

## **Territorial Sea Plan Working Group Workshop Public Comment**

**May 23, 2011**

**Garibaldi, OR**

**#1**

Richard Redman, FACT, "There is a flaw in the fishing maps, because a lot of species of fish are migratory and they don't stay in one place. Meaning that, what are important fishing grounds in one year, may not be important in the next year. And I don't see any way that these maps can be updated every year. And if its done correctly you are going to have a big red box around out fishing areas, because different species, different fishermen, different boating, do different things, and it changes maybe not day to day, but year to year. I've been fishing out here 18 years and I know how much they migrate."

**#2**

Gus Meyer, FACT and private sector, "I'm in favor of renewable marine energy, but concerned that the council is ignoring the land siting. We have a sensitive grid system, shoreline, and shore line uses. Please take into account the land side uses when siting renewable energy projects and tie points. That may be a local government issue and I would leave it up to them to do it responsibly. The council has a tough job in using the ecological, protected area, existing use criteria to site developments, but I have not heard anything about reconciliation. How do you reconcile the value of these areas with respect to new uses? I suggest the council use reconciliation when you have multiple stacked requirements. Additionally, the ocean observatory initiative, which is something that I would have loved to take in my geology courses, is providing much information about ocean vents. Our oceans are changing and I'm concerned that the council is not taking this data into account."

**#3**

David Yamamota, Pacific City Resident, Tillamook County Futures Council, Chair Elect Pacific City Woods Planning Committee, "I'm glad to see many diverse stakeholders represented on this council. However, I do believe that you are leaving out the largest stakeholder group, which is simply people that live on the Oregon Coast. You have been working on the process since about 2008, but not realizing that the residents of the coastal communities have been left out. I hope that over the next couple months, as you continue this process, you will be seeing more community involvement. And I hope that you do not impose artificial proposal dates already set, because you may not

be able to meet those dates after you get the community involved along the coast, including many people you have not heard from. I appreciate you holding these meetings; this is my first opportunity to provide input. Please allow time to get more citizenry involved on this on an active basis because you may need more time to put this together.”

#4

Rick Williams, OWET, Oregon citizen, career mariner, “I’m a founding board member of the Oregon Wave Energy Trust. About 5 years ago the Oregon Economic Development Department, through the Oregon Innovation Council put out a call for emerging industries. There were some 21 submissions, through an exhaustive competitive process looking at existing industries, emerging industries, and research initiatives, called Signature Research Centers. Wave energy was competitively selected as Oregon’s most promising emerging industry. The reasons for that are the wave resource in Oregon is very good; the grid has hundreds of mega watts of excess capacity and the loads are along the coast. One of the transmission problems in Oregon is that the generation is on the east side of the Cascades and a lot of the load is on the West side, creating a transmission imbalance. It turned out that wave energy in theory is a good emerging industry. So the Oregon Wave Energy Trust was formed as a public private partnership, and our mission is responsible development of wave energy. Recently in a unanimous board meeting, we confirmed that we support the territorial sea planning process and we look forward to participating. OWET funded part of the effort to get the fishermen’s input into this process through the fishing intensity mapping and we are very pleased with how that is progressing. We also recently authorized to have an equivalent effort to evaluate the wave energy industry needs. There are a wide range of devices and many of them have different needs, but in the industry we think that there are some shared needs that we can articulate. As a chair of the Industry Advisory group for OWET, we all realize we all have a lot to learn. There are information gaps about how small devices and small arrays are going to work and we fully support the phased development that is written into TSP chapter 5. As far as shared needs, all of the industry members are going to need access for offshore support vessels, 20-23’ draft, so we all need to be close to deepwater ports. Particularly, during the early stages when there is no revenue. This is an early stage industry. We all need to be close to an accessible grid connection, if it’s on top of a cliff that’s a problem. We also need to be in an area where there is a cable corridor, where you can bury the cable. Thankfully, that’s sandy bottom, and we don’t want to be on rocky bottom. That’s good news.

Finally as a citizen, Oregon has come out against nuclear, oil and gas, and coal; I think we need to figure out what we are for. To date, renewable energy has been something that we are for. Wave energy is less intermittent than wind and it's dispatchable and approach base load power. So this is a very viable technology to provide our energy needs as long as we do it in responsible manner."

#5

Peg Reagan, Conservation Leaders Network, Gold Beach, "I was pleased to hear that [ODFW] are working with whale scientists to pull together all the whale migration data and that it will be incorporated into MarineMap. I have heard from a couple folks, not from people in this working group, that whales are smart and they can avoid wave energy facilities. I want to remind the working group that a statement like that does not meet any appropriate standard under the marine mammal protection act. Finally, I still have a question about how the test site off Newport was selected in advance of this process?"

#6

Paul Hanneman, Pacific City Dorymans Association, "The association represents up to 400 marine vessels that fish out of Cape Kiwanda. There has been a great deal said about why the association did not participate in the data collection. For the record, I want to make clear that the association did send a letter to the department within the last two months indicating our concern with the process and procedures that the department was pursuing in the collection of data. To this date, we have not received an answer although I was notified today that the letter was posted on a website.

The letter was primarily concerned with the procedure that's been followed. We believe that the collection of data in this 20 mile section of coast between Cascade Head and Cape Lookout is likely more difficult given the nature of our fishery fleet, which is 95% recreational. Today is the first time I heard mention of a 50% standard for adopting the fishing effort maps from a port. I don't think that 50% standard is appropriate for Garibaldi and that a great deal of the interest there is left untabulated and it is not representative of the port of Garibaldi at all. Pacific City and Tillamook County are the closest section of the coast to Portland and we have high uses of our beaches and tremendous use of our fisheries. Alternative uses that disturb the traditional economic value of our ocean are not appropriate. If you are going to economically disturb or reduce the value of the fishery in the Tillamook County area, the citizens of Oregon are not gaining anything. Thank you."

#7

Jim Carlson, Netards resident, Our Ocean, Tillamook County Local Citizen Planning Advisory Committee, "A comment about the outreach and participation of this group to local citizens that do not use the ocean outright, is an issue that I believe needs to be looked into a little further as you make any decisions. This is going to effects on people up and down the coast. There seems to be some confusion in the minds of local citizens about what spatial planning really means. My suggestion is to letters should be written to county commissions that can be disseminated out to local jurisdictions, to explain what it means to start drawing lines out in the ocean and how that will effect the land sea connection. In my part of the world people are concerned about water quality, and this is just the next step out. My recommendation is that we put a little more emphasis on educating the public and allow them to weigh in on this important subject."

#8

Kevin Greenwood, Port Manager for Port of Garibaldi, "Prior to my current position I was the city manager in Garibaldi for 5 years, during my time in the community, I've learned a lot about water industrial zoning, and I think I understand the need for marine spatial planning. And I have learned that it's been done about as good as it could be done by involving the south coast fishermen early on. But I think that there is an issue that we haven't really talked about and that is the estuary zoning. I think that the effort that the state undertook to make sure that the upland zoning and estuary zoning was done comprehensively, meaning that water zoning abuts estuary development zoning, and when we go to try to rearrange the zoning of a particular area to allow for mixed use development we are told by DLCD that we can rearrange but there will not be a change in the inventory. This is important, in terms of marine spatial planning, to the extent that it results in ocean zoning, I suggest that it too be done comprehensively with estuary and upland zoning. I don't think it would be considered comprehensive if you have estuary development abutting the ocean and no opportunity for industrial development just offshore. So I think that looking back on the ground work of land use planning in the state of Oregon as a comprehensive process, that the ocean planning should be an equal part in that. If its not we are going to be put into a difficult spot with upland zoning that is highly dependent on industrial use, if there are decreased opportunities for the ocean to provide opportunities for the commercial fishermen. There may be opportunities for wind and wave energy and we certainly

want that upland zoning to be able to take advantage of that. The bottom line is, ocean zoning, estuary zoning, and upland zoning need to be thought of comprehensively from the states perspective."

#9

Mike Marrow, M3 Wave Energy Systems, "I'm going to give you a little perspective from a small start up wave energy company. First, I want to say that I've monitored the development of this mapping tool and it's a great resource and tool it's a testament to all the stakeholders that made it happen. I wanted to offer some insights on my impressions of how this industry is evolving. Just as fishing changes, I think you are going to see the industry evolve. There may be technologies that you haven't been invented yet that will become the key that we will want to embrace as a society. I think that it's important as we go through this process and use these tools, that we keep the idea that we need to be flexible down the road. This may be a good idea for 10 or 20 years down the line, but there needs to be a mechanism for us all to reconvene at some point and adapt the plan for new technologies and new information, because we don't know which technologies or combinations of technologies are going to be the right way to go."

#10

Tom Marlin, 4<sup>th</sup> generation Oregonian, FACT, past chairman Coalition for Anadromous Salmon and Steelhead Habitat, "We've had some wonderful politicians in the past who helped save the beaches for the public. The fishermen buy licenses to fish in the ocean for salmon, halibut, bottom fish etc..., we now may be forced to stop fishing by politicians allowing structures to be placed in the fishing grounds in the ocean. Already we are not allowed to fish in deeper water for bottom fish. Where are we going to fish if our present areas are taken away from us by other uses, like wave energy and marine reserves? We could use wave energy, but at what cost?"

#11

Robert Lurie, VP Business Development for Ocean Power Technologies, "As you well know we are developing our project in Reedsport that will represent the first wave energy project in the state, as well as the country. We wanted to thank you for putting together this process, give you a little context, and request some inclusion of information. We very much support the process you are going through and we are very excited about the potential of this process to codify some rules about minimizing impacts on the environment and on natural resources, which is very much in our interest as well. When we first

announced our desire to build our project in Reedsport about five years ago, there really were not any rules of the game, there was not much data available about how we determine the impacts, both positive and negative, and there was not a process in place to evaluate that. We agreed to a negotiation process with various stakeholders to determine how we go about collecting that data using our buoys in the waters as the means by which we gather real facts about what the effect of these devices might be. That resulted in a settlement agreement that lays out dozens of protection, mitigation, and enhancement measures that we will enter into in order to build our project as well as six major studies that will provide data for this and future projects. So we stand ready to contribute any information we can to help lay out what the ideal or best sites might be for wave energy, with the intent to minimize the effects on the environment and natural resources, but which will also result in an economically viable project at the end of that process. We also think that there is a need to quantify what constitutes a high value wave energy project similar to what the group has determined what has been high value for other uses. At the end of the day we recognize there needs to be a balance in a conditional use process that the state might go through. Example of what might constitute a high value wave energy project, in constructing our first buoy in this state there has been a \$6.2 million direct impact in terms of the contracts we've had with Oregon companies which has created almost a hundred jobs directly plus all the jobs associated with the suppliers. Jobs impact is one way in which the value of a project can be measured. Also, the amount of energy that the project produces that will contribute to the transition to renewable energy for the state. That could be represented by power density, how much energy can be produced from some amount of ocean area. And we applaud the council for this extremely rigorous and impressive process that you are going through to gather so much data from various stakeholders and make informed decisions. We hope it will provide a means by which we can get to yes for a project in the state, by telling us in advance what factors we need to consider, data we need provide, and what criteria do we need to meet to go forward with a project. This puts Oregon out ahead of many states, which have not begun this type of process. Thank you."

#12

Linda Buell, Co-chair FACT, Garibaldi Charters, "Thank you OPAC for coming to Garibaldi. The state maps are pretty useful in general but when it comes down to picking sites we hope you would contact the local fishing associations. Both TIDE and FACT work with developers and we find that to be a win-win for both sides, they learn about us

and we learn about them. We've given them sites that they have looked at for wave energy that fishermen have chosen on maps. I would hope you would not undercut TIDE and organizations like that when designating sites; you really do need to talk to the local groups. Fishing changes from year to year. Also, if we can get these studies to get out on the deep reef it would not be a big deal, right now we are so constrained where we have to fish that we cannot afford to lose anymore grounds, and that's the main reason we did not want a marine reserve. Even if the developers say we can fish on these devices we don't know how that will work out. Theresa [Aquaterra] comes to a lot of our meetings as we are glad to have her and we think it's an important part of the process. I have a question about how often you think you will update these maps?"

#13

Laura Anderson, Director FISHCRED, "FISHCRED is a fisherman's based organization trying to ensure that the diversity of commercial fishing interests are represented and communicated in the spatial planning process. The fishing knowledge maps are the central theme of this organization. We have a 15 member board of directors that is distributed geographically along the coast, and I want the people here to know that the person representing the Port of Garibaldi is Bob Browning and that Garibaldi, Depoe Bay and Pacific City are considered a port group from FISHCRED and that Mark Roberts from Depoe Bay also represents this area. Someone had asked how many commercial fishermen from Garibaldi were interviewed for this purpose, and I can say that 11 commercial fishermen were interviewed. The point that I want to make for the local community is that FISHCRED recognizes that local associations and groups exist and are incredibly important and effective on the coast. However, as this process heats up FISHCRED sees the need for a statewide coalition and that's why I'll be coming to a FACT meeting this month as well as the Dorymans association, as well as others so we can form some stronger alliances. I just hope that we can contribute some maps that are going to be useful for this process and still protect fishermen confidentiality at the same time."

#14

Carol Steele, Tillamook County resident, "I have 30 years of development experience, and what I'm seeing here seems to leave out a lot of what I've dealt with. I just want to point out, Oregon is known nationally and internationally for the way that it has used and protected and continues to deal with its ocean. There are lots and lots of states in other countries that have not done so well. Recognizing

that we have 200 years of history here, we need to take it slow. This seems to be poised to lease or give away or sell off bits and pieces of the ocean. I think that would be a terrible mistake for everyone concerned. For development purposes, I think we need to be able to look at the basis of cost and benefits, and that means costs in every sense of the word, we need to try and understand the consequences. Because adding another major industrial use and splitting it off from other uses means creating all kinds of problems. That includes for the industry. Because if we lease out something for a technology that changes, or does not prove to be appropriate, it means we will lose out on that particular part of the ocean and on replacing it with the good things that can come along. As this process goes on, I hope we try to understand what the real problem is. Your program says be part of the solution, but we need to figure out what the real problem is. If the problem is that we need more renewable energy, there may be all kinds of ways to solve that that do not involve the ocean. Thank you."