

Dale: For the record, my name is Dale Beasley.

Dale: I only have a short comment here tonight. Good evening, everyone. I welcome this opportunity to speak unfiltered on behalf of Washington Coastal fish and water dependent communities. My name is Dale Beasley, president of both the Columbia River Crab Fishermen's Association and the Coalition of Coastal Fisheries. I'm representing thousands of seafood dependent families owned businesses coast wide, 15 different fish organizations, many coastal businesses, and several port districts in Southwest Washington. CCF fishing groups are recreational and commercial and we have worked together on common problems since 1979. My comments tonight are not comprehensive. That will follow on or before December 12th in writing.

In reviewing the draft Washington Coastal Marine Spatial Plan and the associated draft EIS, I am very concerned that the public and coastal fishing fleet will not be able to discern the full legislative intent or statutory requirements of the coastal marine spatial plan to avoid conflict with existing uses, including fishing and that the enabling legislation [inaudible] was intended to protect. This lack of clarity that I've read so far - I've had trouble because I haven't read it all and I'll admit that - is troubling in reviewing the ocean energy maps in the area preferred energy placing them in very high value fishing grounds, which the legislature intended to avoid.

The intent that the Washington coastal marine spatial plan is to protect and preserve existing uses including fishing and the high value and environmentally sensitive areas that the coast is depended upon for its economic stability and viability. Some of these words I've taken right out of the legislation. It is not evident anywhere in a draft plan that I've been able to tell so far that the legislature intended to locate new use in our off-shore waters that could supplement the coastal economy. And the new use is to be sited to avoid conflict as its major citing criteria and have only minimal adverse impact on fish water dependent communities. There's no such map in this plan that I can discern. The only energy maps are in high value fishing areas, leaving the wrong overall tone for the plan. That's how I see it.

it is concerning that the documents as presented have not adequately reflected stakeholder or public input during meeting process and discussions leading up to the draft plan. I attended many of the public meetings and anywhere in the state that I have not, new use has not been identified as a preferred alternative to coastal waters. And again, I haven't read thoroughly through the plan to see that in the plan. This is a complicated subject.

The supporting documents are long, comment period is inadequate even though twice as long as the minimal 30 day requirement for careful review and forum public comments of this lengthy document and for a clear understanding of potential harm to coastal communities that are already subject under tremendous burden of the Rafiti decision where 50% of all fish and the majority of the coast have been lost to state fishermen and those fishing efforts Northwest have shifted south, making that southern fish pie excessively small to support the historical communities' needs and has removed over \$160 million of complete income to date.

The next generation of fishermen will be the highest debt fishermen in the history with the least amount of fish to service that crushing debt, making the next generation extremely vulnerable to total failure. This high degree of vulnerability is not adequately addressed in the plans I see. A simple mention is not enough in a plan for the future of fishing as intended in the legislature to be protected and preserved. Washington is the only state in the nation with the supportive federal court decision, the nation removing 50% from affected fishermen. In Washington we have developed as if we were the same as Rhode Island, which is far from actual reality facing coastal fish dependent communities. The pie is much smaller here than in any other state in the nation.

For most who gaze upon the ocean from the shore, the ocean seems like a vast [inaudible] as far as the eye can see. Those of us who have lived and worked on coastal marine waters have a far different view. We see it as busy, limited, and already fully utilized space on the continental shelf, especially inside 125 [inaudible]. The CMSP process helped to support that view but with competing maps have failed to unravel the existing conflicts on coastal dependency.

I wish I had printed this a little larger. [laughter]

Off shore waters and instead of [inaudible] you list the number of uses and use that as a proxy. You don't really put the value to the community like crab fishermen supplies over 50% of fish income in any given year. It is equivalent to walking the dog on a beach as displayed on the use maps. I find this troubling. The use maps with these documents demonstrate that no new use of ocean space could be cited anywhere without conflict with existing fisheries. And in most cases, conflicts with many uses that may or may not contribute to the stability or the viability of the coast. In the central coast where the maps do identify some areas of minimal use, we have no way to discern what that use may be in the maps. It is not a valuable fishing area where some new use may be located that could avoid conflict with use essential to coastal economic wellbeing.

And when the coastal marine spatial plan was built - this isn't in my paper but I'm going to say it anyway - Senator Ranger came to the coast. And he rounded up a bunch of people, including our local legislators. And before anything happened whatsoever, Coalition of coastal fisheries, the state legislators met in Aberdeen a couple of times. The concern was that this plan could protect and preserve existing uses. And that, to me, isn't really clear from what I've been able to read out of the plan yet. And the plan, the 6350 bill did not go even to committee until it had met with a coalition of coastal fishery members a number of times. And at that time back in 2010, there were 243 applications for permits around the country. There were a couple that showed up in Washington about that same time. And we were concerned that what little bit of fishing that we had left in this coast that was concentrated mainly in the 38 miles south of West Port would be displaced. And that, I can tell you one thing for certain that I do know because we sat in the back room when a lot of these bills was written. And the main concern for that coastal marine spatial plan in this state was different than any other state. It wasn't put in new use. It was to protect existing use. And I don't see that thoroughly projected in this plan. And I'll admit, I haven't read it all completely yet. The legislative intent to develop CMSP was to protect and preserve existing use, including fishing that coastal communities need for their stability and viability and

to look off our coast that new use could be placed. When we started this program back before 2010, before the bill was done, we really didn't know how extensive the use was on the coast. And so the legislatures didn't want to cut any economic activity off that could help the coast improve. And so that's why they wanted to have use maps so that they could see what the use was and to protect that use from those maps. That was the primary use. And then if there was a hole left in that mapping system then new use was acceptable to be put in. And I don't think that's really clear in this plan. I don't think it really reflects the intent of the legislature. And that's a very important distinction because most other states in this country that have put in coastal marine spatial planning, they did it to install a new use. In Washington, it was to protect existing use first and foremost. And I don't think that's really clear in the plan.

The plan does not address important information to make informed decisions about the potential extent of the ocean conflict to avoid that would be consumed by renewable energy, the prime motivator for Washington CMSP. We don't really -- we didn't address the potential for what was out there.

And one of the things that I requested throughout the process is that we use an example so that people can really understand the extent of what we were looking at. And we refused to look at our neighbor next door that had an ocean power technology and just for example, we could've easily calculated how many units it would take to equal one Bonneville Dam. And then once we got that number of units, we could've calculated the square miles that it would've taken up. I'll give you an example. OPT power buoys would've taken approximately 7300 units and consume over 2400 square miles. And compare that to the land mass of Pacific County, which is 933 square miles. This could've been easily done but we didn't do that in our marine spatial plan. The same is similar with principle power to equal one Bonneville Dam would've been around 520 square miles. And that's the most efficient device that I know of today. We didn't look at other examples like Block Island wind turbines in Rhode Island that cost approximately \$150,000 for households served. That's a pretty steep hookup fee if you ask me. But not nearly as expensive as power that would've come out of the Coos Bay facility that would've cost \$225,000 per household to hook up. Now, I don't know about you, but I can't afford to hook up to power at \$225,000 a hookup. So, those are things that are missing from the plan. And that, you know, there's -- it's difficult to plan ahead if you only look at one or two or three or four or five units that really don't put out much power because those will never be economical. To put out something economical, you have to compare it to something reasonable. And I think the public really should know what kind of area consuming these things are. In the future, we might get something better. But the physics of the problem, I don't think we're going to improve much on where we ought to be.

The legislature made clear it is not their intent to force new use in coastal waters that will displace, disrupt, or harm existing sustainable uses such as fishing that coastal communities depend upon. It is now time for Washington coastal marine spatial plan to make it clear that fishing is to be protected and preserved, that new uses to avoid conflict with only existing off-shore waters. Only a minimal impact of fishing occurs. The very important use maps that site new use that meets these parameters are not seen in our

legislation has not been produced to date. I have not seen that, whereas you could put something in with minimal impact.

And if you looked at things like the significant impact, those are in the old portions of ORMA that were done back in 1989. You won't find those in the new portion of the legislature. On the 12th of January, the Supreme Court rendered a 9-0 unanimous decision based on written language in their interpretation on the Washington ocean resource management act. The primary duty of ORMA was to ascertain and carry out the intent of the legislature.

And if we're going to avoid conflict and hold that conflict to a minimal amount, I'm having a hard time justifying that in trying to understand from what I've seen when you put the best place for ocean energy is in one of the best crab fishing grounds that we have, especially here locally in Pacific County. I don't see how that avoided that. What the legislature intended to do was to find that sweet spot where the impact was minimal and say this is the best place for it. I don't see that in the plan. And put it in the middle of the ground and portray those maps, ocean energy got to say, "This is the best place for us and this is where we want to be." Contrary to that, fishing never got to say, "This is the best place for us and this is what we need to protect and preserve." That wasn't part of it. And that's an unfortunate aspect of this because I know that's what the legislature intended when this bill was written. It makes it difficult to look at this plan and reflect what I know what the legislature meant at the time.

I don't have a whole lot more to say but I do want to see the short-tailed albatross in this plan specifically. And I want new uses to be held to the same standard that fishing has two takes and two years to shut down. That's what will happen to us if we have two takes. And we have to have some way to document those takes. And if there's no documentation, it shouldn't go in.

That's all I have for this evening. I'll have more comments.