

West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health Workshops on the Competitive NOAA Regional Ocean Partnership Funding Program

Workshop Summary

November 16, 2010 – Olympia, WA

Prepared by Kearns & West

Introduction – Workshop Objectives, Structure and Participants

Objectives

The workshop was intended to inform the development of a proposal led by the West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health (WCGA) to pursue funding opportunities made available through a [Regional Ocean Partnership Funding Program](#) (ROPFP). The workshop was designed to:

- Provide an overview of the ROPFP;
- Identify ideas to advance West Coast regional coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP) while supporting the full range of West Coast regional ocean priorities to facilitate a coordinated and robust application for funding under the ROPFP; and
- Confirm next steps moving forward.

Bob Nichols, Natural Resource Policy Advisor to Governor Gregoire, welcomed and thanked participants for attending the workshop. He provided context for the Regional Ocean Partnership Funding Program (ROPFP) and explained that in July 2010, the Obama administration established the first National Ocean Policy (NOP) to coordinate and encourage stewardship of the ocean, coasts and lakes, and that the purpose of the meeting was for workshop participants to articulate project ideas that align with various ROPFP priorities. He mentioned that the United States House of Representatives was the only Congressional body to allocate funding towards this program, and acknowledged that Congress's approach to the NOP may change as a result of the recent election. He said that the ROPFP has focused unprecedented dialogue and attention on ocean health, and that this Federal Funding Opportunity (FFO) has brought the region together to look at this from a comprehensive ocean management point of view.

Bob mentioned three avenues to become involved in the ROPFP: to share ideas and feedback at this workshop; to share more detailed project ideas on the website; and to share a specific project proposal online. He mentioned that once the WCGA Executive Committee receives all of the information, it will assess how to mold it into a proposal that is nationally competitive. In addition, he explained that tribes are central to this process; there is active interest from coastal tribes, who will be convening their own discussions and will solicit feedback and information from those conversations. Debra Nudelman, Kearns & West facilitator, invited the workshop participants to introduce themselves and reviewed the agenda and ground rules.

Structure

The three statewide WCGA workshops were held to facilitate public input toward the development of a proposal(s) in pursuit of the ROPFP opportunity. The California Workshop was held in San Francisco, California on November 12; the Oregon workshop was held in Newport, Oregon on November 15; and the Washington workshop was held in Olympia, Washington on November 16, 2010. The agendas for each workshop were identical.

Each workshop proceeded according to the following basic structure:

- WCGA staff provided an overview of the context for the ROPFP. This included a review of the funding criteria and existing coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP) priorities as identified by the WCGA and other partnerships. Participants were provided with an opportunity to ask clarifying questions.
- Workshop participants were provided with an extended period of time, in both plenary and breakout settings, to share their views on priorities for CMSP along the West Coast.
- The workshop concluded with WCGA staff describing the next steps to develop the funding proposal and how public input can be submitted. Participants were again provided with the opportunity to ask clarifying questions.

A workshop agenda is included in Appendix 1.

Participants

Fifty-eight participants attended the Washington workshop; the list of workshop participants is attached as Appendix 2. Together, the participants represented a broad variety of stakeholder interests, including Washington conservation groups, local, state, and federal agencies, commercial fishing interests, other ocean users, research institutions, and consulting organizations. Participants provided input during the workshop and on group report forms for consideration by the WCGA to develop a ROPFP proposal.

Bob Nichols, Lisa DeBruyckere (WCGA Ocean Health Coordinator), and Debra Nudelman (Kearns & West Facilitator) convened the workshop.

Context for the Regional Ocean Partnership Funding Program

Lisa DeBruyckere provided context for the ROPFP and reiterated that there is no other public engagement process of this extent being conducted by any other ROP in the country. She then reviewed elements and highlights of the scoping document, emphasizing important deadlines and clarifying sections. In particular, she drew workshop participants' attention to the following goals of the scoping document:

- Highlight West Coast regional priorities;
- Merge concepts in the ocean policy task force, funding program, and WCGA action plan;
- Merge guiding criteria that are needed for the WCGA to compete nationally for this funding
- Bring structure and transparency to a complex issue within a short timeframe.

Lisa also explained other essential elements of the Scoping Document, including the three basic ways to submit ideas for the FFO, which include: 1) Attending workshops; 2) Submitting a 500-word description explaining the proposed project idea via the WCGA website; and 3) Submitting a detailed proposal via the online application tool, also available at the WCGA website.

She defined “regional” projects, explaining that a project does not have to occur at the same level in all three states to be considered a regional priority. In addition, she explained that the WCGA Action Coordination Team (ACT) work plans do not comprehensively address all priorities in the WCGA Action Plan—and that other ideas could help further a regional action plan. She said that it would be helpful to list other actions and partnerships that already exist to further proposed action plans. She said that she hopes workshop participants have a shared understanding that a project proposal may include priorities identified to date in any ACT work plan as well as other ideas beyond those work plans.

Lisa drew the group’s attention to focus on advancing CMSP, and emphasized that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has stated it will give highest priority to projects that advance comprehensive CMSP. She urged collaboration among workshop participants, stating that the WCGA will present the most compelling case if it speaks with a unified voice. There are a limited number of projects that will be funded; the WCGA hopes to propose projects that both incorporate large themes and address a variety of smaller ideas from multiple participants.

She provided an overview of the timeline for submitting project ideas and for the subsequent review by members of the WCGA Executive Committee. She finished her review of the Scoping Document by underscoring its utility as a working document and its main purpose as a point of reference and framework for workshop participants.

In addition, Lisa mentioned her observations from the California and Oregon workshops. She observed that both workshops engaged in discussions about public and tribal stakeholder engagement and how those parallel processes might be funded to further this conversation about robust CMSP plan in the next five years. She then asked for questions regarding the ROPFP process.

One workshop participant asked who was doing Ecosystem-Based Management (EBM). Bob answered that EBM is community-driven, and that there are ample opportunities to support local community engagement.

Another participant asked about CMSP and its relationship to the WCGA. Lisa answered that the WCGA is interested in CMSP as it aligns with West Coast regional priorities. Bob mentioned that a comprehensive CMSP plan is built upon a baseline of information and data, and emphasized that this is a five-year stepwise process. Another follow-up question centered on whether WCGA anticipates a long-range approach, or whether a primary goal is more short-term data synthesis. Bob answered that it is important to attempt to articulate the long-term vision and how these individual proposals sustain and support that long-term goal.

Other questions focused on logistics and the scale of project funding, to which Lisa answered that there is an anticipated \$1 million to \$3.5 million available for each region, but that there is no hard

cap. Others asked how a project will be implemented should it be selected, to which Lisa answered that a fiscal sponsor will disburse the funds for successful projects.

Another participant asked how data will be updated and how they will inform policy decisions in a dynamic global system. Bob answered that there needs to be adaptive management, but cautioned against letting the absence of perfect information prevent forward progress.

Another participant asked for a definition of “West Coast.” Lisa mentioned that the ROPFP defines the West Coast as the state waters and U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (i.e., 200 miles offshore) off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California. In addition to NOAA’s definition in ROPFP, Bob clarified that the West Coast includes all the habitats and areas that affect ocean health, including estuaries, watersheds, and uplands.

Discussion of Regional CMSP Priorities

Plenary Discussion of Regional CMSP Priorities

Debra Nudelman led a plenary discussion of regional CMSP priorities. Reviewing the priorities as identified by the WCGA, workshop participants considered which should be included in the ROPFP proposal, what other priorities should also be included, how these ideas can leverage existing activities, and other suggestions to improve the proposal.

One participant asked how the WCGA process fits into the broader CMSP process. Lisa answered that the WCGA process is part of a multi-phase approach that will lead to the development of a robust coastal and marine spatial plan for the West Coast. The initial funding available through the ROPFP is a result of the ocean policy task force recommendations, and part of the broad vision for national ocean policy. The next step is to develop regional coastal and marine spatial plans, and this funding opportunity is an incremental step towards that larger vision. The relationship of the planning body to the WCGA and ROP has yet to be defined. These topics will be clarified.

Another participant asked whether Focus Area 2 funds will be used for developing these processes and relationships. Lisa answered that, according to the ROPFP, Focus Area 2 funds will be used for the administration of a regional ocean partnership, processes that help inform regional priorities and support stakeholder and tribal engagement, enhanced coordination, and broad participation.

A participant expressed the need for coastal Marine Resource Committees (MRCs) to be included as part of the process. She mentioned that the coastal partnership should be locally-driven during its initial phase, adding that the Washington coast and its resources are different from those of Puget Sound. She said that Washington is independent from California and Oregon in this area. She continued that there needs to be a funding source to carry out CMSP and reiterated that the outer coast needs an administrative entity. A number of participants expressed support for this approach.

Another participant asked about the process for making suggestions and edits to the draft funding proposal, as well as Lisa’s role in the process. Lisa answered that the WCGA funding proposal must be regional in perspective. Stakeholder suggestions can either be coast-wide or state-specific, but state-specific suggestions must fit within a coast-wide perspective. She reiterated that proposals submitted by a state independent of the WCGA are not as strong. She said that all indicators point

to a region-wide funding application. An additional participant stated that information regarding the proposal should be distributed to a coalition of coastal fisheries along the coast.

A participant expressed concern about making CMSP a category that encompasses all ecosystem-based initiatives. He explained that the first step of the CMSP process should be to identify and designate important ecological areas around California, Oregon, and Washington, and to focus on where management authority and priority habitat areas are located. Sea floor habitats are important foraging areas. A regional approach could build an atlas of important ecological areas, plan for siting, and ensure that siting occurs outside of those areas. It is possible to proceed with identifying important ecological areas with data that are currently available, however a necessary next step is to create a central system to begin to identify those areas, and conduct workshops with coastal communities to ground truth the areas. Other participants expressed their interest in collaborating on similar mapping and stakeholder engagement projects in multiple areas along the coast and in Puget Sound. Bob Nichols reiterated that local information feeds into a more comprehensive system, and that there is no distinction between collecting information and MSP.

Another participant said that they view CMSP as mapping, and expressed the need for infrastructure to propagate mapping information that is available to all potential users. He mentioned the need to discuss pre-existing data and identify data gaps that need to be filled and suggested assessing what type of data should be collected to fill those gaps. He also expressed the need to identify and develop the infrastructure to transmit that information in a user-friendly fashion. Another participant asked how to secure the resources to create a centralized infrastructure for all state agencies to maintain and share data.

A number of others agreed, and added that user data from fishermen and recreational interests are as important as ecological data. Others added that it would be helpful to display data for use by scientists and increase compatibility across the region and to add economic data to data sets. Still others expressed the need to build data sets that function both within and across the three states. Many participants agreed that there needs to be a solid infrastructure to communicate those data across the three states through a web portal. One participant said that it would be possible to leverage prior investments given the funding available. Still others added that the process of managing mass quantities of data has already begun, and if people coalesce around a framework and structure for data management, then the three states could move collectively to build a solid system. Another participant suggested the need to anticipate regional needs and develop a way to provide regional solutions. A number of participants suggested a framework for collaboration among scientist, recreational interests, industry, and members of the public.

One participant noted that seafloor mapping is important, and that NOAA will examine funding opportunities to advance local, regional, and national efforts. He mentioned the need to analyze data gaps and define metadata. Others noted that data sets should include a wider range of existing human resource uses, such as shipping.

Bob Nichols responded by explaining that local and statewide data should fit within a regional scale, and reiterated the need for an overarching data set. He asked the group to consider the macro questions: What types of information are needed, and what are the standards of data collection?

Some participants suggested there is a need for an educational component on the broadest level to help explain why CMSP is important and why it is important to collect and synthesize this data and information. They also voiced the need to consider the effects of climate change in the short and long term. The educational component should include visual and online information to indicate that resources are at risk. Another participant queried how best to develop a regionally-coordinated response to the effects of climate change and ocean acidification.

A participant indicated that Washington tribes have been discussing similar topics and mapping has become a priority, especially with regard to bathymetry and backscatter. Habitat mapping combined with biogenic habitat overlays will be a major contribution to the tribal proposal.

Breakout Discussions of Regional CMSP Priorities

Debra Nudelman then provided an overview of the breakout group activity and worked with the group to identify appropriate breakout group topics. Workshop participants self-selected into six breakout groups to discuss additional ideas for consideration in the funding proposal. Each group was asked to develop recommendations and share themes, priorities and consensus ideas with others when the groups reconvened. Although each breakout group had a main focus, there were many overlaps in priorities and themes discussed. The section below highlights key points made during the reports back from the breakout groups to the plenary.

The six breakout groups focused on the following topics:

Group #1: Data Collection

Group #2: Data Synthesis

Group #3: Public Engagement

Group #4: Climate Change

Group #5(a): Decision-Making, Governance and Problem Identification

Group #5(b): Decision-Making, Governance and Problem Identification

After the breakout groups discussed their topics, Debra reconvened the plenary and provided each group with the opportunity to share ideas and to coalesce efforts. Each of the breakout groups reported back and their summaries are as follows:

Group #1: Data Collection

Overarching themes included consolidating all data to assess data gaps and targeting data collection. Emerging priorities were to address what data are missing to complete the mapping of the issues that have been identified along the coast and to strategically fill in those gaps. Consensus ideas included working to fill in the largest data gaps, including: fisheries; near-shore habitat; and benthic and coastal mapping. Cross-regional coastal functions, especially with migratory fish, are critical.

Group #2: Data Synthesis

Overarching themes included: collaborating to make data relevant and accessible to a variety of interests; constructing a framework using seed money to pilot implementation of tools to access and analyze data; developing standards and qualitative priorities; and leveraging existing databases and portals. Emerging priorities were to develop the product in the near-term and provide a capacity for decision-making. Consensus ideas included support for allowing users to access and analyze data; building and maintaining a system incorporating public input; leveraging other federal and state

programs outside of this ROPFP; and providing an avenue for stakeholder groups to be the decision-makers.

Group #3: Public Engagement

An overarching theme included the concept of creating a formal, supported structure for stakeholder involvement. Emerging priorities included addressing the stakeholder component at state and regional levels to fill the “human use” data gap and to provide for and promote public participation. Consensus ideas included developing a lead entity role on the Washington coast and continuing to address the following questions: How can we include stakeholders in the conversation, and How can we ensure funding into the future and what is the timeline?

Group #4: Climate Change

Overarching themes included: determining what data are necessary to conduct climate change data collection regarding sea level, inundation, and near-shore mapping; determining what data layers exist already; inquiring about biological upwelling data along the coast; community resilience; and identifying vulnerabilities by identifying coastal hazards and communities’ ability to incorporate changes. Emerging priorities included integrating climate as one criteria of many that are used in CMSP efforts. Consensus ideas included considering ways to address the uncertainties that make it difficult to incorporate climate change research into a broader policy discussion on the local level, as well as finding overlaps and synergy between the Integrated Ecosystems Assessment Act and Climate Change Act. Other topics included determining how to use traditional and tribal knowledge of coastal natural history and integrating that knowledge into coastal planning and promoting public awareness and education about ocean acidification assessments through partnerships with National Science Foundation and NOAA.

Group #5(a): Decision-Making, Governance and Problem Identification

Overarching themes included considering the most effective way to be governed and how to make decisions at the local level; organizing a governing body on the Washington coast and ensuring equal representation among interested parties; promoting local governance that is congruent with federal and state guidelines; striving for balance between Focus Area One and Focus Area Two; adapting programs and processes that are already in place instead of proposing new structure; continuing to discuss Washington’s intentions about CMSP and identifying specific priority areas; and using renewable ocean energy to invite widespread stakeholder participation.

Group #5(b): Decision-Making, Governance and Problem Identification

Overarching themes included considering how to integrate tribes within the decision-making community as well as the division of governance between the regional, state, and local levels. Developing a governance structure for Washington’s coast and developing an approach for CMSP that is separate from a state ocean caucus. Emerging priorities included conducting a tribal meeting to discuss the ROPFP (which occurred on Wednesday, November 17) and developing a coastal commission and coastal MRCs to begin governance processes. Consensus ideas included collaborating with tribes and states to develop a regional ecosystem and governance structure with a broad coalition of groups and continuing to discuss whether the best decision-making approach would be collaborative or top-down. Other topics discussed included considering the role of Canada in the ROP and addressing seafloor mapping and human uses for data before addressing siting energy facilities.

Lisa then mentioned that Oregon and California workshops included discussions on data synthesis, communication, and information sharing, as well as how the governing structures are organized. Bob added that the state organizing center should be organic within Washington and that a balance needs to be struck between capitalizing on the state's unique resources and opportunities and collaborating as part of a coast-wide effort.

Project Ideas

During a plenary discussion that followed the break out group reporting, Bob invited workshop participants to articulate specific project ideas. The list below highlights these project ideas:

- Develop a project that interfaces data collection and transmittal with users.
- Create a coalition of coastal fisheries and work with the coastal MRC and bring fishermen resources for CMSP.
- Create Ecodapt, an online climate adaptation knowledge exchange. This could serve as a potential model for sharing and connecting people.
- Convene a tribal working group that brings a message to WCGA crafted by local groups including MRCs such as the Ocean Leadership Council for the purposes of funding research on habitat mapping, near-shore assessment, indicator species, and a harmful algal bloom assessment.
- Provide for stakeholder involvement.
- Display data and integrate information to improve compatibility of web atlas applications. The project will: create regional data access and a viewing application, including regional maps to inform policy decisions; facilitate regional discussions and planning processes; and build on work already conducted to establish a process to develop data standards.
- Investigate renewable energy opportunities.
- Enhance governance structure.
- Integrated ecosystem assessment action plan, habitat use for forage fish and genetic work to link habitat uses in collaboration with tribes. Bird migration should be included with fish migration.

Next Steps: Working Toward Achieving West Coast Regional Ocean Partnership Priorities and a Regional Coastal and Marine Spatial Plan

Lisa described the WCGA proposal review process moving forward. She indicated that by the end of all three workshops, the WCGA Executive Committee is likely to have collected 15 to 20 main ideas, and will then consolidate and coalesce those ideas into three to five projects with a key federal funding piece. The Executive Committee will attempt to link people with similar ideas and provide the opportunity for collaboration and synergy. She encouraged workshop participants to inform others if leveraging funds is possible. She followed up by saying that there is no cost-sharing requirement, but it would bolster the competitiveness of the proposal. WCGA will have a fiscal sponsor that disburses funds to the implementing entities.

In developing a response to the ROPFP, the WCGA is aiming to be as transparent as possible. The public is invited to provide direct input on WCGA's response to the ROPFP as well as to share information with other stakeholders. This can be done in three ways:

1. Attend a public workshop in one of the three West Coast states. The webcast of California's workshop will be available online. Workshop summaries will be posted on the WCGA website (www.westcoastoceans.gov) by November 23rd.

2. Submit a comment or idea (500 words or less) at www.westcoastoceans.gov. All submitted comments are public and available for others to read. For consideration in the proposal, comments must be submitted by December 3, 2010.
3. Submit a specific project idea at www.westcoastoceans.gov. Ideas can be submitted via an online survey until November 19th. The survey contains 31 questions, but “N/A” can be submitted for any question without an applicable answer. [A Word document version is also available]

All submitted ideas and proposals will be considered by the WCGA. On November 30th, the WCGA will host a post-workshop webinar to summarize input to date and describe the content of the draft proposal. The public can submit feedback on this proposal until December 3rd. The final proposal will be submitted to NOAA on December 10, 2010. A final decision from NOAA is anticipated in June 2011.

Meeting Summary and Acknowledgements

Deb Nudelman closed substantive discussion, thanked workshop participants for their efforts, and turned the workshop over to Bob Nichols for a meeting summary and acknowledgements.

Bob commended workshop participants for their hard work and effort and expressed appreciation for their willingness to engage in these important discussions.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

This meeting summary respectfully submitted by Kearns & West.

Appendix 1: Workshop Agenda

**WEST COAST GOVERNORS' AGREEMENT ON OCEAN HEALTH WORKSHOPS
ON THE COMPETITIVE NOAA REGIONAL OCEAN PARTNERSHIP
FUNDING PROGRAM**

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2010; 10:00 AM – 4:00 PM

Washington Workshop
Heritage Room at Capitol Lake
604 Water Street
Olympia, Washington 98501
(360) 943-9494

PROPOSED AGENDA

Workshop Objectives:

- Provide overview of the Regional Ocean Partnership Funding Program (ROPFP);
- Identify ideas to advance West Coast regional coastal and marine spatial planning (CMSP) while supporting the full range of West Coast regional ocean priorities to facilitate a coordinated and robust application for funding under the ROPFP; and
- Confirm next steps moving forward.

- 10:00 – 10:30 Welcome, Introductions, Workshop Purpose and Agenda
- Welcome, introductions, workshop purpose – *Bob Nichols, Executive Policy Advisor, Office of the Governor, WCGA State Lead for Washington*
 - Agenda review and workshop objectives – *Debra Nudelman, Kearns & West*
- 10:30 – 11:00 Context for the Regional Ocean Partnership Funding Program including Funding Criteria and Existing CMSP Priorities – *Lisa DeBruyckere, West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health Coordinator*
- Review of funding criteria as outlined in the ROPFP
 - Overview of Existing West Coast CMSP Related Priorities
 - Outline WCGA approach to responding to the ROPFP
 - Question/Answer
- 11:00 – 3:30 Discussion of Regional CMSP Priorities (*lunch provided*)
- (~1.5 hours) Provide feedback on priorities identified in the Scoping Document, including identifying:
 - Which of these priorities, if any, do you agree should be included in the ROPFP proposal?
 - What other priorities should be included, if any?
 - How do these ideas leverage existing activities?
 - What else would you suggest to improve the proposal?
 - Others?

- (~1.5 hours) Break out groups over lunch to identify additional ideas for consideration:
 - Self-select into break out groups with charge to do an assessment of new ideas against selection criteria

- (~1.5 hours) Reconvene plenary to coalesce breakout group efforts; seek areas of alignment, identify and strive to recommend activities with greatest likelihood of ensuring the West Coast can maximize the financial resources it receives to support marine spatial planning that furthers regional priorities for a healthy ocean and vibrant coastal communities:
 - Any overarching themes?
 - Any priorities emerging and why?
 - Any consensus ideas?

3:30 – 4:00

Working Toward Achieving West Coast Regional Ocean Partnership Priorities and a Regional Coastal and Marine Spatial Plan – *Lisa DeBruyckere, West Coast Governors’ Agreement on Ocean Health Coordinator*

- Describe process and logistics for proposal development: brief overview and Q&A about grant application structure and guidance for submitting ideas
- Outline key next steps including:
 - Meeting summaries
 - Webinar
 - Public comment opportunities,
 - ROPFP proposal development schedule until December 10, and
 - Confirm ways to continue engaging with stakeholders as efforts progress beyond December
- Acknowledgements and concluding remarks

4:00

Adjourn

Appendix 2: Washington Workshop Attendees

Name	Affiliation
Dale Beasley	Pacific County Marine Resources Committee
Richard Chwaszczewski	Science Applications International Corporation
Theresa Connor	North Star Strategies, LLC
Dan Crowther	Washington Department of Ecology
Jon Daslea	David Evans & Associates
Garrett Dalan	Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee
Penny Dalton	Washington Sea Grant
Lisa DeBruyckere	West Coast Governors' Agreement on Ocean Health
Eric Delvin	The Nature Conservancy
Matthieu Denuelle	Environmental Systems Research Institute
Ben Enticknap	Oceana
Fred Felleman	Friends of the Earth
Douglas Fricke	Coalition of Coastal Fisheries
Megan Gale	Global Seas
Simon Geerlofs	Marine Sciences Laboratory
Daniel Grant	Kearns & West
H. Gary Greene	SeaDoc/Tombolo
Kathy Greer	Surfrider Foundation
Maryanne Guichard	Office of Shellfish and Water Protection
Jennifer Hagen	Quileute Natural Resources, Quileute Indian Tribe
George A. Hart	Navy Region Northwest
Johan Hellman	Washington Public Ports Association
Eleanor Hines	Surfrider Foundation
Joanna Hobson	Tetra Tech
Katrina Hoffman	University of Washington
Don Hussong	Fugro, Seattle
David Jennings	Puget Sound Partnership
Jody Kennedy	Surfrider Foundation
Doug Kess	Pacific County Marine Resources Committee
Michael Kyte	Nisqually Aquatic Technologies
Gayle Kreitmann	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Suzanne Lawrence	Consultant
Eli Levitt	Department of Ecology
Dayv Lowry	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Dennis Lucia	Nisqually Aquatic Technologies
Brian Lynn	Department of Ecology
Emilio Mayorga	University of Washington
Scott McQueen	Geo Engineers
Key McMurry	Key Environmental Solutions
Crescent Moegling	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Jamie Erin Mooney	Washington State Emergency Management – Coastal Hazards
Tom Newman	Terrasond
Bob Nichols	Office of the Governor

Debra Nudelman	Kearns & West
Richard Osborne	Clallam County, Department of Community Development Natural Resources
Dave Peeler	People for Puget Sound
Karlista Rickerson	SCUBA Diving
Anne Shaffer	Coastal Watershed Institute
Jo Smith	The Nature Conservancy
Shannon Smith	ConsiouSystems
Kathy Taylor	Washington Department of Ecology
James Trask	Washington SCUBA Alliance
Mike Webb	Puget Creek Restoration Society & South Sound Chapter of Surfrider Foundation
Eric Wilkins	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
C. William West	Gordon Thomas Honeywell
Brian Williams	Science Applications International Corporation
Steve Wilson	Washington Trollers' Association
Krystyna Wolniakowski	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation