



DLCD

Department of
Land Conservation
& Development



OCMP

Oregon Coastal
Management Program



**OREGON
CONSENSUS**

DECEMBER 19, 2024 MEETING PACKET





AGENDA: Floating Offshore Wind Roadmap Roundtable

Thursday, December 19, from 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM

Mill Casino

3201 Tremont Ave, North Bend, OR 97459

ZOOM:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/join/zoom-join?zjs=1&from=addon>

Objectives for December Meeting # 3:

- Welcome and provide updates
- Discuss offshore wind effects and potential pathways to development
- Discuss potential areas for deeper dives and strategy work

9:00am	Arrival, Welcoming (full session) ● Welcome from the Coquille Tribe ● Providing a moment for participants to join and settle in ● Revisit public engagement opportunities in the Roadmap process ● Updates & Reminder about the “question box” online or at the meeting <i>Coffee, hot tea, and water will be provided.</i>
9:30am	Reviewing the “Visions” from Nov 19 (full session) ● What was exciting when you saw all the visions merged? What is still missing? ● What next? ● Discussion
10:00am	Environmental Effects: Listing the effects of concern (breakouts) ● Discussion on current environmental opportunities and risks ● Which of these opportunities and risks:



	○ Have the highest uncertainty? ○ Are of most concern? ● Discussion to generate a joint list of effects (full session)
11:00am	Morning Break (provided)
11:15 am	Social, Economic, Community Effects: Listing the effects of concern (breakouts?) ● Discussion on current human opportunities and risks ● Which of these opportunities and risks: ○ Have the highest uncertainty? ○ Are of most concern? ● Discussion to generate a joint list of effects (full session)
12:15pm	Public Comment Part I
12:30pm	Lunch Break (provided)
1:30pm	Path to Development: Listing the path elements (breakouts?) ● Discussion on elements needed that would advance opportunities for OSW in Oregon? ● Which of these opportunities and risks: ○ Have the highest uncertainty? ○ Are of most concern? ● Discussion to generate a joint list of development path elements (full session)
2:30pm	Key Dilemmas: Where do we need a deep dive? (full session) ● What are some of the key dilemmas the Roadmap needs to navigate? ● What are some of the priority dilemmas to schedule time for at future meetings?
3:15pm	Afternoon Break (provided)
3:30pm	Establishing Our Working Groups (full session) ● Review survey feedback on working group priorities ● Define teams/tasks or work groups, roles, and how to collaborate moving forward. ○ What are the scopes for each workgroup?



	○ What to deliver and by when ○ Who needs to be in those groups and how best to bring information back to the Roundtable?
4:15pm	Public Comment Part II & Questions
4:50pm	Closing & next steps (full session)
5:00pm	Adjourn

ATTACHED MEETING MATERIALS:

- Summary of potential effects (risks and opportunities) for the environment, economy, and community
- Summary pathways to development
- Synthesized Vision statements
- Version 3 of the Roadmap Outline
- Version 2 of the Roundtable Charter

OFFSHORE WIND EFFECTS TABLE
(DISCUSSION DRAFT)





Offshore Wind Effects Compilation Table

Last Updated 12/10/24

The following table was originally developed as a tool to support permitting decisions related to offshore renewable energy projects. It originated from the collaborative interagency discussions surrounding the PacWave South permitting process and has been adapted for offshore wind. The main inputs to this table include:

- Effects identified during the PacWave permit scoping process (with amendments to be applicable to offshore wind instead of wave energy devices)
- Effects identified in public and agency comments during the BOEM leasing federal consistency review in 2024
- Section 3 of the Offshore Wind Roadmap Considerations document (2023)
- Responses to the Roadmap Roundtable online survey conducted in December 2024
- Individual staff conversations and research into potential offshore wind effects, in support of future federal consistency reviews.

The table should be considered a living document and a work in progress. The focus of the December meeting will be on the first two columns (**Effects of Interest** and **Effect Details**). As the conversation evolves, we plan to add:

- **Primary Information Sources**: For each effect, where in the standard offshore wind permitting process would we expect to see this effect addressed? (e.g., before leasing, in NEPA documents to support leasing, in the Construction/Operation Plan review stage, via Adaptive Management post-construction, or via additional studies external to the formal process)
- **Data Needs / Uncertainties**: What information, if we had it, would be effective as a source to reduce our uncertainty or support adaptive management? (This can feed into the research agenda piece later)
- **Corresponding Enforceable Policies**: This will be filled out to support future Roundtable meetings discussing potential policy gaps and standards that may be needed to appropriately address the effect. Initial information is provided now but will be further fleshed out over time.

Effect	Effect Details	Primary Info Sources <i>(Type and stage of the process)</i>	Data Needs/ Uncertainties	Corresponding Enforceable Policies
GEOLOGIC AND SOILS RESOURCES				
Effects of project presence, installation, and removal activities on local geology and soils.	Impacts of cables on seafloor, shoreline, and terrestrial resources, including cultural resources	Site characterization data/models in EIS	High resolution seafloor mapping of geologic resources and hazards.	Territorial Sea Plan Part 5; Statewide Planning Goal 19
Effects of project on sediment transport processes (erosion, accretion)				
WATER RESOURCES				
Effects of anchor and cable installation on water quality, including sediment suspension.				ORS 468b, OAR 340 (Water Quality)
Effects of toxics introduced by the Project (e.g., antifouling paint or coatings) on water quality.				ORS 468b, OAR 340 (Water Quality)
Negative effects to water quality from construction/ops (e.g., vessel and maintenance operations)	Includes ballast water, inadvertent spills, in estuarine and open sea			ORS 468b, OAR 340 (Water Quality)
Effects of accidental spills of fuel, lubricants, marine debris, PFOAs, bisphenols (BPA), and hydraulic oil on water quality in event of release				OAR 340-141 (oil spills) ORS468b
AQUATIC RESOURCES				
Effects to the benthic community or alteration of benthic habitat from installation/removal activities and presence of Project structures on the seafloor (e.g. anchors, cable).	Destruction of seafloor habitats from anchors, mooring chains, cable placement, etc.		• Surveys of benthic habitat (type, density, distribution, composition of species present). High resolution seafloor mapping of sensitive seafloor habitats in the lease area. • Mounding of dead invertebrates around structures?	Statewide Planning Goal 19; Territorial Sea Plan Part 4/5

Effect	Effect Details	Primary Info Sources <i>(Type and stage of the process)</i>	Data Needs/ Uncertainties	Corresponding Enforceable Policies
Effects of changes to marine community composition at the Project site (e.g., use patterns, attraction, and aversion).	• Effects of changes in the presence of fouling organisms; • Effects of pinniped haulout, seabird perching; • Effects of alterations in the distribution or abundance of predators and prey species; • Effects on species interactions (as a result of attraction to or avoidance of the Project); • Invasive Species establishment on hard structures		• Longitudinal spatiotemporal information relevant to seasonally migrating species and interannual variability of ocean conditions. • Long-term monitoring of birds and marine mammals • Data from control areas to support BACI designs • To what extent do reef effects result in net benefits to biodiversity and abundance?	Goal 19 TSP Part 5 ORS 496 - Wildlife Policy, ORS 506 - Food Fish Policy
Effects to anadromous coastal fish species (salmon & steelhead) migration in the ocean and coastal rivers	What is the specific effect of concern? What would be the source?			Goal 19 TSP Part 5 ORS 496 - Wildlife Policy, ORS 506 - Food Fish Policy
Effects of underwater noise/vibration on marine mammals, fish, sea turtles, and seabirds.	Bird behavior, whale foraging behavior, migratory routes, predator-prey interactions			Goal 19 ORS 496 - Wildlife Policy
Effects or risk of collision or entanglement with Project structures, entangled gear, or service vessels to marine species.	Bird and bat strikes, mammal entanglement or collision, ship strikes, light pollution effects on bats			Goal 19 ORS 496 - Wildlife Policy ORS 506
Effects of Project navigational lighting and boat traffic lighting on seabirds.				Goal 19 ORS 496 - Wildlife Policy
Effects of changes in wave energy on neritic/seafloor, littoral and shoreline habitat				Goal 19
Effects of electromagnetic field (EMF) emissions on species sensitive to EMF				Goal 19 ORS 496

Effect	Effect Details	Primary Info Sources <i>(Type and stage of the process)</i>	Data Needs/ Uncertainties	Corresponding Enforceable Policies
Effects of Project construction, operation and maintenance on state-listed, special-status or strategy species not protected under the federal ESA				ORS 496 Wildlife ORS 496.171 Management authority for T/E species
Effects to species from marine debris, hydraulic fluids, PFOAs, bisphenols (BPA), and oil contamination from turbines releasing into the ocean environment				Goal 19 ORS 496 ORS 506.109
Energy extraction effects to upwelling and primary production, both locally and cumulatively across the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem	Reduction of primary productivity, relocation of productivity, change in migration and forage behavior (e.g., birds fly out to upwelling fronts), changes to ocean mixing, changes to larval drift/ocean transport			Goal 19 ORS 496 ORS 506.109
Effects related to invasive species introduction from vessel activities and permanent infrastructure attachment				gap? ORS 496.012?
Effects to estuaries from project development and cables	Pollution from biofouling, ballast water, spills; changes to hydrodynamics and species/habitats from dredging; shoreline development impacts; loss of eel grass habitat			Goal 16 - Estuaries Goal 17 Shorelands Local plans and codes
Rocky reef and nearshore ecosystem effects from projects and cables	What would be the mechanism for this? Downstream wake effect changes to wind/current?			TSP Part 3 Goal 19 ORS 496 Wildlife
Co-effects of climate change and offshore wind	Exacerbation of adverse climate effects or mitigation of?		Given expected shifts in ocean composition, climate patterns, and species presence, what are the projected changes in Oregon's near-shore ocean in a 2.8°C world with (or without) floating offshore wind in Oregon?	Goal 19 ORS 496 Wildlife ORS 506.109

Effect	Effect Details	Primary Info Sources <i>(Type and stage of the process)</i>	Data Needs/ Uncertainties	Corresponding Enforceable Policies
Cumulative effects to marine food webs	Combined effects of all of the above on marine species abundance, behavior, and migration, both near the project and regionally			Goal 19 ORS 496 Wildlife ORS 506.109
TERRESTRIAL RESOURCES				
Effects of temporary displacement of and/or disturbance to wildlife and botanical resources in the immediate vicinity during Project construction.	Destruction of plants, displacing animal species, lost recreational access			ORS 390 Ocean Shores ORS 496 Wildlife others? Local plans and codes
Shoreline effects of cable placement	Beach/dune ecosystem impacts			ORS 390 Ocean Shores Goal 18 Beaches and Dunes Local plans and codes
Effects of habitat alteration or loss due to the presence of onshore Project structures (e.g., power monitoring and control building, support facilities).				ORS 496 Wildlife Local plans and codes others?
Effects of Project construction, operation and maintenance on state-listed, special-status or strategy species not protected under the federal ESA.				ORS 496 Wildlife Local plans and codes others?
Wildfire hazards associated with transmission lines				Gap?
Effects of wind energy extraction to swell, coastal erosion, longshore currents, nearshore weather patterns, and sea state				Gap?
THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES, CRITICAL HABITAT AND ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT				
Effects of the Project on federally listed species in the Project area, both aquatic and terrestrial, including multiple species of marine mammals, fish, birds and reptiles.*				Outside OR jurisdiction?
Effects of Project structures and activities on Designated Critical Habitat (DCH).				Outside OR jurisdiction?

Effect	Effect Details	Primary Info Sources <i>(Type and stage of the process)</i>	Data Needs/ Uncertainties	Corresponding Enforceable Policies
Effects of Project structures and activities on Essential Fish Habitat.				Outside OR jurisdiction? Goal 19 ORS 506.109
RECREATION AND LAND USE				
Effects to navigation and commercial and recreational fishing and crabbing.			Effects to ports and slip space from increased vessel presence/traffic?	Goal 19 TSP Part 5
Effects of Project land-based structures and facilities on recreational qualities and uses of state park lands.				ORS 390 others?
Effects of recovery/clean-up activities associated with spills or other emergencies on coastal recreation.				ORS 390 OAR 340 (oil spill rules) Goal 19
Effects on ocean waves and swell downwind of projects. Effects to safety from physical nearshore changes? Attraction/avoidance?				Goal 19?
Closure of beach access during installation, and noise effects to nearby residents				ORS 390 Ocean Shores
Shoreline privatization effects?				Local plans and codes? others?
CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES				
Effects of the Project on historic, archeological and traditional cultural resources located within the Project Area of Potential Effect (to be determined in consultation with Oregon State Historic Preservation Office and Tribes)			Assumes no visual presence from characterization activities and no other archaeological resources in the vicinity offshore	ORS 358 ORS 390 ORS 97
Effects of the Project on tribal uses and/or resources located within the Project area.				Gap? (for those uses/resources not already covered by a resource protection statute/rule, e.g., water, wildlife)

Effect	Effect Details	Primary Info Sources <i>(Type and stage of the process)</i>	Data Needs/ Uncertainties	Corresponding Enforceable Policies
Effects to lifeways, including sacred views; commercial and subsistence activities, important foods, natural resources as cultural resources				TSP Part 5 (views) Goal 19 (views, species, resources) ORS 506.109 (food fish)
AESTHETIC RESOURCES				
Effects of platforms and navigational lighting on the aesthetic/visual experience from shore (viewshed effects).		BOEM Visual Simulations; Analysis based on Viewshed Standards in TSP Part 5.	Will offshore characterization buoys have lighting visible from shore?	TSP Part 5 Goal 19
Effects of land-based Project structures and facilities to visual resources or state park lands.			Assumes no land-based structures are part of the lease decision.	ORS 390 Local plans and codes
SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES AND EFFECTS TO COASTAL USES				
Effects to commercial fishing	● Loss of fishing grounds from area exclusion, ● loss of catch efficiency due to area avoidance, ● Gear loss, ● “fleet squeeze” into available areas, ● secondary effects to support industries, ● decreased catch from adverse effects to fish species ● Increased competition for port space and services ● Adverse effects to vessel safety or navigation equipment ● Increases to bycatch in available areas ● Disruption of scientific management and MSC certification			Goal 19; TSP Part 4/5; ORS 506.109 Food Fish Policy; ORS 496.012 Wildlife Policy

Effect	Effect Details	Primary Info Sources <i>(Type and stage of the process)</i>	Data Needs/ Uncertainties	Corresponding Enforceable Policies
Effects to crabbing?	Temporary effects from cable installation; others?		Assuming no crabbing presence in farther offshore areas	Goal 19; TSP Part 4/5; ORS 506.109 Food Fish Policy;
Effects to recreational fishing?				Goal 19; TSP Part 4/5; ORS 506.109 Food Fish Policy;
Effects to harbor space and port service availability	Includes both harbor space and airports for support operations			Gap?
Effects of the Project and potential navigation restrictions on marine transportation				Gap?
Effects of the project to maritime safety (e.g., helicopter access, other SAR)				Gap? ORS 506.109 (4) to develop and maintain access to the lands and waters of the state and the food fish resources thereon. Also ORS 496.012(4) develop and maintain public access to the lands and waters of the state and the wildlife resources thereon
Effects of local, state and regional economic benefits resulting from the development and presence of the Project.	Job creation, housing, economic stimulation, supply chain			Gap?
Effects to other types of subsea cables resulting from competition for landing areas onshore and cable routes offshore			Assumes all data reporting would be remote	Gap?
Effects to scientific research resulting from the presence of offshore structures, vessel traffic, and other project-related changes to offshore conditions	Potential interference with stock surveys			Gap?

Effect	Effect Details	Primary Info Sources <i>(Type and stage of the process)</i>	Data Needs/ Uncertainties	Corresponding Enforceable Policies
Effects to military operations and national security				Outside OR jurisdiction?
Effects to housing from industry growth				Gap?
Socioeconomic benefits of new industry on workforce, economies, social services, education and training				Gap?
Effects to tourism	What specific effects are of concern or interest?			Gap?
HAZARDS EFFECTS				
Effect of failed/sunken platforms on ● Permanence of fish exclusion zones ● Loss of fishing gear ● Marine pollution (e.g., oil, debris) ● Oregon Beaches, Rocky Habitats, Marine Protected Areas (if structures wash up onshore or sink in nearshore waters.			What will happen if there is another "Buoy on Bottom" event like occurred in 2006? What is known about array maintenance, failure, and recovery in other places?	ORS 390 – Ocean Shores ORS 274 – Submerged Lands TSP Part Three – Rocky Shores Goal 19 – Ocean Resources
Cascadia Subduction Zone Co-Effects ● Anchor shifting/sliding on the continental slope ● Failure of transmission lines ● Effects to energy reliability? (positive or negative?)				Oregon PUC requirements for energy reliability?
UNCATEGORIZED EFFECTS				
Project Decommissioning effects	waste management, increased activity, risk of spills or failures, traffic effects, species disruption, noise, port infrastructure for dismantling and transport, etc			Various offshore and onshore policies could apply depending on activities
Effects to grid reliability and resiliency in the coast, state, and region			Would there be changes to electricity access, resilience, rates on the coast?	Gap?
Effect to attainment of Oregon clean energy targets			If power is sold to other states, what is the effect on Oregon clean energy targets? Is it more difficult to attain?	Gap?
Effects to/from aquaculture?				Gap?

Effect	Effect Details	Primary Info Sources <i>(Type and stage of the process)</i>	Data Needs/ Uncertainties	Corresponding Enforceable Policies
Impacts to low-income and marginalized communities?	Includes energy cost impacts to ratepayers			Gap?

PATHWAY TO DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS





Pathway to Development

Last Updated 12/10/24

I. Background

If Oregon is interested in floating offshore wind energy located off of Oregon's coast, there are actions that can be taken to clarify pathways to development for offshore wind energy. This memo focuses on some of the pathway elements the State of Oregon might consider.

Actions along a pathway to development might include:

- Improving market certainty for energy developers, ports, and supply chain participants by clearly defining offshore wind goals and needs
- Reducing financial risk for energy developers, ports, and supply chain participants
- Providing clarity on regulations, standards, and expectations that need to be met
- Ensuring the planning and infrastructure is in place to support a pipeline of development
- Ensuring the materials/supply chain and labor/workforce is in place when it's needed
- Cooperating regionally with California and Washington to ensure a coordinated and efficient ports system and supply chain

II. A Pathway to Development

2.1. Increasing certainty that there is a market for the OSW energy

- Power purchase agreements
 - Competitive procurement
- Regional energy markets
- Financing and incentives
- Procurement mechanisms in place for long lead resources (i.e., energy generation projects that take a long time from start to finish) to ensure power offtake
- Opportunities for innovative public-private partnerships
- How much "dirty" energy would get displaced by OSW, and are there ways to ensure that as overall energy demand increases

2.2. Clarity on regulations, standards, and expectations

- Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of negative effects
- Enforceable policies that are achievable and reasonable, on par with existing markets to ensure competitiveness along with responsible development
- Expectations and opportunities for positive effects

- Community benefit agreements and mitigation funds (if needed)
- Revenue sharing, co-management, co-ownership
- Promotion of net positive impacts on biodiversity
- Contracting with local maritime and coastal businesses
- Port development and revenue

2.3. Local planning and infrastructure

- Signals on/maps of call areas that avoid conflict and optimize energy opportunity
- Pre-identified cable landing locations
- Port infrastructure¹
 - Regionally
 - Coordination with California and Washington ports, and among Oregon ports
 - Locally
 - Upgrades/updates that are useful with or without OSW
 - Nominal dredged bottom depth, channel width, bar crossing probability, fueling capabilities, fuel storage capacity, required airspace, and mitigation measures for conflicts with existing airport flight paths
 - Upgrades/updates needed specifically for OSW
 - Boatyards for servicing vessels
 - Infrastructure for decommissioning
- Grid improvements & Transmission
- Substations (land and sea)
- Housing and services needs (if any?)
- Vessel construction
- Any transportation needs (aside from ports) for components, such as roads and rail

2.4. Supply chain

- Understanding of current Oregon supply chain capabilities, gaps, needs, and opportunities
 - Imports/exports
 - Role in West Coast supply chain
 - Role in global supply chain
- Goals/objectives for timing, certainty, and cost to accessing supply chain components
- Vessels
 - Wind turbine installation
 - Cable lay
 - Scour protection
 - Heavy lift
 - Transport

¹ Some additional information on Port Infrastructure needs can be found here: https://renewablenw.org/sites/default/files/Reports-Fact%20Sheets/Floating%20OSW%20Manual_2024.pdf.

- Service operations
 - Crew transfer
- Chains and anchors and moorings
- Cables
 - Dynamic cables
 - Seabed cables
- Electrical infrastructure at generation sites
- Power transmission infrastructure
- Floats and platforms
 - Components
 - Assembly
- Turbine, blades, and tower
 - Components
 - Assembly
- Services
 - Development and permitting
 - Survey/site assessment
 - Public outreach
 - Engineering and design
 - Project management
 - Turbine supply
 - Turbine installation
 - Foundation installation
 - Subsea cable installation
 - Anchors and moorings installation
 - Onshore construction
 - Ports and logistics
 - Operations
 - Turbine inspection and maintenance
 - BoP inspection and maintenance
 - Education and training provided
 - Other professional services

2.5. Workforce

- Training and apprenticeships
 - Utilize current state standards, including building codes, to guarantee a proficient and well-trained workforce in the FOSW sector. the implementation of the apprenticeship division of the Oregon Bureau of Labor and Industries (BOLI); Advocate for local hiring mandates that prioritize "first look" opportunities.
- Safety and wage standards, and other labor standards
 - Enhance current state standards, including building codes, by integrating them with the standards for constructing floating offshore wind turbines, while implementing weatherization measures and strategies to protect against the severe conditions of the Pacific Ocean.

- Prioritizing development with low income, rural, Tribal, Black, Indigenous, People of Color and others who have historically not had the same access to building wealth and opportunity
- Regional coordination across states

2.6. Research, development, and third party testing

- Research on environmental and human effects
- Research optimizing turbine alignments and infrastructure
- Development of new technologies
- Third party testing of
 - OSW components and technology
- Third party monitoring of environmental and human effects
- Independent science and monitoring, data transparency/open science practices
- Accessible science/tech translation communications and education;

2.7. Explore viability and need of a pilot project

- Who else is doing pilots and how have those worked or not (e.g., CA in state waters, ME, Scotland)
- Where would the funding and financing come from?
- How would partners be selected?
- How would OSW move from pilot to scaled implementation?
 - What would need to be learned?
 - Who makes those decisions?

OFFSHORE WIND ENERGY ROADMAP OUTLINE
VERSION 3 REVISED AFTER THE NOVEMBER 19 ROUNDTABLE



Part I: Introduction

1. Purpose and Background
 - 1.1. Scope of the document (what it does and doesn't cover)
2. Existing research and information relevant to Oregon Offshore Wind
 - 2.1. Summary-level compendium of relevant information sources
 - 2.2. Known data gaps and ongoing research areas
 - 2.3. Ocean function context and how offshore wind technology interacts with marine systems.
 - 2.4. Climate change co-effects relevant to offshore wind
3. Current Status of Offshore Wind in Oregon
 - 3.1. What has happened with offshore wind so far in Oregon
 - 3.2. Offshore wind industry and market overview globally, nationally, and on the west coast
 - 3.3. Energy layout of the state: Grid infrastructure, Oregon-centric power economics, Relevant Oregon energy/climate policies, offshore wind potential role (scale of development being considered, including regional demand)
 - 3.4. State energy goals, the role of renewables, and the role of offshore wind (from the State Energy Strategy in progress)
 - 3.5. Regulatory framework and state levers on decision-making
 - 3.6. Interested parties and associated processes already in play,
 - 3.7. Challenges and opportunities that are known today (what are the “meaty topics”?)
4. Lessons learned in other states about successful processes
5. Oregon definitions of success for the roadmap regarding offshore wind direction-setting

Part II: Mapping to Alternative Futures

1. Alternative Future Destinations
 - 1.1. The state successfully hosts an offshore wind presence. What were the waypoints that got us there? What did we do right? What were the pitfalls we avoided? What was the sequence of events?
 - 1.2. The state does not site offshore wind turbines, but participates in offshore wind supply chain. What were the waypoints that got us there? What did we do right? What were the pitfalls we avoided? What was the sequence of events?
 - 1.3. Along the way to either of these futures, the state decides to pause/stop/oppose OSW development off Oregon. Why did we choose this path? What happened next?
 - 1.4. The state does not move forward on offshore wind in a coordinated fashion. Where does this scenario play out (in what arenas) if not led by the state?
2. Common elements and themes from alternative futures
3. Sequence of waypoints from future mapping compared to existing processes and plans
4. Roadmap Infographic figure (visual synthesis of the alternative futures and other strategic elements in the document that follows)

Part III: State Policy Assessment and Recommendations

1. Key effects of concern, existing policies to address concerns, and perceived gaps

- 1.1. By geography (e.g., offshore, onshore, state/local)
 - 1.1.1. Offshore effects
 - 1.1.2. Onshore effects by region
 - 1.1.3. Regional/Interstate
- 1.2. By project lifecycle phase (e.g., siting, supply, installation, maintenance, decommissioning)
 - 1.2.1. Planning
 - 1.2.2. Siting
 - 1.2.3. Construction
 - 1.2.4. Operations and Maintenance
 - 1.2.5. Decommissioning
- 1.3. By House Bill 4080 Topic Area
 - 1.3.1. Effective stakeholder engagement
 - 1.3.2. Local and regional coastal communities
 - 1.3.3. The creation of economic opportunities and sustainment of existing local and regional economies
 - 1.3.4. The creation of an offshore wind energy workforce that is local, trained, housed and equitable
 - 1.3.5. Protection of tribal cultural and archaeological resources, culturally significant viewsheds and other interests of Indian tribes;
 - 1.3.6. Protection of the environment and marine species; and
 - 1.3.7. Achievement of state energy and climate policy objectives, including energy resource diversity, reliability and resilience of state and regional energy systems.

2. Policy recommendations and options to address identified gaps and concerns

- 2.1. Values, Interests, Information Needs, Assets (what a policy should achieve/protect based on feedback from the Roadmap process)
- 2.2. Specific policy recommendations (how a policy might be framed/constructed)
- 2.3. Policy implementation Options and considerations (how a policy recommendation might be formalized and potential barriers due to resources, timing, capacity, conflicting laws, etc.)

3. Intersections with federal and local policies

4. State and local agency capacity assessment (parallel separate effort)

Part IV: Strategic Planning Elements

1. Protecting the Environment: Challenges and Opportunities

- 1.1. State of the science and major uncertainties or knowledge gaps surrounding environmental effects of concern and protection of marine species and marine life.
- 1.2. Process for science-based risk and uncertainty management in state and federal permitting processes (e.g., trusted information, decision-making process, risk “retirement”, risk valuation and contextualization)
- 1.3. Cumulative Impacts (how to evaluate individual projects in a larger context of potential future growth)
- 1.4. Role of marine spatial planning for protecting the environment (also included as a separate topic section later in the outline)
- 1.5. State research agenda to address uncertainties
 - 1.5.1. Who is doing what on scientific research for Oregon
 - 1.5.2. Identify unmet needs or state priorities
 - 1.5.3. Oregon-specific R&D?
 - 1.5.4. Timing of research vs. permitting decisions
- 1.6. Risk mitigation policies and strategies (avoid, minimize, offset, observe over time, compensate)
- 1.7. Monitoring plans to look for adverse effects that might not be readily apparent. Consider difficulty of collecting information on the ocean.
- 1.8. Adaptive Management options, standards, and recommendations
- 1.9. Catastrophic failure / disaster and recovery planning (also discussed in the “Accountability” section later in the outline)
- 1.10. Exit ramps
 - 1.10.1. Tipping points/thresholds
 - 1.10.2. Decision rules
 - 1.10.3. Timing (when is it too early or too late?)
 - 1.10.4. Role of monitoring
 - 1.10.5. Authorities
 - 1.10.6. When do we know that investment is a safe path (i.e., that an exit ramp is not likely)?
- 1.11. Recommendations and actions

2. Socioeconomic Effects: Challenges and Opportunities

- 2.1. Needed Information to support decision processes (connects to research agenda above)
 - 2.1.1. Visual/Scenic Resource inventory and valuation
 - 2.1.2. Fisheries sector broader effects
 - 2.1.3. Recreational valuation?
 - 2.1.4. Forecasted job and economic development opportunities (info need)
- 2.2. Identifying and valuing community impacts
- 2.3. Labor standards and workforce implementation
- 2.4. Mitigating effects to existing ocean users
 - 2.4.1. Fishing industry effects and mitigation
 - 2.4.2. Recreation
 - 2.4.3. Tourism

- 2.4.4. Shipping
- 2.4.5. Port space
- 2.4.6. Cultural and spiritual
- 2.5. Just transition principles (need more here)
- 2.6. Exit ramps for socioeconomic effects (following same structure as for environmental effects)
- 2.7. Recommendations and actions

3. Pathway to Development for Offshore Wind: Challenges and Opportunities

- 3.1. Information Needs
- 3.2. Challenges
 - a Port availability, shoreside development
 - b Transmission and cable landings
 - c Supply chain and logistics
 - d Workforce implementation
 - e Permitting and consent (including uncertain environmental and socioeconomic effects)
 - f Economics and procurement
 - g Others?
 - h Energy Procurement
 - i Economical price of power for residential and commercial consumers and related policy standards (exit ramp?)
 - j Policy and process structures for power purchase agreements
 - k How to incentivize developers if OR's conditions are more stringent than CA or WA? (opportunity cost analysis)
- 3.3. Opportunities
 - 3.3.1. Policy
 - 3.3.2. Investment
 - 3.3.3. Actions
- 3.4. Recommendations and actions

4. Shoreside Supply Chain and Port Development: Opportunities and Challenges

- 4.1. Information needs
- 4.2. Challenges
 - 4.2.1. Workforce development, training, and retention consistent with Oregon's labor policies and goals
 - 4.2.2. Needed "market signals" for infrastructure investment and supply chain development
 - 4.2.3. Environmental and permitting risk and uncertainty
 - 4.2.4. Service vessels and stationing - Port utilization by other ocean users (slip space and dock space conflicts)
 - 4.2.5. Development challenges: Estuary and community impacts
- 4.3. Opportunities:
 - 4.3.1. Policy
 - 4.3.2. Investment

4.3.3. Actions

4.4. Recommendations and actions

5. State Energy Strategy Interconnections

5.1. Interstate and regional energy markets

5.1.1. Power affordability

5.1.2. Transmission planning

5.1.3. “Which state benefits”?

5.1.4. Oregon Renewable Portfolio Standards and Offshore Wind: e.g., Can Oregon have a say in which kinds of technology would be most applicable to RPS? Or do we need to re-think how to apply RPS, if Oregon supports a supply chain for California OSW, but doesn’t actually develop OSW off Oregon? And how do RPS fit in if OSW is developed off Oregon but the energy is sent to California or Washington via transmission lines in the ocean (it never comes to shore in Oregon)?

5.2. Energy resiliency effects from different development scenarios

5.3. The role of demand reduction?

5.4. Transmission planning – local and regional

5.5. Power purchase economics and structures – policy/procurement options

5.6. Defining the scale of cumulative development and effects

5.6.1. How much offshore wind is enough? Can we identify a practical limit for Oregon? What of meeting needs for the region?

5.6.2. To what extent OSW is an end in itself or an intermediate or temporary stage on the road to a stable energy future.

5.6.3. Can Oregon still reap some of the economic benefits of offshore wind if the state decides to include OSW in its renewable energy mix, but not at the levels anticipated by developers?

5.6.4. How do we find the appropriate scale of energy production balanced with ocean protection?

5.6.5. Holistic thinking: How does OSW fit in with other renewable energy in Oregon? That is, what is the balance with solar and onshore wind and, possibly, wave energy?

5.6.6. What is the total amount of “harvestable wind”?

5.7. Models of offshore wind ownership (investor-owned vs. public-owned vs. community-owned vs. other)

5.8. Timelines for offshore wind coming online relative to state energy goals

5.9. Recommendations and Actions

6. Enforceable Agreements and Compensatory Mitigation – structures, organizing needs, state role,

6.1. Options for structures and commitments to benefit agreements and compensatory mitigation

6.1.1. Legally enforceable community agreements (alternative to Community Benefit Agreements)

6.1.2. Labor standards and effects on various groups

6.1.3. Fishing industry compensatory mitigation management structure

6.1.4. Tribal benefit agreements

- 6.1.5. Transmission agreements? (need to learn more)
- 6.2. Affected Community Selection and Organization – needs, opportunities, challenges (e.g., communities of place and communities of interest)
- 6.3. State role – challenges, opportunities, recommendations
- 6.4. Recommendations and actions

7. Fisheries Management and Offshore Wind

- 7.1. Agency-led management needs, challenges, opportunities
- 7.2. Protecting species availability and abundance
- 7.3. Fishing users effects and mitigation
- 7.4. Secondary and support industry effects and mitigation
- 7.5. Recommendations and actions

8. Accountability for Development Effects

- 8.1. Catastrophic event recovery and compensation
- 8.2. Unexpected effects after permitting
- 8.3. Enforceability of agreements with developers and oversight agencies
- 8.4. Maintenance commitments
- 8.5. Decommissioning plans
- 8.6. Waste management
- 8.7. Grievance Procedures
- Recommendations and actions

9. Transmission Upgrades and Development – Beyond Planning

- 9.1. Scale and location of transmission necessary to support offshore wind development in Oregon (info need or estimate)
- 9.2. Integrating offshore and onshore transmission needs (siting and spatial planning for sea/shore/upland)
- 9.3. State processes for addressing community effects from transmission development
- 9.4. Community agreements related to transmission? (need to learn more)
- 9.5. Recommendations and actions

10. Offshore Wind Tribal and Public Engagement Expectations (inside and outside permitting processes)

- 10.1. How can trust be built? Federal government, state government, developers and industry, science, others? What is the web of necessary trust for offshore wind?
- 10.2. Tribal engagement and consultation, including government to government interactions (repeated as separate section below)
- 10.3. Local community engagement
- 10.4. Permitting process engagement Fisheries engagement
- 10.5. Other affected communities
- 10.6. Data management, sharing, and public availability
- 10.7. Maintaining trusted information and addressing misinformation

10.8. Recommendations and actions

11. Tribal Engagement and Consultation in Offshore Wind Development

12. Offshore Wind Permitting Process Coordination and Improvement

- 12.1. Public engagement improvements
- 12.2. Science and uncertainty management in state decisions
- 12.3. Local government involvement in decision-making
- 12.4. State relationship with federal agencies concerning offshore wind
- 12.5. Recommendations and actions

13. State Marine Spatial Planning for Federal Waters

- 13.1. Can the state identify off-limits areas? Both offshore from an ecosystem or use perspective but also from a shoreside impact perspective (e.g., port developments, visual impacts)
- 13.2. Combination with marine reserves?
- 13.3. Spatial planning for cable crossings and landings
- 13.4. Integration with federal efforts
- 13.5. Accounting for climate change effects on suitable development areas
- 13.6. Recommendations and actions

14. Alternative concepts (thinking beyond just turbines)

- 14.1. State-led design standards preferences for offshore wind: E.g., height, visual effects, mooring types, amount of wind harvested, maintenance aspects
- 14.2. Integrated solutions, e.g., aquaculture, hydrogen production, wave energy
- 14.3. Opportunities and challenges with integrating offshore wind with wave energy

15. Financing – government subsidies, private equity, intellectual property ownership

Part V: Action Plan

- 1) Short term
- 2) Medium Term
- 3) Long term

REVISED OFFSHORE WIND ENERGY ROADMAP
ROUNDTABLE CHARTER



Floating Offshore Wind Roadmap

Oregon Roundtable

DRAFT Charter Version

last updated 12/10/24

Where this document came from:

This draft charter was developed through A) an template provided by Oregon Consensus, B) and comments from an Oregon Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable task team on November 14, 2024 group meeting.

Feedback from participants in the November 19, 2024

- To revise and include as part of the language the marine ecosystem and the ocean context and the importance of it within the role of the roundtable as an advisory body within the roadmap development process.
- To double check the language on HB4080 about the diverse perspective that need to be included, cultural specific and from tribes
- In section 3, as the roundtable objectives, include the to address the questions about the impacts, mitigation, and study needs.

Changes are highlighted in yellow below.

This Charter is intended to be revisited as needed when suggested by the Roadmap Roundtable members.

Floating Offshore Wind Roadmap.....	1
Oregon Roundtable.....	1
DRAFT Charter Version	1
1. Background: Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Development.....	1
2. Formative Assumptions	3
3. Roundtable Objectives	3
4. Participation Guidelines	4
5. Organizational Structure	5

6. Meetings	6
7. Decision-Making	6
8. Process Ground Rules of Engagement.....	7
9. Initial Members	8

1. Background: Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Development

The **Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)** has been directed by **House Bill 4080**, passed during the 2024 Legislative Session, to develop an **Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap** on behalf of the State of Oregon. The Roadmap aims to establish standards for processes related to offshore wind energy development and approval. These standards will guide future research, investments, partnerships, and community engagement surrounding the potential development of offshore wind in Oregon. **The Roundtable group also recognizes that any historic, current, or future uses of the ocean fit within the context of the ocean ecosystem, and the connections between land, water, and people.**

Key Objectives and Standards of the Roadmap

According to House Bill 4080, Section 3: “The standards defined in the Offshore Wind Roadmap must support:

- (a) Effective stakeholder engagement;
- (b) Local and regional coastal communities;
- (c) The creation of economic opportunities and sustainment of existing local and regional economies;
- (d) The creation of an offshore wind energy workforce that is local, trained, housed and equitable;
- (e) Protection of tribal cultural and archaeological resources, culturally significant viewsheds and other interests of Indian tribes;
- (f) Protection of the environment and marine species; and
- (g) Achievement of state energy and climate policy objectives, including energy resource diversity, reliability and resilience of state and regional energy systems.”

Governance and Process Overview

DLCD has appointed members of the **Roadmap Roundtable**, which will provide advice on both the content and engagement process for the Roadmap. Members may also participate in **working groups** focused on specific topics, such as:

- Environmental/cultural resource effects
- Energy needs and considerations
- Supply chain and port development
- Workforce development and labor standards
- Fisheries industry effects
- Community benefits and equity

- Tribal impacts and benefits
- State and local permitting

The **Roadmap development process is not a formal rulemaking effort. It cannot directly create or amend laws, rules, or enforceable policies.** Instead, it will identify and inform future public processes required to amend any enforceable policies.

Community Engagement and Strategic Planning

DLCD, with support from **Oregon Consensus**, will coordinate the Roadmap's development and engagement process. The Roadmap may provide strategic planning guidance on steps the state should consider, such as future research, investment, and partnerships related to offshore wind energy development.

The development process will include ongoing opportunities for community engagement and public comment through June 2025. DLCD will also seek direct input from affected communities to ensure their perspectives are included in the Roadmap.

The ultimate goal of the Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap is to establish a comprehensive framework that aligns with Oregon's energy, environmental, labor, economic, and social goals while promoting sustainable and equitable development of offshore wind energy infrastructure.

2. Formative Assumptions

2.1. The Roundtable IS...

- An advisory group that provides input on the content and engagement process of the Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap.
- A forum where members can participate in specialized working groups to focus on key areas relevant to offshore wind development.
- A space to identify potential benefits and/or impacts of concern, as well as questions to be addressed or studied regarding marine ecosystems and coastal environments.
- A platform to explore infrastructure needs and economic opportunities associated with offshore wind.
- An advocate for inclusive benefits, ensuring all communities, including underrepresented groups, are involved and able to benefit from offshore wind development.
- A facilitator of shared learning and consensus wherever possible, promoting an inclusive and collaborative dialogue among participants.
- A source to explore and develop recommendations for studies, mitigation, and enforceable state policies necessary to understand and address offshore wind impacts.
- Inclusive of Tribal governments, seeks to understand and address impacts to resources of Tribal concern, and recognizes the obligation of the State to meaningfully engage in consultation.

2.2. The Roundtable IS NOT...

- The group is not a decision-making body and has no formal authority to make or enforce policies. It is also not a sanctioned task force or authoritative committee.

- This group will not address specific offshore wind proposals or directly engage with current draft Wind Energy Areas.
- Participation in the group does not imply support or opposition to offshore wind development. Instead, it serves as a collaborative body and forum for inclusive dialogue and exploration.

3. Roundtable Objectives

The Roundtable is intended to:

Serve as a collaborative body and learning forum—Increasing understanding and awareness of offshore wind energy (OSW) issues through open dialogue, shared learning, and collaboration.

- Build relationships and trust amongst participants.
- Cultivate transparency in the roundtable collaborative process
- Build understanding of the development process and clean energy needs of the state of Oregon
- Build a shared understanding of the climate change
- Craft informed recommendations that could guide future research, investments, and policy development regarding sustainable offshore wind development in Oregon.
- Establish guiding principles and values around offshore wind energy
- Develop collaborative partnerships to craft and implement strategies
- Build understanding of the ocean ecosystem, offshore wind impacts, mitigation measures, and study needs

4. Participation Guidelines

4.1. Timeline

It is anticipated that the collaborative work of the group will occur in phases beginning November 2024 and will span through June 2025, possibly beyond.

4.2. Membership

The collaborative group will represent a balance of interests. The initial members of this group are those invited by DLCD. Invited Roundtable members may designate an alternate and will approve an alternate with DLCD in advance of meetings. Oregon Consensus may check for alignment and disagreement around particular Roundtable recommendations (see Section 8.0 Decision-Making).

The Roundtable will have ex officio members representing state and federal agencies. Each of the nine federally-recognized Tribes in Oregon will have one seat on the Roundtable reserved for a representative of Tribal government.

4.2.1. Participation

Each Roundtable member (or alternate) will participate in making recommendations to DLCD. State and federal agencies will be invited to participate as subject matter experts, and may be asked to provide support in drafting documents, research and providing context on state and federal law and regulations. Full Roundtable meetings will be open to the public, and all meeting recordings, notes, and materials will be posted to the DLCD website. There

may be small group breakouts that will be open but may not be fully viewable. There may be task teams that help brainstorm ideas to bring back to the full Roundtable. Every effort will be made to ensure transparency. Roundtable participants should be aware that these meetings are viewable to the public and media and therefore their comments in their participation are attributable to them.

4.2.2. New Members

DLCD may appoint new Roundtable members who can add important perspectives to the Workgroup at any time.

4.3. Commitments/Norms

Roundtable participants are expected to:

- Participate in a respectful manner, no intentional disruption of meetings, no harassment;
- Attend meetings and follow through on promises and commitments;
- Bring concerns related to the group's work from their interest group or organization up for discussion at the earliest point possible in the process;
- Share all relevant information that will assist the group in achieving its goals; and
- As appropriate, keep their organizations or interested communities informed of the group's process and substance.

The facilitators will help remind people of these norms, and will work with individual members if needed, and if ongoing challenges with behavior continue to occur, the facilitators may recommend further actions with DLCD. There are some additional ground rules in Section 8.

4.4. Attendance

Attendance is always preferred, but is most critical during times the group is forming a recommendation. In the event of planned absence or an unplanned emergency, Oregon Consensus and DLCD will take steps to ensure a missing member is provided an update about the meeting if an alternate is not able to attend and provide that organizational/agency continuity. Attendance can be either virtual or in-person.

4.5. Withdrawal

Any member may withdraw from the Roundtable at any time. Early verbal and written communication about the reasons for withdrawing, if related to the process, would be expected.

4.6. Onboard New Members

Procedures for inviting new Roundtable members is outlined in 4.2.2 New members. If there is a new member joining who does not already have organizational representation in the group, the facilitation team will lead the onboarding.

4.7. Use of Alternates

The use of alternates is permitted. If the primary representative for an agency or organization is not available to attend a meeting, they may send someone else to attend. The primary representative is responsible for ensuring the alternate is up-to-date on the work of the group before a meeting so they can fully participate when called on to do so. The alternate will be responsible for briefing the member afterward.

4.8. Use of Subgroups

The full Roundtable may form subgroups for specific tasks between meetings (“Task Teams”) or Workgroups for draft strategy planning over time (“Workgroups”). As a new subgroup forms, it will include a description of membership, tasks, timeline, and draft products/recommendations expected to bring back to the full Roundtable.

5. Organizational Structure

5.1. Facilitation Team

Oregon Consensus is responsible for providing facilitation for the Workgroup and any subgroup efforts. This also involves developing agendas, meeting summaries, following up on action items, and coordinating meeting logistics.

5.2. DLCD Team

DLCD will be responsible for crafting the content for meetings, synthesizing feedback into options, and writing the draft and final Roundtable report.

5.3. Roundtable Members

Roundtable members are interested parties who actively provide feedback and craft recommendations to DLCD for the Oregon Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap.

5.4. Agency Members

State and federal agencies participate in the Roundtable, and also provide feedback and craft recommendations. When Oregon Consensus checks with the Roundtable for levels of agreement or disagreement on recommendations, agencies will abstain.

5.5. Tribal Workgroup

DLCD will convene a workgroup made up of the nine federally-recognized Tribes in Oregon for discussions on topics specific to the nine Tribes.

5.6. Broader Community and Public

The anyone interested from the broader community is always welcome at Roundtable meetings. Each meeting will have an opportunity for public comment. However, there will be many opportunities for the broader community to engage in crafting the Roadmap.

6. Meetings

Meeting notices will be sent to the distribution list managed by DLCD. Meetings will be a mix of virtual and in-person, and each meeting will be recorded. Oregon Consensus will develop a meeting summary, which will then be distributed to the same list. Meeting recordings will be posted on DLCD’s YouTube channel, with a link in the meeting summaries and where additional Roundtable and Offshore Wind Roadmap information is posted.

6.1. Roundtable Meetings and Community Engagement

The Roundtable will meet monthly for full-day workshops between November 2024 and June 2025. Meetings will generally run from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM, with a preference for in-person meetings on the coast, supplemented by a hybrid Zoom option. Additionally, we anticipate supporting workgroups to explore and advise on key strategies identified by the Roundtable, with topics potentially including environmental impacts and community benefits.

Roundtable meetings will be open to the public and viewable online, with opportunities for public feedback. DLCD will also organize various engagement opportunities for community members to interact with Roadmap content and provide input throughout the process.

6.2. External and Media Relations

DLCD will be the primary point of contact speaking for the Roundtable as a whole to external audiences and the media. Roundtable members are welcome to talk to the media about their own opinions. DLCD will notify the Roundtable of any media inquiries or external requests for updates, and will strive to create opportunities for a diversity of Roundtable members to help provide those updates.

7. Decision-Making

Throughout the process, members may be asked about their level of agreement or disagreement on a particular recommendation to DLCD; in these cases the group will strive for high levels of agreement in its recommendations, and documenting where there are remaining disagreements.

If full agreement on a recommendation is not reached, the group will make time to hear the concerns of the individual(s), discuss, and then engage in alternate strategies to attempt to increase the level of agreement. If full agreement is still not reached, Oregon Consensus will document the different viewpoints, the nature of the disagreement, and what was tried to reach agreement.

If a Roundtable member, or their alternate, is not available for an important recommendation (important being defined by the member, the group, or the facilitator), the facilitator will work with the member in advance or after the meeting where the recommendation is being discussed to include that member's opinion. Roundtable members can submit their contributions to a recommendation by email, phone, or other means before or after a meeting.

Materials and questions related to recommendations will be sent one week in advance, except in time-sensitive cases, to provide time for vetting with various constituents, Tribal Councils, etc. There may be times where a recommendation needs more than one week to discuss. Any member can request additional time.

8. Process Ground Rules of Engagement

8.1. Good faith

All members agree to act in good faith in all aspects of this Roundtable. As such, members will consider the input and viewpoints of other participants and conduct themselves in a manner that promotes collaboration.

8.2. Rights in other forums

Participation in the Roundtable does not limit the rights of any member. Members will make a good faith effort to notify the group in advance if another action outside the process will be initiated or pursued which could affect the continuation of the Offshore Wind Roadmap process. .

8.3. Ground rules

- Share the information you received.
- Be clear about the issues you are discussing.
- Be clear about who you and the group do or do not represent.
- Alone we know a little, together we know a lot.
- Be civil and respectful, avoiding what could be perceived as personal attacks. Being respectful can include being loud, direct, and passionate- everyone has a different style of showing up.
- Agree to hold each other accountable for meeting these expectations.
- Avoid making assumptions or attributing motives, instead asking for clarification.
- Embrace the “gray areas” that may be uncertain or uncomfortable.

9. Initial Members

See a roster of Roundtable members and ex-officio Agencies at:

<https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/ocmp/pages/offshore-wind-roadmap.aspx>

DRAFT ROUNDTABLE 11/19 MEETING SUMMARY





Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable Friday, November 19 from 9:00 AM - 4:00 PM

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Meeting Recording: <https://www.youtube.com/live/qUUiO8rZank>

Meeting Slides:

https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/OCMP/Documents/OSW_DLCD_Roundtable%20Nov019024_complete.pdf

I. Attendees:

Roundtable (RT) members in the room:

Rick Eichstaedt (CTCLUSI- Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians); Jesse Beers (CTCLUSI); Teresa Spangler (CTCLUSI); Brad Kneaper (CTCLUSI); Lorne Bulling (Ironworkers Local 29); Robert Westerman (IBEW Local Union 932); Ashley Audyski (Rogue Climate); Annie Merrill (Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition); Ann Vileisis (Kalmiopsis Audubon Society); Charlie Plybon (Surfrider Foundation); Nick Edwards (SPMC/OPAC/Port Commissioner of Coos Bay); Mike Graybill (public); Joe Liebezeit (Bird Alliance of Oregon); Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro (BlueGreen Alliance); Jason Busch (Pacific Ocean Energy); Lexie Woodward (South Coast Development Council); John Bragg (Friends of South Slough); Tan Perkins (Oregon AFL-CIO); Kyle Stevens (International Port of Coos Bay, OCEAN); Karina Nielsen (SeeGrant); Rod Taylor (Coos County Commissioner); Natalya Stranadko (DSL); Jason Sierman (ODOE); Jeff Hampton (Business Oregon); Susan Chambers (West Coast Seafood Processors Association);

RT Virtual participants (via Zoom):

Scott Kent (Port of Umpqua); Julia B. DeGraw (National Wildlife Federation); Dawn Barlow (Oregon State University Marine Mammal Institute); Kevin Howard (Climate advocacy); Deanna Schafer; Bill Gorham; Kelly Coates (Cow Creek Tribe); Joshua Basofin (Climate Solutions); Jena Carter (The Nature Conservancy); David M. Petrie (OCEAN Winds); Dean Apostol (Scenic resource and environmental planning); Casey MacLean (Renewable Northwest); John Schaad (BPA- Bonneville Power Administration); Jenny Jones (North Bend City Council); Caitlin Barns (Stantec); Lauren (Parks and Recreation); Marcus Hinz (tourism); Andrea Sumerau (Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians); Karlen Yallup (Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission); Kelly Andrews (NOAA); Sara Stephens (Southwestern Oregon Workforce Investment Board); Delia Kelly; Valerie Thompson (DEQ); Stef Stavrakas (USFWS); Hannah Dondy; Jo Beaudreau; Julie Siestreem; Maggie Dower; Karie Silva; Scott McMullen (Commercial fishing industry)

Department of Land Conservation and Development staff: Jeff Burright, Andy Lanier, Alexis Hammer, Cynthia Smidt, Eva Krukowski, Hui Rodomsky.

II. Executive Summary

The second Offshore Wind Roundtable meeting aimed to refine the outline for the roadmap for offshore wind energy development in Oregon. Key objectives included finalizing the draft roadmap outline, confirming the group charter, and conducting a visioning exercise to assess critical policies and waypoints for offshore wind development. Discussions emphasized community engagement, policy integration, environmental protection, and economic considerations. Attendees provided feedback on the roadmap outline and discussed the broader implications of offshore wind development versus alternative renewable energy options.

Action Item	Who	Date
Update RT member roster with organizational affiliations.	DLCD	
Integrate input from the visioning exercise into a final visioning document.	DLCD/OC	
Distribute surveys to gather input on potential workgroups.	OC/DLCD	

III. Welcome attendees and provide updates

Jesse Beers from the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians provided an introduction about the Tribes' restoration journey, their connection to water, and access to ancestral lands. He emphasized the importance of considering the ocean's multitude of uses and benefits, particularly for Tribal communities, as a foundational perspective for discussions. He also offered an opening prayer and welcome.

A quick round of introductions followed, with participants stating their names and organizational affiliations.

The main purposes of the meeting were shared by Bobby Cochran from the OC facilitation team and included the following:

- Ensure safety and comfort
- Finalize group formation: Confirm the composition of the group and identify the types of conversations necessary to develop the roadmap.
- Refine the group charter: Establish clear goals and shared principles for collaboration.
- Visioning for the future: Explore scenarios, such as whether to pursue offshore wind

development. Discuss the key conversations and actions required to realize these potential futures.

- Welcome Mapleton High School students: Acknowledge and welcome the students attending from the Mapleton local high school.
- Reminder about the Question Box: Encourage participants to use the Question Box Google Form feature for questions and comments.

IV. Roadmap Outline Revisions

- During the November 1st kickoff meeting, an initial draft outline was shared. DLCD also distributed a survey to gather feedback.
- This feedback was incorporated into a revised outline included in the Nov 19 meeting packet.
- The goals for this session were to review the updated outline, generate additional ideas, and refine it further.

Some of the key updates and feedback for the outline, highlighted by Jeff Burright from DLCD, included the following:

- Policy Considerations: Emphasizing the incorporation of federal and local policy interactions while ensuring the roadmap's purpose is clearly defined.
- Waypoints: Identifying specific milestones along the roadmap's development path to provide structure and direction.
- SWOT Analysis: Including a detailed analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats to guide decision-making.
- Coordination with OPAC: Enhancing collaboration with the Ocean Policy Advisory Council to align efforts and strategies.
- Offshore and Onshore Wind Integration: Examining the interaction between offshore and onshore wind systems and evaluating Oregon's potential participation in offshore wind development.

Comments and Feedback on the Outline

- Mike Graybill suggested the outline should include context on how the ocean functions and how offshore wind technology interacts with marine systems. This foundational understanding would help clarify the implications of deploying offshore wind technology.
- Ann Vileisis: Highlighted the importance of environmental protection, particularly through marine spatial planning. She advocated for a more robust approach to spatial planning to enhance comfort and confidence among stakeholders.

Purpose Clarification: Jeff reiterated that the roadmap aims to identify actionable steps for advancing offshore wind development in Oregon in a way that is responsible, and aligned with the state's broader goals.

- Karlen Yallup suggested extending the approach to include marine species and marine life, emphasizing the importance of both animals and plants.
- Natalya Stranadko clarified that the outline will inform the roadmap and recommended including an introduction that ties local stories to global contexts.
- Jenny Jones (via chat) suggested incorporating footage of offshore operations and addressing offshore wind information needs. Proposed using a Google form to gather these inputs.
- Ranfis Villatoro recommended framing climate change and weather changes as central contexts in scenario planning and positioning offshore wind as a potential solution.

- Jeff (DLCD): Highlighted that offshore wind development, if pursued, represents a human response to climate change scenarios. Focused on clarifying the process Oregon would need to follow to proceed responsibly with offshore wind.
- Rick (CTCLUSI): Proposed that each section of the outline should conclude with recommendations and actions, identifying necessary studies, data, policies, and constraints for offshore wind development in Oregon.
- Karina Nielsen pointed out that Oregon's contribution to climate change solutions would be part of a larger global scale problem, emphasizing the need to be mindful of this perspective.
- Lorne Bulling called for a robust discussion in Section 6 about labor standards, addressing the impacts on various groups and the importance of community benefit agreements.
- Natalya Stranadko recommended incorporating an understanding of Pacific Ocean conditions and climate change into the outline, particularly in relation to offshore wind development.
- Anne Vileisis suggested differentiating between "communities in place" and "communities of interest" within the outline, particularly in Section 6.
 - Jeff (DLCD): Responded by emphasizing the need to identify who should be part of the conversation and how to include them effectively.
- Rod Taylor (Coos County Commissioner) shared his constituents oppose offshore wind and believe there should be no outline, citing insufficient information. He also raised questions about the expected price per gigawatt and the economic benefits of offshore wind in Oregon.
- Charlie Plybon suggested strengthening Section 3 by including a policy assessment tied to HB 4080 and addressing the participation and capacity of various agencies to respond to offshore wind development.
- Gage Hansen: Highlighted that the fisheries section in the outline is limited, calling for an expanded focus beyond economic impacts to include environmental concerns outlined in Section 1.
- Ashley Audycki: Asked if the draft was the initial version and how it would be refined moving forward.

At the end of the discussion, Bobby Cochran facilitated a check-in on the second draft of the roadmap outline using the "fist of five" approach. In the fist of five approach, participants rate their support for a proposal on a scale of 0 (closed fist, no support) to 5 (fully supportive).

- In the room results showed most participants showed 4s and 5s, with a few 2s and 1s.
- Online Results: Feedback was more mixed, with most ratings between 3 and 4, and some 2s.

V. Charter revisions of the final draft

From the facilitation team, Sofia Castellanos shared the process undertaken to refine the initial draft of the roundtable charter. The purpose and aim of having a charter were first introduced to all attendees during the kickoff meeting on November 1st. At that meeting, a small group of members volunteered to revise the initial draft. This group, consisting of Karina Nielsen, Ranfis Villatoro, Casey MacLean, Julia DeGraw, and Rick Eichstaedt, reviewed and edited the draft, adding comments, suggestions, and proposed language. They created a revised draft during a meeting on November 14th, which was shared with all roundtable members on November 15th for further review.

During the November 19th meeting, Karina and Ranfis, presented the revision process to attendees, highlighting key edits. They emphasized clarifying the roundtable's purpose and role, as well as the objectives of having a charter to guide and model the collaborative work of roundtable members.

Comments and Feedback from Attendees:

1. Ocean Ecosystem and Uses. Mike Graybill stressed the importance of including language about the ocean ecosystem and its uses as a critical element for roadmap discussions.
2. Legislative Alignment. Andrew suggested incorporating language from HB4080 into the charter, particularly regarding the inclusion of diverse perspectives and culturally specific input, including tribal perspectives.
3. Roundtable Objectives (Section 3): Rick Eichstaedt recommended adding language to the charter's objectives to address key questions about offshore wind impacts, mitigation measures, and study needs.
4. Marine Ecosystem Context. Additional feedback emphasized the importance of integrating the marine ecosystem and broader ocean context into the roundtable's role as an advisory body for roadmap development.

VI. Oregon Policies Overview

Presentation on State Policy Assessment and Federal Consistency

Cynthia Smidt, from the DLCD team and in charge of the state policy assessment and overview, provided an explanation of federal consistency as a coordination tool and outlined where it applies. A detailed explanation of the federal consistency process was also provided, emphasizing its importance in aligning state and federal actions.

Cynthia clarified that this group is addressing not only the placement of turbines in the ocean but also the onshore policies and actions required to support offshore wind development. The discussion highlighted the interconnected nature of offshore and onshore policies.

Jeff Burright (DLCD) further explained the procedural framework, emphasizing how the process depends on enforceable policies. He noted that the roadmap will help examine these processes to ensure they are effective and aligned with the group's goals. Jeff also stressed that the state's jurisdiction is primarily at the local and state levels for onshore activities, making collaboration and enforceable policies critical.

- **Current Policy Overview:** An overview of existing state policies relevant to offshore wind development was provided to help the group understand the regulatory landscape.
- **Examples and Statutes:** Cynthia shared examples of policy statutes and highlighted their relevance to the roundtable's work.

Ocean Resources Goals and Enforceable Policies of the Territorial Sea Plan, Presented by Andy Lanier (DLCD):

Territorial Sea Plan Overview:

- The plan consists of five sections, ranging from its history to specific considerations for marine renewable energy.
- Section 5: Focuses on marine renewable energy siting.
- Goal 19: A foundational document referenced whenever Oregon's Territorial Sea Plan is involved. It outlines implementation requirements for ocean resources and serves as a guide for policy alignment.
- Goals 16, 17, and 18: These goals pertain to local-level planning and decision-making.
- Recurrent Concerns from Roundtable Members: A key question raised was how the state will make decisions regarding marine life and the economic and social impacts of offshore wind development.
- NOAA must approve changes to Oregon's Coastal Management Program.
- Specific examples of NOAA-approved language were shared to illustrate how policies can align with state needs for effective evaluations, such as:
 - Ecological Resource Protection Standards: Aligned with Goal 19 requirements.
 - Recreational Resource Standards: Addressing how to preserve recreational uses while considering offshore wind impacts.
 - Visual Resource Protection Standards: Maintaining the quality of scenic views and managing potential changes caused by offshore development.
 - All examples provided directly connect to Goal 19, emphasizing its relevance to marine resource policies and planning.

Offshore Wind Energy Policy, Presented by Cynthia (DLCD):

- The policy assessment focused on identifying key enforceable policies critical to guiding offshore wind development. This process also involved evaluating the reasonably foreseeable effects on various uses and resources, ensuring that the potential impacts are carefully considered and addressed in the planning stages.
- **Planned Outreach:**
 - DLCD will hold discussions with counties, cities, and ports over the next six to seven months. These meetings will:
 - Assess community concerns and gaps.

- Hear feedback from elected officials.
- Collect information on the benefits and consequences of offshore wind from local perspectives.
- A timeline was presented to outline when and where these meetings will occur.

Comments and Clarifying Questions and Responses:

- Bobby Cochran clarified the purpose and intention of the work, explaining how each stage will progress over the coming months.
- A question about the capacity assessment, raised the concerns about the capacity of local agencies to handle offshore wind-related processes.
 - A response from Cynthia, DLCD, noted that the agency plans to send a survey to counties and cities to gather insights into their capacity and challenges.
- Charlie Plybon raised a question about the intended audience for the local reports:
 - In response to that concern, DLCD noted that the reports will inform state funding decisions and will be presented to the legislature as part of the roadmap, which is expected by September 2025.
 - DLCD will also provide a set of recommendations to the legislature.
- Ranfis raised a question about the importance of having well-trained professionals involved in offshore wind development, emphasizing the need for training individuals to address specific tasks such as surging cables or turbine installation. He highlighted that the process must account for the skills required to meet the needs of users and the marine environment. Additionally, he pointed out that the Territorial Sea Plan is a dynamic framework, adapting over time.
 - Andy responded by noting that the decision-making processes outlined in the Territorial Sea Plan are designed to evolve. He emphasized that DLCD is not working alone; a pool of experts from various agencies is actively participating to evaluate the potential positive and negative effects of proposed actions.
- Joshua, participating via Zoom, asked how conflicts between federal and state enforceable policies are managed.
- Rick asked about the number of enforceable policies required to determine where cables should or shouldn't be located. Jeff (DLCD) responded by confirming that DLCD already has a map outlining cabling locations. He also highlighted that many enforceable policies are focused on onshore considerations.

VII. Future Vision Exercise

Purpose of the exercise is to identify early waypoints and critical policies/information needs.

The visioning exercise aimed to establish a framework for considering scenarios with and without wind turbines in the ocean as a means of producing renewable energy. Key criteria and characteristics to include in the exercise were:

- Identifying “no regrets” actions that would be beneficial regardless of whether offshore wind turbines are implemented.
- Exploring the broader implications of using the ocean to produce renewable energy,

including social, economic, and environmental factors.

Clarifying Question:

Mike Graybill asked for clarification about the scope of the discussion, asking if the focus was specifically on wind turbines or the broader concept of using the ocean for renewable energy production.

- Jeff (DLCD) confirmed that the discussion is centered on floating offshore wind technology.

Instructions for the Visioning Exercise

Part I:

Participants were divided into breakout groups, with in-person attendees working off-camera. Each group was given 20 minutes to discuss a specific question. Afterward, the groups rotated, adding their insights to the previous group's discussion. The focus was on exploring two potential scenarios for offshore wind in the state: the "yes" and "no" offshore wind futures. Participants identified and discussed the components they would like to see occur in each scenario, considering the key elements necessary for both paths.

Part II:

Participants explored scenarios envisioning two distinct potential futures. Each group worked with a roadmap visual representing a scenario and created a diagram to identify key phases—such as planning, construction, and other critical stages—that would be necessary for both the "yes" and "no" offshore wind futures.

The key questions guiding the discussion included:

- How do we reach each envisioned destination?
- What resources, actions, decisions, or phases are needed to achieve these outcomes?
- What conversations must take place to effectively progress toward each destination?

Reporting out Visioning Exercise within the full group of attendees

The Mapleton High School students were invited to voluntarily participate in the visioning exercise, and several accepted the invitation, reporting their insights back to the group.

For the **"No Offshore Wind"** scenario, the students highlighted:

- A desire for some form of renewable energy, prompting the question: What alternatives could be explored?
- The need to address community pushback and opposition.
- An emphasis on research and development to explore renewable energy options beyond turbines.

For the **"Yes Offshore Wind"** scenario, they focused on:

- Location and infrastructure: Identifying ways to build offshore wind projects without causing harm to the environment or local communities.
- New technology: Exploring innovative solutions, such as advancements in boats and mills, to support offshore wind.
- Considering methods for building and transporting materials in the best, less impactful way.

Zoom Breakout Group 1 Report-Out: Julia DeGraw (RT member)

Group 1, led by Julia DeGraw, identified broad themes across the two scenarios:

- Science-Based Processes: Emphasized the importance of processes rooted in scientific research that actively engage communities and tribes in decision-making.
- Mitigation Strategies: In the event offshore wind moves forward, focus on minimizing and mitigating potential impacts.
- Exploring Alternatives: If offshore wind does not proceed, explore alternative methods for generating renewable energy and what those solutions might look like.
- Energy Needs Assessment: Evaluate the energy demands of the three coastal states and identify ways to meet those needs.
- Regional Considerations: Highlighted the need to understand both regional energy requirements and the cumulative impacts of development across the region.

Zoom Breakout Group 2 Report-Out: Trevor Hildebrand (Moderator)

Group 2, led by Trevor, shared key insights from discussions on both scenarios:

- Data Availability: Emphasized the importance of having sufficient data and identifying knowledge gaps. A question raised was: Who will be responsible for ensuring a data-driven approach to decision-making?
- Adaptive Management: Highlighted concerns about implementing adaptive management practices to address uncertainties and evolving circumstances.
- Clean Energy Alternatives: Discussed the potential of wave power and expressed interest in exploring whether this could be a viable alternative if offshore wind turbines are not pursued.
- Data as a Deciding Factor: Recognized that the availability of comprehensive and reliable data could serve as a crucial breaking point in determining whether to move forward with offshore wind development.

In-Room Breakout Group Report-Out: Joe Liebezeit (RT member)

Joe presented the key points discussed by the in-room group for both scenarios:

"Yes Offshore Wind" Scenario:

- Transparency and Communication: Emphasized the importance of clear and open communication with the community throughout the process.
- Unforeseen Challenges: Highlighted the need to consider and plan for decommissioning as a potential surprise or overlooked aspect of the project.

"No Offshore Wind" Scenario:

- **Alternative Energy Solutions:** Suggested rethinking nuclear energy as a potential option, along with exploring wave energy, micro-production systems, and microgrids.
- **Planning Considerations:** Stressed the importance of conducting a cost-benefit analysis during the planning stage, evaluating both the "yes" and "no" scenarios for offshore wind, and accounting for the possibility of catastrophic events.

In-Room Breakout Group Report-Out: Ann Vileisis, Mike Graybill (RT members)

They shared the key points discussed by the in-room group, addressing both scenarios:

With or Without Turbines:

- **Economic Outcome:** Highlighted the importance of evaluating the economic implications of either scenario.
- **Empowered Communities:** Emphasized the need for informed and empowered communities to play a central role in deciding whether to move forward with turbines.
- **Comprehensive Decision-Making:** Advocated for an objective and well-rounded approach to decision-making.

"No Turbines" Scenario:

- **Active Participation:** Clarified that opting for no turbines does not equate to disengagement from the sector or a lack of effort by the state.
- **Flexible Pathway:** This scenario envisions multiple exit ramps, as well as experimentation and pilot phases to explore other opportunities.

They also highlighted Oregon's potential to play a key role in the renewable energy supply chain, even without turbines.

- **Revenue Sharing:** Suggested a revenue-sharing model that could provide economic benefits to communities and foster a more sustainable economic framework.
- **Building Trust:** Stressed the importance of building trust among communities throughout the process.
- **Learning from California:** Suggested drawing lessons from California's experiences to inform Oregon's approach.

Zoom Breakout Group Report-Out: Turner Odell (moderator) and Bill Gorham (RT member)

They presented key points from their group's discussion, focusing on the "With Wind Turbines" scenario:

- **Emphasized that the number and density of turbines would have minimal impact on the environment, including limited effects on bird populations.**
- **Renewable Energy Goals:** Highlighted the importance of developing enough renewable energy to meet Oregon's needs in a sustainable manner.
- **Education and Workforce Development:** Stressed the need for programs that support educational opportunities and workforce development related to renewable energy.
- **Called for policies that enhance energy efficiency and conservation.**
- **Recognized the need for upgrades to the energy grid to support offshore wind integration.**

- Ensured that energy produced would remain affordable for consumers.
- Ensuring that local communities do not bear costs that exceed the benefits they receive from the project.

Zoom Breakout Group Report-Out: Eva Krukowski (Moderator)

Eva shared the following insights from her group's discussion:

- Community Benefit Agreements: Highlighted the importance of establishing agreements that ensure communities benefit directly from the offshore wind development process.
- Community Resilience Hubs: Proposed the creation of resilience hubs and upgrades to energy grids to enhance community preparedness and adaptability.
- Community-Centered Approach: Stressed that communities should benefit throughout the entire process, from planning to implementation.
- Pilot Project: Suggested initiating a pilot project to gather additional data and insights, which would support more informed decision-making.

In-Room Breakout Group Report-Out: Karina Nielsen (RT member)

Karina shared key points discussed by her group regarding the "Yes Wind" scenario:

- Long-Term Environmental Monitoring: Highlighted the importance of ongoing monitoring to assess environmental impacts over time.
- Adaptive Management: Emphasized the need for flexible strategies that can adjust based on new information and changing conditions.
- Long-Term Data Collection: Advocated for sustained data collection to inform future decisions and improve project outcomes.
- Revenue Sharing: Suggested implementing revenue-sharing mechanisms to ensure local communities benefit economically from offshore wind development.

This group also acknowledged the challenge of engaging in a discussion about the "No Offshore Wind" scenario. They found it difficult to envision a future without addressing the pressing need for renewable energy in the state, and took them longer to fully engage in that part of the conversation.

In-Room Breakout Group Report-Out: Jeff Burright (Moderator)

Jeff shared key insights from his group's discussion:

- Informed and Empowered Communities: Highlighted the importance of providing communities with the information and tools needed to participate meaningfully in decision-making.
- Adaptive Management: Stressed the need for flexible approaches that can evolve as new information becomes available.
- Trade-Offs and Sacrifices: Acknowledged that offshore wind development will impact individuals and communities differently, necessitating a clear understanding of the trade-offs involved.
- Co-Ownership and Co-Management: Proposed models that include co-ownership and co-management to ensure shared responsibilities and benefits.

- **Community Benefits and Environmental Impacts:** Emphasized the need to deliver tangible benefits to communities while carefully understanding and mitigating impacts on the environment and ocean species.
- **Identifying Affected Communities:** Recognized that some communities will be affected regardless of the decision and stressed the importance of identifying these communities early in the process.
- **Early Community Engagement:** Advocated for engaging communities early to discuss their needs and the potential benefits of offshore wind.
- Highlighted the importance of identifying and conducting the studies needed to inform decision-making and address potential impacts.

Comments and Questions Raised by Participants

- A participant noted that permitting processes were absent from the roadmap and asked for clarification on how these would be addressed.
- An additional question asked specific aspects of the roadmap (details not provided in your input; clarification needed).
- Also, it raised concerns about the "No Offshore Wind" scenario, noting a lack of clarity on who would fund renewable energy alternatives and other necessary initiatives. She also asked how the costs and benefits of these alternatives would be accounted for.

VIII. Public Comment & Questions

Lyn Coker: Expressed appreciation for the productive and educational community event. Raised two points:

- Inquired about the federal consistency process, specifically how it would unfold if the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) receives a non-competitive unsolicited bid to lease within Oregon's Wind Energy Areas (WEAs).
- Asked whether the roadmap process would include oversight mechanisms for risk reduction and mitigation in local communities.

Andrew Orahoske: Voiced appreciation for the ongoing conversation and reviewed the authorizing legislation, House Bill 4080. Noted that the bill outlines the rules of the process, primarily under the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). Expressed concerns about the limited public engagement and the absence of Oregon Consensus or DLCD decisions in the process. Expected greater participation as an observer and found the information provided so far to be misleading to the public. Sought clarification on the nature of the process and how public comments would be incorporated into decision-making.

IX. Closing and Next Steps

- **Upcoming Meeting Dates:**
 - **December 19, 2024:** Coos Bay (Mill Casino)
 - Other dates: January 9, February 20, March 31, April 15, May 15, and June 18, 2025

Reflections and Recommendations for Future Meetings:

- **What to Repeat:**
 - Continue involving high school students in discussions, as their participation added valuable perspectives.
- **What to Improve:**
 - Provide more detailed instructions for exercises to ensure clarity and smoother facilitation.
 - Incorporate designated breaks and clear lunch schedules to support participant needs.
 - Adapt meetings to accommodate participant feedback and requirements, as this flexibility is always appreciated.

Stipend Availability:

- Stipend funds of \$500 are available for participants for the initial phase.
- An additional \$500 will be provided during the second phase.
- Instructions on how to access the funds will be sent out soon.

X. Action Items:

- Update the Roster:
 - Request Roundtable (RT) members to complete the roster by including their organizational affiliations.
- Visioning Exercise Integration:
 - Compile all input and components from the visioning exercises into a finalized visioning document.
- Feedback Survey:
 - Distribute a survey to gather feedback on the potential formation of workgroups and their focus areas.

The meeting adjourned at 4:18 pm

NOVEMBER 19TH ROUNDTABLE MEETING
VISIONING EXERCISE COLLECTED INPUT





Imagining a Future Related to Offshore Wind

Last Updated 11/21/24

[Images](#)-Vision Exercise-Breakouts groups

I. Background

On November 19, 2024 the Oregon Offshore Wind Roundtable met and spent an afternoon imagining two alternative futures:

- A future with wind turbines off the Oregon coast; and
- A future without wind turbines off the Oregon coast.

For both futures, Roundtable members were asked to identify the characteristics of each future where they would have “no regrets”. Roundtable members were asked to set their positions or current concerns aside, and imagine both futures that could line up with their interests.

Roundtable members were then asked to start designing an “infographic” of a roadmap that described the key conversations, policies, and actions that got us to those futures (e.g., What pitfalls were avoided, which questions were answered, what bargains were struck, which protections were put in place, and which questions did we leave to adaptive management?).

This synthesis is intended to reflect the collective input from Roundtable members. It is not intended to be a vision that everyone agrees with yet. The synthesis is offered here as a tool for further conversation.

II. A Future with or without wind turbines and what decisions and discussions occurred as “waypoints” along the way

When do these futures begin? 10, 30 years? Longer?

For any of these scenarios, communities were empowered to make the decision

2.1 Early synthesis of the combined notes

Across the eight breakout groups exploring alternative futures, there were some common themes (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 Themes from the alternative futures exercise (“What does ‘no regrets’ look like?)

Future <u>with</u> wind turbines	Themes for <u>both</u> futures	Future <u>without</u> wind turbines
	Tribal consultation is authentic and complete; Impacted communities are engaged and empowered with decisions	More time for regional conversations and understanding
	Cultural resources are protected	
An investment in clean energy creates <u>a lot</u> of investment that helps increase local jobs	The future energy mix is decarbonized & the state has a strategy for how much energy it needs from which types of resources. Power remains affordable and accessible on the coast.	There is a focus on conservation, and other renewable sources must be pursued (wave, geothermal, onshore wind, solar, and even small nuclear). Economic development comes from other industries.
Upgraded transmission and grid to improve energy resiliency and support new generation from OSW		Transmission and grid upgrades are still made
Ports are expanded, updated, and electrified		Ports are updated and electrified
There is coexistence between energy industry, conservation, fisheries, and other ocean uses		Fishery and conservation uses are prioritized and protected
Before decisions are made, there is an understanding of the cumulative impacts on the California Current Ecosystem and other resources in the ocean, nearshore, and estuarine habitats.		A lot of unknowns become known
We have found a way to avoid and minimize environmental impacts	We have the science to know how the environment responds to new ocean uses and climate change. Important coastal resources are protected.	We protected the environment in its current state

Future <u>with</u> wind turbines	Themes for <u>both</u> futures	Future <u>without</u> wind turbines
Existing tourism and recreation is protected, and enhanced with wind tourism		Tourism and recreation is protected
High paying, local, durable jobs	Workforce development and education	Oregon participates in OSW Supply chain and support for region
Construction and operations is safe		
Decommissioning leaves no trace with clear responsibilities		

2.2 A future with wind turbines

Oregon addresses its responsibilities to clean energy and climate change mitigation

- Oregon is an actor in a global effort to meet climate goals
- We meet our climate imperative and mitigate ocean and global temps
- Public health benefits of cleaner air
- Broader benefits to the state/society

Coexistence between industry, conservation, labor, Tribes, etc. (x2)

- OSW configurations enable multiple uses (fishing, etc.)

OSW construction phases are done safely

- seasonal closures, avoidance
- Remote sensing of organisms used to minimize impacts of construction and operation
- Improve radar and ability for coast guard response

Tribal governments and coastal communities are actively engaged and build consensus on how projects are rolled out

- Effective partnerships between the Tribes and BOEM and other Agencies, like we have now with NOAA Fisheries
- Effective cooperations and adaptive management plan between federal, state, local, Tribal government and research/education institutions
- Meaningful engagement with coastal Tribes beyond consultation
- Community visioning around how to solve problems
- A future where Tribes and fishermen have their concerns addressed
- Tribal public-private partnership
- Co-management model with Tribes
- Know what Tribal consultation means, and uphold that practice
- Tribes have access to data for interpretation and feedback
- Tribal cultural traditions are protected and supported

Protection of important cultural aspects of the coast

Those who sacrifice accept the terms (x2)

- There was a good process to address tradeoffs
- Local communities are not bearing costs in excess of benefits

Massive amounts of energy into our coastal grid

- Enough energy developed to meet Oregon needs, and in a sustainable manner
- Opportunities for using clean energy
- Benefits of fixed wind v floating
- Could wind energy offset the loss of hydro power in the future

- Possibly powering green hydrogen
- OSW was a successful interim step to more energy conservation
- Energy goals are met with low or no impact to environment and cultural resources
- Co-ownership, revenue sharing, and co-management of energy (x2)
- Demonstrate that OSW is the least impactful form of energy
- Opportunity to purchase the power locally /in Oregon (x4)
 - Procurement standards for regional clean energy to Oregon
 - Oregon gets credit as the clean energy producers
 - Can excess energy go to grid after local communities get served
- Lower energy cost over time (x3)
 - Sell excess out of state to subsidize local affordability
- There's an integrated, regional approach to OSW development that factors in reliability, resilience, and costs

Incremental build out (x3)

- Pilot projects done before full-scale installations like in Scotland, Portugal, California

Differentiation in energy pricing

- Pay attention to different pricing between BPA and wind energy

Energy resiliency for coastal and rural communities (x3)

- Prioritize Oregon coastal community energy reliability, independence, resiliency
- Infrastructure for transmission is improved
 - Transmission upgrades allow for greater use of onshore renewables
- A secondary supply that will power the coast if transmission over the coast range is interrupted due to weather events or wildfires (x3)
 - Fewer people shut off during weather events
- Microgrids
- Utility-scale battery installations
- Oregon gets RPs credit from energy coming to shore in Oregon
- Communities near turbines should benefit from the energy produced
- Insurance to protect communities from natural disasters and the impacts from the turbines
- Community resilience hubs

Tax revenue to fund housing, schools, services

Eliminate subsidies for fossil fuels (x2)

The work is accomplished without public subsidies

Prevent/bar agency capture and iron triangle outcomes

Making our coastal communities grow and be strong again

- Economic opportunities to coastal residents to enter trades apprenticeships
 - Economic opportunities for coastal citizens into trades apprenticeships (x2)
 - Opportunity to learn and educate a new generation for clean energy
- Increased local economies with high paying local jobs (x2)
- Long-term manufacturing and supply chain jobs
- Durable, long-term development (housing, economy, etc.)
- Good clean energy jobs

Strong regional coordination

- Learn from California and Maine

Really get the state's consistency review ready:

- Strong, comprehensive enforceable policies
- Support for coastal county and city capacity to make enforceable policies

Adaptive management (x4)

- Not by the seat of our pants
- Clear exit ramps (before and after construction) (x2)
- Backup plan if not working
- We learn
 - Learn from The Oregon Story (documentary about Oregon fisheries) and learning from the fishing communities on how to adapt to changing ocean landscape and ecosystems
- Study how floating offshore infrastructure could attract fish
- Robust science for initial decisionmaking coupled with post-construction monitoring
- Technology developed to tease out effects from turbines and broader climate change
- Decision Making based on the broadest consensus of the data

It is clear who cleans up

- Clear plans to decommission turbines when their operational life ends (x2)
- No sunken turbines
- Leave no trace- full decommissioning
- Plan for unexpected failures
 - Protection from catastrophic disasters created by the turbines

Marine mammals, fisheries, estuarine resources, deep sea coral, endangered and threatened species, and cultural resources are protected

- Number and density have minimal impacts on marine life and birds- which is thriving
- Marine wildlife and habitat not negatively affected by OSW
- It is clear who pays for the environmental costs of wind farms
 - Harms are continually mitigated
- Port development minimizes impacts to estuary, nearshore, and coastal zone (x2)
 - Coos Bay estuary is not wrecked by development

- Protected like in Maine
- Ocean resources and uses are protected
- Robust agency capacity to do this protection
- We did analysis that turbines would not negatively impact upwelling of CCLME
- Effects are mitigated
- Resources are protected and enhanced
- More research on effect of vibrations and sound on wildlife
- Look at environmental hazards (subsea landslides and marine volcanos)
- Mitigation measures are achievable and effective for reducing impacts

Important viewsheds are protected

- Effects are mitigated
- Resources are protected and enhanced
- Unbroken views of the horizon is a cultural resource
- How visible would turbines be if 50mi offshore?
- Lights might visible at nighttime
- Stripes on blades have been successful onshore in reducing bird strikes

Framework for legal, enforceable agreements

Robust spatial analysis

- Protect upwelling zones
- Plan to have some areas off limits for conservation and fisheries
- Turbines sited outside of 1300 meters (x2)
- Turbines are sited in “clusters” in “deconflicted areas” rather than as continuous swaths of turbines

Thriving fisheries

- Effects are mitigated
- Resources are protected and enhanced

Onshoring avoids recreation and tourism and cultural resource impacts or alteration of uses

- Wind port tourism

We have a complete “before” picture of the California Current Ecosystem before OSW

We know that cumulative impacts are not significant across the West Coast (x2)

- Cumulative impacts analysis for CCLME
- Cumulative impacts are understood and inform how much development can occur
- Major questions are answered during the pre-leasing process
- EIS includes 3rd party data validation and quality control

There is independent scientific monitoring and assessment (x3)

- Objective, robust, transparent fact-finding

- Real information
- Open and available data exists on energy generation and lifecycle processes all the way to decommissioning

Strong, robust, enforceable community benefit agreements, Tribal agreements, conservation credits are implemented to strengthen coastal communities and economies (x2)

- Education credits, new investments, and apprenticeships paid for by lessee (x2)
- Broad community benefits for Tribes and labor
- Labor us supported and communities have received benefits (there is a net positive impact on workforce development)

Coastal communities thriving (x2)

- New economic opportunities for coastal region that have not existed in the past (x2)
- Inclusive career pathways for women and BIPOC people
- Development of a new US-based industry supplying the Pacific with manufacturing of offshore wind energy components (x2)
- Generational clean energy jobs in construction and manufacturing in the 5-county area
 - Many sustainable jobs created
 - Skilled workers able to work locally
 - Good paying jobs for our future
- Keeping good paying jobs locally in Oregon and union trades thrive
 - High paying local jobs
- Alcoholism down
- Unemployment down
- Affordable and adequate housing
- Using fishing fleet for service and supply vessels
- Education and workforce development needs are met

Port development is balanced with nature-based solutions, co-benefits, and multiple uses

- Port development supported a new industry, while avoiding and mitigating other impacts
- Ports were electrified and made more efficient

Multiple technologies considered in conjunction with onshore technologies and storage

Waypoints

Overall- If the answer to 50 questions is “I don’t know” then the answer to moving forward is “no” vs. a stepwise approach of “maybe” or “yes” with an option on “no”.

Public comment across all phases; Oregon Land Use laws upheld

PLANNING

West Coast Tribes afforded a voice and allowed to contribute to decision making process

Careful planning and transparency in the process occurred ahead of facilities being built
NEPA scoping at the very beginning

- Cumulative impact analysis (especially CCLME and upwelling)
- Cumulative impacts assessed and considered

Pre-application meeting with Joint Agency Review Team (JART) under the Territorial Sea Plan
Part 5

Clean energy goals

- Answer whether we actually need the power
- Regional energy portfolio context analysis
- Utilities understand risks
- Transmission needs

Shore landing location planning

Impacted communities were identified

- Those communities receive direct community benefits

Communities are engaged early in CBA discussions

- Accountability and measurable results or outcomes on any promises under a PLA/CBA

Identify all the needed studies for a Construction and Operations Plan EIA early

- NMFS offshore wind science plan is completed to inform EIS
- Literature review about knowledge gaps is generated
- Radar impact study
- Coast guard capabilities
- Information is in place before decisions are made

Threshold analysis and decision triggers

Engagement and education

- Tribal engagement
- Community engagement
- BOEM involves communities when identifying call areas
- Consultation, meaningful, results-based, in-person with BOEM

Robust, comprehensive, independent marine spatial planning / Spatial planning identify areas that are off limits from development (and that's based on meaningful response to comment) (or instead of off limits, it's "maybe" areas)

- Identify optimum locations for OSW
- Spawning areas are protected in siting
- Important visual areas where turbines should not be seen

Port infrastructure ready process

Mitigation plans for environmental impacts

Decision criteria analysis (go-no-go) [With potential exit ramp after]

Pilot projects first

SITING

Exclude identified no-go zones
The “sacrifice” discussion begins
Community impact is defined
No loss or restriction on an individual community’s voice regardless of agreements
Before call areas, we know effects to fishery users
Legal agreements on corporate indemnification of harms and accepting liability
Negotiate and secure performance bonds
A location has conditions/terms based on the community of impact
Environment effects of a specific project are reasonably well known
Project Labor Agreements and Community Benefit Agreements are in place
Programmatic environmental impact statement and cumulative effects

- For all stages of development
- For full coastal region
- For California current

EIS
Construction and Operations Plan
Planning

Exit ramps

CONSTRUCTION

Supply chain agreements are executed

- Responsive supply chain ongoing

Different “approaches”: Pilot phase then to moderate scale or slow scale implementation

- Piloted approach before scaling up

Effective emergency and disaster management plan
Strong mitigation conditions enforced to protect marine and estuarine resources

- Real mitigation for communities impacted by catastrophic events

Do we have a viable fishery? (May not know until turbines are in the water for 10 years)
Planning

Adaptive management (technology and ecosystem impacts) (x3)

- Long-term environmental monitoring (funded, conducted, reported transparently) (x2)
- Gather info from pilot progress, identify next steps
- Monitors are in place
- Public accountability
- Industry-independent monitoring
- Reduce monitoring conflicts of interest
- Look for co-benefits to ocean science data
- Entanglement monitoring
- Regional Science Collaborative is used to inform science and research needs
- Don’t let a project get “too big to fail”
- Look at bioaccumulation and community development around a new structure as part of post-construction monitoring

- Plan includes adaptive management requirements of companies

Opportunities for local ownership at all levels

- Co-ownership
- Co-proof sharing
- Co-management

Decision criteria analysis (go-no-go) [With potential exit ramp after pilot]

Technology development improvement

OPERATION

Ongoing compliance

Revenue sharing

Job creation

Plan for changes in use of energy production (e.g., transmitting electrons or producing hydrogen)

Planning

DECOMMISSIONING

Develop a list of qualifying events that trigger decommissioning

Return to nature avoid/reduce harm

Have a decommissioning plan and bond with adequate funding

2.3 A future with no wind turbines

Communities were empowered to make the decision (x3)

- Communities were informed what it meant to not have OSW
- We decided we're OK with the opportunity cost of not doing OSW (x3)
- We know the impacted communities (beyond the coast)
- Collectively, we decided that impacts outweigh benefits
- Those decisions were made after analysis of the best data

Thriving fish, bird, marine mammal, etc. populations (x3)

- Respect and value community resources (e.g., fishing)
- Long-term fishing returns/catches grow
 - Fisheries not displaced
- Existing industries would not be impacted (x2)
- Few impacts would be beneficial for natural resource protection
- No endangered species take permits issued

Ocean ecosystems are protected from industrial development

- No estuary impact to Coos Bay estuary
- CA Current protected

Oregon received power from CA OSW (cables to OR via sea or land)

Other renewable energy projects for communities are identified (x2)

- 1-3GW of renewable energy met with land based and other renewable sources (x3)
 - Still find a way to reduce reliance on hydropower from dams
- Decrease greenhouse gas emissions from energy
 - Oregon would still meet its climate imperative
- Put our efforts into energy conservation not generation (x4)
 - Implement policies that require conservation and load management (x2)
- Would investment in energy storage be cheaper
- Other sources of renewable energy (e.g., wave energy; geothermal) (x6)
 - Good alternatives built in time to meet power needs
 - Not nuclear
 - Yes small nuclear
 - Generating energy locally so less susceptible to being cut off in an emergency
- Broader look at energy strategy (x2)
- More efficient land-based energy (e.g., would land based windmills be cheaper)
- Cost of energy
- Still achieve energy resilience and reliability on the Oregon coast
- Upgrades to grid and transmission still occur to support onshore renewable energy

Transmission upgrades are still made

Port infrastructure is improved and resilient

- Ports electrified and improved

Local comprehensive plans and estuary plans are still updated

Tourism and recreation sectors on the coast are thriving

A lot of current unknowns become known (x2)

- Develop better OSW technology
- Get answers on ecosystem impacts
- Decisions are made upon solid research and not misinformation

Time for regional conversations

- Opportunity for real conversations on what coastal communities want to see
- Tribal cultural traditions are protected and supported
- Tribal consultation happened early and often; and it is different for each tribal government
 - Tribal capacity issues were alleviated and improved
 - Cultural and natural resources continue to be protected
 - Questions were answered during the consultative process and concerns were addressed

Viable fisheries and coastal communities

- Thriving communities with economies based on local assets (seafood, natural amenities)
- Coastal communities realize economic and natural resource prosperity

Economic development is not necessarily consistent with power generation

- Opportunities for other sustainable industry proposals come to communities
- Increased local economies with high paying local jobs
 - If no wind, we will forgo jobs, investment, economic prosperity
- Education and workforce development needs met

Find balance of benefits of Oregon supply chain with impacts of supply chain on Oregon communities

- Supply chain involvement (CA and other places) (x3)
- Robust supply chain industry in OR

Investments are still made in workforce development

Waypoints

Thorough research conducted on priorities and data gaps

- Who decides when we have “enough” data to move forward? What does the data confidence need to be
- Science is an ongoing process

- Adaptive management could mean “conditional approvals”
- There is a “shelf-life” to data

Ongoing monitoring if “exit ramps” were taken, and resources directed to alleviate the reason for those exit ramps

Tradeoffs have been thoroughly evaluated

Decisions are made before resources are sacrificed

Decision was made based on robust and holistic information

- There has been a cost benefit analysis that can feed into an energy strategy
- Carbon footprint and environmental impacts of turbine materials and construction are understood

There is other forms of renewable energy production

- We have renewable ocean energy that is decarbonized
- Community-scale, energy efficient projects (with incentives for these)

Fish and wildlife are protected

Supply chain businesses develop

Grid and transmission networks are upgraded for resilient coastal energy

There is a small scale offshore wind pilot developed

No federal lease