Executive Summary of TSP Public Comments
March 16, 2012

Oregon's Territorial Sea plan is being amended to find areas suitable for marine renewable energy development in the Territorial Sea. These amendments are being made using a transparent and robust public process, meant to engage stakeholders and solicit input regarding draft recommendations that will ultimately go to the Land Conservation and Development Commission for final adoption. In this effort, the Territorial Sea Plan Working Group held two rounds of public work sessions to solicit public comment on the data and process used to amend the plan, as well as location specific input. Public comments from the first round of work sessions were summarized here. During the second round, the TSPWG held 10 public work sessions in coastal and inland communities over a two-month period. The TSPWG was specifically seeking input on several questions posed at each work session:

1. Do you notice any data gaps?
2. What do you think about our classification of resources /uses?
3. Do you think that our categories of resources /uses are appropriate?
4. How would you define the categories "most /high /moderate /least"?
5. Do you think there should be exclusion areas for wave energy?
6. Do you think there should be opportunity areas for wave energy? If so, what percentage of the Territorial Sea should be made available?
7. Should we be planning for federal waters?

Since the end of the first public work session, approximately 220 comments were collected (this compares to just under 50 for the first round.) The majority (176) were collected during the public work sessions held on the coast. Additionally, comments were submitted online through http://www.oregonocean.info/ (36), or mailed to the Dept. of Land Conservation and Development (8). The vast majority of comments were made by stakeholders who identified as citizens of Oregon, i.e. public-at-large (60). Additionally, comments were made by individuals representing commercial fishers (34), the conservation community (31), non-consumptive recreational users (29), renewable energy industry (24), and local governments (9). Generally, stakeholders expressed appreciation for the opportunity to provide input and optimism in the OPAC process, but many urged a cautious approach to allow for testing and development of the industry until more information about environmental impacts of wave energy could be assessed. As anticipated, this round of work sessions saw many more data and location-specific comments in addition to the questions posed above. While some of the questions posed received few comments, others elicited strong responses from the public. This summary is organized to highlight major comments reiterated over multiple work sessions as well as important comments from individual work sessions. Several comment themes were reiterated by one individual at multiple meetings; those comments are marked with an asterisk.

The themes that emerged from the work sessions were as follows:

1. Do you notice any data gaps?
    - Visual/ Aesthetic Resources (21)*
    - Commercial fishing data /Economic Analysis (10)
    - PCDA Fishing Maps (6)*

2. What do you think about our classification of resources /uses?
    - Move Non-consumptive resource to level 1 (27)*
    - Move Visual resources to level 1 (21)*
    - Move Fishing resources to level 1 (10)
    - Move ESA species data to level 1 (7)*

3. Do you think that our categories of resources /uses are appropriate?
    - Support exclusion category (53)*
        -Near headlands, jetties, and river mouths/harbors (13)
        - Fishing areas (10)
        -ESA species (7)
    - Support development of a comprehensive spatial plan (15)

4. How would you define the categories "most /high /moderate /least"?
    - Tie level of burden to level of protection (2)

5. Do you think there should be exclusion areas for wave energy?
    - Yes (53)*
    - No (5)*

6. Do you think there should be opportunity areas for wave energy?
    - Yes (26)*
        -primarily for testing and development (12)*
        -support fishery consultation /mitigation in siting (20)
        -local government consultation in siting (4)
    - No (6)

7. Should we be planning for federal waters?
    - Yes (5)

In addition to the overall comments described above, regional interests were expressed at public work sessions:

Portland & Eugene (2/2/12)
- General support for the process
- Encouraged inclusion of Surfrider "hotspot" data for Level 1 protection
- Recommended 1000m buffer around undersea cables

Bandon & Brookings (2/10/12)
- Encourage development of spatial plan with protection for fishing areas
- Encouraged inclusion of Surfrider "hotspot" data for Level 1 protection

Camp Rilea & Cannon Beach (2/17/12)
- Recommend mitigation for loss of fishing access
- Express concerns about view shed issues
- Express desire for protection of headlands

Waldport & Reedsport (2/24/12)

- Recommend exclusion at river mouths, jetties, and headlands
- Recommends moving fishing areas to highest level of protection

Depoe Bay & Pacific City (3/6/12)

- Encourage use of PCDA map for fishery protection
- Concerns over view shed issues, state parks

The public comment spreadsheet is organized so that you can sort entries based on forum, date, name, affiliation, or comment type. In addition to the comment summary, each comment is presented in its entirety. Comments received at public work sessions are colored orange and those collected by other means are blue. If you prefer reading comments in an adobe format you can download that here.

I encourage you to read through all the comments and let me know how I can make this more useful to you. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions.

Todd R. Hallenbeck | Sea Grant Fellow
West Coast Governors Alliance
Office of the Governor
635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150 | Salem, OR 97301-2540
Office: (503) 373-0050 ext. 242 | Fax: (503) 378-6033
todd.r.hallenbeck@state.or.us | www.oregon.gov/LCD