



# Hood Canal Coordinating Council (HCCC)

Jefferson, Kitsap & Mason Counties; Port Gamble S'Klallam & Skokomish Tribes

## Hood Canal Shellfish Initiative (HCSI) Workgroup Meeting #5

Date: May 19, 2020; 1:00 PM to 3:30 PM

Location: Zoom

Links:

- [Agenda](#)
- [Objective #1](#) ("Olympia Oysters")
- [Objective #4](#) ("Sustainable Industry")
- [Objective #6](#) ("Cultural Appreciation")

Attendees:

- Joth Davis, Baywater Shellfish Co.
- Bill Dewey, Taylor Shellfish Farms
- Bobbi Hudson, Pacific Shellfish Institute
- Jon Wolf, Skokomish Indian Tribe
- Blair Paul, Skokomish Indian Tribe
- Camille Speck, WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
- Teri King, WA Sea Grant
- Dawn Hanson Smart, Hood Canal Snail
- Laura Butler, WA State Dept. of Agriculture
- Joel Pillers, WA State Parks
- Jen Doughty, Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group
- Phil Best, Hood Canal Environmental Council
- Dan Tonnes, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- Paul McCollum, Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
- David Fyfe, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Facilitators:

- Nate White, HCCC
- Haley Harguth, HCCC
- Kelly Biedenweg, Oregon State University

### Welcome and Introductions

HCCC staff provided an overview of the meeting

- Brainstorm Actions
- Discuss Actions

### Brainstorm Actions

- HCCC staff split the Workgroup up into three subgroups to brainstorm Actions related to [Objective #1 \("Olympia Oysters"\)](#), [Objective #4 \("Sustainable Industry"\)](#), and [Objective #6 \("Cultural Appreciation"\)](#). Subgroups were instructed on what makes a good Action, including example actions. In addition to brainstorming new Actions, the subgroups reviewed, revised, and deleted actions that were generated previously. The subgroups also came up with appropriate metrics to measure the success of completing the actions. It was acknowledged that brainstorming actions is also an iterative process that can be returned to.

Note: Subgroup notes were captured directly in the Objectives spreadsheets linked above.

### **Discuss Actions**

The full Workgroup began discussion of Objective #4 (“Support a sustainable Hood Canal commercial shellfish industry”). The remaining Objectives will be discussed at the subsequent meetings.

#### Objective #4: Support a sustainable Hood Canal commercial shellfish industry

- Question for the group: Understanding of the advantages of aquaculture enterprise zones (a development area specifically designated for aquaculture), but wouldn't they also naturally spawn the concept of no enterprise areas? Is that a door we want to open?
  - Response: Enterprise zones are being contemplated right now for off-shore areas at the national level (through the President's recent Executive Order as well as legislation being debated). The idea is that you do GIS analysis to identify areas that have the least amount of use conflict and are most appropriate for aquaculture, and streamline the permitting in those areas. There could be a programmatic Environmental Impact Statement done for that area and the permitting would be easier with the possibility of extended leases in that area. A portion of these pre-permitted sites could also be dedicated to experimental work. For example, the testing of new gear that may otherwise be cost prohibitive to permit could be done at an experimental site within an enterprise zone. This provides flexibility and can encourage development in the industry. In areas not designated as Enterprise Zones, shellfish farms could still be proposed, but the permitting may be more difficult and might have a shorter lease period. Enterprise zones are being done in Humboldt Bay, CA (stalled due complications), and in federal waters outside of Ventura, CA. Leases in pre-permitted enterprise zones would be at a higher rate to recapture the upfront costs spent working out all the pre-permitting. But then growers have certainty as far as what their costs are going to be and what their permitting timeframe is, so they can come in and start operations immediately.
  - Response: Enjoyed listening to the progress in Humboldt Bay. One cool aspect was that because such a large area was being permitted at once, it really fostered community discussions and seemed to get support from the community because of that.
  - Response: Understanding of the advantages, but was wondering if the industry had concerns that by proposing this it might automatically lead to people proposing no commercial areas. It could become a political balance between how much commercial versus no commercial.
  - Response: It's a legitimate concern, and one that has been raised throughout the years as the industry has talked about doing projects like this or marine spatial planning, etc. From the industry's perspective, there's merit to processes such as marine spatial planning or enterprise zones that can facilitate growth of the industry with predictability and efficiency, but there shouldn't be areas excluded from being able to submit a permit and have it debated through the public permitting process. If there's appropriate opposition to deny a permit let that be worked out. Marine spatial planning should be seen as a tool to facilitate appropriate development and not designate exclusive uses or zoning.
  - Response: The Skokomish Indian Tribe is not necessarily against shellfish development, but they're not keen on seeing tideland structures and other off-the-ground development that make it difficult to access salmon and other fisheries. They would have to think about this more. Not sure if they'd be OK with a big map showing where shellfish farms are allowed.
  - Response: Any type of effort like this would have to absolutely be coordinated with the tribes so as not to affect their treaty rights.

- There are lots of openings on Hood Canal planning commissions (Jefferson, Kitsap, and Mason counties) right now. If people are interested in planning, we need people on the commissions who are interested in shellfish.
- HCCC comment: we had a lot of discussion around the regulatory process: what that looks like at the different levels of government and what this group could potentially take on. We're starting to zero in around local regulations that are found in Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs). We talked about the need for analysis of our local SMPs and what they say about shellfish, and how those regulations, programs, or practices align, don't align, or could be better coordinated, made more efficient, etc.
  - Response: Would like to see Hood Canal stormwater management plans, outfalls, NPDES renewals, liquid waste management, and sewage treatment (or lack thereof) on that list for consideration.
  - Response: It seems like those last suggestions are more appropriate in the water quality objective.
  - Response: There will be actions that meet multiple objectives and so it's good to make note of that for when we start using our structured decision making tool (DASEES).

### **Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held May 28, from 1:00-3:00 on Zoom. The Workgroup will continue discussing the actions that have been brainstormed.