

“WE CAN LEAD”: WASHINGTON STATE’S EFFORTS TO ADDRESS OCEAN ACIDIFICATION

Amanda M. Carr*

“[O]cean acidification is not a one-time problem with quick and easy solutions. It is a long-term challenge that requires a sustained effort across [multiple] fronts—global and local source reduction, adaptation and remediation, research and monitoring, and public education—and continued engagement by and with governmental and non-governmental entities, industry, and the public. Maintaining a sustainable and coordinated focus on ocean acidification is necessary for ensuring our long-term success.”¹

ABSTRACT: The world’s oceans have become approximately thirty percent more acidic since the Industrial Revolution and are currently acidifying at a rate ten times faster than anything the earth has experienced over the last fifty million years. Washington State is undertaking a groundbreaking effort to address ocean acidification, a global issue that has serious implications for the world’s oceans, marine ecosystems, and the individuals and communities that depend upon the services that they provide. These localized actions, in isolation, will be insufficient to effectively combat and adapt to the acidification of marine waters. While acknowledging this generally accepted premise, Washington has

* Amanda Carr, J.D. is a partner at Plauché & Carr LLP, a natural resources and environmental law firm based in Seattle, Washington. Thank you to Jessica Anderson for providing invaluable research for and review of this article. Additional thanks to three anonymous peer reviewers for their thoughtful review and comments.

The title of this article is derived from a statement by Washington State Governor Christine Gregoire regarding Washington’s ability to address ocean acidification. ERIC SCIGLIANO, SWEETENING THE WATERS: THE FEASIBILITY AND EFFICACY OF STRATEGIES TO PROTECT WASHINGTON’S MARINE RESOURCES FROM OCEAN ACIDIFICATION 7 (Eric Swenson ed. 2012) (“As the first effort of its kind, Washington’s initiative—starting with the launch of Governor Gregoire’s Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification and continuing into the implementation of measures to tackle the problem—is being closely watched around the country and around the world. Governor Gregoire famously summed up the responsibility and the opportunity that come with this mission in a single word. When asked what a small state like Washington could do about a global problem such as ocean acidification, she replied: ‘Lead.’”).

1. WASHINGTON STATE BLUE RIBBON PANEL ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION: FROM KNOWLEDGE TO ACTION, WASHINGTON STATE’S STRATEGIC RESPONSE, at 20 (H. Adelsman & L. Whitely Binder eds., 2012).

nonetheless determined to become a leader in responding to ocean acidification. This article discusses several reasons why this issue is being addressed at the state level and by Washington in particular, and examines the successes and challenges of, and lessons that can be learned from, Washington's response to ocean acidification.

I.	INTRODUCTION	190
II.	WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT OCEAN ACIDIFICATION: CAUSES, STATUS, SOLUTIONS, AND IMPACTS.....	191
	A. An Emerging Understanding.....	192
	B. Why Ocean Acidification Matters to Washington State	197
	1. Regional Contributors to Ocean Acidification...	197
	2. Regional Impacts of Ocean Acidification.....	198
III.	STATE AND FEDERAL LEGAL AVENUES TO ADDRESS OCEAN ACIDIFICATION.....	200
IV.	WASHINGTON STATE'S RESPONSE.....	205
	A. Washington Shellfish Initiative.....	206
	B. Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification	208
	C. The Panel's Recommendations: Key Early Actions.....	211
V.	THE REACH OF THE BLUE RIBBON PANEL ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION	219
	A. State Implementation of the Blue Ribbon Panel's Recommendations	220
	1. Governor's Executive Order 12-07 and Budget	221
	2. University of Washington Ocean Acidification Impacts and Adaptation Center	223
	3. Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction (SB 5802).....	224
	4. Washington Marine Resources Advisory Council (SB 5603).....	225
	B. Other States' Efforts: Oregon and California.....	226
	C. EPA Assessment of Water Quality Criteria Relevant to Ocean Acidification.....	227
VI.	WHAT OTHER STATES CAN LEARN FROM WASHINGTON'S EFFORTS	230
	A. Challenges and Limitations.....	230
	B. Successes	233
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	235

I. INTRODUCTION

The oceans' absorption of anthropogenic (human generated) carbon dioxide (CO₂) causes changes to marine chemistry and biology. Our understanding of the chemical reactions that result from this absorption is relatively well developed; our understanding of the impacts to the oceans' species and ecosystems is not. The impacts are, however, expected to be severe.

The first signs of these biological impacts occurred within the past decade when commercial shellfish hatcheries in the Pacific Northwest experienced an unprecedented die-off of larval oysters. This prompted hatchery operators to reach out to researchers and request assistance in determining the cause.² Washington's shellfish resource and industry are important to the State, which stands to incur substantial losses in an increasingly acidified marine environment.

Early partnerships on this issue between the shellfish industry and the scientific community served as a catalyst for State action. In 2011, Washington announced a Shellfish Initiative that included a commitment to take a leadership role in investigating the sources of and solutions to ocean acidification.³ Changing the trajectory of ocean acidification will require a global reduction in CO₂ emissions that is largely out of the State's control; nonetheless, Washington's work under its Shellfish Initiative places it at the forefront of efforts to address what is becoming widely known as "the other CO₂ problem." Whether Washington State can sustain this leadership effort in the long term remains to be seen. What is certain is that we as a State will need to find ways to adapt to the changes ahead.

Part I of this article provides a summary of the sources and anticipated impacts of ocean acidification. It includes an explanation of why Washington's waters are experiencing acidification earlier and more acutely than most other areas of the planet, and what Washington stands to lose if ocean

2. See WASHINGTON STATE BLUE RIBBON PANEL ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION: OCEAN ACIDIFICATION: FROM KNOWLEDGE TO ACTION, WASHINGTON STATE'S STRATEGIC RESPONSE, at xi (H. Adelsman & L. Whitely Binder eds., 2012) [hereinafter BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT].

3. STATE OF WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON SHELLFISH INITIATIVE (2011) [hereinafter WASHINGTON SHELLFISH INITIATIVE].

acidification is not addressed. It provides information on how and why Washington's shellfish resources and industry have influenced the State's response to ocean acidification. Part II sets forth the legal avenues available to state and federal governments to address ocean acidification. Part III provides an overview of the State's recent efforts to address ocean acidification through the formation of the Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification ("Blue Ribbon Panel" or "Panel") under the Washington Shellfish Initiative, and includes a summary of that Panel's recommendations. Part IV examines the influence of the Blue Ribbon Panel and the implementation of its recommendations to date. Efforts to address ocean acidification in the areas of law, policy, legislation, research, coordination, education and outreach are occurring at the regional, national, and international levels; this part summarizes a number of these processes and actions and describes how Washington's leadership has influenced them. Part V discusses lessons that other states can take from Washington's efforts, including the role of public-private partnerships and the importance of localized adaptation. Ultimately, this article explains why taking early and sustained local action is critical even in the face of a problem that clearly requires national and international solutions.

II. WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT OCEAN ACIDIFICATION: CAUSES, STATUS, SOLUTIONS, AND IMPACTS

We have known for some time that the oceans are absorbing a significant amount of human-generated CO₂ emissions. Historically, this was generally considered a beneficial phenomenon; the world's oceans act as a massive carbon sink, removing and storing CO₂ from the atmosphere and slowing the rate of global warming.⁴ We have recently become aware, however, that this valuable mitigation measure results in chemical and biological changes to the ocean and its organisms and ecosystems. This phenomenon has been referred to as "the other CO₂ problem" (climate change, of course, being the

4. See, e.g., Ben I. McNeil, *Significance of the Oceanic CO₂ Sink for National Carbon Accounts*, 1 CARBON BALANCE MGMT. (2006), <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1550387/> (discussing the inclusion of coastal nations' exclusive economic zones as carbon sinks when calculating a nations' carbon emissions and reductions).

“primary” CO₂ problem).⁵ The 550 billion tons of anthropogenic CO₂ that the world’s oceans have already absorbed is anticipated to cause a “profound long-term impact” on marine chemistry and biology.⁶

A. *An Emerging Understanding*

The first sign of trouble appeared in the Pacific Northwest less than a decade ago. From 2005 to 2009, two commercial shellfish hatcheries in Washington and Oregon suffered massive die-offs of Pacific oyster larvae.⁷ During that same timeframe, wild Pacific oysters in areas of the Pacific Northwest where they have naturalized failed to successfully reproduce.⁸ The failed natural reproduction coupled with significant hatchery production problems in two of the main West Coast shellfish hatcheries threatened the viability of much of the West Coast shellfish industry, which is dependent upon hatcheries and wild reproduction for seed.⁹

Initially, the die off of larvae in hatcheries was thought to be caused by blooms of a strain of bacteria called *Vibrio tubiashii* flourishing in oxygen-starved dead zones.¹⁰ As hatchery operators, researchers, and others worked to understand the source of the problem, an alternate theory emerged: that the ocean’s absorption of anthropogenic CO₂ was increasing the concentration of hydrogen ions and reducing the pH and the dissolved carbonate ion concentration, as well as the aragonite

5. Ryan P. Kelly & Margaret R. Caldwell, *Ten Ways States Can Combat Ocean Acidification (and Why They Should)*, 37 HARV. ENVTL. L. REV. 57, 58 (2013); Scott C. Doney et al., *Ocean Acidification: The Other CO₂ Problem*, 1 ANN REV. MARINE SCI. 169, 170 (2009); *Ocean Acidification*, NAT’L OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMIN., [http://www.pmel.noaa.gov/co2/story/Ocean+Acidification_\(last visited Nov. 23, 2013\)](http://www.pmel.noaa.gov/co2/story/Ocean+Acidification_(last+visited+Nov.+23,+2013)).

6. WASHINGTON STATE BLUE RIBBON PANEL ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION, SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY OF OCEAN ACIDIFICATION IN WASHINGTON STATE MARINE WATERS, at 4 (2012) [hereinafter BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY].

7. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at xi.

8. Elizabeth Grossman, *Northwest Oyster Die-offs Show Ocean Acidification Has Arrived*, ENVIRONMENT 360 (Nov. 23, 2011), http://e360.yale.edu/feature/northwest_oyster_die-offs_show_ocean_acidification_has_arrived/2466/.

9. Craig Welch, *Oysters in Deep Trouble: Is the Pacific Ocean’s Chemistry Killing Sea Life?*, SEATTLE TIMES (June 14, 2009), http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2009336458_oysters14m.html.

10. Ralph A. Elston et al., *Re-emergence of Vibrio tubiashii in Bivalve Shellfish Aquaculture: Severity, Environmental Drivers, Geographic Extent and Management*, DIS. AQUAT. ORG. 82: 119-134 (2008); Kenneth R. Weiss, *A Warning from the Sea*, L.A. TIMES (July 13, 2008), <http://articles.latimes.com/2008/jul/13/local/me-oysters13>.

and calcite saturation states of coastal marine waters, which was having a significant and adverse effect on larval oysters' ability to form shells.¹¹

The chemical reactions that cause ocean acidification—a reduction in the pH of the ocean over an extended period, typically decades or longer—are well understood. Scientists have demonstrated that ocean chemistry is changing as a result of anthropogenic CO₂ being released into the earth's atmosphere, and can trace the increased input of CO₂ via radio isotopes to the burning of fossil fuels.¹² When CO₂ enters the ocean, it reacts with water to form carbonic acid, releasing hydrogen ions and lowering the ocean's pH.¹³ A portion of the hydrogen ions released by carbonic acid reacts with the ocean's reserves of carbonate ions to produce additional bicarbonate.¹⁴ This reaction depletes the ocean's reserves of carbonate ions.¹⁵

Approximately twenty-five percent of the anthropogenic CO₂ produced since the Industrial Revolution has been absorbed by the world's oceans, resulting in a decrease in surface ocean pH

11. George G. Waldbusser et al., *A Developmental and Energetic Basis Linking Larval Oyster Shell Formation to Ocean Acidification Sensitivity*, 40 GEOPHYSICAL RESEARCH LETTERS 2171 (2013); Press Release, Nat'l Science Foundation, World Oceans Month Brings Mixed News for Oysters (June 11, 2013) available at http://www.nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=128228; Barton et al., *The Pacific Oyster, Crassostrea gigas, Shows Negative Correlation to Naturally Elevated Carbon Dioxide Levels: Implications for Near-term Ocean Acidification Effects*, 57 LIMNOLOGY & OCEANOGRAPHY 698 (2012); A. Whitman Miller et al., *Shellfish Face Uncertain Future in High CO₂ World: Influence of Acidification on Oyster Larvae Calcification and Growth in Estuaries*, 4 PLoS ONE e5661 (2009); Welch, *supra* note 9. There is some debate regarding the extent to which anthropogenic CO₂ (as compared to natural variability) is contributing to lowered ocean pH and the reproduction problems at Pacific Northwest shellfish hatcheries. See Cliff Mass, *Coastal Ocean Acidification: Answering the Seattle Times* (Nov. 18, 2013), available at <http://cliffmass.blogspot.com/2013/11/coastal-ocean-acidification-answering.html>; Cliff Mass, *Ocean Acidification and Shellfish: Did the Seattle Times Get the Story Right?* (Oct. 9, 2013), available at <http://cliffmass.blogspot.com/2013/10/ocean-acidification-and-northwest.html>.

12. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at xi (while ocean acidification is caused primarily by uptake of CO₂ from the atmosphere, it can also be caused by other chemical additions or subtractions from the ocean). BANKOKU SHINRYOKAN, INT'L PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE (IPCC), WORKSHOP REPORT: IMPACTS OF OCEAN ACIDIFICATION ON MARINE BIOLOGY AND ECOSYSTEMS 37 (2011); see also BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 3.

13. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at 4 (The concentration of hydrogen ions is measured by the pH scale; the pH scale is the negative log of the hydrogen ion concentration.).

14. *Id.*

15. *Id.*

by approximately 0.1 pH units over the past two hundred and fifty years.¹⁶ Although this may not seem like a significant change, this represents an approximately thirty percent increase in acidity over this time period.¹⁷ The rate of change is also alarming: the ocean is acidifying ten times faster today than it has over the last fifty million years. This rate is higher than it has been at any time in the last 100 million years.¹⁸ The rate also appears to be accelerating faster than anticipated. For example, recent modeling demonstrated that the pace of acidification off the California coast will occur far faster over the next four decades than previously expected.¹⁹

In contrast to our understanding of the chemical changes that result from the oceans' absorption of anthropogenic CO₂, our awareness and understanding of how ocean acidification is likely to affect marine species and ecosystems is in its infancy. However, it is clear that the impacts will likely be far reaching and significant. Numerous lab studies have demonstrated the potential of ocean acidification to impact marine life.

Much of the research on ocean acidification impacts to date has focused on its effects on marine calcifiers.²⁰ Marine calcifiers include oysters, clams, scallops, mussels, abalone, crabs, pteropods, corals, barnacles, sea urchins, sand dollars, sea stars, sea cucumbers, and phytoplankton and zooplankton.²¹ Calcifiers depend on carbonate ions for their survival; they are essential "building blocks" they use to build shells or skeletons.²² Reduced dissolved carbonate ion concentrations leads to a reduction in the saturation states of

16. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at xi.

17. *Id.*

18. *Id.*; Jerry Miller & Tom Armstrong, *Study Finds Ocean Acidification Rate is Highest in 300 Million Years, CO₂ is Culprit*, WHITEHOUSE.GOV (March 13, 2012, 13:27 EDT), <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2012/03/13/study-finds-ocean-acidification-rate-highest-300-million-years-co2-culprit>.

19. Nicolas Gruber et al., *Rapid Progression of Ocean Acidification in the California Current System*, 337 *SCIENCE* 6091 (2012); Barbel Honisch, *The Geological Record of Ocean Acidification*, 335 *SCIENCE* 1058 (2012); Lin Edwards, *New model suggests ocean pH falling more rapidly*, Phys.Org (June 15, 2012), <http://phys.org/news/2012-06-ocean-ph-falling-rapidly.html>.

20. Waldbusser et al., *supra* note 11; Press Release, Nat'l Science Foundation, *World Oceans Month Brings Mixed News for Oysters* (June 11, 2013) *available at* http://www.nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=128228; *supra* note 11.

21. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at xiii.

22. *Id.* at 10.

aragonite and calcite (biologically important forms of calcium carbonate), which compromises these organisms' ability to form shells and skeletons.²³

In addition to impairing calcifiers' ability to build shell or skeleton, ocean acidification is expected to impact a diverse range of biological functions in a multitude of species. For example, mussels grown in acidified conditions have weaker byssal threads, the mechanism that allows them to attach to rocks, docks and other hard surfaces.²⁴ Clownfish may also lose their hearing and sense of smell, compromising their ability to avoid predators.²⁵

Until recently, the observed effects of ocean acidification were limited to laboratory studies and relatively controlled environments such as hatcheries. Then, in late 2012, scientists demonstrated for the first time the impacts of ocean acidification on a marine species in its natural habitat.²⁶ Samples of marine snails (pteropods)²⁷ taken from the South Ocean showed evidence of shell dissolution caused by ocean acidification.²⁸

Because scientists have only recently begun to study the potential impacts of climate change, it is challenging to predict how ocean acidification will affect the local and global marine environments—and the people that depend on those environments—at an ecosystem level.²⁹ However, “[g]iven the

23. Waldbusser et al., *supra* note 11; Press Release, Nat'l Science Foundation, World Oceans Month Brings Mixed News for Oysters (June 11, 2013) *available at* http://www.nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=128228; Barton et al., *supra* note 20.

24. Michael J. O'Donnell et al., *Mussel Byssus Attachment Weakened by Ocean Acidification*, 3 NATURE CLIMATE CHANGE 587 (2013); Stephanie P. Ogburn, *Ocean Acidification Weakens Mussels' Grip*, SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=ocean-acidification-weakens-mussels-grip> (last visited Nov. 23, 2013).

25. S.D. Simpson et al., *Ocean Acidification Erodes Crucial Auditory Behavior in a Marine Fish*, BIOLOGY LETTERS (June 1, 2011), <http://rsbl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/early/2011/05/25/rsbl.2011.0293.full.pdf+html>; *Ocean Acidification Leaves Clownfish Deaf to Predators*, SCIENCE DAILY.COM (June 4, 2013), <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/05/110531201221.htm>.

26. N. Bednaršek et al., *Extensive Dissolution of Live Pteropods in the Southern Ocean*, 5 NATURE GEOSCIENCE 881 (2012).

27. *Limacina helicina antarctica*.

28. Bednaršek et al., *supra* note 26.

29. Craig Welch, *Sea Changes Harming Ocean Now Could Someday Undermine Marine Food Chain*, SEATTLE TIMES (Nov. 25, 2012), http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2019765681_pteropods26m.html; *What is Ocean Acidification?*, NAT'L OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMIN., <http://www.pmel.noaa.gov/co2/story/What+is+>

large number of species for which negative responses to [ocean acidification] have been demonstrated, changes in food web structure and function are likely,”³⁰ potentially resulting in long-term shifts in species composition as early as this century.³¹ For example, pteropods are a vital food source for plankton, fish, birds, and whales.³² Pteropods comprise more than fifty percent of the diet of Pacific Northwest pink salmon during the first year of the salmon’s life in the open ocean.³³ A decrease in phytoplankton, which are expected to be affected by ocean acidification, could have significant environmental effects as phytoplankton currently produce approximately half of the oxygen on the planet.³⁴ Additionally, a diminishment in coral reefs, and the ecosystem services they provide, could have dramatic effects to reef systems’ composition and diversity. The economic costs are anticipated to be significant as well. One analysis estimated that the production loss of mollusks (*e.g.*, clams, mussels, oysters), due alone to ocean acidification, would cost over \$1 billion worldwide.³⁵

It is important to note that ocean acidification may not prove to be dire for all marine animals; some species may benefit from ocean acidification. For example, blue crabs, lobsters, and shrimp may grow bigger shells or skeletons as waters become more acidic.³⁶ Seagrasses may also benefit from higher marine levels of CO₂.³⁷ Other species like sea corals and sea urchins

Ocean+ Acidification%3F (last visited Nov. 23, 2013).

30. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at xii.

31. Astrid C. Wittmann & Hans-O. Pörtner, *Sensitivities of Extant Animal Taxa to Ocean Acidification*, 3 NATURE CLIMATE CHANGE 995 (2013).

32. Bednaršek et al., *supra* note 26.

33. *Id.*; Welch, *supra* note 29.

34. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at 64.

35. Daiju Narita, Katrin Rehdanz & Richard SJ Tol, *Economic Costs of Ocean Acidification: A Look into the Impacts on Global Shellfish Projection*, 113 CLIMATIC CHANGE 1049 (2012) (assuming an increasing demand of mollusks with expected income growths combined with a “business-as-usual” emission trend towards the year 2100).

36. Bednaršek et al., *supra* note 26; Welch, *supra* note 29; *Acidic Oceans May Be a Boon for Some Marine Dwellers*, SCIENCE NOW (Dec. 1, 2009), <http://news.sciencemag.org/sciencenow/2009/12/01-01.html> (last visited Nov. 23, 2013).

37. Justin Baker Ries, *Effects of Secular Variation in Seawater Mg/Ca Ratio (Calcite–aragonite Seas) on CaCO₃ Sediment Production by the Calcareous Algae Halimeda, Penicillus and Udotea – Evidence from Recent Experiments and the Geological Record*, 21 TERRA NOVA 323 (2009); *Seagrasses may prosper under high CO₂*, CLIMATE SHIFTS (Oct. 18, 2010), <http://www.climatehifts.org/?p=5911>.

exhibit variable responses that indicate a potential to be able to adapt to increased ocean acidity.³⁸ Both adverse and beneficial impacts of ocean acidification to individual species are likely to contribute to ecosystem-wide effects.

B. *Why Ocean Acidification Matters to Washington State*

Although it is a global problem that will require global solutions, ocean acidification is also a regional issue for Washington State because of the region's susceptibility to acidification, and the potential impacts on the state's environment, economy, and culture.³⁹

1. *Regional Contributors to Ocean Acidification*

Regional contributors exacerbate acidification and its effects on Washington's marine waters. These regional contributors include: upwelling of high-CO₂ ocean waters respiration and hypoxia, natural and anthropogenic freshwater inputs, and the addition of other acidifying gases and wastes.⁴⁰

Upwelling, a wind-driven process that occurs along the Pacific coast of the United States, brings water deep in the ocean up to the surface. This deep ocean water is higher in CO₂ than surface waters, in part because colder water holds more CO₂. The effect is an increase in ocean acidification in areas where upwelling occurs.⁴¹ The water upwelled off of Washington's coast today carries with it anthropogenic CO₂ loads from thirty to fifty years ago, when that water was last at the surface. This means that even if humans reduced CO₂ emissions and other contributors today, marine water upwelling to the surface would continue to increase the acidity of surface waters for the next thirty to fifty years.⁴²

Respiration and low dissolved oxygen levels can also contribute to ocean acidification. Washington's shallow marine waters contain high levels of nitrogen, which leads to algal

38. Melissa H. Pespeni et al., *Evolutionary change during experimental ocean acidification*, 110 PROCEEDINGS OF THE NAT'L ACAD. OF SCI. 6937 (2012); Marcia Malory, *Sea urchins cope with rising CO₂ levels*, PHYS.ORG (April 9, 2013), <http://phys.org/news/2013-04-sea-urchins-cope-co2.html>.

39. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at xi.

40. *Id.* at xi-xii.

41. *Id.* at xi.

42. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 11, 13.

blooms.⁴³ Organic material from these blooms sinks into deeper waters, where it is remineralized back to CO₂ through a process called microbial respiration.⁴⁴ Respiration releases CO₂ into the water column, affecting pH and aragonite saturation rates in a manner similar to the ocean's absorption of atmospheric CO₂.⁴⁵ Anthropogenic inputs of nutrients (including nitrate, phosphate, and iron) result in eutrophication—an increase in the rate or supply of organic matter.⁴⁶ Eutrophication leads to excessive growth of algae and low dissolved oxygen, and has been linked to increased acidification in other areas.⁴⁷

Freshwater also brings both natural and anthropogenic acidification to Washington's marine waters. Freshwater is naturally lower in pH than saltwater.⁴⁸ Freshwater also delivers several carbon species including dissolved organic carbon, particulate organic carbon, dissolved inorganic carbon, and total alkalinity, which can contribute to ocean acidification.⁴⁹

Local sources of other acidifying gases and wastes include motor vehicles, ships, electric utilities, and agricultural activities.⁵⁰ These sources release CO₂, nitrogen oxide, and sulfur oxide gasses into the atmosphere.⁵¹ These gases result in nitric acid and sulfuric acid, which when added to marine waters lower pH and increase acidity.⁵²

2. *Regional Impacts of Ocean Acidification*

Ocean acidification has the potential to significantly impact Washington State in a number of ways. One notable example is ocean acidification's anticipated effects on mollusks such as clams, mussels, and oysters. Shellfish play a significant role in Washington State's economy, culture, and environment.

43. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at 12.

44. *Id.*

45. *Id.*

46. *Id.* at 13-14.

47. *Id.*

48. *Id.* at 15.

49. *Id.*

50. *Id.* at 14.

51. *Id.*

52. *Id.*

Washington is the top producer of farmed clams, oysters and mussels in the nation, with an annual value of over \$107 million.⁵³ People have been farming shellfish in Washington since the mid-1800s.⁵⁴ Today, the state's shellfish industry directly and indirectly employs over 3200 people and annually contributes an estimated \$270 million to the state's economy.⁵⁵ Shellfish farmers are significant private employers in rural coastal areas of Washington.⁵⁶ In Pacific and Mason counties alone, the industry generates over \$27 million annually in payroll.⁵⁷ Although the hope is that this historic industry will be able to employ adaptation measures that allow it to continue to thrive in Washington, the threat of acidification has already led shellfish companies to relocate a portion of their businesses from Washington to Hawaii as part of their adaptation strategy.⁵⁸

Washington's recreational shellfishing activities are also economically and culturally significant.⁵⁹ Over 300,000 licenses are purchased annually to harvest shellfish, providing over \$3.3 million of revenue to the state.⁶⁰ On average 244,000 digger trips are made per season for recreational razor clam harvest on Washington's coast bringing an estimated \$22 million to coastal economies.⁶¹ In addition, an estimated 125,000 shellfish harvesting trips are made annually to Puget Sound beaches, representing an estimated net economic value

53. WASHINGTON SHELLFISH INITIATIVE, *supra* note 3, at 1.

54. WASHINGTON SEA GRANT, SMALLISH-SCALE SHELLFISH FARMING FOR PLEASURE AND PROFIT IN WASHINGTON, at 2 (2002), available at <http://wsg.washington.edu/mas/pdfs/smallscaleoysterlr.pdf>.

55. WASHINGTON SHELLFISH INITIATIVE, *supra* note 3, at 1.

56. Shellfish growers are the largest private employer in Pacific County and the second largest in Mason County, according to surveys from the early 2000s. WASHINGTON SHELLFISH INITIATIVE, *supra* note 3, at 1.

57. *Id.*

58. John Stark, *Bellingham Audience Told Glaciers, Oysters Show Climate Change Impacts*, BELLINGHAM HERALD (November 21, 2013), <http://www.bellinghamherald.com/2013/11/21/3328354/bellingham-audience-told-glaciers.html>; Craig Welch, *Sea Change: Oysters Dying as Coast is Hit Hard*, SEATTLE TIMES (September 12, 2013), <http://apps.seattletimes.com/reports/sea-change/2013/sep/11/oysters-hit-hard/>; Craig Welch, *Willapa Bay Oyster Grower Sounds Alarm, Starts Hatchery in Hawaii*, SEATTLE TIMES (June 21, 2012), http://seattletimes.com/html/localnews/2018496037_oysters22m.html.

59. WASHINGTON SHELLFISH INITIATIVE, *supra* note 3, at 2.

60. *Id.* at 2.

61. *Id.*

of \$5.4 million.⁶²

Shellfish have also played a significant role in the diets and economies of western Washington Native American tribes for thousands of years.⁶³ Historically, tribes harvested clams, oysters, and other shellfish for consumption, and also traded them across a large regional intertribal network.⁶⁴ Today, Washington tribes engage in commercial, ceremonial, and subsistence harvest of shellfish including Pacific oysters; native littleneck, manila, and geoduck clams; Dungeness crab; and shrimp. All are calcifiers threatened by ocean acidification.⁶⁵

In Washington's marine waters, as with the global marine ecosystem, ocean acidification is expected to significantly impact food web structures and functions, as well as individual species.⁶⁶ Over thirty percent of Puget Sound's marine species are calcifiers including oysters, clams, scallops, mussels, abalone, crabs, geoducks, barnacles, sea urchins, sand dollars, sea stars, sea cucumbers, and some seaweeds.⁶⁷

III. STATE AND FEDERAL LEGAL AVENUES TO ADDRESS OCEAN ACIDIFICATION

Both the Clean Water Act⁶⁸ (CWA) and the Clean Air Act⁶⁹ (CAA) are available to combat the drivers of ocean acidification.⁷⁰ Under these statutes, the federal government

62. *Id.*

63. *Shellfish*, NORTHWEST INDIAN FISHERIES COMM'N, <http://nwifc.org/about-us/shellfish/> (last visited Nov. 23, 2013).

64. NW. INDIAN FISHERIES COMM'N, TRIBAL NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT: A REPORT FROM THE TREATY INDIAN TRIBES IN WESTERN WASHINGTON, at 7 (2013), available at <http://nwifc.org/wp-content/uploads/2008/07/NWIFC-Annual-Report-2013.pdf>.

65. *Id.* at 6.

66. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at xii.

67. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 5.

68. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251-1387 (2012) (congressional goal includes restoration and maintenance of chemical integrity of Nation's waters).

69. 42 U.S.C. § 7401 (2012) (congressional purpose includes protection and enhancement of Nation's air resources to promote public health and welfare).

70. Outside of the CWA and the CAA, commentators have also identified creative paths to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and the discharge of pollutants causing ocean acidification at both the state and federal levels. For an excellent discussion of options available to states to combat ocean acidification, see Kelly & Caldwell, *supra* note 5. For a discussion of ways in which the President and the Executive Branch can

sets thresholds for environmental protection while states are invited to enact more stringent regulations.⁷¹ States also implement, administer, and enforce both acts, though the federal government may step in where a state is delinquent or noncompliant.⁷²

The CWA is the primary mechanism available to states and the federal government to regulate and control the direct deposition of pollutants into marine and fresh waters, including pollutants associated with ocean acidification—nutrients, nitrate, phosphate and iron. In theory, the CWA gives states substantial power to control water pollution.⁷³ The CWA directs states to set water quality standards for bodies of water within their jurisdictions, which includes designating a particular use for the water body and setting water quality criteria to ensure that use goals are met.⁷⁴ Threshold water quality criteria for a subset of pollutants are set out in the Federal Guidelines; states may implement these criteria or may set more protective criteria for particular pollutants.⁷⁵ States may also set criteria for pollutants not covered in the Federal Guidelines, including atmospheric pollutants such as nitrogen oxides and sulphur oxides, which can alter the pH balance and contribute to acidification when deposited in marine waters.⁷⁶

combat climate change without the participation of Congress, see Chris Wold, *Climate Change, Presidential Power, and Leadership: "We Can't Wait"*, 45 CASE W. RES. J. INT'L L. 303 (2012).

71. See 33 U.S.C. § 1370 (2012); 42 U.S.C. § 7416 (2012). To a more limited extent, tribes also have authority to enforce and administer air and water pollution laws within their jurisdictions. See 33 U.S.C. § 1377; 42 U.S.C. § 7601(d). These statutes also provide avenues of engagement for concerned citizens, including citizen suits aimed at forcing state and federal agencies to meet their responsibilities under both acts. For example, the Center for Biological Diversity recently sued the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"), alleging that the EPA violated the CWA when it approved Washington's and Oregon's lists of impaired water bodies that improperly excluded waters impaired by ocean acidification. *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. EPA*, No. 2:13-cv-01866-JLR (W.D. Wash. 2013); see Section V(C), *infra*.

72. See, e.g., 33 U.S.C. § 1313; 42 U.S.C. § 7410.

73. *Shell Oil Co. v. Train*, 585 F.2d 408, 410 (9th Cir. 1978).

74. 33 U.S.C. § 1313(d)(1)(A) (2012); 40 C.F.R. §§ 131.2, 131.6 (2012).

75. 33 U.S.C. § 1314(a) (2012).

76. See Anil J. Antony, *Shotguns, Spray, and Smoke: Regulating Atmospheric Deposition of Pollutants Under the Clean Water Act*, 29 UCLA J. ENVTL. L. & POLY 215, 268 (2011); ENVTL. PROT. AGENCY, FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT ATMOSPHERIC DEPOSITION: A HANDBOOK FOR WATERSHED MANAGERS, at 2 (2001), available at http://www.epa.gov/oar/oaqps/gr8water/handbook/airdep_sept.pdf.

States also play a key role in ensuring compliance with water quality standards by issuing National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits to individual point sources of pollution such as wastewater treatment plants.⁷⁷ A permitted entity must comply with federally set, technology-based effluent limitations standards.⁷⁸ As with water quality criteria, states may choose to set technology-based controls for point sources that are more protective than those set by the federal government. States may, for example, target large contributors of pollutants associated with ocean acidification.⁷⁹ If technology-based standards are insufficient to ensure that a water body meets water quality standards, an NPDES permit may incorporate water quality-based discharge limits.⁸⁰

Finally, if a water body is designated as impaired because it does not meet water quality standards, the CWA requires states to set Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for each pollutant contributing to the impairment.⁸¹ The responsibility for meeting TMDLs is spread between point sources of pollution regulated via the NPDES program and non-point sources of pollution.⁸² The CWA leaves the states with exclusive authority to control nonpoint sources of pollution, though in practice this authority is seldom exercised.⁸³

77. 33 U.S.C. § 1342 (2012).

78. *Id.* at § 1311(b)(1)(C) (2012).

79. Kelly & Caldwell, *supra* note 5, at 72-74. For example, Washington State has modified the federal technology standards for combined waste treatment facilities and municipal water treatment plants. Wash. Admin. Code § 173-220-130(1) (2012).

80. 33 U.S.C. § 1312 (2012); *see also*, PUD No. 1 of Jefferson Cnty. v. Wash. Dep't of Ecology, 511 U.S. 700 (1994).

81. 33 U.S.C. §§ 1311(b)(1)(C), 1313(d) (2012); 40 C.F.R. § 130.32(c) (2013). Note that a change in the use designation portion of a water quality standard may move the water body into "impaired" status, triggering the protective TMDL process. Kelly & Caldwell, *supra* note 5, at 80-81.

82. 40 C.F.R. § 130.2(i) (2013); *Friends of Pinto Creek v. EPA*, 504 F.3d 1007, 1014-15 (9th Cir. 2007).

83. *Friends of Pinto Creek*, 504 F.3d at 1014-15; *Pronsolino v. EPA*, 291 F.3d 1123, 1128 (9th Cir. 2002). For a good discussion of the "toothless" TMDL program and the failure of states to regulate nonpoint sources under the CWA, see Oliver A. Houck, *The Clean Water Act Returns (Again): Part I, TMDLs and the Chesapeake Bay*, 41 ENVTL. L. REP. NEWS & ANALYSIS 10208 (2011). It is worth noting that Washington's Department of Ecology has exercised its authority to control nonpoint sources of pollution under Washington's Water Pollution Control Act, Chapter 90.48 RCW. This authority was recently upheld by the Washington State Supreme Court. *Lemire v. Dep't of Ecology*, 309 P.3d 395, 401-02, 178 Wash. 2d 227, 240-41 (2013) (en banc).

Nevertheless, the control of point and nonpoint sources remains a powerful weapon in state arsenals, and one that could effectively limit pollutants such as nutrients and nitrates, which impact marine pH.

The CAA is the primary existing mechanism available to states and the federal government to combat atmospheric drivers of ocean acidification such as CO₂.⁸⁴ The CAA regulates stationary and mobile sources of air pollutants and sets regional air quality goals through the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) program.⁸⁵ Responsibility under the NAAQS program is divided between states and the federal government: the EPA establishes NAAQS for a list of “criteria pollutants,”⁸⁶ while the authority to regulate polluters’ compliance with the NAAQS is left to the states.⁸⁷ In places that are designated as attainment areas under NAAQS, major emitting facilities must comply with the Prevention of Serious Deterioration provisions of the Act and employ best available control technology;⁸⁸ in nonattainment areas, new emitters must comply with the EPA’s lowest achievable emissions rate technology standards.⁸⁹ Outside of the NAAQS program, the CAA also requires new emitters within defined source categories to meet New Source Performance Standards⁹⁰ and new motor vehicles to comply with defined emissions standards.⁹¹

CO₂ and other greenhouse gases are not criteria pollutants

(holding that the Department of Ecology acted within its authority in issuing administrative order pursuant to Water Pollution Control Act requiring livestock rancher to address conditions that resulted in substantial potential for nonpoint source pollution on his property).

84. Commentators have argued for and against regulating greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act. *See, e.g.,* Jonathan Miller, *Double Absurdity: Regulating Greenhouse Gas Under the Clean Air Act*, 47 HOUS. L. REV. 1389, 1404 (2011) (against); Scott Schang & Teresa Chan, *Federal Greenhouse Gas Control Options from an Enforcement Perspective*, 2 SAN DIEGO J. CLIMATE & ENERGY L. 88 (2010) (for).

85. 42 U.S.C. §§ 7407-11 (2012); 40 C.F.R. Part 50 (2013).

86. 42 U.S.C. § 7408 (2012). The EPA has set NAAQS for six criteria pollutants. *National Ambient Air Quality Standards*, ENVTL. PROT. AGENCY, <http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html> (last visited Nov. 23, 2013).

87. 42 U.S.C. § 7410 (2012) (requiring states to adopt state implementation plans).

88. *Id.* at §§ 7471, 7472, 7479.

89. *Id.* at §§ 7502(a)(2)(A); 7503(a).

90. *Id.* at § 7411; 40 C.F.R. Part 60 (2013).

91. 42 U.S.C. § 7521 (2012).

and until recently were not regulated under the CAA. That changed following the landmark 2009 Supreme Court decision *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency*,⁹² in which the Court held that greenhouse gases fell within the CAA's definition of "air pollutant" and could be regulated under the Act.⁹³ The Court opined that if the EPA made a determination that greenhouse gases caused or contributed to air pollution detrimental to human health (an "endangerment finding"), the EPA would be required to regulate their emissions.⁹⁴ Soon thereafter, the EPA made an endangerment finding for CO₂ and six other greenhouse gases, opening the door to regulating these gases under both mobile and stationary source provisions of the Act.⁹⁵ The EPA followed its endangerment finding with rules limiting greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles⁹⁶ and proposed rules limiting their emissions from new and existing power plants.⁹⁷

Outside of the CAA context, Congress also has the authority to enact legislation to control or limit greenhouse gas emissions. Though Congress has entertained numerous pieces of such legislation in recent years, none of the proposed bills passed.⁹⁸ Where Congress has stumbled, however, state and

92. *Mass. v. Env'tl. Prot. Agency*, 549 U.S. 497 (2009).

93. *Id.* at 528.

94. *Id.* at 533 (opining that if greenhouse gases caused or contributed to air pollution that was detrimental to human health or welfare, the EPA was required to regulate their emissions from new motor vehicles under 42 U.S.C. § 7521(a)(1)).

95. EPA, Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings from Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, 40 C.F.R. Ch. 1 (2009).

96. *See, e.g.*, EPA & Nat'l Highway Traffic Safety Admin, Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards, Final Rule, 40 C.F.R. Parts 85, 86, and 600; 49 C.F.R. Parts 532, 533, 536 (2010).

97. In 2010, President Obama directed the EPA to write new rules to limit emissions from new and existing power plants under Section 111 of the CAA. Memorandum on Power Sector Carbon Pollution Standards, 78 Fed. Reg. 39,533 (June 25, 2013). The first of these rules, applicable to new power plants, was announced on schedule on September 20, 2013, rules limiting emissions from existing power plants are expected by June 1, 2014. News Release, EPA, *EPA Proposes Carbon Pollution Standards for New Power Plants* (Sept. 20, 2013), available at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/0/da9640577ceacd9f85257beb006cb2b6!OpenDocument>.

98. For example, three prominent bills were introduced in the House and Senate in the 111th Congressional Term alone, none of which passed: The American Clean Energy and Security Act, H.R. 2454, 111th Cong. (2009); the American Power Act, S. Discussion Draft, 111th Cong. (2010); and the Carbon Limits and Energy for America's Renewal Act, S. 2877, 111th Cong. (2009). For a discussion of the legislative tools available to fight climate change, *see, e.g.*, Scott Schang & Teresa Chan, *Federal*

local governments have to some extent taken up the torch, passing greenhouse gas reduction legislation under their own powers.⁹⁹

In addition to the CWA and CAA, Washington and its cities and counties have the authority pursuant to several state laws to reduce local contributors to ocean acidification such as nitrogen, phosphate, carbon, and iron. Washington's Growth Management Act,¹⁰⁰ Shoreline Management Act,¹⁰¹ State Environmental Policy Act,¹⁰² Water Pollution Control Act,¹⁰³ Dairy Nutrient Management Act,¹⁰⁴ and Forest Practices Act¹⁰⁵ all provide avenues for local source reduction.¹⁰⁶

IV. WASHINGTON STATE'S RESPONSE

Washington became the first state in the nation to study ocean acidification in depth with the formation of a Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification under the Washington Shellfish Initiative.¹⁰⁷ Although states have existing legal and policy tools at their disposal for mitigating the effects of ocean

Greenhouse Gas Control Options from an Enforcement Perspective, 2 SAN DIEGO J. CLIMATE & ENERGY L. 87, 90 (2010); Robert N. Stavins, *A Meaningful U.S. Cap-and-Trade System to Address Climate Change*, 32 HARV. ENVTL. L. REV. 293, 296 (2008).

99. On December 20, 2005, thirteen Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to implement a Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, a market-based cap-and-trade program that sets a multi-state cap on CO₂ emissions. See REGIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INITIATIVE, <http://www.rggi.org/> (last visited Oct. 29, 2013). On the West Coast, California passed Assembly Bill 32: Global Warming Solutions Act in 2006, setting economy-wide 2020 emissions reduction targets. Cal. Health & Safety Code § 38500 (2007). For an overview of state and local government climate change initiatives, see Kirsten H. Engel & Barak Y. Orbach, *Micro-Motives and State and Local Climate Change Initiatives*, 2 HARV. L. & POL'Y REV. 119 (2008).

100. Wash. Rev. Code § 36.70A (2012).

101. Wash. Rev. Code § 90.58 (2012).

102. Wash. Rev. Code § 43.21C (2012).

103. Wash. Rev. Code § 90.48 (2012).

104. Wash. Rev. Code § 90.64 (2012).

105. Wash. Rev. Code § 76.09 (2012).

106. For a detailed analysis of legal avenues available to Washington to address ocean acidification, see RYAN KELLY & JENNY GROTE STOUTENBURG, WASHINGTON STATE'S LEGAL AND POLICY OPTIONS FOR COMBATING OCEAN ACIDIFICATION IN STATE WATERS (2012), prepared at the request of the Blue Ribbon Panel to assist in its deliberations and included as Appendix 8 to the BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2.

107. WASH. STATE DEP'T OF ECOLOGY, PUB. NO. 13-01-002, FOCUS ON: OCEAN ACIDIFICATION IN WASHINGTON'S WATERS (2013) [hereinafter FOCUS ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION].

acidification,¹⁰⁸ outside of Washington and other West Coast states that have followed Washington's lead,¹⁰⁹ states have taken few actions to date to address this issue.¹¹⁰ This is likely a combination of states' perception that ocean acidification can only effectively be addressed on a national and international scale, and a lack of resources or geographic-specific threats to warrant expending limited resources to address the issue. Washington took action to examine ocean acidification primarily because ocean acidification was already visibly impacting shellfish, an economically, culturally, and environmentally significant resource to the State. In doing so, it recognized that global CO₂ emissions were the largest contributor to ocean acidification, and that effectively addressing ocean acidification necessitated a global reduction in those emissions. Washington's efforts, outlined below, have focused on adaptation, remediation, research, outreach, and local source reduction. Where appropriate, the State has also assumed a leadership role as an advocate for global reduction of CO₂ emissions.

A. *Washington Shellfish Initiative*

Washington State's coordinated efforts to address ocean acidification arose out of the Washington Shellfish Initiative. Launched by then Washington State Governor Christine Gregoire in late 2011, the Washington Shellfish Initiative is a cooperative effort among Washington state government, federal government, tribes, the shellfish industry, and shellfish restoration practitioners.¹¹¹ It is a regional implementation of a National Shellfish Initiative that the National Oceanic and

108. See Kelly & Caldwell, *supra* note 5.

109. See *infra* Part V.B.

110. See Kelly & Caldwell, *supra* note 5, at 102 ("It is difficult to persuade a local, state, or tribal government to spend money out of its very limited budget to mitigate an environmental problem, when the precise harm is uncertain and lies largely in the future. Ocean acidification is not yet a priority for many jurisdictions . . . [with Washington State being a notable exception.]"). As outlined further on in this article, however, Washington has inspired other states to take action.

111. Press Release, *Office of the Governor, Governor Gregoire Announces New Initiative to Create Jobs, Restore Puget Sound: Washington Shellfish Initiative Promotes Clean Water and Creation of Jobs in State's Aquaculture Industry* (Dec. 9, 2011), available at http://www.ecy.wa.gov/news/2011/gov_20111209.html [hereinafter Shellfish Initiative Press Release].

Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) released in June 2011 concurrent with its National Aquaculture Policy.¹¹² Washington was the first state in the country to respond to the National Shellfish Initiative with a regionally focused effort.¹¹³

The Washington Shellfish Initiative's goals are to restore and expand Washington's commercial, tribal, and native shellfish resources, and create green and family wage jobs in Washington State.¹¹⁴ The Washington Shellfish Initiative recognizes that "shellfish aquaculture and commercial and tribal harvest of wild shellfish resources are water-dependent uses that rely on excellent water quality" and that shellfish can be "part of the solution to restore and protect endangered waters," and renews the state's shellfish protection, restoration and enhancement efforts in order to increase recreation and clean water jobs, and to create a healthier Puget Sound and coastal marine waters.¹¹⁵

The Washington Shellfish Initiative creates public/private partnerships for shellfish aquaculture through several objectives: focus on furthering shellfish aquaculture research and streamlining aquaculture permitting; promote native shellfish restoration and recreational shellfish harvest; and take specific actions to ensure clean water to protect and enhance shellfish beds.¹¹⁶ One such action was the convening of a Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, announced as part of the Washington Shellfish Initiative and formally convened in February 2012.¹¹⁷

112. The purpose of NOAA's Aquaculture Policy is to enable the development of sustainable marine aquaculture within the context of NOAA's multiple stewardship missions and broader social and economic goals. Concurrent with its Aquaculture Policy, NOAA launched a National Shellfish Initiative to increase domestic populations of bivalve shellfish through commercial production and conservation activities.

113. NOAA FISHERIES, IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NATIONAL SHELLFISH INITIATIVE: CURRENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND KEY ACTIONS FOR FY13 (2013), *available at* http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/aquaculture/docs/policy/shellfish_init_accomp_04_13.pdf. To date, NOAA has now partnered with five states (Washington, Maryland, Louisiana, Alabama, and California) to expand opportunities for shellfish farming and restoration under the National Shellfish Initiative. *Id.*

114. *Id.*

115. WASHINGTON SHELLFISH INITIATIVE, *supra* note 3, at 1.

116. *See generally id.*

117. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at xvi.

B. *Washington State Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification*

Governor Gregoire convened the Blue Ribbon Panel because of ocean acidification's threat to shellfish, which in turn posed a threat to Washington's economy, culture, and environment.¹¹⁸ Shellfish provide to the state "thousands of jobs, literally hundreds of millions of dollars in commercial and recreational benefits, and . . . a deep cultural heritage."¹¹⁹

The Blue Ribbon Panel was charged with developing "clear, actionable recommendations on understanding, monitoring, adapting and mitigating ocean acidification in Puget Sound and Washington waters."¹²⁰ Governor Gregoire outlined four key science and policy objectives for the Blue Ribbon Panel:

(1) Review and summarize the current state of scientific knowledge of ocean acidification pertinent to Washington State.¹²¹ (The Blue Ribbon Panel was specifically directed to include existing scientific knowledge of the anticipated consequences of ocean acidification on shellfish and other marine species.)¹²²

(2) Identify additional research and monitoring needed in Washington to increase scientific understanding and facilitate connections between science and management actions.¹²³

(3) Develop recommended state actions to respond to ocean acidification, with a focus on using existing laws, regulations, policies, programs, and activities. (These actions were to include ways to reduce ocean acidification's harmful effects on Washington's shellfish industry and other marine resources.)¹²⁴

118. *Governor's Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification: Remarks of Keith Phillips* (TVW television broadcast March 30, 2012), available at http://tvw.org/index.php?option=com_tvwplayer&eventID=2012030125A.

119. *Id.*

120. WASHINGTON SHELLFISH INITIATIVE, *supra* note 3, at 5.

121. WASHINGTON SHELLFISH INITIATIVE: OCEAN ACIDIFICATION BLUE RIBBON PANEL CHARTER (2012), available at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/water/marine/oa/charter.pdf>. This review was intended to build on the work presented at the 2011 Washington Sea Grant Ocean Acidification Symposium [hereinafter BLUE RIBBON PANEL CHARTER. *See id.*

122. *See id.*

123. *See id.*

124. *See id.*

(4) Identify opportunities to improve and expand coordination among levels of government, non-profit organizations, and private businesses, and enhance public awareness and understanding of ocean acidification and how to address it.¹²⁵

The Blue Ribbon Panel's two co-chairs and twenty-six members were comprised of state, federal, local, and tribal government representatives, scientists, nonprofits, public opinion leaders, shellfish industry, and other private industry representatives, and restoration representatives.¹²⁶ The Panel met seven times over the course of 2012.¹²⁷

The Blue Ribbon Panel presented its findings and recommendations in a report to Governor Gregoire in November 2012. The Panel recommended a list of forty-two actions categorized into six "Action Areas": (1) reduce emissions of carbon dioxide; (2) reduce local land-based contributions to ocean acidification; (3) increase our ability to adapt to and remediate the impacts of ocean acidification; (4) invest in Washington's ability to monitor and investigate the causes and effects of ocean acidification; (5) inform, educate and engage stakeholders, the public, and decision makers in addressing ocean acidification; and (6) maintain a sustainable and coordinated focus on ocean acidification.¹²⁸

In addition to the forty-two recommended actions, the Panel's scientific advisors prepared a technical summary of ocean acidification that includes a literature review and summary of research and monitoring capabilities relevant to Washington State, identifies gaps in research and capacity,

125. *See id.*

126. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at iii. The Blue Ribbon Panel was co-chaired by William D. Ruckelshaus, Madrona Venture Group, and Jay J. Manning, Cascadia Law Group. *Id.* The Washington Department of Ecology and Washington Sea Grant provided administrative management and support. *See* BLUE RIBBON PANEL CHARTER, *supra* note 121. Funding for the Blue Ribbon Panel was provided by NOAA, Rockefeller Brothers Funds, the Stanford University Center for Ocean Solutions, Sustainable Fisheries Partnership, the Bullitt Foundation, Ocean Conservancy, the EPA, the University of Washington Climate Impacts Group, the University of Washington College of the Environment, the Washington Department of Ecology, the Washington Department of Natural Resources, and Washington Sea Grant. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at iv. For a summary of Blue Ribbon Panel meetings, see *Ocean Acidification Blue Ribbon Panel*, DEP'T OF ECOLOGY, <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/water/marine/oa/panel.html> (last visited Nov. 23, 2013).

127. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at iii.

128. *Id.* at 9.

and sets forth recommended actions on the scientific front.¹²⁹ The report also provides a technical analysis of region-specific ocean acidification issues in three different areas of Washington: Washington's Outer Coast,¹³⁰ Puget Sound and the Strait of Juan de Fuca,¹³¹ and the Columbia River Estuary and other Washington shallow estuaries.¹³² The report's overarching recommendation was to "[c]reate an ocean acidification science coordination team to promote scientific collaboration across agencies and organizations and connect ocean acidification science to adaptation and policy needs."¹³³

Two key reports that informed the Blue Ribbon Panel's deliberations were included as appendices to its final report. The first, *Washington State's Legal and Policy Options for Combating Ocean Acidification in State Waters*,¹³⁴ was drafted to provide Blue Ribbon Panel members with information about the legal and policy tools available to Washington State to address ocean acidification.¹³⁵ The report sets forth a toolbox of existing and potential options for the state, focusing on existing policy tools, but, at the direction of the Blue Ribbon Panel, does not make any specific recommendations.¹³⁶ Options are categorized by type of input—terrestrial, governed by land use laws; atmospheric, governed by air quality laws; and marine and aquatic, governed by water quality laws.¹³⁷ The report also examines the option of voluntary incentive programs as well as civil and criminal nuisance laws.¹³⁸

The second report, *Sweetening the Waters: The Feasibility and Efficacy of Strategies to Protect Washington's Marine*

129. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at 101-02.

130. *Id.* at 17-26.

131. *Id.* at 27-44.

132. *Id.* at 45-56.

133. *Id.* at 102.

134. KELLY & STOUTENBURG, *supra* note 106. The Center for Ocean Solutions has also published a similar report for California. RYAN P. KELLY & MARGARET R. CALDWELL, WHY OCEAN ACIDIFICATION MATTERS TO CALIFORNIA, AND WHAT CALIFORNIA CAN DO ABOUT IT (2012), available at <http://www.centerforoceansolutions.org/sites/default/files/2012%20Why%20Ocean%20Acidification%20Matters%20to%20California.pdf>.

135. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 51.

136. KELLY & STOUTENBURG, *supra* note 106, at 3.

137. *Id.* at 8.

138. *Id.*

Resources from Ocean Acidification,¹³⁹ analyzes the feasibility, efficacy, benefits, and other consequences of a variety of strategies for addressing ocean acidification.¹⁴⁰ The report looks at options for adaptation (with a focus on shellfish production systems), mitigation (reduction of anthropogenic inputs), and remediation (local and regional scale measures to restore healthy ocean chemistry).¹⁴¹

C. *The Panel's Recommendations: Key Early Actions*

Recognizing the urgent need for source reduction of CO₂ emissions on a global scale, as well as Washington State's limitations in achieving such reduction, the Blue Ribbon Panel recommended that the state provide leadership in regional, national, and international forums to advocate for such reductions. The Panel also recommended taking local mitigation, adaptation, and remediation actions to "buy time" until a global reduction in emissions is achieved.

Washington's shellfish industry and native ecosystems cannot rely on emissions reductions alone, however. Our marine waters are continuing to acidify and reducing carbon dioxide emissions takes time. To rely solely on those reductions would result in significant—and in some cases irreversible—economic, cultural, and environmental impacts. This is why additional local actions, including local source reduction and adaptation and remediation, are absolutely necessary to "buy time" while society collectively works to reduce global carbon dioxide emissions.¹⁴²

Out of its forty-two recommended actions, the Blue Ribbon Panel identified eighteen "key early actions" (KEAs), based on the level of urgency and relative importance. Implementation of these KEAs is "necessary to ensure the continued viability of native and commercial shellfish species [in Washington] and to make real progress against the threat of ocean acidification to [Washington's] marine resources, [Washington's] economy, and

139. ERIC SCIGLIANO, SWEETENING THE WATERS: THE FEASIBILITY AND EFFICACY OF STRATEGIES TO PROTECT WASHINGTON'S MARINE RESOURCES FROM OCEAN ACIDIFICATION 7 (Eric Swenson ed. 2012).

140. *Id.*

141. *Id.* at 5, 7.

142. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at xvii.

jobs that depend on these resources.”¹⁴³ These eighteen KEAs are set forth below, organized by six action areas in the same manner they are categorized by the Blue Ribbon Panel.¹⁴⁴

Action Area 1: Reduce emissions of carbon dioxide. CO₂ emissions are universally recognized as the largest anthropogenic contributor to ocean acidification. The Panel recommended that Washington continue ongoing efforts to reduce emissions at the state level; work with federal and regional partners on emissions reduction; and raise awareness nationally and internationally about the sources of ocean acidification such as CO₂, as well as its consequences.¹⁴⁵

- **KEA 1: Work with international, national, and regional partners to advocate for a comprehensive strategy to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.**¹⁴⁶ Form partnerships to protect marine waters from the threat of acidification, such as agreements to cooperate in scientific initiatives and agreements on pollution reduction. Share knowledge, data, scientific expertise, and potential policy initiatives, and engage in joint outreach to build public awareness.¹⁴⁷

- **KEA 2: Enlist key leaders and policymakers to act as ambassadors advocating for carbon dioxide emissions reductions and protection of Washington’s marine resources from acidification.**¹⁴⁸ Panel members, elected state officials and other leaders can all serve as ambassadors. Develop communications materials and periodically brief ambassadors to ensure that they are conveying up to date information.

Action Area 2: Reduce local land-based contributions to ocean acidification. Nutrients

143. WASH. DEP’T OF ECOLOGY, OCEAN ACIDIFICATION IN WASHINGTON STATE: FROM KNOWLEDGE TO ACTION, GOVERNOR’S PROPOSED 2013-15 BUDGET, PUB. NO. 12-01-018 (2012), available at <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/publications/1201018.pdf> [hereinafter WASH. OCEAN ACIDIFICATION BUDGET].

144. This article discusses only the eighteen KEAs. For a Table of all KEAs, see BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at xx-xxi. For a comprehensive list and detailed discussion of the Blue Ribbon Panel’s forty-two recommended actions, see *id.* 28-91, Appx. 1.

145. *Id.* at 36.

146. *Id.* at 37 (Action 4.1.1.).

147. *Id.*

148. *Id.* at 39 (Action 4.1.4.).

from point and nonpoint sources (such as discharges from municipal and industrial wastewater treatment facilities, large stormwater outfalls, runoff from on-site septic systems, farms, and grazing lands) and organic carbon from living or decaying organic matter release CO₂ into marine waters, lowering pH and contributing to ocean acidification.¹⁴⁹ While the Blue Ribbon Panel recognized that these inputs of nutrients and organic carbon into Washington's waters contributed to ocean acidification, it was unable to ascertain the extent of that contribution. The Panel's recommendations therefore focused on determining the relative influence of local sources on ocean acidification, rather than actually reducing that influence. The Panel also recommended strengthening and enhancing existing nutrient and organic carbon reduction programs. The Panel's report does include two recommended actions to impose stricter controls of nutrients and organic carbon, but does not identify any of these as KEAs, stating that they "should be implemented only if research finds that more substantial reductions . . . are necessary to address ocean acidification."¹⁵⁰

- **KEA 3: Implement effective nutrient and organic carbon reduction programs in locations where these pollutants are causing or contributing to multiple water quality problems.**¹⁵¹ Direct increased resources and political support to strengthen two existing nutrient reduction programs: a stakeholder group in Samish Bay working to reduce pollutant sources that caused a downgrade of commercial shellfish beds in 2011, and a nitrogen removal effort by the LOTT (Lacey, Olympia, Tumwater, and Thurston County) sewage treatment plant designed to reduce nutrient loading into Budd Inlet in South Puget Sound. Implement programs in other areas where nutrient loading is determined to be contributing to ocean acidification, through implementation of best management practices, improved technologies, and innovative approaches such as nutrient trading. Initiate a stakeholder process to evaluate and, if deemed appropriate, design a nutrient trading program for

149. *Id.* at 43.

150. *Id.* at 45.

151. *Id.* at 46 (Action 5.1.1.).

Washington State.

- **KEA 4: Support and reinforce current planning efforts and programs that address the impacts of nutrients and organic carbon.**¹⁵²

Utilize existing regulatory and voluntary programs such as the Growth Management Act, the Shoreline Management Act, Washington State Voluntary Stewardship Program, and the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda to reduce nutrients from nonpoint sources, conserve forest and agricultural land uses to remove nutrients and sequester carbon, and take other measures to manage and reduce nutrients and organic carbon.

Action Area 3: Increase our ability to adapt to and remediate the impacts of ocean acidification. Both adaptation and remediation actions will be necessary to reduce ocean acidification's impacts on native and cultivated shellfish in Washington State. The Panel recommended that the science coordination team¹⁵³ establish a formal process for soliciting, evaluating, and recommending adaptation and remediation measures.

- **KEA 5: Develop vegetation-based systems of remediation for use in upland habitats and in shellfish areas.**¹⁵⁴ Develop phytoremediation techniques to change the chemistry of seawater, either using vegetation to remove nutrients before they enter marine waters or using vegetation in shellfish beds to absorb CO₂ from the water column. Further develop phytoremediation techniques through experiments, field trials, and monitoring to better understand their mitigation potential.

- **KEA 6: Ensure continued water quality monitoring at the six existing shellfish hatcheries and rearing areas to enable real-time management of hatcheries under changing pH conditions.**¹⁵⁵ Secure funding to maintain and improve current monitoring of pH, pCO₂, salinity, temperature, and dissolved oxygen at intake lines at two shellfish hatcheries in Washington and a third shellfish hatchery in Oregon, and three sites in Willapa Bay on Washington's Coast. As a result of this monitoring,

152. *Id.* at 48 (Action 5.1.2.).

153. BLUE RIBBON PANEL SCIENTIFIC SUMMARY, *supra* note 6, at 102.

154. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 56 (Action 6.1.1.).

155. *Id.* at 58 (Action 6.2.1.).

hatcheries are able to conduct operations when CO₂ levels are lower and pH levels are higher, helping to ensure successful operations. This monitoring also helps inform scientific understanding of ocean acidification and its impacts.

- **KEA 7: Investigate and develop commercial-scale water treatment methods or hatchery designs to protect larvae from corrosive seawater.**¹⁵⁶ Overcome “significant engineering, design, and research hurdles” and develop (i) a means of changing marine water chemistry as it enters the hatchery in a manner that reduces its harmful effects, and (ii) close-loop hatchery systems.

- **KEA 8: Identify, protect, and manage refuges for organisms vulnerable to ocean acidification and other stressors.**¹⁵⁷ Locate such refuges in areas that currently, or have the potential to, protect vulnerable species such as shellfish from ocean acidification. Preserve them so they can be utilized to address future needs, and use them to test shellfish adaptation and remediation methods.

Action Area 4: Invest in Washington’s ability to monitor and investigate the causes and effects of ocean acidification. The Blue Ribbon Panel concluded that significant research is needed to understand the sources and impacts of ocean acidification before decisions can be made about where to expend limited resources. The Panel called for research in four key areas: (1) understand the status of and trends in ocean acidification in Washington’s marine waters; (2) quantify the relative contribution of different [global and local] acidifying factors to ocean acidification in Washington’s marine waters; (3) understand the biological responses of local species to ocean acidification and associated stressors; and (4) develop capabilities to identify real-time corrosive seawater conditions, as well as short-term forecasts and long-term predictions of global and local acidification effects.

- **KEA 9: Establish an expanded and sustained ocean acidification monitoring network to measure trends in local acidification**

156. *Id.* at 60 (Action 6.2.3.).

157. *Id.* at 62 (Action 6.3.2.).

conditions and related biological responses.¹⁵⁸

Expand the state's existing monitoring sites to form a sustained monitoring network in a manner that will allow scientists to "discern trends across space and over time" and "evaluate the relationships between changing chemical conditions and biological responses"¹⁵⁹

- **KEA 10: Quantify key natural and human-influenced processes that contribute to acidification based on estimates of sources, sinks, and transfer rates for carbon and nitrogen.**¹⁶⁰ Develop a budget that shows the degree to which various sources of carbon and nitrogen contribute to regional ocean acidification, and what role these sources can be anticipated to play in the future.

- **KEA 11: Determine the associations between water and sediment chemistry and shellfish production in hatcheries and in the natural environment.**¹⁶¹ Conduct research to better understand how water and sediment chemistry affect shellfish growth and survival to allow improved management and cultivation of shellfish as acidification increases and enable farmers to change cultivation practice or location; identify particularly adaptable stocks or strains; and enable or increase survival.

- **KEA 12: Conduct laboratory studies to assess the direct effects of ocean acidification, alone and in combination with other stressors, on local species and ecosystems.**¹⁶² Prioritize studies of "species of ecological, economic, or cultural significance, species of concern, and species that can influence human health and well-being" to inform management and adaptation actions.

- **KEA 13: Establish the ability to make short-term forecasts of corrosive conditions for application to shellfish hatcheries, growing areas, and other areas of concern.**¹⁶³ The chemistry of marine waters that hatcheries utilize

158. *Id.* at 69 (Action 7.1.1.).

159. *Id.* The Panel also provided additional recommendations for data collection, data quality provisions and training, data preservation, and public access.

160. *Id.* at 72 (Action 7.2.1.).

161. *Id.* at 74 (Action 7.3.1.).

162. *Id.* at 75 (Action 7.3.2.).

163. *Id.* at 76 (Action 7.4.1.).

varies seasonally as well as with the tidal cycle and the time of day.¹⁶⁴ If shellfish farmers are able to forecast when conditions (for example, pH levels) will be more favorable to cultivation activities, they can plan for operations to occur during these times. Farmers could use real-time monitoring and modeling to forecast when conditions will be particularly favorable and unfavorable, and then provide online access to this information so that it can be accessed and tracked by shellfish farmers.

Action Area 5: Inform, educate, and engage stakeholders, the public, and decision makers in responding to ocean acidification. Although the global and regional implications of this issue are significant, at the time the Panel was deliberating, public awareness of ocean acidification was very low.¹⁶⁵ Polling conducted in 2012 resulted in a US composite score of 14 out of 100 when participants were asked if they had heard of the issue of ocean acidification.¹⁶⁶ This number dropped to 10 out of 100 when participants were asked if they were “familiar with” or “informed about” ocean acidification.¹⁶⁷ Similar polling puts these numbers even lower, with only seven percent of Americans having even heard of the issue.¹⁶⁸ When prompted with a brief explanation of ocean acidification, there was a dramatic increase in levels of concern about the issue among polling participants.¹⁶⁹ This research suggests that increased public awareness is a critical component of addressing the issue. The Panel recommended educating the general public as well as elected officials, resource managers, business

164. Press Release 12-070, National Science Foundation, Ocean Acidification Linked With Larval Oyster Failure in Hatcheries, (April 11, 2012), *available at* http://www.nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=123822.

165. THE OCEAN PROJECT, AMERICA AND THE OCEAN: OCEAN ACIDIFICATION, SUMMER 2012 SPECIAL REPORT: PUBLIC AWARENESS OF OCEAN ACIDIFICATION (2012), *available at* http://theoceanproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Special_Report_Summer_2012_Public_Awareness_of_Ocean_Acidification.pdf [hereinafter THE OCEAN PROJECT, AMERICA AND THE OCEAN].

166. Based on a sample of 1,817 responses from adults in the United States to an online survey between March and April 2012. Respondents were screened, certified, and paid. The overall confidence level is 99 percent. *Id.*

167. *Id.*

168. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 81.

169. THE OCEAN PROJECT, AMERICA AND THE OCEAN, *supra* note 165.

and industry leaders, and youth.¹⁷⁰ The Panel further identified four key messages that should be conveyed regarding ocean acidification: (i) that ocean acidification is affecting jobs and resources in Washington; (ii) the importance of oceans to human health and well-being and coastal economies; (iii) the pace at which Washington's marine waters are acidifying and the potential impacts on marine and human life in Washington; and (iv) what Washingtonians can do about the issue, and the importance of early action.¹⁷¹

- **KEA 14: Identify key findings for use by the Governor, Panel members, and others who will act as ambassadors on ocean acidification.**¹⁷² Develop communication materials that draw the connections between human activity and ocean acidification; explain the significance of natural resources, especially shellfish, to the economy and the environment; and share examples of Washingtonians impacted by acidification.

- **KEA 15: Increase understanding of ocean acidification among key stakeholders, target audiences, and local communities to help implement the Panel's recommendations.**¹⁷³ Conduct a public opinion survey and engage key stakeholders to inform the preparation of education and outreach "toolkits" related to ocean acidification. Toolkits should include specific actions that members of the public can take to address ocean acidification, and provide examples of actions others are taking as well as resources at risk from ocean acidification.

- **KEA 16: Provide a forum for agricultural, business, and other stakeholders to engage with coastal resource users and managers in developing and implementing solutions.**¹⁷⁴ The Panel identified a need for these stakeholders to reduce nutrient inputs into the marine system in order to maintain shellfish production and address ocean acidification.

Action Area 6: Maintain a sustainable and

170. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 81.

171. *Id.*

172. *Id.* (Action 8.1.1.).

173. *Id.* at 82 (Action 8.1.2.).

174. *Id.* at 83 (Action 8.1.4.).

coordinated focus on ocean acidification at all levels of government. The report recognized the need for sustained leadership in order to ensure implementation of the Panel's recommendations.¹⁷⁵

- **KEA 17: Charge, by gubernatorial action, a person in the Governor's Office or an existing or new organization to coordinate implementation of the Panel's recommendations with other ocean and coastal actions.**¹⁷⁶ Ensure that the coordinating person or entity: (i) has full support of the Governor; (ii) supports the Governor's ocean policies; (iii) has full support of and partnership with state agencies with responsibility over oceans; and (iv) is adequately resourced. Charge this person or entity with the following responsibilities: (i) advance the Panel's recommendations; (ii) seek and ensure effective expenditure of funding; (iii) lead future efforts to update recommendations; (iv) work with tribal, federal, state, and local governments, organizations, and the private sector; (v) continue to bridge science and policy needs related to ocean acidification; and (vi) build public awareness, support, and engagement on ocean issues.¹⁷⁷

- **KEA 18: Create an ocean acidification science coordination team to promote scientific collaboration across agencies and organizations and connect ocean acidification science to adaptation and policy needs.**¹⁷⁸ Once created, this team should focus on acidification-related research in Washington, ensure that implementation of the Panel's recommended actions are as coordinated and efficient as possible, and connect science and policy needs.

V. THE REACH OF THE BLUE RIBBON PANEL ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION

In the twelve months since the Blue Ribbon Panel issued its

175. *Id.* at 89 ("The state's effectiveness in addressing the impacts of changing ocean chemistry on our marine ecosystems and coastal communities requires sustained leadership and support by the Governor and other state officials and a coordinating mechanism to facilitate implementation of the Panel's recommendations.").

176. *Id.* at 89 (Action 9.1.1.).

177. *Id.* at 89-91, App. 3.

178. *Id.* at 91 (Action 9.1.2.).

report, the State and the Panel's members have worked to implement the Panel's recommendations. Washington has taken further steps consistent with the Panel's recommendations in the areas of education and outreach, research, and monitoring, and to reduce local CO₂ emissions, as explained in further detail below. Complementary individual, local, regional, national, and international efforts to address ocean acidification have also progressed. The influence of the Blue Ribbon Panel is evident in many of these other processes. Other states are following Washington's lead and building off of the Panel's work. At least partially in response to a request from the Panel, the Environmental Protection Agency is initiating an investigation into the assessment of water quality criteria relevant to ocean acidification. The Blue Ribbon Panel and its members have successfully elevated awareness of ocean acidification's risks and early signs of impacts to Washington's shellfish resource to other states, the Environmental Protection Agency, non-governmental organizations, and the United Nations, among others. This section examines some of these efforts to address ocean acidification and the impact of the Blue Ribbon Panel and its members.

A. *State Implementation of the Blue Ribbon Panel's Recommendations*

Much of the Blue Ribbon Panel's recommendations focused on monitoring, research, education and outreach. With regard to reducing emissions, the State experiences political hurdles similar to the federal government in enforcing existing laws and passing new laws to reduce emissions and other contributors to ocean acidification. However, the State recently passed legislation to convene a work group to examine and recommend a state program of actions and policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

As acknowledged by the Blue Ribbon Panel in its report, responses to ocean acidification are hamstrung by significant information gaps. Without a better understanding of the relative significance of regional contributors, it is difficult to determine where to best allocate limited resources. Thus, efforts are primarily falling into the arenas of research, monitoring, outreach, and education, as well as the formation of advisory bodies and work groups to continue to examine ocean acidification and make further recommendations.

1. *Governor's Executive Order 12-07 and Budget*

On November 27, 2012, the same day that the Blue Ribbon Panel delivered its report, Governor Gregoire issued an Executive Order entitled, "Washington's Response to Ocean Acidification."¹⁷⁹ The Executive Order recognizes that Washington's waters are particularly vulnerable to acidification and that the increasing acidification of these waters poses "serious and immediate threats" to the shellfish industry and resource as well as important implications for Washington's tribal communities and fishermen and the broader marine ecosystem.¹⁸⁰

The Order charges the Director of the Department of Ecology with nine specific tasks:

1. Coordinate implementation of the Blue Ribbon Panel's recommendations;
2. Work with the University of Washington and state agencies to establish a mechanism that ensures coordination between scientists and decision makers that will enhance the state's ability to respond to ocean acidification;
3. Develop an agreement among state and federal agencies to support data sharing, collaboration, and leveraging and prioritizing of funds;
4. Conduct a technical analysis of local sources of contributors to ocean acidification in partnership with the University of Washington;
5. Reduce nutrients and organic carbon where those pollutants are causing or contributing to marine water quality problems;
6. Formally request that the Environmental Protection Agency begin the assessment of water quality criteria relevant to ocean acidification;
7. Review unimplemented actions recommended by the Climate Action Team and identified in the State Energy Strategy and propose implementation of additional actions to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide where appropriate;

179. Exec. Order No. 12-07, Washington's Response to Ocean Acidification (Nov. 27, 2012).

180. *Id.*

8. Increase policymakers, interested organizations, and the public's understanding of ocean acidification and its consequences;
9. Work with stakeholders to develop and implement local solutions; and
10. Provide a progress report on the Order's implementation to the Governor by December 31, 2013.¹⁸¹

The Order also directs the Governor's Office and cabinet agencies to advocate for reductions in CO₂ emissions at global, national, and regional levels and orders the Puget Sound Partnership¹⁸² to incorporate the Blue Ribbon Panel's scientific findings, strategies, and actions into existing documents, programs, and plans.¹⁸³

Both Governor Gregoire's and Governor Jay Inslee's proposed budgets for the 2013-2015 biennium included \$3.31 million to begin implementation of the Blue Ribbon Panel's KEAs.¹⁸⁴ \$1.82 million of these funds was directed to the University of Washington for a new Ocean Acidification Impacts and Adaptation Center. An additional \$1 million was proposed for the Department of Ecology and \$510,000 to the

181. *Id.*

182. The Puget Sound Partnership, created in 2007 by the Washington State legislature, is a community effort of public and private stakeholders to restore and protect Puget Sound. PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP, <http://www.psp.wa.gov/aboutthepartnership.php> (last visited Nov. 17, 2013); *Puget Sound Partners*, EPA, <http://www.epa.gov/pugetsound/partnerships/> (last visited Nov. 23, 2013).

183. Exec. Order No. 12-07, *supra* note 179. The Governor's order to take regional steps to reduce CO₂ emissions builds on existing strategies. Since 2005, Washington State has taken the following steps toward this goal: (1) adopted clean cars and alternative fuel standards, (2) established a standard for renewable energy in Washington, (3) adopted changes in the energy code to achieve a 70 percent reduction in building energy by 2030 compared to 2006, (4) invested in green building and energy efficiency projects for public buildings and low-income properties (5) expanded its fleet of hybrid, all-electric and alternative-fuel vehicles, and (6) adopted legislation to end the burning of coal for power generation at the TransAlta power plant, which will lead to large reductions in CO₂ and other harmful gases. FOCUS ON OCEAN ACIDIFICATION *supra* note 107.

184. WASH. OCEAN ACIDIFICATION BUDGET, *supra* note 143; WASH. OFFICE OF FIN. MGMT., WORKING WASHINGTON BUDGET PRIORITIES 2013-15: CLIMATE, ENERGY AND NATURAL RES. at 17-19 (2013), *available at* http://www.ofm.wa.gov/budget13inslee/climate_energy_naturalresources.pdf ("Implement the priority recommendations of the blue-ribbon Ocean Acidification Panel to monitor and reduce impacts of acidic water on the state's shellfish industry and native shellfish. (\$3.3 million total: \$2.0 million State Toxics Control Account; \$820,000 Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account; \$510,000 Resource Management Cost Account)").

Department of Natural Resources for the implementation of additional specific KEAs.¹⁸⁵

The final 2013-15 Operating Budget, SB 5034, signed into law by Governor Jay Inslee on June 30, 2013, directed \$1.82 million to the University of Washington for a Center for Ocean Acidification (“Center”). Unfortunately, the budget did not include the requested \$1.51 million for the Departments of Ecology and Natural Resources.¹⁸⁶

2. *University of Washington Ocean Acidification Impacts and Adaptation Center*

The funds for the Center are directed to work necessary to implement the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Panel.¹⁸⁷ Consistent with the Panel’s recommendations, the Center will be modeled after the University of Washington’s Climate Impacts Group (CIG).¹⁸⁸ The Center is charged with implementing the following specific Blue Ribbon Panel KEAs:

1. Ensure continued water quality monitoring at the six existing shellfish hatcheries and rearing areas to enable real-time management of hatcheries under changing pH conditions.¹⁸⁹
2. Investigate and develop commercial-scale water

185. These KEAs were: “for the Department of Ecology, Implement effective nutrient and organic carbon reduction programs in locations where these pollutants are causing or contributing to multiple water quality problems. (Action 5.1.1); Quantify key natural and human-influenced processes that contribute to acidification based on estimates of sources, sinks, and transfer rates for carbon and nitrogen. (Action 7.2.1); Increase understanding of ocean acidification among key stakeholders, target audiences, and local communities to help implement the Panel’s recommendations. (Action 8.1.2). For the Department of Natural Resources: Provide a forum for agricultural, business, and other stakeholders to engage with coastal resource users and managers in developing and implementing solutions. (Action 8.1.4); Develop vegetation-based systems of remediation for use in upland habitats and in shellfish areas. (Action 6.1.1); Identify, protect, and manage potential refuges for organisms vulnerable to ocean acidification and other stressors. (Action 6.3.2); Determine the association between water and sediment chemistry and shellfish production in hatcheries and in the natural environment. (Action 7.3.1).” BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 46-83.

186. Act effective Jun. 30, 2013, 2013 Wash. Laws ch. 4.

187. *Id.*

188. Press Release, Univ. of Wash., Ocean acidification center another example of state leading the nation (Aug. 8, 2013), *available at* <http://www.washington.edu/news/2013/08/08/ocean-acidification-center-another-example-of-state-leading-the-nation/>.

189. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 58 (Action 6.2.1.).

treatment methods or hatchery designs to protect larvae from corrosive seawater.¹⁹⁰

3. Establish an expanded and sustained ocean acidification monitoring network to measure trends in local acidification conditions and related biological responses.¹⁹¹

4. Conduct laboratory studies to assess the direct causes and effects of ocean acidification, alone and in combination with other stressors, on Washington's species and ecosystems.¹⁹²

5. Establish the ability to make short-term forecasts of corrosive conditions for application to shellfish hatcheries, growing areas, and other areas of concern.¹⁹³

The Center's Co-Directors, Dr. Terrie Klinger and Dr. Jan Newton, both served on the Blue Ribbon Panel.¹⁹⁴ Many of the KEAs that the Center for Ocean Acidification is charged with implementing are targeted toward shellfish hatcheries, ensuring that ocean acidification-related collaboration and open information exchange between researchers and shellfish hatchery operators will continue to occur.

3. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction (SB 5802)*

Two bills significant to climate change and ocean acidification were enacted during the 2012-2013 legislative session. The first, SB 5802, addresses CO₂ emission reduction.¹⁹⁵ SB 5802 was introduced in the Senate at the request of Governor Inslee. As enacted, Section 1 of SB 5802 commissions a study of climate change mitigation alternatives while Section 2 of the Bill creates a bipartisan climate legislative and executive work group ("Work Group"). The purpose of the Work Group is to recommend a state program of

190. *Id.* at 60 (Action 6.2.3).

191. *Id.* at 69 (Action 7.1.1.).

192. *Id.* at 75 (Action 7.3.2.).

193. *Id.* at 76 (Action 7.4.1.).

194. Press Release, Univ. of Wash., Klinger & Newton named as co-Directors of new Ocean Acidification Center (Aug. 15, 2013, 9:38 a.m.), *available at* <http://depts.washington.edu/smea/news/archive/klinger-newton-named-co-directors-new-ocean-acidification-center>.

195. Act effective April 2, 2013, 2013 Wash. Laws ch. 6.

actions and policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that, if implemented, would ensure achievement of the state's emissions targets as set forth in RCW 70.235.020.¹⁹⁶ The Bill authorizes the office of financial management (OFM) to contract with an independent consultant to prepare an evaluation of approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. This report must include: an analysis of greenhouse gas emission reduction programs or strategies adopted in other parts of the country and internationally;¹⁹⁷ an evaluation of Washington's emissions and energy consumption profile, including options to increase expenditures on energy produced in-state and opportunities related to clean energy;¹⁹⁸ and a summary of federal policies that will contribute to meeting the state's emissions targets.¹⁹⁹ The Work Group is charged with selecting the consultants to be retained by the OFM, reviewing the evaluation prepared, and, ultimately, recommending a state program of policies and actions that, if implemented, would ensure that Washington meets its emissions targets. Recommendations are to be "prioritized to ensure the greatest amount of environmental benefit for each dollar spent based on measures of environmental effectiveness."²⁰⁰ The Work Group must report back to the legislature by December 31, 2013.²⁰¹

4. *Washington Marine Resources Advisory Council (SB 5603)*

SB 5603, passed into law on May 21, 2013, creates the Washington Marine Resources Advisory Council ("Advisory Council") within the Office of the Governor to make recommendations and take actions related to ocean acidification. The Advisory Council includes a broad selection of industry, environmental, science, and government representatives. It is charged with maintaining "a sustainable coordinated focus, including the involvement of and the collaboration among all levels of government" and other sectors to increase the state's ability to address ocean acidification through monitoring, research, analysis and other response

196. *Id.* at § 2(b)(4).

197. *Id.* § 1(3).

198. *Id.* § 1(4).

199. *Id.* § 1(5).

200. *Id.* § 2(b)(4).

201. *Id.* § 2(b)(8).

work.²⁰² The Advisory Council will also work with the University of Washington to study the sources and effects of ocean acidification, seek public and private funding necessary for ongoing technical analysis, and deliver recommendations to the governor and appropriate house and senate committees.²⁰³ Finally, the Advisory Council will conduct public education activities regarding the impacts of and contributors to ocean acidification, as well as implementation strategies for addressing ocean acidification.²⁰⁴

Although the Advisory Council addresses issues related to ocean acidification, neither the Blue Ribbon Panel nor its recommendations are mentioned in the language of the bill.

B. *Other States' Efforts: Oregon and California*

Following Washington's lead, other states have initiated regional efforts to address ocean acidification. In August of 2013, Oregon and California jointly convened the West Coast Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Science Panel.²⁰⁵ This panel is comprised of scientists from British Columbia, Washington, Oregon and California in the fields of chemical and physical oceanography, biogeochemistry, marine biology, ecology and

202. Act effective July 28, 2013, 2013 Wash. Laws, ch. 318 at § 4(8)(a).

203. *Id.* § 4(8)(b)-(c).

204. *Id.* § 4(8)(e).

205. *The West Coast Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Science Panel*, CAL. OCEAN SCIENCE TRUST, <http://calost.org/science-advising/?page=ocean-acidification-and-hypoxia-panel> (last visited Nov. 17, 2013) ("California and Oregon have identified ocean acidification as an issue of which the states would benefit from improved scientific understanding. More broadly, the West Coast Governors Alliance on Ocean Health recently signed an agreement citing ocean acidification as a priority ocean and coastal health issue. All this comes on the heels of the State of Washington's Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, which released its final report on November 27, 2012. The knowledge base established in Washington will provide a robust foundation for the work of the OAH Panel, resulting in a West Coast-wide understanding of ocean acidification and hypoxia that will inform multiple levels of government."); *West Coast Scientists Team up on Ocean Acidification Panel*, EARTHFIX (Aug. 28, 2013), <http://www.earthfix.info/water/article/west-coast-scientists-team-up-on-acidification-panel/>; Oregon.Gov, *Governor Kitzhaber Announces West Coast Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Science Panel*, OREGON.GOV, http://www.oregon.gov/gov/media_room/Pages/press_releases/press_082813.aspx (last visited Nov. 17, 2013); Memorandum of Understanding Between the State of Cal. Natural Res. Agency and the State of Or. Governor's Natural Res. Office to Establish the W. Coast Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Science Panel (2013), available at http://www.oregon.gov/gov/GNRO/docs/082013_MOU_OA%20and%20OH_CA%20and%20OR_executed.pdf [hereinafter Science Panel Memorandum].

physiology. Among its charges is an examination of what ocean acidification means for West Coast fisheries, natural resources, and coastal communities. The panel will examine existing research on ocean acidification and identify priorities for additional research and monitoring. Washington's efforts "provide a robust foundation" for this panel, which was assembled to "complement" the work of the Blue Ribbon Panel.²⁰⁶

C. *EPA Assessment of Water Quality Criteria Relevant to Ocean Acidification*

On December 24, 2012, Department of Ecology Director Maia Bellon sent a letter to EPA requesting that the agency begin an assessment of water quality criteria relevant to ocean acidification. The request was in response to the Blue Ribbon Panel's recommended Action 5.1.3²⁰⁷ and Governor Gregoire's Executive Order 12-07.²⁰⁸ EPA Acting Administrator Nancy Stoner sent a formal response stating that EPA planned to convene a technical workgroup in the near future to assess the possibility of water quality parameters to address ocean acidification.²⁰⁹

Shortly thereafter, EPA made a similar commitment in response to a petition submitted by the Center for Biological Diversity (CBD).²¹⁰ On April 17, 2013, CBD submitted a

206. Science Panel Memorandum, *supra* note 205.

207. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 49 (Action 5.1.3) ("Assess the need for water quality criteria relevant to ocean acidification.").

208. Exec. Order No. 12-07, Washington's Response to Ocean Acidification (Nov. 27, 2012).

209. Letter from Nancy K. Stoner, Acting Asst. Admin. EPA, to Maia Bellon, Director, Washington Department of Ecology (April 19, 2013) [hereinafter Stoner Letter].

210. CBD has a history of active engagement on ocean acidification issues. Between 2007 and 2009, CBD petitioned every coastal state to designate their coastal waters as threatened by ocean acidification. In 2007, CBD petitioned the EPA to strengthen water quality standards for ocean pH. In 2009, the CBD petitioned the National Marine Fisheries Service to list 83 species of coral as threatened or endangered. In the same year, CBD issued a notice of intent to sue the EPA for its failure to protect coastal waters by strengthening water quality standards for pH. CBD has also initiated three lawsuits against the EPA; the first, in 2009, for the EPA's failure to address ocean acidification on the coast of Washington State; the second in 2010 to protect endangered black abalone habitat; and the third in 2013 for EPA's approval of Washington's and Oregon's lists of impaired water bodies, which do not include ocean acidification-impaired marine waters. *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. EPA*, Case No.

petition for nondiscretionary action to EPA requesting that EPA promulgate water quality criteria for ocean acidification under the CWA.²¹¹ On May 17, 2013, EPA responded to CBD by letter, agreeing to convene a technical workgroup to evaluate data and research regarding water quality and ocean acidification.²¹²

CBD's April 17, 2013 petition was designed to move EPA to produce new water quality standards to address ocean acidification. In the petition, CBD argues that current water quality criteria for pH in marine waters, which rely on measuring changes in pH from baseline pH levels, are insufficient to protect against ocean acidification.²¹³ The Petition names seawater chemistry parameters (minimum aragonite saturation levels) and biological criteria (no measurable decline in calcification rates for target calcifiers) as appropriate indicators of ocean acidification that may be integrated into water quality criteria and that do not rely on changes in baseline pH.²¹⁴ The Petition also argues for the adoption of biological criteria specifying that there be no measurable decline in calcification rates for target calcifiers.²¹⁵

The Petition also requests that the EPA publish information to provide guidance on ocean acidification pursuant to Section 304(a)(2) of the CWA. The Petition points to the Blue Ribbon Panel to demonstrate that states are waiting for federal

2:13-cv-01866 (W.D. Wash. 2013); *see* Section V(C), *infra*.

211. CTR. FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL WATER QUALITY CRITERIA AND GUIDANCE UNDER SECTION 304 OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT, 33 U.S.C. § 1314, TO ADDRESS OCEAN ACIDIFICATION (2013), *available at* http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/ocean_acidification/pdfs/EPA_OA_petition_2013.pdf [hereinafter CBD PETITION]. CBD based its right to petition on the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and the Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. § 553(e).

212. Letter from Nancy K. Stoner, Acting Asst. Admin. EPA, to Miyoko Sakashita, Senior Attorney and Oceans Director, Ctr. for Biological Diversity (May 17, 2013) *available at* http://www.eenews.net/assets/2013/05/30/document_pm_02.pdf.

213. CBD PETITION, *supra* note 211, at 32. Reliance on baseline measurements is also problematic because data is often missing or unreliable. *Id.* at 32, 34. These facts, CBD argued, are supported by the "latest scientific knowledge" and derogate the EPA's sole reliance on ocean pH as a measurement of ocean acidification, triggering EPA's nondiscretionary duty to act under the CWA. *Id.* at 33, 34 ("In light of recent information demonstrating that marine pH alone is a less effective metric to evaluate the impacts of ocean acidification, EPA must promulgate criteria on alternative ocean acidification parameters.") (relying on 33 U.S.C. § 1314(a)(1)(b)-(c)).

214. *Id.* at 32-33, 40.

215. *Id.* at 32.

guidance on water quality criteria relevant to ocean acidification.²¹⁶ The Petition highlights the steep increase in research and information on ocean acidification in the last several years, providing a wealth of information to “serve as a foundation for EPA’s guidance.”²¹⁷ Specifically, CBD requests that EPA include a discussion of: “(1) the impact of carbon dioxide on seawater chemistry; (2) the impacts of ocean acidification on fish, shellfish and wildlife; (3) the recommended methods for measuring ocean acidification parameters and considering data and information on ocean acidification; and (4) recommendations for developing and implementing total maximum daily loads for ocean acidification.”²¹⁸

EPA responded by letter to CBD one month after CBD submitted its petition to EPA, and committed to convening a technical workgroup to study water quality criteria relevant to ocean acidification.²¹⁹

In addition to petitioning the EPA to amend water quality criteria to address ocean acidification, CBD has actively engaged with coastal states in an effort to encourage inclusion of marine waters in state 303(d) lists of impaired waters.²²⁰ Between 2007 and 2009, CBD petitioned every coastal state to designate their coastal waters as threatened by ocean acidification. When the EPA approved Washington’s 303(d) list, which failed to include any marine waters as impaired by ocean acidification, CBD sued the EPA.²²¹ After that case settled, EPA determined that inclusion of waters impaired by ocean acidification on state 303(d) lists was appropriate. However, in 2012 the EPA again approved a 303(d) list from Washington that failed to list any marine waters as impaired

216. *Id.* at 35.

217. *Id.* at 45.

218. *Id.* at 43.

219. Stoner Letter, *supra* note 209.

220. Between 2007 and 2009, CBD petitioned every coastal state to designate their coastal waters as threatened by ocean acidification. In 2007, CBD petitioned the EPA to strengthen water quality standards for ocean pH. In 2009, the CBD petitioned the National Marine Fisheries Service to list 83 species of coral as threatened or endangered. In the same year, CBD issued a notice of intent to sue the EPA for its failure to protect coastal waters by strengthening water quality standards for pH.

221. *See* Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief at 9, Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Env’tl. Protection Agency, No. 2:13-cv-01866-JLR (W.D. Wash. filed Oct. 16, 2013).

by ocean acidification.²²² EPA additionally approved Oregon's 303(d) list, which similarly failed to list any marine waters as impaired.²²³ On October 16, 2013, CBD again filed suit, alleging that the EPA's approval of Washington's and Oregon's 303(d) lists, and its failure to identify Washington and Oregon marine waters as impaired by ocean acidification, was arbitrary, capricious and in violation of law.²²⁴ CBD's complaint cites research published under the auspices of the Blue Ribbon Panel to support its claims, including an allegation that more than thirty percent of Puget Sound's marine species are vulnerable to ocean acidification.²²⁵

VI. WHAT OTHER STATES CAN LEARN FROM WASHINGTON'S EFFORTS

States can learn much from the formation of the Blue Ribbon Panel and its deliberations, recommendations, and implementation efforts. Unquestionably, the Panel and its members have made great strides in raising public and stakeholder awareness of ocean acidification, securing additional research funding, enhancing networks and exchanges of valuable information, and advancing local priorities. The road to implementation of the Blue Ribbon Panel's recommendations has thus far been a bumpy one, however, with some predictable challenges other states will also be likely to face in undertaking a similar effort. This Part discusses the Panel's roadblocks and the successes, and makes the case for other states to follow Washington's lead in addressing ocean acidification.

A. *Challenges and Limitations*

The most significant limitation states face in addressing ocean acidification is the inability to reduce CO₂ emissions at a global scale.²²⁶ The Blue Ribbon Panel recognized this

222. *Id.* at 9-10.

223. *Id.* at 10-11.

224. *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Env'tl. Protection Agency*, No. 2:13-cv-01866-JLR (W.D. Wash. filed Oct. 16, 2013).

225. Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief at 14, *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Env'tl. Protection Agency*, No. 2:13-cv-01866-JLR (W.D. Wash. filed Oct. 16, 2013).

226. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at xvii ("Additional local actions,

limitation, but did not disregard the issue altogether, identifying ways that the state could contribute to emissions reduction.²²⁷ Indeed, the first action area and the first two KEAs in the Panel's report address ways in which Washington and its leaders can most effectively engage on this issue: by acting as advocates and "ambassadors" for CO₂ emissions reductions. At the same time, recognizing that Washington cannot rely on emissions reductions alone, the Panel developed recommendations in the areas of research, adaptation, coordination and public outreach, focusing on local priorities and solutions. In addressing ocean acidification, other states can look to the recommendations and reports of the Blue Ribbon Panel to help define the legal and policy tools available to states to address the issue.

A second challenge Washington faces is that the legal and policy tools states possess to address ocean acidification are frustrated by political realities and resource limitations that are in some ways similar to those existing at the national level. Efforts to pass legislation and enforce existing laws to reduce inputs from local contributors to ocean acidification are hampered by a lack of resources and political will. For example, despite identifying ocean acidification and implementation of the Panel's recommendations as critical priorities for the State, the 2013-15 Operating Budget does not include \$1.51 million requested by the Governor for the Departments of Ecology and Natural Resources to implement specific KEAs in the Blue Ribbon Panel's report.

Adding to these challenges is the reality that our scientific understanding of the extent to which each local source contributes to ocean acidification is limited and in some cases nonexistent. If a state cannot ascertain the extent to which a reduction in certain types of local inputs will affect local

including local source reduction and adaptation and remediation, are necessary to 'buy time' while society collectively works to reduce global carbon dioxide emissions."); see also, Kelly & Caldwell, *supra* note 5, at 61 (recognizing that state efforts alone will be insufficient to solve the global CO₂ problem).

227. It is worth noting that Washington State is also a leader in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Currently, the State's Climate Legislative and Executive Workgroup (discussed earlier in this Article) created under E2SSB 5802 during the 2013 legislative session is developing recommendations to ensure achievement of Washington's emissions reduction limits. For more information about Washington's efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, see *Climate Change*, DEP'T OF ECOLOGY, <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/climatechange/> (last visited Nov. 23, 2013).

acidification, if at all, it usually does not make sense to expend significant resources and political will to change practices that may not have an ultimate impact on reduction of the problem. For this and other reasons, the Blue Ribbon Panel recommended an initial step of quantifying the relative contribution of different acidifying factors to ocean acidification in Washington's marine waters, rather than starting with reduction actions themselves. Thus, states looking to reduce localized contributors should prepare for the likelihood of needing to: (i) quantify the relative influence of different local inputs prior to taking reduction actions, (ii) prioritize where to expend likely limited resources, and (iii) engage stakeholders early on in the process.

Finally, since the issuance of the Blue Ribbon Panel's report, the State has seen a change in administration. Implementation of the Washington Shellfish Initiative and the Blue Ribbon Panel's recommendations have both suffered as a result. As the Panel noted in its report, "[t]he state's effectiveness in addressing the impacts of changing ocean chemistry on our marine ecosystems and coastal communities requires sustained leadership and support by the Governor and other state officials and a coordinating mechanism to facilitate implementation of the Panel's recommendations."²²⁸ The recently created Marine Resources Advisory Council within the Governor's Office may support both of these requirements; Governor Inslee has appointed councilmembers and the Council's inaugural meeting was held in November 2013.²²⁹ At this time, less than twelve months into the Inslee administration, it is too early to tell the extent to which the change in administration has slowed the momentum of the state's efforts to lead the charge on ocean acidification, but it is clear that there has been an effect. It is important for states to consider how a change in administration will impact efforts to address ocean acidification and prepare for transitions to the extent possible.

228. BLUE RIBBON PANEL REPORT, *supra* note 2, at 89.

229. *Ocean Acidification and Washington State*, DEP'T OF ECOLOGY, <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/water/marine/oceanacidification.html> (last visited Nov. 23, 2013).

B. *Successes*

Washington's leadership in addressing ocean acidification has met with success in many areas. The role of public-private partnerships in the formation of the Panel and the implementation of its recommendations has greatly enhanced this success. Shellfish hatcheries were the first to observe the impacts of ocean acidification. Although they did not know ocean acidification to be the cause of larval die-offs, hatchery operators quickly collaborated with scientists, worked to secure funding, and undertook their own efforts to determine the source of the problem. Shellfish growers shared knowledge, observations, and resources with researchers, enabling them to understand more about the issue and inform their scientific process and understanding.

This public-private partnership has resulted in great strides toward identifying adaptation measures that will allow shellfish farming and restoration efforts to continue in the Pacific Northwest. Researchers have readily shared their findings with hatchery operators and designed their research so that the findings will have practical utility. Since the formation of the Blue Ribbon Panel, scientists have discovered the chemical and biological processes that cause larval mortality in hatcheries, greatly enhancing shellfish growers' ability to adapt to an increasingly acidified environment. These discoveries have not only benefitted those that work with shellfish, however; they have also greatly enhanced the scientific community's understanding of ocean acidification and its impacts. This will lead to an improved ability for communities and governments to adapt to ocean acidification.

Ultimately, having an impacted economic interest serve as the "canary in the coal mine" elevated the issue to the attention of legislators, policymakers, government, researchers, and private foundations in a way that likely would not have been possible by scientists alone. The Blue Ribbon Panel and University of Washington's Ocean Acidification Impacts and Adaptation Center are prime examples of this influence. Formed under the Washington Shellfish Initiative, the Panel was charged to examine scientific knowledge and recommend responses that include a focus on shellfish. The Ocean Acidification Impacts and Adaptation Center will implement specific Blue Ribbon Panel KEAs that will enhance shellfish hatcheries' ability to adapt to ocean acidification and also further scientific understanding of

ocean acidification through monitoring and laboratory studies.

This win-win approach of public-private collaboration is one that other states can adopt as a model for responding to ocean acidification. Coastal communities will be affected by ocean acidification in a myriad of ways. For example, Alaska's red king crab fishery is projected to be particularly affected by ocean acidification.²³⁰ States should identify vulnerable economic interests and communities, engage them on the issue, and work collectively towards adaptation efforts that will help ensure that these industries and communities are able to continue into the future.

Washington's efforts have also been greatly furthered by "ambassadors" who have worked to raise awareness of ocean acidification locally, nationally, and internationally. Deliberately or not, many individual Panel members have worked to carry out the Panel's recommendations to inform, educate, and engage stakeholders, the public, and decision makers in responding to ocean acidification and reducing CO₂ emissions. For example, Panel members have given dozens of presentations at conferences, to organizations, the public, law and policy makers, and in international fora.²³¹ As mentioned, at the time the Panel was deliberating in 2012, public awareness of ocean acidification was very low.²³² Although data is not available to determine how the Panel and its members' outreach efforts have changed awareness of ocean acidification, it is clear that public awareness is increasing, at least in the Pacific Northwest. The Panel's work has also inspired other outreach efforts. For example, *The Seattle Times* recently undertook the first in-depth analysis by a major news

230. Craig Welch, *SeaChange: Lucrative crab industry in danger*, SEATTLE TIMES (Sept. 12, 2013), <http://apps.seattletimes.com/reports/sea-change/2013/sep/11/alaska-crab-industry/>.

231. See, e.g., United Nations, Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, *United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea*, UN.ORG, <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N13/398/71/PDF/N1339871.pdf?OpenElement> (last visited Nov. 23, 2013) (presentations by Panel members Richard A. Feely and Bill Dewey); *Scientific Forum—The Blue Planet*, INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, http://www-pub.iaea.org/MTCD/Meetings/PDFplus/2013/cn207/cn207_FinalProgramme.pdf (last visited Nov. 23, 2013) (presentation by Bill Dewey); *Signing of Pacific Coast Action Plan on Climate and Energy*, October 28, 2013, <http://www.pacificcoastcollaborative.org/Documents/PCC%20NR%20-%20October%2028%202013.pdf> (last visited November 23, 2013) (presentation by Bill Dewey).

232. THE OCEAN PROJECT, AMERICA AND THE OCEAN, *supra* note 165.

organization of ocean acidification and its consequences.²³³

Researchers, non-governmental organizations, policymakers, governments, and others can look to the Blue Ribbon Panel and its recommendations as a roadmap for addressing ocean acidification. Individuals working to secure funding for research and development efforts can now use the Panel's report to articulate the significance and implications of the issue. This has led to increased interest, awareness, and research funding. For example, the recently convened West Coast Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Science Panel will use the Blue Ribbon Panel's work as a robust foundation for its efforts, which are designed to complement the work of the Panel. The Panel has also influenced efforts to address ocean acidification through existing legal and regulatory frameworks. For example, CBD's April 17, 2013, petition points to the Blue Ribbon Panel to demonstrate the need for federal guidance on water quality criteria relevant to ocean acidification. The CBD also references the work of the Blue Ribbon Panel in its recent lawsuit against the EPA for approving Washington and Oregon's lists of impaired waters, which do not include waters impaired by ocean acidification. Further efforts at the state level can build off of these early efforts, using them as a guide while tailoring them to the individual needs of each states' coastal communities and industries that depend upon the natural resources threatened by ocean acidification.

VII. CONCLUSION

Washington State's efforts in the areas of research, monitoring, education, and outreach have resulted in increased awareness of ocean acidification, directed additional resources toward ocean-acidification related research, inspired other jurisdictions to take further action, and drawn the attention of organizations from the Center for Biological Diversity to the United Nations. And, notably, the State has established itself as a geographic leader in ocean acidification research, with a focus on bridging research and policy, which is likely to lead to increased federal and private funds being directed toward

233. Craig Welch, *SeaChange: The Pacific's Perilous Turn*, SEATTLE TIMES (Sept. 12, 2013), <http://apps.seattletimes.com/reports/sea-change/2013/sep/11/pacific-ocean-perilous-turn-overview/>.

research directly applicable to Washington State's remediation and adaptation needs. Washington's Blue Ribbon Panel on Ocean Acidification, while not solely responsible for these efforts, deserves much of the credit for galvanizing and furthering many ongoing efforts to address the issue, and developing a blueprint for action that has the support of and input from numerous critical stakeholders. The Panel's efforts have been greatly furthered by the work of individual Panel members and by critical public-private partnerships between the shellfish industry, researchers, non-profit organizations, and the State.

As the Panel recognized, addressing ocean acidification requires sustained efforts in the areas of global and local source reduction, adaptation and remediation, research and monitoring, public education, and continued engagement by and with stakeholders. Whether Washington will be able to enact or enforce existing measures that demonstrably reduce localized contributors to ocean acidification remains to be seen, but in many ways Washington has succeeded in its first steps as a leader addressing this significant issue. Hopefully, going forward, Washington will be able to sustain or even increase its efforts. The anthropogenic CO₂ being absorbed by the world's oceans and the chemical processes that result make clear that ocean acidification is a problem beyond Washington's borders, impacting marine waters throughout the United States and the world. Other states—as well as the federal government and other nations—have much to learn from Washington's response, and can and should take actions that build off of and complement Washington's early efforts.