



DLCD

Department of
Land Conservation
& Development



OCMP

Oregon Coastal
Management Program



NOVEMBER 19, 2024 MEETING PACKET



AGENDA: Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable Meeting #2

Tuesday, November 19 from 9 AM - 5:00 PM

**Three Rivers Casino Resort
5647 OR-126, Florence, OR 97439**

ZOOM:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/join/ztZkOCtpz4tHNx0n1x3J6vM8H1oLx4Ze-tb>

Objectives for November Meeting #2:

- Welcome & and provide updates
- Finalize the draft Roadmap outline
- Refine and confirm the group charter
- Future Vision Exercise to identify early waypoints and critical policies/information needs

9:00am	Arrival, Welcoming (in full session) • Welcome from Chief Barrett, Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians • 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 • Review the Nov 1 meeting summary <i>Coffee, hot tea, and water will be provided.</i>
9:30am	Roadmap Outline (in full session) • Overview from DLCD on what changes were made since the last time • Questions? Refinements? ◦ What other layers of detail feel important for defining the outline ◦ Are there any of the Roadmap elements that are rising to the level of needing their own workgroup yet? • Group check: This outline is good enough to work from now?
10:30 am	Group charter (in full session) • What updates does the task team have? • Questions? Refinements? • Discussion • Group check: This charter good enough to work from now?
11:00am	Public Comment Part I

11:15am	Morning Break (provided)
11:30am	Informational Presentation: Getting to Know Oregon's Enforceable Policies (full session) • Presentation • Discussion
12:30pm	Lunch Break (provided)
1:15pm	Visions Part I: What does the future of Offshore Wind look like? (in breakouts) • Imagine that Oregon has A) successfully developed offshore wind, and in an alternative future, B) has decided not to develop offshore wind turbines–But you feel good about both of these futures. Describe each of those futures and the markers of success. • For each of these alternative futures, which conversations, policies, and actions got us to those futures (e.g., What pitfalls were avoided, which questions were answered, what agreements were made, which protections were put in place, and which questions did we leave to adaptive management?
3:00pm	Break
3:15pm	Visions Part II (full session) • Sharing what small groups came up with • How should the waypoints and markers guide the Roundtable conversations and Roadmap recommendations?
4:15pm	Public Comment Part II & Questions
4:45pm	Closing & next steps (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
- DRAFT Roadmap Outline
- DRAFT Roundtable 11/1 Kickoff Meeting Summary
- Primer on Oregon's enforceable policies
- DRAFT Initial list of vision statements and definitions of success

PROPOSED FUTURE ROUNDTABLE DATES (FULL DAYS, LOCATION TBD):

- Dec 18
- Jan 9
- Feb 20
- March 31
- April 15
- May 15
- Jun 18

ROUNDTABLE ROSTER



Oregon Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable

Roster – Current as of 11/7/24

Name	Affiliation
Dean Apostol	
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
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
Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro	Community Organization-Bluegreen Alliance
Bill Gorham	
Michael Graybill	
Marcus Hinz	Business Association & Tourism Industry
Jeffrey Holmes	Alaska Communications
Kevin Victor Howard	
Jenny Jones	
Scott Kent	Special District, Port of Umpqua
Joe Liebezeit	Bird Alliance of Oregon (formerly Portland Audubon)
Casey MacLean	Renewable Northwest
Robert (Bob) Main	Coos County Commissioner
Scott McMullen	Commercial fishing industry
Annie Merrill	Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition
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	International Union of Operating Engineers Local 701

Scott Strickland	SMART Local 16
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

Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Agency Advisors

Name	Affiliation
Jonathan Allan	DOGAMI
Jeremy Thompson	ODFW
Delia Kelly	ODFW
Laurel Hillmann	OPRD
Valerie Thompson	DEQ
Haley Teach	Alternate: DEQ
Jason Sierman	ODOE
Chris Frazier	BIZ OR
Nataliya Stranadko	DSL
John Pouley	OPRD/SHPO
Robin Freeman	PUC
Zachariah Baker	Alternate: PUC
Kim Peacher	Navy
Lilah Ise	NOAA-NMFS
Kelly Andrews	Alternate: NOAA-NMFS
Kris Wall	NOAA-OCM
Rebecca Smyth	Alternate: NOAA-OCM
Primary TBD	FCC
Primary TBD	BLM
Hannah Dondy Kaplan	BPA
Primary TBD	USCG
Primary TBD	NPS
Primary TBD	FERC
Primary TBD	USFWS
Primary TBD	USACE
Emily Bitlac	EPA
Jill Rolland	USGS
Primary TBD	USDOE
Yvonne Fish	BIA

PROPOSED MEETING CONVERSATION “ARCS”



Work stream	Kickoff	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June
				PUBLIC MEETING			PUBLIC MEETING		PUBLIC MEETING
FORMATION	Roadmap Outline (DRAFT)	Roadmap Outline (FINAL) Roadmap Charter (FINAL)							
VISIONS;	Roadmap scope, vision, context	Future visioning exercise:							
INFO., DATA, RESEARCH		Key information needs for the Roadmap process	Bring key info back	Bring key info back	Adaptive management (AM) approaches	AM recommendations and strategic steps			
ENVIRON. EFFECTS (EE)		Info: Getting to know Oregon's Enforceable Policies	EE: Concerns, uncertainties, information needs, and perceived risks	EE: Existing policies and processes to address effects of concern; Exit ramps	EE: Policy gaps and options to address	EE: Policy recommendations and strategic steps			
HUMAN EFFECTS (HE)		Info: Getting to know Oregon's Enforceable Policies	HE: Major uncertainties and perceived risks	HE: Existing policies and processes to address effects of concern; Exit ramps	HE: Policy gaps and options to address	HE: Policy recommendations and strategic steps			
PATH TO DEVELOPMENT			Major uncertainties and perceived risks Risks and Uncertainties	Existing policies and decision-making; Processes Policies and Processes	Energy System Policy Interconnections and Options – Alternatives to generation?	Policy recommendations and strategic steps			
STRATEGY ELEMENTS			Outline: Strategic Element Planning Working Group Establishment				Report out 1 from Working Groups (Strategic Planning Elements)	Report out 2 from Working Groups (Strategic Planning Elements)	
				WkGrp 1: Mtg 1	WG 1: Mtg 2	WG 1: Mtg 3	WG 1: Mtg 4		
				WkGrp 2: Mtg 1	WG 2: Mtg 2	WG 2: Mtg 3	WG 2: Mtg 4		
				WkGrp 3: Mtg 1	WG 3: Mtg 2	WG 3: Mtg 3	WG 3: Mtg 4		
				WkGrp 4: Mtg 1	WG 4: Mtg 2	WG 4: Mtg 3	WG 4: Mtg 4		
WORK AND ACTION PLANNING					ENGAGEMENT: Principles of effective engagement and Tribal consultation	ENGAGEMENT: Policy recommendations and strategic steps	Offshore Wind Engagement Expectations and Local Government Roles	Build a Work Plan Short/Medium/ Long-Term actions	Work Plan: Short/Medium/ Long Term Actions
ROADMAP RECOMM. & DOCUMENT DRAFTING							Putting It All Together: Craft and Refine Draft Recommendations	Review Draft Recommendations	Review comments on draft recommendations Next Steps

OREGON ENFORCEABLE POLICIES PRIMER



Enforceable Policies Primer

The Oregon Coastal Management Program (Program) is made up of 40 partners at the county and city level and 11 state agency partners. Each local entity has documents governing how they operate and guiding how they administer land use in their community. Each state agency has chapters of statutes guiding operations and helping them administer state law. These documents include comprehensive plans and land use regulations, state statutes, and statewide planning goals. DLCD incorporates the documents in their entirety into the Program.

Within the various statutes, goals, plans, and ordinances only certain elements meet the criteria to be used for federal consistency review. These special policies are called enforceable policies. A [legal definition of enforceable policies](#) is available in the federal regulations. Enforceable policies are the parts of the Program that are legally binding and can be enforced. For this reason, enforceable policies make up a relatively small part of the management program.

Enforceable policies are used during the federal consistency review process. The federal activity is compared to the enforceable policies that apply to it. This review determines whether a project is consistent with the enforceable policies of the management program.

Many of Oregon's enforceable policies are linked to state or local permits. Examples include the Removal-Fill authorization from the Department of State Lands or various land use approvals from the city or county. In Oregon, obtaining state and local permits is the best way to demonstrate consistency, according to Oregon's [official administrative rules](#).

Oregon's Enforceable Policies

The list of enforceable policies for federal consistency review changes often because Program changes are submitted to NOAA on a rolling basis. Please check back frequently for updated lists.

[State Statute & Administrative Rule enforceable policies](#) are selected from state statute chapters and administrative rules that help govern resources in the Coastal Zone.

[Statewide Planning Goal enforceable policies](#) are selected directly from Goal language and the Territorial Sea Plan.

[North Coast: County and City enforceable policies](#) are selected from local comprehensive plans and land use regulations.

[South Coast: County and City enforceable policies](#) are selected from local comprehensive plans and land use regulations.

Criteria for Crafting Enforceable Policies (15 C.F.R §923.84(b))

- ✓ Must be enforceable under state law.
- ✓ Must include mandatory language.
- ✓ Must contain a clear standard.
- X Cannot discriminate against a particular coastal user or federal agency.
- X Cannot be preempted by federal law.
- X Cannot regulate federal agencies, lands, or waters.
- X Cannot hinder the national interest objectives of the Coastal



Enforceable Policy Crafting Guidance

The links below contain information about how to craft Enforceable Policies that may be used by state coastal management programs in the review of federal licenses and permits, using the state's [Federal Consistency](#) authority under the Coastal Zone Management Act:

- NOAA Enforceable Policies Training:
<https://coast.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/training/enforceable-policies.html>
- EP Training transcript for easy reading: [Enforceable Policies Transcript for 508 compliance \(noaa.gov\)](#)
- Regulatory Enforceable Policy approval criteria: [15 CFR 923.84](#)
- List of current Enforceable Policies of the Oregon Coastal Management Program (scroll to the bottom of the page to find Excel spreadsheets listing the policies):
[Department of Land Conservation and Development : Enforceable Policies of the OCMP : Oregon Coastal Management Program : State of Oregon](#)
- [Strong Enforceable Policies: Examples and Tips \(Environmental Law Institute\)](#)

Read a Federal Consistency Review of Offshore Wind Leasing in Practice

BOEM's Consistency Determination submission to Oregon reviewed their proposed action against the applicable enforceable policies for the action and can be read here:

https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/OCMP/FCDocuments/Consistency-Determination_LeasingWEAsOffshoreOregon.pdf

OCMP's federal consistency decision (applicable only to leasing, NOT an actual project):

https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/OCMP/Documents/20240717FedConsistencyDecision_BOEM-OSW-Leasing_signed.pdf

REVISED DRAFT OFFSHORE WIND ENERGY ROADMAP OUTLINE
11/12/24



Oregon Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap
Outline Draft for Discussion – REVISED 11/8/24

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
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

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
- 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)?

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

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

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. Fishing industry compensatory mitigation management structure
 - 6.1.3. Tribal benefit agreements
 - 6.1.4. Transmission agreements? (need to learn more)
- 6.2. Affected Community Selection and Organization – needs, opportunities, challenges
- 6.3. State role – challenges, opportunities, recommendations

7. Fisheries Management and Offshore Wind

- 7.1. Agency-led management needs, challenges, opportunities
- 7.2. Fishing users effects and mitigation
- 7.3. Secondary and support industry effects and mitigation

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
- 8.8. Recommended 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. Recommended policies or 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. Recommended 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. Recommended 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

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

DRAFT ROUNDTABLE 11/1 KICKOFF MEETING SUMMARY





Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable Friday, November 1 from 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Meeting Recording: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-zzj4p4tICc>

Meeting Slides: <https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/OCMP/Documents/Roadmap-InfoSession.pdf>

Attendees: Roundtable (RT) members: Dean Apostol; Ashley Audycki; Dawn Barlow; Joshua Basofin; Lorne Bulling; John Bragg; Jena Carter; Susan Chambers; Melissa Cribbins; Julia B. DeGraw; Briece Edwards; Nick Edwards; Rick Eichstaedt; Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro; Bill Gorham; Michael Graybill; Marcus Hinz; Jeffrey Holmes; Kevin Victor Howard; Jenny Jones; Scott Kent; Joe Liebezeit; Casey MacLean; Robert (Bob) Main; Scott McMullen; Annie Merrill; Karina Nielsen; David M. Petrie; Tan Perkins; Charlie Plybon; Hans Radtke; Bryson Robertson; Karie Silva; Angela Sondenaa; Sara Stephens; Kyle Stevens; Nate Stokes; Scott Strickland; Katrina Thompson-Upton; Robert Westerman; Lexie Woodward; Ann Vileisis Karlen Yallup

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

Oregon Consensus Facilitators: Bobby Cochran, Sofia Castellanos

1. Executive Summary

The meeting convened Oregon's Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable to discuss objectives, define group operations, and review a draft Roadmap outline. Key objectives included establishing a collaborative environment, clarifying the group's advisory role, and setting a structure for collecting diverse input.

Action Item	Who	Date
Provide feedback on Roadmap outline & reply to scheduling polls for remaining Roundtable meetings	Roundtable members	Nov 8
Convene charter task team and draft a Roundtable charter	Sofia, Casey, Julia, Karina, Ranfis, Rick	Nov 14
Distribute Nov 1 meeting summary, and Roundtable roster	Jeff, Bobby	Nov 12
Distribute Nov 19 meeting agenda and materials	Jeff	Nov 12

Establish online resource library for RT members	Jeff, Sofia	Dec 1
--	-------------	-------

2. Welcoming

Karin Power from Governor Kotek's office opened the meeting with a warm welcome, emphasizing the significance of the offshore wind initiative for Oregonians and expressing gratitude for attendees' participation. They noted that this marked the beginning of a critical process to consider offshore wind efforts in the state, honoring past contributions and looking forward to future progress.

Ground Rules and Public Participation

The facilitation team outlined ground rules for operating effectively in a large group. Public comments would be reserved for the end of the session, and participants were asked to keep the chat clear. The meeting was recorded, and participants were reminded to be mindful of their comments. The "WAIT" rule was introduced: "Why am I talking?" or "Why am I not talking?" to encourage thoughtful contributions.

Comment Submission Guidelines

Attendees were informed about the options for submitting comments, either through a provided Google form (<https://forms.gle/e3iUKSkARnaVuinr9>): "Question Box" or directly via the DLCD's email (dlcd.OSWRoadmap@DLCD.oregon.gov). Both options were shared in the chat for the Roundtable participants.

Moderated Session 1: Roundtable (RT) members Introductions

All Roundtable members were invited to join breakout rooms, introduce themselves, share the organization they represent, and discuss their expectations and vision for the Roundtable's work in the coming year. Each breakout room had a moderator to facilitate the conversation.

Guiding Question: "What's one thing the Roadmap accomplished that signifies 'success' for you?"

A Zoom Whiteboard was provided for Roundtable members to write their definitions of "success" on virtual Post-Its, encouraging them to use as many as needed. Each group had a moderator in charge of facilitating the conversation among the participants.

Reporting out the 1st round of breakouts:

- **Group 1 (Moderator: Eva):** The group aimed to explore responsible wind energy practices with a vision for community benefits. They shared that success next year would involve establishing a clear pathway for responsible offshore wind development, ensuring benefits for Oregonians and future generations.
- **Group 2 (Moderator: Lisa):** The group was agency-heavy and included representatives from the Confederated Tribes, highlighting that the agency's role was to respond to and learn from the process. Chief Barrett raised the importance of prioritizing ecosystem restoration and fitting into it thoughtfully. All Oregon coastal communities receive meaningful and measurable benefits.
- **Group 3 (Moderator: Sofia):** The team managed initial introductions, sharing organizational affiliations and expectations for contributing to the process. Sofia emphasized this group needed more time to gather feedback on how each participant

perceives success.

- **Group 4 (Moderator: Cynthia):** Started with minimal participation but eventually included some introductions. Themes included the desire for a predictable and transparent process, understanding common ground, and achieving win-win outcomes. The group also mentioned paying attention to impact to fisheries, and being able to understand tradeoffs between sustainable seafood and wind energy. The group talked about the importance of exit ramps, and using marine spatial planning for state and federal waters.
- **Group 5 (Moderator: Jeff):** Focused on establishing a clear and collaborative process informed by stakeholders' concerns, identifying key issues, resources, and data gaps. The breakout group raised the need for true tribal consultation and addressing unanswered questions from the BOEM process. Scenic and community impacts, infrastructure needs, and workforce considerations were also discussed. The group's notes mentioned revealing a pathway to responsible wind energy development for the benefit of Oregonians and meeting climate future; recommending enforceable measures that protect natural and cultural resources; ocean communities are driving development decisions rather than the State of Oregon or BOEM; necessary studies are identified and implemented to understand impacts; There is zero emission energy; Mitigation measures are identified to avoid impacts.
- **Group 6 (Moderator: Hui):** Completed introductions and shared personal backgrounds. The breakout group emphasized the importance of transparency, stakeholder consensus, effective communication and coordination, community-engaged processes (with lots of different ways to engage), and balanced approaches. There was interest in a holistic view of offshore wind, stressing responsible development and positive outcomes for wildlife. The group also talked about growing shared understanding, especially the challenges of decarbonizing energy for transportation, buildings, and heating. The group also talked about understanding the biggest knowledge gaps and prioritizing a plan to address those gaps. The group talked about protecting natural and cultural resources and Tribal sovereignty, and advancing the discussion of scenic issues. There is remaining concern about the lack of true consultation between BOEM and Tribes.
- **Group 7 (no moderator):** Jena Carter and Scott McMullen shared that their vision of success for this process is ensuring a process where all sides could be heard, allowing us to listen to and learn from each other.

3. What to expect for the next year: Overview of the Roadmap process

Presentation and Discussion Highlights

Jeff Burrigh, DLCD lead for the Roadmap development process, provided an overview of the Oregon Coastal Management Program, which includes policies, plans, federal consistency authority, and a networked structure involving 11 state agencies, 33 coastal cities, and eight counties that contribute relevant policies. He shared his background in managing collaborative processes and risk in marine resource management, including prior experience with the Oregon Coastal Management Program. The Roadmap's origins via HB 4080 and purpose were explained, emphasizing its alignment with Oregon's energy needs and growth projections.

Key Points:

Overview of Federal and State Processes. The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) process was outlined, focusing on the identification of wind energy areas and the state's role in reviewing these areas under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). Two main points for state involvement were noted: during the leasing decision phase and prior to project construction approval. The past informal offshore wind working group (<https://oregonconsensus.org/projects/oregon-offshore-wind-work-group/>) efforts from 2023 were also acknowledged for their foundational role in guiding current discussions.

House Bill 4080 and Roadmap Objectives. House Bill 4080 was highlighted as the legislative foundation directing DLCD to lead the OSW Roadmap. The Roadmap aims to define a clear path for OSW development, identify policy gaps, and suggest solutions through broad engagement.

Engagement and Participation Plan. The Roadmap development includes monthly full-day Roundtable meetings with in-person and hybrid options, open to all with recordings available on YouTube. Tribal engagement will be a continuous element throughout the process. Additional working groups, focus groups, and public engagement events will support input collection. A public review of the draft Roadmap is planned before submission to the legislature. A dedicated email and google form (see links in the notes above) are available for ongoing public feedback and information requests throughout this nine-month period.

It was emphasized that the Roadmap process aims to ensure Oregon is well-prepared for OSW development, with comprehensive tools, discussions, and strategic actions in place before reviewing future project proposals. The Roadmap's collaborative approach, with contributions from various stakeholders and public engagement, is designed to align with Oregon's energy strategy and community needs.

Energy Needs. Jeff highlighted Oregon's significant energy growth needs, projected to reach 475 gigawatts, emphasizing the importance of generating more energy to meet this demand. He noted that offshore wind presents both an opportunity and a challenge, quoting Governor Kotek on the necessity of pursuing this Roadmap initiative.

Q&A and Conversations Highlights

Question on if BOEM Re-started the South Coast Leasing Process, Would the State Conduct Another Review: Jeff Burright explained that the state conducted an initial federal consistency review of BOEM's proposal to lease two wind energy areas. If BOEM were to restart leasing in these same areas, he believes another state review might not be needed. However, BOEM would have to return to the Proposed Sale Notice step, reopening the process to competitive interest. If BOEM proposed new areas or responded to a lease request in a different area, it would trigger a new review by the state. When asked if this would restart the process, Jeff said they would need to check with NOAA's Office for Coastal Management to confirm. He suggested that if the proposal involved areas previously reviewed, it might not require a new review if the impacts were not significantly different.

Tribal Consultations: During the federal consistency review for the BOEM leasing action earlier this year, DLCD provided notifications to Tribes consistent with the Tribal notification process that was coordinated with Tribes in 2022. Included with the notification was an offer to meet with Tribes to discuss the state review upon request. During the review, DLCD had two meetings with Oregon Tribes and five public meetings along the coast as part of its review process to

engage and inform the public and tribal communities.

State-Focused Roadmap: As a reminder, the facilitators emphasized that the current focus is on shaping a Roadmap that prioritizes Oregon's future needs, rather than revisiting past processes.

Question on Feedback Process: Julia DeGraw asked whether feedback submitted through forms between meetings would be actively considered throughout the process, noting that traditional public comments are typically formal and addressed at the end. DLCD clarified that the Roadmap's feedback process is dynamic, with the google form serving as a "question box" to review participant input during meetings. Feedback from various sources, including the Roundtable, state agencies, local communities, and public meetings, will be synthesized to inform the Roadmap. Most Roundtable meetings will be designed with a public comment period (a brief one near the beginning, and a longer one at the end). DLCD aims to share relevant feedback with the Roundtable throughout the process, and a formal public comment period will follow the Roadmap's completion.

Question on Exit Ramps: John Bragg asked if DLCD could you expand on the concept of "exit ramps" and explain how this process will work and where it fits into the Roundtable discussions? The response explained that "exit ramps" will come up naturally during the Roundtable discussions. The considerations document created by the informal offshore wind workgroup (https://oregonconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/Considerations_Oregon-FOSW-Roadmap-with-Exit-Ramps_04262024_final.pdf), provided in the meeting materials, points out the importance of identifying issues or points that might cause a pause the offshore wind energy process. This is an important part of making careful decisions. The goal is to explore and set these thresholds and decision rules during the discussions and see how they fit within current decision-making processes. It was confirmed that exit strategies will be included in the Roadmap.

Question on Incorporating Science: Joe Liebezeit raised a question about incorporating ongoing offshore wind initiatives, such as OPAC and its Science and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC), into this process to keep the Roundtable informed.

The response acknowledged the importance of coordination, noting that multiple entities are positioned to act as key sources of scientific information. The Roundtable will need a plan for working with these groups. While the Roadmap might develop a research agenda over the coming months, a focus on organizing long-term collaboration may also be necessary, potentially extending into the Roadmap's implementation phase.

Joe clarified that OPAC's science group is not developing a research agenda but instead aims to ensure transparency in BOEM's future processes. The goal is for Oregon communities to have an independent way to understand and engage with BOEM's work. Given past concerns with BOEM's scientific transparency, this group should work to ensure Oregon's input effectively shapes the federal process.

Question about an Online Library for Resources: Briece Edwards asked about setting up an online space to share pre-existing work that could be useful for the group, including studies and efforts from Washington and Northern California. He noted that while the collective knowledge in the room is valuable, having access to these resources would help everyone get up to speed, especially with limited time. He suggested using a google doc or a similar tool to make these

resources available to everyone.

Question about Public Participation: Ashley Audycki asked for details on public engagement, including whether feedback could be sent anytime, if there would be a formal comment period for the Roadmap draft, and if the public could attend all Roundtable meetings. She also asked about community meetings and their timeline. The response confirmed a focus on inclusion with many ways to participate. All Roundtable meetings will be open to the public, both in person and online. Public comment periods will be part of the meetings, and feedback can be submitted via email or the Google Form. Community meetings are still being planned, and there may be separate events, with a timeline for future meetings being developed.

Bob Westerman's Acknowledgment. Bob thanked the AFL-CIO and Tan Perkins for their efforts on House Bill 4080. He noted that the bill, which started as a labor standards measure for offshore wind, was expanded to include DLCD's role in the Roadmap process thanks to the work of a previous informal work group. Bob wanted to make sure credit was given.

4. How do we want to work together? Roundtable Charter

Sofia Castellanos from Oregon Consensus introduced the Roundtable to some elements that would define how the Roundtable wanted to work together including:

- The principles of collaboration where individuals can both advocate for their own interests AND look for opportunities for joint gains through collaboration—that collaboration provides the opportunity for participants to reach better outcomes together than they could on their own;
- The role of Oregon Consensus as a third party neutral, ensuring a fair process while being agnostic on the content;
- Defining what the Roundtable is (an advisory body and a forum for dialogue) and is not (a decision-making body);
- Operating principles for working together and making recommendations; and
- The role of a charter document for writing all of these down.

Operating Principles and Group Charter Elements with an emphasis on the role of making recommendations and ongoing tracking of questions and answers.

Q&A and Conversations/Comments Highlights

Mike Graybill asked for **clarification on the role of the Roundtable**. He wondered if its main purpose was to act as a source of diverse ideas and input for the Roadmap or if it was also responsible for assembling the Roadmap itself. He noted that the way members collaborate would change depending on whether the Roundtable is just contributing ideas or tasked with creating the actual document?

Jeff highlighted the importance of checking for agreement and disagreement within the Roundtable. When the group agrees on ideas, these should be prioritized. When there are different policy ideas, opposing views should be included in the Roadmap responsibly. The goal is to gather and manage these perspectives effectively. The Roundtable will act as a source of ideas, gathering values and information while checking for consensus.

Challenges Identified. Bobby noted that with a large group and many topics, the process will start broad and narrow down over time. He emphasized trusting DLCD staff to summarize input and present drafts for feedback. The goal is to refine the document through multiple reviews to reflect the group's input and reach as much consensus as possible.

The process approach will involve DLCD leading the drafting ("holding the pen") throughout, as currently designed. To ensure broad participation and diverse input, creative methods will be needed to engage everyone.

Rick Eichstaedt (CTCLUSI) suggested that the Roundtable should focus on generating ideas for studies, mitigation measures, enforceable policies, and strategies to engage coastal communities and consult with tribes, with an emphasis on idea-sharing rather than fully developing them. Julia DeGraw added that, given the group's size and limited meeting time, some members may not feel comfortable speaking up. She proposed using survey forms to help capture feedback and ensure all voices are included. It was noted that the process should be flexible and creative, allowing the Roundtable to explore a broad range of themes and topics. Julia DeGraw also emphasized the need for clarity on the state legislature's authority and jurisdiction, as the Roundtable will report to them. She highlighted the importance of producing actionable, feasible recommendations and asked whether the group would remain engaged during implementation or dissolve after finalizing the Roadmap. Additionally, Julia DeGraw offered to help draft a charter to be shared on November 19th.

Comment on Energy Conservation: Marcus Hinz noted that while these meetings aren't for debating offshore wind, he felt the need to express a concern. He pointed out that over half of the country's energy is reportedly wasted, which makes him worry that offshore wind facilities could add capacity that ends up wasted too. He shared that, in his experience with Wisconsin Public Service, an energy-saving campaign once made it unnecessary to build a new coal plant. Marcus suggested that recommending energy conservation could help meet energy needs. At this point of the conversation, the facilitation team suggested that Roundtable members aim for consistent attendance to support shared learning and productive dialogue. Completing some homework between monthly sessions can make in-meeting time more effective, with focus on sense-making over orientation. Surveys and other tools will gather input in advance. Meetings are scheduled from 9 to 5, with planned breaks and food to support in-depth engagement.

Ann Vileisis was interested in ensuring we **don't focus solely on areas of agreement but also address areas of conflict**. If we only look for agreement, we may miss valuable discussions on points of disagreement and the reasons behind them. Will this process allow us to address these areas without common ground? The facilitation team agreed, emphasizing the importance of addressing trade-offs and tensions where conflicting viewpoints arise. They suggested identifying these areas early and allowing space for unresolved issues, promoting ongoing dialogue without needing immediate resolution.

Comment from Ranfis Villatoro emphasized the need for a space to discuss contentious and difficult subjects. Highlighting that tribal perspectives have evolved from initial support to caution, opposition, and eventually litigation due to a lack of space for open dialogue on coastal community concerns. The hope is that this process will provide a genuine platform for these important discussions.

Facilitators asked for volunteers to help draft a Roundtable charter document to share for November 19. Volunteers included Casey MacLean, Julia DeGraw, Karina Nielsen, Ranfis Villatoro, Rick Eichstaedt

5. Draft Roadmap outline

Jeff Burright shared that with this process, we have approximately eight full-day meetings between now and June, supplemented by working groups and additional sessions. The

challenge lies in organizing these discussions effectively. One promising idea is to create a list of significant topics and organize our conversations into thematic categories.

The November 1 meeting materials included a discussion draft of a Roadmap outline intended to guide the conversation for November 1. The Roadmap is expected to include mandatory standards for offshore wind projects per House Bill 4080, as well as optional elements addressing development paths, environmental impacts, and community concerns. Key discussion areas included environmental effects, stakeholder engagement, state role, and possible gaps in policy that could be filled. The goal is to balance both immediate and long-term actions, setting a framework for the Roadmap to transition into actionable phases.

To structure the Roadmap, five main sections were included in the discussion outline:

1. Introduction - Covering the purpose and context, including existing resources.
2. Future Scenarios - Mapping milestones and waypoints.
3. Policy Assessment - Addressing gaps identified under House Bill 4080.
4. Strategic Planning - Broad elements beyond policy, guiding state and community actions.
5. Action Plan - Outlining short, medium, and long-term steps for implementation post-Roadmap.

Moderated Session 2: What is missing from the outline? And what are other questions we have?

All Roundtable members were invited to join breakout rooms, and discuss what's missing from the discussion draft of the Roadmap outline. Each breakout room had a moderator to facilitate the conversation.

Reporting out the 2nd round of breakouts:

Group 5 Recap: (Moderator: Jeff)

The breakout group discussed existing research and information sources essential for the Roadmap, identifying key areas to explore further and sources to integrate into the group's work. Members generally supported the proposed structure for the policy assessment, which involves examining potential impacts, assessing current policies, spotting gaps, and deciding how to address them.

In the strategic planning discussion, participants emphasized the critical role of transmission and connectivity in the offshore wind Roadmap, specifically how these factors might impact local communities. They suggested looking at the entire energy system, from offshore generation to onshore use. A request was made to give Tribal engagement its own dedicated section in the Roadmap rather than grouping it under general engagement.

The group discussed integrating offshore wind with other renewables, like wave energy, and whether Oregon could set preferences for specific turbine designs. They noted uncertainties about offshore wind's impact on ecosystems and agreed on the need to define acceptable uncertainty levels, consider cumulative impacts, and use adaptive management to handle ongoing unknowns.

The group's notes also pointed to protecting archaeological and cultural resources, consider Tribal concerns and consultation, consider coastal communities and industries, include recommendations for A) studies, B) mitigation, and C) enforceable policies. Include recommendations for areas to be excluded from OSW. Look at climate/energy thresholds that

change the urgency of developing OSW. Include Workforce as a strategic element.

The group's notes also wanted to make sure the preamble doesn't presuppose just one pathway and that all pathways end in OSW development.

Group 2 (Moderator: Lisa)

Several recurring themes emerged during the discussion. A key point was the importance of a regional perspective on energy, including the collaboration with California and Washington. This includes not only environmental impacts but also the supply chain, workforce considerations, and overall energy usage in the region.

The Roadmap needs to be connected with all the other processes (especially the state energy strategy—i.e., it would be good to know how much OSW we need) moving forward concurrently in case that affects any recommendations. There should be considerations of the cost, and if OSW is even worth pursuing.

The group talked about leading the Roadmap with the vision (adapting from HB 4080), then having goals/subgoals for the process, and then how to achieve goals using measurable outcomes. For example, a desired outcome is the federal government is transparent with interested parties and the public.

Tribal interests and the process for engaging them were also discussed, with a focus on ensuring these interests are effectively integrated. Participants highlighted the need for clarity around costs—both for consumers and developers—and the importance of establishing a clear framework so all stakeholders understand state expectations and requirements.

With various ongoing energy processes, there was a strong interest in aligning the offshore wind Roadmap with the broader energy strategy that ODOE is developing, ensuring that everyone involved understands how these efforts fit within the larger picture. While the legislature has focused on offshore wind, other marine renewable energy options were mentioned as part of a broader energy landscape, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive approach rather than working in isolation to avoid conflicting policies or strategies.

Group 6 (Moderator: Hui)

The discussion focused on establishing a clear vision, goals, and measurable outcomes aligned with the directive of House Bill 4080. While there are different ideas about what the vision for this process should be, a unified vision will need to be established in the final document. There was also feedback suggesting that having questions or materials provided in advance would be helpful, as managing both the whiteboard activity and answering questions simultaneously proved challenging, with a substantial portion of time spent navigating the whiteboard tool.

The group talked about some existing information that could be helpful: IPCC 6th assessment summary; TETHYS SEER; HUmboldt Scaatz energy reports for OSW in Eureka; Sea Grant's compilation; Regional information on the California Current; Transmission-related work.

There needs to be some outlet to talk the nitty gritty (e.g., for siting). For environmental effects, there are a lot of unknowns.

Transmission and connectivity is missing. UO's architecture program may be doing some work on who will be affected in which ways across all the aspects of OSW development. Clarify that

tribal engagement belongs in its own section.

Group 1 (Moderator: Eva)

Key points from the discussion included the need to build trust within the Roundtable and with community members, as trust enables open, honest participation. The group recommended an introductory section in the document to address climate change, consider future generations (the "seventh generation"), and clarify definitions of "green" and "clean" energy. Alternatives to offshore wind, such as wave energy, were also discussed, along with reasons for prioritizing wind energy at this stage. The importance of future scenario mapping was highlighted, setting thresholds to revisit the Roadmap or explore other options as circumstances change.

Ranfis Villatoro suggested reframing the exploration of "Benefit Agreements" to "Legally Enforceable Agreements." He noted that the term "Benefit Agreements" might imply cash payouts or presume a positive impact, which could limit the scope of discussion. By using "Legally Enforceable Agreements," the focus shifts to agreements that could include mechanisms for oversight, accountability, and mitigation, providing a broader and more balanced perspective on development projects. The group also talked about compensation for communities.

An additional key point was raised about the need for this group to identify areas collectively agreed upon as unsuitable for offshore wind development and, conversely, areas that may be appropriate. This dialogue could clarify shared values and help reach consensus on protected and development zones.

The group also talked about developing and sharing the maps and reports for better coordination of information and transparency; and they talked about including design standards and processes for evaluating those designs and making determinations so Oregon is in the driver's seat. The group talked about strategic planning for A) cable crossings and landings, B) life cycle analysis for OSW, C) marine spatial planning, D) supply chain, E) port development, and F) ensuring the energy generation benefits are realized in coastal communities.

Additionally, sustaining trust requires empowering participants over time. Legally enforceable agreements should be seen not as one-time input opportunities but as guarantees for ongoing stakeholder involvement. It's essential that people feel their voices will shape decisions continuously, reinforcing their influence and ensuring enforceability as the project progresses.

Group 4 (Moderator: Cynthia)

The group emphasized defining which coastal areas should remain undeveloped, which can be considered for development, and establishing clear parameters for areas in between. There was a strong interest in ensuring a transparent process across all entities, including the publication of maps, reports, and better coordination in sharing this information. The group also suggested that the document should outline the roles and perspectives of the state, referencing insights from the prior working group and the development of a marine spatial planning program that considers both federal and state waters.

Concerns were raised about developer responsibilities to local communities, particularly in cases of natural disasters or other catastrophic events, highlighting the importance of Community Benefit Agreements. The group expressed a desire for Oregon to lead in setting design standards and participate actively in other areas of the process. Strategic planning should comprehensively address all relevant aspects. Additionally, there was a concern to

ensure that coastal communities benefit directly from the energy generated offshore, even if not all energy returns to the Oregon coast.

The group asked about how to address misinformation, and how Tribal government concerns would be incorporated. The group asked about what all is part of 'socioeconomics' (e.g., fishing, recreation/tourism/visual, what else)? Look at cabling and onshore transmission. Look at areas that should be off limits to development and exit ramps for community and social issues, not only environmental.

There needs to be more specific callouts for labor standards and community benefit agreements. Consider how compensation would work for impacted communities. Include considerations for coastal energy resilience.

Group 3 (Moderator: Sofia)

The group asked whether the Roadmap scenarios would be more robust than those being developed by the State Energy Strategy. The group also wanted part of the supply chain strategy to consider business and workforce participation in OSW in other states. Consider transmission. There may need to be a specific chapter for Tribal Sovereign interests, considerations, and recommendations, or should those interests be woven throughout? Include information on funding pathways to implement the Roadmap. Look at landside considerations (i.e., estuaries, port development, etc.). Look at data management and sharing as research occurs.

6. Public Comment & Questions

Bobby Cochran opened the public comment period, inviting people to submit written comments via the Google Form and/or sign up to speak for up to 2 minutes. Public Comment List: Will E. Isakson; Heather Mann, Director of Midwaters Trawling Cooperative; Christopher Hall, Water League; Mike Okoniewski.

Public Comments and Key Insights:

- **William Isakson:** Highlighted that certain environmental impacts, such as unaccounted greenhouse gasses (e.g., live steam), are often overlooked in federal regulations. The need for comprehensive consideration of such impacts was emphasized, particularly when scaling from a few wind turbines to large-scale developments that could potentially alter weather patterns, as suggested by historical studies.
- **Christopher Hall from Water League:** Raised concerns about the balance between achieving consensus and fostering a diversity of ideas. He noted that while consensus is often seen as positive, it can sometimes stifle minority viewpoints that may represent the broader public interest. Since the RT is an advisory group without decision-making power, it should ensure diverse perspectives are valued to avoid "manufacturing consent."
- **Heather Man, Executive Director of the Midwater Trawlers Cooperative:** Urged the group to consider the broader impacts of offshore wind development, such as effects on tribal concerns, food security, and sustainable seafood. She pointed out that areas under consideration for leasing are significant for regional and national seafood supply, including contributions to school lunch programs. The group was encouraged to think about secondary and tertiary impacts and determine acceptable levels of disruption.
- **Mike Okoniewski, a veteran of the seafood industry:** Recommended reviewing a report

by All Grid Works, commissioned by Washington's governor. This report identifies 53 data gaps relevant to offshore wind and marine spatial planning. He suggested sharing this resource to inform ongoing discussions. Mike also raised a question about the tangible job opportunities associated with offshore wind development in Oregon. While projects are underway in other states (e.g., Los Angeles, Puget Sound, Humboldt Bay), clarity on where job creation would occur in Oregon was requested to manage expectations and ensure local economic benefits.

It was noted that public feedback had been received through online forms from multiple contributors, thank you.

6. Closing & next steps

Participants were encouraged to take a reflective “thinking homework” moment: imagining themselves 30 years into the future, looking back on the Oregon coastline and considering what the group did to responsibly integrate offshore wind. Key questions included: What protections were in place? What important questions were addressed before moving forward? There’s also a plan to send out a survey, inviting feedback on the draft Roadmap outline and gathering input on information needs and visions of success. The survey will be sent by November 8 with a fast turnaround to allow time for review before the next meeting on November 19.

Looking ahead, all monthly meetings through June will be scheduled soon for easier planning. The facilitation team asked for prompt responses to streamline coordination. Lastly, the team will review public engagement methods for breakout sessions and improve tools to capture notes for hybrid meetings, ensuring everyone’s input is included.

7. Action Items:

- ☐ **Schedule a Working Meeting:** Organize a session with the following volunteers to draft the Charter Document: Casey MacLean, Julia DeGRaw, Karina Nielsen, Ranfis Villatoro, Rick Eichstaedt
- ☐ **Survey Proposal:** Implement a suggestion from Julia DeGRaw to conduct surveys with the RT (Resource Team) between meetings.
- ☐ **Homework for Next Meeting:** Encourage participants to think about the future vision for OSW.
- ☐ **Surveys:** Decide on the specific surveys to be used and distributed.
- ☐ **Meeting Scheduling:** Plan and schedule upcoming meetings up to June 2025.
- ☐ **Public Engagement Strategy:** Revisit strategies for engaging the public during breakout sessions and hybrid meetings.
- ☐ **Online Library:** Establish an online resource library for RT members.
- ☐ **Roster Distribution:** Ensure the distribution of the current RT member roster to all team members.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm

DRAFT INITIAL LIST OF VISION STATEMENTS AND
DEFINITIONS OF SUCCESS



Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable

Visions of Success & Key Information Sources: From Nov 1 and Survey of Roundtable Last updated 11/11/24

Notes from November 1, 2024: “What’s one thing the Roadmap accomplished that signifies ‘success’ for you?”

Reporting out the 1st round of breakouts:

- **Group 1 (Moderator: Eva):** The group aimed to explore responsible wind energy practices with a vision for community benefits. They shared that success next year would involve establishing a clear pathway for responsible offshore wind development, ensuring benefits for Oregonians and future generations.
- **Group 2 (Moderator: Lisa):** The group was agency-heavy and included representatives from the Confederated Tribes, highlighting that the agency’s role was to respond to and learn from the process. Chief Barrett raised the importance of prioritizing ecosystem restoration and fitting into it thoughtfully. All Oregon coastal communities receive meaningful and measurable benefits.
- **Group 3 (Moderator: Sofia):** The team managed initial introductions, sharing organizational affiliations and expectations for contributing to the process. Sofia emphasized this group needed more time to gather feedback on how each participant perceives success.
- **Group 4 (Moderator: Cynthia):** Started with minimal participation but eventually included some introductions. Themes included the desire for a predictable and transparent process, understanding common ground, and achieving win-win outcomes. The group also mentioned paying attention to impact to fisheries, and being able to understand tradeoffs between sustainable seafood and wind energy. The group talked about the importance of exit ramps, and using marine spatial planning for state and federal waters.
- **Group 5 (Moderator: Jeff):** Focused on establishing a clear and collaborative process informed by stakeholders’ concerns, identifying key issues, resources, and data gaps. The breakout group raised the need for true tribal consultation and addressing unanswered questions from the BOEM process. Scenic and community impacts, infrastructure needs, and workforce considerations were also discussed. The group’s notes mentioned revealing a pathway to responsible wind energy development for the benefit of Oregonians and meeting climate future; recommending enforceable

measures that protect natural and cultural resources; ocean communities are driving development decisions rather than the State of Oregon or BOEM; necessary studies are identified and implemented to understand impacts; There is zero emission energy; Mitigation measures are identified to avoid impacts.

- **Group 6 (Moderator: Hui):** Completed introductions and shared personal backgrounds. The breakout group emphasized the importance of transparency, stakeholder consensus, effective communication and coordination, community-engaged processes (with lots of different ways to engage), and balanced approaches. There was interest in a holistic view of offshore wind, stressing responsible development and positive outcomes for wildlife. The group also talked about growing shared understanding, especially the challenges of decarbonizing energy for transportation, buildings, and heating. The group also talked about understanding the biggest knowledge gaps and prioritizing a plan to address those gaps. The group talked about protecting natural and cultural resources and Tribal sovereignty, and advancing the discussion of scenic issues. There is remaining concern about the lack of true consultation between BOEM and Tribes.
- **Group 7 (no moderator):** Jena Carter and Scott McMullen shared that their vision of success for this process is ensuring a process where all sides could be heard, allowing us to listen to and learn from each other.

Raw survey responses submitted by November 8, 2024 from Roundtable Members.

We received 34 responses, and 20 Roundtable members responded to the question: “We recognize we didn’t have much time to talk about members’ individual visions for success for the Roadmap. Would you like to elaborate some more here?”

Community infrastructure needs: housing, roads, city infrastructure. Workforce preparedness and setting up communities for success (ie. pre-apprenticeship programs)
Wind farms are: used for local power needs first (costly to move power so this should be a no-brainer); built to protect migrating birds (alternating blade colors, sounds, etc); using local workers maintain and repair the system; allowing fishes to ultimately benefit from some new land masses in the oceans because wind farms are weather proof and last decades and beyond.
Offshore wind is placed in and evaluated as one option in a comprehensive portfolio of renewable energy options that could be developed in Oregon. OSW’s costs and potential benefits should be measured in the context of the energy planning and development framework that guides all energy development in Oregon
I see success as a Roadmap that looks at Oregon’s OSW future as only one part of a mix of renewable energy options that preserves our ocean environment and productivity. As I see it, the California Current is responsible for ocean and environmental health/weather for more areas and animals/people than just in/offshore Oregon. We can’t afford to mess it up.

My vision for a successful Roadmap includes having exit ramps when it's necessary to pause or perhaps to stop the projects. To ensure we safeguard all marine life and to keep a healthy ocean environment for all ocean use and users: fishers, cargo ships, USCG and recreational users as well. They all depend on a highly pristine and productive ocean ecosystem off the Oregon Coast.

TO ensure that our roadmap has an exit ramp so that development of FOSW will not inadvertently wreck/ irrevocable degrade our rich, productive, wind-driven marine ecosystems—Oregon's part of the broader California Current Large Marine Ecosystem, which is habitat for birds, fish and wildlife from all around the Pacific. That FOSW development would proceed only if we find that the benefit clearly outweighs the risks.

TO ensure that our roadmap will have a process to listen to, engage with and address concerns of local citizens, and will not take the approach of just rolling local communities and assuming that's OK.

To make sure this process is authentic and isn't just a venue to justify or window-dress a desired, preconceived political outcome.

To tackle hard questions along the way --so we truly drill down to the tradeoffs that really matter --and when we don't know the answers, to be clear about what is known and not known.

Create pathway scenarios to explore offshore wind (and roadmaps) done responsibly, protecting the environment, and providing benefits like jobs, economic development, and tax revenue, while meeting our energy needs and clean energy goals.

Success: 1 - Reduced energy consumption is a goal of OSW development, with future expansions in OSW beyond baseline development tied to demonstrable reductions in emissions of carbon-producing energy sources. 2 - OSW development does not simply spark new demand for coastal development and consequent higher energy consumption.

I would like to make sure we discuss how we think the roadmap can lead to more developer interest in OSW. I would like everyone to have an understanding of the current rules regarding 60 million acres of OCS leases needed to be made available by BOEM before new renewables leases can take place. I think it is also good for the group to think about how Oregon fits in the overall supply chain picture for OSW. There is a scenario where Oregon could have the manufacturing jobs far before we ever saw windmills. I would like to see OR courting the supply chain companies and manufacturers as we would any large industry with the ability to provide a massive needed boost to the coastal economy. We can be receptive to all of the other parts of OSW while figuring out how we get to windmills. I also think it would be good to look at the rapid drop in lease prices and what is the value in not being last. This is happening in many places and many other states have gone through this. We don't need to pretend we are first to have these discussions and should borrow proudly where we can from other areas.

A transparent, equitable, and inclusive process, that seeks to establish understanding of each others differences, and aims to find where there is consensus, and to seek consent so we can make recommendations to the state legislature on if and how to responsibly proceed with offshore wind development.

The Roadmap should incorporate relevant aspects of the concurrent Oregon Energy Strategy in explaining how Part 2, #3 Alternative Future Roadmaps will fulfill the state's energy strategy in the absence of floating offshore wind.
The Roadmap should also explain that consultation with individuals or parties does not mean that everyone gets their own way. But it should also explain how different perspectives were considered (or rejected) in reaching an ultimate decision.

My vision for success is that everyone will engage in an honest, authentic, and respectful conversation manner and we will find points of commonality.

Not at this time.

The roadmap needs to take a fair shake at ensuring osw comes to Oregon. We have strict energy goals to meet, but communities most affected must also benefit and this is easily achieved through a CBA like what has happened in other states.

My vision is that this is an open forum and dialogue where we are able to build trust and relationships. This process should make folks feel heard and understood. Ultimately, my hope as an ocean climate advocate is that we can use this process to inform a just and responsible transition to renewable energy, for the benefit of future generations and our ecosystems.

- Public trusts the roadmap process that resulted in its outcomes and outputs
- Improved understanding of how our energy systems work
- Helped the public to come up to speed on what is known and what still needs to be learned or studied and what we cannot know in advance.
- Helped people distinguish between evidence-supported knowledge and intentional mis/dis information.
- Improved understanding the tradeoffs inherent in any of the energy choices we might make for our future.
- Tribes feel that their perspectives and rights were respected and represented
- Sets the stage for developing effective adaptive management and mitigation for OSW projects
- Identifies priorities for ongoing scientific monitoring
- Reduces social conflict
- Benefits all Oregonians
- Reduces historic and ongoing energy system burdens and harms
- Helped Oregon and the region meet its climate and clean energy goals

It would be great to uplift community and Tribal government priorities and concerns through meaningful engagement. As well as build out with roundtable members what a just transition for a renewable energy future looks like for coastal communities.

- Structure for decision making that leans on science, data and public input to inform responsible siting and ties those initial siting decisions to standards and criteria that must be met by site characterization studies/surveys and ongoing monitoring during and after construction.
- Benchmarks/standards of what constitutes adequate information at one step before the state may move forward to the next step. Please clarify how an “exit ramp” would be triggered and how it would function.
- Lays out process for decision making with multiple feedback loops for public input throughout the process.
- Roadmap should successfully identify the extent and limits of state authority under various policies and regulatory processes. Should lay out a path to overcome regulatory disconnect between marine and onshore environments. Potentially through Rulemakings or other policy changes made following the completion of the Roadmap.
- Ability to persist as a living document that guides state agencies through the regulatory process as it evolves in the future.

I think more understanding how the process works. I think people think that these windmills are going to be built as soon as the call or bid is accepted

there should supporting needs assessment. maybe this already exists?
roles and how this will tie into to BOEM's process

Raw survey responses submitted by November 8, 2024 from Roundtable Members.

We received 34 responses, and 9 Roundtable members responded to the questions: “What additional sources of information do you need to best advise the Roundtable/DLCD on the contents of the Roadmap?: and “What sources of information do would you like to add to a Roadmap Library?”

Helpful to You	Helpful for the Roadmap
	Research from other counties that have been doing this for decades
I think there are a lot of concerns around impacts to upwelling, and wildlife, and habitats that people have. Most data that exists is not specific to the Pacific Coast, so I don't know if these sources of information exist yet. But providing access to experts and scientists who can help us understand what we do and don't know and what actions/studies need to be completed could be really helpful to the roundtable and to the state.	I will reach out to the National Wildlife Federation offshore wind energy team to see what they recommend. We could help build up the library with documentation of permitting processes, and legislative processes (for things like procurement) from other regions if that is helpful.
I think getting the RT folks to review the 'Considerations' document would provide some excellent context for this ongoing discussion.	I think any documentation about the Oregon electricity decarbonization and demand growth would be good context for discussions. Otherwise, I fear we will be gathering thoughts, opinions and perspectives in isolation of some of the overall reasoning for considering offshore wind in Oregon/PNW.

I feel well informed	As discussed in our opening meeting, there are many existing resources in Tethys (https://tethys.pnnl.gov/about-oes-environmental) including their annual State of the Science reports, Marine Renewable Energy: An Introduction to Environmental Effects, OES-Environmental Short Science Summaries, & U.S. Offshore Wind Synthesis of Environmental Effects Research (SEER), The Nature Conservancy of Massachusetts - Nature Connects series on offshore wind (https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL-o5jtJniubZ89pYevGxEx9R8TL-U3NY3); and other related resources such as captured in this PDF document (https://drive.google.com/file/d/15sbql9ouu-HChQ2LIIW-lckSl27CyRah/view?usp=drive_link)
BOEM maps that show results over time: all locations considered initially, locations that remained for lease process, any locations specifically requested for leasing after process started, what made it through to local consideration, what ultimately gets leases, etc.	BOEM maps that show results over time: all locations considered initially, locations that remained for lease process, any locations specifically requested for leasing after process started, what made it through to local consideration, what ultimately gets leases, etc.
1) Realistic job forecasts. Electricity usage demands by potential data centers/bitcoin/AI infrastructure and how much those are driving the demand for energy, particularly renewable energy (the "enough energy to power XXX,XXX homes" just doesn't cut it). 2) Experts to discuss the influence of the California Current on weather patterns (maybe use the potential collapse of one major Atlantic current as a cautionary tale). 3) Information about much energy is used and how much additional greenhouse gas emissions are necessary to build just one turbine (as in, will building these things exacerbate GHG emissions in the short term, negating any climate change progress? I just don't know). 4) Information about how energy markets work.	Washington's Gridworks report: https://gridworks.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Gridworks-WA-OSW-Engagement-Report.pdf NOAA's West Coast Offshore Wind Energy Strategic Science Plan: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/s3/2024-10/offshore-wind-energy-strategic-science-plan-wcr-2024.pdf

	Any peer reviewed scientific data that is available to us.
I am concentrating on the state portion of it.	Part IV: Strategic Planning Elements