bit more. We have 50 million dollars for this  
current

20 fiscal year, and we have our third round of  
funding, uh,

21 our funding opportunities, and that's now  
currently

22 underway now, and that concludes in June.

NEPA hrg

23 And as far as doing business with the  
Department of  
24 Energy, we are a funding agency, and almost all  
of our  
25 finds are competitively selected, and we go  
through a

20

1 bidding process through these funding  
opportunities. And

2 these are some of the web sites where you can  
go if you do

3 want to receive Department of Energy funding.  
Or, really,

4 any agency funding.

5 The list here, the first FedConnect  
website, that

6 is the main avenue where we tell people to go  
to look for

7 Department of Energy funding. All agencies are  
there, or

8 you could just kind of see the types of  
projects that DOE

9 is soliciting, and kind of where the program is  
going by

10 reading some of the information there.

NEPA hrg

11 quick, high-level

Again, that was just a very, very

12 overview of both the NEPA process and the Water  
Program.

13 In your folders, if you grabbed one, there is a  
business

14 card in there with both Laura's and my e-mail  
address.

15 Feel free to e-mail us with any questions.  
This

16 presentation will be on the public website,  
which is that

17 first website there, and I believe it's also at  
the very,

18 very bottom of that card in your folder, so you  
don't have

19 to write that down. But if you have any  
questions about

20 this presentation, feel free to shoot us an  
e-mail.

21 I believe we're going to take a quick  
5-minute

22 break if you have any questions for Laura or  
myself. If

23 there are more specific project questions,  
perhaps about

24 what we're actually funding here in Oregon,  
Mel eah is going

25 to talk next, and then we will have a long  
period of open

21

1 discussion for public comments.

2 JOHN LAVRAKAS: John Lavrakas. When I  
think of the

3 environmental impact, the first thought is  
affecting the

4 environment, which would be, you know, ocean  
life and

5 things like that. And I noticed you had in  
there like

6 marine navigation, so then I see that the  
effects there

7 include maybe some other activities in the  
ocean. So the

8 thought -- the question I have is, would it  
also include,

9 you know, during normal operation there would  
be effects,

10 but if things go wrong, then there would be  
additional

11 effects that may affect agencies, or at least,  
umm,

12 emergency service organizations. So would you  
consider

13 those applicable in this case as environmental  
impacts?

NEPA hrg

14                   LAURA MARGASON: It definitely could be  
considered  
15                   a potential impact. NEPA is not just the  
natural  
16                   environment. I like to truly think of it, and  
I had it up  
17                   there, as the human and natural environment.  
So it is  
18                   going to look at things. Umm, the fishing  
industry, that  
19                   is a human environment, part of the human  
environment. We  
20                   will look at that, and look at the  
socioeconomics,  
21                   environmental justice sections. But how it  
affects the  
22                   emergency response systems are a potential  
topic for  
23                   analysis.

24                   JOHN LAVRAKAS: Thank you.

25                   LAURA MARGASON: Are there any other  
clarifying

22

1                   questions?

2                   UNIDENTIFIED MAN: If someone disagrees

NEPA hrg

with your

3 final environmental assessment, is there an  
appeal process?

4 LAURA MARGASON: There is. Umm, NEPA  
is not, umm,

5 -- I should know this. Just went over it  
today. It's

6 truly up to the public to comment and appeal.  
Umm, often

7 times, if there is an organization, umm, --

8 UNIDENTIFIED MAN: How do we appeal?

9 LINDA MARGASON: How? That's through  
the judicial

10 system. Umm, specifically, I'm sorry, I do not  
know. But

11 it is through the judicial system. I would  
imagine you

12 hire a lawyer, and they would, umm, go through  
that

13 process. But a lot of times, umm, through the  
public

14 comment period we are going to address your  
concerns, so we

15 are looking for specific concerns, things that  
you can

16 specifically point out that, you know, we would  
hope prior

17 to the decision that we would be able to  
mitigate.



NEPA hrg

6 tell us their concerns. And DOE is truly  
looking to not go

7 into litigation, so we are going to address  
your concerns,

8 definitely.

9 KAETY HILDENBRAND: We probably have  
time for one

10 more clarifying question. (Pause, with no  
comment.)

11 Okay.

12 MELEAH ASHFORD: Okay. Thank you for  
coming

13 tonight to help us with our scoping process.  
My name again

14 is Meleah Ashford, and I'm the Program Manager  
for the

15 Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy  
Center, which we

16 just call NNMREC.

17 Well, I'm going to tell you about the  
proposed

18 project. But first I'm going to start with a  
little bit of

19 overview about wave energy in Oregon and about  
our center.

20 So, by the way, why Oregon?

21 As Tim mentioned, there are a lot of  
different ways

NEPA hrg

22 to get renewable energy from the ocean, but in  
Oregon we

23 have great waves. We have some of the best  
waves in the

24 world, as you can see by the map there . The  
red areas are

25 kind of the sweet spot, and they are along a,  
umm, usually

24

1 a west-facing coast where there is a long ocean  
that allows

2 the waves to build up. So, uh, we have got  
good waves. We

3 have a high coastal population, and our  
population

4 generally gets its power from the other side of  
the

5 mountains, so it would be nice to have a local  
power

6 source.

7 We have a power infrastructure along  
the coast.

8 The mills that were installed over the century  
had power

9 coming to the coast. Power doesn't care which  
direction it

and 10 is going. So we do have a good infrastructure  
11 electrical grid. And we have good research  
capabilities 12 and capacities with Oregon State University and  
the 13 Hatfield Marine Science Center here. And,  
also, the 14 resource of waves as you see in the, umm, --  
Let's see. 15 This is very slow. As you can see from  
the graph 16 there, this is over time; wave, power over  
time. We get 17 the biggest waves in the summer -- I mean in  
the winter, 18 which is when you need to use that power.  
19 So getting energy from the waves,  
there's a lot of 20 different ways. There's over a hundred  
different devices 21 out there right now, and we are in the process  
of -- The 22 industry is in the process of down selecting to  
what is 23 really going to be the power generation process  
now for 24 wave energy.

25 You have shore-based facilities like

this, umm,

25

1 WaveGen here that sits on the shore, and waves  
come in and  
2 blow air through a turbine out through the top.

3 Pelamis is a very famous one that's  
like a snake.

4 It undulates and, umm, fluid moves between  
those sections

5 and runs the turbine.

6 This is the Finavera Buoy, which you  
may be

7 familiar with. It was deployed out there. It  
plunges up

8 and down and runs a turbine in a vertical  
direction.

9 The Oyster here on the bottom is a --  
is a near

10 shore device. It flaps back and forth. In  
that flapping

11 action it pushes the water onto the -- through  
a piping

12 system on the shore and runs a turbine.

13 The other two here are what we call  
point

14 absorbers, and they collect energy from the  
waves in a deep

15 water situation. Not really deep, but like 150  
to 200 feet

16 deep. The OBT device, you probably heard  
something about

17 that, about proposing some in southern Oregon.  
And that's,

18 again, like a plunger device.

19 And this is Columbia Power Technology  
device down

20 here on the bottom, and it gets energy use  
through several

21 different types of motions; the motion of flaps  
coming

22 down, and the sideways motion.

23 They are all innovative, but they are  
all very much

24 in developmental stages, which is why we had so  
much

25 interest on the coast.

26

1 So the Northwest National Marine  
Renewable Energy

2 Center, we are a partnership between Oregon  
State

NEPA hrg

3 University and the University of Washington.  
They focus on

4 tidal issues. They have large tidal resources  
coming in

5 and out of the Puget Sound.

6 We are funded partially by Department  
of Energy,

7 but we have a lot of local funds. The State of  
Oregon

8 provided us money for the actual  
infrastructure, and we

9 have various other funding agencies that are  
shown there on

10 the side. We also partner with the National  
Renewable

11 Energies Lab, who is helping us with some of  
the technical

12 testing issues.

13 The idea of NNMREC is to develop a  
range of

14 capabilities to support wave and tide and  
energy

15 development, and this center is structured to  
facilitate

16 the development through the testing process and  
the

17 modeling process to form regulatory and policy  
decision

18 makers to close information gaps.

19 So we are really a virtual center. We  
don't have

20 a, you know, a location itself. Umm, and we  
are divided

21 into three different areas. The technology  
area: In

22 addition to technology, we have a testing and

23 demonstration, which is what this project is  
about. We

24 look at wave forecasting, survivability,  
reliability of

25 devices, anti-fouling and corrosion issues, and

27

1 device/array optimization issues. Those are  
all modeling

2 issues, and they are all part of the process.

3 In the environmental area we are  
studying sediment

4 transport, electromagnetic fields, Benthic  
ecosystems

5 issues, acoustics, umm, and then we have some  
others on

6 there. Marine mammals is another area that we  
are

7 studying.

8 And then in the human dimension we are  
looking at

9 the impact on the inside of things, fisheries  
and crabbing,

10 outreach and engaging, and we're working on  
existing users

11 and the local economy.

12 So the proposed action is the design,  
construction,

13 and operation of a mobile, full-scale, open  
ocean wave

14 energy testing facility. And the, uh, the  
project consists

15 of two of these testing devices, and I'll show  
you what

16 they look like. And those two devices will be  
connected to

17 two wave energy devices. So our two test  
berths, and then

18 two devices, so there's four things in the  
water.

19 And we are also looking at an  
underwater substation

20 pod, which is a device that connects the cables  
from the

21 energy devices. And then it's eventually  
designed to take

22 that back to shore, so if there was an array of

NEPA hrg

these

23 device s, the array can come together to one  
substati on

24 pod, and then one cable could go to shore.

25 Umm, in our case we are not grid  
connected. The

28

1 idea is it is a mobile test facility. And the  
grid

2 connection results in a lot of issues that, not  
only the

3 communi ty, but funding issues, we are just not  
ready to

4 tackle yet. So we are looking at this in a  
mobile sense.

5 And, umm, the site that we are  
considering is about

6 two nautical miles off of Newport.

7 So this is a drawing, a conceptual  
drawing, of what

8 the test facility looks like, the test berth  
itself. And

9 we are working with a design team of SAIC, Hyak

10 Electroworks. Glosten and Associates are  
worki ng on a

11 mooring system. Peregrine Power is working on  
the power

12 issue. And then R.E.C.S. is a company that's  
putting in

13 the hull.

14 And it's a composite hull in a boat  
shape. It is

15 formed after the NOMAD style buoy that NOAA  
uses. Umm, it

16 has internal spaces that are all subdivided so  
they are all

17 watertight, and it's designed to be a plug and  
play, so a

18 variety of different devices could use our  
testing

19 facilities, and they will literally plug their  
device into

20 the Mobile Ocean Test Berth. And we would be  
measuring the

21 current, the voltage, and the, uh, -- of the  
device itself.

22 There's other parts of the device that  
are bilge

23 pumps, the shore -- The data would be  
transmitted back to

24 shore. So we collect data about how the device  
is creating

25 energy, and that data would go back to shore  
for analysis.

29

1 And there are auxiliary sensors that are  
looking at the

2 motion of the test -- I'm sorry -- the motion  
of the device

3 under test, and checking the strains on that  
device and, as

4 I said, the power off of that device.

5 So this is -- This is a conceptual  
drawing of the

6 typical type wave energy conversion device that  
we are

7 focusing our efforts on being able to test at  
this point in

8 time. So I showed you a bunch of slides of  
lots of

9 different types of wave energy conversion  
devices, but,

10 umm, we think that it will be these point  
absorbers that,

11 umm, that will use our services the most.

12 And this is a picture of a three-point  
mooring

13 system, and this is how the point absorbers  
will typically

14 be moored. So you've got the device in the

middle, you've

15 got the power cable coming out the bottom, and  
you've got

16 the three, uh, three mooring systems, and the  
anchoring

17 system would vary depending on the device. We  
look at

18 probably a large dead weight anchor as the  
anchor that we

19 would use.

20 Now it gets a little more hairy. This  
is a picture

21 depicting what it would look like for our  
testing facility

22 connected to the wave energy device.

23 So, umm, we've got the wave energy  
device over here

24 with the three-point mooring. That's the  
photograph I just

25 showed you. And then it is connected to the  
test berth by

30

1 an underwater cable. The cable is probably  
going to be

2 about that big. A lot of data and a lot of  
information is

NEPA hrg

3 going to be pushed back and forth on that  
cable. And, uh,  
4 it -- Conceptually right now it looks like that  
the test  
5 berth itself will also be a three-point  
mooring. So you've  
6 got quite a few more cables out in the ocean.  
7 Okay. This is a description of the  
underwater  
8 sub-sea pod. Some people call it a central  
junction box.  
9 But it connects multiple wave energy devices  
and, uh, will  
10 eventually be used for grid connection,  
although in our  
11 case we would not use it in a grid connection  
because we  
12 will not be grid connected. And it is an area  
that's  
13 targeted research for Oregon State, and it's  
being covered  
14 under NEPA because it's being funded by the  
Federal  
15 Government.  
16 So this is a picture of the site that  
we are  
17 considering for the Mobile Ocean Test Berth,  
and, umm,

NEPA hrg

18 we've gone through a process where Oregon State  
has done

19 two different tests of devices that were  
developed at

20 Oregon State.

21 This test would be for commercial  
developers, but

22 we do have some experience with testing of  
these devices

23 that are -- that are not to the size that you  
are looking

24 at with this one. We are looking at up to a  
megawatt, to

25 have a capacity of up to a megawatt of energy  
from the

31

1 device. And the tests that we have done in the  
past were

2 about 30 to 40 kilowatts. But, umm, -- So we  
know these

3 devices need about 140 feet of water, out to  
possibly 200

4 feet of water. That's the area that we are  
targeting.

5 So we knew that there were some  
conditions that we

6 needed. We needed the 150 feet of -- 140 to  
150 feet of  
7 depth, and we needed a soft, sandy bottom. And  
we wanted  
8 to make sure that it was close to a port so  
that we weren't  
9 spending a lot of boat time and lose a lot of  
operations in  
10 going back and forth, so we wanted to be close  
to a port.  
11 We gave those considerations over to  
the FINE  
12 Committee, which is Fishermen Involved with  
Natural Energy,  
13 and we had discussions with them about where a  
site would  
14 be the least impact with them and from the  
fisheries  
15 standpoint, but meet the Oregon State criteria  
for that  
16 test berth.  
17 So our final site will be one nautical  
mile by one  
18 nautical mile. But we have to date not honed  
in on exactly  
19 what one nautical mile, where it would be  
within this study  
20 area. So we have a big study area that's six  
square miles,

NEPA hrg

21 but the final site will be one square mile  
within that six

22 square miles. And we have some additional  
community

23 processes to go through to finalize the  
location of that

24 one mile site.

25 Just some things to note. The red line  
on the map

32

1 is the Territorial Sea Line, and the  
territorial sea is

2 what is under the jurisdiction of the State of  
Oregon, as

3 opposed to what is beyond the Territorial Sea  
Line and is

4 under the jurisdiction of the Mineral  
Management Service.

5 The regulations are different under the Mineral  
Management

6 Service. That's not to say it is bad or good.  
It is

7 different. We chose to be within the Oregon  
Territorial

8 Sea. Primarily, that's the depth range that we  
are

NEPA hrg

9 targeting.

10 Okay. So other agencies and approvals  
that will be

11 necessary for this project. So we are going  
through the

12 NEPA process right now because the federal  
action is

13 funding of this design, construction, and  
deployment of the

14 Mobile Ocean Test Berth. But prior to the  
deployment

15 there's a lot of other agencies involved.  
Primarily

16 through the Corps of Engineers. So prior to  
deployment of

17 this, we will need a permit from the Corps of  
Engineers,

18 and we will do that process separately.

19 Uh, we will be going through  
consultations with

20 NOAA; the National and Marine Fisheries  
Service; the

21 Department of State Lands; Department of Land  
Conservation

22 and Development to look at consistency with the  
territorial

23 sea plans; the Department of Environmental  
Quality; the

24 Coast Guard; Parks and Rec.

NEPA hrg

25  
because we are

We will not be going through FERC

33

1  
Regulatory

not grid connected. That's the Federal Energy

2  
we don't go

Commission. We are not grid connected, and so

3  
Mineral

through FERC. And we don't go through the

4  
territorial

Management Service because we are within the

5  
sea.

6  
as we've gone

So I just want to bring this up. Uh,

7  
have input

through this process, it is important for us to

8  
good input

from the community. To date we have had really

9  
understand some

from the FINE community, and they helped us

10  
working with the

of the issues that we will be facing when

11  
impact that we

ocean, and have made us acutely aware of the

12  
will have on the fishing industry.

13 But, uh, we also realize there are  
other people in  
14 the community that we would like to have  
engaged in the  
15 process. So as the test berth goes forward,  
not only to  
16 the design and the construction of the test  
berth, but on  
17 to the operation of the test berth, we felt it  
would be  
18 important to have a group of people from the  
community that  
19 would be involved in helping us make sure we  
are  
20 considering things, umm, that we -- that we may  
miss along  
21 the way, including discussions about the study,  
the study  
22 area and the siting area that we have.

23 So we have put together a Test Berth  
Committee, and  
24 in your packet there is an application form for  
that Test  
25 Berth Committee. It describes what we expect  
from people

NEPA hrg

1 who would like to be involved in this  
committee. And we

2 anticipate the responsibility would be a  
commitment up to

3 about two years, attend meetings, uh, around  
four times a

4 year. Of course, that would be different  
depending on what

5 was going on.

6 And the make-up of the committee, this  
is just a

7 general description of it. The ones in the  
packet is just

8 a little more accurate. This is a Mac, and I  
wasn't able

9 to make the last minute changes to this. But  
basically the

10 local communities, recreational fishermen,  
commercial

11 fishing, ports, the wave energy device  
developers, the

12 recreationalist, and conservationist, the  
marine

13 researchers, the utility groups, economic  
development.

14 And, uh, the one missing off here is just the  
general

15 public.

16 So I wanted to get in that little plug.

NEPA hrg

If you

17 want to be involved in the process, we would  
love to have

18 you involved through that Test Berth Committee.

19 I believe that's the last of my slides,  
and I will

20 turn it over to Kaety, who will talk about the  
public

21 comments.

22 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Great. So next we  
have quite a

23 bit of time, actually, to receive public  
comments. We do

24 have a microphone that's going to be going  
around.

25 Umm, we're going to limit it to three  
minutes per

35

1 speaker, and if time allows, you can speak  
again at the

2 end. We do have a court reporter present here,  
so make

3 sure to state your name in the beginning of  
comments. And

4 if you have a difficult spelling of your name,  
please spell

NEPA hrg

5 it out for us. And let us know if you are  
speaking as

6 yourself or for a group. Again, the comment  
cards are in

7 your packet as well.

8 To start it off, we're going to go down  
the list of

9 when people said they want to comment when they  
signed in

10 tonight. The first one is Chuck Pavlik. The  
microphone is

11 coming.

12 JOHN HORST: I'm John Horst. Just go  
ahead and say

13 your name again so it's on the record.

14 CHUCK PAVLIK: My name is Chuck Pavlik,

15 P-A-V-L-I-K.

16 On your map here, your six-mile area,  
how long do

17 you anticipate that that would be in effect,  
the six miles,

18 before you go to your one square mile?

19 KAETY HILDENBRAND: So the purpose  
tonight is to

20 look at and sort of scope out the entire  
six-mile site, and

21 then through some of the things that are

addressed through

22 the process, as well as some other statements  
and comments

23 that are received through the various  
processes, umm, the

24 actual one-mile site will be chosen from all of  
those

25 comments. So in the near future, before the  
first buoy

36

1 goes into the water, we will have this one-mile  
site

2 selected. It's depending on various devices,  
and that

3 one-mile site could change, depending on the  
needs. I

4 guess that's one of the good things about  
staying mobile

5 with the test berth; we can move it around.

6 Does that answer your question?

7 CHUCK PAVLIK: Yeah. I live down the  
road in

8 Waldport. I'm a sports fisherman, and I keep a  
boat in

9 Newport six months out of the year, and I fish  
a lot right

NEPA hrg

10 in your blue area that you have highlighted.  
And, uh, it's

11 a very popular halibut fishing area, salmon  
later in the

12 year, as well as crabbing; not commercial, but  
sport. And,

13 uh, basically, when I look at that, uh, I see a  
six-mile

14 area where no trespassing signs are posted.  
Tell me that

15 isn't so.

16 KAETY HILDENBRAND: The six miles will  
not be off

17 limits. There will be a one-mile area that  
will be off

18 limits, not six miles.

19 CHUCK PAVLIK: Okay. Did you -- When  
you were

20 choosing your site, did you consider any areas  
further from

21 Newport? Did you -- For instance, did you look  
, uh, at

22 the area down by Waldport? When you get that  
far south,

23 you've eliminated 98 percent of the sports  
fishing during

24 the summer season out of Newport. There's  
literally

25 hundreds of boats that use this area, you know,  
like a

37

1 bunch of bees around the hive. They never get  
far from the

2 jetties and the mouth in that area where you  
are at, a

3 little bit south and a little further out.  
They stay

4 pretty close to home. And, uh, just looking at  
your

5 selection, uh, did you not look further south  
or further

6 north to get further away from such a high use  
area?

7 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Umm, I'm kind of  
speaking for

8 the people from OSU. In the criteria that was  
set down,

9 for the people at OSU Waldport was too far for  
them. They

10 wanted to be closer to, umm, the jetty entrance  
to be able

11 to service that project.

12 CHUCK PAVLIK: Well, I can appreciate  
their desire

NEPA hrg

13 to have a convenient area, but Waldport is  
about 15 miles

14 south, and, uh, they do have several million  
dollars worth

15 of boats, OSU does, that are research vessels  
that could be

16 used to get south or north to an area that  
didn't have any

17 conflicts with sports fishermen out of Newport.  
Newport is

18 the busiest area on the Oregon Coast as far as  
sports

19 fishing goes. There are lots of boats, lots of  
fishing, a

20 lot of people that use it for recreation all  
summer long.

21 And, uh, for you to take away part of that area  
when there

22 really isn't a need to, if you could just  
relocate a little

23 ways, I think you have other options available.

24 JOHN HORST: Thank you very much.

25 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Uh, the next one  
that had a

38

1 question mark next to the name is a John

NEPA hrg

Sherman. Is John

2 Sherman still here?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: He stepped out.

4 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Okay. Another name  
with a

5 question mark was Mike Donnellan.

6 MIKE DONNELLAN: I'm Mike Donnellan,  
and --

7 JOHN HORST: Use this.

8 MIKE DONNELLAN: My name is Mike  
Donnellan. And I

9 have a question just about the six-mile site.  
I understand

10 it was developed with community input. So is  
that set in

11 stone, or is that still, uh, potentially  
movable? In

12 particular, I'll tell you why: Because Yaquina  
Head is an

13 extremely important area for sea birds, in  
particular

14 common murrers. About 80 or 90 thousand birds  
nest there

15 and use that area, which is north, and, uh,  
British

16 Columbia and Washington. And it's in a great  
whale

17 migration corridor, so I was just wondering, is

that set in

18 stone?

19 LAURA MARGASON: Uh, Kaety did the last  
one, and

20 I'll get her out of the hot seat this time. So  
the answer

21 is that it is not cast in stone. We did go  
through a

22 process of what areas and what parameters  
Oregon State

23 developed were critical for the success of the  
Mobile Test

24 Berth, and then we did work with the FINE group  
to talk

25 about, you know, where from a fishing  
standpoint that area

39

1 would be best placed. And, uh, this six square  
miles that

2 we came up with, in the end there would be one  
square mile

3 that we would end up with. So, umm, it is at  
this point

4 the most desirable location for us, but it is  
not cast in

5 stone.

NEPA hrg

6 MIKE DONNELLAN: Thank you.

7 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Is there anybody  
else who  
8 wishes to comment that did not mark that?

9 JOHN HORST: Let me make my way to the  
back.

10 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Sure.

11 STEPHEN WEBSTER: Thank you very much.

12 JOHN HORST: What's your name?

13 STEPHEN WEBSTER: Umm, Stephen Webster.  
I've got

14 two questions. Umm, if the site is finally  
permitted, is

15 there any sunset to this permit? Is this in  
perpetuity?

16 What's -- What's the time frame that the  
permit, uh, its

17 life span?

18 LAURA MARGASON: You know, I have to  
say that I

19 don't know how long the Corps of Engineers  
permit lasts.

20 But our intent is that, umm, that we are  
looking at a

21 ten-year horizon for the operation of the test  
berth. That

22 is the best that we can foresee at this point

NEPA hrg

in time.

23                   STEPHEN WEBSTER: My second question  
is, uh, what

24                   is your budget for ten years? What is your  
annual budget?

25                   If you could give some, uh, rough sketch of  
what that

40

1                   budget entails.

2                   LAURA MARGASON: Okay. Uh, the budget  
for the

3                   Mobile Ocean Test Berth is about 3 million  
dollars for the

4                   design and construction. And that's what we  
are looking

5                   for in the standpoint of funding.

6                   Umm, the operation and maintenance and  
the

7                   management of the testing is to be determined.  
You know,

8                   we have some general ideas of, you know, how  
much

9                   management it would take and how much operation  
costs will

10                   be, but until that gets finally designed, we  
don't have

NEPA hrg

11 that information at this point.

12 STEPHEN WEBSTER: I don't have any  
other questions.

13 The only other comment I would like to make is  
I would be

14 like Mr. Pavlik, noting that you are contending  
for prime

15 real estate and that you couldn't choose an  
area that's

16 probably more -- has any denser use in our  
region. Thank

17 you.

18 JOHN HORST: Thank you. Appreciate  
your input.

19 Okay. Right here. I'd have you state  
your name.

20 JOHN LAVRAKAS: John Lavrakas,  
L-A-V-R-A-K-A-S.

21 I have a company, Advanced Research  
Corporation.

22 We've recently figured an infrastructure  
investment for

23 wave energy in Oregon. In it we learned that  
one of the

24 issues that came out was the availability of  
emergency

25 services for conditions when the, umm, things  
go wrong.

41

1                                   And in this case I would ask that  
attention be paid  
2                                   to those services as part of the environmental  
impact. It  
3                                   could be where someone works the vessel. When  
the ship  
4                                   gets in trouble, they get tangled up in the  
lines, or the  
5                                   vessel breaks free. In any of those things  
there is a tax  
6                                   on the emergency services. And they need to be  
aware of  
7                                   what kind of situations could occur so they are  
prepared;  
8                                   they have some kind of contingency planning  
that will work  
9                                   with you all working with them. That's my  
recommendation.

10                                 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Okay. I think I  
saw one more

11                                 hand in the back.

12                                 JOHN HORST: Who had another comment?  
Okay.

13                                 DANIELLE ASSON: Hi, my name is  
Danielle Asson,

14 A-S-S-O-N, and I guess I had a question about  
-- You said

15 it was going to be anchored by the three --  
that little

16 tripod anchor setup. And I was wondering if  
you were

17 considering any other options for anchoring,  
because I know

18 how much -- how much environment that those  
anchors

19 actually impact, uh, like how big the concrete  
blocks have

20 to be in order to keep that stable. And it  
doesn't seem

21 very mobile to me as well.

22 I'm just wondering if you are taking  
that into

23 consideration or if there are any other options  
on the

24 table for anchoring. You know, I mean it is --  
you have to

25 figure out how best to do. But I do know that  
those

42

1 anchors seem to have a pretty large impact on  
the

would be 2 environment, and, also, I don't see how they

you guys are 3 easily moved. And so I was just wondering if

other options 4 considering anything else, if there are any

with maybe a 5 on the table, if there is any way to do this

6 lesser environmental impact. That's all.

7 LAURA MARGASON: Okay.

8 JOHN HORST: Thank you very much.

the early, 9 LAURA MARGASON: We are, you know, in

Test Berth. 10 early stages of the concept of the Mobile Ocean

dictated by 11 And depending on the final weight, that will be

berth, which 12 the components that are inside the mobile test

need us to 13 are dictated by what the wave energy devices

types of mooring 14 provide them, uh, which will determine the

15 that we have to do.

which are, 16 So we are considering Danforth anchors,

and the dead 17 you know, kind of a traditional type anchor,

18 weight anchors. And I think that the hope  
would be we

19 could use Danforth anchors, but it will depend  
on the final

20 weight and configuration of the test berth,  
whether those

21 anchors will be adequate or not.

22 Also, with the mobile test berth  
itself, that

23 anchoring system will stay for the duration of  
the test

24 berth site, so they won't be moved. So there  
will be

25 marker buoys that the test berth, when it does  
go into port

43

1 for maintenance, whatever, uh, they will stay  
there, and

2 then it will come back out and hook up to those  
moorings.

3 Now, for the wave energy converter  
itself, those

4 moorings will be brought in, and my  
understanding is that

5 they bring in their full-size moorings. They  
are not able

6 to -- they want to test a full-scale ocean  
device. So they

7 put in their full-scale mooring and anchoring  
system, and

8 at the end of the test it is our plan to have  
them take

9 those out. But the mooring system for the  
Mobile Ocean

10 Test Berth will stay in.

11 DANIELLE HESTON: If you're planning on  
-- Danielle

12 Heston, H-E-S-T-O-N.

13 If you're planning on testing multiple  
devices, is

14 there any way that you could leave the mooring  
and just

15 hook the mobile devices up to them?

16 LAURA MARGASON: Yeah, that's a --  
That's a

17 consideration, and it would be up to the wave  
energy device

18 developers. The devices, by the time they get  
to the point

19 where they are testing on a full scale, are  
very expensive.

20 And there's a lot of liability associated with  
the moorings

21 and anchoring systems that they would not want  
to pass from

NEPA hrg

22 one developer to another.

23 So based on experience in Europe, each  
device

24 developer's anchoring and mooring system is a  
little bit

25 different than the last one. So the chances  
that one

44

1 system would work for another are pretty slim.  
So our

2 intent is that they would remove that at the  
end of their

3 test -- remove their system at the end of the  
test.

4 DANIELLE HESTON: I got one more  
question.

5 LAURA MARGASON: Yeah.

6 DANIELLE HESTON: Uh, so when this  
finally comes, I

7 guess, into being, uh, I don't know if you will  
be able to

8 answer this. Umm, are you planning on testing  
multiple,

9 like varying, all different types of wave  
energy things and

NEPA hrg

10 with the intention of putting them along the  
Oregon Coast,

11 or just to see, I guess, how they work?

12 And if you are going to -- if they are  
going to be

13 put on the coast, will we have a say in which  
device we

14 ultimately use? Because I know a little bit  
about the

15 devices, and I know which one I prefer. So  
will that --

16 will this process be continued when it comes to  
actually

17 starting to use that wave energy so we can base  
our

18 opinions on like which devices we think should  
be there

19 based on how much energy they give, and also  
with the

20 environmental impact?

21 LAURA MARGASON: Umm, that's a good --  
A pretty

22 quick answer to that is, umm, only if it is  
federally

23 funded. Because the NEPA process is the  
public, umm,

24 involving the public. If it were an action  
that, uh,

25 either the Department of Energy or Army Corps

of Engineers,

45

1 if it is a federally funded project, then yes,  
there will  
2 be a public process to allow people to comment  
on.

3 The intent of this project is mainly to  
provide

4 testing. Umm, a little background: A lot of  
times you

5 need to verify a concept and test it in, umm,  
you know, in

6 an ocean environment in order to prove the  
capability of

7 the technology, and that is what this is going  
to be.

8 That's the intent of this test unit.

9 Where it goes from there, it's really  
up to the

10 developer at that point and what they foresee  
as an

11 applicable area for their deployment of their  
technology.

12 So the public will be able to come into play if  
it is

13 government funded at this point, you know.

NEPA hrg

14 But the permitting process does involve  
other  
15 federal agencies, so even if DOE doesn't, there  
is FERC and  
16 Army Corps and MMS, and they are all subject to  
the NEPA,  
17 and they have their own public review process.  
So it's  
18 always good to keep your ear open for these  
type of  
19 deployments.

20 DANIELLE HESTON: Thank you.

21 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Any other comments?

22 JOHN HORST: And, again, for this  
entire process,

23 we are very grateful that you are here, and  
your concern to

24 see some interest.

25 WIL BLACK: My name is Wil Black, and I  
also work

46

1 for Advanced Research Corporation. I have kind

of a

2 two-part question. They are related questions.

NEPA hrg

3 First of all, who -- who as far as wave  
devel opers

4 have expressed an interest in putting their  
devices to be

5 tested with the Mobile Ocean Test Buoy? And  
the second

6 part of that is, umm, why would they want to do  
that when

7 already they are putting devices by the end of  
the summer

8 down in Reedsport doing this? And they are  
putting devices

9 in the water around the world. Why do they  
need to use

10 these?

11 MELEAH ASHFORD: Okay. I will answer  
those. We

12 have a couple of devel opers, and I'm not going  
to name

13 names, but we do have a couple of devel opers,  
and we plan

14 on the first version of the test berth really  
to be focused

15 on point absorbers, so those are ones that  
float vertically

16 in the water, up and down, basically. And,  
umm, so we have

17 talked with several people who are interested.  
We've got

18 some scheduling things to work out.

19 And, umm, the process that you are  
talking about in

20 the south, in Reedsport, where OPT is planning  
to put their

21 one buoy in there, they are just ahead of us.  
They have

22 indicated that if the test berth was ready,  
they would use

23 it, but they are ahead of us in the process.

24 So if they can go ahead without the  
need for the

25 test berth, I think is what your second  
question is, why

47

1 would you build a test berth? Umm, the OPT has  
tested

2 their device, and is testing their device now  
at the test

3 facility in Europe. The premiere test facility  
in the

4 world is called the European Marine Energy  
Center. It's on

5 the north shore of Scotland, the island of  
Orkney, and,

6 umm, they have four test facilities there that

NEPA hrg

are grid

7 connected, and they are fairly well booked out.  
So there

8 is a lot of interest in testing these  
facilities. And OPT

9 has tested their device there. You can -- You  
can develop

10 your device without a test berth, but you don't  
get that

11 third party, reliable information that we  
believe and DOE

12 believes that the world needs.

13 You need a standardized process, you  
need

14 standardized testing, and it needs to be at  
some point a

15 third party so that it is well accepted.

16 WIL BLACK: So there has been pretty  
good industry

17 interest in that?

18 MELEAH ASHFORD: Yes, we are working  
with

19 developers at this point.

20 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Final comments?

21 JOHN HORST: Just restate your name.

22 MIKE DONNELLAN: My name is Mike  
Donnellan. I just

23 have one more question. It's my understanding  
that there's

24 another federal funding wave energy project  
just offshore

25 of this. Uh, it was a successful grant by OSU.  
I think it

48

1 was Minerals Management Service or something.  
So I'm just

2 kind of wondering about the bigger context  
here.

3 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Yeah. I think the  
project you

4 are referring to is actually not. It's related  
to sort of

5 energy and the ocean, but it is not a wave  
energy project.

6 It's actually a team of social scientists at  
Oregon State

7 University looking at outer continental shelf  
uses and sort

8 of how to mitigate or reduce conflict with  
energy producing

9 devices that are put in the ocean. It is not  
specific to

10 Oregon or this site. It's actually a project  
being done

NEPA hrg

11 both on the West Coast and on the East Coast.  
This is not

12 a specific, you know, power project. It's  
looking at just

13 how to reduce conflict more in different  
regions in the

14 ocean. That's the only one that I know of that  
you might

15 be thinking of.

16 MIKE DONNELLAN: Yeah, that sounds like  
it.

17 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Okay.

18 DICK BRIM: I'm Dick Brim. I  
apologize. I got

19 here late. So if my question has been answered  
earlier,

20 please let me know, and I'll get the  
(inaudible).

21 I'm curious. You have an onsite study  
area of six

22 square miles with a final site of the one  
square mile. Can

23 we assume that after you've made that final  
site selection

24 that the other five square miles will be  
released and won't

25 be used?

1                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That is correct.  
We made a  
2                   commitment to the community, and the FINE group  
in Lincoln  
3                   County was involved in that, that our site at  
this point  
4                   would be one nautical mile by one nautical  
mile. And we  
5                   were not able to come to a conclusion on  
exactly the one  
6                   mile by one mile square yet, but there was  
general  
7                   agreement about the six mile square area that  
allowed us to  
8                   start the NEPA process. And before we get  
permits for  
9                   deployment of the device, we will have one mile  
by one  
10                  mile. And those are nautical miles.

11                  DIFFERENT UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just  
want to  
12                  clarify, those six miles are not closed now.  
It is not  
13                  like they need to be released after we decide.  
We are just  
14                  looking at it, so it's not closed. None of it

NEPA hrg

is closed at

15 this point.

16 DICK BRIM: Thank you.

17 KAETY HILDENBRAND: Anyone else?

18 JOHN HORST: I can handle this side of  
the room. I

19 think we are okay.

20 LAURA MARGASON: Okay. I think it is  
official. I

21 just want to thank everyone for the comments.  
We heard

22 some really, very important things, umm, and  
received some

23 great input. And rest assured, we're going to  
take all of

24 your concerns and comments into consideration  
in developing

25 the EA. Those of you who are on our mailing  
list, who have

50

1 received cards -- Those of you who have not,  
please make

2 sure you send us some type of comment, or at  
least your

3 name and address, to either -- preferably to

NEPA hrg

myself. 1

4 will make sure that you get on the distribution  
list for

5 notification when the draft EA comes out. And  
other than

6 that, that will be our next step. So thank you  
for

7 attending tonight, and we appreciate all your  
comments.

8 SARAH HENKEL: I was just wondering, if  
people who

9 spoke tonight, if they can still make any  
further comments?

10 LAURA MARGASON: Yes. I mentioned that  
before.

11 You have until May 27th. Per our regulations,  
we have a

12 30-day window for scoping comments. It is the  
same with

13 the draft environmental assessment comes out.  
It's going

14 to be a 30-day window for anyone to provide  
their comments.

15 And so please have e-mail or mail your  
comments to

16 me by the 27th. As long as they are  
postmarked, you know,

17 we have a couple days. We are not very strict  
about dates,

NEPA hrg

At that 18 but please try to have them in by that point.  
we need 19 point we are already writing the EA draft, and  
20 those scoping comments by then.

21 Thank you, everyone.

22 (End of meeting)

23 \*\*\*\*\*

24

25

51

1 COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3 I, Lee Blackwood, Certified Court  
Reporter for the

4 State of Oregon, do hereby certify that the  
statements set

5 forth in this matter are a true and correct  
transcript of

6 said statements.

7 I further certify that the statements  
were made

8 before me at the time and place set forth in  
the caption

NEPA hrg

9 hereof; that at said time and place I reported  
in Stenotype  
10 all proceedings had in the foregoing matter;  
that  
11 thereafter my notes were transcribed by me; and  
that the  
12 foregoing 50 pages constitute a true and  
accurate  
13 transcript of my original stenographic notes.

14 In witness whereof, I have hereunto  
affixed my  
15 signature this 21st day of June, 2010.

16  
17  
18 Lee Blackwood  
19 Certified Court  
Reporter  
20 Certificate No.  
90-0130

21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## Scoping Meeting Sign-In List



U. S. Department of Energy  
 NEPA Scoping Meeting for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC)  
 May 5th, 2010

NAME	ADDRESS/ZIP CODE	ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE	EMAIL ADDRESS	Do you wish to comment tonight?
Chuck Paulik	785 Bayview Ln Waldport, OR. 154240 Nye St Newport 97365	Sport Fisher Advanced Resource Corp	563-5265 265-9690	muleskimmer@peak-erg.org jnavrales@oregonarc.com	yes
John Navrales					
Bob Hardy		SELF	921-0294		No
Danielle Asson		SELF			
Danielle Heston	97333 PO Box 434 97380	SELF			No
Theresa Lusner	PO Box 942 Collinsville, OR 97331	AMP	541-444-2334 541 602 4166	twinsner@hughes.net	No
MIKE MORROW		M3 WAVE		MIKE@M3WAVE.COM	No
Maryann Bozza	HMSC 890 SW 29th St #D Newport, OR 97365			maryann.bozza@oregonarc.com	No
Richard Brin	157 NW 15th St Newport OR 97365		541-867-7051	rockrntn_5@latmail.com	No
Jed Smith	88 Pioneer Trail Toledo, OR	ARC Advanced Research Corp	541 265 8636 541-270-9512	jsmith@oregonarc.com	NO
Wil Black				wil.black@oregonarc.com	NO

U. S. Department of Energy  
 NEPA Scoping Meeting for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC)  
 May 5th, 2010

NAME	ADDRESS/ZIP CODE	ORGANIZATION	TELEPHONE	EMAIL ADDRESS	Do you wish to comment tonight?
TERRY Lettnermiller	P.O. Box 550, Sumner, WA		509-867-4603	lett@pent.org	No
Yvonne Leikland	P.O. Box 75704, Waldport, OR 97139-0704		509-563-4090	wldport@pacchar.com	no
STEPHEN WEBSTER	113 SE Bay Blvd Nt.	BAR ERIK Nt.	253-725-7253	siletzbu@clawfish.net	yes
Yvonne Niekirk		OSU	311 867 0268	stevonniekirk@reg.state.or.us	?
John Oberman	P.O. Box 1676, Newport, OR 97136		—	—	?
MIKE DOWNUM		ODFW			7
Bruce Lovelin		ELFUD		bl Lovelin@earthlink.net	No
Caren Graham		ODPW		Abhayadava@yahoo.com	
KHEM SO	417 SW 6th				
Sneema Steingass	Hatfield	OSU	307-752-0244	steingass@onid.orst.edu	NO

50





## **Appendix B: Agency Correspondence**

---





## Department of Energy

Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, Colorado 80401-3393

July 27, 2010

Thomas Taylor  
Regulatory Project Manager  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
CENWP-OD-GP  
333 SW First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97204

**SUBJECT: INVITATION FOR COOPERATING AGENCY STATUS**

Dear Mr. Taylor:

As you are aware, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Golden Field Office in Colorado is the lead agency in preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the development of a Mobile Ocean Test Berth (MOTB) located approximately two miles off the coast of Oregon near the city of Newport. The proposed project is expected to deliver a mobile capability for testing the output of wave energy conversion (WEC) devices for the generation of electricity. The Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC), led by Oregon State University, is the proponent of the project. NNMREC was established through the DOE Water Power Program and local funding to support wave and tidal energy development for the United States. DOE's Proposed Action is to provide funding to NNMREC to support the design, construction, testing, and deployment of a MOTB to perform off-electrical-grid testing of WEC devices.

During the first quarter of CY 2010, interactions regarding this project occurred between the EA contractor, NNMREC, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to address project overviews and status of activities. In addition, on April 27, 2010, the USACE was provided with a Notice of Scoping for the proposed project and associated EA. Since the proposed project must meet the permitting requirements of Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, the DOE would like to extend an invitation to the USACE to become a cooperating agency in the development of the document. We anticipate the delivery of the Preliminary Draft EA by August 9<sup>th</sup>. If formal status as a cooperating agency is not desired, please provide us with the level of involvement the USACE deems appropriate for the process.



We look forward to your response and the opportunity to continue to work together on this important alternative energy test project.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Laura Margason". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping loop at the end of the word "Margason".

Laura Margason



## Department of Energy

Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, Colorado 80401-3393

July 29, 2010

Roger Roper  
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer  
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department  
State Historic Preservation Office  
725 Summer Street NE, Suite C  
Salem, OR 97301

**Subject: Request for Opinion; Proposed Oregon State University Wave Energy Project, Newport, Oregon**

Dear Mr. Roper:

This letter is to inform you that the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) is preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA), in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), for the proposed Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC) Mobile Ocean Test Berth (MOTB). The NNMREC is a DOE funded partnership between Oregon State University and University of Washington.

The proposed MOTB would be sited off the coast of Newport, Oregon (T. 10 N., R. 12 W., W.M). The analysis conducted pursuant to NEPA will cover a larger "Study Area" of approximately 2 X 3 miles in the Pacific Ocean. During final design a smaller 1 X 1 mile Test Site will be identified in which up to two MOTBs would be deployed. The final Test Site location is currently being determined through the NEPA and a site selection processes in conjunction with local governmental groups, the local community, and the Fisherman Interested in Natural Energy (FINE), a Newport fishing group. Each MOTB would be connected to one wave energy conversion (WEC) device. The MOTB would be capable of testing the output of a variety of wave energy conversion WEC devices without being connected to the electrical grid as a cost-effective means to evaluate the technical aspects, performance characteristics, and environmental impacts of developing marine renewable energy. One underwater sub-station pod (USP) may also be included in the facility and would be connected to both MOTBs and WEC devices.

The MOTB consists of a single-hull vessel, containing an adjustable load bank (ALB), submarine power cable, power analysis and data acquisition (PADA) unit, transformers,



and miscellaneous instruments and equipment. The hull would be approximately 14 feet wide by 32 feet long by 11 feet high and including equipment, would weigh approximately 45,000 pounds. The PADA measures the WEC device's output voltage and current waveforms with respect to time at high sampling rates. The ALB dissipates power generated from the WEC device by transforming it into heat that is dissipated into the ocean. Also included in the NEPA analysis is a USP, which enables the power take-off cables from multiple test berth modules and wave energy devices to be connected, and enables the power to be delivered back to shore via a single subsea cable.

The MOTB would likely be moored to an anchoring system on the sea floor consisting of a three-point mooring system with standard ship-type anchors (Stato anchors). The WEC devices would use a range of independent mooring and anchoring configurations depending on the device design; however, it is anticipated that they would also use a three-point mooring configuration. The MOTB and WEC device would be connected by a submarine power cable. The USP would also be moored to the sea floor during testing. The monitoring equipment would either be set on the sea floor (AWAC) or moored (Waverider, ADCPs, Plankton plates, etc.).

This project is the recipient of funding from the federal government, and requires a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for work in waters. The DOE is the lead Federal Agency responsible for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). Pursuant to compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, DOE is initiating consultation with your office regarding the proposed Area of Potential Effects (APE) for this wave energy project. Enclosed please find maps that illustrate the proposed APE for this project.

A record search was conducted at the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in Salem, Oregon, in February of 2010. The records search was used to identify previously documented archaeological, historic, and architectural resources within, and directly adjacent to, the APE, and to help establish a context for developing expectations about potential resources within the study area. No cultural resource surveys have occurred in, or within one mile of, the APE. No archaeological sites or isolates were identified in, or within one mile of, the APE. In addition, an analysis of historic shipwreck locations along the Oregon Coast (Marshall 1984) indicated that no recorded wrecked ships are located within the APE.

Please provide any comments within 30 days of the stamped date on this letter to assist us in the development of the EA.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding this project. Please feel free to contact me by phone at 720.356.1322 or via email at [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov) if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,




Laura Margason  
NEPA Document Manager

Enclosures:

USGS 1:24,000 scale map Newport North, with project APE overlay  
National Geographic Society TOPO (courtesy of ESRI) of MOTB Study Area

cc: Dr. Dennis Griffin, State Archaeologist



**Legend**  
 Proposed APE


Source: Newport North 64154-F1 (Quadrangle Map, courtesy of USGS)




Oregon State University  
 Wave Energy  
 Proposed Area of Potential Effects

Map prepared by:  
**ICF**

March 16, 2010



Source: National Geographic Society TOPO, courtesy of ESRI



**Figure 2-1**  
**Mobile Ocean Test Berth**  
**Project Area**







# Oregon

Theodore R. Kulongoski, Governor

## Parks and Recreation Department

State Historic Preservation Office

725 Summer St NE, Ste C

Salem, OR 97301-1266

(503) 986-0671

Fax (503) 986-0793

[www.oregonheritage.org](http://www.oregonheritage.org)

August 9, 2010

Ms. Laura Margason  
DOE Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Blvd  
Golden, CO 97401

RE: SHPO Case No. 10-1830  
OSU Wave Energy Proj  
10S 12W, Newport Lincoln County



Dear Laura:

Our office recently received your report about the project referenced above. I have reviewed your report and agree that the project will have no affect on any known cultural resources. No further archaeological research is needed with this project.

Please be aware, however, that if during development activities you or your staff encounters any cultural material (i.e., historic or prehistoric), all activities should cease immediately and an archaeologist should be contacted to evaluate the discovery. Under state law (ORS 358.905-955) it is a Class B misdemeanor to impact an archaeological site on public or private land in Oregon. Impacts to Native American graves and cultural items are considered a Class C felony (ORS 97.740-760). If you have any questions regarding any future discovery or my letter, feel free to contact our office at your convenience.

Dennis Griffin, Ph.D., RPA  
State Archaeologist  
(503) 986-0674  
[dennis.griffin@state.or.us](mailto:dennis.griffin@state.or.us)







## Department of Energy

Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, Colorado 80401-3393

June 19, 2012

Roger Roper  
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer  
Oregon Parks and Recreation Department  
State Historic Preservation Office  
725 Summer Street NE, Suite C  
Salem, OR 97301

**Subject: Update regarding Proposed Oregon State University Wave Energy Project, Newport, Oregon**

Dear Mr. Roper:

This letter is to provide you with an update on the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Environmental Assessment (EA), which is being prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), for the proposed Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC) Wave Energy Test Project. The NNMREC is a DOE funded partnership between Oregon State University and University of Washington.

In our letter dated July 29, 2010, DOE described the location where the proposed project would be sited, the components that would comprise the proposed project, and the specifications for those components. DOE's letter also described the record search that was conducted at the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) in Salem, Oregon, in February of 2010 and stated DOE's conclusion that no cultural, archeological, or historical sites are located within the area of potential effect (APE) for the proposed project. A figure illustrating the APE was enclosed in the 2010 letter and is also enclosed in this correspondence. In a letter dated August 9, 2010, the Oregon SHPO replied with their concurrence that the project would have no effects on known cultural resources.

At that time, it was anticipated that the Draft EA for the proposed project would be published in late 2010; however, the preparation of the Draft EA was postponed temporarily. During this time, NNMREC made minor changes to the proposed project. For example, these included changing the test apparatus (described as the Mobile



Ocean Test Berth or MOTB during scoping) from a 30- to 40-foot boat-shaped hull capable of testing loads up to 1 megawatt, to the Ocean Sentinel, a 6-meter NOMAD-shaped buoy capable of testing loads up to 100 kilowatts. The duration of deployments for the testing apparatus was shortened from 12 months to 3 to 6 months. The range of possible anchoring and mooring infrastructure was narrowed, and the standoff distance between the test buoy and the WEC device under test was decreased. The first WEC device (the WET-NZ device) to be tested at the project site was identified, though it fell within the parameters for likely WEC devices that would be tested as described in scoping. During scoping, the project site was defined as a 6-square-mile quadrant. Later, the project site was narrowed down to a 1-square-nautical-mile area within the original, larger site. DOE is presently revising the Draft EA to reflect all changes to the proposed Project and anticipates releasing the Draft EA in late June of 2012.

Because the specific location of site for the proposed project was refined to a smaller area within the original larger site and the activities that would take place as part of the proposed project are do not differ materially from those described during earlier consultation carried out pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, DOE believes that the SHPO's concurrence (letter dated August 9, 2010) also applies to the project in its current form.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this project, please feel free to contact me by phone at 720.356.1322 or via email at [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov).

Sincerely,




Laura Margason

NEPA Document Manager

Enclosures:

USGS 1:24,000 scale map Newport North, with project APE overlay  
National Geographic Society TOPO (courtesy of ESRI)

cc: Dr. Dennis Griffin, State Archaeologist



Source: Ingeport North Wetland (Quadrangle Map), courtesy of USFWS

**Legend**

Proposed APE



Oregon State University  
Wave Energy  
Proposed Area of Potential Effects

Map prepared by:  
**ICF**

March 16, 2010





## Department of Energy

Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, Colorado 80401-3393

January 11, 2012

Keith Kirkendall  
Habitat Conservation Division  
National Marine Fisheries Service-Northwest Region  
1201 NE Lloyd Blvd.  
F/NWRS, Room 1100  
Portland, OR 97232-1274

**Subject: Endangered Species Act, Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, and Marine Mammal Protection Act Consultation for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center and Oregon State University Wave Energy Test Facility Project, Newport, Oregon**

Dear Mr. Kirkendall:

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) proposes to authorize the expenditure of Federal funding to the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC) and Oregon State University to support their Wave Energy Test Facility Project (Project). The funding of NNMREC's proposed Project would enable of final design, construction, and initial operation, including deployment, of a wave energy testing facility that would be able to perform off-grid testing of Wave Energy Conversion (WEC) devices. The proposed Project would allow for testing the output of WEC devices in an open-water setting, studying the environmental effects of a range of wave energy technologies, and supporting the market development of environmentally sustainable technologies that harness wave energy to generate electricity in a manner compatible with ocean and coastal environments and coastal users.

Implementation of the proposed Project, as funded by DOE, would entail deploying up to two WEC devices and their associated moorings in the project site, operating the devices, and recovering the devices. Additional WEC device testing by NNMREC is anticipated throughout the life of the wave energy testing facility. It is estimated that each WEC device would be deployed for a period of up to 12 months. Each WEC device mooring system would consist of up to a four-point mooring configuration that may be left in place between WEC deployments. Project operations would also involve deploying either a manned vessel carrying a test device or up to two instrumentation buoys to be connected to the WEC devices for testing. The instrumentation buoys could receive power from the WEC devices and would analyze and record technical data on the power generation. The instrumentation buoys would have their own mooring systems that would consist of up to a four-point mooring and would be connected to the WEC devices by a floating or submerged cable at a distance of approximately 100 meters (328 feet). The instrumentation buoys would be unmanned during the test. Tests would run for 1 to 6 months during the months of May to October, although the WEC devices might remain on site



for longer, as noted above. Depending on the preferences, any of three possible testing scenarios could be implemented at the project site:

1. The WEC developers could deploy WEC devices and monitor their power generation using equipment contained within the device. Such deployments would typically last at least several months and could continue for as long as 12 months, thus, allowing WEC developers to see how their devices handle the severe winter storms that affect this region. NNMREC may help developers with the design and construction of the internal testing equipment.
2. The WEC devices could be monitored using test equipment deployed on a vessel. In this case the WEC devices would be connected to the vessel by a floating or submerged electrical cable at a distance of approximately 100 meters (328 feet). The vessel would be manned at all times and stationed using its own anchor. Due to the expense of keeping a manned vessel on site, such tests would not be expected to last more than 10 days. The WEC devices might remain on site for a longer period of time to demonstrate the survivability of the device. In this case, the power generation unit would either be taken off line, or directed toward an on-WEC load (e.g., a resistor bank).
3. The WEC devices could be monitored using test equipment deployed in self-contained instrumentation buoys. The instrumentation buoys would have their own mooring system that would consist of up to a four-point mooring configuration and would be connected to the WEC devices by a floating or submerged cable at a distance of approximately 100 meters (328 feet). The instrumentation buoys would be unmanned during the test. Tests would run for 1 to 6 months, although the WEC device itself might remain on site for longer, as noted above.

At the end of the proposed Project, WEC devices and the instrumentation buoys would be permanently removed from the site. All mooring components would be permanently removed at this time, with the possible exception of anchors, which may be decommissioned on site.

The proposed Project would be located within a 3.4-square-kilometer (1-square-nautical-mile) site (project site) in the Pacific Ocean off the Oregon coast near the city of Newport (see Figure 1-1 in the enclosed Biological Assessment). The final project site was refined through environmental studies and consultation with stakeholders and other interested parties, including the NNMREC research team, Hatfield Marine Science Center, Fisherman Involved in Natural Energy, and Oregon Sea Grant. Over a 24-month period, beginning prior to scoping and during more than 12 months of preliminary project development, NNMREC conducted a site selection process, which involved stakeholders and interested parties and resulted in a variety of site criteria.

DOE has prepared a Biological Assessment (BA), which includes a detailed description of the proposed Project and addresses the potential effects of the proposed Project on species listed as endangered or threatened, or proposed for such listing, under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as well as the proposed Project's effects on critical habitat. The enclosed BA also

incorporates an evaluation of the potential effects of the proposed Project on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH), in compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended in 2007, and establishes proposed Project compliance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act, as amended in 2007. The BA is enclosed with this letter. The conclusions of the BA are summarized below.

### **Endangered Species Act: Listed Species and Designated Critical Habitat**

DOE has determined that the proposed Project **may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect** the following species under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service:

- Chinook salmon, lower Columbia River ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Chinook salmon, upper Willamette River ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Chinook salmon, upper Columbia River spring-run ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Chinook salmon, Snake River spring/summer run ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Chinook salmon, Snake River fall-run ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Coho salmon, Southern Oregon/Northern California coast ESU (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)
- Coho salmon, Oregon coast ESU (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)
- Coho salmon, lower Columbia River ESU (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)
- Green sturgeon, southern DPS (*Acipenser medirostris*)
- Eulachon, southern DPS (*Thaleichthys pacificus*)
- Leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*)
- Green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*)
- Loggerhead sea turtle, Pacific DPS (*Caretta caretta*)
- Olive Ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*)
- Steller sea lion, eastern DPS (*Eumetopias jubatus*)
- Killer whale, southern resident DPS (*Orcinus orca*)
- Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)
- Blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*)
- Fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*)

Designated Critical Habitat (DCE) has been identified for several of the species listed above. DOE has determined that the proposed Project would have **no effect** on DCE for the following species:

- Chinook salmon, lower Columbia River ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Chinook salmon, upper Willamette River ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Chinook salmon, upper Columbia River spring-run ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Chinook salmon, Snake River spring/summer run ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Chinook salmon, Snake River fall-run ESU (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)
- Coho salmon, Southern Oregon / Northern California coast ESU (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)
- Coho salmon, lower Columbia River ESU (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)
- Eulachon, southern DPS (*Thaleichthys pacificus*)
- Green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*)
- Steller sea lion, eastern DPS (*Eumetopias jubatus*)
- Killer whale, southern resident DPS (*Orcinus orca*)

DOE has determined that the proposed Project **may affect, but is not likely to adversely modify** DCE for the following species:

- Coho salmon, Oregon coast ESU (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)
- Green sturgeon, southern DPS (*Acipenser medirostris*)
- Leatherback turtle, eastern DPS (*Dermochelys coriacea*)

### **Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation Act: Essential Fish Habitat**

The area in which the proposed Project would take place includes designated EFH for three fishery management plans: coastal pelagics, Pacific coast groundfish, and Pacific salmon. The species covered in these three fishery management plans are summarized in Tables 8-1, 8-2, and 8-3 in the BA prepared by DOE and enclosed with this letter. DOE has determined that the proposed Project **would not adversely affect** designated EFH for federally managed fisheries in Oregon waters.

### **Marine Mammal Protection Act**

Marine mammals are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, which restricts the taking, possession, transportation, selling, offering for sale, and importing of marine mammals. In addition to the five marine mammal species listed under the ESA, a number of other marine mammals are likely to occur in the project site or in the nearby surrounding waters. Marine mammal species likely to occur in and around the project site include cetaceans and pinnipeds and are described in Section 5.10 of the enclosed BA.

The most common year-round inhabitants are the pinnipeds, including the Pacific harbor seal and Steller sea lion. Male California sea lions and northern elephant seals are occasionally observed foraging in southern and central Oregon coastal areas but are not regular inhabitants. Section 6.1.18 of the enclosed BA includes an analysis of effects of the proposed Project on the Steller sea lion, eastern DPS and identifies potential impact mechanisms that can be considered applicable to other pinniped species in and around the project area.

Cetaceans potentially present in and around the project area include the transient killer whale, California gray whale, killer whale of the southern resident group, blue whale, finback whale, sei whale, Pacific right whale, humpback whale, and sperm whale. Section 6.1.19 through Section 6.1.22 of the enclosed BA includes an analysis of effects on cetacean species listed under the ESA. It describes potential impact mechanisms that can be considered applicable to other cetacean species in and around the project area.

In Section 7.18 of the BA, which includes the effects determination for the Steller sea lion, eastern DPS, DOE concludes that the proposed Project would result in an insignificant probability of incidental take for this species. In Section 7.19 through Section 7.22, which includes the effects determination for the four cetacean species analyzed in the BA, DOE concludes that the proposed Project would result in an insignificant probability of incidental take for these species.

Because the impact mechanisms and potential impacts for pinniped and cetacean species in and around the proposed Project area would be similar to those for the ESA-listed species analyzed in detail in the enclosed BA, DOE has determined that incidental take of marine mammals is unlikely to occur.

DOE requests your concurrence with the findings summarized above and detailed in the enclosed BA. We look forward to hearing from you regarding this project. Please feel free to contact me by phone at 720.356.1322 or via email at [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov) if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,



Laura Margason  
NEPA Document Manager

*Enclosures*

*Biological Assessment for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center and Oregon State University Wave Energy Test Facility Project*





## Department of Energy

Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, Colorado 80401-3393

January 11, 2012

Ann Grey  
Program manager  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
2600 SE 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 100  
Portland, OR 97266

**Subject: Endangered Species Action Section 7 Informal Consultation for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center and Oregon State University Wave Energy Test Facility Project, Newport, Oregon**

Dear Ms. Grey:

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) proposes to authorize the expenditure of Federal funding to the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC) and Oregon State University to support their Wave Energy Test Facility Project (Project). The funding of NNMREC's proposed Project would enable of final design, construction, and initial operation, including deployment, of a wave energy testing facility that would be able to perform off-grid testing of Wave Energy Conversion (WEC) devices. The proposed Project would allow for testing the output of WEC devices in an open-water setting, studying the environmental effects of a range of wave energy technologies, and supporting the market development of environmentally sustainable technologies that harness wave energy to generate electricity in a manner compatible with ocean and coastal environments and coastal users.

Implementation of the proposed Project, as funded by DOE, would entail deploying up to two WEC devices and their associated moorings in the project site, operating the devices, and recovering the devices. Additional WEC device testing by NNMREC is anticipated throughout the life of the wave energy testing facility. It is estimated that each WEC device would be deployed for a period of up to 12 months. Each WEC device mooring system would consist of up to a four-point mooring configuration that may be left in place between WEC deployments. Project operations would also involve deploying either a manned vessel carrying a test device or up to two instrumentation buoys to be connected to the WEC devices for testing. The instrumentation buoys could receive power from the WEC devices and would analyze and record technical data on the power generation. The instrumentation buoys would have their own mooring systems that would consist of up to a four-point mooring and would be connected to the WEC devices by a floating or submerged cable at a distance of approximately 100 meters (328 feet). The instrumentation buoys would be unmanned during the test. Tests would run for 1 to 6 months during the months of May to October, although the WEC devices might remain on site for longer, as noted above. Depending on the preferences, any of three possible testing scenarios could be implemented at the project site:



1. The WEC developers could deploy WEC devices and monitor their power generation using equipment contained within the device. Such deployments would typically last at least several months and could continue for as long as 12 months, thus, allowing WEC developers to see how their devices handle the severe winter storms that affect this region. NNMREC may help developers with the design and construction of the internal testing equipment.
2. The WEC devices could be monitored using test equipment deployed on a vessel. In this case the WEC devices would be connected to the vessel by a floating or submerged electrical cable at a distance of approximately 100 meters (328 feet). The vessel would be manned at all times and stationed using its own anchor. Due to the expense of keeping a manned vessel on site, such tests would not be expected to last more than 10 days. The WEC devices might remain on site for a longer period of time to demonstrate the survivability of the device. In this case, the power generation unit would either be taken off line, or directed toward an on-WEC load (e.g., a resistor bank).
3. The WEC devices could be monitored using test equipment deployed in self-contained instrumentation buoys. The instrumentation buoys would have their own mooring system that would consist of up to a four-point mooring configuration and would be connected to the WEC devices by a floating or submerged cable at a distance of approximately 100 meters (328 feet). The instrumentation buoys would be unmanned during the test. Tests would run for 1 to 6 months, although the WEC device itself might remain on site for longer, as noted above.

At the end of the proposed Project, WEC devices and the instrumentation buoys would be permanently removed from the site. All mooring components would be permanently removed at this time, with the possible exception of anchors, which may be decommissioned on site.

The proposed Project would be located within a 3.4-square-kilometer (1-square-nautical-mile) site (project site) in the Pacific Ocean off the Oregon coast near the city of Newport (see Figure 1-1 in the enclosed Biological Assessment). The final project site was refined through environmental studies and consultation with stakeholders and other interested parties, including the NNMREC research team, Hatfield Marine Science Center, Fisherman Involved in Natural Energy, and Oregon Sea Grant. Over a 24-month period, beginning prior to scoping and during more than 12 months of preliminary project development, NNMREC conducted a site selection process, which involved stakeholders and interested parties and resulted in a variety of site criteria.

DOE has prepared a Biological Assessment (BA), which includes a detailed description of the proposed Project and addresses the potential effects of the proposed Project on species listed as endangered or threatened, or proposed for such listing, under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as well as the proposed Project's effects on critical habitat. The BA is enclosed with this letter. The conclusions of the BA are summarized below.

DOE has determined that the proposed Action **may affect but, is not likely to adversely affect** the following species under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:

- Marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*)
- Western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*)
- Short-tailed albatross (*Phoebastria albatrus*)

Designated Critical Habitat (DCE) has been identified for two of the species listed above. DOE has determined that the proposed Action would have **no effect** on DCE for the following species:

- Marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*)
- Western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*)

DOE requests your concurrence with the determinations summarized above and detailed in the enclosed BA. We look forward to hearing from you regarding this project. Please feel free to contact me by phone at 720.356.1322 or via email at [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov) if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,



Laura Margason  
NEPA Document Manager

*Enclosures*

*Biological Assessment for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center and Oregon State University Mobile Ocean Test Berth Project*



## Moelter, Chris

---

**From:** Moelter, Christopher  
**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2012 7:15 AM  
**To:** kim.hatfield@noaa.gov; keith.kirkendall@noaa.gov  
**Cc:** Oestman, Richard; Meleah.Ashford@oregonstate.edu; laura.margason@go.doe.gov  
**Subject:** NNMREC/OSU Wave Energy Test Project Biological Assessment

Dear Mr. Kirkendall and Ms. Hatfield:

On behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), I present you with a Biological Assessment (BA) for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center and Oregon State University Wave Energy Test Project. The BA includes a detailed description of the Proposed Project and addresses the potential effects of the Proposed Project on species listed as endangered or threatened, or proposed for such listing, under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as well as the Proposed Project's effects on critical habitat. The enclosed BA also incorporates an evaluation of the potential effects of the Proposed Project on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH), in compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended in 2007, and establishes Proposed Project compliance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act, as amended in 2007.

The BA can be accessed through the ICF Secure File Transfer (SFT) site by following the link below. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you experience any difficulty in accessing or downloading the BA through the SFT and I will make immediate arrangements to provide it to you through alternative means.

The DOE requests your concurrence with the findings in the attached BA. We look forward to hearing from you regarding this project. Please feel free to contact me by phone at 503.525.6145 or email at [CMoelter@icfi.com](mailto:CMoelter@icfi.com) or Laura Margason, NEPA Document Manager, DOE at 720.356.1322 or via email at [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov) if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Christopher Moelter | Manager | 503.525.6145 (office) | [cmoelter@icfi.com](mailto:cmoelter@icfi.com) | icfi.com  
ICF INTERNATIONAL | 615 SW Alder Street, Suite 200, Portland, OR 97205 | 503.228.3820 (fax)

Please consider our environment before printing this e-mail.

File(s) will be available for download until **02 June 2012**:

File: [OSUWave-BA\\_05172012.pdf](#), 5,566.56 KB

You have received attachment link(s) within this email sent via ICF International's Secure File Transfer System. To retrieve the attachment(s), please click on the link(s). If you experience trouble please visit the ICF Service Desk at <https://servicedesk.icfi.com> or call (703) 934-3100.

[Accellion File Transfer](#)

## Moelter, Chris

---

**From:** Moelter, Christopher  
**Sent:** Friday, May 18, 2012 7:18 AM  
**To:** Jeff\_Everett@fws.gov  
**Cc:** laura.margason@go.doe.gov; Oestman, Richard  
**Subject:** NNMREC/OSU Wave Energy Test Project Biological Assessment

Dear Mr. Everett:

On behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), I present you with a Biological Assessment (BA) for the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center and Oregon State University Wave Energy Test Project. The BA includes a detailed description of the Proposed Project and addresses the potential effects of the Proposed Project on species listed as endangered or threatened, or proposed for such listing, under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as well as the Proposed Project's effects on critical habitat.

The BA can be accessed through the ICF Secure File Transfer (SFT) site by following the link below. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you experience any difficulty in accessing or downloading the BA through the SFT and I will make immediate arrangements to provide it to you through alternative means.

The DOE requests your concurrence with the findings in the attached BA. We look forward to hearing from you regarding this project. Please feel free to contact me by phone at 503.525.6145 or email at [CMoelter@icfi.com](mailto:CMoelter@icfi.com) or Laura Margason, NEPA Document Manager, DOE at 720.356.1322 or via email at [laura.margason@go.doe.gov](mailto:laura.margason@go.doe.gov) if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Christopher Moelter | Manager | 503.525.6145 (office) | [cmoelter@icfi.com](mailto:cmoelter@icfi.com) | icfi.com  
ICF INTERNATIONAL | 615 SW Alder Street, Suite 200, Portland, OR 97205 | 503.228.3820 (fax)

Please consider our environment before printing this e-mail.

File(s) will be available for download until **02 June 2012**:

File: [OSUWave-BA\\_05172012.pdf](#), 5,566.56 KB

You have received attachment link(s) within this email sent via ICF International's Secure File Transfer System. To retrieve the attachment(s), please click on the link(s). If you experience trouble please visit the ICF Service Desk at <https://servicedesk.icfi.com> or call (703) 934-3100.

[Accellion File Transfer](#)



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**  
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE  
1201 NE Lloyd Boulevard, Suite 1100  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97232-1274  
June 7, 2012

Laura Margason  
Department of Energy  
Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, Colorado 80401-3393

Debra Henry  
US Army Corps of Engineers,  
Portland District  
PO Box 2946  
Portland, Oregon 97208

RE: NMFS Request for Additional Information regarding the Department of Energy's Request to Initiate Endangered Species Act (ESA) section 7 consultation, and submittal of their Biological Assessment – Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center and Oregon State University Wave Energy Test Facility Project, May 2012 and US Army Corps Engineers Nationwide Permit #5 Application – Wave Energy Test Project at the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center, March 27, 2012.

Dear Ms. Margason and Ms. Henry:

After reviewing the submitted Biological Assessment (BA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) needs specific additional information listed below before Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation can begin. The requested additional information may be submitted on its own, revision and resubmission of the BA is not necessary.

- 1) Please provide a detailed description of anchor, tethering and tensioning plans or detailed drawings for all lines on all structures. This information is necessary for the evaluation of entanglement risk for marine mammals and ESA-listed species.
- 2) Please provide a detailed description including all tethering and tensioning plans, for any structures (e.g. anchors, lines, subsurface and surface floats, marker buoys) which may remain in place over the winter or any time when the WET-NZ buoy, Ocean Sentinel or other structures are removed for maintenance or overwintering. This information is necessary for the evaluation of entanglement risk for marine mammals and ESA-listed species.
- 3) Please clarify the statement "The Ocean Sentinel will be constructed with NMFS-approved passive deterrents, such as bull rails and netting, to prevent its use as a marine mammal haulout." If the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC) has determined what



form of deterrent would be used, please provide a detailed description and plan drawings. If NNMREC is seeking guidance on development of an appropriate passive deterrent, please clearly state when such discussion is proposed to occur and that the Ocean Sentinel would not be deployed until NMFS has approved the deterrent method. This information is necessary to evaluate the risk of pinniped haulout.

4) Please clarify the potential operation of "oscillating water column" type wave energy converter (WEC). The limited information provided makes it difficult to determine if there is a risk of entrainment, entrapment or injury of marine species. This information is necessary to evaluate the effects of testing this type of device on ESA-listed species.

5) Please clarify the duration and nature of activities proposed to occur in Yaquina Bay which would not be considered normal marine/bay traffic and operations, such as deployment of the testing equipment or WECs in the bay for longer than 7 days. This information is necessary to evaluate the effects on Critical Habitat within Yaquina Bay.

6) Please clarify that derelict gear monitoring and, if deemed necessary, removal (Adaptive Management Framework (AMF) Section 3.2 p.6) will be conducted when **any** project related equipment remains in the water (e.g. anchors, lines, tethers, marker buoys and similar items related to the Ocean Sentinel and mooring gear, as well as each WEC that will be tested at the site). Not just when the Ocean Sentinel, TRIAXYS or other monitoring equipment is deployed. Please provide the frequency and method of such monitoring.

7) Please provide the analysis of effects to the Primary Constituent Elements (PCEs) of green sturgeon critical habitat referenced in the BA section 7.12 Green Sturgeon, southern DPS or clearly describe where in Chapter 6 the discussion and evaluation of effects on the PCEs for green sturgeon critical habitat is located. The final paragraph of this section concludes that the proposed action may affect but is not likely to adversely modify designated critical habitat of the green sturgeon and refers to an analysis in Chapter 6. However, NMFS was unable to locate the referenced analysis and needs this information for its effects analysis.

8) While not an additional piece of information needed, NMFS recommends that recording and reporting of opportunistic observations of marine mammals and other listed species during any visits to the site including installation, maintenance, monitoring and removal visits. This should be included in the both the NNMREC AMF and WET-NZ Adaptive Mitigation Plan, as well as any future WEC test Adaptive Mitigation Plan. The observations should not be a separate monitoring effort, but rather a practice added to any site visits and should not be limited to identification of injured or stranded marine mammals.

We appreciate the efforts the U.S. Department of Energy, US Army Corps of Engineers and NNMREC have made to work with NMFS on the development of the open ocean test program which will further research and development of alternative energy sources such as wave energy.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Kim Hatfield (503-231-2315 or [Kim.Hatfield@noaa.gov](mailto:Kim.Hatfield@noaa.gov)).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Keith Kirkendall". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "K".

Keith Kirkendall, Chief  
FERC and Water Diversions Branch  
Hydropower Division

cc: (Sent electronically, unless noted as "hard copy")  
Therese Hampton, PEV  
Delia Kelley, ODFW  
Debra Henry, Corps  
Jeff Everett, USFWS





Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center-OSU  
Oregon State University, 204 Rogers Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331-6001  
Phone 541-737-9492 | Fax 541-737-2600 | <http://nnmrec.oregonstate.edu>

June 14, 2012

Ms. Laura Margason  
Department of Energy  
Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, CO 80401-3393

Ms. Debra Henry  
Biologist/Regulatory Project Manager  
United States Army Corps of Engineers  
Portland District Regulatory Office  
333 SW First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97204-3495

**Subject:** NMFS Request for Additional Information

Dear Ms. Margason and Ms. Henry,  
On June 7, 2012, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) submitted a request for additional information to support Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation for the US Department of Energy's funding of the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC) and the US Army Corps of Engineers' issuance of Nationwide Permit #5 for the 2012 - 2013 Wave Energy Test Project at the NNMREC ocean test site. We have reviewed the request and our responses are enclosed. If you have any questions or require further information, please feel free to contact me at (541) 737-9492 or via email at [belinda.batten@oregonstate.edu](mailto:belinda.batten@oregonstate.edu).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in red ink that reads 'BB Batten'.

Belinda Batten  
NNMREC Director

Cc (via electronic mail):

Keith Kirkendall, NMFS  
Kim Hatfield, NMFS  
Delia Kelley, ODFW  
Jeff Everett, USFWS

**Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center at OSU Response to the National Marine Fisheries Service's Request for Additional Information**

**June 14, 2012**

Note: Each of NMFS's requests is shown in *italics*. NNMREC's response to each request follows.

*1) Please provide a detailed description of anchor, tethering and tensioning plans or detailed descriptions drawings for all lines on all structures. This information is necessary for the evaluation of entanglement risk for marine mammals and ESA-listed species.*

**Response:** The mooring systems for the Ocean Sentinel, WET-NZ device and TRIAXYS™ Wave Monitoring Buoy, as well as the overall deployment configuration, have been fully analyzed under a wide range of loading conditions to ensure the reliability of the systems and minimize the risk of marine mammal entanglement. Due to the dynamic nature of the ocean environment, the amount of tension in the lines will vary depending on the conditions.

The anchoring and mooring system is described in detail with graphics in section 2.8 of the Biological Assessment. In general, during a test, the anchoring and mooring will include:

1. Ocean Sentinel – one buoy anchored using a three-point system attached to moorings with surface floats. The tension in the Ocean Sentinel mooring lines will range between 500 – 1,500 lbs during calm sea states and could reach upwards of 6,000 lbs during significant wave events.
2. WET-NZ Device – one buoy anchored using a three-point system attached to moorings with surface floats. The tension in the WET-NZ mooring lines will range from 3,300 – 13,000 lbs in calm seas and could reach 35,000 lbs of tension under extreme weather conditions. The umbilical cable between the WET-NZ and the Ocean Sentinel is designed with subsurface floats to maintain tension at all times, with a peak tension of approximately 1,500 lbs.
3. TRIAXYS wave measurement device – one buoy anchored to the west of the test with a single-point mooring.
4. Marker buoys - four buoys anchored at the corners of the site on single-point moorings.

While the levels of tension in the mooring lines will vary with the sea state, the mooring systems feature subsurface floats to maintain tension in the lines taught and prevent any “slack” when the load decreases. Additionally, the mooring lines have an extremely high breaking strength, such that they will not “snap” under extreme load conditions, including that of a potential whale encounter.

*2) Please provide a detailed description, including all tethering and tensioning plans, for any structures (e.g. anchors, lines, subsurface and surface floats, marker buoys) which may remain in place over the winter or any time when the WET-NZ buoy, Ocean Sentinel or other structures are removed for maintenance or overwintering. This information is necessary for the evaluation of entanglement risk for marine mammals and ESA-listed species.*

**Response:** As described in section 2.8 of the Biological Assessment and the response above, the mooring systems and deployment configuration are designed to maintain tension at all times, in both static and dynamic states. To ensure that no slack is introduced into the system when the Ocean Sentinel is removed (either for maintenance or overwintering), its mooring lines will be connected to the corner marker buoys, and the marker buoys' anchors will maintain tension on the lines. When the WET-NZ is removed, its anchors and mooring lines will be removed as well.

3) *Please clarify the statement "The Ocean Sentinel will be constructed with NMFS-approved passive deterrents, such as bull rails and netting, to prevent its use as a marine mammal haulout." If the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC) has determined what form of deterrent would be used, please provide a detailed description and plan drawings. If NNMREC is seeking guidance on development of an appropriate passive deterrent please clearly state when such discussion is proposed to occur and that the Ocean Sentinel would not be deployed until NMFS has approved the deterrent method. This information is necessary to evaluate the risk of pinniped haulout.*

**Response:** Due to the irregular shapes of the Ocean Sentinel, WET-NZ and TRIAXYS buoy, NNMREC does not anticipate that pinnipeds would be able to haul-out on any of these structures. As described in the Adaptive Mitigation Plan (AMP) and the Adaptive Management Framework (AMF), NNMREC would make opportunistic observations of marine mammals and other listed species during installation, maintenance, monitoring and any other activities at the project site. If pinnipeds are observed on one or more of the project structures, NNMREC would implement the haulout protocols listed in the AMP and notify NMFS to report the incident. In addition, NNMREC would seek guidance from NMFS on selecting and installing an appropriate haulout deterrent, as well as any other measures deemed necessary (e.g., device removal, modification of Project operations or monitoring plans).

4) *Please clarify the potential operation of "oscillating water column" type wave energy converter (WEC). The limited information provided makes it difficult to determine if there is a risk of entrainment, entrapment or injury of marine species. This information is necessary to evaluate the effects of testing this type of device on ESA-listed species.*

**Response:** Because testing of an OWC device has not been proposed, the operations of such a device cannot be described in further detail at this time. However, in general, and specifically for the example provided in the EA, the water column moves up and down with the wave action in a relatively stationary open chamber. As the peak of the wave passes air is compressed in the chamber and pushed through a turbine either at the top of the chamber or on the side of the chamber. As the water recedes as the wave trough passes a vacuum is created and air passes through the turbine back into the chamber. For this reason, these devices are sometimes referred to as oscillating "air" columns since oscillating "water" column is somewhat misleading.

If testing of an OWC device(s) is proposed, then NNMREC would consult with NMFS to evaluate the potential impacts and identify measures to minimize any risk of entrainment, entrapment or injury of marine species. Such consultation would take place during the permitting of the proposed test, in the Adaptive Management Committee proceedings, and/or other appropriate forum (e.g., direct consultation between NNMREC and NMFS). While there is limited information on OWC devices at this time, the NMFS screening criteria for traditional

hydropower projects may be useful in developing mitigation measures for OWC devices to minimize the risk of entrainment, entrapment or injury of marine species.

*5) Please clarify the duration and nature of activities proposed to occur in Yaquina Bay which would not be considered normal marine/bay traffic and operations, such as deployment of the testing equipment or WECs in the bay for longer than 7 days. This information is necessary to evaluate the effects on Critical Habitat within Yaquina Bay.*

**Response:** When the Ocean Sentinel and/or WET-NZ are removed from the project site for maintenance, there may be a need for dockside mooring at existing piers or docks in Newport. Dockside moorings would not occur for more than seven days at a time and would not involve excessive generation of noise or electrical currents, disturbance to bottom habitat, or changes in water quality. These activities would be within the scope of normal marine traffic and operations and would be performed in compliance with all applicable laws.

If activities that exceed the scope or duration of normal marine traffic and operations are proposed in the future, NNMREC would consult with NMFS and obtain the appropriate authorizations. Any such activities, once approved, would be performed within the in-water work window for Yaquina Bay and in adherence with any guidance or conditions prescribed by NMFS.

*6) Please clarify that derelict gear monitoring and, if deemed necessary, removal (Adaptive Management Framework Section 3.2 p.6) will be conducted when any project related equipment remains in the water (e.g. anchors, lines, tethers, marker buoys and similar items related to the Ocean Sentinel and mooring gear, as well as each WEC that will be tested at the site). Not just when the Ocean Sentinel, TRIAXYS or other monitoring equipment is deployed. Please provide the frequency and method of such monitoring.*

**Response:** Response to discovery of derelict gear would be performed in accordance with the thresholds and measures described in the AMP. In addition, NNMREC will add the following procedures to the AMP and the AMF:

- i. **Detection:** NNMREC will perform underwater visual monitoring at least three times for each test: once prior to device deployment, once during active deployment, and once after device removal; as described in the Benthic Habitat Monitoring Plan (Appendix A of the BA). For the 2012 WET-NZ test this is anticipated to be June, August, and October 2012. The before and after monitoring would be when neither the Ocean Sentinel, TRIAXYS nor WEC device is deployed. Video lander sampling of anchors and reference locations will continue for the duration of the project (i.e., when any project related equipment remains in the water), weather permitting (as described in the Benthic Habitat Monitoring Plan). This sample method will provide for monitoring of derelict gear, as well as animal entanglement.
- ii. **Notification:** If derelict gear is detected, NNMREC will contact NMFS and ODFW within two days of detection.
- iii. **Removal:** Any gear entangled with project structures or moorings will be removed in spring/summer (prior to test device deployment) or in fall

(immediately following test device removal). If the gear poses an entanglement risk to marine organisms, NNMREC will consult with NMFS and ODFW to determine if an earlier or more immediate response is necessary (as described in the AMF and AMP).

- iv. **Return:** NNMREC will make every effort to return gear to owner and will be responsible for storage of gear and contacting owner to retrieve property; ODFW can provide owner contact information.
- v. **Recycle:** In the event that attempts to return gear are unsuccessful, gear may be recycled at the “Fishing for Energy” project located at Newport’s International Port.

In addition to the above procedures, NNMREC will perform visual monitoring from the water surface during all visits to the project site to detect any entangled gear. NNMREC will also participate in monthly FINE meetings, contact members of the fishing community directly, and maintain ongoing communication with ODFW in regards to lost or entangled gear. Further, NNMREC would consult with NMFS, either through their participation in the Adaptive Management Committee or otherwise, to ensure the efficacy of the derelict gear monitoring and response methods for the duration of Project activities. For instance, if derelict gear is routinely found caught on the mooring lines or anchors, monitoring and removal episodes may need to be increased.

*7) Please provide the analysis of effects to the Primary Constituent Elements (PCEs) of green sturgeon critical habitat referenced in the BA section 7.12 Green Sturgeon, southern DPS or clearly describe where in Chapter 6 the discussion and evaluation of effects on the PCEs for green sturgeon critical habitat is located. The final paragraph of this section concludes that the proposed action may affect but is not likely to adversely modify designated critical habitat of the green sturgeon and refers to an analysis in Chapter 6. However, NMFS was unable to locate the referenced analysis and needs this information for its effects analysis.*

**Response:** Please see **Attachment 1: Green Sturgeon Southern DPS: Primary Constituent Elements of Critical Habitat**

*8) While not an additional piece of information needed, NMFS recommends that recording and reporting of opportunistic observations of marine mammals and other listed species during any visits to the site including installation, maintenance, monitoring and removal visits. This should be included in the both the NNMREC AMF and WET-NZ Adaptive Mitigation Plan, as well as any future WEC test Adaptive Mitigation Plan. The observations should not be a separate monitoring effort, but rather a practice added*

**Response:** As described in the AMP, opportunistic observations of marine mammals and other listed species would be conducted in a consistent manner, as frequently as possible. Additionally, NNMREC would coordinate with NMFS, either through their participation in the Adaptive Management Committee or individually, to develop a standard form to use in recording and reporting marine mammal observations. If marine mammals or sea turtles are observed entangled, injured or impinged at the Project, NNMREC would immediately follow the Reporting Protocol for Injured or

Stranded Marine Mammals (listed in Section B. iii of the AMP) and, as soon as practical within 24 hours, provide NMFS and ODFW with available information on the incident. In addition, NNMREC would consult with NMFS and ODFW regarding modifying the Project and/or monitoring plans.

# ATTACHMENT 1

## Green Sturgeon Southern DPS: Primary Constituent Elements of Critical Habitat

Chris Earle, ICF. June 11, 2012.

Critical habitat for the green sturgeon southern DPS was designated by NMFS on October 9, 2009 (74 FR 52300). Critical habitat includes the coastal marine waters 110 meters (361 feet) deep from Monterey Bay, California north to Cape Flattery, Washington, including the Strait of Juan de Fuca, Washington, to its United States boundary; and certain other areas, specifically including Yaquina Bay (74 FR 52300). The designated critical habitat includes the action area. In their proposal for critical habitat designation, NMFS identified PCEs for green sturgeon critical habitat in freshwater, estuarine, and nearshore marine habitats. The PCEs for freshwater habitat are irrelevant as no freshwater habitat occurs in the action area. The PCEs for estuarine habitat and nearshore marine habitat are identified below.

For estuarine habitat:

- Food resources that “primarily consist of benthic invertebrates and fishes, including crangonid shrimp, burrowing thalassinidean shrimp (particularly the burrowing ghost shrimp), amphipods, isopods, clams, annelid worms, crabs, sand lances, and anchovies” (73 FR 52089).
- Water flow (only applicable to the Sacramento River system).
- Water quality “including temperature, salinity, oxygen content, and other chemical characteristics, necessary for normal behavior, growth, and viability of all life stages.” (73 FR 52089).
- Migratory corridor, “[a] migratory pathway necessary for the safe and timely passage of Southern DPS fish within estuarine habitats and between estuarine and riverine or marine habitats.” (73 FR 52089).
- Water depth, “[a] diversity of depths necessary for shelter, foraging, and migration of juvenile, subadult, and adult life stages.” (73 FR 52089).
- Sediment quality “necessary for normal behavior, growth, and viability of all life stages” (73 FR 52090).

For coastal marine habitat:

- Migratory corridor, “[a] migratory pathway necessary for the safe and timely passage of Southern DPS fish within marine and between estuarine and marine habitats” (73 FR 52090).
- Water quality “with adequate dissolved oxygen levels and acceptably low levels of contaminants” (73 FR 52090).

- Food resources, including “[a]bundant prey items for subadults and adults, which may include benthic invertebrates and fishes” (73 FR 52089).

The proposed action has little potential to affect PCEs for estuarine habitat; the action area only includes Yaquina Bay because project components would be deployed from and returned to that site, and physical locations used in Yaquina Bay would all be associated with pre-existing marine service facilities. As separately reported, no extended project-related activities (lasting more than 7 days) would occur in Yaquina Bay, which also supports a determination that those activities have minimal potential to affect PCEs for estuarine habitat.

Regarding PCEs for coastal marine habitat, the action area for the proposed project is located in nearshore marine waters traversed by green sturgeon migrating and foraging along the Oregon coast, and thus has the potential to affect these PCEs.

As noted in the BA species account, there is limited information on green sturgeon movements, behavior, habitat preferences, or requirements out in the open ocean. Data collected from seven out-migrating green sturgeon tagged with pop-off archival tags in the Rogue River indicates that green sturgeon generally inhabit depths of 40 to 70 meters, and occasionally make rapid ascents to the surface (Erickson and Hightower 2007). Lindley et al. (2008) found that peak migration rates of tagged green sturgeon exceeded 50 kilometers per day during the spring time southward migration. Available information from offshore commercial trawling efforts indicates green sturgeon remain within the 110-meter depth contour line (Erickson and Hightower 2007, National Marine Fisheries Service 2005a). If so, then green sturgeon in the vicinity of the action area are likely migrating between 3.5 km and 30 km offshore, where mean water depths are -40 to -110 m.

#### *“Migratory Corridor” PCE*

The WEC and Ocean Sentinel moorings obstruct only a few meters width in this corridor and thus have negligible potential to be perceived by migratory sturgeon; moreover they do not present any greater obstacle than existing features such as rock reefs and thus have minimal potential to present any impediment to sturgeon migration, or to alter the.

The WEC would also produce sound, which hypothetically could alter the marine acoustic environment in a manner that could affect green sturgeon migration. As noted in the BA analysis of hydroacoustic effects for lower Columbia River Chinook salmon, Section 6.1.1.1, there is very little reason to expect the acoustic signal from an operational WEC to be detected by a migrating green sturgeon, with acoustic effects damped to background levels within a short distance of the WEC. Thus acoustic stimuli, like the mooring structures, represent a very small fraction of the width of the migration corridor, with a proportionally small potential to alter green sturgeon behavior. There is, moreover, no evidence that acoustic stimuli per se have the potential to alter green sturgeon behavior. However, as noted in Section 6.1.1.1, there are nonetheless substantial uncertainties regarding potential acoustic impacts of WEC operation, and those impacts would be assessed periodically via an adaptive management process. It would also be appropriate at that time to reassess the potential for acoustic effects to affect green sturgeon migration.

The WEC would also produce EMF, which hypothetically could alter the marine EMF environment in a manner that could affect green sturgeon migration. As noted in the BA analysis of EMF effects for lower

Columbia River Chinook salmon, Section 6.1.1.4, there is very little reason to expect the EMF signal from an operational WEC to be detected by a salmonid, and even a green sturgeon is unlikely to detect EMF effects at a distance of more than about 10 meters (Section 6.1.12). Thus EMF stimuli, like the mooring structures, represent a very small fraction of the width of the migration corridor, with a proportionally small potential to alter green sturgeon behavior. However, as noted in Section 6.1.1.1, there are nonetheless substantial uncertainties regarding potential EMF effects of the proposed project on marine fishes, and those impacts would be assessed periodically via an adaptive management process. It would also be appropriate at that time to reassess the potential for EMF effects to affect green sturgeon migration.

#### *“Water Quality” PCE*

No mechanism has been identified whereby the proposed project could affect dissolved oxygen concentrations. Contaminant release from the proposed project is analyzed in detail in the BA, Section 6.1.1.2, and is there found to pose a negligible risk to Chinook salmon, a conclusion reiterated in Section 6.1.12 with regard to green sturgeon. By the same rationale there is negligible potential for the proposed project to affect the PCE for water quality.

#### *“Food Resources” PCE*

The proposed project has no identified potential to alter food resources availability except by placement of the physical structure of the WEC and its moorings. Those effects are analyzed in the BA, Section 6.1.1.3, which covers various effects related to project structures. That analysis finds that the proposed project is likely to cause some fish aggregation and may on occasion snag derelict fishing gear. Both of these constitute environmental changes that may locally alter foraging behavior of certain marine organisms, including green sturgeon. However, as explained in Section 6.1.1.3, these effects have minimal potential to appreciably alter fish behavior in the area, particularly in consideration of conservation measures addressing removal of derelict gear, monitoring of benthic habitat, and periodic adaptive management to reassess project effects on marine habitat. In view of these conservation, monitoring, and adaptive management measures, the proposed project has negligible potential to alter the PCE for food resources, and there is moreover high confidence that this conclusion will be periodically reassessed via the adaptive management process.

#### *Literature Cited*

- Erickson, D.L. and J.E. Hightower. 2007. Oceanic distribution and behavior of green sturgeon. *American Fisheries Society Symposium* 56:197–211.
- Lindley, S.T., M.L. Moser, D.L. Erickson, M. Belchik, D.W. Welch, E.L. Rechisky, J.T. Kelly, J. Heublein, and A.P. Klimley. 2008. Marine Migration of North American Green Sturgeon. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 137(1):182-194.
- National Marine Fisheries Service. 2005a. Green Sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*) status review update. National Marine Fisheries Service Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz, California. 31 pp. Available: <[http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/statusreviews/greensturgeon\\_update.pdf](http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/statusreviews/greensturgeon_update.pdf)>. Accessed: July 27, 2010.





**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**  
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE  
1201 NE Lloyd Boulevard, Suite 1100  
PORTLAND, OREGON 97232-1274  
June 21, 2012

Laura Margason  
Department of Energy  
Golden Field Office  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden, Colorado 80401-3393

Debra Henry  
US Army Corps of Engineers,  
Portland District  
PO Box 2946  
Portland, Oregon 97208

RE: Initiation of formal ESA section 7 consultation for the Department of Energy's Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center and Oregon State University Wave Energy Test Facility Project and US Army Corps Engineers Nationwide Permit #5 for Wave Energy Test Project at the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center.

Dear Ms. Margason and Ms. Henry:

This letter acknowledges National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) receipt of the Department of Energy's (DOE) letter and biological assessment (BA) on May 21, 2012 and the US Army Corps of Engineers' letter and submission of the DOE's BA on June 8, 2012 requesting concurrence with an Not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA) determination for the following Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed species, critical habitat and essential fish habitats occurring within the project action area.

NMFS does not concur with the NLAA determination because the effects of the proposed action are unlikely to be insignificant or discountable, and are not wholly beneficial. NMFS based this preliminary assessment on the temporal scale (ten years), the risk of entanglement of marine mammals, and the significant uncertainty about sound and electromagnetic fields generated by the project and the resulting effects on marine life. These factors may adversely affect ESA-listed species. Therefore, this letter serves as notice of initiation of formal consultation under Section 7 of the ESA. Section 7 allows NMFS up to 135 calendar days from the receipt of a complete biological assessment to conclude formal consultation and complete our biological opinion (unless NMFS and the action agency mutually agree to an extension). NMFS received your response to our request for additional information dated June 15, 2012, on June 18, 2012. NMFS has determined that the BA and the additional information response provide all the information required from you to initiate consultation or that the information is available from other sources for our consideration and reference. NMFS considers consultation initiated as of



June 18, 2012, the date we received your response to our additional information request. Therefore, we expect to provide our biological opinion to you no later than October 31, 2012.

As a reminder, the ESA requires that after initiation of formal consultation, the Federal action agency may not make any irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources that limits future options. This requirement ensures that agency actions do not preclude the formulation or implementation of reasonable and prudent alternatives that avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of endangered or threatened species or destroying or modifying their critical habitats.

If you have any questions or concerns about this consultation or the consultation process in general, please feel free to contact Kim Hatfield of my staff at 503-231-2315 or [Kim.Hatfield@noaa.gov](mailto:Kim.Hatfield@noaa.gov).

We appreciate the efforts the U.S. Department of Energy, US Army Corps of Engineers and Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center have made to work with NMFS on the development of the open ocean test program, which will further research and development of alternative energy sources such as wave energy.

Sincerely,



Keith Kirkendall, Chief  
FERC and Water Diversions Branch  
Hydropower Division

cc: (Sent electronically, unless noted as "hard copy")  
Therese Hampton, PEV  
Chris Moelter, ICF  
Delia Kelley, ODFW  
Debra Henry, Corps  
Jeff Everett, USFWS

## **Appendix C: Example WEC Device Technologies**

---




## Introduction

Over the lifetime of the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center's Wave Energy Test Project, (Proposed Project) a number of wave energy conversion devices are expected to be tested. The specific WEC device prototypes and models that would be tested as part of the Proposed Project are not presently known, with the exception of the WET-NZ device, which has a planned deployment at the project site in August of 2012 and will undergo testing in 2012 and 2013. As described in Section 2.7 of the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Proposed Project, general WEC device designs that are reasonably expected as part of this Proposed Project include pitching/surging/heaving/sway devices, point absorber devices, and oscillating water column devices capable of operating in water depths of approximately 55 meters (180 feet). Examples of these designs are provided in this Appendix and include the most probable types of devices that could be tested with the Proposed Project. These examples provide a basis for the analysis of effects of the Proposed Project that is included in the EA. Other WEC devices proposed for future tests would require authorization by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act prior to their deployment and would undergo environmental reviews under this process.

## Ocean Power Technologies PowerBuoy®

The PowerBuoy® design, developed by Ocean Power Technologies (OPT), is one of the most widely deployed WEC device designs in the world. Presently, a 10-buoy test array of the PB150 PowerBuoy® is proposed for deployment in Reedsport, Oregon (Figure 1). The PB150 is a utility-scale 150 kilowatt (kW) buoy that—in the initial design—contains hydraulic fluid, which is cycled as the buoy moves up and down with the waves. The moving fluid or mechanical parts are used to spin a generator, which produces electricity. The buoy is approximately 35 meters (115 feet) tall (of which approximately 9 meters [30 feet] project above the water's surface) and 11 meters (36 feet) in diameter. It is held in place by a three-point mooring system (Reedsport OPT Wave Park 2010).

**Figure 1. Ocean Power Technologies PB150 PowerBuoy®**



Source: Reedsport OPT Wave Park 2010.

## Embley Energy SPERBOY™

The SPERBOY™ (Figure 2), developed and patented by Embley Energy, is a floating oscillating water column device consisting of a buoyant structure with a submerged, enclosed column. Housed above the oscillating water column on top of the buoy is the plant: turbines, generators, and associated system facilities. Air displaced by the oscillating water column is passed through turbine generators above the water's surface. The device can be deployed in deep water to maximize energy production. The entire body floats and maintains optimum hydrodynamic interactions for the prevailing wave spectrum, maximizing energy capture. The total height of the device is approximately 50 meters (164 feet), with 35 meters (115 feet) of the device below water. The diameter of the SPERBOY™ is approximately 30 meters (98 feet<sup>1</sup>) (U.S. Department of Energy 2008).

<sup>1</sup> Dimensions represent maximum envisaged size of a full-scale commercial unit

**Figure 2. Embley Energy SPERBOY™**



Source: U.S. Department of Energy 2008.

## Ocean Energy Ltd. OEBuoy

The OEBuoy device is a floating system with the mouth of the oscillating water column facing away from the wave direction that uses wave energy to compress air in a chamber and pump it through an air turbine system (Figure 3). The design isolates the power conversion system above and away from the seawater and also provides high-speed air flow to the turbine. The OEBuoy has undergone several years of development and testing. In 2006 and 2007, Ocean Energy Ltd. conducted a winter sea trial on the 25,401-kilogram (28-ton), 1:4-scale OEBuoy prototype at the Irish Marine Institute test site in the waters off of Galway, Ireland (U.S. Department of Energy 2008). OEBuoy is the only device of its kind to have undergone 2 years of rigorous testing and is now ready for market.

**Figure 3. OEBuoy (1:4 Scale)**



Source: U.S. Department of Energy 2008.

## Floating Power Plant A/S FPP Poseidon

The Poseidon is based on a hydraulic power take-off system. It is designed for an offshore location in areas with considerable variation in wave activity levels and has a high efficiency and energy production. The Poseidon uses a float that absorbs the energy from incoming waves, and uses a piston pump to transform energy from the wave into water pressure. That water is then sent through a turbine to generate electricity. Poseidon was developed by the Danish company, Floating

Power Plant A/S (FPP). The Poseidon 37, a 327,000-kilogram (360-ton) and 37-meters (121-foot)-wide hybrid renewable energy demonstration plant (Figure 4), was launched in 2008 off the coast of Lolland in Denmark (Floating Power Plant 2011). Although the Poseidon 37 can be configured with wind turbines, any Poseidon device tested as part of the Proposed Project would include wave energy components only.

**Figure 4. Poseidon 37 (Shown with Wind Turbine Configuration)**



Source: Floating Power Plant 2011.

FPP has also developed and tested Poseidon models of the following sizes (Floating Power Plant A/S 2011):

- 2.4 meter (7.9-foot) wave front, system test
- 15 meter (49-foot) wave front, floater test
- 4 meter (13-foot) wave front, system test

## References

Floating Power Plan A/S. 2011. Home of Poseidon. Available: <<http://www.poseidonorgan.com/>> Accessed May 9, 2011.

Reedsport OPT Wave Park. 2010. FERC Project No. 12713. Available: <<http://www.oceanpowertechnologies.com/reedsport.htm>>. Accessed: March 25, 2010.

U.S. Department of Energy. 2008. Marine and Hydrokinetic Technology Database. Last revised: November 25, 2008. Available: <<http://www1.eere.energy.gov/windandhydro/hydrokinetic/default.aspx>>. Accessed: February 24, 2010.

## **Appendix D. Adaptive Management Framework**

---



Newport Open Ocean Wave Energy Test Site  
Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center

# ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

Revised 5/15/2012

---

**NNMREC Test Facility Adaptive Management Framework**

**Table of Contents**

1 INTRODUCTION ..... 1

2 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE ..... 3

    2.1 RECOMMENDATION AND REVIEW PROCESS ..... 3

        2.1.1 Annual Report ..... 3

        2.1.2 Adaptive Management Committee Meeting ..... 3

        2.1.3 Committee Recommendations ..... 4

        2.1.4 NNMREC and Agency Review ..... 4

    2.2 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION ..... 4

    2.3 MEETING PROVISIONS ..... 5

3 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT THRESHOLDS ..... 5

    3.1 BENTHIC SPECIES AND HABITAT ..... 5

    3.2 DERELICT GEAR ..... 6

    3.3 MARINE MAMMALS ..... 7

    3.4 ACOUSTICS ..... 7

    3.5 ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS ..... 9

Attachment 1: WET-NZ/Ocean Sentinel Adaptive Mitigation Plan ..... 1-A

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this Adaptive Management Framework (Framework) is two-fold. First, it provides a means for the broader regulatory and stakeholder communities to stay informed of and provide feedback on NNMREC test center monitoring and mitigation. The Adaptive Management Committee, described in Section 2, will receive an Annual Operations and Monitoring Report (Annual Report). The Annual Report will be a compilation of monitoring results, adaptive management thresholds, and mitigation actions taken during tests conducted at the NNMREC site. The Committee will meet on an annual basis to review results and provide guidance on future test center activities. Section 3 presents the Adaptive Management Thresholds that the Adaptive Management Committee will use in their review of monitoring results. This component of the Framework will be in place for the duration of NNMREC test center operations.


The NNMREC test center will be in operation from 2012 – 2022. Throughout this period, NNMREC will provide an opportunity for various WEC technologies to conduct short-term, non grid-connected tests within the project site, which is a 1 square-nautical-mile area in the Pacific Ocean, approximately 2 miles off the coast of Oregon near the city of Newport.

Second, this Adaptive Management Framework provides a foundation for the monitoring and adaptive management associated with individual tests at the NNMREC site. For each test performed at the NNMREC ocean site, an Adaptive Mitigation Plan will be developed that includes thresholds and mitigation actions for the particular test. The Adaptive Mitigation Plans will account for the unique attributes of that test, such as the characteristics of the technology being tested and duration of testing. In addition, results and analysis of previously completed monitoring studies will be used to inform the plans for future tests.

The Adaptive Mitigation Plan for the Ocean Sentinel/WET-NZ test (provided in Attachment 1) is included as an example of the Adaptive Mitigation Plan that will be developed for each test. Attachment 1 identifies thresholds that if exceeded may require a mitigation response. Monitoring results will be reviewed by NNMREC in real-time, whenever possible, to determine if thresholds have been exceeded. If the results show that thresholds are *not* exceeded then no action will be taken. If results show that thresholds are exceeded, NNMREC will consult with NMFS and ODFW to develop an appropriate response. Responses may include changes to monitoring methods, project operations and/or mitigation actions, as appropriate.

The general process for this Adaptive Management Framework is depicted in the figure below.

Adaptive Management Framework Flow Chart



## **2 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

The purpose of the Adaptive Management Committee (“AMC” or Committee) is to review marine resource issues (i.e. benthic habitat, derelict gear, marine mammals, acoustics, and electromagnetic fields) related to wave energy testing activities at the NNMREC Open Ocean Test Site and to make recommendations for changes in monitoring, project operations, and/or adaptive management/mitigation thresholds for the test center.

### **2.1 RECOMMENDATION AND REVIEW PROCESS**

The timelines outlined in this section are designed to ensure that previous year’s test information can be used to inform any permitting, adaptive management or other review processes for future year tests.

#### **2.1.1 Annual Report**

No later than December 1 of each year, an Annual Report will be provided to the Adaptive Management Committee for all tests conducted in the previous year. The Annual Report will include a compilation of monitoring conducted (including a summary of the purpose for monitoring, the methods used, and monitoring results) and mitigation actions taken. In addition, plans for future tests will be summarized.

#### **2.1.2 Adaptive Management Committee Meeting**

No later than January 31 of each year, NNMREC will convene and facilitate an annual meeting of the Committee. The Committee will evaluate the information relative to the adaptive management thresholds and mitigation actions discussed in the sections that follow.

The Committee will also evaluate technical issues and data interpretation associated with the monitoring, as appropriate. Such evaluation will include the sufficiency and adequacy of the information provided by the monitoring, consideration of monitoring results, as well as possible adjustments to subsequent monitoring methods and frequencies. Key functions of the Committee are to:

- a) Review the results of studies and monitoring conducted during the previous testing period;
- b) Use study and monitoring results, as well as other sources of relevant information, if applicable, to determine whether a change to project monitoring (e.g., study design, methods, or duration) is warranted or if existing monitoring approaches continue to be appropriate;
- c) Review available information about wave energy devices proposed for testing in the following test season;
- d) Evaluate any changes in plans made by NNMREC in response to the studies and/or monitoring, or upcoming devices; and

## ***NNMREC Test Facility Adaptive Management Framework***

- e) In the event effects are identified that require modification to project operations or monitoring, provide NNMREC with recommended measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the effects, which may include ceasing testing and/or removal of project structures.

### **2.1.3 Committee Recommendations**

The Annual Reports will be used by the Adaptive Management Committee to inform discussions and make recommendations to NNMREC for the monitoring, operations, and adaptive management plans associated with the NNMREC test center. The recommendations of the Adaptive Management Committee are not intended to supplant or fulfill any required permitting processes needed for future tests, but will be completed no later than February 28 of each year.

### **2.1.4 NNMREC and Agency Review**

Upon conclusion of the Committee's review, NNMREC, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, will consider the Committee's recommendations and determine the appropriate approach to the monitoring, operations, and adaptive management/mitigation thresholds to ensure the Project's compliance with the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and other relevant federal and state statutes. NNMREC, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, will also consider the Committee's recommendations in determining whether any additional mitigation measures are needed no later than March 31 of each year.

## **2.2 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION**

Participation on the Committee by state or federal agencies does not affect their statutory responsibilities and authorities. Issues involving the exercise of agencies' specific authorities can be discussed, but agency decisions are not delegated to the Committee. Representatives of the following organizations will be invited to join the Committee:

- Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- National Marine Fisheries Service
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
- Department of State Lands
- Local Tribes
- Oregon Coastal Zone Management Agency
- Fishermen Involved in Natural Energy (or other appropriate fishing organization)
- Surfrider Foundation
- Oregon Shores

Representatives from other organizations may be asked to join, as deemed appropriate by NNMREC.

## **2.3 MEETING PROVISIONS**

NNMREC shall arrange, administer, and chair all meetings, unless otherwise agreed. The Committee shall establish protocols for Committee meetings such as agenda development, subcommittee involvement, and timely distribution of materials, location and scheduling.

NNMREC will convene and facilitate an annual meeting of the group to be schedule no later than January 31 of each year. The Committee will convene annually for the life of the test center operations, unless deemed otherwise by Members.

NNMREC shall make the Committee meeting schedule and meeting agenda available on its web site.

NNMREC shall bear all costs associated with conducting meetings. Each Member shall bear its own cost of attendance. A Member's ongoing participation on the Committee is subject to that Member's budget and resource constraints.

## **3 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT THRESHOLDS<sup>1</sup>**

The Adaptive Management Thresholds outlined in this section are used by the Adaptive Management Committee, NMFS, ODFW and NNMREC in the annual review of monitoring results and other operational information. As outlined in Section 2 above, these thresholds are used to evaluate single year data and multi-year data from the test center. These Adaptive Management Thresholds do not apply to individual testing operations. Specific adaptive mitigation thresholds developed for each test will be implemented during operations of individual tests.

In addition to the conducting the monitoring referenced below, NNMREC staff will make opportunistic observations of marine mammals and other listed species during installation, maintenance, monitoring and any activities at the project site. NNRMEC will record all opportunistic observations and include them in the Annual Report of monitoring results provided to the Adaptive Management Committee, NMFS and ODFW.

### **3.1 BENTHIC SPECIES AND HABITAT**

**Adaptive Management Threshold 1:** If monitoring conducted as described in the Benthic Species and Habitat Monitoring Plan, which includes visual observation and gut analysis, shows *substantial differences* or *significant trends* as defined in consultation with ODFW and NMFS in benthic habitat or associated ecological communities between the Project-affected sites and reference sites, or at any one site over time, as defined by:

- a. substrate composition; for example changes in grain size proportions;

---

<sup>1</sup> The use of the term consultation in this document does not relate to Section 7 ESA Consultation.

## ***NNMREC Test Facility Adaptive Management Framework***

- b. species composition; for example there could be new species attracted to anchors/devices or species no longer present;
- c. species relative abundances; for example, existing species becoming more common or rare; and/or
- d. changes to feeding habits; for example a new prey item or disappearance of a species both from visual observation and from gut analysis.

NNMREC will, after consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS, implement one or more of the following actions to ensure Project compliance with ESA, MMPA and other relevant federal and state statutes:

- Modify the monitoring plan and/or sampling frequency to determine if ecological interactions have negative effects on protected species, benthic habitat or associated ecological communities;
- Modify the Project to mitigate for Project effects;
- Conduct additional sampling or studies; and/or
- Make determination that no changes to monitoring plans or Project operations are needed.

### **3.2 DERELICT GEAR**

**Adaptive Management Threshold 1:** If Annual Reports indicate that derelict gear is being ensnared on the *Ocean Sentinel* or project structures and posing harm to species, NNMREC will, after consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS, implement one or more of the following actions to ensure Project compliance with ESA, MMPA and other relevant federal and state statutes:

- Modify the Adaptive Mitigation Plan<sup>2</sup> to assure that derelict gear is addressed in a timely manner; or

Modify the Project to reduce the incidences of derelict gear being ensnared on the Ocean Sentinel and/or its mooring configuration.

**Adaptive Management Threshold 2:** If Annual Reports indicate that derelict gear is being ensnared on and posing harm to species during project tests on WEC devices similar to those proposed for upcoming test, NNMREC will, after consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS, implement one or more of the following actions to ensure Project compliance with ESA, MMPA and other relevant federal and state statutes:

---

<sup>2</sup> An individual Adaptive Mitigation Plan will be developed for each installation of any anchors, mooring lines, and devices associated with the Ocean Sentinel and WEC devices. Each Adaptive Mitigation Plan will be in effect as long as project structures are deployed.

## ***NNMREC Test Facility Adaptive Management Framework***

- Recommend an Adaptive Mitigation Plan , which includes derelict gear removal, to the WEC developer to assure that derelict gear is addressed in a timely manner; or
- Require WEC developer to modify its device and/or mooring configuration to reduce the incidences of derelict gear being ensnared.

### **3.3 MARINE MAMMALS**

**Adaptive Management Threshold 1:** If Annual Reports indicate observations of pinnipeds hauled out on the Ocean Sentinel, NNMREC will, after consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS, implement one or more of the following actions to ensure Project compliance with ESA, MMPA and other relevant federal and state statutes:

- Modify the Project to reduce the potential for pinniped haul-out on the Ocean Sentinel; and/or
- Apply for an Incidental Harassment Authorization if needed for deterrence or removal of hauled-out pinnipeds.

**Adaptive Management Threshold 2:** If Annual Reports indicate observations of pinnipeds hauled out on WEC devices similar to those being proposed for upcoming test, NNMREC will, after consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS, require the WEC developer to implement one or more of the following actions:

- Require WEC developer to modify its device to reduce the potential for pinniped haul-out; and/or
- Require WEC developer to apply for an Incidental Harassment Authorization if needed for deterrence or removal of hauled-out pinnipeds.

### **3.4 ACOUSTICS**

**Adaptive Management Threshold 1:** If acoustic monitoring indicates that sound pressure levels attributable to the Ocean Sentinel device at a distance<sup>3</sup> of 100m are above Level A injury threshold

---

<sup>3</sup> It may be ineffective to use an acoustic threshold 10 meters from the Ocean Sentinel as it not likely to result in measurements of the actual noise levels generated solely by the device. A 10-meter distance would be inside the larger project installation and the signals received may be inaccurate due to reflections (and other interactions) with other physical structures nearby. Therefore a greater threshold distance of 100 meters is proposed. Marine mammal detections in surveys covering the Oregon-Washington coast (*Green et al. 1992*) indicate a mean incidence of 0.5 animals per square kilometer. A 100-meter radius around the device corresponds to an area of 0.03 square kilometer so the risk of marine mammal exposure within that area is  $0.03/0.5 = 0.06$  animals, or about a 6% risk in association with a day or an incident of elevated underwater sound generation. Since the test device would be deployed for limited periods of time, there is lower potential for such incidents to occur frequently or for a sustained long period of time. As such the risk of exposure for any marine mammal is very low, even within the 100-meter radius.

## ***NNMREC Test Facility Adaptive Management Framework***

criteria (either continuous or impulse of 180dB RMS for cetaceans and 190dB RMS for pinnipeds) or Level B harassment threshold criteria (120dB RMS continuous and 160dB RMS impulse), NNMREC will, after consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS, implement one or more of the following actions to ensure Project compliance with ESA, MMPA and other relevant federal and state statutes:

- Design and perform additional monitoring;
- Modify the operation of the Ocean Sentinel to decrease its acoustic emissions (e.g., locking down the device during high surf, increasing controls to slow the motion of the device, or repairing the device if noise is due to device malfunction);
- Apply for an Incidental Harassment Authorization for acoustic emissions of the Ocean Sentinel.

**Adaptive Management Threshold 2:** If acoustic monitoring indicates that sound pressure levels attributable to a WEC device similar to the device type (e.g. buoy or attenuator) proposed for testing are above Level A injury threshold criteria (either continuous or impulse of 180dB RMS for cetaceans and 190dB RMS for pinnipeds) or Level B harassment threshold criteria (120dB RMS continuous and 160dB RMS impulse) at a distance of 100m (see footnote 4 regarding rationale for 100m), NNMREC will, after consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS, assure that one or more of the following is implemented during testing of the WEC device to ensure Project compliance with ESA, MMPA and other relevant federal and state statutes:

- Additional monitoring;
- Modify the operation of the WEC device to decrease its acoustic emissions (e.g., locking down the WEC device during high surf, increasing controls to slow the motion of the WEC device, or repairing the WEC device if noise is due to device malfunction);
- Applying for an Incidental Harassment Authorization for acoustic emissions of the WEC device.

**Adaptive Management Threshold 3:** After review of individual test results, NNMREC, in consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, will:

- Evaluate whether acoustic monitoring techniques are sufficient to adequately assess potential effects of different technologies;
- Assess new information about other sources of noise to confirm confidence in study ability to assess device noise; and
- Determine whether acoustic testing is required for all devices and whether previous study results can be used to support future tests.

Based on the evaluation and assessment described above, NNMREC, after consultation with the

## ***NNMREC Test Facility Adaptive Management Framework***

Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS, will implement one or more of the following to ensure Project compliance with ESA, MMPA and other relevant federal and state statutes:

- Modified or additional monitoring techniques;
- Utilize data and information from existing studies to estimate acoustic emissions and perform potential effects analysis for future tests.

### **3.5 ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS**

Monitoring electromagnetic fields (EMF) for marine renewable energy is a newly emerging application, and mission-specific instrumentation is needed. NNMREC has designed and will carry out the first deployment of an advanced 2<sup>nd</sup> generation EMF monitoring instrument to characterize the ambient EMF at the project site and measure the EMF during an energized WEC test. Post monitoring data analysis will take approximately 90 days. The results will be written up in a monitoring summary and provided the Adaptive Management Committee as part of the Annual Report by no later than February 1 following the initial test.

**Adaptive Management Threshold 1:** NNMREC, after consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS, will consider the following:

- Validate the effectiveness of the EMF Propagation Model and assess its efficacy in measuring EMF for future tests. If necessary, potential modifications to the model will be recommended.

Consider both the ability to detect and the level of EMF from the project devices and determine whether there is a meaningful source of EMF from the Project. Based on the evaluation and assessment described above, NNMREC will, after consultation with the Adaptive Management Committee, in consultation with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval by NMFS implement one or more of the following to ensure Project compliance with ESA, MMPA and other relevant federal and state statutes:

- Modified or additional monitoring techniques;
- Compare the EMF results with known values for impact on endangered species known or likely to be present in the area. If the results indicate that WEC-related EMF levels are within the documented magnetic or electric field sensitivity range of such species, NMFS, ODFW, OSU scientists and the Ocean Facilities Manager will work together on an approach to reduce EMF levels during a test. In the event that the monitoring shows EMF signatures at levels below concern, and after consulting with NMFS and ODFW, the EMF monitoring program will be modified accordingly.
- Utilize data and information from existing studies to estimate EMF emissions and perform potential effects analysis for future tests.

## **4**    **References**

Green, G.A., J.J. Brueggeman, C.E. Bowlby, R.A. Grotefendt, M.L. Bonnell, and K.T. Balcomb, III. 1992. Cetacean Distribution and Abundance Off Oregon and Washington, 1989-1990. Chapter I. In Oregon and Washington marine mammal and seabird surveys, J.J. Brueggeman (ed.). Final Report prepared for the Minerals Management Service, Pacific OCS Region. OCS Study MMS 91-0093. 400 pp

# Attachment 1: WET-NZ/Ocean Sentinel Adaptive Mitigation Plan

---

## **A) ADAPTIVE MITIGATION ACTIONS**

This Adaptive Mitigation Plan outlines the thresholds and real-time mitigation actions that may be taken during the test of the NNMREC's Ocean Sentinel and the WET-NZ device. All mitigation action decisions associated with the WET-NZ and Ocean Sentinel will be made by NNMREC and Northwest Energy Innovations, Inc. (NWEI) in consultation with NMFS and ODFW. The Adaptive Management Committee (described in Section 2 of the Adaptive Management Plan) will not be convened or be used to inform real-time decisions for mitigation outlined below.

No later than December 1 following the test a Annual Report of monitoring results, adaptive management thresholds, and any mitigation actions associated with the deployment of the WET-NZ and Ocean Sentinel will be provided to the Adaptive Management Committee (as described in Section 2 of the NNMREC Test Facility Adaptive Management Framework). This report will be used to inform the Committee's discussion of monitoring and adaptive management plans associated with the NNMREC test center and future tests.

## **B) ADAPTIVE MITIGATION THRESHOLDS AND MEASURES**

In addition to the conducting the monitoring referenced below, NNMREC staff will make opportunistic observations of marine mammals and other listed species during installation, maintenance, monitoring and any activities at the project site. NNMREC will record all opportunistic observations and include them in the Annual Report of monitoring results provided to the Adaptive Management Committee, NMFS and ODFW.

### **i. BENTHIC SPECIES AND HABITAT**

Consistent with the Benthic Monitoring Plan, benthic monitoring will be conducted prior to, during, and after the test. The monitoring results will be summarized and provided to the Adaptive Management Committee as outlined in Section 2 of the NNMREC Test Facility Adaptive Management Framework.

There are no adaptive mitigation thresholds for benthic habitat associated with this test.

### **ii. DERELICT GEAR**

Derelict gear will be monitored using the cameras described in the Benthic Monitoring Plan. If monitoring shows that derelict gear has become ensnared on any Project structure, the NNMREC Ocean Test Facility Manager will be notified within three days by the NNMREC scientist reviewing the monitoring results. The NNMREC scientist will review the footage and evaluate whether the gear has

## WET-NZ TEST ADAPTIVE MITIGATION PLAN

the potential to endanger the safety of organisms and/or project devices. The NNMREC scientist may recommend taking additional photos or footage to better characterize the derelict gear.

**Adaptive Mitigation Threshold and Measure 1:** If monitoring shows that derelict gear has become ensnared or collected on any Project structure but no organisms are caught within it and the gear poses no threat to navigational safety or marine species, NNMREC will remove the derelict gear during removal of the test devices.

**Adaptive Mitigation Threshold and Measure 2:** If monitoring shows that derelict gear has become ensnared or collected on any Project structure and has entangled or poses the risk of entanglement to organisms, NNMREC will remove the derelict gear as soon as feasible, notify NMFS and ODFW within two days, and provide a report with all available information on the case. NNMREC will then, after consulting with NMFS and ODFW, modify the Project and/or monitoring plan if necessary.

**Adaptive Mitigation Threshold and Measure 3:** If monitoring shows marine mammals or sea turtles entangled in fishing gear or marine debris, NNMREC will report the incident as soon as practical and remove the gear consistent with the Reporting Protocol for Injured or Stranded Marine Mammals (outlined in Section iii below). NNMREC will then, after consulting with NMFS and ODFW, and approved by NOAA modify the Project and/or monitoring plan if necessary.

### iii. ENTANGLED OR INJURED SPECIES

**Adaptive Mitigation Threshold and Measure 1:** If marine mammals or sea turtles are observed entangled, injured or impinged at the Project Structure, NNMREC will immediately follow the Reporting Protocol for Injured or Stranded Marine Mammals (listed below) and give NMFS and ODFW all available information on the incident. In addition, NNMREC will contact NMFS and ODFW as soon as practical within 24 hours to consult with them regarding modifying the Project and/or monitoring plans.

**Reporting Protocol for Injured or Stranded Marine Mammals:** NNMREC proposes to implement the following NMFS protocols in the event an injured or stranded marine mammal is observed:

- i. *Live marine mammals or sea turtles observed swimming but appearing debilitated or injured.*

Capability to respond to free swimming animals is very limited and relocation is a major issue. In addition, medical treatment facilities for marine mammals and sea turtles are for the most part non-existent in Oregon. Therefore, we recommend that monitors record the sighting as part of the monitoring report and provide the information to the Stranding Network. The data should include: 1) any photos or videos, if possible 2) species or common name of the animal involved; 3) date of observation; 4) location (lat/long in decimal degrees); 5) description of injuries or unusual behavior observed.

- ii. *Live marine mammals or sea turtles observed entangled in fishing gear or marine debris.*

The marine mammal disentanglement network in Oregon is based at Hatfield Marine Science Center - contact Jim Rice at 541-867-0446 or Barb Lagerquist at 541-867-0128. The national network is available

## **WET-NZ TEST ADAPTIVE MITIGATION PLAN**

at 877-SOS-WHALE (877-767-9425). Contact should be made immediately if an entanglement is observed and, if possible the reporting vessel should remain on scene while contact is made. Report should include the following information: 1) species or common name of animal involved; 2) location (lat/long in decimal degrees); 3) whether the animal is anchored by the gear or swimming with the gear in tow; 4) a description of the entangling gear (line size, line color, size number and color of floats if attached, presence or absence of pots or webbing; 5) if animal is towing gear, give direction of travel and current speed; 6) local weather conditions (sea state, wind speed and direction) 7) whether the vessel can stand by until someone is able to get there. The disentanglement network will determine whether or not a response can be mounted immediately and will advise the reporting vessel on next steps.

iii. *Dead marine mammals or sea turtles observed floating at sea.*

Dead floating marine mammals fall within the definition of "stranded" under the MMPA. To report strandings off central Oregon coast contact the Oregon Marine Mammal Stranding Network (Jim Rice) 541-867-0446.

iv. *Dead protected species found entangled or otherwise impinged at the project.*

These should be reported as part of the monitoring report to NMFS and ODFW, giving all available information on the case. The report should include the following information; 1) species or common name of animal involved; 2) location (lat/long in decimal degrees); 3) whether the animal was found on a project device or anchoring system; 4) a description of injuries or entanglement observed; if derelict fishing gear or other debris was involved, give a description of the gear (line size, line color, size number and color of floats if attached, presence or absence of pots or webbing; photographs if possible. In the event derelict gear is involved, the presence of protected species entangled in the gear should be included in the report initiating gear removal planning and coordination.

**Adaptive Mitigation Threshold 2:** If pinnipeds are identified on one or more of the project structures, NNMREC will implement the NMFS haulout protocols listed below. In addition, NNMREC will notify NMFS and ODFW within two weeks of the haul-out incident.

### *Pinniped Haulout Protocols*

- i. If pinnipeds are present on one of the project structures, monitoring or maintenance activities will occur at minimum of 100 yards from the structure (in accordance with the current NMFS guideline of 100 yards for vessel approach of hauled out pinnipeds).
- ii. If the pinnipeds do not leave the structure upon approach up to 100 yards and the pinnipeds are non-ESA listed species (e.g., California sea lions), NNMREC may proceed to deter the pinniped from project structures so long as such measures do not result in the death or serious injury of the animal (pursuant to Section 101.(a)(4)(A) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act). NNMREC will follow NOAA guidance on deterring pinnipeds: <http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/marine-mammals/seals-and-sea-lions/deterring-pinnipeds.cfm>

## WET-NZ TEST ADAPTIVE MITIGATION PLAN

- iii. If pinnipeds present on project structures are an ESA-listed species (e.g., Steller sea lions), NNMREC will not pursue any directed take or intentional harassment, and will remain at least 100 yards from the structure so long as the ESA-listed species is present.
- iv. If NNMREC needs to perform emergency maintenance that requires immediate attention (e.g. closing an opened hatch, repairing a failed mooring or electrical fault) and deterrence of a listed species is necessary, NNMREC staff will request assistance from a government official.<sup>4</sup> The NNMREC Response Coordinator will provide an account of the incident to the appropriate staff at NMFS and ODFW as soon as possible.

### iv. ACOUSTICS

The objective of the acoustic monitoring is to determine if the WET-NZ and/or Ocean Sentinel devices increase the ambient noise at the project site beyond mammal harassment thresholds, as described in the Acoustic Monitoring Plan in Section XX. This will be accomplished by measuring time-dependent acoustic background levels and frequency distributions of environmental, biological and anthropogenic sound sources that contribute to the noise budget during the test. NNMREC has collected continuous passive acoustic data to characterize the baseline acoustic conditions at the test site. During the WET-NZ/Ocean Sentinel test, amplitude and frequency distribution through time of the ambient noise field will be characterized and sound sources will be identified.

- Initial monitoring will occur within two weeks following deployment of the WET-NZ/Ocean Sentinel test. (This window may be modified if the health and safety of personnel is at risk due to unforeseen conditions such as weather or operational complications where approaching the device is not safe.)
- Results will be made available to NMFS and ODFW within seven days of the completion of monitoring. If results cannot be transmitted to NMFS and ODFW within seven days, NNMREC will contact NMFS and ODFW with an updated delivery schedule and the reason for delay.
- The following contacts will be notified regarding monitoring results and proposed mitigation, if applicable:
  - NMFS: Keith Kirkendall, Chief of FERC and Water Diversion Branch, 503-230-5431 or [keith.kirkendall@noaa.gov](mailto:keith.kirkendall@noaa.gov)
  - ODFW: Delia Kelly, Ocean Energy Coordinator, 541-867-0300 or [delia.r.kelly@state.or.us](mailto:delia.r.kelly@state.or.us)

---

<sup>4</sup> Section 109(h) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act provides exceptions for take of listed and non-listed marine mammals by Federal, state or local government officials if such taking is for the protection or welfare of the mammal, the protection of the public health and welfare, or the nonlethal removal of nuisance animals [50 CFR 223.202].

## WET-NZ TEST ADAPTIVE MITIGATION PLAN

**Adaptive Mitigation Threshold and Measure 1:** If acoustic monitoring indicates that sound pressure levels attributable to the WET-NZ and/or Ocean Sentinel device at a distance<sup>5</sup> of 100m are above Level A injury threshold criteria (either continuous or impulse of 180dB RMS for cetaceans and 190dB RMS for pinnipeds) or Level B harassment threshold criteria (120dB RMS continuous and 160dB RMS impulse),, NNMREC scientists and Ocean Test Facility Manager, in coordination with NMFS and ODFW, and after approval from NMFS, will develop and implement a response plan that outlines the appropriate mitigation action within 14 days of acquiring monitoring results. Actions may include, but are not limited to:

- Performing additional or alternative monitoring;
- Modifying the operation of the WET-NZ and/or Ocean Sentinel (e.g., locking down the device during high surf, increasing controls to slow the motion of the device, or conducting on-site repairs if noise is due to the device malfunction);
- Ceasing operations and performing necessary modifications to minimize noise levels. Subsequent monitoring would be conducted to verify that the noise associated with the test has been abated;
- Decommissioning of the test/installation; and/or
- Applying for an Incidental Harassment Authorization.

### v. ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS

As described in the EMF Monitoring Plan in Section XX, monitoring of Electromagnetic fields (EMFs) will be conducted during deployment of the Ocean Sentinel and the WET-NZ when the devices are energized, as well as when the devices have been removed. The monitoring results will be summarized and provided to the Adaptive Management Committee as outlined in Section 2 of the NNMREC Test Facility Adaptive Management Framework.

There are no adaptive mitigation thresholds for EMF associated with this test.

---

<sup>5</sup> It may be ineffective to use an acoustic threshold 10 meters from the Ocean Sentinel as it not likely to result in measurements of the actual noise levels generated solely by the device. A 10-meter distance would be inside the larger project installation and the signals received may be inaccurate due to reflections (and other interactions) with other physical structures nearby. Therefore a greater threshold distance of 100 meters is proposed. Marine mammal detections in surveys covering the Oregon-Washington coast (*citation pending*) indicate a mean incidence of 0.5 animals per square kilometer. A 100-meter radius around the device corresponds to an area of 0.03 square kilometer so the risk of marine mammal exposure within that area is  $0.03/0.5 = 0.06$  animals, or about a 6% risk in association with a day or an incident of elevated underwater sound generation. Since the test device would be deployed for limited periods of time, there is lower potential for such incidents to occur frequently or for a sustained long period of time. As such the risk of exposure for any marine mammal is very low, even within the 100-meter radius.



## Appendix E. Monitoring Plans

---



# List of Monitoring Plans

---

**NNMREC Ocean Test Facility (OTF) Short-term Acoustic Test**

**NNMREC Ocean Test Facility (OTF) Benthic Monitoring Studies**

**Proposed Study Electric and Magnetic Field (EMF) Monitoring of WET-NZ 1/2 scale Wave Energy Generator at NNMREC Ocean Test Facility**



**NNMREC Ocean Test Facility (OTF) Short-term Acoustic Test**  
(03/14/2012)

**Title:** Short-term acoustic assessment of wave energy conversion at OSU's OTF

**Principle Investigators:** Joe Haxel, Robert Dziak, and Haru Matsumoto – Oregon State University/ Cooperative Institute for Marine Resources Studies (CIMRS)

**Background:** Continuous long-term passive measurements of ambient sound levels (1 Hz – 2 kHz) have been collected from March 2010 – April 2011 at two sites within the MOTB providing a characterization of background acoustic levels (*Haxel et al., in press & in prep.*) over a range of sea states and environmental conditions. Ambient sound in the ocean is composed of a complex amalgam of sources. Despite prior knowledge of probable sound sources within an oceanic region, a distinguishing characteristic of marine ambient sound is that no individual signal dominates or can be readily identified within the received field. Analogous to the background “hum” emanating from a large city, ambient sound in the ocean is the background sound resulting from remote and near-field contributions of a multitude of anthropogenic and natural sources. At the MOTB site, the ambient noise field consists primarily of sounds emanating from breaking waves, winds, vessel traffic, marine mammals, and fish.

Root mean square (rms) maximum and minimum total sound pressure levels ( $SPL_{rms}$ ) from the 1Hz-2kHz band calculated over 1 minute intervals during the experiment reached 136 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa and 95dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa respectively. Meanwhile, the time averaged  $SPL_{rms}$  value for the year-long deployment was 113 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa.

$$SPL_{rms} \text{ (dB re } 1\mu\text{Pa)} = 20 \log_{10}(p_{rms}/p_{ref})$$

Peak  $SPL_{rms}$  values were encountered during heavy surf conditions recorded at a nearby offshore NOAA NDBC buoy ([http://www.ndbc.noaa.gov/station\\_page.php?station=46050](http://www.ndbc.noaa.gov/station_page.php?station=46050)).

Underwater sounds generated by the operations of the mobile ocean test berth (MOTB) instrumentation buoy (Ocean Sentinel) and wave energy converter (WEC) this summer (2012) are expected to contribute to the local noise budget. The purpose of this study is to provide a rapid measurement of the maximum, root mean square (rms), and minimum absolute sound pressure levels (SPL) received at a range of 10 m – 200 m distance from the WEC device. These observations will provide the necessary information to evaluate the acoustic impact of the operational WEC on marine mammals based on NMFS criteria for harassment (120 dB) and injury (180 dB).

**Project Objectives:** Little information is known about the sound impact of WECs. The objective of the acoustic monitoring is to determine if the device under test transmits acoustic energy above mammal harassment thresholds.

**Project Description:** The methods and instrumentation will be similar with techniques used by Bassett et al. (*in press*) to perform a similar evaluation of a WEC in Puget Sound operated by Columbia Power Technologies. Unlike the drifter used in the Bassett et al. (*in press*) study, we

propose to deploy a calibrated cabled hydrophone from a vessel. Each recording will begin and end ~200 m up and down drift of the WEC device. The hydrophone will be dropped to ~10 m below the sea surface and the vessel's engines will be shut down in order to eliminate noise contamination. The calibrated hydrophone system will record continuously at a sample rate of 50 kHz, providing reliable power spectral density estimates up to 20 kHz. A series of 4 drifts will be made past the WEC device during each recording cruise session.

Initial baseline near surface acoustic recordings using the protocol outlined above will be performed in May prior to any MOTB mooring installations in the area designated by Oregon State University for the WEC test. These baseline measurements will provide background for comparison of operational acoustic transmissions from the WEC, as well a test of our recording procedure prior to WEC installation and operation. Additionally, these initial recordings may indicate pre-existing ambient sound conditions above NMFS threshold criteria prior to MOTB activity. A subsequent recording cruise mission will be carried out after the WEC device has been deployed and is in operation.

**Reporting:** Data from each recording session will be processed and analyzed in a timely manner to provide NMFS and ODFW regulatory personnel with the necessary received SPL measurement information in order to assess acoustic levels produced by the WEC test.

**Adaptive Management:** Upon review of the initial results, and in coordination with NMFS and ODFW, NNMREC scientists may recommend further recording or no further recording upon satisfactory completion of the acoustic monitoring required by the WEC test permit.

If confirmed testing indicates that sound levels are above Level A (180dB SPL for cetaceans and 190dB for pinnipeds) or Level B (120dB SPL) harassment threshold criteria, and that the sound levels are attributable to the WEC test, NNMREC scientists and Ocean Test Facility Manager, in coordination with NMFS and ODFW, will determine the appropriate action. Action may include:

- Further recording to confirm acoustic pressure levels;
- Modifying the operation of the WEC or Ocean Sentinel;
- Ceasing operation and performing necessary modifications to minimize noise levels. Testing would be conducted to verify that the noise associated with the test has been abated; and/or
- Applying for an Incidental Harassment Authorization.

### **Schedule:**

May 2012–baseline recording

July 2012 – initial recording of WEC (within 2 weeks of installation, weather permitting)  
(initial results provided within 1 week)

August 2012 – continued recording of WEC (if necessary)

## **NNMREC OTF Benthic Monitoring Studies**

**Title:** Monitoring of benthic habitat, invertebrates, and fishes at OSU's ocean test facility

**Principle Investigator:** Sarah Henkel – Oregon State University, Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center and Hatfield Marine Science Center

**Background:** Pre-installation baseline sampling of benthic habitats and species was conducted at and around the future ocean test facility location from May 2010 to December 2011. After exploratory video sled surveys in May 2010, sample stations were established on a regular grid. Twelve stations were established: two transects north of Yaquina Head, two transects south of the Head, and stations at approximately 30, 40, and 50 m on each of the transects. These transects are designated as (north to south): BB (Beverly Beach), MB (Moolack Beach), NH (Newport Hydrographic Line), and NS (Newport-South). All 12 stations were sampled ~bi-monthly for sediment and infaunal organisms using a box corer. For beam trawl surveys, only 9 stations were sampled on each visit. Those stations along the southern-most transect lie at the edge of a reef, and it is too risky for the net and the reef organisms to sample those stations. Video footage from the beam trawl was effectively captured in summer months; winter videography (attempted in February 2011) did not yield useful footage. Although not a primary objective of the videography, evidence of derelict gear did not show up on any of the transects. Wayward crab pots and research gear are anticipated to be the predominate type of derelict gear in the test area.

### **Project Objectives:**

1. The presence of anchors and the potential for changes in benthic habitat may affect the distributions of benthic fishes and invertebrates. To investigate this hypothesis, benthic species and habitat monitoring will be conducted in to determine how benthic organisms will respond to WEC-induced changes to the habitat.
2. The introduction of hard surfaces may encourage colonization by marine invertebrates and fish attraction. To investigate this hypothesis, visual observations of the introduced surfaces to assess colonization will be conducted. Additionally, the ongoing benthic sampling conducted under objective (1) will investigate whether resident species are being affected by those attracted to the structures.
3. Marine mammals could become entangled or entrapped by derelict gear that has been ensnared on any Project structure. To investigate this hypothesis, derelict gear monitoring will be conducted to determine if gear is being ensnared by the anchors and mooring lines.

**Project Description:** The OTF is planned to be located approximately on the MB sampling transect in 45 m of water, so it will be in between the 40 and 50 m sampling stations on that line. Post installation monitoring of the NNMREC Ocean Test Facility (OTF) for assessing interactions with benthic habitats and species will be carried out in much the same manner as pre-installation baseline sampling. Table 1 indicates the pre-installation sampling already conducted (black text) and planned future monitoring, generally at the permitted site and for the 2012 test (blue text).

**Table 1: Sampling visits and gear types.**

	<b>Box Core</b>	<b>Trawl</b>	<b>Trawl Video</b>	<b>Lander Video</b>
June 2010	✓	✓		
August 2010	✓	✓	✓	
October 2010	✓	✓		
February 2011		✓	✓	
April/May 2011	✓	✓	✓	
June 2011	✓	✓	✓	
August 2011	✓	✓		
October 2011	✓	✓	✓	
December 2011	✓	✓		
June 2012	✓	✓	✓	✓
August 2012	✓	✓	✓	✓
October 2012	✓	✓	✓	✓

We will visit the site in June 2012, once more prior to deployment since it will have been 6 months since our last visit. After the Sentinel Buoy and associated WEC device under test are deployed in July, we will visit the site again in August 2012 for an assessment while the devices are operational. Weather permitting, we will again visit the site after the Sentinel Buoy and WEC device are removed to assess if there are ‘decommissioning’ effects or if site characteristics are similar to pre-test conditions and/or baseline observations. Sample collection and data analysis methods are described in detail below.

***Sample Collection Methods***

- i. Box core. One box core will be taken at each beam trawl station. The box core is a 0.1 m<sup>2</sup> modified Gray-O’Hare box corer. Upon landing the corer, a subsample of sediment from the

undisturbed surface will be collected and preserved for grain size and total organic carbon analysis. The sample will then be sieved onboard through a 1 mm mesh screen; samples will be stained and preserved for later identification and enumeration. Samples will be sorted into major taxonomic groups by lower level staff; these major taxonomic groups will be weighed for biomass determination. The laboratory manager will identify the echinoderms and molluscs to species and crustaceans and polychaetes to family (lower if possible).

- ii. Beam trawl with mounted video camera. The beam trawl is 2 m wide by 0.5 m high with 20 mm wall netting and 3 mm cod end netting. The duration of beam trawls will be kept to 10 min from contact with bottom to retrieval. We will collect and preserve (freeze with dry ice and store at -20 °C) fish and invertebrates from the net catches for later taxonomic identification. In the laboratory, all fish will be analyzed for size and morphometric body condition as well as their gut contents identified. This will enable us to investigate if the condition of the fish or their feeding habits has changed from what we observed in our 18 months of pre-installation baseline monitoring. Invertebrates will be sorted to species and each species' biomass determined. Videos will be viewed to determine the densities of sessile and mobile invertebrates (e.g. sea pens, crabs, sea stars) that are not well captured with the net.
- iii. Video lander (drop-video camera). This is a sampling tool that was not used for baseline monitoring but will be valuable for assessing potential fish aggregating effects of anchors. The video lander is an aluminum frame with two sets of video cameras with lights mounted on the frame. The two cameras are oriented 180° from each other so that they are facing opposite directions. The lander will be deployed at the 40 and 50 m stations on the BB and MB lines as reference locations as well as dropped near each anchor of the Ocean Sentinel (n = 3; ~45 m depth) and at each anchor of the WEC under test (as appropriate for each device type). The lander will be left on the bottom for a total of 15 minutes at each drop station. The number of each species or taxa of fish observed over time by each camera will be counted and the primary (mostly sand) and secondary (potentially anchor) substrate observed will be recorded. Counts will be compared to determine if more fish are observed at anchor locations than at reference locations and if more fish are observed by the camera facing the anchor than facing away. Since the anchors for the Ocean Sentinel are planned to be left in the water, video lander sampling of Ocean Sentinel anchors and reference locations will continue for the duration of the project, regardless if whether there is a WEC device under test. This sample method will also provide for monitoring of derelict gear that may become tangled on the anchors and animal entanglement. For derelict gear, the location (lat/lon in decimal degrees), type of gear, and condition (approximate size, line color, number and color of floats, if attached, presence or absence of pots or webbing) will be recorded. For entanglement, the species, its condition of entanglement and location will be recorded.
- iv. CTD-DO with chl a, and alkalinity. We will sample properties of the full water column with a SeaBird CTD profiler (SBE 25) with DO (SBE 43), pH, transmissivity and chlorophyll a sensors at every sampling station on each visit.

### ***Data Analysis***

For species assemblage analyses (conducted separately for box core invertebrates, trawl invertebrates, trawl fishes, and video lander fishes), taxa for which there is just one individual collected/observed

for the entire dataset will be removed so as not to skew the data based on rare species. Cluster analysis will be conducted on transformed density datasets for each assemblage in order to produce groups of similar stations based on species abundances. The SIMPROF routine will be run in Primer 6. This routine conducts a series of permutation tests to determine if clusters in a dendrogram have statistically significant structure. Samples within a cluster that cannot be significantly differentiated are considered to be a genuine group. The SIMPER procedure in Primer then will be used to identify species contributing most to similarities within clusters and differences between clusters. This analysis will be used to determine if there are unique communities within each assemblage found across the site. Analysis of the pre-installation collections indicated that there was strong spatial heterogeneity in the invertebrate collections that were stable over time. The spatial distributions of significantly different species groups from the post-installation surveys will be compared to the pre-installation surveys. Analysis of the fish data from pre-installations collections did not elucidate any spatial patterns of species presence or abundance; thus it will be interesting to see if we observe spatial differences in fish distributions post-installation. There was however, strong temporal variability in species present across seasons. We will determine if those patterns are consistent post-installation.

Multivariate analysis of the combined pre- and post-installation datasets will be conducted in Primer. Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) will be used to analyze the transformed density data to examine species composition and proportions across stations. MDS is an ordination technique where a small number of axes are selected prior to analysis and data are fitted to those dimensions, Data will be displayed in MDS plots such that samples that form a genuine cluster, as determined using the SIMPROF routine, have the same symbol on the plot. Thus, we will be able to visually determine if samples from the same season before and after installation cluster together or if post-installation samples are significantly different from pre-installation. Following MDS analysis of the organism data, the BEST function in Primer will be used. The BEST function is based on the BIO-ENV procedure, which uses all the available potential 'explanatory' (usually environmental) variables to find the combination that corresponds best to the patterns in the biological data. A correlation value is given for each comparison of the biological assemblage patterns and every combination of environmental variables. We will include a binary factor indicating pre- or post-installation in the environmental matrix in order to determine if that factor contributes to observed distinctions among collections.

In addition to multivariate analyses at the species level, we will compare our observations of infaunal invertebrates and fishes to longer time series by comparing summary statistics. The US Army Corps of Engineers samples the dredge spoils from Yaquina Bay for infaunal invertebrates and occasionally fishes. The location of the North Disposal Site and sampling area falls within the NNMREC sampling area (Figure 1); thus we are able to compare densities of major taxonomic groups (Polychaetes, Molluscs, Crustaceans, Echinoderms) to the USACE to expand our reference dataset, enabling us to put post-installation observations in the context of longer term, inter-annual trends and variability. Various Oregon State University researchers have been sampling flatfish along the MB and NH transects at various time since the mid-1970s. While direct density comparisons may not be possible due to differences in gear types, we will compare the relative abundances of different

flatfish species in our pre- and post-installation observations to those observed over the past few decades.

Drop camera footage will be viewed to determine if more fish are observed at anchor locations than at reference locations and if more fish are observed by the camera facing the anchor than facing away. Derelict gear and incidents of entanglement will also be recorded if found on the footage.

### ***Reporting***

Following each WEC test, a summary report of the pre-, during-, and post-test surveys will be prepared and submitted to NMFS and ODFW for review of both sampling procedures and findings. The report will include findings related to derelict gear and animal entanglement. This reporting will be in compliance with NNMRECs Mobile Ocean Test Berth Operations and Maintenance Plan, Section 9: Marine Mammal Consideration, Reporting Protocol for Injured or Stranded Marine Mammals. The presence of derelict gear itself will be reported to the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. If marine mammal entanglement is observed the Oregon Marine Mammal Stranding Network, which is based at the Hatfield Marine Science Center, will be contacted as well.

The approach described above is that which will be used for the NNMREC Ocean Test Facility site, generally, as well as what is proposed for the 2012 test, which will commence in July 2012. Changes to the timing of deployment for future tests may necessitate slight changes to the sampling schedule. Study plans for the following year and subsequent tests will be submitted to NMFS and ODFW, particularly in the event that any changes from the previous sampling are proposed. If adaptive measures are planned (see below), they will be reflected in the report.

### ***Adaptive Management***

We believe it will be difficult to detect measureable changes in most of the sampled populations due to project effects of the Ocean Sentinel and a single WEC device under test. The ‘baseline’ sampling for the Ocean Power Technologies project off Reedsport, OR, is scheduled to commence when they have the first buoy in the water, as this is still considered ‘pre-installation’, and no measureable changes are expected with the deployment of the single buoy. Thus, for benthic monitoring at the NNMREC Ocean Test Facility site, there are few scenarios we can anticipate that would trigger a change in sampling strategy or test operations based on benthic changes.

If monitoring shows that derelict gear has become ensnared or collected on any Project structure, the NNMREC Ocean Test Facility Manager will be notified by the NNMREC scientist to review the footage and evaluate whether the gear has the potential to endanger the safety of species and/or the devices in the area. This may include taking additional photos or footage to characterize the gear more, if necessary. Action will depend on the severity of the derelict gear entanglement and the risk the gear poses to the safety of the test or entanglement of animals. If the gear poses no threat to safety or animals, it will be removed during removal of the project. Gear removal planning and coordination will be initiated by the Ocean Test Facility Manager if deemed appropriate.




Figure 1: Map of project area. Repeat sampling locations are indicated with blue pins. The Ocean Test Facility project area is indicated by the light blue box. The planned location for the first test is indicated with the red star. US ACE dredge spoils sampling area is indicated by the white outline.

## PROPOSED STUDY

### **Electric and Magnetic Field (EMF) Monitoring of WET-NZ 1/2 scale Wave Energy Generator at NNMREC Ocean Test Facility**

PI: Dr. Adam Schultz, College of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences, Oregon State University, Corvallis OR 97331-5503

Proposed Project Start Date: 1-April-2012

Proposed Project Duration: 24 months

#### **Background**

The proposed project involves deploying the WET-NZ ½ scale wave energy converter (WEC) with the Ocean Sentinel instrumentation buoy at the Northwest National Marine Renewable Energy Center (NNMREC) Newport test site offshore Yaquina Head, Oregon. Deployment of the Ocean Sentinel and the WEC unit is planned for July, 2012. We propose to carry out measurements of electric and magnetic fields on the seafloor within and adjacent to the test site during periods when the Ocean Sentinel and WEC are installed and energized. To characterize background, baseline EMF levels, we propose to carry out measurements of EMF during periods when the devices have been removed.

EMF monitoring is not a yet a fully defined science for marine renewable energy applications, and mission-specific instrumentation is needed for the industry. OSU is in the process of developing this instrumentation and will be applying it for the first time to this project in an experimental mode. The National Science Foundation (NSF)-supported National Geoelectromagnetic Facility (NGF) at Oregon State University, led by the PI of this proposal, operates the US national academic instrument pool for terrestrial geoelectromagnetic instruments. The NGF pool currently consists of 46 transportable long-period magnetotelluric (magnetic and electric field) geophysical measuring instruments, as well as 7 such instruments that are permanently deployed at sites across the continental US. The NGF is also currently constructing the first 10 geoelectromagnetic instruments of a new type – termed “ultra-wideband”. This collection of instruments is used extensively in geophysical investigations on land, both to image the electrical resistivity structure of the Earth’s shallow near surface, crust and mantle, and to characterize both natural and anthropogenic electric and magnetic fields (EMFs).

Under Oregon Wave Energy Trust support, the PI of this proposal collaborated with M. Slater of SAIC in construction of a first generation marine EMF sensing platform that was a marine adapted direct offshoot and functional copy of the NGF ultra-wideband instruments that the PI developed under separate NSF support, in collaboration with Zonge, International, Inc. In July 2010, this instrument was successfully used by the PI, NGF technician A.T. Peery and M. Slater, to detect EMFs on the bottom of Yaquina Bay Oregon. The NGF team induced an artificial EMF in a buried, submerged pipeline under the bay by using a Zonge International, Inc., controlled source electromagnetic generator connected to the pipeline. In addition to detecting the location of the buried pipeline, this team also characterized the background natural and anthropomorphic EMFs at the waterline and on the seafloor in Yaquina Bay.

In 2011, under Oregon State University support, and with contributions from Zonge International, Inc. (and more recently through additional NNMREC/DOE support), the PI began the development

and construction of a more advanced, 2<sup>nd</sup> generation “multi-physics bottom lander” (MPBL) system that incorporates a significantly improved EMF sensor package, a wideband ocean bottom seismometer, auxiliary sensors including pressure, accelerometers, etc., capabilities for acoustic telemetry of sensor data from the seafloor to a surface vessel, a trawl resistant cowling to protect the instrument from damage due to fishing activity, and the capability for autonomous deployment of the sensor platform from the deck of a ship and buoyant return of the platform to the surface, by acoustic command.

The MPBL has been carefully designed to characterize EMFs associated with Ocean Sentinel and WEC installations (and, with the addition of its ground motion sensors/seismometers/accelerometers, it is also well suited to environmental monitoring of offshore wind energy installations, as well as to a variety of marine geophysical investigations). The sensors have been designed following guidance found in Slater, Schultz, Jones and Fischer, *Electromagnetic Field Study* (2010), Oregon Wave Energy Trust (346 pages).

The MPBL system consists of an EMF sensor package in a trawl-resistant conical capsule approximately 2m in diameter and 1.5m tall. The lander is hoisted overboard using a vessel-mounted winch at the locations indicated in the survey lines. After approximately 10-20 minutes of recording, it is winched back on to the vessel to be deployed at the next location. Operating in this deployment mode, a single MPBL can be used to characterize the EMF signature of a WEC/Ocean Sentinel installation. In future, the MPBL will also be configurable for an autonomous long-term monitoring mode, where it is deployed at a fixed position on the seabed to monitor EMFs and other environmental parameters over periods of days-to-weeks or longer.

The magnetic field sensors have been custom developed for the MPBL, with a noise floor of approximately 0.05 pT/ $\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$  at 1 Hz and 0.002 pT/ $\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$  at 50 Hz (where 1 pT =  $10^{-12}$  Tesla). The Earth’s magnetic field intensity as measured by a compass is about 50,000 nT (1 nT =  $10^{-9}$  Tesla). In addition to their extraordinary sensitivity, the MPBL’s magnetic field sensors have a flat frequency response from 0.1 Hz to 1 kHz, which makes them ideally suited to detecting even extremely small levels of 50/60 Hz power line noise at the fundamental frequency and its significant harmonics.

We have also developed a custom marine electric field detection system that is matched to the sensitivity of the magnetic field sensors, and both electric and magnetic field sensors detect both the amplitude and the direction of the EMFs, which is critically important during a survey in discriminating between several geographically disparate sources of EMFs (i.e. to determine which cable/installation is the origin of a given signal at a given location). These sensors have been coupled to the first portable, low power geophysical data acquisition system employing a digitizer with 32 bits of precision, providing the ability to digitize the MPBL’s sensor signals with extraordinary fidelity (e.g. with a signal-to-noise ratio of 3.2 million:1 for signals at 250 Hz). This extended fidelity is important in efforts to detect the sometimes-subtle EMFs of interest that may be otherwise overwhelmed by signals (natural and anthropogenic) that may come from other sources such as the shore-side power grid.

Such a degree of sensitivity to, and ability to distinguish the sources of, EMFs is required if we are to match the known and postulated electro- and magneto-sensitivity of indicated species, some of which are endangered within this range, as detailed in Slater, et al (2010). That report also indicates that with appropriate conditions (bathymetry, seafloor rock type), it is possible for electrically resistive sub-seafloor geologic formations to act as a type of waveguide, extending the distance range over which potentially biologically significant EMFs may propagate, relative to the more rapid attenuation

of such fields in electrically conductive seawater. It is therefore necessary to carry out a program of EMF monitoring of WEC sites in order to characterize background and induced EMFs from such installations. Ideally such monitoring efforts will be coupled with numerical modeling of EMF propagation using a realistic 3D model of the electrical resistivity structure of the seafloor, water column and coastline.

Our current development plan calls for completion of the data acquisition, power supply, magnetic and electric field sections of the MBL, and fabrication of a survey frame to mount these components so they are field deployable for pre-deployment acceptance testing in Yaquina Bay Oregon, by early August 2012.

### **Monitoring Objectives:**


1. Marine EMF monitoring for marine renewable energy is a newly emerging application of this method, and mission-specific instrumentation is needed for the industry. To increase our understanding of EMF monitoring, OSU has designed and will carry out the first deployment of an advanced 2nd generation EMF monitoring instrument.
2. It is hypothesized that the proposed project is highly unlikely to generate EMF at levels that would adversely impact endangered species. To investigate this hypothesis EMF monitoring will be conducted to characterize EMF during an energized WEC test.

### **Proposed EMF Monitoring**

We propose to carry out two EMF surveys within and immediately surrounding the NNMREC ocean test site. It will be necessary to map the seafloor EMFs surrounding the Ocean Sentinel/WEC installation when that system is operational and energized, and also to repeat the survey after the Ocean Sentinel/WEC system has been removed or powered down. Given the MPBL's acceptance testing schedule, we propose to begin monitoring operations in August 2012, while the Ocean Sentinel/WEC is in its energized configuration. Following its removal and before any new deployments of the Ocean Sentinel take place during the spring/summer of 2013, we will return to ocean test site and repeat the survey to obtain baseline EMF measurements.

During each survey, we plan to acquire data using a 4 kHz sampling rate, so we may resolve power line frequencies up to the 16<sup>th</sup> harmonic (960 Hz) of the 60 Hz fundamental frequency and beyond. The survey will be capable of detecting both AC EMFs originating at the WEC generator (at ocean swell frequencies of ~0.07 Hz and harmonics, as well as at 60 Hz power line frequencies and harmonics) as well as DC power line transmission related electric fields that might arise in the event of faulty/damaged/cut cable insulation or connector failures..

# Survey Configuration



**Figure 1.** Map view of the Ocean Sentinel/WEC installation mooring lines and watch circle. The distance scale is marked in feet.

Our survey configuration is shown in Figure 2. This survey configuration will be repeated twice; first in August 2012 while the Ocean Sentinel/WEC system is positioned and energized, and again in the spring/summer of 2013 when it has been removed and prior to the reinstallation of the Ocean Sentinel. In the event of delays on the part of the WEC or Ocean Sentinel operators in deploying the system, we will adapt our schedule accordingly, reserving the ability to carry out all survey in 2013 if required. During each of these surveys the ship (the 53' Oregon State University coastal research vessel R/V Elakha) will deploy the EMF sensor platform on the seafloor at the positions indicated in Figure 2 (the red dots), using the vessel's winch. The positions will be navigated with reference to GPS.

36 separate survey stations are identified in Figure 2. Two 1-km long survey lines are shown. All directions are with reference to Magnetic North, a direction that in this location is close to parallel to the coastline and to lines of constant bathymetry. The first survey line is oriented to magnetic north-south and the second orthogonal line is oriented to magnetic east-west. The two lines cross near the center of the Ocean Sentinel/WEC installation midway along the umbilical between the Ocean Sentinel and WEC that is shown in Figure 1.

**Figure 2.** Each seafloor EMF measurement station is shown as a red dot lying along either a N-S or E-W (magnetic coordinates) survey line. Survey locations are found 4m, 8m, 16m, 32m, 63m, 125m, 250m, 375m and 500 m radially outward from the array center, in each of the four cardinal magnetic directions.



The EMF surface array is designed to tighten spacing between stations geometrically as the center of the array, i.e. the Ocean Sentinel/WEC installation is approached. Field intensity will increase geometrically with proximity to the signal source, so tighter station spacing is required closer in, while sparser EMF sampling is appropriate at greater distances. In addition to stations obtained along the cardinal directions (an approach that also increases ease of survey navigation and operational efficiency), as time allows additional EMF stations will be acquired within each of the quadrants bounded by the survey lines.

It is appropriate to monitor EMFs using such an array configuration to account for bathymetric effects on EMF propagation, and for the possibility that shallow sub-seafloor geology structure may vary in three dimensions, leading to non-uniform EMF propagation with distance from the Ocean Sentinel/WEC installation. The 500 m radius of the survey footprint allows for capture of EMFs that may have propagated along buried geologic waveguides. Experience from studies of induced EMF propagation along such waveguides, a phenomenon used in the oil industry to characterize marine oil/gas reservoirs, provides a rule of thumb: the propagation of induced EMFs due to an “electric dipole” source of a given length can be detected approximately ten dipole lengths distant, if a geologic waveguide is present. The length of the power transmission line between the Ocean Sentinel

and the WEC is approximately 50 m, thus the EMF rule of thumb suggests we should monitor EMFs to distances of up to 500 m radially from that cable. In the absence of such a waveguide, we would expect much more rapid attenuation of EMFs with distance from the center, thus the denser station spacing closer in, with stations as close as practical to the center point of the cable (minimum distance to be determined by the Ocean Sentinel manager and the Elakha's captain given prevailing winds and currents. The closest stand-off distances illustrated in Figure 5 are subject to change).

EMFs are best measured from a stable platform of the seafloor. The motion of the sensor platform dragged through the water column leads to a series of technical complications. Such a scenario would move the sensor package through the Earth's magnetic field lines, inducing an electric field that is an artifact of that motion. The platform would also pitch and yaw, changing the orientation of the sensors with respect to the EMFs being measured. Such motion would need to be carefully logged so the measured EMFs could be numerically rotated into constant orientation coordinates. Finally the motion of seawater across the electric field sensor electrodes would create "streaming potentials" that lead to spurious electric field measurements. Given these complications, it is preferable to execute the survey as described above, i.e. as a series of stable bottom station measurements.

### **Reporting**

Post monitoring data analysis will take on the order of 90 days. The results will be written up in a short monitoring summary and transmitted to NMFS and ODFW for review.

### **Adaptive Management**

The EMF results will be compared with known values for impact on endangered species known or likely to be present in the area. If the results indicate that WEC-related EMF levels are within the documented magnetic or electric field sensitivity range of such species, NMFS, ODFW, OSU scientists and the Ocean Facilities Manager will work together on an approach to reduce EMF levels during a test. In the event that the monitoring shows EMF signatures at levels below concern, and after consulting with NMFS and ODFW, the EMF monitoring program will be modified accordingly.