Oregon
John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

Department of Land Conservation and Development
635 Capitol Street, Suite 150
Salem, OR 97301-2540
(503) 373-0050
Fax (503) 378-5518
www.lcd.state.or.us

Memo

To: **Scott McMullen, Chair, Ocean Policy Advisory Council**
From: **Todd Hallenbeck, Sea Grant Fellow**
Date: **Dec. 20, 2012**
Re: **TSP Public Comment Executive Summary**

Oregon's Territorial Sea plan (TSP) is being amended to plan for the development of marine renewable energy while balancing ecological resources and existing ocean uses. The draft plan developed by the Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC) in April 2012, has been augmented and refined by the Territorial Sea Plan Advisory Committee (TSPAC) with help from public input. These amendments are being made using a transparent and robust public process, meant to engage stakeholders and solicit input regarding draft recommendations.

In this effort, Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff and members of TSPAC held three public work sessions in North Bend, Newport, and Astoria over a two-week period in early November to share information and gather public input on the draft Territorial Sea Plan, Part 5 and proposed Suitability Study Areas. Additionally, the Tillamook Futures Council held a fourth public meeting in Tillamook. This summary represents the themes and tone of the public comment collected at those four meetings as well as that received online or in the mail between Oct. 17, 2012 and Dec. 20, 2012. A TSP Survey was conducted by the Tillamook Futures Council; you can view the results here. Public comment will continue to be collected at tsp.comments@state.or.us and considered by OPAC and LCDC until the final plan is adopted at the January 24, 2013 LCDC hearing.

A total of 213 comments were received to date. The largest number of public comments came from individuals who were identified as "public at large" (111), as opposed to commercial and recreational fishing (53), conservation and recreation (24), local government (11), or ocean energy (6) representatives, indicating that outreach efforts are getting to this stakeholder group. Generally, stakeholders are supportive of ocean energy development on a limited basis and pleased with the approach of the TSP process, but expressed some concerns that the process needs more time for adequate public input. Stakeholders reiterated the need to protect fishing

grounds, viewsheds, and ecologically sensitive areas. Many comments were directed at proposed sites, suggesting modifications or opposing them outright for fishery, ecological, safety, or viewshed impacts. In order to reflect the different type of comments received, I have categorized them as General, Location, Process, and Data.

Comment Themes:

General

- Support Marine Reserves and Marine Protected Areas as exclusion areas (51)
- Encourage highest protection for rock reefs, headlands, and river mouths (33) and buffers (8)
- Support adaptive, phased, precautionary approach (23)
- Concern for cumulative impacts to fishing industry (12)
- Support plan for testing and research, as opposed to commercialization (11)
- Support flexible plan with large Development Areas (7)
- Support “micro-siting” approach (4)
- Concerns over adequacy of financial bonding requirements (3)

Location

- Camp Rilea
    - Concerns about impacts to fishing, safety (4)
- Netarts
    - Concerns about proximity to important ecological areas, lack of community vetting (5)
- Pacific City/Nestucca
    - Concerns about impacts to fishing, viewsheds, tourism (31)
    - Modification – Move northern boundary below mouth of Nestucca R.(9)
- North Newport
    - Concerns about proximity to Otter Rock MR, NNMREC, whale migration (9)
- Reedsport
    - Concerns about impacts to fishing (1)
    - Modification – Move northern boundary below mouth of Tahkenitch R. (9)
- Lakeside
    - Support (4)
- Langlois
    - Concerns about impacts to fishing, light pollution (16)
    - Modification – Reduce size, move southern boundary north to avoid viewshed impacts (12).
- Gold Beach
    - Concerns about proximity to important ecological areas, lack of community vetting (27)

Process

- Support for the TSP approach and outreach to stakeholders (31)
- Concern over the pace of the process and lack of public input (21)

Data

- Data Gaps
    - Seabird and marine mammal foraging and migration (5)
    - Effects of anchors on soft sediment (3)
    - Cost/Benefit analysis (3)
    - Salmon and EMF (2)

In addition to this executive summary, each comment is presented in its entirety. You can find those comments on Oregonocean.info and at the following links:

TSPAC/OPAC Public Comments - General, Dec. 20, 2012

TSPAC/OPAC Public Comments - Location, Dec. 20, 2012

TSPAC/OPAC Public Comments - Process, Dec. 20, 2012

TSPAC/OPAC Public Comments - Data, Dec. 20, 2012