



Floating Offshore Wind Roadmap Roundtable

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

Marina Activity Center, Winchester Bay RV Resort

120 Marina Wy, Winchester Bay, OR 97467

ZOOM: <https://zoom.us/join/joinMeeting?jmtk=Q7SOAkLJSqGU1u0qnpkteg#/registration>

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Meeting Recording:

Meeting Slides:

RT members in-person:

Mike Graybill (public); Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro (BlueGreen Alliance); Julia B. DeGraw (National Wildlife Federation); Delia Kelly (ODFW); Ann Vileisis (Kalmiopsis Audubon Society); Ashley Audycki (Rogue Climate); Karie Silva; Karina Nielsen (SeaGrant); John Bragg (Friends of South Slough); Susan Chambers (West Coast Seafood Processors Association);

RT members via Zoom: Scott McMullen, Lynn Coker (Curry County Commissioner); Dean Apostol (Scenic resource and environmental planning); Laurel Hillmann (OPRD), David Petrie, Joe Liebezeit; Jena Carter (The Nature Conservancy); Angela Sondenaa (Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians); Rick Eichstaedt (CTCLUSI- Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians); Karlen Yallup (Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission); Kevin Howard, Andrea Sumerau, Robert Westerman, Lorne Bulling, Scott Kent, Dawn Barlow, Briece Edwards, Katrina Thompson, Caitlin Barns

Others: Michelle Carillo, Hanna Epstein, Stefanie Stravrakas, Kate Sullivan,

Department of Land Conservation and Development staff in-person: Jeff Burright, Hui Rodomski

Department of Land Conservation and Development staff via Zoom: Andy Lanier; Brett

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

I. Executive Summary

II. Opening & framing: Welcome and agenda.

- Bobby opened, walked through the agenda and plan for the day.
- Karie shared an early note on the roadmap document draft and noted that there is a lot of “should” in the draft—consider where “must” is appropriate for clarity and enforceability.
- Participants were asked to share priorities for feedback and readability (e.g., definitions, accessibility for multiple audiences).

III. Summer updates (June–September)

Jeff shared what got done over the summer:

- Over the summer, two working groups met several times—Community Benefits & Enforceable Agreements and Research Agenda & Coordination—and their recommendations now live in Section 5.
- The early May–June “concept-draft” grew into a full 176-page draft, paired with a 30-page executive summary.
- On engagement, DLCD hosted a virtual public meeting and opened a public survey (about 30 responses so far). DLCD also held two meetings with fishing communities (mid-day and evening), kept a fishing-focused survey open, convened tribes-only table conversations (June–August), and ran a South Coast focus group with mid- and north-coast sessions planned for this fall.
- DLCD is also running topic-specific focus groups (tourism; local and large utilities), with a supply-chain session coming up and a youth-voices session in the works.
- And DLCD launched a Lunch & Learn series—starting with transmission studies—with an upcoming session featuring California perspectives and research collaboration.
- On audience and length, John Bragg asked who the roadmap is really for and how long it should be.
- Jeff shared that the Legislature is the primary audience, but the document also needs to work for the public, industry, and agencies—so some depth is necessary.
- To make it usable, we’ll package it three ways: a short Legislative Executive Summary, a plain-language Background/Context overview, and the full Roadmap with details.
- DLCD will confirm any formal page/word limits the Legislature expects and size the Executive Summary to fit.
- Bobby encouraged everyone to keep the feedback coming and reminded the group of the timeline. Written comments are preferred by Oct 10 (bonus) and due no later than

Commented [1]: @acastel2@pdx.edu Could you change first person to be more specific throughout?
Assigned to acastel2@pdx.edu

Oct 20 so they can roll into Draft #2 for Nov 18. A Word version is available for Track Changes, and to ask if needed that file.

IV. Orienting to the Full Draft (Discussion)

- Jeff walked through what changed since spring and how the draft is organized, so everyone knows where to zero in next.
 - Section 1 – Introduction (done): Set the frame so readers immediately understand scope, audiences, and how to use the document.
 - Section 2 – Alternative Futures & Principles (in progress): Make it explicit that “no arrays/no turbines” is still an action (not “no action”). Add a short Maine example and a bit of Oregon history to ground the alternatives.
 - Section 3 – Existing policies, effects, concerns (in progress): Broaden coverage and start a plain-language glossary for terms that keep coming up (checkpoint, exit ramp, adaptive management, transferability, FPIC/UNDRIP, TEK, etc.).
 - Section 4 – Pathway & Phases diagrams (in progress): The build-turbines path reads clearly; we also need equally clear vertical pathways for no-turbine scenarios and a supply-chain-only option.
 - Section 5 – Strategies & Actions (in progress): Keep sharpening the clear asks and policy nuances. Any “streams of work” language should be tied back up front to the Oregon Principles so we’re not introducing new terms late.

Comments & questions:

- Ann asked where the earlier “exit ramps” landed and how they relate to today’s “checkpoints.” She also noted that other state energy policy work is happening in parallel, and readers need enough big-picture context to see options—not just granular modeling.
- John said he likes the metaphors (streams, pathways, checkpoints) but wants them tightened so they don’t conflict—keep terms consistent and avoid mixed signals.
- Delia asked for a “What this roadmap does / doesn’t do” box right up front to set expectations. She flagged the Executive Summary as too broad for mixed audiences and suggested trimming/synthesizing so readers aren’t stuck waiting until Section 5 to find the answers they came for.
- Karina asked for balance across scenarios—the draft is strong on “how to build,” but lighter on the non-turbine options (supply chain, R&D/technology, market development). She wants comparable research/market/supply-chain agendas for those paths.
- Mike said the main graphic is excellent for “build-turbines,” but there’s no corollary vertical pathway for the no-turbine and supply-chain-only routes. He also asked us to

name that a legitimate planning outcome can be “bad idea,” and to acknowledge the community-capacity cost of long, speculative timelines.

- Caitlin asked that the new “streams of work” terms be explicitly linked to the Oregon Principles so we aren’t dropping fresh labels late without anchors.
- Ranfis asked us to clearly separate offshore wind’s contribution to energy goals from broader climate outcomes, and to keep the language accessible and precise across audiences.
- Steve (Reedsport) said we still need a short organization conversation to keep the document usable for busy readers—what’s where, and why.

V. Public Comment, Part I

- Michelle Carillo thanked the team for progress (paths included; policy gaps show risks and opportunities; stronger treatment of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK), viewsheds, subsistence, co-stewardship). She asked to go further:
 - Move beyond consultation to a human-rights approach (FPIC, UNDRIP reference) and the concept of prior, informed consent.
 - Add tribal-led safety/Missing and Murdered Indigenous People protection plans as state checkpoints (California models exist).
 - Resource community participation (liaisons/navigators; small grants) and publish a comment-disposition table in the final public draft.
 - Address affordability (e.g., joint purchasing) and biosecurity.
 - Strengthen environmental protections (fisheries compensation/transition funds; cumulative-impact and health-equity screening; developer co-investment in shoreline resilience/SLR; tribal data sovereignty; stronger biodiversity monitoring).
 - Keep climate resilience (not just energy resilience) woven throughout.

VI. Section 3 Gallery Walk: Pathway & Phases Diagram

- How this will develop:
 - Three ongoing streams in every phase: meaningful engagement, good information, regional coordination.
 - Dean asked if protecting the environment includes scenic resources (flag to clarify).
- **Siting & Planning phase (multi-year)**
 - Delia said the key issue isn’t state vs. federal waters, it’s the process. When and how does the state (and the public) engage, during BOEM planning, or only once a developer files a proposal?
 - Julia emphasized that “baseline data” must come with a commitment to ongoing monitoring; it’s not one-and-done—track how conditions change over time.

Commented [2]: @acastel2@pdx.edu Were you able to get the post it notes incorporated?
Assigned to acastel2@pdx.edu

Commented [3]: I was reviewing those stickies notes yesterday, so not yet in the meeting summary. I can do it tomorrow afternoon. :)

Commented [4]: Sure! I will revise the meeting summary again tomorrow. thanks! :)

- Ranfis asked for clarity on agreements, are they required or voluntary?
Jeff: replied the team is exploring state policy options to require certain agreements (contractual methods) at the right stages.
 - Karina flagged the need to design for long-term monitoring now (what gets monitored, by whom, and how it's funded).
 - Bill noted that previous federal funding streams have supported foundational studies; if those return, they could help fill information gaps.
 - John (and Karina) suggested leveraging OSU/universities as research partners and setting up a mechanism to channel funds to them.
 - Caitlin (zoom chat): urged tying any new "streams of work" language back to the Oregon Principles to avoid introducing new terms late without anchors.
- **Leasing & environmental review**
 - Group agreed it's useful to have a cumulative effects analysis "in your pocket."
After lease, site surveys must follow safeguards (e.g., avoid archaeological harm, use observers on vessels).
 - Bill: asked to include clear data-sharing expectations.
 - Delia (tribal engagement segment): asked what we mean by transmission plans, port infrastructure, and supply-chain plans—what exactly must a lessee show for getting power from A to B and what structures are needed? (Not asking for financing terms or port agreements here—just the technical/logistical plan.)
 - Caitlin (chat): noted that even if the transmission line is treated as separate from the OSW project, it still needs its own environmental review.
- **Values, scope, and proportionality**
 - Mike expressed discomfort that the discussion assumes we want offshore wind. He described a broader policy shift in public sentiment and urged that a legitimate output of planning can be "bad idea." He also flagged the community capacity cost of long, speculative processes. "Studying community investment needs" can sound like we're preparing to impose something—be clear about community interest and values.
 - Steve (Reedsport) asked us to be explicit about what we are and are not addressing. He used a historical analogy to argue for focusing the analysis on what's feasible and most important, rather than trying to evaluate everything.
 - Dean (zoom) said offshore wind is not a decarbonization linchpin for Oregon or globally; it may be a contributing resource but not a make-or-break one. He's pro-renewables and can accept some OSW, but won't be convinced it's the global "deal-breaker."

Key Questions for the Roadmap (Full + Breakouts)

- Prompts covered: how much detail for which audiences, which sections need the most discussion, and where the remaining dilemmas sit in the draft.
- Group leaned into permitting and then supply-chain-only as a scenario check.

Deep Dive: Permitting Stage

- walked through how permitting would actually play out from the state's point of view—what has to be in the file, what's enforceable, and where the state can (and should) set gates or conditions.

Comments & questions:

- Bill asked how state and coastal benefits show up if arrays are far offshore (e.g., off Brookings). In short: if the action is offshore, how do the on-shore dividends (jobs, ports, transmission, community investment) actually land along the coast?
- Mike flagged the problem of timelines and extensions. Big projects often start with low maturity and “arm-wavy” concepts, then linger for years, draining community capacity (cited LNG exports: ~16 years, never built). Asked for policy guardrails that screen out speculators, require readiness, and ensure communities only spend time on bona fide proposals.
- Julia shared East Coast experience (NWF) that some developers exceed required terms (e.g., vessel speed practices negotiated with NGOs). In emergencies, they asked permission to deviate, suggesting voluntary commitments + NGO oversight can raise the bar beyond minimums.
- Ann asked what enforceability really means for communities. When something goes wrong, are we talking state law, federal conditions, or contracts—and does a town end up suing a mega-company? I wanted the layers spelled out clearly.
- Jeff clarified that if we memorialize requirements in contracts, they're enforceable under contract law—not just through the Coastal Zone Management Act. Proposed a gate: before the state issues its consistency or key sign-offs, certain contracts must be in place so the state and communities retain leverage over time.
- Ranfis asked us to define the core terms we keep using—oversight, accountability, inclusivity—for different ocean users. Where there are gaps, consider legal agreements to cover them.
- Delia noted this part of the process is huge and over-compressed in the current sketch. Under that “little blue well,” Effects Evaluation & Mitigation is substantial—this is where

Territorial Sea Plan (Part 5) work, environmental analyses, and a lot of remaining work live. We should show the weight of this step.

- Mike (diagram): Said the visual is unclear, looks like 3 or 6 streams. Recommended widening the streams and placing the text inside each stream so readers immediately see what's what.

Offshore Wind Supply Chain Participation — Path 2

- What Path 2 is: Oregon participates in the offshore wind supply chain (even if arrays aren't built off Oregon). This could mean work happening in Oregon that supports projects elsewhere.
- Working definition to pin down (in plain language): What counts as "supply chain" here?
 - Services (engineering, environmental surveys, operations & maintenance)
 - Manufacturing & fabrication (components, assemblies)
 - Transportation & logistics (ports, staging, specialized vessels)
 - Testing, R&D, and prototyping (test facilities, grid-connected pilots)
 - (Team asked to agree on which of these belong in Path 2's scope.)

Comments & questions:

- Mike suggested prototype and test facilities modeled on wave-energy testbeds (with grid connections) so Oregon can validate turbine or subsystem designs as part of the supply chain.
- Julia noted Mike's idea functions like a pilot project—useful to show how a test facility pathway would actually run.
- John proposed starting a needs assessment—a clear "shopping list" of what Oregon would need (infrastructure, skills, vendors, equipment).
- Delia asked to show that without investing in Oregon arrays, Oregon would still invest in other energy sources; that belongs inside this pathway and in the diagram.
- Ann flagged risk and cost need to be spelled out for all alternatives (1A/1B show very high costs and unknown risks—Path 2 needs the same level of scrutiny).
- Jeff asked what truly differentiates this path from others and what Oregon needs if it later decided to do arrays. Noted the state could pursue both (local and global roles) if it invests in each future, but there are opportunity costs—e.g., if Oregon doesn't spend on spatial planning or research now, it saves money/time today but may lose time if arrays come back later (or if federal leasing returns). Path 2 can be an earlier/cheaper focus, with tradeoffs primarily in time.
- Karina asked to reorder and redraw the diagram so Path 2 appears as a first-class pathway, not a side note.

- Ashley asked to outline community engagement steps in Path 2 as well (not just in the array-build path).
- Jeff (closing thought): Path 2 has been discussed since the beginning; next month's session with supply-chain folks should clarify what policies, interventions, and investments the state should consider that aren't already happening.
- Bobby asked for as much feedback as possible by Oct 10 (bonus points by Oct 20) to help Jeff turn it around for Nov 18.

VII. Key Questions for the Roadmap (Full + Breakouts)

- Bobby set the frame: we'll use the breakout to answer the six questions Jeff needs for Nov 18.
- We blended two pieces: targeted feedback on those questions and open space for pressing topics people noticed while reading the draft.

Breakout Questions — Key Points Synthesis

Group 1. Key Points Synthesis Moderator: Andy

1) What belongs in the main body vs. the appendices?

- Keep the body readable and conceptual; put deep technical detail in appendices that mirror the body's structure (easy cross-walk).
- Aim the Roadmap at stakeholders and the Legislature; let the Executive Summary carry the strategy "what/why," with links into sections.
- Appendices should align by section (1: Intro, 3: Context/Policy, 5: Strategies) so readers can jump straight to supporting detail.

2) Readability & language

- Acronyms: add a front-of-book acronym table; define on first use and hyperlink to the definition.
- Keep plain language throughout; let the appendices carry specialist terms if needed, but always define them somewhere.

3) Should the Roadmap set a goal/limit for offshore wind?

- Favor directional guidance, not a hard target: use market needs, investment, and environmental factors to size OSW over time.
- Consider time-boxed estimates ("by X year, approximately Y need") and a minimalist framing: "produce what's practicable."

- Address receiving power in Oregon (resilience benefits) vs. exporting to CA; consider policies that prioritize in-state delivery.
- Explore phase caps (e.g., 1 GW early phase) and suitable sea-space bounds with criteria for expanding later (benefits, risks, transmission).

4) Information requirements: leasing vs. permitting

- Before leasing: require a cumulative impact assessment (can be conceptual with sensitivity analyses).
- Before permitting: resolve uncertainties via (1) relevant external data, (2) Oregon/West-coast specific studies, or (3) Adaptive management + monitoring—to show consistency with state policy.

5) Connecting shoreside and offshore projects

- Treat transmission to shore as part of the offshore proposal, but recognize many shoreside projects (port upgrades, grid upgrades, navigation changes, staging/integration, manufacturing, vessels, storage, O&M) may have separate timing and independent utility.
- Planning should coordinate these tracks but not assume their permits will move in lockstep.

6) No formal “exit” between siting and leasing—how to handle?

- Balance developer certainty with resource/community protection: front-load transparency and standards so only serious proposals proceed.
- Consider requiring release of survey/data gathered during leasing investigations—even if a COP isn’t filed.
- Explore amending TSP Part Two to (a) require cumulative assessment scaled to the proposal and (b) avoid sensitive areas (rearing/migratory corridors, high-effort fisheries, high visual impact).
- Caveats: who pays for state-led spatial/cumulative work; potential impacts on other development; what if the state can’t fund it?
- Fallbacks: accept no exit at that stage (as in 2024), object later if needed (risk: sunk-cost pressure after leasing)

Group 2. Key Points Synthesis Moderator: Brett

1) What belongs in the main body vs. an appendix?

- Keep the body short and readable. Put technical detail in appendices so deep-dive readers can find it without cluttering the narrative.
- Use hyperlinks in the body that jump to the right appendix section.
- This approach had support from Scott; Robert agreed.

2) Readability & language (Executive Summary vs. body vs. appendices)

- No additional comments captured here.
- Implicit direction: the ES stays plain-language, the body explains decisions, the appendix holds specs/data.

3) Should the Roadmap set a goal/limit on the *amount* of offshore wind?

- Scott: Favors a limit to give certainty (especially for fisheries). 1 GW was discussed but feels arbitrary; precedent exists (e.g., caps for wave energy near certain ports).
- Robert: No hard cap. Profitability and supply chain/transmission will naturally limit scale. If a cap is forced, >1 GW (e.g., ~3 GW) would be more realistic.
- Info request: Scott asked what's proposed in Morro Bay/Humboldt to benchmark.

Should there be a goal/limit for suitable sea space in spatial planning?

- Scott: Protect fish plants & fishing infrastructure; could accept up to ~25% of area furthest offshore if that avoids high-use nearshore zones.
- Robert: Asked whether limits should be a % of territorial sea.
- Benefits/drawbacks & criteria to expand:
 - Robert: If an area isn't big enough for a viable project, developers won't come.
 - Scott: Look to Eureka examples; cable-to-shore cost is a big driver; needs more information to refine a position.

4) Information requirements at leasing vs. permitting

- At leasing (front-loaded):
 - Scott: Wants Construction & Operations Plan elements much earlier; BOEM puts too much late.
 - Require a coast-wide cumulative impact assessment (conceptual is okay, with sensitivity analysis).
- At permitting (before approvals):
 - Close key uncertainties via: (1) relevant external data, (2) OR/West-Coast studies, or (3) adaptive management + monitoring that demonstrates consistency with state policy.

- Scott: Do all we can up front, but some unknowns will remain.
- Robert: The process itself will inform legislation; some answers only arrive with a real developer.

5) How should the Roadmap handle the connection between shoreside and offshore projects?

- Transmission cable to shore is part of the project and has its own impacts (routing, burial) that must be reviewed. Developers expect burial.
- Robert: Treats offshore + cable + onshore as one project; if it's a separate supply-chain project by an independent third party, that's different. Scott agreed.
- Timing: Shoreside permitting can be years apart from offshore and still have independent utility.
 - Scott: Pointed to PAC-Wave permitting "through the shore to the building."
 - Robert: Developers generally want end-to-end permits secured.

6) No formal exit between siting and leasing — how to handle?

- Option A — Policy gate (amend TSP Part Two):
 - Require cumulative assessment scaled to the proposal and avoid sensitive areas (rearing/migratory corridors, high-effort fisheries, high visual impact).
 - Idea: no leasing proceeds without spatial planning & cumulative analysis done.
 - Unknowns: Who pays? What else gets affected?
- Option B — State-led planning first:
 - Be proactive: launch state spatial planning & cumulative analysis; assume federal agencies wait for completion.
 - Risk: What if the state can't fund it?
- Option C — Accept no exit (status quo):
 - Mirrors 2024 experience; the state can object later, effectively invalidating the lease.
 - Concern: Sunk-cost pressure after leasing can make later objections harder.

Group 3: Key Points Synthesis. Moderator: Hui

1) What belongs in the main body vs. an appendix?

- Executive Summary (ES): It's overwhelming and reads like another chapter. Trim hard. Consider a bullet-list ES that's truly a briefing.

- Main body (Secs. 1–5): Long and complex but needed. Keep the detail; improve navigation (clear chapters/sectioning).
- Background doc: Pull dense background into a separate background piece so the body stays readable.
- Summaries & glossary: Give each section a short summary (call-out box/handout style) and add a glossary for recurring terms.

2) Readability & language (ES vs. body vs. appendices)

- Right-size each layer:
 - ES: ultra-plain, bullets, scannable.
 - Body: narrative + decisions, light on jargon.
 - Appendices: deep specs, data, citations—link out from body.

3) Should the Roadmap set a goal/limit on the amount of offshore wind?

- Not yet. Premature to lock a GW number.
- If needed for phasing certainty (e.g., fisheries/transmission planning), explore a starter phase cap (e.g., ~1 GW) later—backed by conditions.
- Today we can size space more than GW (generation depends on many variables). Focus on identifying suitable areas first.

4) Should there be a goal/limit for suitable sea space in spatial planning?

- Lean toward defining appropriate areas and the criteria to expand (benefits, risks, transmission, conflicts).
- Be explicit about pros/cons of bounding areas up front, and what would trigger future expansion.

5) Information requirements at leasing vs. permitting

- Before leasing: Require a cumulative impact assessment (conceptual is OK) with sensitivity analysis.
- Before permitting: Close uncertainties using one of three routes:
 1. Relevant external data; 2) OR/West Coast—specific studies; or 3) Adaptive management + monitoring that shows consistency with state policy.

6) Connecting shoreside and offshore projects

- Treat transmission to shore as part of the offshore proposal.

- Other shoreside pieces (ports, grid upgrades, navigation, staging/integration, manufacturing, vessels, storage, O&M) can move on different timelines and may have independent utility.

7) No formal exit between siting and leasing — how to handle?

- Option A: Policy gate (amend TSP Part Two). Require cumulative assessment scaled to the proposal and avoid sensitive areas (rearing/migratory corridors, high-effort fisheries, high visual impact). Leasing can't proceed without the spatial/cumulative work. Open questions: who pays; what else is affected?
- Option B: State-led planning first. Proactively do state spatial planning + cumulative analysis; assume federal agencies wait. Risk: funding.
- Option C: Accept no exit (status quo). As in 2024—state can object later, functionally invalidating a lease; sunk-cost pressure remains a concern.

Group 4: Key Points Synthesis. Moderator: Jeff

- Body vs. appendices (and overall structure)
 - The draft is too detailed up front; move what matters to the front and push deep technicals to appendices.
 - Publish two companion docs: a conceptual roadmap (main body) and a technical reference (appendices).
 - Explain the “no exit ramp” issue earlier so readers aren't confused.
 - Add a short policy-maker summary at the start.
 - Note: The framework could generalize to other ocean development (e.g., oil & gas).
 - Fix the table of contents: it's overwhelming. Use a brief paragraph blurb per chapter; remove deep numbering.
 - Diagram edits: show the phases up front; fix the left-hand stream label to say federal siting & permitting accurately.
- Readability & language
 - Do a “should → must” pass where obligations are intended to be binding.
 - Keep the Executive Summary tight and truly skimmable; let the body carry decisions and the appendices carry specs.
- Goal/limit on the amount of offshore wind
 - Consider a phased cap (e.g., ~1 GW) to provide certainty (fisheries, transmission upgrades, coastal effects).

- Treat as a phase gate rather than a forever ceiling.
- Goal/limit for suitable sea space (spatial planning)
 - Define benefits vs. drawbacks of bounding space early; set criteria to expand (benefits, risks, transmission feasibility, conflicts).
- Information requirements: leasing vs. permitting
 - Before leasing: require a cumulative impact assessment (conceptual OK) with sensitivity analysis.
 - Before permitting: close uncertainties via one of three:
 - Relevant new data from elsewhere, 2) OR/West Coast-specific studies, or 3) Adaptive management + monitoring that shows consistency with state policy.
- Connecting shoreside and offshore projects
 - Treat the cable to shore as part of the offshore project (review routing/burial impacts).
 - Other shoreside pieces (ports, grid upgrades, navigation, staging/integration, manufacturing, vessels, storage, O&M) may move on separate timelines and have independent utility.
 - Add decision aids:
 - A “but for” test (is a facility only needed but for this OSW project?).
 - Cable landing feasibility info at leasing (Delia’s idea), including transmission cost considerations.
 - Side note: Recommend the state submit comments to DOI rulemakings reflecting Oregon priorities in the Roadmap.
- No formal exit between siting and leasing—options
 - Policy gate (amend TSP Part Two): require scaled cumulative assessment and avoid sensitive areas (rearing/migratory corridors, high-effort fisheries, high visual impacts).
 - Open questions: who pays, what else gets affected.
 - State-led planning first: launch state spatial planning + cumulative analysis and assume feds wait.
 - Risk: funding and timeline.
 - Accept no exit (status quo): mirrors 2024; the state can object later (but watch sunk-cost pressure once leases are issued).

- Additional notes if Oregon steps back:
 - Baseline takes time to build; if Oregon pauses planning/siting or doesn't participate in the BOEM task force, the state loses time if developers proceed.
 - If analysis shows no viable place, notify BOEM by letter with mapping/policy basis.
 - Consider dropping the pilot project from alternatives (not feasible given dev side/federal funding shifts).

Group 5: Key Points Synthesis. Moderator: Sofia

1) What belongs in the main body vs. an appendix?

- Keep the main body readable and focused on the story and decisions; move dense background and technicals to appendices (no repetition—use hyperlinks back and forth).
- Build a tight, 2-page Executive Summary (ES) “above the fold” with the main takeaways and recommendations; consider a slightly longer ES tailored for different audiences.
- Improve accessibility: run readability checks (e.g., Word score), add helpful visuals, and include basic educational resources for non-experts.
- Name the audiences (legislators, local leaders, others) and write to them directly. Stage the key messages up front.

2) Readability & language (ES vs. body vs. appendices)

- ES = plain language, scannable bullets, links into sections; main body tells the narrative and decisions; appendices carry data/methods.
- Consider peer review by non-process folks to help translate jargon and check accessibility.

3) Should the Roadmap set a goal/limit on the amount of offshore wind?

- There's interest in a limit (e.g., phased 1 GW) to reduce uncertainty for both developers and communities—but many cautioned that a fixed number may be premature given evolving technology and environmental impacts.
- Instead of a hard cap now, define criteria for future decisions (e.g., technology readiness, impacts, benefits, transmission feasibility, tribal values). Research can help fill gaps.
- The Science Advisory work is developing a similar criteria-based approach—align with that.

4) Should there be a goal/limit for suitable sea space (spatial planning)?

- A spatial limit/ceiling could help reduce uncertainty, but it should come with clear criteria to expand if/when conditions warrant (benefits, risks, uses to be balanced, user priorities).
- We likely won't finalize an exact limit by the end of this roadmap process; what we can finalize is the approach and criteria. The roadmap could be a model for other industries.

5) Information requirements at leasing vs. permitting

- Manage uncertainty via three routes: (1) relevant new data from elsewhere, (2) OR/West Coast-specific information, or (3) an Adaptive Management + monitoring program. Use all three where appropriate.
- Before leasing: require a cumulative impact assessment (conceptual is OK with sensitivity analysis). Emphasize baseline information early—especially for local communities.
- Before permitting: close key uncertainties using the methods above to show consistency with state policies. Consider the durability of this approach across different federal administrations—be explicit what's state vs. federal.

6) How to connect shoreside and offshore projects?

- Treat the transmission line into shore as part of the offshore project review. Other shoreside projects (ports, grid, navigation, staging/integration, manufacturing, vessels, storage, O&M) may run on different timelines and still have independent utility.
- Show the bigger picture in planning: include MOUs, on-shore options, and a simple map of components and dependencies.
- Add an appendix listing related shoreside projects, their current status, and which roadmap sections will need updating as these evolve. Emphasize that OSW cannot happen in isolation from these linked efforts.

Group 6. Key Points Synthesis. Moderator: Trevor

VIII. Audience, structure, and readability

- Design the Table of Contents as a map, not a list—use simple graphics and “start here” cues so readers jump straight to background, policy, or technical sections.
- Acknowledge this is effectively several documents for different audiences; signal that in the TOC and headings (e.g., “For policymakers,” “For practitioners”).
- Keep the Executive Summary tight and scannable; hyperlink into sections/appendices so people can go deeper only if they want.

3) Should the Roadmap set a goal?

- The Roadmap may not be the place to set numeric goals (that could come from the Governor's Office or future policy).
- If we include a goal, make it a range (low–high) and pair power output with an approximate turbine count so impacts feel concrete.

4) What information is required when?

- Before leasing: complete a cumulative impact assessment.
- Before permitting: we can't eliminate every uncertainty, but we must manage the knowledge gaps—document what's unknown and how it will be addressed (studies, data, adaptive management).

5) How to connect shoreside and offshore?

- Consider shoreside permitting needs during offshore leasing—ask proponents to include on-shore siting options and dependencies in their proposals.
- Learn from past undersea fiber-optic cable landings in Oregon—apply those siting/coordination lessons so we don't repeat mistakes.

6) Exit between siting and leasing?

- The group flagged a scenario where adding a major exit ramp here could look like Oregon acting in bad faith.
- If an exit is needed, make criteria transparent and early; otherwise, avoid a gate that surprises stakeholders after they've invested time and resources.

Full Group Report Out: Synthesis from slides

Document organization & readability

- Design the front matter to help people find what they need fast: route readers to background, policy, or technical sections.
- Acknowledge this is effectively multiple products for different audiences (e.g., policymakers vs. practitioners).
- Make the main body a conceptual, easy-to-read story; move deep detail to appendices that mirror the body's order.

- Tighten the Executive Summary; consider a 2-pager with takeaways on page 1/first paragraph and short chapter summaries.
- TOC is overwhelming → redesign it as a map (simple graphics, “start here” cues).
- Do a global “should → must” pass where obligations are intended.
- Add a glossary, watch acronyms, and hyperlink key terms to definitions; consider help from a professional communicator.

Untitled presentation (3)

Power generation (targets, ranges, framing)

- Prefer low–high ranges rather than a single numeric target.
- Consider pairing power (GW) with an estimated turbine count (more concrete for readers).
- The Roadmap may not be the place to set a top limit—leave that to marine spatial planning (MSP) or future policy.
- Capture current zones of agreement/disagreement so decision-makers see where stakeholders stand.
- Possible direction: “do as much as is reasonably practicable,” or phase development with natural checks from supply/transmission; note TSP Part 5 references to energy goals/limits.
- Bottom line sentiment: there should be some limit, but the Roadmap’s role is to offer the framework and criteria, leaning on MSP to balance uses/values.

Untitled presentation (3)

Uncertainty, risk, and information timing (leasing vs. permitting)

- Shift language from “uncertainty” → “knowledge gaps.” Not all uncertainty can be removed, but gaps must be managed.
- Front-load transparency and information, especially before and during leasing, so later phases don’t bring surprises.
- Don’t defer key info too late; say in the Roadmap what we want to see even if the formal mechanism isn’t there yet.
- Heavier information burden at permitting than at leasing.

Untitled presentation (3)

Shore–sea connection (how to link projects)

- Yes, try to connect shoreside and offshore planning; specifics are hard, but:
 - Use a “but-for OSW” test for facilities (would they exist without OSW?).

- At leasing, developers should demonstrate viable options to connect components (correspondence, commitments, siting options).
 - Treat each component's impacts separately, but acknowledge it's one integrated project; demonstrate enough certainty that the package can be completed.
- Untitled presentation (3)

Siting → leasing “exit” (whether/where to have one)

- A conspicuous exit between siting and leasing could look like bad faith if MSP was done well.
 - “De facto” exits exist (e.g., the state not investing or not participating in BOEM task forces).
 - If MSP concludes no suitable sites, Oregon could notify BOEM by letter and document the mapping/policy basis.
 - Even if projects don't proceed, the state should still seek information (e.g., for a conceptual cumulative-effects view).
- Untitled presentation (3)

IX. Action items

- All Roundtable members
 - Send written comments preferred by Oct 10 (bonus) and no later than Oct 20 to roll into Draft #2 for Nov 18. Ask Bobby/Jeff for the Word version if needed.
 - Flag any terms that belong in the Glossary; suggest plain-language definitions.
- Jeff (DLCD) & drafting team
 - Prepare Draft #2 for the Nov 18 meeting (integrate comments).