

#	Forum	Date	First	Last	Affiliation	User Group	Comment Type	Comment Theme	Comment
1	Online Form	5/21/2011			Fishermen Interested in Natural Energy	Commercial Fishing	Data	Urges consideration of juvenile habitat	Data we should consider are the Euphausiids surveys, and pacific hake survey. (Ideas for data mentioned by Terry Thompson.) Data layers on female crab abundance and distribution are important. FINE group may come up with surrogates for juvenile habitat for different species and preferences.
2	Email	6/30/2011	Catherine	Woodward	Private resident	Public-At-Large	General	Urges no development on the OR coast.	Thank you for your time. I am a 3rd generation Oregonian with twins' that are both 4th generation Oregonian on both sides of our respective families. We are lucky to have been born here. The idea of our priceless coast line being impacted by this green energy/ ocean wind farms is not worth the loss our pristine Pacific ocean. (I have seen from attending college back East and in Europe parts of the Atlantic Ocean's impact is never reversed). I am not quite sure where to air these views so thank you for sending this e-mail to the right place. Your e-mail was forwarded to me about the July 26, 2011 Newport, Oregon with the TSPWG meeting. Ergo this e-mail. What I am trying to get to the point about and don't know who to tell is the following, please: Our Oregonian statehood waters (rivers & lakes) our one of our PRICELESS treasures. We have been running the rivers, lakes, and our statehood waters well for awhile. We don't want the Fed's making more rules that hurt fishing, more fees, etc. Who are these companies that think they can come in "here" in our coastal waters (my "neck of the woods" is Neah-kah-nie Mountain/Nehalem River valley [my home beach is Manzanita]); place huge ugly wind farms/"green energy" with our tax dollars etc. that we are stuck looking at while the energy is being pumped over our Oregonian heads via the local public utility to Bonneville, then sold to the highest bid. Am I on the right page? We need marine reserves that Oregonians run (not the Feds-just for oversight); areas for fishing for our economy (besides a good bar-b-q), marine & oceanography research, etc.. Most important -The line of sight/view starting from Tillamook Head to Cape Meares is a priceless Oregonian cultural treasure (and now I hope seen literally-by our Commander in Chief President Obama -as a potential national treasure). Of course there is also the breath taking view...To even be in question to have wind farms etc. impacting this incredible view is difficult to comprehend. Anyone who has seen this view will understand there is no impact studies needed to prove the priceless value of our public 325 mile Oregonian beaches and our statehood waters to remain special. the Oregonian mapping needs to reflect this special treasure we are responsible to pass-on.
3	Public Meeting	7/26/2011	Catherine	Woodward	Private resident	Public-At-Large	General	Urges no development on the OR coast, view shed issues	I'm representing 8 generations of Oregonians and the future generations that are not here to speak today. The Oregon ocean is very special, it's a state park for the nation and it's priceless. Regardless of the cost benefit analysis, this is a treasure for the entire country, and no one has talked to us about kickbacks. We need to consider the visual impacts of these devices and the responsible decommissioning of devices. I think that we are rushing this process without taking into account the necessary data needed to make these decisions. Oregon is the only state in the lower 48 with public access to the beach granted for all Oregonians. These oceans are for everybody. We should all get out and play on the ocean and find out what these devices will do. We need to be thoughtful and careful. This is our playground and it's under siege.

4	Public Meeting	7/26/2011	Vince	Pappalardo	Private resident	Public-At-Large	General	Appreciates process, urges no development in recreational areas	I am coming to you as a coastal home owner. I am a mechanical engineer at HP so I am a technologist and embrace technology. But I also like to shepherd the environment. I am worried about large scale deployment of these devices and how that dissipation of wave energy will affect the intertidal zone. I am also worried about some of the nearshore devices that are deployed closer to the recreational use areas and how they may influence the economics of recreational users coming to the coast. I appreciate you having these meetings for people to voice their concerns. I would also like to offer my services to help work through concerns of general citizens don't want to be passive in this process. Thank you.
5	Public Meeting	7/26/2011	Steve	Johnson	Private resident	Public-At-Large	General	Urges protection of the coast.	I've been to many of these community meetings over the years and the focus always changes, as it is now with the wave energy issue. I would like to remark that we had Gov. Tom McCall back in the early sixties and he got one of the biggest bottle bills passed that probably influenced the world. As a skim boarder, I was cutting my feet all the time on broken bottles, and he got this bill passed to limit the amount of flotsam and jetsam in our oceans. Right now we have an opportunity to look to the future and make decisions about our oceans, and deal with some of these marine debris issues, and we should keep the spirit of Tom McCall alive as we have this discussion.
6	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Theresa	Wisner	Aquamarine USA	Renewable Energy	General	Voiced concerns about viewsheds	There has been a lot of discussion today about view shed issues and that is the only thing I am going to address right now. When you do your studies about view sheds and consider devices and the ocean, please take a look at how they interact together in different ocean conditions, because neither the devices nor the ocean is static.
7	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Jason	Busch	Oregon Wave Energy Trust	Renewable Energy	General	Appreciates process, urges that state of OR wants to develop ocean energy	I appreciate the opportunity to make some comments. There has been a lot of discussion today about the state of Oregon and the decision as whether or not to have ocean energy. I think that conversation has been going on for a while and I think that many in the state leadership do want ocean energy. There are some good reasons for that namely that we are increasingly an energy consuming species and our per capita use of energy in the United States continues to go up, not down. In the US we are 5% of the world's population and use 25% of the energy. Our energy infrastructure is on the decline and the average age of a power plant is 50 years old. Regardless of whether you like ocean energy, we do need new forms of energy. Ocean energy is one of the options we have and we are fortunate enough to be sitting on an amazing resource identified by the Electricity Power Research Institute (EPRI). As a result we had an influx of companies that wanted to take advantage of our resources. That's why the state helped fund the Oregon Wave Energy Trust. We were created to promote the responsible development of wave energy, that's why we fund FINE, SOORC, FACT, FISHCRED, OCZMA, OR Sea Grant and others. We helped fund fishing maps and studies to understand the environmental impacts of wave energy. We will continue to do that and hope to reach a place where we can fully weight the benefits of wave energy with the potential impacts. If you would like to learn more please talk to me or visit our webpage at oregonwave.org or come up to Portland for the OWET conference to get a big picture of the industry. We would very much appreciate coastal residents to come up to Portland and will offer discounts. Thanks.

8	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Rick	Williams	OWET Industry advisory committee	Renewable Energy	General	Appreciates process, urges ocean energy development in areas suitable for industry	<p>I am a retired navy captain and career mariner. I am an Oregon resident and I have raised my family in Oregon after I finished 25 years active duty and my son is a merchant mariner. So we are ocean people. I started as a hard hat diver, salvage officer and I've been a deep draft skipper. As a frame we have talked about power, we seem to like the lights being on. Base load is what keeps the lights on and grid needs to be balanced every 2 seconds. So you have a base load supply and spinning reserves. We have eliminated nuclear in OR, we don't like coal, we don't like fossil fuels, we are running out of things that are base load. Wind and solar are intermittent renewables. Geothermal is pretty consistent but its way out in Eastern Oregon and there are transmission problems. Wave energy happens to fit the niche of a dependable renewable resource. And when it's proven you can dispatch it within 24 hours with a 95% chance that you will get the power. I'm the chair of the OWET industry advisory board and one of the things we realized is that while we had funded the fishing industry to provide their needs, we hadn't funded a spatially explicit needs study for the industry. The board passed a policy that we support the TSP process and we will provide these reports to you when I get the consensus from the industry. We heard it today that commercial power plants have a 50 year lifespan; this industry needs to plan decades ahead. We need an understandable and consistent framework for how to do the temporary operations to prove commercial viability and how to do that in phased development. For example, how do we decommission an embedment anchor? There are three categories of input we are gathering from industry; shared industry wide – practical power plant demonstrations, dependability to a deep water port, proximity to a cable corridor and landing, appropriate cable corridor condition, proximity to an accessible grid connection. The other categories will reflect specific technology and project needs. One size does not fit all, each technology has different requirements, and there will be some project specific information. Please remember that none of the devices are on the shelf. They all have to be fabricated for the site. From the time we get an approved license it will be 4-5 years to get a device in the water. These are long timelines. It takes a lot of time and money to stick with it. Thank you.</p>
9	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Susan	Allen	OurOcean	Conservation	General	Appreciates process, wants responsible ocean energy development	<p>I'm excited about the state's opportunity to responsibly plan for the nearshore. As a member of the TSPAC I am glad that we have forged some partnerships with other stakeholder groups to ensure that Oregon takes the time to responsibly plan. Our 250,000 member's statewide are interested in figuring how we look both to the short term and regional needs as well as the long term needs and future needs of the state to make a common sense series of decisions that will ultimately benefit future generations. I want to express our coalition's interest in participating and stewarding the planning of the territorial sea and working together to move forward constructively. I'm excited to talk more.</p>

10	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Linda	Buell	Garibaldi Charters	Recreational Fishing	Process	Urges consultation with fishing communities before siting projects	<p>I am a member of TSPAC and a co-chair of Fishing Advisory Committee to Tillamook (FACT). I go to all these public meetings and I am struck that no one bothers to get up and mention how local communities or the state of Oregon are going to benefit from offshore power. I was talking to a representative from our local Public Utility District (PUD) who mentioned that the local PUD will actually make money from selling the offshore energy to Bonneville and that should go back to their costumers, our county, and help defray electricity rates. Nobody ever talks about that. They won't tell you how much it's going to cost because instead of \$.45, it will be \$.26 KWh. I think that sort of messaging would help this process. I also want to bring up that in April 2007 Gov. Kulongoski issued a statement calling for no more than 9 marine reserves and no more than 6 energy sites. If you can put a limit on the number of sites and a limit on the size of individual sites, there would be a lot more for people to talk about and support, instead of panicking about a million devices out on the ocean. And for about 70 years Oregonians have not allowed oil and gas on the ocean, and now it's supposed to be ok to have this other type of metal on the water? And I'm not so sure that all Oregonians away from the coast would go for that. The main thing I would like to say about FACT and other local community groups is to let us help site these devices, because we can tell you where they won't affect our fishing and where they won't affect the view shed. So after you do your maps and make your recommendations you need to come back to us to see if it will be suitable for us. As I have already testified previously, we have helped site several projects as places where they won't bother us, but they need to be checked with the rest of the community. I would also like to say that I really like Rick Williams's presentation because I heard in what he said a lot of what the fishermen have been saying for a long time about what testing reliability and testing environmental effects out in the ocean, which isn't going to happen in a wave tank. The fishermen are out there all the time and are a great resource if you need help.</p>
----	----------------	-----------	-------	-------	--------------------	----------------------	---------	---	---

11	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	David	Yamamoto	Pacific City Woods Planning Committee	Public-At-Large	Process	Appreciates process, cautious approach, view shed concerns	<p>Thank you to the working group for this opportunity to address you. The work you are doing is very important, but it is another question as to whether you are trying to go too quickly. One of the issues I would like to bring up is the involvement of local governments and I think that it is past time that this has been addressed. I know that you have begun discussing the issue of view sheds and that is going to be the major issue regarding the general public. As discussed today that is a local social issue, and I am afraid that this working group is coming to this issue a little late. But I am glad to hear that at this point you want to engage the coastal communities, 250,000 residents of the coast and 3.5 million in this state. Creating visual simulations of what these devices are going to look like in the ocean is going to be very important for residents on the coast and inland. Because you will find that almost everyone in the state of Oregon considers this ocean theirs, their legacy. We have heard from special interests and I think you need to recognize that we have 3.5 million other ocean users that we really need to get involved in this process. I do agree very much with Caren Braby that ocean energy is in its early stages. To be an early adopter of ocean energy is not a bad place to be, but it's also not necessarily something we want to get ourselves locked into. Given that commercial energy production is at least a decade away, I'm not sure we want to lock ourselves into this early development scheme and we need to be flexible as technology changes. I hope that you give the communities on the coast the opportunity to have a say about view sheds and other issues. It's going to be much better to be able to deploy these technologies far offshore where they won't be in view. I know you don't want to hear a "go slow" approach and that you have deadlines set but I hope at this point we will actively involve the people of Oregon so that they have a say in what's going on. Thank you.</p>
----	----------------	-----------	-------	----------	---------------------------------------	-----------------	---------	---	--

12	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Linda	Buell	Garibaldi Charters	Recreational Fishing	General	Appreciates process, urges consultation with fishing communities	I want to thank you for allowing public comment today. This is Oregon's way and I appreciate it. If the State is going to decide where wave energy is going, it is going to be with plenty of public comment from the fishing community and everybody else. I know everyone wonders why the fishermen from Garibaldi don't agree with the mapping efforts. We prefer to talk with the developers and help them site based on the type of devices they are planning on using. So I hope that the State will listen to the local fishing groups as well as the local governments when making their decisions. One of the reasons we don't want to map is that we are afraid they will be turned into dollar values, and we are not necessarily concerned with the worth of the fisheries, it is because it is a heritage, a historical use. It is what we do and we don't want to do anything else. We would prefer that you use the fishing maps as a dataset to inform this but not the only thing you use to site the devices. I still think we need to hear the benefits we will be getting from the industry. I just read that our interstate energy usage has gone down 1.5% and also that Sonoma County in CA, which had three energy projects, decided to mothball them all because of expense. I would also ask OPAC to contact Flaxen Conway from OSU to give a presentation about the BOEMRE map, she came to Garibaldi and got plenty of input from us because she wasn't using values. Thank you.
----	----------------	-----------	-------	-------	--------------------	----------------------	---------	---	--

13	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Charlie	Plybon	Surfrider Foundation	Non Consumptive	Process	Urges consideration and use of the Non consumptive recreational use study	<p>engaged in this process for the last couple years, including how we do public outreach to our members. Surfrider first got involved in wave energy 4-5 years ago when the initial interest was on the coast. We responded by asking our membership what they thought about this. We got a bit of a mixed bag with some people interested in the concept of moving off of finite energy sources and some people who were really concerned about special places on the coast; ecological, recreational areas, view sheds. We responded by coming up with a statement that all our members could get behind that said we support the comprehensive planning and we want Goal 19 and stakeholders to drive the process. I want to tell you a little about what we have done to engage the process. I've heard a lot about these datasets that have been put in the process, and the limitations of those datasets and how we can't make them a panacea. They are a great starting place so we can have a discussion about what uses are happening in the ocean. We participated in a non consumptive recreational use survey that went out to our membership and to a random subset of all Oregonians asking them 'what do you do, where do you do it, and how often to you do you do it on the coast?' And that generated data that is in MarineMap. What we have done with that data is that we have looked through it and asked what it mean to us. We sat down with our Non-Consumptive representative on TSPWG and looked at the maps and asked is this really what's happening on the coast. We consulted published material, recreational guidebooks, and came up with a preliminary list and map of sites that we felt were of primary importance and we based this on the quantitative and qualitative data. We are bringing that back to our membership and to the public at large to make sure it jives with what they think is important. We understand that there are difficult decisions and sacrifices that might be made, and they understand those tradeoffs. We think that both quantitative and qualitative data is extremely important to this process. We prioritize the quantitative data because that is what this process called for. I want to share with you our process, this month we are holding chapter meetings in Oregon to show them the preliminary protection areas that we came up with. We also issued press releases to notify the public of these meetings as well as announcing it on our list serv. The number one and two activities on the Oregon coast are beach combing and scenic enjoyment. And you can look at our dataset and see where the hotspots for this ocean use are. The only other thing I want to mention is that MarineMap is an outstanding resource, and it may</p>
14	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Gus	Gates	Surfrider Foundation	Non Consumptive	Process	Urges development of a plan that has exclusion and opportunity zones	<p>investment for the state of Oregon and something that our members use a lot as well. It's very user friendly and that's the cool thing about it. I wanted to dive a little bit into the planning options discussion that we will be happening later today. Without advocating for a specific planning option, because I have just recently seen the options, I think that all of us would agree that Option 1 'No Action' is a non starter. For us to spend all this time and money planning for wave energy, choosing that option is irresponsible. I think that something in the Option 4/Option 5 range is something we should be striving for. We can talk later today about the timelines for this and the resources needed to implement those options. I am particularly interested in the visual buffer in Option 5+ because it would be a good way to address those view shed concerns. I would also like to suggest that the visual buffer concept could be applied to any option, and we need to talk about what distance that visual buffer is. Certainly with some technologies (wind, oil) 3 miles might not even address those issues. One of the things that I think has been lacking as we move into this next phase of meetings, and break down the complexity of the is process so</p>

15	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Hugh	Kink	SOORC	Commercial Fishing	Data	Urges use of fishery maps to protect communities	I will be speaking in conjunction with a letter from SOORC by Nick Furman. We have been working with Laura for quite a bit and I agree with her regarding the difficulties in getting people together to make decisions. One of the problems we have is that we are so diverse here at SOORC. To give you a little background we ended up forming SOORC out of necessity because of the two projects with FERC applications right in our backyard. When we formed we decided to not just have commercial fishermen in our organization, but everybody that was affected by these projects. So we ended up with commercial, recreational fishermen, allied businesses. So working with FISHCRED is a little tough because they only represent the commercial side. And that's why we have had a little confusion. When we first started doing the mapping it was fishing effort mapping and it was supposed to protect us under goal 19, thinking that yellow, orange, and red are important to us. It has morphed more into looking at the economic side. We want to make sure that if we go that route that we protect everyone who is giving out that information; allied businesses, recreational fishermen, etc... There seems to be a little lack of direction in terms of what we need to protect ourselves. We really need to know what is going to protect everybody at
16	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Susan	Allen	Our Ocean	Conservation	Process	Urges increased outreach for TSP	We are in the business of making lasting partnerships. Our Ocean is doing outreach to as many different stakeholder groups as possible letting them know that his process is happening. Now is the time to really start working together. All of the stakeholder leaders should be working collaboratively. We only have a short amount of time to bring people up to speed. Our Ocean took this message to the League of Oregon Cities conference in Bend, OR. Working with Paul Klarin and David Allen to make sure we had the right information. The reception was excellent. So much that we followed up with the League to do some co hosted presentations or webinars because we know that resources are scarce. I think we need to tap into existing networks and work collaboratively. As you know, when there are public meetings, we let our people know what those meetings are happening. I hope that we can continue to adhere to public meetings laws so that people can come out. Finally, I was reviewing the planning options and it seems like keeping as many options on the table makes the most sense. It also makes sense to work with other stakeholder groups to find out what they think about the options.
17	Public Meeting	10/7/2011	Mark	Mcconnell	City of Newport	Local Government	Process	appreciates process, encourages better outreach to youth	I really appreciate the time and effort that has been put into this so far. Your expressed desire to include as many different people is very important. Don't forget that you are focusing on the future and any way that you can try to include the younger generation that is not well represented here today is critical. Please continue to reach out to younger generations. There are ways of cloning Andy Lanier and getting the message out, using the internet and social media to create some videos that can go on YouTube and be useful to the general public and local government to simplify and visually tell your story. Newport is all about the ocean, fishing, marine science, and tourism; they all rely on the ocean. They all take an incredible amount of energy to be successful. There is going to be sacrifices to be made in the future. We appreciate the effort you have done and the people who attend these meeting regularly. David Allen gives us updates each council meeting and our particular council is very well informed. However, we would be interested in seeing some visual examples of what we will see off our coast when those are available. Thank you.

18	Online Form	10/7/2011	Ryan	Cruse		Non Consumptive	General	Appreciates process	My name is Ryan Cruse and I live in Portland. I am an avid surfer and spend much of my free time out on the coast. I would like to say that I think this is a very important process and am very happy to see the State moving forward on this with the inclusion of all stakeholders/users. I have submitted specific comments on areas which are important recreation sites to me to Surfrider's Oregon Policy Manager Gus Gates. Those comments should be reflected in the data that comes from Surfrider. Please keep up the good work.
19	Email	#####	Gus	Meyer	FACT	Commercial Fishing	Data	Urges inclusion of social and economic criteria for projects	<p>Energy development interests.I was impressed with the attention afforded to Environmental "Visualization Values" of MRE device concerns addressed. It was well communicated the need for Goal 1 Citizen Involvement at this meeting. Tillamook County Commissioner Tim Josi has expressed county concerns for stemming frustrations and lengthy confusing appeals for developers proposing MRE installations along our Oregon Coast.</p> <p>I now advocate the following Economic / Social limiting considerations be included within TSPWG planning efforts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MRE Electro-magnetic force field related distribution effects upon marine life. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o AC Generation (Alternating Current) and marine cabling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 1 MW (Megawatt) power <input type="checkbox"/> 5 MW (Megawatts) power <input type="checkbox"/> 10 MW (Megawatts) power <input type="checkbox"/> Electrical device and cabling high voltage shorts 2. MRE Electro-magnetic force field related distribution effects upon marine life. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o DC Generation (Direct Current) and marine cabling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 1 MW (Megawatt) power <input type="checkbox"/> 5 MW (Megawatts) power <input type="checkbox"/> 10 MW (Megawatts) power <input type="checkbox"/> Electrical device and cabling high voltage shorts 3. HYDROKINETIC forced high pressure water releases (and potential sediment disturbances) from such as Aquamarine's "Oyster" MRE devices. 4. ACOUSTICS (sound) related effects upon marine life. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Multiple MRE Generation device vibrations and noises o Multiple MRE anchor cable stress vibrations <p>Anecdotal support information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reedsport OPT latest Newsletter states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o "In accordance with OPT's Settlement Agreement with eleven federal and state agencies and three non-governmental organizations, baseline testing for acoustics and electromagnetic fields (EMF) will proceed prior to deployment of the first buoy. The Oregon Wave Energy Trust completed an EMF study which indicates the fields from the single buoy should be negligible. The planned testing is anticipated to confirm the conclusions of the study". <p>Note: Testing for less than 1 Mega-watt of power.</p>
20	Mail	#####	Richard	Williams	Industry Advisory Group, OWET	Renewable Energy	Data		see attached letter
21	Mail	#####	Rick	Goche	FISHCR ED	Commercial Fishing	Data		see attached letter

22	Mail		Dale	Beasely	Columbia River Crab Fisherman's Association	Commercial Fishing	General		see attached
23	Mail	12/9/2011	Robert	Lurie	Ocean Power Technologies	Renewable Energy	Data		See Attached letter. OPT-
24	Mail	#####	Mark	Kujala	City of Warrenton	Local Government	General	Urges Clatsop County to include local stakeholders in planning for Camp Rilea proposal, protect areas important to commercial/recreational fishing fleets	See Attached letter, Warrenton -
25	Email	#####	Sean	Oneill	Ocean Renewable Energy Coalition	Renewable Energy	General		See Attached, OREC
26	Email	#####	Paul	Hanneman	Pacific City Dorymans Association	Commercial Fishing	Data	Inclusion of Pacific City fishing value map (attached) in process	See attached Dorymans Letter
27	Letter	#####	Peter	Huhtala	Clatsop County	Local Government	Process		See attached letter, Clatsop
28	Letter	#####	Peg	Reagan	Conservation Leaders Network	Conservation	General	Support for the National Ocean Policy and Oregon's CMSP activities	See Attached letter, CLN
29	Public Meeting	#####	Bernie	Bjork	LCRA	Commercial Fishing	Location	Portion off of Clatsop County proposed for Camp Rilea development is used by fishermen	The LCA formed in 2003 to stop the closure of further fishing grounds, from marine reserves initially and now these zones. I see in the draft planning option 2 a sliver of area off Camp Rilea off Clatsop county as a proposed area for exclusion. I have a letter from the City of Warrenton to the Clatsop County Commission, because our organization is concerned about how the county is proceeding. [See Below]"

30	Public Meeting	#####	Rick	Williams	Industry Advisory Group, OWET	Renewable Energy	Data	Changes words and titles, don't use planning grids	I am an Oregon resident, a retired sea captain and practicing ocean engineer and sit on TSPAC representing ocean industry so I am a proponent. OWET started an Industry Advisory Group to get the private industry members involved in the responsible development of ocean energy and we worked to get a consensus statement on the public record [see Data_112011]. There are a couple points I would like to make. There are existing permitted uses and as Paul Klarin pointed out we don't have the position to undue existing permitted uses. So the marine reserves that are permitted, the dredged disposal sites that are permitted, the navigation channels that are in the public record, those are facts. So it would be helpful if the information was displayed in MarineMap as facts with actual coordinates, as opposed to the planning grid representation which is a good tool but expands the footprint of these existing uses. It would be more useful if the GIS coordinates were used in place of the planning grids so we could do some more precise planning. The use of the planning grid undoes a precedent by Columbia Power Technologies in the Puget Sound. Located a 1/7 scale prototype in Puget Sound and the US Coast Guard advised them to place it near a channel buoy, because it is convenient to avoid both at the same time. Collocation of uses may be a preferable approach to finding compatibility and expanding those uses with the planning grid may preclude that. We are at a fork in the road we can either have options that have "exclusion" areas on the majority of the OR coast which sends a message to industry and investors, 'don't come to OR because you excluded' or we can recognize that the industry probably doesn't want to go to most of those places you are calling exclusion zones. So instead of telling us those places we can't go, if this commission can come up with a handful of areas as "suitability study zones" that say through the deliberations and public process 'these are the places we want you to look at first.' So you are inviting investment and due diligence in handful of areas, which exist off of each coastal county. Invite the industry to places where you would like us to focus as to excluding us from major portions of the coast
31	Public Meeting	#####	Linda	Buell	FACT	Commercial Fishing	Process	Urges consultation with fishing communities before siting projects	The maps and the data layers identify general areas where wave energy should be sited. But you need help from the fishermen to help identify specific areas. Because that information is with the fishermen, even though they helped make the maps, many of them didn't. I know that Paul Klarin at our FACT meeting said that there would be a secondary filter besides the information you have to help fill in the gaps, but if that isn't evident in some statute that is probably not going to happen. So that's what I am asking for. Also, it is unclear how you have arrived at options 2 and 4 for consideration. Zoning the ocean is a huge step that can create consequences that can cause problems if it is not done with the input of the local fishermen and communities.
32	Public Meeting	#####	Peg	Reagan	Conservation Leaders Network	Conservation	General	Proposed energy zones should undergo extensive study before deployment	I found out earlier today that one of your members is old enough to remember when dams were put in on the river, another effort to provide electricity without knowing the negative consequences, now we know. We know the harm they have done to fish runs and we are looking now at the cost of removing the dams and trying to figure out how to modify the dams so that fish can get through and so on. So that makes me wonder if wave energy is going to be the dams for this generation. I urge you to move cautiously. You required that marine reserves, something that would not do any physical harm you insisted two years of study and evaluation. At the very least any sites you are going to offer should undergo the same scrutiny and evaluation. I also question how you think any part of the territorial sea should be open for siting as with the option 5 with MREC development zones. It seems more appropriate that you designate the areas to be closed and then for the areas that the State would consider do a further analysis. I realize this doesn't give the industry a green light but Goal 19 requires that living marine resources get preference over new industrial uses. And phased on the public comment we have heard today it seems everybody is urging that you do something along those lines.

33	Public Meeting	#####	Nadia	Gardner		Public-At-Large	Data	Should protect area off of Cape Falcon and include recreation use data	I've been involved in the Marine reserve process for about 10 years and I was on the Cape Falcon community team. I was happy to see that the Cape Falcon reserve made it on the maps. I want to urge you to pay attention to that area which starts in south Arch Cape and goes down to Manzanita. The area will be closed to industrial and extractive uses, I have hope. Today I want to point to a headland that is more important ecologically than Cape Falcon. When we first started talking about marine reserves and asking ourselves if we were going to have an offshore marine reserve, where is the most ecologically diverse and important spot, in terms of species or habitats? We looked first at Tillamook Head. It runs from Seaside to Canon Beach. Most of you have visited Ecola State Park. ESP encompasses most of that headland and is 1300 sq acres. It is important ecologically, but also represents an important tourist destination. So I urge you to resist opening up that area, for both ecological and economic reasons. Finally, I want to note that the headland is important to recreational users, both onshore and offshore. Because there are surfers in the room I won't mention how great the surfing is there but it is an important place for recreation. I noticed that what you included on the maps represented the permitted uses and activities, and ocean recreation is not permitted and so is harder to track, but Surfrider has some great information on that. Thank you."
34	Public Meeting	#####	Geogre	Warren		Commercial Fishing	General	Opposes the use of public money for wave energy development	The only comments I have is that if we take a good hard look at the economic viability of this. The fact that I haven't heard anything about that other than it is sucking up a lot of public money, is making me nervous. I would hate to see another Solyndra clone be dumped off the coast here and not give any return for what it is providing. The other thing that concerns me a little is that the only people I see here are bureaucrats and academics and that there is only one fisherman on the committee. If we remember the outcome of the marine reserves, it was pretty much foreordained that the commercial interests were outnumbered about 9 to 1. I just urge this group to consider all the implications of what they are doing. Especially the affect on commercial fishermen whose livelihoods depend of what's going on offshore and the true economic benefit that will derive from generating wave power out there.

35	Public Meeting	#####	Jason	Busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	General	Expresses support for the porcess	is not the official position of OWET, we are waiting to see the trajectory of this plan so we know better where we are headed to make comments on it. OWET's mission is to promote the responsible development of ocean energy. That's why we funded over a million dollars of environmental studies to understand the potential impacts of ocean energy. Much of our work has directly contributed to our understanding of the marine environment; including crab and fish populations, bathymetry, whale migrations routes, crab mortality from EMFs etc... OWET also funds the fish mapping effort and continues to fund the various fishing representation groups including FINE, FACT, SOORC, FISHCRED, as well as OCZMA and OR Sea Grant. We did this so that these folks can be at the table and have a voice in the process. And we are dedicated to making sure that ocean energy minimizes to the greatest extent possible its impacts on the ocean and it users. With that said, our goal is to promote the ocean renewable energy industry, because of its potential to create a significant new economic engine for our state. One that brings much needed family wage jobs, profits, new opportunities and clean reliable electricity. This is an economic development opportunity for the state. The State identified ocean energy as a growth sector years ago and invested in it as a way to bring high wage manufacturing and supply chain jobs to Oregon. The state has invested well over \$10 million to date to make ocean energy a reality. Your decisions and their implications extend well beyond the boundaries of your own community, your own industry, political affiliations, and the next election cycle. This is an effort that will have long term implications for the state as we try to find work for the approximately 200,000 people in our state who are currently trying to find a way to earn a living, put food on the table and create opportunities for their children. In order to make ocean energy work the territorial sea plan should maximize flexibility, both to allow local government and stakeholders to work with industry to find sites, that all can agree on. And also to make sure that decisions we make today, with today's information, do not unwittingly obstruct ocean energy as it evolve and develops with newer and better technologies. One way to make the plan conducive is to view ocean energy as a valuable OR asset rather than as an afterthought. Ocean energy can't go just anywhere. We are expecting private companies to invest millions of dollars, but if our plan does not identify, protect, and make available god sites for ocean energy and we will have failed. The process thus far has been a resounding success from my perspective. Namely a bottom up effort to ensure that people's voices are heard and decisions have the weight of evidence and science behind them and that regardless of the outcome the process is viewed as legitimate. I believe we have achieved that goal to date. In a large part because of your contributions and willingness to
36	Public Meeting	#####	Robert	Lurie	OPT	Renewable Energy	General	Expresses suiupport for the processs	Thank you members of the committee. I represent Ocean Power Technologies, and for the benefit of the audience we are developing the small ocean array off of Reedsport, with ultimately up to 10 wave energy buoys. As part of that process we have been working for years and have developed a settlement agreement with 11 federal and state agencies and 3 NGOs, including Surfrider and the fishing group SOORC, in order to set forth a process by which we will gather information. We commit ourselves to conduct extensive studies to provide for mitigation from effects of wave energy. We are in favor of the process and have said we are in favor of responsible development of wave energy. WE respectfully suggest to TSP members and OPAC that given all the uncertainties with this early stage technology, we treat wave energy as being compatible with other uses, until we can gather the data we have promised to collect and use an adaptive management process as we have agreed in our settlement agreement to mitigate those effects and find a way to live together in the ocean. I think that's an appropriate way to deal with this uncertainty. I also want to point to our submitted public comments [See Data_120911]."

37	Public Meeting	#####	Ben	Enticknap	Oceana	Conservation	General	Expressed support for the process. Urges reevaluation of existing uses as "beneficial" for the state	We support smart coastal and marine spatial planning. We think that we can find areas of the TS for responsible wave energy development. We commend the DLCD and ODFW for the science based and comprehensive approach to identifying important ecological areas off our coast. In the West Coast Governors on Ocean Health Action Plan, they stated identification of key habitats is a critical first step for future protection efforts. This was also identified in the NOP task force recommendations for CMSP. We are happy to OR is taking this approach as well. We think that is critical for long term planning for future discussions and planning. This will help the state designate and protect these areas. We think that the important ecological areas not be lumped together in the Goal 19 resources, that each be presented as separate. There is an important issue I want to bring, that all existing uses are beneficial uses. [Restates Goal 19]. This idea that all existing uses are beneficial is not the right approach. We should be looking at cumulative impacts and this will help the state determine if areas are being used to their full beneficial use."
38	Public Meeting	#####	Melissa	Cadwallader	Cannon Beach City Council	Local Government	Process	Urge inclusion of local governments in planning process.	Local involvement and input will be important in this process. I'm glad to hear recognition that local input will be seriously considered before plans are made final."
39	Public Meeting	#####	Charlie	Plybon	Surfrider	Non Consumptive	Data	Urge inclusion of Surfrider data for Level 1 protection	I'd like to reiterate Surfrider's outreach process, because I think its important to engage many more people that aren't able to be in these rooms. Back in 2007, we engaged with our statewide membership to find a balance statement on ocean renewable energy, later adopted by our board. That state focused on protecting existing uses, including recreation and fishing, but that we could find opportunities for this new ocean use. Following that we learned that this process needed spatially explicit information, at the request of DLCD we put together an extensive study in partnership with ODFW and DLCD. This was a peer reviewed spatially explicit study looking at where and how frequently people recreate on the coast, that was going to inform this process and we looked the economics. The results showed that in 2010, there were 27 million trips to the coast of which 80% was recreation, that economic value was 2.4 billion dollars annually. That's important to keep in mind in this process. We continued outreach to our members looking at the maps that this study generated and got the buy in of our members because we thought these maps would be used to protect Goal 19 areas important to recreation. We have been doing GateKeeper outreach to people who own businesses, people that represent larger groups of recreational users. We have groundtruthed that study. As it stands now, we are very disappointed that in these preliminary maps, the coarse filter that only existing uses are those that are permitted. We had the understanding that our maps would be used in the process. We understanding that there will be a secondary filter in which this data would be used but we feel that they should be protected up front
40	Public Meeting	#####	Gus	Gates	Surfrider	Non Consumptive	Process	Urge inclusion of Surfrider data for Level 1 protection	At the last meeting I expressed general interest in planning option 5, because the concept of temporary uses areas had a lot of support. It speaks to many of the principles of proceeding cautiously and incrementally, employing adaptive management. The recreational Use survey has garnered a lot of feedback and enthusiasm along the coast. This enthusiasm has precipitated quickly to heartburn as we realize that the spatially explicit information we collected was not included. I would like to know when it was decided that this information would not be used and who it was made by. This frustrates our involvement in the process. The blatant disregard of the recreational uses does not pass the "red face" test and just isn't right. I would like to ask that the conditional use areas that have been identified off of Tillamook Head, Ecola State Park, Cannon Beach and Arch Cape be removed from consideration at this time.

41	Public Meeting	#####	Susan	Allen	Our Ocean	Conservation	Process	Urge transparency for why certain data (surfrider, OWET) were not included	I've listened the testimony and would like to ensure that there is transparency in the dialogue we have established over the last 4 years. I'm concerned that there is a lack of reciprocation in the policy process, I hear from OWET and Surfrider that their maps are not being used in the outcome. I find that troubling. I'm open and listening and hope the state will explain these decisions. I think we can find areas for wave energy while at the same time protecting ecological and existing uses. I've seen OPAC inspire people and promote a constructive conversation and if you lose that momentum recognize that you lose more than just that
42	Public Meeting	#####	Keith	Tymchuk	Reedsport	Local Government	General	Urge for planning to identify wave energy sites as promising new coastal industry	My name is Keith Tymchuk, I currently serve as the Mayor of the City of Reedsport, as a Port of Umpqua Commissioner, as a member of the Oregon Wave Trust Board of Directors, and as the Governor's appointed Convener of the South Coast Regional Solutions Team. I have, of course, been involved with wave power in Oregon for a long time. State, county and municipal leaders, across the state, have long wrestled with the balance between "goals" and development. At the municipal level, a city council commonly establishes yearly goals that establish direction for a Manager and staff. Councils commonly recognize, however, that such goals may change as circumstances change. After establishing "goals," we recognize that there is flexibility in attaining them. Likewise, I believe that Statewide Planning Goals are goals, not directives. Accordingly, the TSP process (which is valuable and needed) should attempt to interpret what the intent of Goal 19 was 30 years ago and evaluate that in light of the fact that the Oregon Legislature has recognized ocean energy for three consecutive budget cycles. Such an action guarantees a balanced decision making process for today and, more importantly, for the future. Goal 19 seeks the conservation of marine resources to provide long-term ecological, economic, and social value. I would suggest that the wave environment is a unique marine resource and should be regarded, as other marine resources are, as providing a long-term economic value. Certainly an independent study by the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) pointed out that Oregon has a rare combination of wave-related resources and the US Department of Energy competitively selected Oregon for a national center of excellence in wave energy. These bodies certainly see the wave environment off Oregon's coast as a unique resource. The deliberations of the Oregon Innovation Council competitively selected the wave energy initiative as Oregon's next emerging industry and the deliberations of three legislative sessions have budgeted for wave energy and recognized Oregon's unique advantage in this field. I recommend that the independent evaluations of these thoughtful people be a factor in TSPWG, OPAC, TSPAC and LCDC decision-making. As you look at a sea filled with marine resource, please see the wave environment as one worthy of protection, too.
43	Mail	#####	Gus	Gates	Surfrider	Non Consumptive	Data	Urge inclusion of recreational "hotspot" data in Level 1 protection	see attached

44	Email	1/11/2012	Andrew	Stone	Surfrider	Non Consumpti ve	Data	<p>Urge inclusion of recreational "hotspot" data in Level 1 protection</p> <p>I am concerned that a significant amount of data was submitted and apparently not considered at all. The Surfrider Recreational Use study and other non-extractive, non-consumptive data appears to not be included. I am a conservation biologist. This sounds to me like the old days of the Forest Service, where really all that mattered was extracting resources. Consideration of recreation and ecologically sensitive areas should at a minimum be considered alongside if not take priority over other factors in many locations.</p> <p>I support the idea of wave energy development over coal, LNG, and in many cases hydro. But it should be done with every effort to take into consideration the mistakes of the past, the social and economic value of tourism and recreation, and ecological services.</p>
45	Email	1/12/2012	Andrew	Kerr	Surfrider	Non Consumpti ve	Data	<p>Urge inclusion of recreational "hotspot" data in Level 1 protection</p> <p>Please forgive my zip code. I am a long time Oregonian who recently relocated to California to pursue a career opportunity. I participated in the earlier stages of the TSP process while residing in the 97202 zip code area.</p> <p>I am a recreational user who spends a lot of time on the central and north Oregon coast. I primarily enjoy backpacking and surfing. Some time ago I participated in a survey of non-consumptive recreational use on the Oregon coast. I did so in order to better provide the State with the most accurate and complete data possible on the economic benefit of non-consumptive recreational use.</p> <p>It has come to my attention that despite having been given the results of the study some time ago, the State is ignoring it in its ongoing TSP planning. I believe the State needs to use non-consumptive recreational use data in the TSP process or provide a compelling reason for ignoring this information.</p> <p>Using this data will help protect recreational opportunities on the Oregon coast. As the study points out, non-consumptive ocean and coastal recreation provides major economic and social benefits to the State. It does a disservice to the TSP process and insults the many Oregonians that value non-consumptive ocean and coastal recreation and gave their time freely to participate in Surfrider Foundation's non-consumptive recreational use survey.</p> <p>While I support wave energy development, I want the State to ensure that we the room we allocate to such projects are not located in key recreational or ecological areas. Recall the recreation of the crabbers when their high value territory was identified as a site for future hydrokinetic energy development. Then consider that non-consumptive ocean recreational users are a much larger demographic that is similarly well organized with vocal advocates. If the purpose of the TSP process is to reduce future conflict, then it stands to reason that the State does itself a disservice and undermines the process by risking future conflict directly as a result of ignoring valuable and useful information in its planning process; information precisely of the sort presented in Surfrider's non-consumptive ocean recreational user survey.</p> <p>Thank you for inviting and considering my comments. Please also reconsider your decision to ignore other information presented to you, like the non-consumptive ocean recreational user survey.</p>
46	Email	1/13/2012	Nicole	Parisi-Smith	Surfrider	Non Consumpti ve	Data	<p>Supports inclusion of surfrider data into planning process</p> <p>As a Surfrider Foundation member who participated in the Surfrider Recreational Use Study, I am extremely concerned to hear that the State is not using the information that the organization collected in the Territorial Sea Planning Process. I am a non-fisherman recreational user who spends a lot of time on the coast, and by not taking into account the Surfrider data, you are leaving me out of the planning process. Ocean recreation provides revenue to the State in the form of tourism dollars. I do not understand why you are not taking this into account in the process.</p>

47	Public Meeting	1/20/2012	Jo Anne	Manson	OR Military Department	Military	Data	Urge inventory of resources , not categorization. Remind public about env. Review already in place	I am a planner with the OR Military Dept. We support OR National Guard, with four large training facilities. One is Camp Riley. I have been working since 2005, I am a planner by training and education. In California, have environmental review requirements (CEQA), many of the things you are struggling with deal with the lack of these at the state level. From that perspective, I am speaking about the mapping products that have seen portrayed in the categorization of resources as protected or not protected. I think that is difficult without thinking about the rigorous environmental review process, which I don't think happens here at this policy level. I agree with the mapping process, i think you need to include the "danger zone" designation off Camp Rilea. I don't think they should be set into categories in this process. Agency plans, including ours, need to be taken into this process. I'm perplexed that ODOT is not involved here. I want to reduce redundancy in the review process, and hope that you can point to the appropriate reviews and laws that already exist so we don't have to revisit those and can move forward.
48	Public Meeting	1/20/2012	Rick	Williams	IAG	Renewable Energy	Data	Urges actual footprints of permitted uses , change language of categories, pleased with process	For the record, I live in Oregon City OR. I've operated complex systems at sea for 30 years and it can be done if it is done carefully. There a lot of unknowns ahead. I agree with members of the working group, we need to be careful as we walk through this to understand what those unknowns are. Grid connections cost about \$20 million, who is going to pay for that? DSL language needs to be changed to allow for early stage projects to connect to the grid and generate revenue. I agree with much of what has been said here today, especially with the three levels of restrictions. The tricky part are the words "off limits" or "exclusion." Exclusion areas in the Plan are inconsistent when an application gets to DSL. Certainly the firing range off Camp Rilea would be an exclusion zone, except that Camp Rilea routinely allows other use when they are not active. It gets rigid and eliminates local governments from making smart decisions. Setting a high bar for projects in marine reserves makes sense, I certainly wouldn't want to develop there but calling it an exclusion area gets fuzzy when you use the planning grid, or when we put a buffer around an exclusion area. Whats the basis and law for that and how do you answer that question when you have to defend it? When you put buffers around cables its inconsistent with precedent set by international standards. Another example is creating buffers and excluding new uses in shipping channels. The US Coast Guard allowed Columbia Power Technologies to put a buoy adjacent to a shipping channel. We can't let our rules be inconsistent with national and international standards. To prove commercial viability we need 10 years of grid connection and we need clear path to commercial development because it costs millions of dollars to move through the process. Thank You"
49	Public Meeting	1/20/2012	Peg	Reagan	Conservation Leaders Network	Conservation	Process	Urges that there be an exclusion category , clarification on what the working group wants from the public	I agree with the four levels of restriction you have talked about here; exclusion, moderate, low and least. I think the exclusion areas should be larger than just than the marine reserves and undersea cables. I think the public should have the option of weighing in on an categorical exclusion. Please give them something specific to comment on, i.e. put resources in each level of restriction and allow the public to comment on that. The public can weigh in on that easier that an open ended discussion. If they disagree, what resource would they move to what category? I wanted to talk about TSP Part 5, make it clear in the public work sessions that all applications would go through TSP Part 5. But if you are going to change TSP Part 5, and talk about amending it, that loses public confidence. Under ideal circumstances you would already have the language you want to use before going to the public with it

50	Public Meeting	1/20/2012	John	Shaad	BPA/TSPAC	Transmission	General	Asks TSPWG to consider the energy needs of the coast, ocean energy needed for job growth	I have some perspective about how electricity is served on the the OR coast. Power generation is done in East OR, and the grid is maxed out. We put a band aid on the grid to increase transmission on the coast last year and those fixes get paid out of rates. More and more utility districts require alternative energy to be used in their portfolio, existing hydro doesn't count, ocean energy and wind do qualify. If we want to grow the coasts with new jobs, they are locked out, esp. on the southern coast, unless they can pay \$400-500 million for a new transmission line. There are massive costs associated with bringing energy to the coast from Eastern OR We have the opportunity to solve that with local generation.
51	Public Meeting	1/20/2012	Laura	Anderson	FISHCR ED	Commercial Fishing	Process	Urges process hold off on full planning until can be combined with Federal process	Statewide coalition of statewide commercial and charter fishing interests. I want to provide a counterpoint to the direction Ive heard this morning regarding four tiers of zoning restriction. I want to clarify points about the degree of uncertainty we see talked about with these maps. I don't think a two dimensional planning grid adequately captures the dynamics of the ocean or temporal changes. We may be wanting to look past the three mile limit of the ocean, when in reality we may be looking outside three miles for more suitable areas that aren't in the highest conflict areas. I sense a building pressure that we are trying to find space for ocean energy within this 3-mile limit. My recommendation is to resist the temptation to over categorize, to find suitable study areas, and wait until we can join the federal process to zone the ocean."
52	Public Meeting	1/20/2012	Jason	Busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	Process	Urges that TSPWG needs legal justification for exclusion , encourages tying burden to level of protection, activation of TSPAC to look into Part 5 language	The national process is looking at a programmatic EIS, so that is a several year process. I applaud the level of discussion that is happening today and think we are finding a way forward. The discussion regarding the amendment to TSP Part 5 is productive, however the small piece meal changes will not be very effective, and perhaps we engage TSPAC to meet and do a deep dive of TSP language, coming back to this group with a recommendation. TSPAC is not teed up to do anything for several months and I don't think that is a good use of that valuable resource. I would remind that Part 5 has a tremendous level of review of the industry. I think that we should limit the areas that are included in "categorical exclusion" based on bad, incomplete information or personal opinion. I applaud the discussion regarding the level of flexibility included in these restriction levels, allowing the industry to demonstrate. I think you should tie the burden to the level of protection, but i caution about setting de facto exclusions by setting the bar too high for industry to meet them, do not go above and beyond the requirements in Part 5.. If you had opened up the TSP b4 requirements for all projects, the industry would not be able to meet them. That's why we have the phased development approach. Imagine a point in several years, after industry has had an opportunity to demonstrate their impacts, that we decide we want to allow it in areas that we previously called exclusion. Imagine Coos Bay has a good opportunity for jobs and energy, and they want it. You would have to revisit this process, which we know is hard. If you simply tie this to the time and flexibility of thin diustry. As it understands what its impacts are and can meet the requirements of b4, it should be able to meet them anywhere. I caution you to beware of sacred cows, which are tomorrows nightmares. The only exclusive areas that exists are those that have a legal permitted basis. Everything else should be included in a protection level. The lack of industry representation on this group is an obstruction towards your goal. Relegating industry to three minutes or more is not sufficient

53	Public Meeting	1/20/2012	Charlie	Plybon	Surfrider	Non Consumptive	Process	Urges clarification on what is expected from the public and what will be accomplished at second round of meetings	I've been with this process for quite some time, and have been involved in data collection, and now I am confused about the direction the group is taking. We were given planning options that the public, including myself reacted very strongly to. As we get ready to go to the public we need to be clear about what we present to the public and what we are asking from them. What maps are we bringing to the public? I, and others, represent stakeholder groups and we will going to our constituents and discussing the meetings before they start, and it would be really helpful to know what to expect and guidance on what you are expecting of the public. This group needs to lead. I'm a little confused about the four categories, it seems like there are two medium categories. We need those to be defined. I would encourage you to make the categories consistent with what is on marinemap
54	Email	2/1/2012	Micheal	Cosgrove	?	?	?	Wave energy is not mature and encourages better deveopment of battery systems	<p>This effort is premature, at least, and could be a total waste of time. I am a mechanical engineer who first started renewable energy design in 1957 as an engineering thesis. I designed and built a high temperature solar furnace as a first step into use of the system in building large enough silicon crystals to make semi-conductors. Shortly thereafter our company designed and model tested wave/tide energy systems. They are useless as a continuous source of energy and too costly to maintain for economical energy production. The net energy of the systems, like most renewable energy systems proposed today, is hard to net a positive energy after netting out the energy to build and maintain the equipment. Wave energy, tide energy, wind energy, and solar energy pollute more than fossil fuel when you look at the carbon problems introduced by the battery systems necessary for operation.</p> <p>In conclusion, much more design must be accomplished towards the storage and distribution of alternate energy systems. Todays electric energy systems require very large generation systems with high voltage and amperage distribution systems which step down in voltage and amperage as the branch systems are connected. A large number of small alternative energy systems being collected into larger systems and then distributing through a network like present day electric systems has extremely costly and inefficient problems.</p> <p>Anyone can make a windmill provide energy. That's old technology. Nobody can make a windmill which works without wind. Solar energy will never be available at night. Tides are variable, and waves are even less stable. Electric autos require batteries and a powerplant to charge them. All of the spending on Government programs for such systems is premature. Although solar and wind energy is used in some places in the world, it is with the penalties of the systems. Need for power sometimes drives system design with acceptance of the high costs and other shortcomings of the systems. As a source of reliable power, however, they cannot compete with good clean fossil fueled systems of today.</p> <p>Solve the sustained power level, the batteries design, the recycling of batteries, and the distributed generation systems first and it may (or may not) be feasible to design some of the alternative energy systems.</p> <p>I speak from the standpoint of an engineer who has studied, worked and designed alternative energy systems for 55 years,so far.</p>

55	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Tim	Mckay	Oregon Business Council	Renewable Energy	Process	<p>1. A clear and understandable regulatory environment for industry to follow.</p> <p>2. Sufficient locations for early stage development and research</p> <p>3. Clear path forward to commercialization</p>	<p>"I appreciate the opportunity to comment and thank you for the hard work you're doing. I represent the Oregon Innovation Council and have detailed written testimony. Our mission is to create jobs for Oregonians, we view ocean energy as a way to do that for the coastal economies. We have made over \$10 million investment in the Oregon Wave Energy Trust (OWET). The investments by the Innovation Council have leveraged federal and state dollars to create a research center on the coast at OSU that we think will make Oregon a leader in in wave energy development. I think this process is crucial and think it will be successful if it arrives at three key points:</p> <p>1. A clear and understandable regulatory environment for industry to follow.</p> <p>2. Sufficient locations for early stage development and research</p> <p>3. Clear path forward to commercialization</p> <p>If you are successful in this process, Oregon will be the location of choice for companies to come and develop."</p>
56	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Peg	Reagan	Conservation Leaders Network	Conservation	Data	Supports exclusion areas , "conflicting" use language, and data moved into high categories	We worked nationally with county leaders to protect natural resources. I am troubled by the use of "competing" resource language because it seems to put wave energy on par with fishery and ecological resources spelled out in Goal 19. I don't think that is what goal 19 specifies [reads Goal 19]. On the information sheet, I would urge you to move almost everything up into higher competing use categories. I think there should be exclusion areas. I could see that inactive dredge materials to be in the lower categories. I don't think you can put areas important to fisheries in anything but the "most" level of competing use. I would put marine reserves in parentheses next to marine managed areas. I think that the gray whale migration paths got moved to the least competing use category, I would certainly move it up. Yes, there should be exclusion zones. No, I don't think we should set aside a set percentage. Has the working group decided against revising Part 5? How much trust can the public put in to Part 5? Where would find out what the gaps are and where would we find out what research is in process to fill those gaps?
57	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	greg	McMurray	PEV	Renewable Energy	Data	STAC prioritize data gaps	My understanding is that there will be a Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) review of data, my recommendation is that STAC prioritize data gaps in that review.
58	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Diane	Henkels		Public-At-Large	Pocess	MarineMap needs better interface	<p>What is the process of procedures for updating maps as data gaps are filled? MarineMap is not user friendly though its value is clear and much appreciated. A few suggestions:</p> <p>1. Format OR MarineMap in same way similar to Google Earth which permits a user to enter a address from the very first page.</p> <p>2. Test user friendliness outside of the agency and with different age and occupations, to get a variety of users' perspectives.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
59	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Shirley	Kalkhoven	City of Neskowin	Local Government	Data	Need include visual data	After the meeting in Florence, I got to thinking about what Tom McCall would think about this, if he were still alive today. And one of the things that troubles me in this process is that nothing in the resource inventories talk about visual impacts. A quarter of a million people live on the Oregon coast and like to look at the ocean. I wonder how you can take that into account. Many people think about those aesthetic values as an asset of the state. If you are going to start industrializing the ocean, how do you do it to protect that value. Why is it not on the list of beneficial uses?

60	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Mary	Reddish	Audobon Society	Conservation	Data	Need to include seabird data	Thank you for coming to Portland and provide us with this opportunity to listen and share comments. We are interested in seabirds and what happens to them throughout their life cycle. Seabirds are in decline worldwide, and the West Coast is no different. One set of data layers that is missing, worldwide, is the inclusion of seabird foraging, breeding locations, and uses of the environment throughout their life cycle. Also, in a broader context, where would the public serve the permitting process best?"
61	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Wolfgang	Rain	Tyco Electronics	Ocean Industry	Data	Recommend 1000m exclusion area around subsea cables	We manage undersea cables worldwide and some that land in Oregon. We are glad that the importance of undersea cables are factored into the TSP. Undersea cables carry 97% of communications around the world. These cables provide infrastructure that we rely on every day. Adequate safety corridors are essential for repair and maintenance of cables. Some nations are considering exclusive cable corridors where other activities are excluded or limited. TE subsea communication cables installed about 500,000km of cables globally. They include telecoms cables, scientific arrays, and we have been in touch with other developers about energy cables. We do understand the interest of other seabed users and would like to work with them. Based on input from our cable ship captains and engineers, we recommend a minimum 1000m buffer on cable corridors to allow for safe maintenance and repair of these cables. We recommend these for undersea power cables as well. We would like to serve as a starting point for talking about other uses. The International Cable Protection Committee (ICPC) has had a historical recommendation of 3 water depths, but given the dynamic positioning of cable ships that has been reduced. This does not include structures that are occupying the water column. The safety of the crew, safety of the environment are at stake. I think that specific structure like cables are needed to be mapped as specific footprints and that they should be excluded areas from other areas.
62	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Mary	Wall		Public-At-Large	Data	Ask TSPWG to consider data gaps	I have three questions; 1. Will additional seafloor mapping be done and when will that be done? How do we find what has been done? 2. Your question about what percent should be set aside is for what type of development? 3. Is there going to be a conversation about what we do about areas of the coast where we don't have good information? I would admit to having troubles getting on marine map.
63	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Capt.	Thomas	Tyco Electronics	Ocean Industry	Data	Recommend 1000m exclusion area around subsea cables	The Global Sentinel is a special purpose ship whose purpose is to install and repair undersea cables. Thank you for letting us participate in this process. One of the things I want to revisit is the permitting portion of undersea cables. The permit includes the rights and responsibilities to safely install and repair these cables. The territorial sea is generally very shallow off of Oregon. Regarding the ships of the size we are talking about to install cables, these are very large. The ships are 140m long, so a 1000m corridor is less than 7 lengths of the ship. We are asking for 6-7 ship lengths to keep one of the most important revenue sources for this country going. The commercial data is imperative for finance, defense, and calling our families. The work on the Oregon coast in the wintertime is difficult. When we talk about multiple uses we need to do it smartly and responsibly so that investments in the water can be compatible. In response to data gaps we are more than willing to have observers on board when we go out. Thanks for the ability to participate in this process.

64	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Laura	Anderson	FISHCRED	Commercial Fishing	Process	Inappropriate to specify percentage of territorial sea, need 3d planning framework	FISHCRED is a statewide coalition of fishermen involved in marine spatial planning. My comment is on question 3, what percentage is appropriate for development. We know that goal 19 is ambiguous and in response to the questions about percentages of the TS, I think it is inappropriate to ask that question in this context. If we are asking that question we are surely asking to go down a road of legal definition, which we don't want to do. We are using this 2 dimensional planning grid which our stakeholders think is inappropriate for mapping uses of the ocean. When we talk about conflicting uses it's on the surface, on the bottom, and everything in between. The more appropriate question would where are areas of least conflict are in the Territorial Sea for wave energy to test devices. This is where the fishing industry is looking to go so that we can have industry to industry conversations to reach common ground.
65	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Kevin	Tocke	Surfrider	Non Consumptive	Data	Include surfrider data in Level 1 resource	I believe that the state needs to change non consumptive ocean use from level 2 to level 1 protection. Currently, we see about 80% of the population making trips to the ocean at least once a year. We think this will be more important as new ocean uses are proposed and as statewide population grows. We support ocean energy but don't think it should be sited in areas of recreational or ecological significance. As the population and economic impact from recreation grows this should be the justification for including in level 1. Oswald West and other state parks are certainly areas where ocean recreation should be excluded.
66	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Tara	Gallagher	Surfrider	Non Consumptive	Data	Include surfrider hotspot data in Level 1 resource	I want to thank you for coming to Portland, the ocean is very important to us. Thank you for allowing more transparency in the process. I encourage you to consider the "hot spots" of recreation use in the non-consumptive use in the level one protection. These are areas of reoccurring use. Perhaps not all recreation belongs in that category but think that the "hot spots" should be included, given that many people are using them, the economic importance of recreation, and the precautionary principle. I agree that not all wave energy is incompatible with wave energy. Given the lack of information, we think it would be best to protect the hot spots where multiple users use the coast. I do think that there should be exclusion areas and opportunity areas.
67	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	John	Audley	Renewable Energy Project	Renewable Energy	Process	Encourage flexibility and transparency in process	We are a twenty year project dedicated to responsible siting of renewable energy. We don't have any wave energy companies as members but we do have offshore wind energy members. To emphasize that you are not alone, there are similar discussion about renewable energy in Montana and Washington. The more information we can bring to the process is critical and we will support it. The caution I have with so many layers of data, if we knew then what we know now, we probably would not have developed Nuclear or the hydro system. There are pressures in western states to do away with coal facilities. In the twenty first century we need to figure out how to diversify our renewable energy potential, provide it closer to home, with less dependence on foreign sources and do it in a way that as cost effective and clean as possible. I encourage you to be flexible because the emerging industry costs will be high for rate payers. As you consider all the values heard here, I encourage flexibility and transparency."

68	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Peter	Stauffer	Surfrider	Non Consumptive	Data	Encourage surfrider hotspots as level 1 resource	<p>We are a grassroots environmental group comprised of recreational users who spend time on the beach or on the water. Thank you for coming to Portland, we are a landlocked community but have a lot of people that head out to the coast. There are a lot of economic linkages between here and the coast, Seaside, Cannon Beach, Pacific City. I want to speak on the importance of the recreation use data. We appreciate the clarification that it is level 2. I think that some information should be included in level 1. I want to provide some context for the study. We were not doing this in a vacuum; we had partners in Ecotrust and Natural Equity, under guidance from the state. We looked at over 20 different activities that occur in the Territorial Sea; surfing, diving, windsurfing etc. as well as shore-based activities; wildlife watching, storm watching, beach combing. We employed an opt-in method and on online survey to randomly sample about 4,000 Oregonians. Upwards of 65% of the statewide population went to the coast at least once a year for beach going. Whale watching and wildlife viewing accounted for about 35%. Even ocean-based activities, while in smaller percentages represent thousands of people.</p> <p>These are active uses of the TS and have been spatially mapped and are consistent with protocols. I think there are a couple things you could consider, including participation rates, economic impacts, sensitivity to marine renewable energy development. For example, Han gliding participation rates were astounding when contrasted to other uses where hundreds of thousands of people use an area. Of course the economic impact, the shore side economic report is an excellent resource for that. One criterion I would recommend for inclusion in level 1 or level 2 is sensitivity to wave energy. For some uses, surfing or whale watching these are spatially explicit places and I can't see how siting development would not impact that.</p> <p>We really do support this process, and have from the beginning. If this is successful the outcome will be viable areas for energy development to occur. Our members want to see this industry get started. Just because recreation takes place in certain areas, doesn't mean development cannot occur, but the intensity of use should be considered. I do think we are going to need additional dialogue between stakeholders and the process, between industry conservation, the state, whoever to make this process successful.</p>
69	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	John	Schaad	BPA/TSPAC	Transmission	Data	Encourage use of local PUC transmission and substation data	<p>I would like to talk about three points. I would like to see undersea power cables in the level one category. Perhaps because it is not currently a use, there could be a category of potential future uses. These facilities need onshore cable connection points; I would like the working group to include local utilities lines and substations in MarineMap. I realized that BPA operated undersea power cables in the Puget Sound that serve Lopez Island. I am going to find out as much as I can about what our requirements are for those I want to ask if Goal 19 addresses ocean acidification and its destructive force on other resources and uses</p>
70	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Dan	James	PNGC Power	Utilities	Process	Support this process	<p>"We represent fourteen rural PUCs and collectively are BPA's forth largest costumer. We support this process because we think it's important to development for wave energy and the economic activity it provides. That's why we are attracted to the upcoming test. You have heard lots about wave energy being a clean renewable energy source; we have put in about \$400K to see that that the Reedsport development can be used for power in our PUCs. These are rate payer dollars. We are looking forward to the test and the research that will follow. We also recognize the impact to coastal Oregon and are looking forward to see if development will be successful."</p>

71	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Marty	Gibbons	Independent Clean Energy	Renewable Energy	Process	Support this process	<p>"I've been in power generation for the last three decades, starting with Nuclear, and then out to the East Coast for wind turbines, and now out here. My point is too show support for this process from a developers perspective. The industrial jobs and infrastructure that it brings to Oregon. Time is of the essence. We need to move fast and smart and as a recreational users I support this development if it is done correctly."</p>
72	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Jason	Busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	Data	Agrees with level 1 resources in high category	<p>I appreciate the time here. I have spent some real quality time with MarineMap and think it is a good tool. As I look at the level one resource maps, the biological layers do not jive together. The basic recommendations of what goes into level 1, 2, 3 are appropriate. Given the prevalence of these resources on the coast I think it is appropriate to put these resources in the "high" level, not the "most" level. When you turn all these on, you have squeezed the energy out of the Territorial Sea. The only site left is probably Reedsport. All the areas around the ports are all taken. This is the difficult questions. We take comments and the working group is developing thoughts as it moves forward. This is hard to track from a stakeholder perspective. I think you should be careful about making decision in the middle of the process. In terms of part 5 it talks about the early phases of ocean energy. Where I see the current document breaking down is the second phase, what do you do when you commercialize, 5-10 years. Part five doesn't address this adequately. This is where I would suggest changes."</p>
73	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Tom	Yonker	Coquille Tribe	Tribes	Process	Supports this process	<p>I hope all of you go back to your constituents and tell them about the magnificent way that Oregon does business. I represent a small tribe of about 900 members and I appreciate the way that this process is being run. I think that you should go back to your constituents and let them know that this is a fair process."</p>

74	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Gus	Gates	Surfrider	Non Consumptive	Data	<p>communities and recognizing that Oregon's ocean is something the whole state values. While a focus has been on Goal 19 we need to recognize that Goal 1 is public engagement. There is a lot of information being presented at this meeting and it is a little hard to take it all in. I will take a step back and let you know about the non-consumptive use report that we conducted in partnership with the state and natural equity. We asked people three questions what types of recreation you partake in, where you do it, and how much money do you spend. What the data showed is that 20,000 trips were made to the Oregon coast and 80% of those trips were for ocean recreation. One thing that stands out is that there are hotpots of marine recreation along the coast. To make broad generalizations you see more use associated with jetties, headlands, and state parks. These areas also tend to overlap with ecologically important areas. We have taken this data back out to the public, to people we call "gatekeepers" to ground truth these maps. So we have gotten really good feedback from the communities about places that are special to people. Simpson Reef areas is one of the best places to view marine mammals from shore, Heceta head for bird viewing, Seaside and Winchester bay are highly frequented areas, for kayaking we see a strong correlation with places of coastal access, Port Orford for example. There is also a strong seasonality to these recreation patters, for example perhaps on the north side of headlands during the winter and south side in the spring.</p> <p>We have taken a strong scientific approach to gathering data and now we are moving into the art form portion where we bring in local knowledge and find suitable areas. I think that we need to find opportunity areas for the industry. I think that we also need exclusion areas, that I might call protected areas. If we get into federal waters, then I think we might be biting off too much and think we need to focus on the Territorial Sea.</p> <p>When I walk through the document about justification for what resources we are placing in each category. I think that this makes a lot of sense. Protect ecological resources and fisheries, and we are struggling with the beneficial uses. Perhaps part of this issue is that fact that we haven't updated Goal 19 in the last 20 years. There is a lot more non consumptive use that there was back then. Also, we have a proliferation of scientific research. There are lot of new uses that were not considered back then that contribute a lot to the economy and values of the state. So thinking about this from levels of protection, I think we need to look at economic contribution. Headland, jetties, state parks captures about 90% of the high importance of recreation areas. I think those should be elevated to the highest levels of protection."</p>
75	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Peg	Reagan	Conservation Leaders Network	Conservation	Data	<p>Supports exclusion areas, "conflicting" use language, and data moved into high categories</p> <p>We worked nationally with county leaders to protect natural resources. I am troubled by the use of "competing" resource language because it seems to put wave energy on par with fishery and ecological resources spelled out in Goal 19. I don't think that is what goal 19 specifies [reads Goal 19]. On the information sheet, I would urge you to move almost everything up into higher competing use categories. I think there should be exclusion areas. I could see that inactive dredge materials to be in the lower categories. I don't think you can put areas important to fisheries in anything but the "most" level of competing use. I would put marine reserves in parentheses next to marine managed areas. I think that the gray whale migration paths got moved to the least competing use category, I would certainly move it up. Yes, there should be exclusion zones. No, I don't think we should set aside a set percentage. Has the working group decided against revising Part 5? How much trust can the public put in to Part 5? Where would find out what the gaps are and where would we find out what research is in process to fill those gaps?</p>

76	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	John	Schaad	BPA/TSPAC	Transmission	General	Supports this process and encourage opportunity zones	Bonneville owns and operates about 75% of the grid transmissions for the state. Most of the power generation is on the East side of the state and most of the load is on the west side of the state. One of the biggest difficulties is serving power load on the coast. Wave energy can really help this load problem. I think we need to keep in mind the framework of adaptive management That it critical for this early industry and developing technologies. There was a recent study looking at the potential for power generation in the ocean, and it found terawatts of potential power. That is going to be in federal waters, so we need to work with the feds in there process. In Oregon, we have renewable energy portfolio standards, which excluded existing hydro. We have about six utilities that have renewable portfolio standards. Emerald PUD has been working with a dairy farm to create a power source from methane. There is a new plant I am working with on Hwy 99 south that uses biomass in a digestion process to create power. The utilities are looking for other sources for renewable energy. Its not just coastal utilities looking for that power, but those on land.
77	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Jason	Busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	Data	Encourages Working group to define categories before putting resources in them	<p>Some of the disparity that you feel might be coming from the industry is partly due to the fact there has been one company here for a long time and they have driven this industry and they have had an interest in setting the business model. But it isn't just about them, there are other companies. I would like to promote sites important to ocean energy all the way to level 1. I say that in jest, but until I know what each category means I don't think these categories have much weight. We need to have a conversation about what those levels mean. Does level mean that it is off limits? I can't weigh in about what resources should be in each level, without knowing what they mean. I look forward to keeping this discussion going with TSPAC, and I hope that TSPAC can be activated soon, so we can have this discussion.</p> <p>I see the language in Goal 19 is ambiguous and in figuring out if a new use has an impact, is very loose. Everything has an impact.</p> <p>My last point, the long term goal of OWET is not just to get a couple ocean energy projects in the water. The goal was to foster the industry, and concentrate the jobs here. To provide nearshore economic opportunities. The companies won't do that if they don't have a pathway forward to commercial development to recuperate the monies spent in R&D. And that development is going to be in federal waters so of course we have to be involved in that. The worst case scenario would be that we don't have a plan that encourages nearshore development and industry develops offshore and does not give Oregonians any control or benefit from it that would be a waste of time and money.</p>
78	Public Meeting	2/2/2012	Karen	Janusze wski	Oregonian	Public-At-Large	General	Supports this process	This process is like a shopping trip in which you have a friend who tells you what dress looks best on you. The public is the friend and the dress is the wave energy industry.

									<p>should be factored into the overall economic model for the Oregon Territorial Sea Plan. The world economy, national security, government, industry and the public rely on a reliable global internet, telephone, fax and banking system. Undersea communications cables provide this critical infrastructure, and complex operations are required to provide and maintain these systems. More than 95% of all international communications take place via undersea fiber-optic cables. Adequate safety corridors along cable routes are essential for safe and efficient maintenance and repair of cable networks in order to provide for network availability, as well as new cables. Cables must be able to be repaired quickly.</p> <p>As example of the criticality of subsea communications infrastructure, some nations maintain communications cable protection zones, and more nations with new subsea cable landings are developing national policies to establish cable protection corridors on their continental shelves. UNCLOS maintains provision to lay and maintain undersea communications cables. These instances are evidence of the recognized importance of undersea cables in local and international commerce.</p> <p>TE SubCom has installed nearly 500,000 km of undersea cables around the world. Our subsea cable engineering projects include not only telecommunications cables, but also scientific arrays, independent experiments, shore end engineering and other applications. Developers of several power cable installations have engaged our expertise. SubCom has the engineering and manufacturing potential to build and install wind and wave power cables and associated components, and is considering these important national developments for the future. So, we want to be clear that we understand the interests of all seabed users must be considered. Based on input from Cable Ship Engineers and Masters, a guideline 1000 m clear zone either side of an existing cable is critical. This allows the minimum adequate operating safety for most cable ships and accommodates sea currents, sudden weather changes, and provides contingency for unexpected operational difficulties. This is for the protection of BOTH Wave Energy power infrastructure and telecommunications cables. Although there may be areas where a narrower corridor or a scale proportional to water depth is acceptable, we would ask to review these with the relevant stakeholder on a case-specific basis, qualified through an established notification and agreement process.</p> <p>The ICPC recommendation of 3 X WD referred to by WE developers is intended to address cable proximity to cable operations or low-relief seabed structures such as pipelines—and does not adequately address fixed, vertical marine structures occupying the water column, which could</p>
79	Email	2/6/2012	Wolfgang	Rain	Tyco Electronics	Telecom Cables	Data	Supports 1000m corridor for undersea cables	

									<p>please share also with OPAC for the Bandon meet this week.</p> <p>i wrote you 4 years or so ago stating peoples opinion in Brookings, that where to disgusted to participate in the thought of marine reserves when after fishing their whole life they saw the coastline filled with natural reserves + felt attention should go elsewhere.</p> <p>well sadly the local fishermen that are sustainable feel still very stressed by regulators + the many entities that you have allowed to exist yet they feel they are not included nor do you listen to them. + think you want them to discontinue as small fishing fleet so that big processors can take over. is this your intent or are you being pushed by others to make this happen.</p> <p>the Maguson Stevens act was suppose to regulate along with many other existing entities, which 1 should not exist unless it clarifies ridding out the other. Debra Lambert has stated the Maguson Stevens Act is presently being changed due to public comment, + will open again for another comment period. many stated over regulation is a safety hazard. F+W stated they had no clue fisher folks where bothered or that they are included in many advisory positions, yet many are unaware.</p> <p>sadly what i see has + is continually happening is small ff are leaving the industry due to foolishness that they experience. how many of you have been family fisherfolks. it is bad enough to brave the elements sadly even not respected as in deadlines for some fishing, that was not taken into consideration for closures, ff had to fish no matter how bad the weather.</p> <p>this year again as we loose some trying to make a living + pressured with weather taking them out.</p> <p>yet you want to work 0-3 miles/rivers, as in your Bandon meet this week that i won't attend, which i hope you share these thoughts. for more small fisherfolks in crabbing will be at risk of losing more ground.</p> <p>the crabs are a living species that is dependent on migration, as we are,</p> <p>+ good science has yet to be developed to prioritize our biological</p> <p>+ cycle</p> <p>to sustain life. so when people develop that are fragmented then it goes right into the development. the funds produced by the crabbing, ff feel will outweigh that of all included in development that will interfere in the grabbing or clamming, not to mention the hydrological cycle due to many variables.</p> <p>we have many places + projects in the world that have shown mismanagement, large development that many pocketed from short term, but in the long run the natural biome`s cycle</p>
80	Email	2/8/2012	kara	lincoln		Public-At-Large	General	Urges for consultation with fishing communities	
81	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Elise	Hammner		Port	Process	Encourage co location of cable corridors, development outside TS	<p>I think the concept of this document being a living document is important. From the port we want to emphasize the importance of considering impacts of ocean uses outside of the Territorial Sea, in the ocean stewardship area. It was about 20 years ago when we heard about the telecom cables. Industry is looking to deploy devices outside of the Territorial Sea and the infrastructure for offshore development would need to come to shore. We think that the group should look for ways to partner projects and create cable corridors as well as partner with the federal process. We encourage you to bring these meetings to Coos Bay/Charleston area</p>

82	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Charlie	Plybon	Surfrider	Non Consumptive	Process	Encourage spatial plan, non consumptive recreational protection	<p>I want to speak on behalf of our members. Ocean recreation is very important to our members. We have spent a lot of time and resources mapping spatially explicit information about where ocean recreation occurs. We also mapped economic impacts of ocean recreation. Ocean recreation brings in \$2.8 billion to the coast annually. Surfing, beach combing, kayaking are important to the state of Oregon and coastal communities. Our members don't like this level 1-3 stuff. It sends a message that level 1 is better than the other levels. Currently we are saying that dumping in the ocean is more beneficial than ocean recreation. The public perception is that ocean dumping is better than ocean recreation. Given that, I advocate for inclusion of ocean recreation in level 1.</p> <p>We are over processing our data to the extent that we are not planning. What this group is supposed to be doing is creating comprehensive plan. We need to be putting together a plan. We have had a hard time getting started. We have done a great job collecting data, but now its time to do planning. I know its scary for people who are just seeing this for the first time. There is a lot left for people to engage in. We are going to move a lot faster and more effectively protect Goal 19 resources if we start talking about the plan."</p>
83	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Laura	Anderson	FISHCRED	Commercial Fishing	Process	Encourages flexible plan, re mapping of fishing value	<p>I'm here representing commercial fishing interests. My observation today is that there has been an evolution of what the expected outcome of this process is. We have talked about exclusion, opportunity, and lines. And now we are talking about the degree of compatibility of uses which is more of a guidelines driven approach. FISHCRED has not been very interested in creating hard and fast zones. This does not make sense to them in terms of the dynamic nature of the ocean. I like the direction of that this working group is moving in terms of providing guidelines because ocean conditions change, economies change, and the wave energy industry will change. We look at the fishing effort maps and scratch our heads, how do areas off of Reedsport not show up as important. It depends on who participated in that process. I hope that we can improve the data that we provided."</p>
84	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Jason	Busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	Process	Encourages responsible development	<p>The OWET board is made up of members representing the conservation community, fishing groups, and the general public. What we don't have on our board are members of the wave energy industry. I don't represent industry. I speak for industry a lot just as I speak for conservation community. Everything we do in on our website. That covers research and development, environmental work, and policy development. This is a worldwide conversation. The Europeans i out ahead of us, we work with the National Laboratories. We are working together to answer questions about how EMFs impact fish, shellfish, and skates and rays. There is a lot of information out there about how these devices interact with the environment. What we don't know is how 50 of these devices impact the environment. We are hoping to put 5-10 devices in the water so we can learn about the operation costs and environmental impacts. Then we can put more devices out and grow the industry out in the OCS. This is a phased approach. Right now we are focuses on point absorber like the OPT buoys, but in the future we will see many different types. Some you may not see because they will be fixed to the bottom and you will be able to motor over it and it wont create a visual impact. We are planning today for the technologies at the table. Who are not at the table today are the second generation companies that will be developing better technologies. We want to create a plan that allows for the existing technologies to get out there so we can learn more in the next 5-10 years, but we also want to create a flexible environment that will give these 2nd generation technologies, that may have less impacts, the ability to develop as well</p>
85	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Mike	Miller		Public-At-Large	Process	Cocentrate on federal waters	<p>You should concentrate on the OCS, not on the nearshore because this is where we fish. One mistake could wipe out our livelihoods. You should concentrate where waves and wind will be most likely to occur, offshore."</p>

86	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Ralph	Brown		Commercial Fishing	Process	Encourages spatial plan, consultation with fishermen	<p>old. It was only two years before that that the first salmon season was set. I have lived through most of the management that has been set. In the mid 80's I worked with the late Gail Achterman, I was the first south coast fishing rep on OPAC, sat on STAC, served 8 years on the PMFC, I was a county commission for 8 years in Curry County, and I have testified twice in front of the US Oceans commission because of my experience in planning. I was one of 6 to give testimony for the Council for Environmental Quality for the National Ocean Policy. While I was on OPAC we wrote the first Territorial Sea Plan and the Oregon ocean plan. I've been involved in this stuff for a long time. Much of that is in planning and decision making.</p> <p>I'm really worried about the quality of information we make decisions on. Some of that is that actual information and some of it is how we use it. Because this information will be used to decide trade offs for ocean uses. You talk about using log books for fishery information. I worked with NMFS when they did their exercise to identify EFH and they used log book to identify fish location information. The problem is that trawls don't work in rocky areas. So neither of the data sources showed fish in rocky areas. From their data you would conclude rock fish didn't live in rocks. Please be aware that logbook data is only an indication of where people fish, not where fish are. When I was on OPAC the first time, we were dealing with the potential for oil and gas development and marine mining off the coast. I saw a chart done by ODFW of logbook data broken down by 3mi x 3mi area, in lbs per hour. The places further from port may not be used as much, but they are still very valuable, even though they are considered low here. Even if I just fished in the low areas, I would make a living. When we talk about trade offs, we are really talking about is "potential." It's called "potential" because no one has been able to do it yet. You talked about spending the next couple decades developing a new industry. The problem is "potential" may or may not happen. But when you are talking about excluding existing uses, you are talking about real jobs that will be lost. You talk about winners and losers and when you put a zone in the water you have identified the losers, the people who are not able to use it anymore. Wave energy is politically correct, but burning wood is not. I hope you will keep that in mind. You are not really looking at a real sustainable energy policy.</p> <p>What we are talking about is a sea change in ocean management. Its going to happen, its probably the most profound change that we will ever see in our lifetime. Its called "ocean zoning". If we don't actually do it with a comprehensive plan in mind, then this will be done ad hoc and will be irrational. As soon as you say who gets to use a space then you have prioritized who gets to use it. All the new uses that need to come in; aquaculture, renewable energy, mining all need</p>
87	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Tom	Yonker	Coquille Tribe	Tribes	Process	Appreciation for process	<p>"Great job of explaining the process. You are all getting your presentation down. I watched some of the audience members nodding their heads in agreement. I didn't see anyone fold their arms across their chest in defiance. Keep up the good work."</p>

88	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Rick	Williams	SAIC	Renewable Energy	General	Encourages responsible development, suitable areas for development	<p>"I come at this with 30 years of experience and I wear many hats. I want to give you a little background. In 2005, a study done by the Electric Power Research Institute concluded that Oregon was the best place to develop wave energy because of wave resource, maritime industry, and energy needs on the coast. In 2006, Oregon, through the Innovation Council, put out a call for promising emerging industries. The Oregon Innovation Council selected wave energy as the most beneficial next emerging industry for the state. We established the Oregon Wave Energy Trust, a public-private partnership, with a job creation assignment. The board decided that the mission of OWET was the responsible development of wave energy and support to the industry. David Chin, the chair at the time, supported a "go slow to go fast" approach to answer these questions early on. And we have spent the last 5 years trying to answer questions about impacts from this technology. I work with a number of different companies as a systems engineer. During the gold rush period everyone wanted to do wave energy off the coast and then realized that it was a hard enterprise. There are only a handful of places on the coast that are good to do wave energy off the coast and there are a lot of different devices. The industry developed a consensus statement to explain what the needs of the industry are. I'm also a mariner and have spent time as an ocean engineer, salvage diver, and deep draft captain. In my experience, you can do ocean engineering in rough condition if you do it thoughtfully and carefully, especially if you listen to the people who know the ocean. I took a 26 year old submarine underneath the ice in two consecutive years. As an Oregonian, base load power is needed to keep the grid stable. We have said no to nuclear, coal, hydroelectric, fossil fuel. What are we going to say yes to? Wave energy is dependable, clean, and if done correctly can be done in Oregon. We have adopted the Denmark model, they know how to build, install, and design and have created a knowledge based industry around wind energy. This is what we want to do here in Oregon."</p>
89	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	John	Schaad	BPA/TSPAC	Utilities	General	Advocates for coastal power generation	<p>Bonneville was created to market the power from the federal hydro power system and create the transmission system. One of our customers is the City of Bandon. All that power generation is in eastern Oregon and we have transmission lines coming across the coast range. Its like having a really long extension cord to turn the lights on down here. But as load grows the length of the lines and distance means that those lines are maxed out. We spent \$16 million on a band aid at the Rogue substation. The system can't handle new load needed for coastal job creation. Having local generation on the coast would help to increase load to the Southern Coast, would make a difference, and help allow for continued growth."</p>
90	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Terry	Mott		Public-At-Large	General	Appreciates BPA engagement	<p>I appreciate you being here. I want to reiterate that the message I hear from BPA today is not the same message we hear at the end of the extension cord in Coos/Curry county. As a land owner who has a transmission line going through his property, I have tried to look into ways to encourage and develop wind energy and have not been supported by BPA or the local utilities. At some point you need to get the messaging straight. But I appreciate hearing what you have to say today.</p>

91	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	John	Schaad	BPA/TSPAC	Utilities	General	Advocates for coastal power generation	Renewable ocean energy needs to connect to the grid somewhere. BPA owns about 75% of the transmission grid in the Northwest. They are designed to bring the power from the Columbia out to the public utilities. These are transmission lines that cross cross the state from eastern OR all the way out to the coast. We own and operate those lines. If you visualize the state, in eastern OR all the generation is taking place. All that generation has to come across the state down the I5 corridor and across the Coast Range. The coastal utility districts connect to the grid. Our transmission lines end at the Rogue substation. This transmission system was build when the hydro system was built with lots of capacity for the future. Except now the load has grown and we cannot serve new load on those lines. How do we serve new load for growth on the coast? We can build more transmission lines which has higher costs or we can generate new power. What we have now is the possibility of wind and wave generation which is renewable and can help solve the problem."
92	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Rick	Williams	SAIC	Renewable Energy	General	Encourages responsible development, suitable areas for development	"For the record I live in Oregon, was trained as an engineer at OSU, and work as a consultant for SAIC. I come at this with 30 years of experience and I wear many hats. I want to give you a little background. In 2005, a study by the Electric Power Research Institute, concluded that Oregon was a great place to develop wave energy because of wave resource, maritime industry, grid infrastructure, and energy needs on the coast. In 2006, Oregon put out a call for promising emerging industries. The Oregon Innovation Council selected wave energy as the best next emerging industry for the state. We established the Oregon Wave Energy Trust with a job creation assignment. The board decided that the mission of OWET was the responsible development of wave energy and support to the industry. David Chin, supported a "go slow to go fast" approach to answer these questions early on. I work with a number of different companies as a systems engineer. During the gold rush period everyone wanted to do wave energy off the coast and then realized that it was a hard enterprise. If the original drafters of Goal 19 knew about the potential for wave energy, they would have included that as a beneficial use in the territorial sea. There are only a handful of places on the coast that are good to do wave energy off the coast and there are a lot of different devices. What does it take to be a suitable spot? The industry developed a consensus statement do explain what the needs of the industry are. We need good wave resource, sandy bottom for anchorage and cable, we need to be close to a deep water port. Power projects last 20-30 years and the coast between a day charter and an overnight charter add up over 25 years. I'm also an ocean engineer, salvage diver, and deep draft captain. In my experience, you can do ocean engineering in rough condition if you do it thoughtfully and carefully, especially if you listen to the people who know the ocean. As an Oregonian, base load power is needed to keep the grid stable. We have said no to nuclear, coal, hydroelectric, fossil fuel, what are we going to say yes to. Wave energy is dependable, clean, and if done correctly can be done in Oregon. We have adopted the Denmark model, they know how to build install design and have created a knowledge based industry around wind energy. This is what we want to do here in Oregon."
93	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Lou	Costa		Commercial Fishing	General	Encourages NO development	I'm bothered by testimony I've heard here. When you guys came down years ago for the marine reserves, she nominated Arch Rock. I believe in my right to go fishing. I don't want anyone to tell me where I can go and cannot go. It doesn't make any sense to me that we have two marine reserves already, they want seven more, and you want sites for renewable energy. Where are we supposed to go? My son comes up from California and he says I sure hope it doesn't happen here what happened in CA. And I say, I think its coming. Its ridiculous. You take away our rights, its an infringement. Its just not right. We need electricity, but for millions of years people survived without it, but they cant survive without food."

94	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Kathy Lenly	Hall		Public-At-Large	General	Encourages economic analysis	The company that went through the permit process in Gardiner went through a federal and state process. How much does it cost on an annual basis for the permit and the lease? The money that the state gets from commercial fishing probably doesn't compare to the money they will get from permit fees for landing cables or leasing land. Its almost as if the state is saying you commercial fishermen, you just don't generate enough money. That's my observation here today.
95	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Stephani e	Webb	POORT	Public-at-large	General	Encourage finding opportunity zones	Of course renewable energy is not cost effective right now. Not without the subsidies. But when energy prices go up to \$10 a gallon, everything will be changed. It will change what fishing looks like, it will change what energy looks like, and it will change what power looks like in your homes. How are our counties going to have money for our schools? Renewable energy is a creative way to look for alternatives. We have been zoning the ocean for ever. When we put in cables or other existing beneficial uses. If we look at land, its looking at animal corridors where there are now roads, and deer getting hit all the time. This planning is a different way of looking at it to prevent those types of mistakes."
96	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Peg	Reagan	Conservation Leaders Network	Conservation	Data	Encourages exclusion, ESA, fisheries, conflicting language	"In response about how to approve the data layers. I think it would be really helpful to provide printed maps showing all the level one and level 2 non grid uses and resources so that we can see how these things overlap. I have expressed concerns about impacts to grey whales, who just got off the ESA listing less than 20 years ago. Does Oregon want to take the risk that these devices cause? I also want to repeat my concern that high and moderate fishing levels should be moved to level 1, and that they should be exclusion zones. The areas of great importance to fisheries should be moved to level 1. Level three areas of importance to fisheries is the same language that Goal 19 says we should protect. In regards to the definitions, I have concerns about these levels being called competing uses. Competing means to strive or outdo. Conflicting means to be incompatible, and I think that conflicting is a more appropriate term, and hope you will use it."
97	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Frank	Williams		Public-At-Large	Data	Inclusion of exclusion around navigation channels	"I lived in the Coos Bay area since 1965. I wanted to see where the line was drawn on shipping lanes. In Jordan Cove, someone paid 5 million dollars and hasn't put a stake in the ground. I think that the effect of seals and sea lions on fish populations should be included. Ten or twelve years ago that the NMFS admitted that seals would be doubling or tripling in the next 10 years. I'm a retired longshoreman and no one is paying me to get to these meetings. Sometimes these meetings just wear out the public and you don't necessarily take our input into account. Another thing that concerns me is the fines that we might get by going into these areas. I would be worried that fisherman would have to buy permits to fish in a specific area, that wouldn't be good. I agree that there should be a mile corridor for shipping. It makes sense to exclude the wave buoys from shipping channels. It will be helpful to include place names when presenting maps so we know where we are. One thing you didn't mention is the price for this power. Thanks for giving me the opportunity to speak you guys are putting on a good show."
98	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Dave	Lacey	Our Ocean	Conservation	Data	Protection of recreational areas, spatial plan	"Thanks for coming to the South Coast. I work part time for a conservation group, and I speak for local businesses and fishermen. I support the work you are doing, we need to be careful about what we do in our oceans. As Oregon follows statewide planning goal 19, I am happy to see you guys going slow and gathering input. As an active recreation ocean user, I think that the Surfrider non-consumptive recreation use survey should be included as a level 1 resource. I don't think there is any other data source that shows where recreational use occurs and has been vetted up and down the coast with recreational users. This recreational survey captures what many of us already understand and that is that these recreational uses are valued on our coast. The bottom line is that we need to consider where beneficial resources are on our coast so that we don't impact our fishing and ecological resources. Thanks you."

99	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Peg	Reagan	Conservation Leaders Network	Conservation	Data	Encourages exclusion, ESA, fisheries, conflicting language	"I recommend that you change the terms "competing uses" to "conflicting uses." Goal 19 required that ecological and fishery resources are above new uses and must be protected first. wave energy can only go forward if it does not impact existing resources and uses. I think that most of the level 2 resources should be moved up to level 1, with the exception of inactive dredge areas. I think that level 1 should be an exclusion zone. The areas of great importance to fisheries should be moved to level 1. The three levels of importance to fisheries is the same language that Goal 19 says we should protect. I'm concerned that you are moving the goal post by saying that you are not talking about exclusion areas but more of guidelines. I don't think that is appropriate. I also think that you advise that any new wave energy companies come in need to replace other sources of power, like coal and fossil fuels. It won't do any good if it just encourages more energy usage."
100	Public Meeting	2/10/2012	Richard	Diesingham		Public-At-Large	Data	Need visual data	It occurs to me that the people of Oregon have made conscious decisions to protect the coastline from development. Clearly this is to protect the aesthetic values that Oregonians hold dear. It seems to me to be asking a lot of Oregonians to be siting large yellow lighted devices within the view shed. I want you to consider not siting energy facilities within the site of the land. You can see offshore development all around the county. The one thing you can't see in many places is a pristine coastline without development.
101	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Martin	Reed		Commercial Fishing	General	Encourages mitigation for lost fishing grounds	Surely you are kidding! Are you prepared to pay for our lost fishing grounds? You can't do this here.
102	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Bernie			Commercial Fishing	General	Encourages mitigation for lost fishing grounds	Mitigation... went to Salem....fishermen listening session...we have to start talking about mitigation. You need to be paid for fishing grounds
103	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Ann	Samuals		Public-At-Large	General	Need community decision making	Community decision making. Think about our community, fishermen are fabric of the community. Fisherman can't afford to come to these meetings. Also, siting decisions need to be made with the economy in mind. Submitting map of reduced lunches (by county?)...the amount of hunger present is appalling! When talk about stakeholders, really need to hear the working class (i.e. fishermen)
104	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	dennis	Sturgel		Public-At-Large	general	Urges consideration of other energy sources	Curious to how we are at this point...hydropower has damaged the salmon runs....with other available green energy (solar) available....that would have no effect in marine environment...why are we considering an unknown in ocean. Other sources are much less disruptive to our whole ecosystem

105	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	rick	williams		Ocean Industry	general	Encourages WG to utilize the industry suitability analysis	“In 2005 utilities deregulated, power went to EPRI – Oregon uniquely suited for wave energy, plus culture of mariners who have the knowledge to make implementation happen....wave energy selected as the next emerging industry. OWET formed...explanation of common questions/answers of wave energy. OWET board supports responsible development in ocean. Since 2006, OWET doing bunch studies, but have to put test projects in water to progress in this endeavor. Industry has now produced a consensus statement of industry needs. Now available OregonOcean.info. As a mariner....talks about his experience....ocean is harsh environment to get technology to function....talks about his experience relevant to this....as Oregonian, the state needs renewable energy....no hydropower, nuclear, etc. Wind is valuable, but intermittent, same for solar. Need a combination of power sources, but need dependency....”
106	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	ed	green		Commercial Fishing	general	Urges cautious approach	Commercial fisherman....needs support family, small businessman who has economic concerns. How much will this energy cost the consumer?
107	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	david	yamamoto		Public-At-Large	process	Expressed concerns about view shed issue	Viewshed issue – important to all Oregonians, not just coastal issues. How will ocean change once devices deployed in ocean? Now’s the time, when amending the TSP plan, we need to be at least talking about issue....now at the end of process it’s high time. Can’t ignore any longer...How will the viewshed discussion rollover into TSPWG/OPAC recommendations?
108	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Paul	Daniels		Public-At-Large	general	Urges economic analysis to ensure projects are not abandoned	Green energy not have good economic track record and there have been many bankruptcies in past. I would like to talk about the adaptive management plan. I want to know who is going to be the venture capitalist to fund these companies? Do I (tax payer) have to take responsibility in funding these sorts of endeavors? Who will do the economic analysis of the business models? It looks like right now the analysis will go to a gov agency, but I prefer a quasi-government panel review, with private businessmen. Government paid (scientists) staff not appropriate and I’m not in favor of that. Need outside specialists. Federal waters – we need to stretch into federal waters, avoid unintended consequences. Issue of marine reserves, e.g. Cape Falcon that area is now off limits – no protein production, no money generating from site – is that a return on your investment? Spain went hog wild on green energy, huge unemployment rate, much resources to create a job, it’s imbalanced. Green movement suppose to create jobs, but did opposite. Don’t have the energy to fund their system to get on moving. We have trashed good energy sources

109	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	tim	Gantaway		Public-At-Large	general	Worries that renewable energy will disrupt tourism	<p>Comment about Bernie's comment – diff between the word minimize and mitigate. If fisherman get compensated...how come I don't get compensated? The flow chart is more and more regulations (has family that are fishers)...will eventually be put out business. Banned oil, but now want allow wave/wind energy. The only reason we want green energy is because we want the political pawn....wants to speak against wave and wind energy. We have significant tourism here, an investment infrastructure exists to support this industry, same for fishing industry...why do we keep battering these industries with 1000 cuts?</p> <p>Only small fraction energy can be supplied by undependable sources (solar & wind)...we have system where we develop storage ahead of production...do we think we can pass a law where we use 20% of renewable energy, pass a law and negate the law of physics. As the head of my company, we were looking for co-development projects, first project sabotaged b/c wanted company to go bankrupt...private/public programs, I'm against it.</p>
110	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	peg	reagan		Conservation	process	Expressed concerns about TSPWG process for developing recommendations	<p>I think its disingenuous that this group states is not in the interest of wave energy...we are dancing around the issue of viewsheds....what is your plan and process for making the recommendation....not possible to review all the comments and vet issue in one meeting....and make decision....I suggest you need additional TSPWG meetings?</p> <p>Where are the locations of potential Wave energy sites on OMM...I can't find? What is process for making recommendation? Again, the group is stating that you WILL be siting these facilities...need to be clear.</p>
111	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	carol	steele		Public-At-Large	process	Urges cautious approach to determine if wave energy is right for OR	<p>"Speak to the fact that....the maps are absolutely tremendous, but for this issue not appropriate and almost a diversion...we seem to be making a statement that we need wind and wave energy offshore or else the Feds will do it for us....but the citizens are not buying it. We need to figure out what is best for Oregon...and I'm not sure that this decision can be made in March."</p>
112	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	jason	palmer		Commercial Fishing	process	Encourages mitigation for lost areas	<p>"Mitigation for lost areas....these regulations are shoved down fisherman's throats....fishermen have never been compensated....no idea how industry will be affected by wave energy....lost fishing areas, safety concerns, gear issues need to consider...lost fishing gear in wave energy site...and can't go and retrieve it...major economic loss."</p>

113	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	joanne	hanson		Public-At-Large	general	Expressed that DOM will be seeking sites for wave energy	We have over 50 installations in the state, this is one of them. We have plans to coordinate with locals communities within the state. I have been a planner for over 25 years, working at the city, county, and regional level...speak about Oregon National Guard's goals...from both fed and state levels. OR National Guard has a mission just like other sister agencies and they support local communities. One of the goals of OR National Guard is to develop alternative energy...much met through solar (using fed dollars)...facility in Ontario, Clackamas County...new development in The Dalles...employ a lot of locals...utility maintenance folk...OR selected as a net zero state...OR is in position for future funding from Nat Guard....looking at harvesting rainwater, geothermal, solar, etc...now ocean energy in context of net zero program...the army has awarded Nat Guard some funds to work with SAIC to do study to see if wave energy is viable offshore Camp Rilea, and what sort devices would be appropriate...Camp Rilea has been here for over 90 years...is an active range with a long history of military installation in area. As planner, comment on folk's ideas about how tax dollars spend – context of this feasibility
114	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	kevin	couples	commercial fisherman	Recreational Fishing	data	Encourages clamming be considered in Goal 19 protection areas	It appears that Goal 19 addresses shellfish as a fishery...so clamming should be put under fishery section...will provide written comments
115	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	bryan	?	commercial fisherman	Commercial Fishing	location	Encourages exclusion south of Astoria, Cascade Head.	"I have a problem with fishing mapping methodology – concerned about crabbing fishery. The area south of Astoria on the beach is very important but does not show up on the map. Crab logbook good indication of areas for importance for this industry. All fishing areas should be level 1 resource.....Lookout, Cascade Head into Washington important for shrimping...I want to see areas protected where fishermen make most of their living."
116	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	John	schaad	BPA	Utilities	general	Advocates for coastal power generation	Bonneville power system is maxed out....high costs adding more transmission...need additional power sources...data gap need to work with is in the name of long range planning are the routes we need for various locations for submarine lines offshore...need more data (in process) on our cables, how installed, how they affect surrounding environment."
117	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	rick	voche	fishcred	Commercial Fishing	general	Urges mitigation for fishermen	SOORC got involved because we were looking down the barrel of a gun when OPT came in here drawing lines on the map, right in the midst of our best grounds...FISHCRED joined b/c need to have coast wide voice between fisherman and agency/industry....It is being demanded of us that money gets taken out of our pockets and get put into corporations. Mitigation-wise, I'm concerned about my tax dollars going to fund corporate ventures...think "we" (Fishers) should get something out of this....applauds turnout especially young fishers."
118	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Paul	kleo	commercial fisherman	Public-At-Large	general	Urges complete removal of projects upon termination	These are all experiments that will have a price...huge amount of anchor put out in the ocean....they are going to forever going to change underwater landscape. OPAC should push for removal of everything associated with removal of projects...."
119	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	jason	busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	general	Industry needs test sites to inform if there are env. impacts	OWET happenings....public outreach/education – has contributed funds OCZMA, FISHCRED, SOURCE, etc to get these voices in this decision making processes...paid for MarineMap, funds giving to NNMREC, as part of R&D do a lot of environmental work....we actually know a lot more than think about wave energy devices/potential env impacts. Annex IV (http://mhk.pnnl.gov/wiki/index.php/Annex_IV_Knowledge_Base) is federal website logging info about impacts of ocean energy. OWET's mission....and board....helping to advance the conversation of ocean energy, with goal to minimize impacts: e.g. phased development. Process going to take years...up to 10 years before we have sufficient buoys in water to make significant impact...by then we will have better idea of env. impacts."

120	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Tom	bender		Public-At-Large	process	Encourages projects be sited outside of 3 miles	Has question about whether renewable energy should be considered a beneficial use. Opposes categorizing renewable energy projects in water as a beneficial uses, underdeveloped at this point. Unspoiled coast landscape is the basis of coastal economy – wave energy development will jeopardize – any project within 3 mile is insane. Take into technology hazards that likely occur (high winds, tsunamis, storms, etc).
121	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	wit	sheard	Oceana	Public-At-Large	data	Appreciates process, encourages exclusion areas for ESA listed turtles	I support this process....now starting go through data (Seven Devils, Cape Arago)...find reefs more extensive than previously mapped. Leatherback turtle designated critical habitat – raise issue about wave energy and tidal projects impacting this species
122	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	John	schaad	BPA	Utilities	general	Advocates for coastal power generation	Bonneville power system is maxed out....high costs adding more transmission...need additional power sources...data gap need to work with is in the name of long range planning are the routes we need for various locations for submarine lines offshore...need more data (in process) on our cables, how installed, how they affect surrounding environment
123	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	leann	thompson		Public-At-Large	general	cost benefit analysis with other forms of energy	Cost-Benefit analysis, everything has a price....big on self sufficiency. Encourages group to take into the account the big picture coal fire power will have costs regardless of where it is done – the costs and benefits. Thank you for your process
124	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	charlie	plybon	surfrider	Non Consumptive	process	Encourages moving ocean recreation to highest protection, development of a spatial plan	Move ocean recreation to highest level of protection or recreation could have levels of protection. Regarding the process, public meetings have been switching messages during recent meetings. Thought that the 2nd round would focus on place based issues....seems like still trying to define things should have been sorted out during 1st round public meetings. Offshore recreational activity varies, in terms of distance, for each location. Have been working on ground truthing recreation study findings. TSPWG message switch – thought working on comprehensive plan, shift to guidelines discussion (no certainties)....still wrestling with process and product. Surfrider asked to produce recreation hotspots.
125	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Mike	menzuli	surfrider	Non Consumptive	data	Encourages exclusion areas, ocean recreation protection,	Yes exclusionary, yes raise recreation areas to level one....wave energy off Tillamook Head and Oswald West would be tragic. Tillamook head one of the most biologically productive waters on the coast. North coast super high recreation levels...many valley trippers. Has a concern about OR's tough storm climate....encourages to support Surfrider's recreation study. Waves come from great distances.....surfs maybe 100 yards offshore, but diffraction can greatly impact wave patterns....example dredge materials affecting waves....sea kayaking can extend out as far as Arch Cape/Castle Rock (approx. 1 mile)
126	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	susan	allen	our ocean	Conservation	process	Encourages development of spatial plan	I appreciate the opportunity to talk today. Our Ocean is a coalition of citizens, scientists, businesses, etc...I sit on TSPAC as well. I am concerned about things happening in process over last three months: I think we are straying from original tasks set out in executive order (4th page). During the TSP 5 amendment process the tone and scope centers on Goal 19. Legislative word usage shift to “shall” protect G19 resources....recently competing uses has come into discussion, questions how this fits into G19. Need to be mindful of original plan to develop a comprehensive plan. FERC isn't going to wait forever....encourages completion date by end of 2012. As look at datasets, look at consumptive uses, but also look as far as non-consumptive recreational b/c huge economic input. I am optimistic about this process
127	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	rymar	barlow	cannon beach city planner	Public-At-Large	process	Supports planning option approach with exclusion areas	“I do support original intention to have planning options and am not sure why you moved away from that approach.”
128	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	deborah	burkbate	?	Public-At-Large	process	Concerns over viewshed issues	Public piece missing from process...public aspect trying to be crammed into Surfrider's work. Consideration of public use and visual impacts on the ocean.

129	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	jerome	arnold	?	Public-At-Large	general	Encourages development of spatial plan	Next 35 years....w/ 2% pop growth, conservation will not cut it. Climate change...oil wars, wave energy would reduce foreign dependency, plus have positive effect on global warming – need local energy sources, aesthetics are an issue, but have to make sacrifices.”
130	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	suzanna	gladwin	?	Public-At-Large	general	Encourages flexible plan	Ocean is carbon sink, acidification issue....not sure if levels of protection levels are going to work. Encourages flexible plan to deal with unknowns.
131	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Jim	carlson	Our Ocean	Conservation	general	Encourages counties to develop g19 plans	Clatsop County has done something locally regards to G19, that other communities could follow....will change jurisdictional responsibility...can it change state law....?
132	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Peter	huhtulah	Clatsop County	Local Government	process	Encourages working with federal agencies to plan for federal waters	Federal waters, probably going see more activity than territorial see...likely affect our marine resources....Territorial sea cable system should set stage for cable network that feds eventually use. This practical issue would lend itself for state federal interaction, cooperation. Needs to be documented in process the state-fed relationship.”
133	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	Jim	carlson	Our Ocean	Conservation	general	Encourages minimizing impacts	“More development coming...inevitable. We need power, wave energy is a good source. Need to focus on minimizing impacts.”
134	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	rick	williams	SAIC	Renewable Energy	general	Encourages consideration of industry suitability maps	In 2005 utilities deregulated, power went to EPRI – Oregon uniquely suited for wave energy, plus culture of mariners who have the knowledge to make implementation happen....wave energy selected as the next emerging industry. OWET formed...explanation of common questions/answers of wave energy. OWET board supports responsible development in ocean. Since 2006, OWET doing bunch studies, but have to put test projects in water to progress in this endeavor. Industry has now produced a consensus statement of industry needs. Now available OregonOcean.info. As a mariner....talks about his experience....ocean is harsh environment to get technology to function....talks about his experience relevant to this....as Oregonian, the state needs renewable energy....no hydropower, nuclear, etc. Wind is valuable, but intermittent, same for solar. Need a combination of power sources, but need dependency
135	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	jason	buesh	OWET	Renewable Energy	general	Encourages consideration of industry suitability maps	OWET developed 3 maps – 3 diff tech needs, maps will be posted on OMM soon. OWET description.....issue raised tonight around energy use....10 year energy plan....dealing with climate change, limited fossil fuels, and national security

									<p>your commitment to the OPAC process; I am becoming a believer.</p> <p>As a fishing representative I am hoping that the process really works and protects the "majority" of our fishing grounds from being overrun by emerging use that has real potential over time to displace a lot of existing coastal JOBS. When Grand Coulee Dam went in no one knew they would all but lose public access to salmon or that hundreds of dams would follow. Today's testimony that prime fishing grounds be raised to level 1 protection is really something that needs to happen. I have been in fishing since the first time I went to sea on a crab boat in 1958 at the age of 10 with my dad - I've seen a lot of CHANGE, most of it for the worse. Fishing is at a point it cannot take a lot more abuse. The shore side infrastructure is crippled in a lot of ports. If people/governments do not start paying attention to preserving fishing as a very high priority it will be gone and with it a lot of coastal character and draw of tourism on the coast. Ocean energy will never be able to replace those fishing JOBS or the tremendous freedom all those that fish really know about. The real loss will be that intangible loss of FREEDOM that really matters that a fishing quality lifestyle provides.</p> <p>FYI - In Washington the crab fleet has lost 559 square miles of prime fishing grounds and 50% of the crab on our grounds on over 70% of our coast to federal tribal obligations and a federal court decision. We know what PAIN and loss of fishing ground is all about: Freedoms' LOST can never be mitigated. Re-read the Declaration of Independence - a few of us really understand what it really says.</p> <p>In Washington we are 1/2 way to getting a Washington OPAC through SSB 6169, the Washington senate passed the bill, SSB 6169 by a vote of 45 - 3. We'll be quickly following in your footsteps with a hope of stopping any additional loss of what really counts; our freedom.</p> <p>If this bottom up approach is to really be successful it needs to insure that federal waters are fully accountable to state CZMA and that federal actions are really accountable to local and state regulations and laws out to 200 miles.</p> <p>We'll need alternate forms of energy in the future but we mustn't sell our souls to achieve it at any price, the electric rate payer still needs to be considered as well. Keep Oregon waters</p>
136	Public Meeting	2/17/2012	dale	Beasely		Commercial Fishing	General	Appreciates process, urges fishing level 1 protection	

137	Email	2/21/2012	Tom	bender		Public-At-Large	Data	Encourages inclusion of spritual, view shed, and humility resources along coast	<p>It was apparent at the Cannon Beach public input meeting for the Territorial Sea Plan Revision, that although the group acknowledged the need for mapping esthetic, viewshed, and spiritual dimensions of the Territorial Sea, that nothing had been done on such.</p> <p>I am therefore submitting the attached maps showing Viewshed, Humility, and Spiritual Resource mapping of the Oregon Territorial Sea, to fill in these gaps.</p> <p>I assert that these resources cover the entire Territorial Sea, and extend beyond it to at minimum 12 miles from shore, although visible areas extend farther, particularly from headlands and places such as the top of Neahkahnie Mtn.</p> <p>Please note that all three of these beneficial resources are listed as Level 1 Resources, though most properly they should be listed as Most Competing Uses and Resources. They are not "competing", however. They are compelling. They are vital and irreplaceable resources and uses. They do not compete with or detract from other existing uses, but are irrevocably destroyed by virtually all proposed ocean energy developments.</p> <p>The "Humility" resource has to do in particular with the night-time quality of the Oregon Coast and Territorial Sea. If there was no darkness, we could see no stars, and would have no sense of our origins as the ashes of extinct former stars, of dimensions of time, of the multitude of galaxies, stars, planets, and presumably life throughout our universe. It is a beautifully humbling experience, and one that is quickly destroyed with very little night-time light or flashing warning lights from celltowers, wind towers or ocean energy equipment. Sustainability of our culture requires new values, and humility is one of the core values. It is, indeed, the core value of the "Warrior" archetype. The Oregon Coast, and its abutting Territorial Sea and outer waters are a vital and scarce national and international resource for these dimensions of our lives in an otherwise over-industrialized world</p> <p>All three are resources and uses which are core to our entire coastal tourism and retirement economy. People come here from the city for peace and restoration, for non-industrialized surroundings, to actually see the night sky and stars. There is no need to quantify this. Their qualitative value overrides any "quantified" aspects of other uses. They are incomparable, irreplaceable, and not to be lost. While with some resources such as ocean recreation, the intensity of numbers of people "using" an area may come into play, it is my opinion that for these resources they do not. Indeed, the numbers of people "using" these resources in an area may have an inverse relation to their value. To stand alone on the beach or a headland or a mountaintop, looking out over an unindustrialized ocean, has an incomparable power and value.</p>
138	Email	2/22/2012	David	Landkamer		Public-At-Large	General	Supports including consideration of aquaculture in TSP	<p>I am interested in including the consideration of future potential aquaculture activities in coastal waters in the TSP discussions and decision making processes. To what extent has this been considered, and how do you recommend that the topic be included in the overall planning discussion?</p> <p>I plan to attend some of the coming Public Work Session Meetings along the central coast, and could make or submit comments, in person or in writing, as would be most appropriate to facilitate and contribute to the planning discussion in this regard.</p>

139	Email	2/24/2012	hans	radtke	Economist	Public-At-Large	General	Ureges economic analysis of projects and tradeoffs	<p>I have lived at the Oregon coast south of Yachats for over 30 years. I am an independent consulting economist who has worked for public agencies and private industry on a variety of natural resource issues. One of my projects has been to evaluate the contributions of identifiable industries to regional economies. I am also a co-developer of the Fishery Economic Assessment Model (FEAM) that has been used by most agencies on the West Coast. As a resident of the coast range, our family has lived “off the grid” for 25 years, relying on a small hydro-electric plant to supply a constant 6 KW most of the year.</p> <p>I have also served on the Pacific Fishery Management Council, and am presently on a Federal Advisory Committee for Marine Protected Areas (NOAA and the Dept of Interior).</p> <p>My comments on Oregon’s Territorial Sea Plan relate to two issues:</p> <p>1. Economic Analysis of Alternatives Basic economic analysis involves comparing the costs and benefits of alternative actions. The mapping of the ocean floor and gathering of information on present uses can never be the end product, but only a start for economic analysis. For example, basic information on commercial fishing (landing values, place of harvest etc) is the beginning of the analysis. If an alternative use of a particular location is being considered, then the net cost and benefits of moving the fishery should be compared to the cost and benefits of the alternative use. If the fishery being evaluated is being managed by quota, then the appropriate cost would be only the additional cost associated with having to fish in an alternate site. It would not be appropriate to include as a cost the total harvest removed from the original site.</p> <p>2. Cost and Revenue Stream of One Alternative Use: Wave Energy Having constructed and maintained a small hydro-electric system near the coast, I have become very well aware of the economics of providing alternative energy. Although my residence is now connected to the grid, it is not economically justifiable to sell my excess electricity to Central Lincoln PUD because the current offer of \$0.035 per KWH will not cover my costs. It is interesting to see that in Europe, alternative energy (particularly solar) is a growing percentage of total usage because small producers can receive up to \$0.50 per KWH, due in part to public subsidies and tax incentives.</p>
-----	-------	-----------	------	--------	-----------	-----------------	---------	--	--

140	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	peg	reagan	Conservation leaders network	Conservation	Data, General, Process	Urges a two year moratorium on wave energy development to conduct env. Studies	<p>February 24, 2012</p> <p>David Allen and members of the TSP Working Group:</p> <p>You asked for alternative options to the process you have undertaken. Based on what I've heard from DLCD and public comment, I would like to propose for your consideration:</p> <p>1) The TSPWG should determine what you think FERC requires, and what choices that allows Oregon.</p> <p>2) Since it has become clear that the wave energy industry is not at a point where it can prioritize its needs and desired site locations with specificity, the TSPWG should recommend a two-year moratorium, during which:</p> <p>a) the wave energy industry can use information from existing sites around the world to develop its specific requests;</p> <p>b) the intensity of the use of the gray whale migration path can be studied to determine the areas of most/least use during four migrations;</p> <p>c) the fishing industry can obtain information from fishing interests which didn't participate in the original work, AND can re-evaluate fishing intensity, value and volume in the Territorial Sea;</p> <p>d) the scientific and conservation communities will obtain information on the recently-listed endangered leatherback;</p> <p>e) ODFW will advise the scientific and conservation communities of the data standards currently being utilized, so new or revised data obtained from the scientific and conservation communities on gray whale migration, the leatherback, and other species, can be provided in a format that can be incorporated into existing information;</p> <p>f) the TSPWG will decide whether viewsheds can be protected and, if so, provide one year's notice for coastal communities and others interested to gather information coastwide in a consistent format TSPWG can utilize;</p> <p>g) federal agencies will provide the TSPWG with guidance as to what they would be able to approve relating to spatially defining zones of use for marine renewable energy</p>
141	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	John	griffith	SOORC	Commercial Fishing	data	Questions why Snowy plover included in Goal 19 protection since they are shorebirds	Why were snowy plovers included in Goal 19 protection when they are shorebirds? Can Marxan be adjusted in terms of sensitivity? Concerned with how Marxan deals with abundance and resource value."
142	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	dave	lacey	Our Ocean	Conservation	process	Encourages spatial plan, recreation use protection , and protection of headlands, rivermouths, and jetties	I've heard rumors of the TSPWG only putting together some recommendations to FERC or guidelines....I encourage the completion of a comprehensive plan. Happy to hear about this plan having Goal 19 as a backbone. I participated in Surfrider's recreational use study, consider putting areas of recreation as level 1 resources, specifically headlands, jetties and river mouths. Curry County has a natural resources advisory commission, invites Onno Husing to engage with this group.
143	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	John	schaad	BPA	Utilities	general	Advocates for coastal power generation	Bonneville power system is maxed out....high costs adding more transmission...need additional power sources...data gap need to work with is in the name of long range planning are the routes we need for various locations for submarine lines offshore...need more data (in process) on our cables, how installed, how they affect surrounding environment."

144	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	barry	nelson		Ports	location	Urges exclusion of development with 5-10 miles from any harbor	Lane/Douglas County map is basically wrong (fishery resources), inquire about Reedsport fishery grounds SOORC maps showing something different....should not be Level 3 resource area. As port commissioner, I value the social side of it....we're talking about where to site wave energy, but there are some points that you should have no development, e.g. 5-10 miles from any harbor. This would do away with a lot of complaints from the general populous. Concerned about the value of Crab fishing ground being washed out in ecological hotspot analysis. I really think the answer is that (wave energy industry) is going to have to a little further than 3 miles."
145	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	Stuart	Schupelt s		Commercial Fishing	location	Urges exclusion of development near Umpqua rivermouth	Speaking locally, the value on both sides of the Umpqua river is huge. 10 mile stretch from north jetty to Florence, extremely valuable. Displaced fishing families from the coast don't need coastal energy...wave energy will not help this community one bit."
146	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	John	kipple		Non Consumptive	location	Exclude development on jetties and headlands	Reiterate the importance of jetties and headlands...hard to pin a dollar amount....difficult to quantify. No industrial applications should impact access to these areas
147	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	Jason	busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	general	Appreciates process, Encourages consideration of industry suitability maps	OWET happenings....public outreach/education – has contributed funds OCZMA, FISHCRED, SOURCE, etc to get these voices in this decision making processes...paid for MarineMap, funds giving to NNMREC, as part of R&D do a lot of environmental work....we actually know a lot more than think about wave energy devices/potential env impacts. Annex IV (http://mhk.pnnl.gov/wiki/index.php/Annex_IV_Knowledge_Base) is federal website logging info about impacts of ocean energy. OWET's mission....and board....helping to advance the conversation of ocean energy, with goal to minimize impacts: e.g. phased development. Process going to take years...up to 10 years before we have sufficient buoys in water to make significant impact...by then we will have better idea of env. impacts
148	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	bob	lurie	OPT	Renewable Energy	process	Appreciates process, agrees with mitigation to understand effects	Reedsport project fits into the TSP process, deployment will take place this summer...south coast become the center of attention...has contributed to increasing local jobs and will continue to do so. With leadership and assistance of TSPWG....OPT has worked with the community for six years now to ensure responsible development. OPT will perform mitigation measures and research studies...to assist in evaluating impacts before large scale projects occur. State and local communities can make informed decisions...we believe that data will show that the impacts will be minimal because of adaptive management. If you're a nonbeliever, well we will pay for the specialists to do the research and find out

149	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	nick	furmen		Commercial Fishing	data	Urges highest protection for fishing grounds, consultation with fishing communities	Speak specifically about what's been requested on data gaps, SOORC 100 penny maps done at front end of process before anybody had a clue about how info was going to be used. If carried out the exercise today, I believe the maps would look extremely different...folks would take the mapping effort more seriously. SOORC group has been talking to FISHCRED about contemplating the need to put forth additional info. I feel obligated on behalf of the fishing folks, if look at boxes drawn on territorial sea, 3-5 projects have been in conflict with fishing communities (Winchester and Reedsport)...obvious financial impact. We've told OPT that we support up to ten buoys...2011 is one of the best years for OR fishing industry. Shrimp, Blackcod, Albacore, Crab...mega bucks. Money comes back to these communities. The fishing industry is an important economic driver...I think these guys would suggest that all fishing grounds are level one. We know we have to make compromises, but these areas are important. Real estate is the key issue...highly productive, highly valuable...can't afford to get it wrong.
150	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	peg	reagan	Conservation Leaders Network	Conservation	data; process	Urges a cautious approach, two year moratorium, further env. Studies	Submitted written version....Wants to ensure comments get distributed to TSPWG absent members. Oregonians want Oregon to proceed with caution, public not in support. Need to protect all important fishing grounds, i.e. move to level one. Grey Whale foraging areas moved level one. Many of beneficial uses in level 2 should be elevated to level 1. Leatherback needs to be protected as well. Oregon should require that wave energy facilities should replace a certain amount of fossil fuel use. We don't know enough about where these facilities can be cited, can't make these decisions....second document, alternative options to process taken. Two year moratorium, for more information gathering. The working group needs to understand if viewsheds can be protected, if can then you should provide a years notice....this process is premature!
151	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	Onno	husing	OCZMA	Local Government	data	Fishing maps are valuable, not flawed	"I disagree with the term "flaw" to describe the limitations of the fishery maps. Those represent a tremendous amount of effort, cooperation, and collaboration and should not be considered flawed. The maps are our servants, we are not the maps servants. We will be able to use them to inform this process."
152	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	John	schaad	BPA	Utilities	general	Advocates for coastal power generation	Bonneville power system is maxed out....high costs adding more transmission...need additional power sources...data gap need to work with is in the name of long range planning are the routes we need for various locations for submarine lines offshore...need more data (in process) on our cables, how installed, how they affect surrounding environment
153	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	cindy	carp		Public-At-Large	process	Urges consideration of the land-sea connection	I started on this path in Feb 1996...brainstorming with folks about how we might do wave energy...I find this process very interesting...it's been a long journey to get to this point I'm privileged to be a part of it. We may be missing the boat on water quality, we need to take lead and follow POORT's example...land to sea connection
154	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	hans	radtke		Public-At-Large	process	Urges economic analysis of projects and tradeoffs	Submitted written comment. Independent economist. I've lived on the grid, personal hydroelectric system....two comments, one is the economic analysis in regards to data, you also need to know how you can use that data in the analysis. What will the changes result in the costs and benefits, where will fishing efforts shift...asking that we should make a real effort to use the data we're getting. Econorthwest's study (Sept. 2009) should be referred to an economic study (as opposed to a feasibility study). They assume here that Oregon R&D capability for a tremendous amount of units that they will build here, results in x jobs. We're looking at the placement of units, but not looking at impact of developing wave energy related infrastructure. Report says would not be feasible at current rate – we have to make sure proper analysis of alternatives before restrict areas for specific uses. Before we get too excited about this, I would like a seminar about placement of wave energy and the economics of it. When we go through this system we need to be careful about not creating property rights, e.g. mining rights."

155	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	mark	tilton		Non Consumptive	location	Urges mapping of view sheds, protection of recreational areas	<p>side...comments related to beneficial uses. Florence doesn't have big fishing fleet, reliant on tourism/recreation and aesthetics. Concerned about these issues...need to maximize info related to Surfrider study. Think some recreational areas need to be elevated to level one resources. I/we need to think about surrogates for viewshed issue b/c don't have hard data. One idea would be to use the density of existing ocean front development. Want to avoid impacted property values...need to map beneficial uses as separately as we can. Need to be precautionary in our approach. As an example, when I look at Heceta beach, I just don't think it's going to be appropriate for wave energy development. South of Siuslaw, dunes recreation area, there's no residential development for several miles...that would be a high potential, just looking at the aesthetic values. We need a map that portrays this difference...high aesthetic value contours.based on economic development in the community...needs to be worked in, not sure how. Noticed, when talking about permit process, I didn't see any mention of public review or</p>
156	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	jason	busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	data	Encourages development of spatial plan, in favor of excluision/opportunity areas,	<p>OWET's mission is to promote the responsible development of wave energy. On our board we have lawyers, people from the public, fishermen, but no wave energy deelopers....public outreach/education – has contributed funds OCZMA, FISHCRED, SOORC, etc to get these voices in this decision making processes...paid for MarineMap, funds giving to NNMREC, as part of R&D do a lot of environmental work....we actually know a lot more than think about wave energy devices/potential environmental impacts. Annex IV (http://mhk.pnnl.gov/wiki/index.php/Annex_IV_Knowledge_Base) is federal website logging info about impacts of ocean energy. OWET's mission....and board....helping to advance the conversation of ocean energy, with goal to minimize impacts: e.g. phased development, move towards knowledge export model. Process going to take years...up to 10 years before we have sufficient buoys in water to make significant impact...by then we will have better idea of environmental impacts.</p> <p>We have some data gaps, but it is nowhere near where we were five years ago. You can also count on the industry to begin to fill in some of these data gaps, if they can develop in OR waters. As we develop we are better able to answer these questions. Classifying categories is a great exercise, its important to understand what areas are important for protection, but this is only good in the context of a larger plan, and I am interested to see what this work group comes up with. Exclusion areas are relevant if there are opportunity areas for industry, I think these are</p>
157	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	stephani e	webb	POORT	Commercial Fishing	data	Urges protection for PO crab fleet, north of Blanco, encourages allowances for jetty devices	<p>Ocean resource team does not have enough information to proceed with planning in PO stewardship area. Interested in learning about renewable wave energy opportunities and technologies ...data gaps, Port Orford's fishing resources and crabbing grounds undervalued. When considering Goal 19, crabbing is the highest valued fishery in Port Orford...important areas that should be included and identified resources are north of Cape Blanco and floras lake, neither of which are in level 1 or 2 importance for fisheries. POORT would like to explore technologies that combine with existing jetties or other structures, the area outside of out existing jetty is level two resources, which we don't want to have hinder our ability to replace or repair our jetty....we value renewable energy but not at the cost of our highest valued fishery.” - attached comment”</p>
158	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	chad	Padwick	Citizen	Recreational Fishing	location	Urges protection of Alsea Bay mouth	<p>Alsea Bay has no commercial or industrial traffic coming out of bay...very popular recreational area for fishing. I wanted group to realize, though we're not a major port, it is heavily used. The recreational fishers even venture into the ocean at times. Looking at the resource maps, Alsea Bay is blue, would like to see the mouth protected b/c it is a high use area</p>

159	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	Peg	Reagan	Conservation Leaders Network	Conservation	data;location	Urges a cautious approach, two year moratorium, further env. Studies	“Submitted written version....Wants to ensure comments get distributed to TSPWG absent members. I appreciate work that ODFW and DLCD is doing. Oregonians want Oregon to proceed with caution, public not in support. Need to protect all important fishing grounds, i.e. move to level one. Grey Whale foraging areas moved level one. Many of beneficial uses in level 2 should be elevated to level 1. Leatherback needs to be protected as well. Oregon should require that wave energy facilities should replace a certain amount of fossil fuel use. We don't know enough about where these facilities can be sited, can't make these decisions....second document, alternative options to process taken. Two year moratorium, for more information gathering. The working group needs to understand if viewsheds can be protected, if can then you should provide a years notice....this process is premature!”
160	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	Susan	allen	our ocean	Conservation	process	Urges development of a spatial plan	“I've been reviewing info and getting sense where we are at, this is a great opportunity for state of Oregon. I find all these conversation interesting...data gaps should prevent certain area use, but areas we know, work with that to find suitable areas. We're at a point where place-based information should be included in the conversation. We need a draft map so that we can begin to make comments...right now we're asking “what do we think about the data sets?” we need to consider where we are going to put, we need the plan...ultimately we get to a point where the industry will be able to show that if you work with all stakeholders it is possible. Couple questions: It seems like after this public comment period is over, will all future meetings at local level be posted in a central place? Would it be possible make 3way conduit for info exchange....?”
161	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	melissa	chapman	citizen	Public-At-Large	general	Urges increased outreach to comment on maps	“We want as many people participating as possible. Once we get out of the high level conversations and get the info on the map...our ability to reach out to people will be expedited. When might we be at this point? “
162	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	Paul	englemyer	Citizen	Conservation	data	Supports exclusion areas, recreation protection, federal engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher priority protect important ecological areas • Critical habitats and ESA species and unique life-histories related to sensitive species upgraded to level 1 • Identify 3-5 sites that could be used for research and development / testing difficult technologies • Monitor any potential impacts to species • Clearly identify data gaps – develop partnerships and strategy to gather critical information • Ensure adequate bonds are in place to protect/recover any infrastructure/lease sites for limited time • Urge STAC review Ecotrust Econ assessment • Fishing effort mapping effort should be fine tuned by key fishermen in each port • Will there be benefits to fish as a result of the infrastructure? • Please incorporate recreational data on level 1 protection • Clarify any weighting used in the Marxan DST • Reach out to Pacific Seabird group for draft data sources – create info request letter that could go out to other organizations • Support exclusionary areas – no go for renewable energy

163	Public Meeting	2/24/2012	laura	schmidt	Our Ocean	Conservation	data	Urges recreational use protection	Thank you for these continued opportunities to provide comment. I would like to see non-consumptive recreational uses added to level 1, including the Parks and Rec research and Surfrider studies. As an inland Oregonian, I come to the coast to sightsee, watch wildlife and hike. We know that over \$2billion is spent each year on the coast by tourists and these dollar and people should be taken into account. Renewable energy and wave energy technology can be a good thing for Oregon and create jobs and revenue for Oregonians. We can find ways to keep working together as diverse stakeholders to find prudent areas to consider R&D wave energy siting. Oregon is special in its consideration and protection of Goal 19 resources. I'd like to see our renewable marine resources and habitats protected as we cautiously work together as we move forward with potential together as we move forward with potential renewable energy
164	Email	2/26/2012	adele	dawson		Public-At-Large	General	Appreciates process, encourages protection for ecological areas, esp ESA species	<p>Dear Honorable OPAC Members,</p> <p>Thank you for soliciting comments on how to responsibly plan for renewable energy siting in the Territorial Sea. It is critical to plan for a sustainably managed ocean that is healthy, vibrant and clean. We must preserve the health and biodiversity of the near shore over any other use.</p> <p>Federally listed species like the Marbled Murrelet should have their forage grounds rated as level 1- High Competing uses and resources. Murrelet habitat along the central Oregon coast is a Global Important Bird Area.</p> <p>Areas of scientific research should be protected foremost. Scientific research and monitoring gain valuable knowledge for all of us and bring in millions of dollars to the state every year.</p> <p>The Territorial Sea Plan should clearly identify the ecologically important areas in the near shore separately from those used heavily by the fishing community.</p> <p>Oregon's Territorial Sea is under increasing pressure from fishing to tourism to energy production, as well as climate change and uncertain ocean conditions. We need to use the best science and experiential knowledge available to plan wisely and sustainably manage the resources that belong to all Oregonians.</p> <p>Oregon's Territorial Sea is managed in the Public Trust which is why I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this critically important process. Thank you for your careful consideration of these points.</p>
165	email	2/28/2012	dave	lacey	Our Ocean	Conservation	location	Encourages spatial plan, recreation use protection , and protection of headlands, rivermouths, and jetties	<p>It's very important to make the TSP plan a comprehensive plan that FERC accepts so that we are in the drivers seat when it comes to what is allowed in our waters. We also need a final draft map so that we can comment on the final product to make sure everyone's concerns at least get heard. The rec study and the hotspots inside it need to be made a level one data source. Headlands, river mouths and jetties need to be put aside for their value as recreational areas which bring in a lot of economic and leisure value to Oregonians.</p>

166	email	2/29/2012	jan	meyer	Citizen	Public-At-Large	process	Encourages a spatial plan , consider ESA species for protection	<p>biodiversity of the near shore over any other use. We need to use the best science and experiential knowledge available. All stakeholder need to be included.</p> <p>Habitat and forage areas for the Marbled Murrelet need special consideration as well as ecologically sensitive areas included in the Marine Protected Areas and Reserves.</p> <p>The Territorial Sea Plan should clearly identify the ecologically important areas in the near shore separately from those used heavily by the fishing community.</p> <p>Areas of scientific research should be considered paramount. Scientific research and monitoring</p>
167	email	3/1/2012	Robert	Carillo	Citizen	Public-At-Large	process	Appreciates process, encourages mitigation , cautious approach	<p>I thank the people who have vested so much of your time and effort into this project.</p> <p>During the meeting in Brookings it was obvious that confusion about the sea floor mapping is as vast as the sea floor its self. It seemed as if fishermen were concerned that there would be only single use of restricted or reserved areas. Wave power would some how be granted or sold exclusive use of the sea floor and the entirety of the sea above that area. I envision a multi-use and minimal interference arrangement protecting traditional uses and reserved wild spaces.</p> <p>As great as the potential power is, its accessibility is limited by many factors. Wave power is just one near shore use added onto the already over used resource. Finding a way to SHARE will be the solution. Wave power will have to find a way to participate in a manner that ensures minimal impact and avoids replacing other already practiced beneficial uses. Map all you want but spend time ensuring that current beneficial uses are minimally disaffected or are adequately compensated.</p> <p>Baby steps are required. I support field trials or field laboratory areas for development of concept. Making sure that the way in which these things will be deployed will ensure low impact not just low cost designs. Consider impact attribute data when mapping the beneficial use data.</p> <p>I fear that the mapping is the real end game not wave power. So I too fear the outcome of this</p>
168	email	3/1/2012	jason	tilley	Citizen	Non Consumptive	location	Encourages protection of recreation use areas, bays, jetties, rivermouths, headlands	<p>I would like to start by saying that I am for well planned alternative energy. My concern as a surfboard builder and resident of the Oregon coast is that the location of any planned development does not impact recreational or commercial uses. There are many special places that are relatively unused but of significant wilderness value. All</p>

169	email	3/1/2012	Ion	Otterby	Citizen	Public-At-Large	general	Encourages sufficient bonds for projects	<p>Goal 19 has been the benchmark for many proposals for Oregon's Territorial Sea.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage scientific research on marine ecosystems, ocean resources and uses, and oceanographic conditions to acquire information needed to make ocean and coastal-management decisions; <p>In 2007 the decision to amend the Territorial Sea Plan (TSP) arose only to accommodate proposals for wave energy facilities in Oregon's coastal waters. The proposals to create marine reserves/marine protected areas were a separate issue driven by HB3013.</p> <p>Why is the Plan being amended?</p> <p>The need to amend the TSP arose in 2007 when a number of wave energy companies submitted preliminary permit applications to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to develop energy production facilities within ocean fishing areas off the Oregon coast. At the same time, a system of marine reserves was being proposed for the territorial sea. The resulting high degree of concern in coastal communities and among the fishing industry culminated in a meeting between coastal legislators, fishing industry representatives and Governor Kulongoski. On March 26, 2008, the governor issued Executive Order No. 08- 07 directing agencies to "Protect Coastal Communities in siting Marine Reserves and Wave Energy Projects", and DLCD to "seek recommendations from OPAC concerning appropriate amendments to Oregon's Territorial Sea Plan, reflecting comprehensive plan provisions on wave energy siting projects."</p>
170	email	3/3/2012	Cheryl	Thomas	Citizen	Public-At-Large	General	Encourages development of a spatial plan that identifies important ecological areas and fishing areas	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Cheryl Thomas. My family lives and farms in the Cascade Foothills using organic methods so as not to pollute our waterways. As a family that enjoys the ocean in many ways, we want to ensure that the Surfrider non-consumptive recreational survey is used as a tier one data source. These areas should be identified and stewarded. We support Oregon's Territorial Sea Planning process to responsibly plan for a sustainably managed ocean that is healthy, vibrant and clean based in Oregon State Planning Goal 19 which requires that we preserve the ecological health and biodiversity of the near shore over any other use. The Territorial Sea Plan should clearly identify the ecologically important areas of the nearshore in addition to those areas that are highly used by the fishing community, rather than lumped together. Consider that Oregon's planning goals are key to the success of land use planning. Thank you for your careful consideration of these points and providing inland, coastal, port and non-port communities to participate.</p>

171	email	3/3/2012	pearl	thomas	Citizen	Public-At-Large	General	Encourages development of a spatial plan that identifies important ecological areas and fishing areas	<p>My name is Pearl Thomas. My family lives and farms in the Cascade Foothills using organic methods so as not to pollute our waterways. As a family that enjoys the ocean in many ways, we want to ensure that the Surfrider non-consumptive recreational survey is used as a tier one data source. These areas should be identified and stewarded.</p> <p>We support Oregon's Territorial Sea Planning process to responsibly plan for a sustainably managed ocean that is healthy, vibrant and clean based in Oregon State Planning Goal 19 which requires that we preserve the ecological health and biodiversity of the near shore over any other use. The Territorial Sea Plan should clearly identify the ecologically important areas of the nearshore in addition to those areas that are highly used by the fishing community, rather than lumped together. Consider that Oregon's planning goals are key to the success of land use planning.</p> <p>Thank you for your careful consideration of these points and providing inland, coastal, port and non-port communities to participate.</p>
172	email	3/5/2012	paula	walker	Citizen	Public-At-Large	General	Appreciates this process and hopes it will continue to rely on ecological criteria	<p>In planning to meet our State mandate to obtain 20% of the State's electrical energy from renewable resources by 2025 it is essential that we plan for sustainability and that requires that we prioritize and emphasize the ecological factors involved. While we have an undeniable imperative to provide our energy needs from renewable resources we must not do so at the peril of healthy ocean ecosystems. We must include in this plan to source renewable energy from wind and wave energy off the shore, criteria to protect the health and biodiversity of our territorial waters' ecosystems. Sustainability and ecological health must be the guiding principles to all decisions made on what to do, where to site, and how many installations to permit.</p> <p>To this end we must continue to engage citizen stakeholders in decisions, and provide a framework in the process for local and regional discussions that are formally valued and that directly contribute to the decision making process.</p> <p>Thank you for your efforts to collect public comment, and your genuine consideration of the ideas brought forth.</p>

173	email	3/5/2012	carmen	mathews	Citizen	Non Consumptive	location	Encourages NO development near jetties, Umpqua River	<p>Hello~</p> <p>My name is Carmen Matthews, and I live in Coos Bay. I am an avid surfer and use the ocean on a regular basis. I am writing today to submit a comment on an area that is very important to myself, and my fellow watermen. The areas surrounding the Umpqua river Jetty's are extremely important to the surfing community here in Coos and Douglas county, as well as for traveling surfers. Winchester Bay has one of the best surf spots on the coast, and it is the reason why many of us in the surfing community live here today. Also the area surrounding the north and south jetty's at the mouth of Coos Bay are very important surf regions. We use these areas on a frequent basis, and without these spots, surfing in this region would dwindle, and the economic consequences would be very notable. These surf spots have been used for 40+ years, and are a part of surfing heritage. I ask you to NOT consider the areas surrounding the jetty's for development.</p> <p>On another note, I would like to express my excitement for the movement towards alternative energy here on the coast, and using the ocean to provide a cleaner energy. My hope is we make the right choices in deciding how and where we impliment these developments. Thank you for your time.</p>
174	email	3/5/2012	Stephen	Holden	Citizen	Public-At-Large	process	Urges that no development be sited within 1nm of subsea cables	<p>Global Marine Systems Ltd (GMSL) is submarine cable ship provider and presently in-directly via a third party (TE Subcom) is responsible for the maintenance of a number of submarine cables landing on the Oregon coast. From April 1st 2012 for a period of no less than five years GMSL will be basing a vessel in the region and taking over the maintenance duties for the North America Zone Cable Maintenance Agreement and as such we will be responsible for maintaining an even greater number of submarine cables landing on the Oregon coast. In the UK and Europe GMSL has taken part in many discussions regarding the safe operation of cable repair vessels in or around wind-farms or other offshore energy structures and would welcome the opportunity to share the lessons learnt from this ongoing dialogue to ensure that its customers ability to repair their submarine cables are not compromised in any way, in particular with respect to safe operating distances and cable crossings. As a guide, GMSL would request that any activity within a nautical mile of a live submarine cable results in initial stakeholder consultation by the planning party. Should more information or further discussions be required please don't hesitate to contact me by email or directly on +44 1245 702000</p>

175	email	3/6/2012	alix	sifford	Citizen	Public-At-Large	Data	Encourages no development from Cape Kiwanda to Cascade Head as indicated in the PCDA maps	<p>The Territorial Sea Plan should not allow energy facilities where there is any conflict with other existing fisheries uses, including all state waters from Cape Kiwanda to Cascade Head. This is supported and confirmed by Pacific City fisherman. Designate Level I protection in this area.</p> <p>2. The Sea Plan should value and protect at Level I Western for the from state waters from Cape Kiwanda to Cascade Head viewshed. The western ocean view in a natural state supports coastal tourism and the vacation home economy, and impacts to then.</p> <p>3. The Territorial Sea Plan should acknowledge the primacy of energy generation on shore prior to any offshore (wind, wave) sources. Experimental research into ocean energy should continue at test sites near Reedsport and Newport. However commercial energy interest should be redirected away from state waters from Cape Kiwanda to Cascade Head. On-shore wind is half the cost of ocean wind. On-shore wind, located at the ridge of the Coast Range, and fed into the transmission lines crossing the Coast Range can meet local needs at less cost and with minimal impact to eastern viewsheds.</p>
176	email	3/6/2012	laura	shimdt	Our Ocean	Conservation	data	Encourage elevation of ESA species to level 1, recreation use protection	<p>I appreciate this chance to provide public comment regarding the Territorial Sea Planning process in Oregon. I attended the Newport meetings in December and two of the recent TSPWG public work sessions so far and will also be present for the March 6th Depoe Bay and Pacific City meetings. I commend the working group for committing time and energy in order to complete this inclusive process that allows the greater public to engage.</p> <p>As a native Oregonian with a strong conservation ethic, I support Oregon's TSP process to responsibly plan for a sustainably managed ocean that is healthy, vibrant, and clean based in Goal 19 that requires that we preserve the ecological health and biodiversity of the near shore over any other use.</p> <p>I also took part in our state's effort to establish a science-based network of marine reserves and marine protected areas. As I'm sure many other Oregonians are, I was excited to see that our Legislators passed Senate Bill 1510 this session with overwhelming bipartisan support. A network of marine reserves is only one aspect of our territorial sea and one tool for management. We demand a lot from our ocean: fishing, tourism, recreation, shipping, and energy development. We must continue this open process and encourage more regional discussions that include balanced and diverse stakeholder groups if we want to plan for new uses in a responsible way.</p> <p>Datasets that illustrate important grounds to federally listed species like Marbled Murrelet Forage</p>

177	email	3/6/2012	John	griffith	SOORC	Commercial Fishing	data	Encourages broader interpretation of G19 and fishing value maps, consultation with fishing communities	<p>and handwritten on a card provided for writing comments. However, my handwriting might not be readable so I'm giving comment again now typewritten.</p> <p>My comment concerns Goal 19 and trying to accommodate wave power buoys. Fishing resources maps by DLCD distributed at the meeting showed "low" or "moderate" color-coded categories in some places where our (Southern Oregon Ocean Resources Coalition) maps showed high or highest uses. If I heard and interpreted the explanation correctly, the differences are due to DLCD trying to address resource and use protections in Goal 19, specifically at "IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS (1.) Uses of Ocean Resources" "b. protect;" "4. Areas important to fisheries, which are: a) areas of high catch (e.g., high total pounds landed and high value of landed catch); or b) areas where highly valued fish are caught even if in low abundance or by few fishers [fishermen];"</p> <p>And I thought I heard the explanation that the map supplied by SOORC showed use by fishermen but failed to show 4 a. and b. above. The SOORC map data weren't compiled on those bases, of high catch or value. The result was that the maps distributed at the TSP WG meeting had gaps of fishery value that the SOORC map had shown as a continuous spread of effort from high to highest in color.</p> <p>In my spoken and handwritten comment to the TSP WG I stated that I believe the DLCD-prepared maps stopped short in consideration of Goal 19 from where they should have. I ask that consideration be given to Goal 19, IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS (1.)(b)(4)(d) "areas important to commercial or recreational fishing activities, including those of individual ports or particular fleets;" and that maps be amended or prepared again to reflect that consideration.</p> <p>That is exactly what the SOORC map shows, and it does so without having to show any other considerations found in Subsection 4, specifically Sub. 4 (a) or (b). The SOORC map shows "areas important to commercial or recreational fishing activities," and such areas are explicitly to be protected for those uses to continue under "IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS, Uses of Ocean Resources (b)"</p> <p>Per Sub. (1)(b)(4)(d) these "areas important to commercial or recreational fishing activities" needn't produce high volume or value catches, even though in fact they do. As I stated at the meeting, these "areas important to commercial or recreational fishing activities" can be important to sellers and servicers of boats, tackle and bait, meals and lodging, individual ports, whether high volumes or highly valuable fish are caught. It costs as much fuel, for example, and wear on</p>
178	email	3/6/2012	Derek	Campbell	Citizen	Non Consumptive	data	Urges protection of recreational areas	<p>Non-consumptive use.</p> <p>I would ask that the Surfrider non-consumptive survey be used as a tier one data layer. It provides detailed information on the recreational uses of Oregon's nearshore waters and coastline. I am lifelong Oregonian and I frequently recreate at the coast, I hope my interests along with the multitudes of others that visit the coast every year would be held in high regard.. The areas shown through this study to have value to non-consumptive users should be recognized and stewarded. It would benefit not only the users of these areas but the coastal communities that depend on the economic contributions of said users.</p>

179	email	3/6/2012	derek	Campbell	Citizen	Non Consumptive	General	Urges strong support of goal 19	<p>I am concerned that through our efforts to afford the opportunity for renewable energy sources to establish themselves in our territorial waters we could see an erosion of Goal 19 protections for the states rich marine ecology. I support efforts to move our society towards renewable efficient forms of energy but not at the cost of the natural environment and established renewable resources.</p> <p>It is stated under Goal 19 that the state is to protect and encourage the beneficial uses of ocean resources provided that such activities do not adversely affect the resources protected in subsection 1 those being living marine organisms, biological diversity of marine life, and important marine habitat.</p> <p>I come here today to ask that the state stay committed to a Territorial Sea Planning Process that moves forward under the context of Oregon State Planning Goal 19 which requires that we preserve the ecological health and biodiversity of the near shore over any other use. This will help ensure our ocean waters stay healthy, vibrant and clean.</p>
180	email	3/6/2012	barbara	Ripsey	Citizen	Public-At-Large	General	Urges cautious approach	<p>There is no reason to allocate the industrial use of our ocean until need [for Oregonians!], performance, and cost are PROVEN and after all other "sustainable"/local means of energy conservation and production are seriously addressed first.</p> <p>As a local living on the coast in Manzanita, I have a profound fear that the large corporate profiteers who find their funding in the public purse will eventually hold our incomparably beautiful coastline hostage in the name of energy production.</p> <p>There will be no shame in the destruction of salmon fisheries and other local fisheries or in the desecration of the wild beauty that draws thousands of people to the coast when their PROFITS are at stake. To error on the side of caution in the face of this rather frothy momentum may serve us better than hatching a full blown dud.</p>
181	email	3/6/2012	barbara	marshall	Citizen	Public-At-Large	general	Urges cautious approach, consider view sheds	<p>I would like to register a few comments with you. First and foremost, I believe we should err on the side of caution. The benefits and technologies are still unknown, as are the potential limitations and costs. Our tourism, fishing, and quality of life are very valuable and fragile resources that must be protected--forever. Shortsighted action now could bring irreparable damages in the future. Please consider our viewsheds in any decisions. Also always remember the impact of unintended consequences, which aren't considered at the time but manifest only later. Please protect our fragile resources, our existing way of life here at the coast, and the inherent value of our natural ecosystems. Don't sacrifice us for some vague notion of energy policy.</p>

182	public meeting	3/6/2012	paul	Hanneman	PCDA	Commercial Fishing	location	Encourage use of PC map in TSP	Thanks for coming to Pacific City. We have a 13 member board with over 400 collective years on the ocean. We have 500 members are on our hard copy mailing list including state and local agencies and other partners. We have contact throughout the world and over 900 organizations and individuals. The PCDA knows what is happening with the TSPWG and is following them closely. We chose to present our data/map differently and gave it to the working group for consideration. Thank you, Paul and David. It is also a matter of fact that over three years ago we declared the areas from Cascade Head to Cape Lookout that we established that area as a historic fishing area that Dorymen have fished for over a hundred years.
183	public meeting	3/6/2012	ray	monroe	PCDA	Commercial Fishing	general	Concerns over ecological impacts, loss of access to fishing grounds, view sheds	"I'm speaking for our industry, community and the fleet here. My trepidations are many...losing access, biological impacts, and mitigation for catastrophe. My biggest concern is loss of access; we do most of the fishing within 3 mi for crabs, salmon, and rockfish, sometimes within the same day. Small 22 foot dories...Active surfperch fishery from the beach. We don't have much industry around here, there are cows and fish. This community used to have a substantial coho fishery which contributed greatly to the local economy. We can't lose any access to fishing. Our community is struggling in these tough economic times. Lost businesses, unemployment rate, closed schools, fish companies leaving, the only thing we have left is our fisheries. People come here from across the state to look at our ocean. The only thing we have left is the access to our ocean resources, to fish crab, salmon, and rockfish to support recreational and commercial fisheries that have minimal impacts on the environment. Over 70 percent of the local students qualify for free and reduced lunches, the PCDA sponsors a program to send free food home. Our members don't all fish but they all support our community. Our unease with the biological and physical affects have not been addressed yet. These devices might have effect of currents which will influence sediment transport and larval transport. How will the EMFs effect crab and fish? What will the sound impact migrations? How will they effect our ESA listings? My last concern is mitigation. Who fixes and cleans up after catastrophe? Who will clean up and how will our fishing grounds be restored?"
184	public meeting	3/6/2012	doug	olson	PUC	Utilities	General	OR Energy plan insufficient	Gov. Kitzhaber recently released a Energy plan, the Tillamook PUD will be putting comments in regarding it. The committee developing the plan did not include utility districts, power generators, etc...represents wishful thinking. Tillamook PUD buys power from BPA. There will soon be over 6000 kwh generated from wind power. We have excess power on the coast and have been selling it down to California. The PUDs role will be to wait and see if this comes ashore.
185	public meeting	3/6/2012	craig	wenrick	PCDA	Commercial Fishing	location	Encourage use of PC map in TSP	FACT was formed and created by the county commission in August 2007 to inform the county on fishing issues. We meet every month and have been dealing with wave energy since our inception. I want to say that we are worried about wave energy because there are more questions than answers. We are worried about the zoning and hope that the Pacific City Dorymans map will close some of the gaps. I hope that we could suggest Cascade Head to Cape Lookout be considered for exclusion. It is a fishing, surfing, pristine area that should stay as is. It could be a basis for how you decide exclusion areas around the rest of the coast. Thank you.

186	public meeting	3/6/2012	david	yamamoto	Citizen	Public-At-Large	data	Appreciates process, concerns about view sheds	I want to thank the working group for taking on the task of listening to what we want. They did the heavy lifting to bring the stakeholders together, collect and analyze data, and generate options for the public. I am concerned that at this point, one of the most overlooked issues is the view shed and aesthetics. This has been a three-year process and all the various stakeholders have been involved in producing these maps, we have heard about hot spots for the Goal 19 resources. There are no hotspots for view sheds and aesthetics. They are asking for input about the accuracy and precision of the map products, but view sheds have not been developed. I've heard the proposal that we wait until wave energy companies propose a project, I think that is too late. On TSPAC, I represent the public at large, but there is only one seat for that perspective. I am a supporter of ocean energy but it needs to be done responsibly. The viewshed issue is hard to quantify. Who is to say what effects visual? I applaud the stakeholders who have had input on this point. There is one more stakeholder that needs to be heard from and that is you, the general public
187	public meeting	3/6/2012	Shirley	Kalkhoven		Local Government	process	Appreciates process, concerns about view sheds	I want to thank the TSPWG for putting energy and time into this. I know you will do the best you can when you start making recommendations. My personal feeling is that the Oregon coast is one of the great assets of the state and nation. You can't put a price on it. You have to be very careful when you are thinking about doing things that would change its appearance. I think it's unfortunate that Oregon has not had the opportunity to decide whether wave energy is good for Oregon. My father was the safety engineer on the Grand Coulee Dam and I lived there for 4 years as the cement grew and grew. It is one big pile of concrete. The people that built those dams never considered the consequences to the oceans from building those dams. I hope that when you make you recommendations you will be thoughtful and careful and cautious. There is a lot to be understood as projects get put in.
188	public meeting	3/6/2012	John	schaad	BPA	Utilities	general	Advocates for coastal power generation	Bonneville power system is maxed out....high costs adding more transmission...need additional power sources...data gap need to work with is in the name of long range planning are the routes we need for various locations for submarine lines offshore...need more data (in process) on our cables, how installed, how they affect surrounding environment. [Additional comments submitted]" G
189	public meeting	3/6/2012	Julius	Jortner		Public-At-Large	general	Concerns about view shed issues	I live in Pacific City and when I heard about this I tried to figure out how far you can see from the coast. You can see out at least 3 miles. It means that things out in federal waters will be visible. All these things will be visible
190	public meeting	3/6/2012	carol	steele		Public-At-Large	process	Encourages focussing on areas of testing and development	I am really amazed and impressed by MarineMap and it includes so much information that has not been available before. It will be used for years to come. Your task is to find sites for renewable energy. The juggernaut keeps moving and the companies are waiting to move in. The underlying assumption that Oregon needs wave energy is incredibly flawed and I don't know how that gets inserted into the mix. There are many ways to generate or conserve electricity. We don't have to give up the ocean to do it. From the technology that's available, the cost would far exceed the benefits. The TS is held in trust by the people of Oregon. To the extent that it is sold off or given away for economic uses, the social benefit will be diminished. I hope that Oregonians have the chance to weigh in before that happens. I propose that the TSPWG say that is too early to determine areas where these sites should be. Instead I think you should focus on areas that could be used for testing and allow use to understand these impacts."

191	public meeting	3/6/2012	shubert	moore		Public-At-Large	data	Concerns about view shed issues	I am drowning in acronyms. I want to speak about the view shed issue. I don't like the term "view sheds". As a published poet, the term sucks. "Scenic beauty" is better. There are about 3 million people that come to coast to re-create themselves each year. We have a history of preserving things in this country simply because they are beautiful. People come to boat, surf, swim, some climb the dunes, beach comb, some people build fires out of driftwood. Most people look at the ocean. More than anything else, they look. I was concerned about the aesthetics of the scenic beauty not being recognized by FERC as part of our TSP. I did a little research to understand that we have been protecting things because of their beauty since 1972. [Cites Yellowstone Nat Park ruling]...the purpose of the park is to conserve its scenery. FERC own guidelines say that aesthetics play a pivotal role, [citing Federal Power ACT]..Environments have cultural and scenic significance...in the case of NY, the very concept of installing a 1200 foot long barge is foreign. There is a long established tradition of protecting things because they are beautiful and Pacific City deserves that protect as well.
192	public meeting	3/6/2012	Tom	marlin		Public-At-Large	general	Encourages no wave energy development	We don't need wave energy in Tillamook County, it would take away too many jobs. We have a source that would provide all the energy we need. And I ll just leave with an observation that someone made at the Astoria meeting, 'Gee, it looks like they want the whole ocean
193	public meeting	3/6/2012	rick	williams	SAIC	Renewable Energy	general	Encourages consideration of industry suitability maps	For the record I live in Oregon, was trained as an engineer at OSU, and work as a consultant for SAIC. I come at this with 30 years of experience and I wear many hats. I want to give you a little background. In 2005, a study by the Electric Power Research Institute, concluded that Oregon was a great place to develop wave energy because of wave resource, maritime industry, grid infrastructure, and energy needs on the coast. In 2006, Oregon put out a call for promising emerging industries. The Oregon Innovation Council selected wave energy as the best next emerging industry for the state. We established the Oregon Wave Energy Trust with a job creation assignment. The board decided that the mission of OWET was the responsible development of wave energy and support to the industry. David Chin, supported a "go slow to go fast" approach to answer these questions early on. I work with a number of different companies as a systems engineer. During the gold rush period everyone wanted to do wave energy off the coast and then realized that it was a hard enterprise. If the original drafters of Goal 19 knew about the potential for wave energy, they would have included that as a beneficial use in the territorial sea. There are only a handful of places on the coast that are good to do wave energy off the coast and there are a lot of different devices. What does it take to be a suitable spot? The industry developed a consensus statement do explain what the needs of the industry are. We need good wave resource, sandy bottom for anchorage and cable, close to substation, we need to be close to a deep water port. Power projects last 20-30 years and the coast between a day charter and an overnight charter add up over 25 years. I'm also an ocean engineer, salvage diver, and deep draft captain. In my experience, you can do ocean engineering in rough condition if you do it thoughtfully and carefully, especially if you listen to the people who know the ocean. As an Oregonian, base load power is needed to keep the grid stable. We have said no to nuclear, coal, hydroelectric, fossil fuel, what are we going to say yes to. Wave energy is dependable, clean, and if done correctly can be done in Oregon. We have adopted the Denmark model, they know how to build install design and have created a knowledge based industry around wind energy. This is what we want to do here in Oregon."
194	public meeting	3/6/2012	derek	campbell		Non Consumptive	data	Urges protection of recreational areas	Thanks for allowing me to be here today. I want to speak to you about the Surfrider Non Consumptive Use study. I recommend it be moved to tier one. They should be recognized and stewarded. I hope the TSP process does not stray away from what makes the Oregon marine waters the treasures they are. I would like to say that it is the aesthetic and ecological qualities that make this part of the coast valuable

195	public meeting	3/6/2012	laura	shmidt	our ocean	Conservation	data	Encourage elevation of ESA species to level 1, recreation use protection	I come to the coast to recreate with my family. I am usually coming here to soak up the natural beauty of the coast, which enriches my life. I am happy to be a part of this conversation because people like me from inland areas value the ocean. Thank you. Areas like marine reserves are already exclusion areas and might provide a good stating place. I have questions about what level 1 and level 2 protection is. I'm wondering if one is more important than the other is, or does it just define the types of data? I think grey whale and marbled murrelet areas should be moved up to level 1. I've come here for whale watching my whole life. We need to protect the values described in Goal 19. Thank you for holding these meetings.
196	public meeting	3/6/2012	charles	loos	PCDA	Commercial Fishing	data	Encourages inclusion of the PC map	"I want to talk about data gaps. I would urge the adoption of this [PCDA] map with the rest of the fishery data. The PC Dorymans fishery is probably more documented than any other fishery in Oregon. The fact that this fleet did not respond to the survey at a certain time should not preclude this information from being used in this process."
197	public meeting	3/6/2012	shawn	Carlton		Public-At-Large	process	Concerns about view shed issues	I live and own a business in Pacific City. The view shed in Pacific City is beautiful. [photos of sunset] I think the first step in dealing with view sheds is drawing a mile corridor out from the state parks, then do a per capita analysis to see areas of high population to warrant level 1,2,3 protection. Start incorporating those things and it will be a good start.
198	public meeting	3/6/2012	Tom	carlson	our ocean	Conservation	general	Encourages development of a spatial plan	I want to thank David Y. and Shirley K., for the turnout here. One of the things I hope folks don't leave here with is a sense that this is such a complicated issue that you go home and say "I have no idea what everybody was talking about." Laws, agencies...the main thing to remember is that Oregonians created the beach bill and we have a great legacy of coming together for planning stuff. We have a sense that as a state we have worked through a lot of different processes to arrive as a national lead of how to do planning. We are also on the leading edge of marine spatial planning. This turnout is amazing. Please don't give up, take some of this home with you read. Two things, Gov Kulongoski wrote the Executive Order 0807 telling the state to work with FERC so that through this planning process our plan will compliment FERCs plan. So we have something to say about how this all ends up. The one other thing is to make sure that all the local libraries have these handouts for people that were not able to make it tonight.
199	public meeting	3/6/2012	eileen	cox-rouse		Public-At-Large	general	Concerned about impacts on migrating whales and and birds	I am concerned about the animals and seabirds in the ocean. None of them could make it here tonight so I am speaking for them. I am concerned about the flotsam that comes ashore, logs, and they come from a long ways away. When they meet with the buoys and come into our surf line, I'm concerned that they will be hard to maintain. About 1997, we had 50-foot waves and I don't see how you will be able to ensure these devices will not wash ashore. I think we need to look at what we already have and improve upon it. We need to make wind a much better source of energy.
200	public meeting	3/6/2012	Barbara	Bell-Taylor	Realtors	realtors	process	Concerns about view shed issues lowering property values	"Realtors are in favor of plans to enhance the ability of the coast to generate its own energy. National Realtors released a letter supporting the creation of good family wage jobs to create homeowners. The TSP seems to coincide with this; however, there is a caveat with this plan. Very little has been done to recognize the scenic and economic value of the view sheds ...realtors on the coast sell the views and the devices within plain view would definitely lower property values. Please take into property values in the implementation to this plan. Property values will not come back in Pacific city with those types of devices in the water."

201	public meeting	3/6/2012	susan	allen	Our Ocean	Conservation	process	Urges development of a spatial plan with exclusion/opportunity zones	I'm on the TSPAC, a lifelong Oregonian, and director of Our Ocean. Scott Mc. said it very well when he said that we have a very rare opportunity to help influence FERCs decision. This is a rare opportunity to tell them where, how, and why and FERC has agreed to take that into account. Because we have started this process with Goal 19 in mind, this issue cuts across all stakeholders. I'm afraid that people are getting the sense that the final cut happens on March 22 and that there will not be additional opportunities. Two advisory committees are meeting to weigh in on this process. TSPWG has an important benchmark on the 22nd. Then the TSPAC group is engaged and will start to weigh in on this issue. This will continue throughout the spring and into the summer. I would like us to think about the EO, the state needs to come up with a plan that describes areas that are inappropriate areas for wave energy and spatially describe them. We also need to identify areas that might work based on fishing levels and view sheds...if we don't get into the level of specificity that FERC will accept we will lose the opportunity to influence FERC. Then this historic opportunity will be lost
202	public meeting	3/6/2012	jason	busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	general	Industry needs test sites to inform if there are env. impacts	I've been here for almost all the meetings and I glad we have gotten close to the end. I am offering to integrate PC Doryman's maps into Marine Map. We are committed to responsible development of wave energy. "OWET is funded by the state of Oregon lottery dollars, (used for economic development and conservation of state lands). Our mission is for responsible development, we don't want to support an industry that will have negative impacts on our state. Our board is made up of a number of people, but there is not a wave energy developer, it brings level of neutrality. We definitely want to bring wave energy to Oregon, because we think, it will have many long-term benefits. We have studied everything from bird collision rates, sediment transport, whale migration, effects of EMF on wildlife; We have gathered all this environmental information in the Dept. Of Energy TETHYS database as well as our website OregonWave.org. OWET funded fishery mapping, provided money to the stakeholder groups to allow them to participate in the process. Our vision is to create jobs and a knowledge based model like Denmark. We d not want to cover the TS with energy devices. We need to put the devices in the water to understand how they perform. Devices are in the water around the world, and we are looking for the tough conditions on the OR coast to test. There many technologies, not all are floating buoys. One day there will be a device that will sit on the seafloor and provide energy to communities. There was a question about the carbon footprint of MHK, coal ranges from 800-1100 grams of C; proxy for wave is 9 grams.
203	public meeting	3/6/2012	dan	twitchell	citizen	Public-At-Large	location	Encourages protection of Cascade Head	was looking at the Dorymens' map that cascade head is one of the most important recreational assets on the coast. It is a world heritage site and is visited by millions of people who are after a real scenic experience. And if these devices are in the water nearby it would really diminish that experience."
204	public meeting	3/6/2012	roy	hanson	kayaker	Non Consumptive	process	Supports exclusion areas	I agree with everything the residents and Dorymen have said. I agree that there are a lot of unknowns about the industry. I agree that areas should be out aside as exclusion areas. We need to do what Bob Straubb did to protect our coast so they will not be destroyed. I am highly in favor of exclusion areas.
205	public meeting	3/6/2012	cheryl	thomas		Public-At-Large	general	Appreciates process, wants to exclude development from marine reserves	Considering that the purpose of establishing marine reserves is sanctuary to promote replenishment of species, these areas need to be specifically defined and protected. Once vulnerable areas are depleted of resources, precious species may not regenerate. It is our responsibility to set aside areas to be protected from industry for the health of all life, industry, and future generations of humans and marine species. Thanks you for the opportunity to be included in the community process."

206	public meeting	3/6/2012	peter	schuler		Public-At-Large	general	Encourages cautious approach	It is interesting to understand that Australia and Toronto uses a lot wind energy, but they have found that they are not as good as they thought. Use of infrasonic technology on dams, could be used to keep wildlife away from these devices. I have questions about the durability of these devices. I think we need to be careful about the types of technologies and ensure they are environmentally sound, dust to dust. We need to be careful especially with our salmon.
207	public meeting	3/6/2012	jeurgan	turner	charter fishing	Commercial Fishing	location	Urges exclusion of wave energy near Depoe Bay, 3 mi from port, missing important area of Siletz	I want to support my industry. I am glad that you guys are here and doing this. I am a small business owner. My concerns are that our areas are protected for Depoe Bay. Everything from whale watching to fishing, sightseeing is important to us. The marine reserves are the biggest topic for us. I want to make sure that everything is being done to protect our area for us and the people of Oregon...Our scope is limited for whale watching, 0-5 nm...About 3 miles...Changes seasonally. Sometimes we are operating within about 3 miles, north to boiler bay, south to gold rock and otter crest.
208	public meeting	3/6/2012	lars	robison	charter fishing	Commercial Fishing	location	Urges that spots not fished may still have fish because of regulations	Some of our whale watching boats go clear up to Lincoln city. You were asking about fishing areas. You are missing the spots that have a lot of fish in them that we are not allowed to catch. For example, canary rockfish, which we are not allowed to fish, if the regulations changed then there would be areas with lots of fish that don't show up on the map. We would not want to have wave energy on top of those areas. We need to have those considered. I think the area off the Siletz River hasn't been captured
209	public meeting	3/6/2012	rick	williams	SAIC	Renewable Energy	general	Encourages consideration of industry suitability maps	For the record I live in Oregon, was trained as an engineer at OSU, and work as a consultant for SAIC. I come at this with 30 years of experience and I wear many hats. I want to give you a little background. In 2005, a study by the Electric Power Research Institute, concluded that Oregon was a great place to develop wave energy because of wave resource, maritime industry, grid infrastructure, and energy needs on the coast. In 2006, Oregon put out a call for promising emerging industries. The Oregon Innovation Council selected wave energy as the best next emerging industry for the state. We established the Oregon Wave Energy Trust with a job creation assignment. The board decided that the mission of OWET was the responsible development of wave energy and support to the industry. David Chin, supported a "go slow to go fast" approach to answer these questions early on. I work with a number of different companies as a systems engineer. During the gold rush period everyone wanted to do wave energy off the coast and then realized that it was a hard enterprise. If the original drafters of Goal 19 knew about the potential for wave energy, they would have included that as a beneficial use in the territorial sea. There are only a handful of places on the coast that are good to do wave energy off the coast and there are a lot of different devices. What does it take to be a suitable spot? The industry developed a consensus statement to explain what the needs of the industry are. We need good wave resource, sandy bottom for anchorage and cable, close to substratum, we need to be close to a deep water port. Power projects last 20-30 years and the coast between a day charter and an overnight charter add up over 25 years. I'm also an ocean engineer, salvage diver, and deep draft captain. In my experience, you can do ocean engineering in rough condition if you do it thoughtfully and carefully, especially if you listen to the people who know the ocean. As an Oregonian, base load power is needed to keep the grid stable. We have said no to nuclear, coal, hydroelectric, fossil fuel, what are we going to say yes to. Wave energy is dependable, clean, and if done correctly can be done in Oregon. We have adopted the Denmark model, they know how to build install design and have created a knowledge based industry around wind energy. This is what we want to do here in Oregon
210	public meeting	3/6/2012	john	schaad		utilities	general	Advocates for coastal energy generation	Bonneville power system is maxed out....high costs adding more transmission...need additional power sources...data gap need to work with is in the name of long range planning are the routes we need for various locations for submarine lines offshore...need more data (in process) on our cables, how installed, how they affect surrounding environment.

211	public meeting	3/6/2012	melissa	chapman	our ocean	conservation	process	Encourages development of a spatial plan	I have a lot of respect for this process. However, the more I understand the intricacies the more I get confused. This is an incredible opportunity but also a huge responsibility. Our ultimate goal is to develop a plan using Goal 19 that is comprehensive enough to be accepted by FERC. I want to encourage place based planning.
212	public meeting	3/6/2012	Gus	gates	surfrider	Non Consumptive	process	Encourages development of a spatial plan, protection of recreation areas, 1 mile visual buffer around parks	<p>"I wanted to take this opportunity to thank the working group members; you deserve a pat on the back for your robust efforts. Statewide planning Goal 19 is one of our finest planning goals. The Oregon territorial sea and our coastline is one of most valuable natural resources. It's a lofty goal, and the provisions to protect human uses are things we have identified that we need to do, but it's clearly tough. The amount of information that has been gathered about our Territorial Sea is incredible, what's important for our state, it's really extensive. Good work has gone into this. Under the implementation requirements, state agencies SHALL [read goal 19 protect and encourage beneficial ocean...page 3, part 5] does say "shall" and it is our opinion and those of my constituency that ocean recreation be given level 1 protection. I want to put to the group the proposal made by OR Dept. of Parks and Recreation to put a 1 mile buffer along the entire coast line [at state parks]. We know that wave energy is an unproven technology and the rough conditions on our coast, as well as the projected increase of significant wave heights and storminess. The nearshore buffer may want to be used to provide a precautionary protection until the industry can prove itself. Our study of non-consumptive uses of the ocean, shows that headlands, jetties, river mouths, state parks are the areas of greatest use. Close correlation between access and use. They also coincide with ecological areas. People go to these areas to watch wildlife because that is where wildlife is. We have ground truthed these maps with the people who know these ocean uses, and have found that our maps are accurate. I'm curious about how you and the working group are going to utilize all the information that has been collected and put it into a recommendation in one day. It would be great to look at that agenda to understand the process of how you will be developing the final recommendations. As far as I see it, there are three options for dealing with the visual/recreation issue."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State park recommendation (1 mi buffer) 2. Hotspot areas (jetties , rivermouths, state parks) 3. Surfrider study
213	public meeting	3/6/2012	walter	chuck	FINE	Commercial Fishing	process	Encourages term "conflicting" not "competing", protection of recreation, exclusion areas	I've been on FINE for about 4 years. Goal 19 highlights fisheries and it was missing from the Goal 19 video (shown at the beginning of the meeting). My concern and involvement in the process has been about the impact to the recreational fishing industry. Our group was one of the first groups contacted by the wave energy companies and are working with OSU...We want to make sure the areas such as NNMREC should be emphasized and supported to prove the technology without taking additional areas away from fishing. We were asked to provide information, we want to make sure that our commercial and recreational fishing areas should be used to protect the areas that are important to us. Difference between "existing" and "potential beneficial uses", would like to see the term "conflicting" instead of "competing"...ocean recreation should be moved to level 1, they are established and provide benefit to our coasts. Wave energy will need to be determined as to how it will benefit the coast if they take away further areas from other uses. Please consider the existing beneficial uses, versus the potential beneficial uses. Level one should mean no development.

214	public meeting	3/6/2012	susan	allen	Our Ocean	Conservation	process	Encourages development of a spatial plan	We have been talking a lot about Goal 19, it's a great platform because it embraces the interest of fishing interests and long term sustainable ecology on the coast. We have a rare opportunity in Oregon to inform how renewable energy is sited on Oregon coast. That opportunity is illustrated by the E.O issued in 2008. For me and many of the people I interact with, we feel that this is a rare opportunity to prioritize renewable energy siting in the TS that protects Goal 19, and describes state and federal authorization. The good work that we do here, if we can all stay at the table, is very important. Not only will it be helpful but also it will have a long-term shelf life. It is rare for FERC to allow this type of input from a state. We have the opportunity to protect recreation uses, fishing interests. The thing that makes me even more optimistic, is the time and energy that the working group members have spent gathering information. There is a lot of work to be done. I'm excited to build relationships and the next step is to get to place-based conversations. This will allow people to see gaps and low use to learn from each other
215	public meeting	3/6/2012	laura	schmidt	our ocean	conservation	data	Encourage elevation of ESA species to level 1, recreation use protection	I come to the coast to recreate with my family. I am usually coming here to soak up the natural beauty of the coast, which enriches my life. I am happy to be a part of this conversation because people like me from inland areas value the ocean. Thank you. Areas like marine reserves are already exclusion areas and might provide a good stating place. I have questions about what level 1 and level 2 protection is. I'm wondering if one is more important than the other is, or does it just define the types of data? I think grey whale and marbled murrelet areas should be moved up to level 1. I've come here for whale watching my whole life. We need to protect the values described in Goal 19. Thank you for holding these meetings.
216	public meeting	3/6/2012	jason	busch	OWET	Renewable Energy	general	Industry needs test sites to inform if there are env. impacts	OWET is funded by the state of Oregon lottery dollars, (used for economic development and conservation of state lands). Our mission is for responsible development, we don't want to support an industry that will have negative impacts on our state. Our board is made up of a number of people, but there is not a wave energy developer, it brings level of neutrality. We definitely want to bring wave energy to Oregon, because we think, it will have many long-term benefits. We have studied everything from bird collision rates, sediment transport, whale migration, effects of EMF on wildlife; We have gathered all this environmental information in the Dept. Of Energy TETHYS database. OWET funded fishery mapping, provided money to the stakeholder groups to allow them to participate in the process. I want to address the comments about the 1-mile buffer; it is too blunt of a tool. The industry does not want to go to headlands and river mouths. Jetties should not be excluded entirely because it is an area that is actively being sought after. The necessity of this process is being driven by our societies focus on energy. We are an energy centric society. Jobs have left the coast because there isn't enough energy. This development means jobs. These are tough decisions, but we can't neglect them. The ease with which we power our homes is because of an investment in infrastructure. This process allows us to make that decision and not make the same mistakes that have been made before. I would like to submit a report from the NAS describing CMSP and the value of CMSP in Massachusetts [read abstract].

217	public meeting	3/6/2012	maleah	ashford	NNMRE C	Renewable Energy	location	Industry needs test sites to inform if there are env. impacts	NNMREC is a Dept. of Energy funded program to do research on wave and tidal energy. Our goal is to increase the understanding of wave energy from the technological, environmental, and sociological side of things. At NNMREC, it is our goal to develop models of devices and test in scale testing facilities, and eventually have a cable to shore to test full size devices that will interact with the grid. Last year we tested five new technologies at small scale in our wave tanks. This year it is our intention to test half scale devices off of Newport. We are starting a process to look for a grid-connected site. Warrenton, Reedsport, Coos Bay, and Newport are all places we are looking at. We will be starting a process with those communities and in partnership of the TSP process. Outreach to be done by OR Sea Grant, OWET, and NNMREC. I want the working group to develop a plan that is adaptable in time and process to anticipate changes in technology .
218	public meeting	3/6/2012	Bob	Eder		Commercial Fishing	Process	Urges protection of the social and cultural values of fishing	I'm here today to speak as a stakeholder and in support of the fishing industry. I am urging you to question what you mean by value. Economic value from the fishing industry is huge on the coast and we are coming off a great year. Additionally, the management of the fisheries is extremely successful. When you look at the maps and see intersection with fisheries and ecological area, it is no surprise. We have shown that we can do sustainable fishing. These are good jobs. Someone with a high school education can make more than a living wage. The other values are the social and cultural values of fishing. Part of what we should be protecting is this fishing activity, this successful interaction. It is quite an anomaly that we have hunters-gatherers in the 21st century. There is tremendous protein production. Being a hunting culture and the prize of spatial opportunity, constriction doesn't work with that. It will result in a tokenism of this traditional opportunity. Mitigation is frightening to me. It means fracturization. We are out in the open, and do this for the public. We don't own it, and I can't think of any culture that has sold access to the hunting rights who has been successful. Please give fishing the highest protection. I do believe that there should be exclusion areas.

									<p>(TSP). This is an important process and I appreciate the chance to participate.</p> <p>My perspectives on the TSP are based on three things: 1) my family has owned and operated a sheep and timber ranch in Curry County along Elk River and on the bluffs over the ocean for four generations; 2) I managed watershed protection and related environmental protection programs for the State and for Portland for the last 24 years; and 3) I am an Oregon citizen with tremendous concern about what is happening to the “seed corn” that are our natural resources, especially the habitat, rivers and ocean that support us all.</p> <p>My comments about the TSP:</p> <p>1. As important as wave energy generation may someday prove to be, the priority for Oregon and for this process is the marine ecosystem resource, and protecting that invaluable asset.</p> <p>2. We should proceed cautiously because: a) wave energy facilities are in the early stages of development; b) far too much that we need to know about how they would impact Oregon’s marine resources is unknown; and c) Oregon’s marine ecosystem resource is one of the richest of its kind in the world. Until we know what any wave energy facility will do to that resource, the only valid approach is to go slowly.</p> <p>3. Proceeding cautiously should include allowing facilities to be sited in the near future in only one area of Oregon’s territorial sea, and in that area only to do the trial runs that will tell us: a) whether they can be viable in terms of the amount of energy generated; b) what the impacts of the facilities are to the ocean floor, to fish, benthic and other marine organisms, and to sea birds; and c) whether the facilities have unforeseen operational problems.</p> <p>4. Amendments to Oregon’s TSP are being considered as a result of the interest in developing wave energy, but there will be other requests and demands made on our ocean resources. That makes it even more important to avoid granting any more than a single small area for testing these facilities now. To grant larger or more areas would tie up those areas before we know what the impacts will be, whether the wave energy facilities will be viable, and whether they are going to be our priority use.</p> <p>5. Since the Reedsport facility is grandfathered in, that is the most reasonable place to do the pilot facility.</p> <p>6. The frequently-cited ECONorthwest report that estimated the revenue that could be generated by the wave energy facilities also called for a full analysis of the environmental impacts and</p>
219	Email	3/6/2012	mary	whal	Citizen	Public-At-Large	Data	Urges a cautious approach, testing site at Reedsport	

220	Email	3/11/2012	anne	nelson	Citizen	Public-At-Large	Data	<p>Encourages moving data gap into level 2, consideration of ESA species, marine mammals</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Territorial Sea Plan (TSP) amendment process. The staff of DLCD and ODFW as well as their contractors are to be commended for their hard work to map available data in this important decision-making process. Undoubtedly these uncharted waters have been challenging to navigate and it is apparent from the evolution of data compiled in Oregon Marine Map over the last year that they have been hard at work. Thank you.</p> <p>Data Gaps While the state has done a laudable job seeking out and incorporating available data, many data gaps remain – gaps that could definitively alter siting decisions made in their absence. Therefore, I strongly encourage separating out data gaps from Level 3 and clearly identifying them as gaps. Until they are filled, a precautionary approach, as outlined in Goal 19, should be taken and gaps should be elevated to Level 2, at a minimum.</p> <p>Marine Mammals Goal 19 clearly specifies the mandate to protect species and their habitats. A small subset of gray whales spend summers feeding in the nearshore waters off Oregon. These and the other 18,000+ gray whales travels south in winter and most of the group migrates north in summer, along differing paths. While some gray whale data is incorporated into Oregon Marine Map, there is still substantial uncertainty about the spatial use of Oregon waters by these animals. Project-specific surveys should be pursued to more definitively understand their foraging and migratory patterns. As gray whales are listed as endangered by the State of Oregon and are protected under the federal Marine Mammal Protection Act, both seasonal foraging areas and migratory corridors should be considered as Level 1.</p> <p>Use of Oregon waters by federally listed endangered marine mammals including humpback whales, blue whales, fin whales, killer whales, and other listed marine mammals is known, but not well understood. The scarce existing data have been incorporated as possible into Oregon Marine Map, but very significant data gaps remain. Given the federal and state protected status of these and other marine mammals, all known and suspected marine mammal habitat should be listed as Level 1.</p> <p>Once again state agency staff is to be highly commended in their work to seek out and incorporate this information. Filling key data gaps in marine mammal use of Oregon and federal waters should be a high priority, notably as planning efforts for marine renewable energy is proceeding in federal waters where these federally endangered cetaceans are likely found.</p>
-----	-------	-----------	------	--------	---------	-----------------	------	---	--

221	Letter	3/19/2012	Loren	Goddard	NSAT	Commercial Fishing	Location	<p>Area off Depoe Bay should be given high protection because of recreational, charter, and commercial fishing use</p> <p>The Depoe Bay Near Shore Action Team (NSAT) is greatly disturbed that the current proposed Fisheries Resource mapping of the Territorial Sea Plan (TSP) for the area off the coast of Depoe Bay is given a low use. This does not reflect the reality of commercial charter/sports fishing and crabbing out of Depoe Bay nor does it meet the requirements of OAR 660-015-001 0(4), Goal 19 Ocean Resources, specifically Use of Ocean Resources items 1 bAb, c, d, e; nor does it comply with Governor Kulongoski's Executive Order 0807, paragraph 2.</p> <p>The areas shown as blue (Low, Level 3 Resources) and yellow (Moderate, Level 2 Resources) directly off the coast of Depoe Bay should be depicted as brown (High Level Resources) because of the copious ground fish resources in these areas. Rockfish and other ground fish species are abundant in the area shown on the map as the lowest priority. Seasonally, Salmon are also caught in this area. The low and moderate priority areas of blue and yellow are also prime crabbing areas for both commercial and charter/recreational fisheries. It is not unusual to see urchin divers operating well within the areas depicted as blue on the map.</p> <p>Many of the charter operators stay within what is shown as blue areas since those near shore areas support rockfish and other species close in to Depoe Bay and ocean conditions may dictate staying near shore for safety reasons. Additionally, as of April 1 2012, all recreational fishing for ling cod and rock fish must be done shore-side of the 30 fathom curve.</p> <p>A number of recreational anglers who launch their boats from the Depoe Bay public launch ramp fish close to shore while others track the charter boat fleet. These people and those who fish with our charter fleet contribute significantly to the economies of Depoe Bay and the surrounding communities.</p> <p>DLeD and ODFW have admitted there are gaps in the data displayed on these maps. NSA T believes the low use designation given to the area off Depoe Bay is a reflection of these gaps. While the Ecotrust mapping survey did collect data from many in our charter fleet, they did not gather sufficient data from the transient recreational boat fishermen and women and from some of the charter fleet.</p>
-----	--------	-----------	-------	---------	------	--------------------	----------	--

222	Letter	3/19/2012	Carol	Conners	Mayor, Depoe Bay	Local Governmen t	Location	<p>Area off Depoe Bay should be given high protection because of recreational, charter, and commercial fishing use</p>	<p>Territorial Sea Plan (TSP) Fishery Resources for the near-shore area off the coast of Depoe Bay does not reflect the reality of charter/sports fishing and crabbing out of Depoe Bay nor does it meet the requirements of OAR 660-015-0010(4), Goal 19 Ocean Resources, especially the Use of Ocean Resources item d, “areas important to commercial or recreational fishing activities, including those of individual ports or particular fleets...”.</p> <p>According to data provided by the Oregon State Marine Board, Depoe Bay has the largest charter fleet on the Oregon Coast. Many of these charters routinely stay within what’s erroneously shown as a Low Level 3 Resources area on the Fishery Resources map. The recreational fishermen and women who launch their boats from the Depoe Bay launch ramp fish a great deal of the time within a mile and a half from shore. These people and those who fish with our charter fleet contribute significantly to the economies of Depoe Bay and the surrounding communities.</p> <p>The Depoe Bay City Council is pleased that the Ecological Resources along our coastline have been recognized as a high priority; however fishery resources are just as important as ecological resources to this community.</p> <p>The Depoe Bay City Council is also highly concerned that the Beneficial Uses map shows the area immediately off Depoe Bay including the area off Government Point (Boiler Bay) as Moderate level 2 uses. Obviously, the area outside the Depoe Bay harbor entrance is necessary for navigation, all the way to the limit of the territorial Sea. Boiler Bay is one of the primary tide pooling areas of the Oregon coast and the area immediately north is recognized as an excellent surfing spot. The entire area off Depoe Bay, Cape Foulweather, and Government Point is recognized as the prime gray whale watching area of Oregon. The Oregon State Park’s Whale Watching center located here is routinely the highest visited state park of Oregon. People from all over the world visit to watch the whales from shore and to go out in one of our fleet’s charter vessels. Additionally, members of the Confederated Tribe of the Siletz, through government to government agreements between the United States and tribal groups guaranteeing fishing rights on traditional grounds, use marine resources surrounding Depoe Bay for subsistence (from NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC SC-85).</p>
-----	--------	-----------	-------	---------	------------------------	-------------------------	----------	--	--

223	Public Meeting	3/22/2012	bob	Bailey	OWET	Renewable Energy	General	<p>Supports development of Renewable energy in a responsible manner</p> <p>offer a few thoughts as you draw near to approving a draft amendment to the Territorial Sea Plan for ocean renewable energy. As you may know, I have had a hand in Oregon's territorial sea planning for many years and I continue to follow this work as a member of the board of the Oregon Wave Energy Trust.</p> <p>First, I want to thank each and every one of you for the enormous amount of time and effort you have given to creating this plan amendment. Your work is absolutely critical and your personal investment in this effort is humbling. Likewise, the staff and agency participants in this process deserve enormous thanks and appreciation. I know, from personal experience, that this effort has consumed their personal and professional lives as well. All of Oregon and future generations of Oregonians will be grateful to you. This is not easy to do but it is vital that it be done.</p> <p>Second, I encourage you, as you make your recommendations, to keep a perspective on what this is about. I urge you to take the proverbial "50,000-foot view" from a vantage point of 50 years into the future and what you did to help foster development of a new sustainable energy source for Oregon.</p> <p>Modern society needs electrical energy. There is no way around it. Oregon needs it, each coastal community needs it, and each person in this room needs it. Our children and their children will need it...and it has to come from somewhere. We have learned that there is no such thing as a free lunch when it comes to energy. Each source has its advantages...and disadvantages, some more than others. What matters are conscious decisions about environmental and societal trade-offs.</p> <p>Since World War Two, Oregon and the Pacific Northwest have had the fantastic economic and environmental advantage of prodigious amounts of hydroelectric energy to fuel our communities, economies, and daily lives. But despite the fact that it is renewable energy, we are now all too familiar with the extensive, significant environmental consequences from damming our rivers for hydropower. We are now talking about tearing down dams, not building more to meet increasing demand.</p>
-----	----------------	-----------	-----	--------	------	------------------	---------	--