

OREGON OFFSHORE WIND ENERGY ROADMAP ROUNDTABLE **SEPTEMBER 30, 2025 MEETING PACKET**

1. September 2025 Roundtable Meeting Agenda
2. Roundtable Roster
3. Roadmap Process Schedule as of September 2025
4. Spring Roadmap Concept Roundtable Comment Summary
5. June Roundtable Meeting Summary
6. Oregon Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap – First Review Draft (separate PDF file)





AGENDA: Floating Offshore Wind Roadmap Roundtable

Tuesday, September 30 from 9 AM - 5:00 PM

Marina Activity Center, Winchester Bay RV Resort

120 Marina Wy, Winchester Bay, OR 97467

ZOOM: [https://zoom.us/meeting/register/Q7SOAkLJSqGU1u0gnpkteg#/registration](https://zoom.us/join/joinMeeting?z=Q7SOAkLJSqGU1u0gnpkteg#/registration)

Objectives for September Meeting:

- Welcome & and provide updates
- Review the first full draft of the Roadmap
- Confirm how to focus the remaining Roundtable meetings

9:00am	Arrival, Welcoming (in full session) ● Providing a moment for participants to join and settle in. We'll do more full introductions ● Reminder about the "question box" online or at the meeting <i>Coffee, hot tea, and water will be provided.</i>
9:30am	Summer updates (in full session) ● Which conversations happened? ● How are those affecting the Roadmap?
10:15 am	Orienting to the full Roadmap draft (in full session) ● What changed from the Spring outline? Why? ● How is the Roadmap structured? Why? ● Discussion
11:00am	Public Comment Part I
11:15am	Morning Break (provided)



11:30am	Section 3 Gallery Walk: Pathway and Phases Diagram (in full session) ● Sharing ● Discussion
12:30pm	Lunch Break (provided)
1:15pm	Key questions for the Roadmap (Full & in breakouts) ● How much detail, and for which audiences? ● Which sections need the most discussion? ● Perspectives on “dilemmas” still in the draft ● Debrief and discussion (in full session)
3:00pm	Break
3:15pm	Open Space: Feedback on Draft 1 (in full session) ● Sharing ● Discussion
4:15pm	Public Comment Part II & Questions
4:45pm	Closing & next steps (in full session) ● Reminder about the “question box” online or at the meeting
5:00pm	Adjourn

ATTACHED MEETING MATERIALS:

- Roundtable Roster
- Roundtable Process Timeline and Milestones
- Spring Roadmap Concept Roundtable Comment Summary
- DRAFT #1 Roadmap

PROPOSED FUTURE ROUNDTABLE DATES (FULL DAYS):

- Nov 18, North Bend
- Apr 20, Grand Ronde
- May 27, Newport
- Jun 23, Florence (may not need this one)

OFFSHORE WIND ENERGY ROADMAP ROUNDTABLE

ROSTER



**Oregon Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable
Roster (not including Agency Advisors) – Current as of 9/22/25**

Name	Affiliation
Dean Apostol	Scenic resource expert
Ashley Audycki	Rogue Climate
Dawn Barlow	Oregon State University Marine Mammal Institute)
Caitlin Barns	Environmental consulting, representing offshore wind developers
Joshua Basofin	Climate Solutions
Lorne Bulling	Ironworkers Local 29
John Bragg	
Mark Brenner	
Mark Brown	
Jason Busch	Climate change and blue economy
Jena Carter	The Nature Conservancy
Susan Chambers	West Coast Seafood Processors Association
Alicia Chapman	Willamette Technical Fabricators
Lynn Coker	Curry County Commission
Melissa Cribbins	
Julia B. DeGraw	National Wildlife Federation
Briece Edwards	Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
Nick Edwards	SPMC / OPAC/ Port Commissioner
Rick Eichstaedt	Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians
Hannah Epstein	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition
Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro	Community Organization-Bluegreen Alliance
Bill Gorham	Brookings resident
Michael Graybill	Marine Scientist
Marcus Hinz	Oregon Coast Visitors Association
Jeffrey Holmes	Alaska Communications
Kevin Victor Howard	Climate Changes Everything, LLC
Jenny Jones	Resident of North Bend (current North Bend City Councilor, but not representing or speaking for Council or City on the Roundtable)
Scott Kent	Special District, Port of Umpqua
Jessica LaBerge	Governor's Office – Regional Solutions
Joe Liebezeit	Bird Alliance of Oregon (formerly Portland Audubon)
Rachel Lucine	Bluegreen Alliance (Alternate)
Casey MacLean	Renewable Northwest
Robert (Bob) Main	Coos County Commissioner
Scott McMullen	Commercial fishing industry
Karina Nielsen	Oregon Sea Grant, Oregon State University
Sara Palmer	Coquille Indian Tribe
David M. Petrie	OCEAN Winds
Tan Perkins	Oregon AFL-CIO
Charlie Plybon	Surfrider Foundation
Hans Radtke	
Bryson Robertson	Academia
Karie Silva	
Angela Sondenaa	Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians

Sara Stephens	Southwestern Oregon Workforce Investment Board
Kyle Stevens	International Port of Coos Bay, OCEAN
Nate Stokes	Operating Engineers Local 701
Scott Strickland	SMART Local 16
Andrea Sumerau	Alternate: Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
Katrina Thompson-Upton	Northwest American Indian Coalition
Rob Ward	Mayor - City of Florence
Robert Westerman	IBEW Local Union 932/OSAEW
Lexie Woodward	South Coast Development Council (SCDC)
Ann Vileisis	Kalmiopsis Audubon Society
Karlen Yallup	Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
TBD CTUIR	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
TBD Cow Creek Band of Umpqua	Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians
TBD Klamath Tribe	The Klamath Tribes
TBD Burns-Paiute Tribe	Burns-Paiute Tribe
TBD Warm Springs Tribe	Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs

Roadmap Process Schedule as of September 2025



Oregon Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap – Process Schedule as of September 2025

	Summer 2025	October – January	January – March	April - June
Roundtable	• Begin Lunch & Learns • Working Groups met (Community Agreements; Research Agenda & Coordination)	• Roundtable meetings Sept/Nov • Comment on Sept Draft #1 • Comment on Nov Draft #2 • Lunch & Learns • Work groups meet as necessary	• Draft launched for public review • Roundtable opportunity to comment on public draft #3	• Roundtable meetings in April and May (June optional) • Responses to comments • Finalize Roadmap • Launch Roadmap and present to Legislature
Community Focus Groups	• South coast community-based organization focus group • Tourism focus group • Coastal energy systems focus group	• Community-based Organization focus groups (north & central coast) • Supply Chain focus group • Youth focus group		
Fisheries Engagement	• Virtual sessions July 10 • Survey w/ outreach • Commodity Commission outreach	• Meet with commodity commissions (tentative)		• Responses to comments
Tribal Engagement	• Tribes-only table conversations about Roadmap interests • Formal consultation requests sent	• Begin formal consultations		• Responses to comments
Public Process	• Virtual Public meeting 7/9 on Roadmap • Public online survey		• Release Roadmap draft #3 for public comment (45-day) • Public meetings to introduce Roadmap (tentative)	• Responses to public comments included in final Roadmap
Other		• Agency/Governors Office Engagement		

Spring Roadmap Concept Roundtable Comment Summary





**Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable:
Summary of Comments & Response: Spring 2025 Roadmap Concept
Last updated September 15, 2025**

I. Context

In Spring 2025, DLCD shared a concept draft of the Roadmap with the Roundtable. The draft was shared in advance of the May 15, 2025 Roundtable meeting and discussed at the June 17, 2025 meeting with comments and feedback invited. This document summarizes some of those comments and how they were incorporated into the September, 2025 complete draft of the Roadmap document.

The comments were very helpful, and pointed to substantive changes in how the Roadmap is organized. So many changes occurred, DLCD and Oregon Consensus felt it more useful to provide a high-level summary of comments and changes here rather than a specific response to each individual comment.

The following sections are organized by themes in the comments received.

II. Comment theme: Organize the Roadmap so it is both A) an “atlas” of possible pathways, and B) a clear description of how offshore wind might be developed if Oregon followed that path

At the June 17, 2025 meeting, Roundtable members discussed the role of Alternative Futures in the Roadmap. Many Roundtable members agreed that it was important for the Roadmap to recognize alternatives, and alternatives that included floating wind arrays off the Oregon coast and alternatives that had no arrays. However, other Roundtable members and other commenters noted that a Roadmap with futures that did not include wind arrays was a Roadmap without a clear destination, which created uncertainty for future wind energy developers. There were also several comments to include a clear permitting pathway to offshore wind energy IF Oregon followed that path.

Some commenters spoke to the original intent of HB 4080 as being a ‘pathway to offshore wind’. Others commented that HB 4080 was intended to keep offshore wind energy as an *option* in Oregon’s energy mix.

How DLCD incorporated comments

This ‘theme’ of comments led to very substantive changes in the document. DLCD framed Draft #1 so that offshore wind energy is an option, but not the only option. DLCD also strove to provide the kinds of clarity on permitting processes, standards, and information needed for potential wind energy developers to successfully locate floating offshore wind arrays off the coast of Oregon. Whether that balance is appropriate, and/or clearly articulated is an important conversation for the Roundtable and others to continue discussing.

Specific changes included:

- A decision to keep alternative futures, including a ‘no wind energy’ alternative;
- Added an alternative future that included wind arrays, but no significant new port development
- Refining the alternative futures based on feedback;
- Structuring Section 3 as a ‘pathway to offshore wind energy’ focused on the permitting and process steps, checkpoints, and information needed to travel that pathway. Many of the steps described in Section 3 may not be needed in a ‘no wind energy’ future;
- Structuring Section 5 to focus on the recommended ‘changes’ needed to fill policy gaps identified in Section 4 and/or successfully travel the path described in Section 3 to offshore wind energy;
- The term “Exit Ramp” was changed to “Checkpoint” to better reflect that there are checkpoints along the pathway to offshore wind (see Section 3) where the State of Oregon can ensure information is available and standards are met. If information is incomplete, the State of Oregon has the opportunity to request additional information, say a project is not consistent with its enforceable policies, or decide not to issue a permit where an Oregon agency is the permitting agency. The term “Checkpoint” was suggested by a commenter, and seemed to better fit how the State of Oregon would operationalize a decision to pause (or request a pause for) a potential wind energy project.

III. Comment theme: Articulate both the benefits and impacts, and clarify the coverage of existing policies

Some comments on the Concept Draft noted that the tone of Policy Gaps section was focused more on negative effects to avoid without enough emphasis on the potential benefits that could be realized with offshore wind and the policy opportunities to grasp those benefits. In response, DLCD restructured the Policy Gaps section (now Section 4) to include an introductory discussion for each of the objective areas identified by HB 4080 that seeks to include both effects of concern and positive effects to capture, without extending beyond the actual feedback that has been received so far in the process. Section 4 has also been expanded significantly to describe the key enforceable policies that are already in place in Oregon to cover the effects discussed. Roundtable feedback on this section will help to determine if a fair and accurate balance has been struck relative to the perspectives around each objective area. DLCD is interested to learn whether important potential benefits or concerns are missing that would help better tell the story.

III. Comment theme: Incorporate feedback from Tribes, fishermen, and others in ways that center those voices and provide opportunity for others to comment

DLCD co-convened several meetings with Oregon federally recognized Tribes, open to members and staff, to discuss topics of interest to them related to offshore wind and explore how they could be reflected in the Roadmap. The September Draft #1 Roadmap reflects input and specific recommended actions from those conversations. DLCD is currently seeking formal consultation with Oregon federally-recognized Tribes on the draft recommendations, so the draft language in the September draft is subject to significant change based on the outcome of consultation.

For fishing communities, DLCD is pursuing multiple avenues to bring in more perspectives and gather feedback on the recommendations in the September draft. DLCD provided comment at the June Pacific Fisheries Management Council to invite any interested members to participate in a set of virtual meetings focused on fisheries interests on July 9th. Notice for the meeting was also sent to all commercial license holders in the state, and DLCD engaged in direct outreach with members of two recreational fishing organizations and the chairs of Oregon's commercial fishing commodity commissions. Following the virtual meetings, DLCD developed a survey, based on the questions asked of the fishing communities at the virtual meeting, and shared it among multiple outreach avenues. DLCD has also spoken directly with one commodity commission and is planning to seek opportunities to speak with others this fall. The September draft contains new language to reflect issues of concern and proposed actions to address them.

IV. Provide more background & clear definition of terms

Commenters wanted more background on information such as the status of offshore wind energy and the Oregon energy strategy, the roles of different permitting agencies now, and what the Roadmap is and is not.

How DLCD incorporated comments

DLCD added additional background and context to Section 1 of the document, including information on the status of offshore wind, the roles and permitting process, and the purpose of the Roadmap. DLCD also tried to be more consistent with the use of key terms. The Concept document used the terms: Goal, Objective, Strategy, and Action (borrowed from the Maine Roadmap). Draft #1 defined 'Goal' as the Goal of the Roadmap document, rather than an offshore wind energy goal for Oregon. Draft #1 used the terms: Objective and Strategic Action to try to simplify the number of terms used in the document.

V. Contextualize the potential impacts of FOSW energy with the potential impacts of climate change, and which communities are impacted

Commenters wanted the Roadmap to more clearly place the discussion of potential impacts of wind energy development next to the potential impacts of climate change (if Oregon and others don't successfully reduce greenhouse gas emissions). Commenters also spoke to the importance of prioritizing and/or listening to the voices of various communities across Oregon. For, example, some noted that everyone in Oregon is invested in the pros and cons of wind energy (i.e., energy prices, climate change, jobs) and others noted the prime importance of communities and Tribal sovereigns most impacted by offshore wind energy (i.e., current ocean users, Tribes, fishermen, and coastal communities where onshore wind energy-related development would occur). Some commenters noted that some of the standards requested by the Roundtable or others may be beyond the role and/or jurisdiction of the State of Oregon (i.e., permitting in federal waters).

The September draft references Oregon's non-greenhouse-gas emitting electricity policy (HB 2021) as a leading basis for the state's renewable energy development goals, as well as the challenge of meeting increasing electricity demand from renewable sources as the state's energy sector shifts away from fossil-based energy. References to the effects of climate change are also noted in state policies concerning cumulative effects of project development.

How DLCD incorporated comments

DLCD centered the principles of authentic community engagement in the Roadmap (these were developed primarily through Roundtable feedback). DLCD also clarified where Oregon agencies have current jurisdiction, and in Section 4, where there may be gaps in existing policies relative to standards Roundtable members and others might be interested in.

VI. Contextualize FOSW within the broader energy demand and mix for Oregon

Several commenters wanted the Roadmap to address the potential for other forms of marine renewable energy, and renewable energy that could meet the grid resilience and load demands for the Oregon Coast. Some commenters wanted the Roadmap to orient around an explicit FOSW energy goal (e.g., 3GW of power), or what is needed from marine renewables to meet statewide goals for decarbonizing Oregon's energy mix.

How DLCD incorporated comments

DLCD will include stronger links back to the Oregon Energy Strategy as it is completed. DLCD did not include explicit discussions on the potential (and possible permitting differences) for other forms of marine renewable energy (e.g., wave or small-scale nuclear energy).

I. Comments incorporated from the Tribal Table

Between June and August 2025, DLCD met with members and staff of interested Federally-recognized Tribes of Oregon to discuss topics of specific interest to them related to offshore wind energy development. The feedback from these discussions have been incorporated into the first Roadmap Draft. DLCD is currently seeking formal consultation with interested Oregon

Federally-recognized Tribes. The Roadmap draft sections related to Tribal interests may change significantly as a result of formal consultation.

I. Comments incorporated from the Research and Community Agreement Working Groups

During summer 2025, DLCD convened multiple meetings of the two working groups: Research Agenda and Coordination; and Community Benefits and Other Enforceable Agreements. Draft recommendation language was developed and refined as a result of these discussions, and this language is included in the Roadmap first draft. These recommendations are open for further comment and suggestions from the larger Roundtable and the working group members.

I. Comments incorporated from focus group conversations

DLCD has been engaged in focus group conversations with various additional groups to further expand the context and perspectives represented in the Roadmap. So far, DLCD has met with representatives of the coastal tourism industry, coastal energy utilities, and community-based organizations representing Coos and Curry Counties. The Roadmap draft contains insights and perspectives from these focus group discussions. Additional planned focus groups include community-based organizations on the north and central coast, supply chain industries and ports, and a youth-focused discussion. Future revisions of the Roadmap will be informed by these planned discussions.

OFFSHORE WIND ENERGY ROADMAP ROUNDTABLE

JUNE 2025 ROUNDTABLE MEETING SUMMARY





Floating Offshore Wind Roadmap Roundtable
Tuesday, June 17 from 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM
Three Rivers Resort Casino
5647 OR-126, Florence, OR 97439

Meeting Summary

Meeting Recording:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rmk_uqxHAgU&list=PLtwNVSIg2TZhy1q9WaZ917msYRU7bBUtQ&index=5

Meeting Slides:

[Meeting Slides](#)

[Workforce Panel Slides 1](#)

[Workforce Panel Slides 2](#)

[Workforce Panel Slides 3](#)

RT members in-person:

Jesse Beers (CTCLUSI); Mike Graybill (public); Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro (BlueGreen Alliance); Julia B. DeGraw (National Wildlife Federation); Delia Kelly (ODFW); Ann Vileisis (Kalmiopsis Audubon Society); Jenny Jones (public); Jena Carter (The Nature Conservancy); Nate Stokes (International Union of Operating Engineers Local 701); Angela Sondenaa (Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians); Rick Eichstaedt (CTCLUSI- Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians); Ashley Audycki (Rogue Climate); Karie Silva; Karina Nielsen (SeaGrant); Karlen Yallup (Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission);

RT members via Zoom: John Bragg (Friends of South Slough); Natalya Stranadko (DSL); Scott McMullen, Lynn Coker (Curry County Commissioner); Susan Chambers (West Coast Seafood Processors Association); Dean Apostol (Scenic resource and environmental planning); Jason Busch (Climate change and blue economy); Laurel Hillmann (OPRD), Jason Sierman (ODOE); Julie, David Petrie, Joe Liebezeit;

Others: Stefanie Stravrakas, Kate Sullivan, Laurel Hillman, Shannon Davis, Jean Thurston-Keller

Department of Land Conservation and Development staff in-person: Jeff Burrigh, Lisa Phipps, Hui Rodomski, Brodie McLaughlin

Department of Land Conservation and Development staff via Zoom: Andy Lanier; Cynthia Smidt,

Oregon Consensus Facilitators in-person: Bobby Cochran, Sofia Castellanos

I. Executive Summary

II. Arrival, Welcoming Remarks

- Jesse Beers from the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians opened the meeting by welcoming all Roundtable members. He offered a brief acknowledgment of the Sieslau lands where the meeting was taking place, and shared good wishes for a productive and meaningful session ahead.

Cultural Reflection: Canoe Journey and Coastal Traditions

- Jesse shared a photo of a canoe journey and spoke about the significance of blessing the waters before setting out. He explained that, in these journeys, when paddlers enter another tribe's territory, they must first ask permission to come ashore by raising their paddles in a gesture of respect—a tradition known as "paddles up." This tradition reflects a deep cultural value of honoring sovereignty and relationships, and it continues to be practiced by tribes along Oregon's southern coast.
- This tradition is also expected by the tribes of the southern coast, especially when others plan to work on projects in their waters. Jesse emphasized the importance of cultural exchange, visitors ask permission, bring handmade gifts and food to share, and follow respectful practices.
- He also shared that at the end of a visit, paddlers ask permission once again, this time to depart and travel back through the waters, reinforcing respect for the people and places they pass through.

III. Agenda Overview

- Bobby Cochran from Oregon Consensus welcomed everyone in the room and on Zoom. He provided an overview of the agenda, explaining that the meeting would include:
 - A review of the Roadmap Concept packet, that is also available online

- Jeff's summary of the comments collected so far, and he will highlight key feedback for the group
- Updates on the permitting process
- Updates on recent and upcoming community engagement
- A preview of what to expect over the summer and fall

Comments on the May Discussion Draft

- Jeff guided the Roundtable (RT) members through the changes made to the draft roadmap concept. He explained what edits had been made and how comments from RT members were integrated into the current version, and encouraged everyone to read through not just their own comments but also those submitted by others.

Key Topics Discussed

- The concept and structure of the roadmap, including:
 - The difference between the goal of the roadmap and the principles listed in the document — there was some confusion about the definitions of these terms.
- Section 5 of the document includes individual comments, which explore a range of different ideas and directions.
- Plans for the summer include building on those comments and developing responses, so that in the fall RT members can revisit them and continue the conversation.

High-Level Discussion Questions Raised

- What was the original intent of HB 4080?
- What is the problem statement of the roadmap?
- Clarifying the difference between “goal” and “principles” — what each term means in the context of the roadmap draft.
- Comments on the paths: What actions are needed under each path? For example, Path A and the development of ports, including discussion of potential trade-offs.
- How should objectives be organized across the roadmap?
- Exit ramps: How is this concept defined? How do exit ramps connect to the diagram, streams, and gates included in the roadmap draft?

What Happens Next

- Jeff will spend the summer integrating and responding to the comments received.

- The intent is to return in September with a new version of the roadmap draft to share with RT members.
- Jeff will also create a matrix that shows the comments received and the responses developed by the DLCD team.
- A question was posed to the RT members: Do the discussion themes and patterns Jeff identified also reflect what you submitted or noticed in others' comments?

Comments and Questions

- Mike Graybill asked whether *American Clean Power* is represented among RT members, since several comments seemed to reflect that group's views.
 - Jeff clarified that the comments were submitted online, and there is no RT member representing American Clean Power.
 - Bobby added that some comments also came from public meetings and online public submissions.
- Ranfis shared that more feedback will likely come after July, as they've been busy with the legislative session. Once that's wrapped up, there will be more time to review and comment on the draft roadmap.
 - Jeff noted he will carve out more time in mid-July to balance integration and inclusion of incoming comments into the roadmap draft.
 - From September to November will be a key window to focus on a revised draft and allow RT members to review and provide feedback.
- Rick asked whether it's still worthwhile to submit comments on the current draft.
 - Jeff responded that additional comments are welcome now if members have them, but it's also okay to wait for the updated version in September.
 - Bobby added that *structural* comments (e.g., how the document is organized) are still helpful now. However, if the comments are more about *content*, it might be better to wait until the new version is released.
- Julie Siestream. raised a question about HB 3963 and its upcoming hearing, asking whether there's a lobbyist supporting its extension to continue the offshore wind roadmap work.
 - Julia DeGraw shared that the bill passed the House with bipartisan support, and the upcoming Senate hearing is considered a good sign.
- Jenny Jones offered a comment on the goal of the roadmap:
 - She encouraged the group to think ahead about the industries and companies that will eventually carry out the work.

- She suggested defining the **units** involved—like what would be the minimum viable unit—and considering how industry players will take part in reaching that goal.
- Jeff responded by mentioning the concept of alternative futures and the flexibility of the roadmap:
- He raised the idea of using pilot projects as early units—possibly 5 or 10 mills (or megawatts).
- There’s no final answer yet on unit size, but these are the kinds of framing questions they’re exploring.
- Jenny followed up, asking if there’s already an idea of what the turbine configuration might look like.
 - Jeff shared that this same question came up during the recent public meeting in Coos Bay, he presented a slide during that meeting showing a spacing of roughly one mile between turbines.
 - He did a mapping exercise to scale that within rocky habitats:
 - Estimated around 50 turbines in Coos Bay
 - Around 60–65 turbines near Brookings
 - Together, these installations would approach 1 GW of energy
- Ranfis closed by noting that the work ahead could shift over time and that different assumptions and factors may influence how future scenario planning is developed.

Discussion on Roadmap Vision, Tone, and Next Steps

- Bobby asked the group if the roadmap should be a living document, something that evolves over time.
- Angela responded by pointing out the complexity of the seafloor around Coos Bay and Brookings. She noted concerns about rocky habitats and shared that the map Jeff presented raised a red flag for her due to many unknowns in the area.
- Dean Apostol (on Zoom) also asked a question about the same map and how the turbine locations were counted.
 - Jeff replied that he did his best to fit turbines around existing conditions, including rocky habitats. He explained this was just a rough exercise imagining what a developer might do.
 - Dean followed up, asking if Jeff remembered why rocky habitats should be excluded.
 - Jeff answered that the Part V goal of Oregon’s policies includes protections for rocky habitats, so those areas should not be developed.
- Julie confirmed her agreement that the roadmap should be a living document.

- Jeff brought up a comment from American Clean Power, which raised a concern about how the roadmap is framed, specifically, the "vibe" it gives off. Is it hostile, overly restrictive, or does it set a standard for doing offshore wind development the right way in Oregon?
- Rick reminded the group that Oregon already has existing standards. The roadmap should help clarify how those will affect offshore wind development. He emphasized that Oregon's coast is precious, and the roadmap needs to explore:
 - *Can we do offshore wind here?*
 - *Under what conditions, and how should it be done?*
- Bobby followed up by asking whether the Roundtable (RT) can help define the tone of the roadmap.
- Scott asked about the limits of the territorial sea and what percentage of development can occur within 50 miles of a major port.
 - Regarding the tone, he interpreted the roadmap as: *"If this happens, here's how it should happen."*
- Ann reflected on how many participants are expressing a vision for the Oregon coast and how that vision should guide the roadmap:
 - *What is the goal?*
 - *What is our North Star?*
 - She emphasized how special the Oregon coast is and the need to hold that in mind when making decisions.
- Joe shared a highway metaphor:
 - Oregon is first trying to identify areas where no development should happen — where the "highway" cannot go.
 - Once those areas are avoided, the question becomes what kind of "road" should be built — maybe not a highway, but something smaller like a two-lane road.
 - The wind industry is seeking regulatory certainty — they want to know where and how they can operate.
- Lynn talked about the current ambivalence among developers:
 - There's still uncertainty about investing in floating wind technology, since it's still evolving.
 - Developers may hesitate to invest unless barriers are reduced and expectations are clearer.
 - He posed the key question: *"What are we trying to accomplish with this roadmap?"*
 - He suggested thinking of it as a tool to identify needed infrastructure and pathways, rather than a fixed route from point A to point B.

Comments from Zoom Chat and Discussion on Alternative Futures

- Nataliya Stranadko (DSL) shared that the Maine Offshore Wind Roadmap was developed under the leadership of the Governor’s Office, with a clear political decision in favor of offshore wind. Oregon's situation is different. The state is still in a decision-making phase, weighing the pros and cons of offshore wind, so the purpose and tone of the Oregon roadmap are different.
- Scott Strickland expressed that he wants people from all communities to feel empowered to make informed decisions about moving forward—whatever that may look like. He emphasized the importance of making information accessible and actionable for anyone engaging with the roadmap, regardless of their starting point. He also shared that he values mutual learning in the process and approaches this work with humility and curiosity.

Discussion on Alternative Futures and Scenario Planning

- Jeff posed a key question to the group: Should the roadmap include a scenario where Oregon decides *not* to pursue offshore wind? If that scenario is on the table, is it worth investing in research and planning?
- Julia asked whether there are resources to model a future with no offshore wind development in Oregon. She suggested it would be helpful to understand how that scenario aligns or conflicts with the state's energy goals. She noted the value of laying out what each possible future could look like, including a future with no offshore wind, and questioned whether that should be formally considered if it cannot be fully developed.
- Mike noted that including “alternative futures” helps make the roadmap a living document. Given the dynamic nature of the offshore wind industry and emerging technologies, keeping space for new, currently unforeseen alternatives is important. He emphasized the need for careful wording—especially around scenarios like a 1 GW pilot—and whether the roadmap suggests more projects could follow if the first is successful.

Additional Comments from Zoom Chat and In-Room Discussion

- John Bragg shared that he hopes people will see Oregon as a trusted leader in efforts to reduce or eliminate dependence on fossil fuels.

- Lynn Coker asked whether Oregon can responsibly benefit from California’s investments through collaboration or by participating in a pilot project. She raised the question of what opportunities exist for collaboration with the OSWFT (Offshore Wind Federal Taskforce).
- Nataliya Stranadko (DSL) noted that the roadmap should not make a definitive yes-or-no decision on offshore wind. That decision should come from the state’s broader energy strategy if it is included as part of it.

In-Room Discussion on Next Steps and Scenario Development

- Ranfis suggested forming a subgroup to focus on alternative future scenarios. He proposed that the group:
 - Identify what policy analysis is needed
 - Discuss how to phase a pilot project
 - Define what steps are needed to get to a pilot, and how phasing could be represented in future scenarios
- Rick raised the question of what energy areas are considered under 1 GW and whether those count as pilots. He noted that while BOEM has selected wind energy areas, they may not reflect the choices Oregon would make if deciding independently.
- Jeff shared that developers often see 1 GW as a "sweet spot"—a useful size to target. He suggested the group think about:
 - What would be the minimum (floor) acceptable to developers
 - What would be the maximum (ceiling) Oregon would allow or support

Visual Materials

- A new diagram was introduced that includes updated graphics and introduces the terms “streams” and “gates.”
- Participants were encouraged to become familiar with these terms as part of engaging with the roadmap structure and decision-making pathways.

IV. Workforce Panel Conversation

Four speakers participated in the panel conversation on workforce development, with three joining in person—Ranfis, Nate, and Kyle—representing union perspectives in Oregon. Two additional panelists, Tanner and Scott, joined over Zoom to extend the conversation and provide insights from both Oregon and California.

Ranfis, speaking on behalf of Lorne, shared insights about the apprenticeship system:

- There is currently a 6 to 18-month wait time to enter apprenticeship programs, during which individuals are not yet on job sites.
- Pre-apprenticeship programs like the Multi-Craft Core Curriculum (MC3) are a key model for helping participants transition into registered apprenticeships.
- Registered apprenticeship programs offer structured training and are typically funded privately by union members and contractor partners.

Nate added more context on Oregon's registered apprenticeship programs:

- Oregon has had a state-approved registered apprenticeship system since 1973, governed by statewide standards.
- These standards were updated in recent years to reflect evolving industry needs and to allow for scaling up the number of trainees.
- MC3 programs are being implemented in some high schools, offering earlier exposure to the trades.
- They are beginning to integrate offshore wind into training programs, including hands-on learning with cranes and other relevant technologies.
- Registered apprenticeships typically require about 8,000 hours of training.

Scott (Smart Local 16) emphasized how union apprenticeships are structured:

- They operate under project labor agreements and collective bargaining agreements, which are typically finalized in the pre-hiring phase.
- The model includes both local development and support from international networks.
- They partner closely with community colleges.
- Many large-scale projects—referred to as megaprojects—involve billions of dollars in investment. Examples include projects in Ohio, Arizona, and Kentucky.

Kyle reflected on the broader opportunity offshore wind represents:

- Offshore wind appeals to him as an emerging industry that offers Oregon a chance to shape its own approach to infrastructure, supply chains, land use, and workforce development.
- He noted the potential benefits for Oregon's southern coastal communities, particularly if projects are built locally.
- Union programs and community college partnerships are essential, but training takes time.

- For example, training a needed number of electricians could take several years—meaning the workforce has to be developed well in advance of a pilot project.

Tanner (from Cal Poly Humboldt and the Pacific Offshore Wind Consortium) shared insights from California’s approach:

- He presented a diagram used by the consortium to explain how offshore wind development should unfold.
- In California, they’ve modeled job creation estimates to support professional workforce development.
- They conducted a sensitivity analysis on a project in the Humboldt area, identifying expected labor demand at different stages such as supply chain activities, staging, assembly, and work through educational institutions.
- Their model breaks down labor needs by occupation and estimates the workforce required for floating offshore wind development in the state.

Comments and Questions

The panel and audience explored what Oregon can begin doing now to prepare for offshore wind development if it moves forward in the future.

A question was raised: What should Oregon start doing now to get ready for offshore wind? What actions can the state take now?

Responses from panelists and participants included:

- There is a trained workforce ready to go—especially operating engineers trained to work with cranes—but they need job opportunities to keep their training active and relevant.
- Workers are spread across the state, and there’s a need to create a plan to bring them together. For that to happen, there needs to be a clear promise or pathway to employment.
- Ranfis emphasized the need for a model that creates jobs for the people who are already being trained.
- Kyle noted the importance of intentionality—training people only if there’s a plan to connect them with real job opportunities.

Jeff asked about California’s experience with project labor agreements and whether the agreement in place there was developed organically.

- Nate responded with context: in California, project labor agreements were developed through community engagement and conversations with developers. When federal funding arrived, the agreements were already in place and ready to be implemented.

Julia DeGraw asked about what processes Oregon might explore and what the sequence might look like. She asked if it's correct to assume Oregon needs more people trained in anticipation of offshore wind jobs.

- Nate responded that apprenticeship programs only train people when there are real job forecasts. For example, last year they had 300 applicants but accepted only 40. This year, out of 200 applicants, they accepted 20, based on projections of actual job demand.
- Ranfis added that the union model can be replicated—it's built on training, retaining, and continuing to train workers as needed.

Mike brought up a broader question: the discussion assumes offshore wind will be led by private sector developers, but should the state explore a public development model, like the Bonneville Power Administration or U.S. Highway 101? He asked how Oregon could capitalize on the job opportunities that come with development.

Kyle and Scott reflected on Oregon's unique situation and suggested looking at the impacts of wind energy development along the Columbia River to help anticipate what might happen in coastal communities. Scott mentioned that data centers and other developments have emerged in places like the Port of Morrow as a result of onshore turbines and that these examples could be instructive.

Ashley raised a question that's been coming up in community meetings: how to prioritize local hiring and how an open shop model intersects with union apprenticeship programs.

Jason Busch shared a ProPublica article in the Zoom chat suggesting the Bonneville Power Administration may not be a great model for Oregon energy development.

Scott responded that in Coos Bay, both open shops and signatory contractors are present.

Nate clarified that there are differences in training models between union and open shops. These differences include training locations, equipment, timeline, and structure. Union training programs typically last four years.

Tanner added that they've seen open shop models operate differently and that it's important for jobs to prioritize local hires and ensure community members are actively engaged in the process.

Scott highlighted the value of enforceable agreements in eastern Oregon, where developers are required to meet conditions such as providing housing and healthcare access.

Ranfis noted that legally enforceable agreements make it possible to include small local contractors and ensure the necessary guarantees and workforce integration processes are in place for offshore wind construction.

Bobby closed the conversation with a question: What are the opportunities for regional collaboration between Oregon and California?

Scott Strickland shared a resource in the Zoom chat from the SMART Union:

<https://www.smart-union.org/get-involved/i-got-your-back/>

Julie Siestreem asked whether participants would have access to the workforce panel presentations and thanked everyone for the quality of the discussion, noting it was a valuable and forward-looking process.

Tanner, Nate, Ranfis, and Scott confirmed they are okay with sharing their presentation slides with the group

Regulatory Process, Public Opportunities, and Exits

The session included an overview of the permitting and regulatory landscape related to offshore wind development in Oregon, particularly where federal and state jurisdictions meet.

A slide was presented showing the connection between floating turbines located in federal waters and how cabling would run through state waters to reach the shore and land-based infrastructure.

- Rick reminded Jeff that consultation with tribes is required under the National Historic Preservation Act and must be part of the permitting process. Cabling is one of the major infrastructure components involved, and once it enters state waters and lands, it falls under additional regulations, including those managed by the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL).
- Mike added that Oregon generally prefers cables to be buried, and this is considered a best practice. Jeff noted that cable projects also trigger removal-fill permit requirements.

- Scott McMullen added in the Zoom chat that all Oregon cables have historically required removal-fill permits.
- Delia noted that floating platforms and floating substations could trigger a different type of permitting or authorization process, possibly requiring leases in state waters.

An Oregon State University diagram was shared showing the number of federal agencies involved in offshore wind permitting. It illustrated the handoff between BOEM (Bureau of Ocean Energy Management), which oversees leasing, and BSEE (Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement), which takes over enforcement.

Another slide showed various federal-level agencies involved in the offshore wind process, including NOAA, NEPA, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), and the Coast Guard—which may play a role further down the road.

- Jena asked, based on recent BOEM activity with leasing in the call areas, when in the process BOEM and other federal agencies, like the Department of Defense and Coast Guard, typically engage with communities. She raised concerns about timing and early involvement.
- Mike shared that he had contacted BOEM, and they reported difficulty getting responses from the Department of Defense and the Army. He explained that internal agency operations have made this engagement challenging.

Jeff provided a timeline overview of the BOEM offshore wind process, emphasizing the moments where public input is possible, especially during environmental review phases.

Additional comments from the Zoom chat included:

- Stef Stavrakas (USFWS) noted that the FAA is also involved, particularly for the lighting requirements on tower structures both offshore and on land.
- Scott McMullen referenced the USCG Pacific Ocean Port Access Route Study (PAC PARS), which removed areas from development when they were located within designated transit fairways.
- Susan Chambers added more detail, noting that the Pacific Coast Port Access Route Study (PacPARS), completed by the Coast Guard in 2023, identified tow lanes and port access routes where permanent structures cannot be built to maintain safe navigation. She also shared links to the Coast Guard press release and national Port Access Route study reports:

- <https://www.news.uscg.mil/Press-Releases/Article/3420418/coast-guard-completes-study-recommending-establishing-voluntary-fairways-to-sup/>

- <https://www.navcen.uscg.gov/port-access-route-study-reports>
- Susan also clarified that "COP" refers to the Construction and Operations Plan, an important regulatory document in the offshore wind development process.

Regulatory Process Diagram

Jeff presented a diagram illustrating the regulatory review process for offshore wind permitting. He explained that each bar in the diagram represents the amount of time required for an agency to review and process a permit application. The process includes multiple stages and agency responsibilities.

NEPA is integrated into this process, along with agency-specific consultations and reviews. Jeff noted that each agency has its own role in evaluating the project, and the overall timeline reflects how these responsibilities are distributed.

Federal consistency was described as the final step—or “caboose”—of the process. This step cannot move forward until the other agencies have completed their reviews and issued their findings, which are then used as evidence to support the consistency determination.

Joint Agency Review Teams play a role by making recommendations to state agencies, which ultimately make the final permitting decisions. These teams also assess the adequacy of the NEPA evaluations, including whether cumulative impacts have been properly considered.

The discussion highlighted how permitting is ultimately a decision-making process. Permits have a binary nature—either approved or denied—and the review process builds toward that final decision.

- Anne raised a question about how the federal consistency process is aligned with local agency decision-making. She asked how these different processes come together in a coordinated way to inform and support a final decision.
- Jeff presented the BOEM timeline diagram, which outlines the key stages of the offshore wind permitting process. He noted there are multiple points along the timeline where coordination and collaboration could be improved to make the process more efficient and accessible.
- Ranfis noted that the permitting process involves many steps, and Oregon has to engage across all of them. He suggested that the state consider creating a mechanism—such as

a board—to help track progress, ensure transparency, and support community oversight. He emphasized the importance of enabling the public to follow the process and stay informed.

Feedback on the New Diagram Visual

The new version of the waypoint diagram was presented, featuring updated design elements, components, and terminology such as “streams” and “gates.” The Roundtable provided initial feedback on its clarity and structure.

Delia asked for clarification, noting that the diagram appeared to be missing a title and it wasn’t immediately clear what it represented. Jeff explained that the new diagram is a replacement for the previous waypoint diagram included in Section 3 of the roadmap draft.

Delia also asked when the three streams of engagement—represented visually in the diagram—are expected to occur.

Bobby responded that the three streams—meaningful engagement, good information, and regional coordination—are intended to happen throughout the entire process, not in a single sequence.

Natalya suggested adding a fourth stream to represent the ongoing coordination with other agencies, such as the Department of State Lands (DSL), to reflect continuous processes that are already underway.

Updates on Workgroups and Summer Activities

The facilitation team provided an overview of what to expect from the workgroups and community engagement efforts over the summer.

Several engagement processes are happening in parallel with the development of the roadmap:

- In-person community meetings are underway. A recent event in Coos Bay drew 55 participants. A virtual meeting will follow in July, using the same content and format. RT members were encouraged to invite their networks to attend.
- Jeff is continuing outreach to the fishing industry, with the goal of broadening participation. The National Academy of Sciences is also organizing events related to fisheries, where industry stakeholders are discussing policy priorities, mitigation strategies, and their concerns. Jeff will continue gathering input to inform the next version of the roadmap and will extend open invitations to representatives from the fishing sector.

- On the research front, Jeff is working with Karina to build a research agenda specific to Oregon. He is also in conversation with California colleagues to understand their research needs and how they are supporting offshore wind development.
- In February, RT members used sticky notes to identify conversation topics for future discussion. Based on that input, a series of “brown bag” sessions will be organized around single-topic discussions, including sessions with community-based organizations on the coast. These sessions aim to better understand what community needs may be impacted by new development.
- The team is also planning other focus groups and is currently identifying who should be included in those conversations.
- A virtual meeting is being planned with commodity commissions and regional fishing groups. Conversations are also continuing with the Tribal Table in Oregon. Jeff noted that there are 25 pages of specific tribal interests that will be integrated into the next roadmap draft.
- The updated roadmap draft is currently being developed, with support from Consort consulting. DLCD is also identifying opportunities to participate in other coastal events to raise awareness and share updates about the roadmap.
- DLCD is working on a “story map” based on 6 to 7 key questions around effects and concerns. This resource will be shared with the public. Volunteers from the RT will be asked to review it before publication. Volunteers so far include Julia, Ashley, Brodie, Rick, and John Bragg. The request will go out in the next couple of weeks.

Webinars and Summer Learning Opportunities

Sara shared upcoming webinars and educational events:

- July 9: Monitoring ecological effects at PacWave
- August 20: Understanding marine mammal and seabird distribution to inform offshore wind development

In addition, a series of summer “lunch and learns” will begin on Thursdays at noon, starting July 10. These sessions will focus on high-priority topics and feature guest experts. All sessions will be recorded, but active participation is encouraged. Oregon Sea Grant is organizing these events to support RT members.

- Ashley asked whether the “lunch and learn” sessions are open to the public. Sara confirmed that they are, as the overall process is a public one. The session topics remain flexible, and RT members are welcome to suggest additional topics or reach out directly to Sara with ideas.

Closing Activities Report Out

- Cynthia shared an idea for outreach to the tourism industry, suggesting the team could set up stations at scenic viewpoints to gather public feedback. She mentioned Dean might be able to assist. She also recommended hosting a brown bag session focused on scenic resources and viewsheds.
- Andrea noted she has participated in many overlapping meetings and is ready to review a draft of the roadmap. She expressed curiosity about the concept of “exit ramps,” asking whether they will be included and how they will be applied.
- Lisa reflected on the inclusive and respectful nature of the process. She noted that Jeff has led the effort in a way that allows people to speak openly, even when there is disagreement. She acknowledged that DLCD could have chosen a simpler path to implement House Bill 4080, but Jeff chose to lead a broader and more collaborative process.
- Julia expressed pride in how much information has been gathered and distilled, and how much collective knowledge and trust has been built. She highlighted the importance of integrating Tribal values more fully into the Roundtable space, pointing out a disconnect between broader community resistance—such as through ballot measures—and the proactive dialogue taking place within the Roundtable.
- Nate shared that this has been one of the best-run processes he’s participated in. He’s proud of the collaboration and emphasized the value of having a space where people feel safe and respected.
- Mike shared that he has enjoyed meeting new people from Coos Bay and expressed his appreciation for being part of the process. He said he’s proud to live in Oregon and feels he can make a meaningful impact in this setting.
- Rick emphasized the group’s ability to bring together diverse opinions and maintain a civil and productive conversation. He encouraged Roundtable members to continue connecting with the communities they represent and said he is personally committed to engaging with other Tribes.
- Scott commented that floating offshore wind was not included in the state’s energy strategy and suggested that the strategy may need to become more dynamic. He and David are thinking about what’s realistically possible off Oregon’s coast. Scott also expressed gratitude for the relationships that have formed across such a range of perspectives.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

