

# Michael Nordin

Pg. 39, What is the progress or status of this plan/collaboration, "Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) has partnered with Washington's Emergency Management Division (EMD) and FEMA on improving hazard mitigation planning/risk reduction with scientific technical assistance. This partnership has been a strategic investment, leveraging resources and expertise to provide a robust multihazard dataset used to guide more comprehensive resilience action. Specifically, this partnership has supported the state in the development of the first erosion hazard profile for marine shorelines."?

Also referenced on Page 105-106.

Agreed that this would be very helpful, however no announcements from the Pacific County EM has been published, nor have I heard of such a plan.

Pages 53-56, Recreational/tourism economy is way too high, and if even true (which I would love to see the data on this) it scares me how this is interpreted outside the coastal area. 1. Recreational/tourism sector benefits massively from the Commercial resource extraction sector. If the commercial was gone, the Rec./Tour would be crushed, so there should be some kind of factoring here. 2. Without commercial, offshore developers would no longer have that barrier to keeping them in check. Once again, to the detriment of Rec. Tour. Already, the Federal Government is positioning itself with the administration coming in to dramatically change coastal zoning and use.

Dr. Ray Hilborn provided the only testimony in opposition.

<https://www.congress.gov/116/meeting/house/111092/witnesses/HMTG-116-II00-Wstate-HilbornR-20201117.pdf>

A letter of opposition,

(<https://www.congress.gov/116/meeting/house/111092/documents/HMTG-116-II00-20201117-SD007.pdf>) which many of us have signed, was submitted for the record, as were letters of support for the legislation.

Pg. 56, "↑ The impact to living marine resources is culturally and historically important to coastal tribes. Additionally, shorelines with cultural and historical significance are being lost and threatened by coastal erosion." This is also true for Non-Tribal communities and groups. I know it is politically popular to show support for Tribes, but Non-Tribal folks have been subsisting on the coast for 170 years.

Offshore development is unfavorable to 80% of coastal folks, conservatively. It should not be even hinted at that offshore development is wanted or a positive thing. Rather, the Marine Spatial Plan and Shoreline Master Plans are in place to stop such development.

"Shellfish growers are dealing with the challenge of burrowing shrimp in Willapa Bay and conflicts over prohibition of chemical controls.

Aesthetic/environmental concerns are increasing in Puget Sound communities (particularly against geoduck). Commercial finfish

aquaculture is transitioning to new species after restrictions on

growing non-native species" First, there needs to be more of a delineation between bottom and off bottom aquaculture.

Especially when it comes to ACE permits. Many of the issues above are more focused on off bottom culture.

Commercial Finfish aquaculture should be regulated strictly to terrestrial sites. Nothing in the water. First Nations in Canada are doing this very well and at a profit. Because of this, Canada is moving slowly away from water sites.

pg. 68, I can't believe this is still a possibility...

"• Potential for energy generation from offshore wind, wave, and tidal technologies has been estimated for Washington's Pacific coast. Significant energy resources were estimated for wind and wave power.

• Pacific National Marine Laboratories (PNNL) and Parametrix were contracted

through the Marine Spatial Plan process to create suitability maps for wind, wave, and tidal devices.

• Industrial Economics, Inc. and BST Associates were contracted as a part of the Maine Spatial Plan process to produce a Sector Analysis for Marine Renewable Energy along Washington's Pacific coast. This sector analysis synthesized information to provide an overview of current economic activity, major trends in activity, and potential future resource uses and needs by drawing on publically available information and perspectives from experts."

The major issue with the study is that 1. PNNL has a financial stake in the results and was "very pro" offshore energy development. 2. The model they used for scoring potential siting did not use a "zero" value option. Nor was there ever a

survey from current users to where they would be ok for siting, just where they use and how much they use. Flawed.

pg.71-73, not happy about this section in general. Most those processes were very top down. The CMSP was the most bottoms up, but had a very heavy agency driven process. The only reason CMSP even happened is because coastal citizens and groups pushed it to happen. The process even at first started without any agency seats at the table, just ex-officio, and the Tribal Nations and coastal folks were all at the same table working on issues. Then the state stepped in. I still have all the emails and meeting notes to all of those events.

As for pg. 73, it should at the very least be medium, and efforts to do more planning in the Twin Harbors should occur.

This document is a positive step continuing forward, however, some changes should be made to reflect the true history around the processes, and the true attitude and feeling of folks that live and subsist on the coast.