

RAC Workgroup Meeting Notes – 03/05/25

Process Updates

- Future Plan for Roundtable Process:
 - No Roundtable meeting on the 31st
 - But DLCD will still be in Brookings to meet with local officials and conduct a public meeting
- Next Roadmap meeting – Mid April, then May 15
- Trying to get to draft Roadmap by June

For Today

- Go through notes – consider key questions – what are our lanes
- Address outstanding questions raised - consider how to move forward
- What is our role with respect to developing a research agenda for
- Others are working on this – e.g., OPAC-STAC
 - STAC focusing on science agenda – looking at June but may extend – 25 page report – state’s primary effort

Option 1 Discussion

- Examine specific science of relevance – develop our own best sense of what we do and don’t know
- Challenge – will it muddy the water – should we be developing research questions – maybe not our best role?
 - Some agreement on this –
 - Focus on scope and key questions to be answered – rather than filling gaps
 - Yes – many groups are doing and collecting research – NS (DLCD) will send links to other efforts
- Should not limit scope to existing research –
 - Identify more granular information we would like to obtain
 - What do we need up front vs later in the effort
 - High level prioritization

- Focus on what we need to know in order to move forward in Oregon – topic by topic
 - How do we get granular – challenging
- Maybe let other agency do the work of assessing existing info and then have this group review for gaps
- Also need to incorporate “other ways of knowing” – tribal (ITEK) and other non-traditional sources

Scenic Resources

- Gap – scenic resources – important information is lacking
 - STAC not looking at scenic issue at all
 - Lots of information needed – but not a big lift (resources mentioned in 02/20 meeting on effects)
- Tourism perspective – visual impacts to viewsheds are very important to this major
 - Have to stay ahead of this issue on social media
 - Offline discussion with Dean and Marcus to make sure the agenda is correct
- Dean and others - Developing list of research needs and ways to address – draft coming soon
- OR TSP – assumes higher level of viewshed protection than realistic if built within 25 miles (due to new turbine design)

Scope and Uncertainty

- Scope question – is the State in a position to move forward if the state can’t answer everyone’s question – if not, then the RA is important to moving forward and addressing climate change
 - There will be uncertainty – cannot be a complete block
- To address uncertainty (how to incorp new data) – need to have functional adaptive management plan
 - BOEM has not fully embraced this – so important state role in ensuring this happens
 - See the adaptive management plan for the OSU wave energy effort – or possibly from East Coast FOSW efforts
 - Hard to “adapt” on scenic resources once the turbine is up and visible – not really movable – no way to address without removal

- Time is running out for addressing climate change – yes – but Wind is not moving forward in OR soon – so we have time to address OSW issues
- Some work has to wait until lease is issued and location identified (sea floor assessment, etc.) – but visual impacts can be assessed in advance.
 - Need list of questions that must be answered first (up front)
- Want to avoid late-identified (post-lease) impacts to resources – but also to developers
- Upwellings – unique and needs to be understood and protected
 - Upwelling and dead zones affected by winds – see studies
 - Are effects of OSW on upwellings (and ocean environment generally) reversible – and over what time frame
- List out what kind of baseline monitoring is needed before leases/development (is STAC doing this?)

Data

- Need focus on data housing and data standards – can be many challenges
 - May be models from the East Coast that will be helpful
 - Future work for this workgroup
- When STAC focusses on research needs – focusing on environmental science – but there are other social and economic effects that are not well covered
 - Visual/viewshed is one – what are others?
- Consider Oregon’s renewable energy needs independently vs assessments that may be building CA demand for renewables from OR into analysis

Option 2 Discussion

- Other Option – create a science/research collaborative of our own
 - See, e.g., East Coast wildlife science collaboratives that are reviewing and responding to research
 - CA also funding a science collaborative
 - Do we need our own OR focused science collaborative/panel
 - Is OPAC already doing this? Do we need an additional panel? What is role for the Roundtable/Roadmap

Option 3 Discussion

- Another option – CA is out front on this – let them lead but get seat/role on their panel – or otherwise build a relationship with their panel
 - Resource efficient to chip in
 - But how do we know if OR is effectively represented if we don't have our own panel
 - Single seat is insufficient – but talk to the organizers about how it might work
 - CA organizers are interested in being relevant beyond CA
 - But will the group get too big? Has been done on the East Coast (RWFC) with a very big group
 - Chip in vs just ride coattails
- Or team with WA (similarly situated to OR) and BC?
 - But less funding, momentum, progress, etc. than CA
- Or have one entity for the entire West Coast – enough commonality
 - Like what NWF helped do with the Gulf Coast
 - On East Coast – governance and entity established – defines relationship with feds and state – divided into caucuses – eNGOs, feds, states, industry (no tribes – but CA effort has both tribes and EJ representation)
 - Gulf entity may include other sectors – being thought through now
 - Tribes are sovereign and will have to be included individually without being diminished
- Identify opportunities: If CA does research off NoCal coast – why would we not want to leverage/buy into that and extend the research effort into OR waters.
- Be efficient: See what CA is doing and don't duplicate
- Oregon Ocean Science Trust (OOST)
 - OPAC and Pacific Offshore entity (?) (Pacific Offshore Wind Consortium?) and OOST – coordinating opportunity?

To Summarize

- Roadmap has a role in addressing the research agenda
 - Can be a center of gravity – but not the only one
- Review STAC effort – assess for possible gaps
- Include some basic tenets around renewable energy development and uncertainty
 - Address uncertainty with adaptive management
 - This group can help address – identify what constitutes appropriate offramps

What Else and What Next

- Set priorities – Determine what information we need now/soon and prepare for eventual shift in policy direction back toward wind energy development
 - Especially information that affects leasing decisions and location
- Creation of comprehensive/rigorous FAQs and materials (as in NY) –
 - Shayna to share materials
 - To what extent are we moving the needle with this – who is listening
 - It depends on who is providing info
 - Who are the trusted voices?
- Develop Spreadsheet (/)
 - categories and subcategories of Research
 - what is needed before and after leasing
 - best sources for obtaining
 - E.g., look at effects table – add columns at show where knowledge/research is needed
 - Is STAC doing this?
- What is the total impact effect on Carbon
 - Is there a net benefit given construction impacts, etc.?
 - There is an MIT study that says yes (one to two year turnaround)
 - Roadmap can send signals about cleaning up parts of the development process - helpful