

Floating Offshore Wind Energy Roadmap Roundtable

Meeting Summary

Wednesday, May 27, 2026 | 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM

Pacific Maritime Heritage Center: 333 SE Bay Blvd. | Newport, OR 97365

In-Person and via Zoom

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Attendees ([Roundtable Roster](#))

Participants (in room): Joe; Delia Kelly; Dawn Barlow; Michael Graybill; Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro; Bill Gorham, Brookings resident, Karina Nielsen; Cynthia Smidt; Julia B. DeGraw; Jody; Dean Apostol, John Bragg; Richie; Scott McMullen

Participants (via Zoom): Mandy McNabb; Karlen Yallup, Lynn Cooker, Brett Estes; Carl Merkle; David Petrie; Hannah Epstein; John Pouley; Natalia Stanadko, Richie Scott; Susan Chambers; Sara Palmer; Scott Kent; Steve Wilson; Ashley Audycki; Kate Sullivan; Lauren Hillman; Ann Vileisis; Lexie Woodward; Jason Sierman

DLCD staff: Jeff Burrignt, Cynthia Smidt, Lisa Phipps (Zoom), Andy Lanier (Zoom), Brett Estes (Zoom)

Oregon Consensus facilitators: Katie Permaine, Trevor Hildebrand, Liz Oliver

Executive Summary

The May 27, 2026, Roundtable meeting focused on the review of the Floating Offshore Wind (OSW) Energy Roadmap. Participants discussed how the final document should incorporate public comments, reviewed several unresolved policy topics, considered revisions to the Action Table, and examined the science strategy framework. The discussion reflected a shift from developing recommendations toward ensuring the roadmap accurately captures areas of agreement, identifies unresolved questions, and provides a durable framework for future decision-making.

Participants expressed support for the overall direction of the roadmap while emphasizing the need for transparency regarding areas of uncertainty, the role of local governments and tribes, and the relationship between offshore wind decisions and Oregon's energy and climate strategies.

Key themes included:

- **Balancing Finalization with Continued Transparency.** Participants wanted to understand how DLCD incorporated their comments before the document is transmitted to the legislature and cautioned against extending the process through repeated rounds of revisions. Participants also discussed how best to introduce the roadmap to the legislature.
- **Making Stronger Connections to Oregon's Energy Strategy.** Decisions about offshore wind cannot be evaluated in isolation and should be considered alongside statewide climate goals, energy reliability needs, regional electricity markets, and other renewable energy opportunities. There was broad interest in economic, environmental, cultural, and energy-system analyses that would help decision-makers understand the role offshore wind could play in Oregon's future energy portfolio. The roadmap should identify what information is needed to make informed decisions rather than predetermine specific outcomes.
- **Clarifying State, Local, and Tribal Roles.** Participants discussed how local governments and communities, tribes, state agencies, and federal regulators interact throughout offshore wind planning, leasing, permitting, and operations. Members emphasized the need to recognize both Tribal cultural resources and ongoing cultural practices in future planning efforts and the importance of providing local governments and Tribes with sufficient capacity and resources to engage effectively in future processes. Local governments will likely have the greatest influence over onshore infrastructure and associated impacts.
- **Need for Comprehensive Analysis Before Major Decisions.** Participants emphasized the importance of robust analysis before significant offshore wind decisions are made, including:
 - Economic costs and benefits
 - Energy-system value and reliability
 - Environmental impacts
 - Cultural and tribal considerations
 - Cumulative impacts
 - Climate-related costs of inaction
 - Regional and interstate implications
- **Continued Support for Marine Spatial Planning and Baseline Research.** Members highlighted the importance of baseline information to understand cumulative impacts, support multiple ocean industries, inform future planning efforts, and establish long-term environmental datasets. Some emphasized coordinating with regional science initiatives and leveraging existing academic and research institutions.
- **Port Development Requires Greater Clarification.** Discussion of Pathway 2, economic participation without offshore wind development, revealed differing

interpretations regarding the scale of potential port investments and supply-chain participation. Participants recommended clarifying that port development could occur at different scales depending on community interests, industry needs, and future market conditions. A member noted that ports operate as independent economic entities and that state investments should recognize local decision-making authority. Others stressed the importance of ensuring any future port-related development remains consistent with estuary management plans and local planning objectives.

Action Items

Action	Owner	Timeline
Review sequencing in the Action Table to present in other ways than years	Jeff	Before June 16
Schedule the June 23rd meeting	OC/Jeff	Before June 23
DLCD to distribute the redline version	Jeff	On or before June 16

Meeting Notes

Welcome and Agenda Overview

The group discussed whether to hold an additional Roundtable meeting in June. Jeff explained that DLCD's internal deadline for completing the roadmap draft was June 8, with a goal of submitting the final roadmap to the Legislature by July 10. The previously scheduled June 23 meeting would occur while the draft was undergoing review by the Governor's Office, limiting DLCD's ability to share new materials. June 23 was originally meant to be a celebration of achievements and a discussion of near-term tasks. Participants discussed the purpose of a potential June meeting and whether there would be meaningful opportunities for review.

- Some participants noted that there may be little opportunity to revise the document during June because DLCD may not have new material to present.
- Others emphasized the importance of allowing legislators and stakeholders adequate time to review the roadmap before the September legislative days.
- Participants debated whether a draft version should be shared with legislators before the document is finalized.
- Several members expressed interest in seeing how Roundtable comments were incorporated before the document moves forward.
- Others cautioned against asking legislative staff to review multiple versions of substantially similar documents.
- Suggestions included using a future meeting to discuss legislative outreach and communication strategies.
- Participants noted the importance of clearly identifying areas of agreement and disagreement within the Roundtable.

- Concerns were raised about conducting one-on-one review processes that could create side conversations outside the Roundtable.
- Several members requested an opportunity to review the document before it enters executive review.
- DLCD clarified that internal review will focus primarily on legal, policy, and implementation considerations rather than introducing entirely new pathways or recommendations.
- Participants acknowledged that future public processes will occur as recommendations move toward implementation.
- Some members suggested that concerns not fully reflected in the roadmap could be communicated through separate letters or addenda to legislators.
- Participants requested an updated version of the roadmap to compare against earlier drafts.

Roadmap Final Comments (in full session) - Jeff

Jeff reviewed additional public comments received since the April meeting and outlined plans for incorporating comments into the final roadmap.

- Public comment statistics were reviewed.
- A form-letter campaign was submitted by the National Wildlife Federation.
- Presentation materials will be posted online following the meeting.
- Survey results generally aligned with findings from Oregon State University surveys.
- Ocean views were ranked lower overall in this survey than in some previous community surveys, though importance varied by location.
- Survey responses were collected through an open public link distributed at public meetings.

Jeff identified several comment areas where the roadmap does not yet provide clear direction:

- State-led procurement policies
- Public options for ownership and oversight
- Alternative future comparative analysis
- Siting and Environmental analysis, timing, and scope.

#1 Role of Local Government in OSW Decision Processes

- List of enforceable policies - What are the precedents for other large infrastructure projects (e.g., data centers)?
- Suggestion - state should work with coastal counties to strengthen local planning frameworks for resources of concern - environmental, economic, and visual.
- Recognition that local governments will likely have the greatest authority over onshore infrastructure.
- Discussion of differences between enforceable policies and implementation responsibilities.

- Consideration of how Tribal engagement should address both cultural resources and ongoing cultural practices.
- Discussion of state efforts to align state and Tribal policy frameworks.
- Questions about the role and timing of the Joint Agency Review Team (JART) and how existing planning tools are applied during federal permitting processes.

#2 Energy Strategic Considerations discussion

- The need for a clear process to determine whether Oregon should support offshore wind development.
- Calls for cost-benefit analyses informed by technical expertise.
- Discussion about what information decision-makers need and when it should be collected.
- Suggestions that Oregon's resilient lands and waters framework be incorporated into future analyses.
- Broad support for environmental, economic, and cultural analyses to inform decisions.
- Discussion regarding when those analyses should occur, including leasing, permitting, or energy-planning stages.
- Strong support for maintaining the roadmap as an evergreen planning document.
- The roadmap needs to connect to the state energy markets. Oregon's decisions are influenced by regional energy markets and neighboring states.

#4 Public Options for Ownership and Oversight discussion

- What are Potential public ownership structures (e.g., public utility district (PUD))?
- Use of adaptive management approaches during permitting and operations.
- Clarification of state versus federal authority over leasing, transmission, and permitting.
- Discussion of how permit conditions might create opportunities for long-term state oversight.
- Recommendation to engage additional technical experts on transmission and regulatory issues.
- Concerns about balancing community interests with technical realities.
- Discussion of utility-rate impacts on coastal communities.
- Support for including ownership options in the roadmap so legislators can evaluate them.

#5 Alternative Future Comparative Analysis discussion

- Recognition that declining to pursue offshore wind is a policy choice with consequences.
- Requests for greater discussion of climate impacts, energy needs, and costs associated with maintaining the status quo.

- Roadmap should articulate the costs of Pathway 1 and 2, and should be evaluated using information and analysis rather than treated as a no-action scenario.
- Consideration of whether the roadmap currently provides sufficient information to support decision-making. Participants should review section 4 to evaluate if there is enough information.

#6 Siting and Environmental Analysis Timing and Scope discussion

- Support for environmental studies regardless of whether offshore wind development occurs, coupled with concerns about requesting funding from the legislature for ocean planning, absent a clear development pathway.
- The Ocean Policy Advisory Council (OPAC) recommended that one of their folks be a representative of the West Coast Advisory Center and not consider a state entity.
- Interest in participating in interstate science collaborations and monitoring efforts because Oregon needs to see what's happening in other places, e.g., floating data centers powered by tidal energy.
- Requests for clarification on how cumulative impact assessments would differ across planning and permitting processes. See pages 15-16 of DLCD Selected comments and questions for Roundtable discussion – May 2026 handout

#7 Clarifying Port Development Assumptions in Pathway 2 discussion

- Recognition that supply chain participation can occur at many scales.
- Questions regarding whether "no offshore wind development" also means no participation in related supply chain activities.
- Discussion about whether Pathway 2 assumes small-scale manufacturing and services or larger industrial development. Jeff clarified that Pathway 2 focused on smaller-scale opportunities.

Public Comment

- Terry, a former County Commissioner
 - Environmental impacts should be carefully evaluated before development proceeds.
 - Participants should visit existing test sites to better understand real-world impacts.
 - Support for small-scale demonstration projects if environmental effects are shown to be manageable.
 - Concerns about moving too quickly toward ocean-based energy production without understanding the impacts on fisheries and food resources.

Top Topics from the Public Comment for Further Discussion (Breakouts)

Group 1 (In-Room) — Moderator: Cynthia, Reported by Karina

Topic #1 – Role of local government in OSW decision processes

- Strong support for acknowledging academic survey results.
- Discussion focused heavily on funding and capacity support for local governments and tribes. They should determine how capacity resources are used.
- Calls for greater coordination across jurisdictions.
- Discussion of stakeholder groups that lack formal governmental representation, e.g., fishers.
- Recommendation to highlight local capacity needs in Appendix 5 and the Executive Summary.

Topic #2 – Energy strategic considerations

- Strong support for comprehensive cost-benefit analysis.
- Discussion regarding the appropriate balance between markets, utilities, and government decision-making.
- Concern that Oregon lacks a consistent energy strategy.

Topic #3 – State-led procurement policies

- Preference for allowing utilities rather than the state to manage procurement decisions.
- Discussion about where market forces should drive decision-making.

Group 2 (In-Room) — Moderator: Liz, Reported by Julia

Topic #7 – Clarifying port development assumptions in Pathway 2.

- Port development could vary significantly depending on the pathway selected.
- Recommendation to include explanatory language describing varying scales of development.
- Recognition that ports compete independently and may ultimately determine development outcomes.

Topic #6 – Siting and Environmental Analysis Timing and Scope

- "No offshore wind" should be understood as "not now" rather than necessarily "never."
- Support for collecting baseline data, even if development is not imminent.

- Marine spatial planning and long-term data collection are valuable across multiple industries.
- Longitudinal environmental datasets are important.

Topics #5 and #6 – Alternative future comparative analysis

- Discussion emphasized that a no-action alternative does not mean no environmental change.
- Aging infrastructure and ongoing environmental change should be considered.
- Support for defining cumulative impacts analysis and identifying current information gaps.
- West Coast Ocean Alliance is leading an effort to assess cumulative impact information needs.

Group 3 (Online) — Moderator: Andy, Reported by Ashley

Topic #7 – Clarifying port development assumptions in Pathway 2.

- Discussion focused on balancing economic opportunities with impacts to estuaries and coastal resources.
- Importance of integrating existing planning frameworks, including estuary management plans and resilience initiatives.

Topic #6 – Siting and Environmental Analysis Timing and Scope

- Strong support for conducting planning and baseline studies before development decisions occur.
- Support for marine spatial planning and Oregon State University research programs.
- Discussion of changing technologies and evolving ocean uses.

Topic #5 – Alternative future comparative analysis

- Recommend that climate change should be addressed, although broader climate policy may exceed the roadmap's scope.

Additional Discussion – DLCD assumes Pathway 2 does not include big port development. Does everyone agree?

- If Port development occurs, it should align with existing estuary management plans.
- Economic development opportunities may occur even without turbine deployment.
- Transmission infrastructure could be part of economic participation pathways.

Jeff committed to responding to all individual comments received during the public review process.

Recommended Changes to the Action Table

Suggestions included:

- Replacing year-based timelines with process-based milestones (e.g., leasing, permitting, operations).
- Adding explanatory language about assumptions and uncertainties.
- Providing clearer definitions for table columns.
- Presenting sequencing without implying fixed priorities.
- Retaining the table as a roadmap implementation tool while acknowledging that future conditions may change.

There was broad agreement that the action table is necessary to demonstrate how recommendations could be implemented over time. Jeff agreed to explore alternatives for presenting sequencing and encouraged participants to provide feedback on assumptions embedded in the table.

Updates and follow-up on the Research Strategy

- The roadmap's research agenda is evolving into a broader science strategy.
- Recent cumulative impacts work from Canadian shipping studies may provide useful models.
- Participants reviewed a draft diagram linking roadmap actions to science priorities.
- Discussion focused on how agencies, researchers, and academic institutions would participate.
- Participants requested greater visibility for academic partners, including Oregon State University and the Pacific Marine Energy Center.
- Questions were raised about whether the Joint Agency Review Team should be incorporated into the framework.
- Discussion of the West Coast Offshore Wind Science Collaborative and its relationship to similar efforts on the East Coast.
- Participants noted the importance of coordination with Washington if California's role changes.

8. Expanding and Integrating the Science Strategy

Discussion emphasized:

- The importance of academic institutions and ocean observing systems.
- Coordination with regional science collaboratives.
- Inclusion of tribal, community, and interdisciplinary expertise.
- Long-term support for baseline ecological monitoring and research that informs multiple ocean uses and future decision-making needs.

- The science strategy is an opportunity to create lasting infrastructure for understanding Oregon's marine environment, independent of any specific offshore wind outcome.

Closing and Next Steps

- Placeholder for the June 23rd meeting. Every place in Florence is booked but OC will look for another location
- DLCD to distribute the redline version by June 16.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm

Appendix A: Andy's Group Breakout Notes

7) Clarifying port development assumptions in Pathway 2.

Recognize the impacts on the estuaries and the implicit costs associated with those activities. What is the role of the state in helping with economic development? Supporting local economic development programs. Oregon Ports Association's role? Federal nexus for supporting the industry?

Make sure pathway 2 is holistic in understanding costs and benefits. Think about port use prioritization and capacity. Does it make sense with our estuary management plans? There will need to be coordination with the existing management designations of our estuaries. What is the connection with the Plan for a Resilient Oregon, related to estuary management plans?

Capacity for local governments to adapt their plans and make room for new growth opportunities.

Data center process - there are mechanisms for the state to develop this, based upon local comprehensive plan amendments and updates.

6) Siting and Environmental Analysis Timing and Scope

Having baseline information and monitoring requirements beforehand is going to be important. Agreement with the OPAC recommendation for the state to lead a marine spatial planning exercise.

An MSP exercise should be well-funded, and add capacity for the state to lead a future effort. Some negative response to an MSP exercise for each pathway, as there may be specific focus areas that differ per the pathway that is selected.

Collapse of Oregon's higher education system here... is there a way for the state to support the higher education system, and is there a way to partner with them to help understand the impacts and issues? OIMB, SSNERR, OSU Hatfield, Port Orford OSU Station - should be supported - anything that can be done to support resiliency of those institutions would be important. Should we support a collaborative science effort across the existing institutions to provide long-term support? This would be a separate effort from the West Coast Science Entity.

Recommendations for understanding the basics of our ecosystems in an MSP process. The science entity should help to understand the effects of the new use of the ocean and the impacts on the user communities.

The technology sector can be helpful in understanding our marine system and the potential uses of the ocean.

5) Alternative future comparative analysis

Recommendation - we need to address climate change and growing energy needs. A comprehensive energy picture. But, the scope of the energy picture is beyond the task of the Roadmap, especially for the Pathway 1 - No offshore wind.