

WCMAC

Offshore Wind Technical

Committee

2022-2023 Meeting Summaries



WASHINGTON
COASTAL
MARINE
ADVISORY
COUNCIL



Meeting Summary Contents

Section 1: Meeting Summaries 2022

July 27, 2022

August 25, 2022

October 12, 2022

October 27, 2022

November 17, 2022

November 29, 2022

Section 2: Meeting Summaries 2023

January 17, 2023

February 21, 2023

April 18, 2023

May 16, 2023

August 15, 2023

October 17, 2023

November 21, 2023

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

7/27/22 MEETING SUMMARY

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee Agenda
Virtual, Held on Zoom

Agenda 7/27/22

Time	Agenda Item and Description
10:00 - 10:10am	Welcome + Introductions
10:10 - 10:35am	OSW Technical Committee Purpose + Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of WCMAC's role; timeline of prior WCMAC discussions on OSW energy • Define TC role + objectives • Identify co-leads
10:35 - 10:50am	Engagement and Offshore Wind Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of BOEM's unsolicited lease request process and timeline • Opportunities for engagement throughout the process • Discussion of Principles of Engagement
10:50 - 11am	Committee Logistics + Next Steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss meeting schedule • Identify action items + next steps

Meeting Notes

Attendees

Attendee	Affiliation
Doug Kess	Pacific MRC
Brian Polagye	UW, Associate Professor
Casey Dennehy	ECY, Marine Policy Associate, Staff Support
Corey Niles	WDFW (rep)
Arthur Grunbaum (RD)	Marine Resource Committee, Greys Harbor
Dale Beasley	President Coalition of Coastal Fisheries
Heather Hall	WDFW
Mike Okoniewski	Pacific Seafood Consultant
Henry Bell	ECY, Coastal Planner
Michele Robinson	Consultant, Coastal Fisheries
Nives Dolsak	UW, Professor
Larry Thevik	Commercial Fishing Representative
Mike Chang, Facilitator	Cascadia Consulting
Kristina Zeynalova	Cascadia Consulting
Nicole Gutierrez	Cascadia Consulting
Jimmy Kralj	Environmental Science Associates

Welcome and Introductions

- Mike led introductions and went over the agenda
 - Working from the meeting packet that was shared with the group (Appendix A)

OSW Technical Committee Purpose and Objectives

- Mike provided an overview of WCMAC's role and outlined how WCMAC and this Technical Committee (TC) can move forward in engaging with the OSW process:
 - Can make formal recommendations for WCMAC to consider and reach consensus. Then WCMAC would send those recommendations to the state.
 - Provide an overview or principles of engagement for coastal communities/WCMAC. Outline expectations and best practices as BOEM and the state moves through permitting
 - Run the offshore wind energy through the MSP framework
 - Casey provided an overview at the last meeting.
 - Example: The TC and WCMAC can provide data needs recommendation or data
- Mike went over TC role & objectives
 - Purpose of TC is to provide smaller group discussion with key stakeholders and experts
 - Discuss how the TC and WCMAC should identify engagement priorities and principles/best practices
 - Provide expertise and recommendations for WCMAC to consider, as appropriate
 - Call/propose additional meetings (hold webinars, workshops, working sessions) that can be public
- Discussion
 - Mike O: Has there been thought on how to determine who the audience is for engagement? Target audiences?
 - Mike: There have been preliminary discussions, but that determination would be on the TC to identify before holding engagement events.
 - Note: there are parallel engagement processes with fishing communities and tribes. Mike also noted that members can participate in other engagement events.
 - Larry T: The roles outlines are preliminary and are not finalized. There is an underlying principle for protection of existing marine uses on WA coast. We should be pointing to the MSP.
 - WCMAC serves as an information exchange, a forum. Share expertise and inform policy makers.

- We still don't know who the interacting body in BOEM process will be.
 - Larry T also noted that there are data gaps on marine wind farms and impact to hydrodynamics. TC should inform how to fill these in.
- Corey N: This is an open question that will take longer than one hour. The development will be iterative.
 - Shared that the fishery engagement group is not yet formed.
 - WDFW is unsure of how the state will respond to the unsolicited lease request - what the state will ask BOEM to do.
 - Can pull some experience from similar situations in CA and OR.
 - BOEM process is well intentioned but, a little backwards in how they do the NEPA process.
 - Most important step: getting all the input *before* the wind areas are established.
- Nives: Can we please define the spatial scope of our engagement? Are we engaging with offshore wind (i) that would be located in WA, or any (ii) location that could have an impact on migratory species important for stakeholders in WA?
 - Mike parked this for later in the meeting.

Identify co-leads

- Need to be WCMAC members
- Co-leads are committing to working with Consulting and ECY, helping develop agendas, being the voice of the TC at quarterly WCMAC meetings.
- 2-3 co-leads per TC
- Mike noted that when the TC formed, people were asked if they have capacity to be a co-lead
 - Brian: interest yes, capacity – not sure. New to WCMAC and lacking that institutional knowledge
 - Doug: has interest, not sure if he has capacity. Would contribute how he can. First chair of WCMAC.
 - Dale: sent written interest to be a co-lead.
- Mike offered some information about capacity concerns: the consulting team can do some of the leg work by preparing agendas. But we will not be sending out topics or set discussions as the neutral convener.
- Corey: what is this group going to do? What is this group expected to accomplish?
 - Right now, it is likely that WCMAC would develop recommendations on how the federal/state/tribe should engage with BOEM.
 - Need to answer, what is this TC going to do?
 - Core shared a concern of co-leads setting the scope of what this group does. Also, has a concern about the meeting not being opened to the public. We shouldn't treat the by-laws as constraining. They could be easily changed.
- Casey: The council will decide (in by-laws) who the co-leads are.

- We are setting a foundation to address the issues being brought up.
 - Will take this to the larger WCMAC group in Sept and confirm co-leads
- Dale: Biggest problem will be the State. BOEM treats the state interface as useless. In OR BOEM taskforce members were not getting critical updates. Only met once a year.
 - Must engage with BOEM as a State in a way that is **responsive**.
- Heather: Appreciates the discussion and it feels like we are trying to figure out a lot in a short amount of time. Recognizes what Dale and Corey shared.
 - Most pressing: What is the process of engagement in WA for BOEM?
 - Agrees with Corey that co-leads should not determine scope of this TC.
 - Mike clarified that co-leads would not set scope, but they would help set the agendas. Scope will require by-in from all WCMAC members.
- Brian: Do we have any idea on timeline on how state will engage with BOEM?
 - The state is currently working with state groups (and tribes) engaging in setting next steps. No timeline.
 - Casey: Governor's office is in the lead and consulting with coastal treaty tribes. They are also speaking with BOEM. No timeframe is established, but there are ongoing conversations. We expect to hear more in the near future. This is an opportunity for TC to provide recommendations to the governor on how to engage with BOEM and figure out the process.
- Doug: Echoed what Dale said. Should reach out to reps that the BOEM process is inadequate. It will be important to reach out to the fed/other influential people to flag this BOEM process is broken. **Would like these meetings to be public.**
- Dale: Wants meeting to be public as well.
- Mike: Can consider open public meetings as we continue to define the role and scope of this TC. Workshops and listening sessions in the future could be open.
- Mike O: Echo Dale and Doug. BOEM process is broken. State engagement process needs to be improved
 - We need to accept that we need to take a forceful position to get any protection of our fisheries.
- Corey: BOEM did engage with stakeholders in OR, but the perception is that it was bad. Believes that BOEM is genuinely trying but need to identify where can they do a better job. If this is to go forward in WA, how do we do better?
- Mike: TC can review, assess, provide recommendations that engagement process be better.
- Larry: Disagrees with Corey. BOEM is not genuinely interested in stakeholder engagement. Example: mitigation plan is lacking, but BOEM is moving forward anyways even though the impacts are not fully understood. Found out a lot about BOEMs process, and they don't lead to great outcomes. You need several legs of state representation. We need to provide information to the public and WCMAC on what is missing in this process. "Leasing first and asking questions later".
- Michele: Appreciates everyone's comments and input. This TC was formed without defining what we would do. Purpose is a policy question that should be considered by the full WCMAC. WCMAC should have a thorough discussion on

what WCMAC should recommend. TC should be implementation. How to engage, fishing considerations, other data.

- Dale: Complete list of all permits necessary to put steel in the water. Have heard there could be up to 30?
 - Want all opportunities to engage outlined.

Engagement of Offshore Wind Process

- This conversation was tabled because there was not enough time. However, based on comments shared, there are some initial principles of engagement that TC identified from prior lessons learned. Summary of this is below. This summary is meant to be a starting point and is not comprehensive of all engagement principles and expectations yet.
 - **WCMAC expects consistent and timely engagement with BOEM and the State.** This means meeting multiple times a year with affected stakeholders.
 - **WCMAC expects that all decisions are informed by stakeholder perspectives and key data/information.** If there isn't relevant information, WCMAC expects that BOEM and the State outline how they integrated uncertainty into their decision-making.
 - **WCMAC expects multiple forums of engagement and information dissemination.** There is a diversity of stakeholders, and using one type of engagement (e.g., listening sessions) is insufficient to meaningfully engage all the types of stakeholders and communities affected by off-shore wind.
 - **WCMAC expects transparency in this process.**
- Additional questions to answer re: engagement.
 - Are we engaging with offshore wind (i) that would be located in WA, or any (ii) location that could have an impact on migratory species important for stakeholders in WA?

Committee Logistics

- Mike: We still want to schedule the TC recurring meetings. We can pivot and focus on how to discuss this at the WCMAC meeting - can focus on how to have the engagement discussion with WCMAC in Sept.
 - Packet provided timelines of WCMAC involvement and BOEM timeline. These are not finalized.

Next Steps

- Mike: Thank you for joining everyone. Meeting minutes and summaries will be circulated. Fill out the doodle poll so we can schedule upcoming meetings.
- Any questions reach out to Mike or Casey.

Scheduling Reminder

- Mike: Hearing that we need recurring 1.5-hour meetings
 - Reminder to take the doodle poll to schedule recurring meetings.
- Doug: Cannot make morning meetings

Appendix A

Timeline of WCMAC's Involvement with OSW Energy

August 2018: Marine Spatial Plan adopted, focusing on a) protect existing uses, b) protect cultural uses and resources, c) preserve environment, d) integrate decision-making, and e) provide new economic opportunities.

September 24, 2021: WCMAC Special Meeting convened about this topic.

- Initial plans and discussion about off-shore wind energy project with WCMAC
- Discussion of MSP's role within OSW


December 15, 2021: December WCMAC Meeting

- Reviewed special meeting from September 2021
- BOEM presentation on regulatory roadmap for offshore wind energy
- Presentation on data needs and information related to OSW
- Discussion of WCMAC's next steps on OSW

April 12, 2022: [Unsolicited lease request](#) submitted by Trident Winds to BOEM.

April 20, 2022: April WCMAC Meeting

- Further discussion – especially around concerns about OSW and engagement during the leasing process.
- WCMAC endorsed the formation of a technical committee on OSW to discuss OSW engagement.



May-June 2022: Began to recruit OSW Technical Committee Members. However, only two people initially signed up, so paused this until June WCMAC Meeting.

June 15, 2022: June WCMAC Meeting

- Expanded the scope of OSW Technical Committee to also look at the MSP and data/information needs.
- Recruited more WCMAC member volunteers.

July 27, 2022: First OSW Technical Committee

Opportunities for Engagement

Still under development.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING SUMMARY

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee Agenda

August 25, 2022

10am – 12pm

Agenda

Time	Agenda Item and Description
10:00 - 10:10am	Welcome
10:10 – 11:00am	OSW Technical Committee Overview and Purpose <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technical committee role overview• Defining objectives<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Discussion• Tools for engagement and logistics<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Discussion
11:00 - 11:55am	Engagement and Offshore Wind Process <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Principles of Engagement<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Review draft Principles of Engagement○ Discuss and refine Principle of Engagement
11:55 - 12pm	Next Steps and Closing

Attendees

- Casey Dennehy
- Mike Okoniewski
- Alicia Mahon
- Nives Dolsak
- Larry Thevik
- Brian Polagye
- Dale Beasley
- Corey Niles
- Arthur (RD) Grunbaum
- Henry Bell
- Consulting Team: Mike Chang and Nicole Gutierrez (Cascadia Consulting), Jimmy Kralj (ESA)

Welcome

Mike welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. Mike asked if any members had questions about the agenda before we got started. There were no questions from the committee.

OSW Technical Committee Overview and Purpose

Technical Committee Role Overview

- Mike went over the Technical Committee role, according to the WCMAC bylaws
 - Technical Committees (TC) are formed by WCMAC to carry out specific assignments between WCMAC meetings. Duties of the TC include advising and providing recommendations on technical issues as directed by WCMAC. As stated in the WCMAC bylaws, the recommendations made by the TC are not formal unless they are adopted by the entire Council.
 - **Important Highlight:** recommendations formed in this meeting would need to be voted on by full WCMAC

Defining objectives

- Mike went over objectives and the justification and context. (See Table Below)

Objective	Justification and Context
<p>Provide guidance and principles of engagement to the State and BOEM.</p> <p><i>** This has been identified as the higher priority for the OSW Technical Committee at this time.</i></p>	<p>This was initially brought up at the April 2022 WCMAC Meeting and reaffirmed at the June 2022 WCMAC Meeting. The WCMAC Steering Committee also endorsed this objective.</p> <p>This Technical Committee could provide a recommendation of engaging via a Federal Task Force and/or a State Workgroup. Due to the uncertainty of how the BOEM engagement process will proceed, the WCMAC Steering Committee suggested that WCMAC and/or an associated Technical Committee co-develop principles of engagement so any engagement venue or forum will be informed on best practices of engaging with coastal stakeholders. This allows WCMAC to be proactive ahead of any formal decisions by the State or BOEM, which the timing is still up-in-the air.</p>
<p>Original: Review existing data and data needs in light of OSW Energy unsolicited lease requests.</p> <p>Revised: WCMAC should ensure data gaps are</p>	<p>This was initially identified as an objective in the June WCMAC Meeting. If needed, develop recommendations for WCMAC to consider in filling data needs.</p> <p>This discussion will be forthcoming in future months.</p>

identified to address community questions/needs around data and information.	
--	--

- Mike prompted discussion with the following guiding questions:
 - **Do these objectives make sense? Are they specific enough? If not, what are the clarifying questions you want to pose to the full WCMAC on the Committee’s objectives and charge?**

Discussion

- Nives (in chat): It would help to have a database of stakeholders in OSW in WA. If one does not yet exist, maybe the OSW TC should add this to our list of goals.
- Larry: Understands the charge is to prescribe an engagement process. However, the data needs discussions are as important as the engagement process. Would like to see this technical committee dive deeper into what some of those data needs are. Responsibility to outline process/data gap failures from BOEM in other places (CA, OR), and make sure they are not replicated in Washington.
 - Mike clarified that the engagement objective is a timelier priority as it is currently being considered by the state and BOEM.
 - Casey: Ecology has posted a position for an ocean planner that will focus on data gaps. Ecology is increasing their capacity on this because it is such an important priority.
 - Casey framed the data objective as a 1b priority, data and engagement are equally important, but the engagement process question was flagged by governor’s office and requires our immediate attention.
 - Mike O: Agrees with Larry. Saw in OR that they lacked a perspective to get to the engagement process, was more comments. There is a great need for identifying these data gaps/needs within the engagement process.
- Corey: Agrees that the engagement objective is the more pressing time-wise. Suggests a rephrasing of Objective 2 – “technical committee” is a misnomer. WCMAC is not a technical group but is more policy and decision making oriented. Objective #2 should more-so focus on what are the questions the public want to see and need answered. What questions do people have on the impacts of OSW? For example, how would OSW affect upwelling in California current?
 - **Potentially revise 2nd objective to be:** WCMAC should ensure data gaps are identified to address community questions/needs around data and information.
- Dale: BOEM in Oregon has virtually ignored the task force work. Important to make sure BOEM has honest engagement with stakeholders.
- Mike O: Noted other data gaps would involve hydrological and ecological function, including upwelling (related to objective 2)
- Larry: Appreciates what Corey said. Filling in data gaps doesn’t necessarily mean updating maps or including new species in use maps. It is really important to capture a broader scope of what data needs are. Need adequate environmental assessments.
 - What are the pieces to have people be informed of the engagement process?

- Mike: Identified the need to rephrase second objective – address community needs. Data can mean both social and technical aspects
- Will bring to WCMAC and flag for concerns/adjustment
- Any Concerns/comments?
 - Corey: Research and Data needs derive from research or policy questions. Questions come first – and the data needs come from those questions, to try and answer the questions.
 - Casey: Great points made and agrees. Wording of the objective created some confusion, but the intent aligns with what was shared. Will need to wordsmith objective 2.
 - Mike O: Sat down with developers on OR data, the had missed area of heavy-duty fishing. The institutional knowledge that informs where fishing grounds are is critical information in identifying potential gaps.

Tools for engagement and logistics (Mike)

To fulfill the engagement objective, the tools that the TC has include:

- Propose recommendation(s) for WCMAC
 - Recommendation on Principles of Engagement
 - Recommendation on how BOEM/State should engage
- Scheduling and facilitating events or workshops to support engagement

Additionally, each TC will have 2-3 co-leads. Co-leads are appointed by WCMAC and will commit to ongoing participation in TC meetings and work with neutral conveners and staff in preparing for meetings. Co-leads will also take the role of being the liaison and spokesperson between the TC and WCMAC. What this means for co-leads is that co-leads will:

- Commit to being active in all TC meetings.
- Commit to being a liaison for the TC to the WCMAC.
- Work with the facilitation team to prepare for meetings, as appropriate and needed.

Mike prompted discussion with the following guiding questions:

- **Are there any questions about the tools that the TC has available to them? Is there any additional interest for folks to be co-leads? We will ask WCMAC to approve or appoint TC co-leads at the September WCMAC meeting.**

Discussion

- Brian: Withdrew co-lead interest due to scheduling concerns
- Larry: Requested clarity on what is meant by tools of engagement
 - Currently, the content listed under tools, seems more of an outcome

- Shared examples of what he interprets a tool would be (Task force or other working group/joint planning coordination agreement would be considered tools to him)
- As noted within the processes, there is additional opportunity for engagement
- Would like to see more discussion around the tools we can get to the end products/objectives.
- Mike O: BOEM OR had a decent idea of engagement (OR at least a set of guidelines for engagement that BOEM put out. **Will send to full group**).
 - Workshops can contribute to real dialogue as opposed to just. Would propose that once we have data to look at, we could share that in community meetings or fisheries meetings/sector levels. There is nuance in the different fishing sectors that should be recognized. This is something that BOEM has had a hard time understanding.
- Dale: Agree with what Mike O. shared. Workshop/community meetings are more productive than comments. If BOEM can be engaged. That would be better
 - Dale pointed out that there is a need to engage with more than just BOEM. There are a lot of permits related to OSW. WCMAC should develop a list of all permits and the agencies involved in approving the permits (EPA, Army Corp). There is a need to engage with all of these permit entities.
 - Brian (in chat): Understanding is that NEPA can't occur without a specified location and scope (what technology, scale of project), such that the lease is a necessary precursor for a developer to be able to consider a location without concern that another developer will try to jump in front of them. I'm not saying that it's a good process (for all the reasons that everyone has brought up), but I think that's the reason BOEM structures things the way it does.
 - Nives (in chat): this may be helpful to some:
<https://www.boem.gov/renewable-energy/state-activities/Oregon>
 - Arthur (in chat): When we develop our list of permits, we need those that are required in the ocean, and all of the permits required upland to get the energy to the grid.
- Larry: BOEM will grant leases before any of those permits are requested/provided. Fundamental problem = BOEM leases before impacts are assessed. The environmental socioeconomic considerations are not done before BOEM leases.
- Mike Recap: Gather and synthesize information around permits needed for development. Any final comments?
 - No

Engagement and OSW Process

Principles of Engagement

Mike went over the preliminary list of principles of engagement that could be provided from WCMAC and directed to the Governor's office and state agencies (edited version in table below).

Draft WCMAC Principles of Engagement		Revisions (edits in red)
1	WCMAC expects consistent and timely engagement with BOEM and the State. This means meeting multiple times a year with affected stakeholders, tribes , and agencies, and that appropriate consultation is done prior to important decision-making.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove “tribes” since BOEM has other processes to engage with Tribes in a G2G process. Steering Committee to discuss what “timely” means.
2	WCMAC expects that all decisions are informed by stakeholder perspectives and key data/information. If relevant information is unavailable, WCMAC expects that BOEM and the state address research needs and/or will describe how uncertainty is integrated into decision-making, including prior to leases are issued.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reframing this to be more about best available science rather than incorporating uncertainty. Want to eliminate as much uncertainty as possible.
3	WCMAC expects multiple forums and ways of meaningful engagement and information dissemination. There is a diversity of stakeholders, and using one type of engagement (e.g., listening sessions) is insufficient to meaningfully engage all the types of stakeholders and communities affected by offshore wind. WCMAC expects that public forums, working groups, and fisheries advisory bodies will be formed as needed to ensure robust public engagement. Additionally, multiple opportunities for input need to be provided so that the affected public can participate. Additionally, WCMAC expects that the State and BOEM meets communities where they are at and respect local timing considerations, such as fishing seasons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considerations of aligning State processes with BOEM processes? If State is leading meetings, we should expect BOEM representatives to be there. Revised to also include local timing considerations.
4	WCMAC expects transparency in this process. There have been concerns in other regions about the transparency of decision making during offshore wind planning processes. WCMAC recommends a transparent public engagement process that clearly articulates the overall process and when key decisions are going to be made.	
5	WCMAC expects the State and BOEM to integrate local and community knowledge into the data sources used throughout the permitting process. This can include using fishing locations and other types of community knowledge that is offered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New principle identified.

Draft WCMAC Principles of Engagement		Revisions (edits in red)
6	WCMAC expects all meetings are accessible and conducted in a way suitable for the intended audiences. This could mean hosting both in-person meetings for smaller communities or holding hybrid meetings for others. This is related to Principle #3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New principle identified.
7	TBD, if any	
8	TBD, if any	

Current Engagement Forums

Mike reviewed the current landscape of engagement opportunities:

- BOEM Intergovernmental Task Force¹
- State-led Workgroup¹
- WDFW Fishery Stakeholder Advisory Group – we are coordinating with WDFW
- WCMAC

Mike prompted discussion with the following questions:

- **What other takeaways/lessons learned have we missed from prior case studies/experiences that have been shared?**
- **What other principles of engagement do you want to include? What is the right format for sharing WCMAC’s recommendations?**

Discussion

- Corey
 - WDFW Fishery Stakeholder Advisory Group interest was in favor of establishing a formal group.
 - Timeline engagement is important for fisheries stakeholders.
 - Currently many questions especially as BOEM is considering the unsolicited lease requests. If there is competitive interest (as determined by BOEM), that will raise more questions.
 - Principle #1: Important to define what timely means. What is the right amount of time needed?
 - Suggested that the title “Principles of Engagement” should be word smithed. That title can be misleading.
 - How can the state led engagement process align with the BOEM process? (Aligning the state CZMA and BOEM/ federal decisions)
 - Also questions about energy generation, how much energy is produced and where does energy go?
- Brian


¹ The State has not yet determined a pathway for engagement. These two options are not mutually exclusive, and there are some case studies of when both have happened simultaneously.

- Suggested edit on Principle #3 getting multiple forms of **meaningful** engagement. Emphasize the meaningful engagement point
- CA and OR process were broadly considered to be bad. Has there been any analysis or review of why the process was so bad? Would help inform processes. If not, it would be really nice to have that.
- Suggested a postmortem on CA and OR process.
- Mike O
 - BOEM process discounted concerns of commercial fishing. Used the wrong information for fishing areas, etc.
 - Postponed announcement of call area many times. BOEM did not seem serious in their engagement.
 - Decision making process is vague, it's all based on guidelines. Not rules. No effort in the process to figure out what the cumulative impacts are. Most data will come from developers doing their own surveys.
 - 35 projects moving forward on the east coast. Never heard of them being denied for any reason.
 - For engagement, hybrid (in-person and remote) meetings are great. Fishermen can then participate while they are on the water, very important.
 - BOEM needs to be included in state meetings. Need to get BOEM on the record with community engagement.
 - There are many questions about environmental impacts, that could be answered with a programmatic environmental impact statement. Want to do a PEIS and EIS – not one or the other. Don't know how many wind turbines or wind farms will go in. PEIS can model that without disclosing what the real plan is. Need to do programmatic EIS once area is selected.
 - Sardines for sure are coming from the North Shore. Spawn 60-100 miles off-shore. So will go through wind farms – so unsure some of the impacts that will affect them.
 - Crab larvae will also be affected. Go quite a ways offshore and down with the current.
 - Other factors: bottom structure, current, wind, etc.
- Dale
 - A big problem that we could face is that is BOEM doesn't want to engage, what choice would the group have?
 - Could also engage with USCG and propose reasonable fairways to protect vessel traffic.
 - Dale also noted that WCMAC needs a process to engage in a **timely** manner. Waiting for the full WCMAC to make decisions won't be effective and meeting once a quarter may not be enough.
- Larry
 - Echo Mike O and Dale.
 - Important for WCMAC to recognize past in relation to tribal engagement
 - Tribes will meet with BOEM on their own schedule. Doubts the tribe will engage through WCMAC

- Edit on Principle #2. Concern how we would incorporate uncertainty into decision making. Rather get best available science into our decision making. Wants to eliminate as much uncertainty as possible.
- In response to Nives' question regarding the spatial scope of WCMAC's engagement, Larry shared that there are fundamentally two aspects when considering the geographic scope: Pacific coast wide and site specific
 - Site specific areas where development is likely to occur
 - Broadly, there is a need to recognize how OSW at the scale being proposed will affect and impact ecosystems and migratory paths.
 - Based on the comments Tribes have submitted, it is likely they feel similarly. Comments have noted how OSW impacts to prescribed usual and accustomed areas need to be considered.
 - Mike C. asked if Larry's response answered Nives' question. Nives confirmed that it did.
- Corey
 - How do we do better than OR and CA? This is a question that is being thought through at WDFW and other state agencies. Wan to line up decision making processes.
 - Would want to frontload things more
 - Noted that WA is not part of gigawatt goal within the Climate change agenda., WA was not on BOEMs radar.
 - Would want early engagement – want to know about the potential impacts soon. Call area process.
 - Would also want more analysis done before the leasing stages.
- Alicia: agrees with the frontloading
 - We need to think about multiple ways to engage. In person/hybrid/surveys
 - Different stakeholder groups engage in different ways
 - Need to ensure we are providing enough lead time and disseminating the engagement opportunities (leveraging stakeholders to “market” the opportunity)
- RD: cumulative effects are something we need to highlight
- Nives
 - Suggestion to include previous OR BOEM offshore wind task force members to our next meeting and learn from them about their process and what went wrong
 - ROSTER:
<https://www.boem.gov/sites/default/files/documents/regions/pacific-ocs-region/renewable-energy/BOEM%20OR%20Task%20Force%20Roster%20-%20February%202022v2.pdf>
- Casey thanked everyone for a productive meeting and a robust list of proposed principles that can be brought to the WCMAC.

Next Steps

- Cascadia will be synthesizing Principles of Engagement, incorporating edits

- 
- Further consideration of what some things mean – timely and reasonable, data consideration and engagement
 - Will want to discuss how to be proactive and frontload work further
 - OSW TC
 - Develop list that states all the permits required for OSW construction
 - Engagement stakeholder database

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee Meeting Summary
October 12, 2022 | 2pm – 4pm

Meeting Highlights

- Updates to the Principles of Engagement were discussed and the next iteration is included below (*Table 1. Draft Principles of Engagement*). Review of the Principles of Engagement will be a recurring agenda item until the draft is finalized.
- Data needs were discussed.
- Potential workplan elements were discussed.

Participants

- Dale Beasley
- Casey Dennehy
- Arthur Grunbaum
- Jenna Keeton
- Doug Kess
- Corey Niles
- Mike Okoniewski
- Brian Polagye
- Michele Robinson
- Ann Skelton
- Larry Thevik
- Alle Brown-Law, Cascadia
- Mike Chang, Cascadia
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia
- Jimmy Kralj, ESA

Welcome and Housekeeping Items

- Recording Meetings: Will not be able to record meetings as recordings conflict with public meeting requirements (OPMA). Detailed meeting notes will be taken by the consulting team and provided to the Committee with the opportunity to amend in the form of meeting summaries.
 - Larry had requested that the general WCMAC meetings and workgroup meetings both be recorded. Larry asked if the full WCMAC meetings will be recorded.
 - Casey clarified that this will apply to the full WCMAC meetings as well. Ecology has received this guidance
 - Larry thinks expanded meeting summaries be produced during future meetings to compensate.

- Dale and Larry were confirmed as co-leads during the September WCMAC meeting. Still seeking a 3rd co-lead for the OSW Technical Committee. Members can reach out to Mike and Nicole if interested.

Review Committee Objectives

Nicole read over the below objectives, which were developed by the Committee and reviewed by the full WCMAC.

Objectives
Provide guidance on engagement and/or principles of engagement to the State and BOEM.
Review existing data and community research needs considering the OSW Energy unsolicited lease requests, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See how OSW will fit (or not fit) with the MSP • Lessons learned from other OSW processes • Review of projects alignment with ORMA and other relevant policies

Draft Principles of Engagement

- Nicole reviewed the draft principles of engagement developed by the workgroup. (*Table 1. Draft Principles of Engagement* below has been edited based on the following discussion/feedback)
- **Dale** asked questions about how to bring BOEM to the table in a meaningful way that avoids the problems seen in Oregon.
 - How can we engage BOEM in a manner that focuses on outcomes?
 - Doug noted that fishing and environmental groups have been ignored in the past by BOEM and the principles need to identify ways in which to meaningfully engage BOEM.
 - Larry noted that some of the language is ambiguous, like “decisions” in principle #2. Need to understand which decisions are most important. Decisions from BOEM, by Ecology, etc. Some of these decisions should be identified by what they are and who will make them.
 - Larry also noted that a programmatic EIS would help reduce uncertainty on potential impacts by offshore wind development.
- **RD** shared that the recreational and tribal communities should be included in the principles.
 - Tribes were removed from the draft principles as there is a separate government to government engagement process with tribes outside of the WCMAC-led efforts.
 - RD said that tribes should still be included in the principles to recognize the importance of the issue.

- Doug asked that the WCMAC be kept up to-date on the progress of tribal consultations with BOEM.
- Casey noted that Ecology will be engaging with tribes and invite them to participate in WCMAC led efforts moving forward.
- **Larry** noted that an invitation should be extended to tribal communities (and recreational communities) for these and other WCMAC meetings.
 - In the research needs and data collection, public statements made by tribal communities should be included.
- **Mike O** noted that #3 Principle of engagement, “dialogue” should be added to note that these sessions are intended for idea sharing.
 - Mike provided an example of how dialogue can improve work products and outcomes in settings like this.
- **Corey** stated that the goal of NEPA is to provide decision makers and the public with timely information and meetings are intended to provide decision makers with feedback at the right time.
 - **Corey** also asked about clarifying the role of WCMAC in other state-wide efforts.
 - **Dale** asked who the “central hub” for will be for communicating between the state and Ecology.
 - In Oregon, the hub was the taskforce but there were challenges with that.
 - Casey said there is an opportunity to clarify this for the state by providing these recommendations to the Governor.
 - Dale noted that these task forces do not have affected communities (fishing, etc.) on the task force and there are very limited public engagement opportunities.
 - Casey noted that the state and Governor’s office are paying attention and tracking development of these principles of engagement.
 - Corey added that the state has recognized the need for dedicated stakeholder engagement opportunities to avoid what occurred in Oregon.

Draft Principles of Engagement (10/12/22 edited version)

One overall edit includes removing the word “expects” from the principle of engagement statements. This was found to be a low impact framing of these recommendations. More discussion on framing will be needed to finalize.

Future topic of discussion will include the need for a letter that introduces and establishes the need of these principles of engagement. This letter will set the foundation and provide an overview of WCMAC’s role in providing these principles. The letter can also reiterate/highlight WCMAC’s support for BOEM to have strong tribal engagement efforts and call out the importance of specific stakeholders/interest groups such as recreationalists.

Table 1. Draft Principles of Engagement

Draft Principles of Engagement (in no particular order)	
1	<p>Consistent and timely engagement is provided by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) and Washington State. This means meeting multiple times a year with affected stakeholders, and agencies, and that appropriate consultation is done prior to important decision-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCMAC supports the formation of a stakeholder working group or joint planning effort to participate in and inform the BOEM process. • WCMAC expects BOEM and the State to include government-to-government consultation and engagement with Tribes.
	<p>#1 was edited to clarify what type of engagement WCMAC would support/expect moving forward in this process. Discussion at the meeting noted that a task force (not only limited to federal and state agencies) could be one mode to encourage more consistent and timely engagement. Also, this is a principle where highlighting tribal engagement efforts could be incorporated.</p>
2	<p>Offshore wind decisions (e.g., leasing) by BOEM, the state, and other relevant agencies related to offshore wind development are informed by stakeholder perspectives and key data/information. If relevant information is unavailable, WCMAC expects that BOEM and the state address research needs and/or will describe how uncertainty is integrated into decision-making.</p>
	<p>WCMAC sees a need to work towards requiring a programmatic EIS before leases are issued so that large scale and cumulative environmental impacts are analyzed. This would help provide necessary data and information needed to inform decision making.</p> <p>#2 was edited to specify what types of decisions this principle is related to, and to incorporate the discussion on requiring a programmatic EIS prior to issuing leases.</p>
3	<p>Multiple forums for meaningful engagement and multiple methods of information dissemination are provided. There is a diversity of stakeholders, and using one type of engagement (e.g., listening sessions) is insufficient to meaningfully engage and support dialogue with all the types of stakeholders and communities affected by offshore wind. WCMAC expects that public forums, working groups, and fisheries advisory bodies will be formed as needed to ensure robust public engagement. Additionally, multiple opportunities for input need to be provided so that the affected public can participate.</p>
	<p>Meetings must be accessible and conducted in a way suitable for the intended audiences. The state and BOEM must meet communities where they are at and respect local timing considerations, such as fishing seasons. This could mean hosting both in-person meetings for smaller communities or holding hybrid meetings for others. It is critical that engagement support and facilitate dialogue between the impacted communities, the state and BOEM.</p>

Draft Principles of Engagement (in no particular order)	
	#3 was edited to capture the importance of dialogue in future engagement needs. Additionally, principle #6 was incorporated into #3 due to similarities.
4	The BOEM process should be transparent. There have been concerns in other regions about the transparency of decision making during offshore wind planning processes, including transparency regarding data sources and transparency in engagement processes. WCMAC recommends a transparent public engagement process that clearly articulates the overall process and when key decisions are going to be made – such as permitting decisions and engagement opportunities.
5	The state and BOEM need to integrate local and community knowledge into the data sources used throughout the permitting process. This can include using fishing locations and other types of community knowledge that is offered.
6	WCMAC expects that all meetings are accessible and conducted in a way suitable for the intended audiences. This could mean hosting both in-person meetings for smaller communities or holding hybrid meetings for others. This is related to Principle #3. (Combined with Principle #3)
6	The state and BOEM and should review other relevant laws and policies (e.g., OCSLA) to guide and inform engagement.
7	TBD, if any

Data Needs

- Ecology has hired an ocean planning position and they will begin the position next week (10/19).
 - Primary duties will help identify and coordinate data needs in regard to data needed for understanding offshore winds impacts, including impacts to oceanographic processes.
 - Data assessment not starting from scratch, will be building on previous work
 - Position will be responsible for research and providing information as well
 - One thing that has been mentioned multiple times and will be a focus is the impacts of cumulative effects of offshore wind on oceanographic processes – needs research, information, processes
 - Expect them to be at next technical committee meetings, WCMAC
- **Mike O** is excited to hear that the Ocean Planning Assistant is starting soon. He shared that we have been talking about these ocean effects with BOEM, but they turn a deaf ear – and we are missing information. Essential fish habitat is often focused on fixed bottom structures, but leaves water and hydrological processes

out. Would seem like taking wind and diminishing the amount of energy it imparts to the ocean could have a lot of dire impacts to the ocean (plankton) – Larry or others would be happy to talk with Ocean Planning Assistant to update her on what we've done so far.

- **Dale** appreciated the note about understanding cumulative effects. In Washington, there have been substantial cumulative effects on crab fishing in Washington (35% reduction in fishing determines disaster declarations by NOAA/NMFS – and WA Fisheries hit that years ago. 50% reduction in access to fish and crab on our coast). Any additional cumulative effects that deny access to crab fishing on the coast will make it impossible for future generations to fish in Washington.
- **Larry** noted that it will be important to recognize how deeply the inquiry into what floating offshore wind development may in fact mean. Site-specific, cumulatively, and overtime – all fundamental to the decision whether or not, or where such industrialization should/would/could occur. He was glad that ECY is taking a foundational approach.

Data Needs Discussion

- Nicole asked the following questions to the group for consideration:
 - What do you think are our primary data needs?
 - How do you think we should address our data needs?
 - How do you see the OSW Technical Committee engaging with the State on data needs?
 - What is the Technical Committee's role in fulfilling data needs?
- **Larry** provided the following, and noted that at this time, there is not a set prioritization of these data needs.
 - Need to update use maps in the MSP, add new overlays (Department of Defense areas, newly designated critical habitat for SRKW and humpback whales, Coast Guard fairway zones, etc.), impacts to fishing industries, cumulative impacts.
 - Research needs are much broader but equally important.
 - Also need to understand impacts on federally listed species and potential take concerns. Specifically, short-tail albatross.
 - In critical habitat areas, actions approved or funded by the Federal government are bound by many regulatory considerations associated with water quality, noise, migration patterns, impacts on forage species, etc.
- **Jenna, Brian, Michele, and Ann** had no comment at this time
- **RD** appreciated what Larry brought up, about the resident orca population and shared that we probably need to look at the pelagic birds and the whole interactive ecosystem, sea birds, sea mammals: and ask, how would this be affected? Cumulative effects are the key phrase in this whole thing – if anyone is successful in their bid, there is going to be a lot of pressure to acquire further leases. RD stated that he understands what Dale is saying – there is a whole

community that could be totally excluded at some point. And we have continental law, but we have WA laws, like ORMA and SEPA, and Marine Spatial Plans – we need to have all of that worked in prior to the leasing so the restrictions and cautions are put out here first

- RD's comment about pelagic sea birds reminded **Corey** of what the CA Energy Commission has been doing with 3D models of how pelagic birds use the oceans (related to their SeaScape planning). Not WDFW's purview, but there is an aspect of energy planning side that we're not hearing – what are the transmission needs, the energy side. Everybody is thinking about 15 megawatts traditional turbines – how much acreage is going to be needed for this?
- **Jenna** seconded Corey's point and stated that there is a need for more information on necessary port infrastructure to accommodate potential cables.
- **Corey** recommended looking at California effort. Talking about the effect on the ecosystem. When we say "cumulative impacts" I am thinking – in 20-30 years, what will the impact be? Not ignoring what's going on in Oregon and California either – California current as a whole. Changes in the ecosystem – even if there are no projects up in Washington, our communities could still be impacted.
- **Mike O** noted that it is difficult to truly assess the "cumulative impacts" unless you understand how many wind farms, how much space will be occupied – but you can do modeling – work backwards from 2050. CA keeps talking about "potential"
 - Wind deficit behind the turbines – what effects will that have on ocean hydrology?
 - Wind wakes, upwelling, stratification, spawning habitat (particularly for forage fish who go offshore to spawn), predatory relationship for those forage fish, cumulative impacts, extent of plans to do the modeling, possibility of experimental turbines before going full-in, extraction effects during times of ocean stress (like El Nino)
 - Two places to look – what's occurred in Europe and the CA coast (modeling behind the turbines)
 - Research is needed but data is already out there (academic)
- **Larry** stated the following data needs:
 - Marine Spatial Plan – on the avian species, there was no mention of one species that is endangered and is determinative in the other ocean uses, if takes of that species occur above a certain level – Short-tailed Albatross (was not mentioned in original mapping exercise, or in any original BOEM reports)
 - Need to look at all these species lists to see if there are gaps
 - Overlays – within those overlays, there are requirements: like the DOD exclusionary zones. Now the PAC PAR study by the coast guard (not approved yet, but should be mentioned or rolled in)
 - Critical Habitat descriptions – these carry certain requirements: any federally funded/permitted project that affects water quality, movement of forage fish, migration of animals in the critical habitat, or acoustic noise levels – if they affect any of those elements, those projects are not supposed to occur. Regulatory overlays have requirements.

- **Brian** said that he doesn't necessarily know if this is the right way to think about near-term actions. The data that he thinks is most useful is how to guide the development of OSW in a way that enables existing uses and existing habitat
 - Moving farther offshore – looking more like the terrestrial use of wind where agriculture occurs beneath wind turbines.
 - Doesn't see OSW being developed on the WA coast so long as the cost of OSW exceeds other energy sources.
 - Projections of OSW in 2030 and 2035 – forecasting no OSW off the US coast until 2040
 - In the long-term, OSW will probably be part of the mix, but it might not be a great use of our time now, since it might happen 10-20-30 years
 - Economics drives everything in the energy space, and OSW is currently much more expensive than the other options. The BOEM leasing process still requires environmental permitting under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and there will be many opportunities for WCMAC to provide input and guidance during the leasing phase as it moves forward.
 - **Larry** appreciated Brian's perspective, however, having watched what is going on in the leasing process, as currently BOEM applies it – there's a rush to develop OSW way ahead of some of the significant issues that Brian brought up – they aren't looking at the issues, they are leasing space. We need to develop as much information and research as possible. From what Larry is seeing so far, BOEM and developers and lenders are rushing to put projects in place way ahead of any precautionary principle, or comparing them to other alternatives
 - There may be constraints on the development, but there doesn't seem to be much constraint on the PUSH on the development
 - *Following is back and forth committee members had on the topic of OSW leasing pressure*
 - **Brian:** I agree, BOEM is driving hard on this. And the executive level targets are being flowed down to BOEM, so they are pushing the leases so they can claim progress on those goals. Leases are cheap to come by, but the construction of these projects is massively expensive – we're talking billions of dollars of investment to bring projects to fruition. There are more guardrails on the construction side than the leasing.
 - **Larry:** lease sales of off Atlantic coast totaled \$3.7 B – that seems to be a significant investment
 - **Brian:** The projects on the East coast are not floating projects – standing projects are less expensive; and East coast has higher energy at higher costs, so there are two economic factors on the East coast
 - **Mike O:** everything I've seen so far in last 4 years has been a push – I don't think it's coming from BOEM, it's coming from administration – at any cost. Reduce the amount of environmental review to speed it up even more. 34-35 different companies that are interested in the west coast right now.

- **RD** posed the question: If someone has a lease, can the lessee prohibit access to the area?
 - Casey shared that if a lease is issued, they cannot exclude people from that area, but that lease gives the holder to extract energy from that area but doesn't exclude other uses.
 - Larry added that there is no legal right to exclude other activities within a lease area; but in practice, there is a de facto exclusion of other activities; that would likely conflict with other activities in the ocean.
- **Corey** noted that a potential higher level data need is: if OSW will be developed, how can it be compatible with existing uses? This seems to be the biggest theme.

Workplan Discussion

The following list of workplan elements were provided to the committee:

- **Baseline Information & Resources**
 - Develop principles of engagement to be provided from WCMAC and directed to the Governor's office and state agencies
 - Review similar OSW efforts taking place on the coast
 - Stakeholder database
- **Engagement**
 - Understanding BOEM process and where WCMAC can engage
- **Data Needs**
 - Working through existing MSP framework
 - Review of prior data needs assessment
 - Identify data needs and provide recommendations

Nicole asked the Committee: What workplan elements are missing?

- **Dale** answered that the committee could investigate power purchase agreements
 - Need to understand who would buy this energy, and where it would go. Particularly, at the expense of fishing impacts.
 - Need to also account for inflation rates.
 - **Doug** noted that where power goes is a less important consideration now as for impacts on WA.
 - **Brian** agreed with a lot of what Dale is saying; we want to understand power purchasing agreements – Coos Bay was blocked by public utility commission as being against state law – understanding that a little bit – what those drivers look like for CA, OR, and WA
 - **Mike** shared that he was able to recently attend a Webinar – learned that one of the biggest players was Microsoft; they had made arrangements to acquire 4 GW – if companies like Microsoft and Google are investing in this, they are likely researching this heavily.
 - **Brian** added that where geographically Microsoft is purchasing that energy is key. If we're talking about fixed bottom wind, those corporate

investments make a lot of sense – look at where geographically those investments are being made – West coast is a different beast than East coast

- **Larry** shared that the Committee should look at Chapter 4 of the marine spatial plan and what that recommends in regard to engagement.
 - Also need to clarify what the guideposts are established by state, local, and federal law. Examine the fishery protection standards, data needs to assess impacts and if a proposal would meet consistency issues.
- **Corey** noted that it will be important to look at technological side of things - agree with what Brian & Larry were talking about earlier; also agree with Larry's comments (above). Will be important to build understanding about the process generally.
 - Casey added that understanding federal consistency and enforceable policies work is confusing. Thinks it's a good time to step back, look at MSP & Ch. 4 that goes into enforceable policies (that goes into data required to make decisions). Shared that he is happy to work on this and create better understanding around it.
- **Dale** stated that "Discrimination" is important in CZMA language. Ecology made Pacific County say "no fixed structures" instead of "no offshore wind", but NOAA said that language was discriminatory. Need clarification of what that word means.
 - **Corey** responded and added that fishery use protection standard that has passed NOAA's test of discrimination – that's where our focus should be. Hope to talk about this more.

Next Steps

- Committee will meet 2-3 more times prior to Dec 14th WCMAC meeting
 - Nicole will send out scheduling poll ASAP
- Principles of engagement will be updated and included in the meeting summary. Final draft of principles will be finalized in November ahead of the December full WCMAC meeting.
- Further discussion for data and workplan development is needed and will be a focus in the next meeting
 - Consulting team will synthesize data needs and recommended workplan elements to be included in the next discussion guide.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee Meeting Summary

October 27, 2022 | 1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- Revisions to the draft Principles of Engagement were discussed and the next iteration is included below (*Table 1. Revised Principles of Engagement*). Review of the Principles of Engagement will be a recurring agenda item until the draft is finalized.

Participants

- Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing Rep (TC Co-Chair)
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing Rep (TC Co-Chair)
- Henry Bell, Ecology
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Nives Dolšak, Educational institution rep
- Arthur Grunbaum, Conservation rep
- Heather Hall, WDFW
- Alicia Mahon, PNNL
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Mike Okoniewski,
- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Olivia Zimmerman, Ecology
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia
- Jimmy Kralj, ESA

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Agenda Overview

- The 10/12 OSW Meeting Summary draft was reviewed, and the following edits were provided:
 - Larry clarified that the 35% reduction threshold in fishing catch is NOAA/NMFS threshold that is used to determine fisheries disaster declarations. This is not a BOEM threshold.
 - Larry noted that the Coast Guard is proposing fairway zones for vessel traffic which prevent the construction of fixed structures. By default, these zones would prevent offshore wind development within the fairways.
 - Larry requested the list of regulations related to federally designated critical habitat be expanded to include migration routes and impacts on forage fish species.

- Nicole will reconcile the draft and send out a meeting summary finale to Committee members.
- Meeting Reschedule. Originally, the group had proposed to hold a meeting on November 10th, but the group had little availability.
 - The group agreed that a mid-November meeting would be necessary to prepare for the December full WCMAC meeting.
 - Nicole will send a scheduling poll for a meeting in mid-November and reschedule the existing Meeting invite.

Engagement and Offshore Wind Process

- Nicole provided a summary of the revisions made to the draft principles since the last meeting of the workgroup. Revisions were included in the meeting packet provided prior to the meeting.
- The order of the principles was revised to begin with those related to the overall engagement process, followed by those focused on more specific aspects of stakeholder engagement.

Principle of Engagement Edit Discussion

- Dale stated that the Principle 2 (consistency and timely engagement) is not specific enough to avoid the pitfalls observed in the Oregon process. The BOEM engagement process must allow for public participation. The purpose of WCMAC and the MSP are to protect existing ocean uses including fishing.
- Mike noted that under Principle 1 (transparency), transparency has many different facets. It is important to understand the difference between the guidelines that BOEM follows and the rules that are in place. Additionally, it will be important to learn the decision-making process and who is involved in making decisions.
- Larry stated that Principle 1 captures the intent of that principle. He proposed adding “permitting decisions and engagement” to the language and adding “leasing, permitting, and engagement” at the end.
- Nives noted that at present, the list appears to align with BOEM’s engagement steps at the surface level. Given that the workgroup has expressed serious concerns with BOEM’s engagement efforts in other states, she suggested more details be added to clarify what is expected of BOEM in Washington. She proposed explicitly listing what occurred in Oregon and why it should not be repeated in Washington.
 - Adding more details (like the make-up of a taskforce, meeting frequency, etc.) can help point towards a clearer understanding of the processes desired in Washington.
 - Larry noted that the recommendation of a stakeholder inclusive taskforce is an important decision, however, details about its composition, etc. may not be able to be made by this workgroup.
- Casey suggested including an opening statement at the beginning of the document that explains why the principles were developed and what process should be followed in Washington.
 - This statement could include language about what went poorly in Oregon.

- Casey also noted that the full WCMAC will review these principles in December and they will then be sent to the Governor. Given the timeline, there may not be time to add additional details at this point.
- Larry shared that the problem with the BOEM-led intergovernmental task force is that it excludes stakeholders. However, federal statute says that BOEM can invite local state and tribal governments to a task force or provide other opportunities for joint planning or coordination agreement as provided in CFR 585.102. This may be an opportunity to support a more stakeholder inclusive process.
 - Larry suggested the WCMAC support the development of a stakeholder inclusive taskforce in lieu of the BOEM-led intergovernmental task force.
 - Casey suggested changing the language of Principle 2 to read “WCMAC believes any joint planning efforts incorporate stakeholder input and engagement”.
- Corey agreed with Casey’s proposal to include an introductory paragraph and suggested the group discuss the stakeholder engagement components with the full WCMAC committee.
 - Corey also stated the introductory paragraph discuss the fishery protection standards.
- Dale suggested the group review the original language in the legislation that established WCMAC and agreed with Larry that a stakeholder inclusive process is necessary.
- Larry clarified that his proposal for a stakeholder inclusive task force is in addition to the WDFW-led fishing stakeholder group.
- Nives questioned that if this workgroup recommends WCMAC support a stakeholder inclusive process in lieu of the BOEM-led intergovernmental task force, will the process miss out on anything?
 - Casey suggested that language be included that supports a stakeholder inclusive process instead of “in lieu” language.
 - Henry proposed that several versions of the language could be developed and presented to the full WCMAC as a suite of options.
 - Larry suggested the workgroup could note their preferred option.
 - Larry stated that his preference is something similar to the “in lieu” language.
 - Mike stated that he doesn’t think we can get anything worse than the current process by asking for something different.
- Nives asked if an environmental assessment could be completed before a call area is determined.
 - Alicia stated that some environmental assessment occurs during the transition from call area to wind energy area.
 - Corey shared that BOEM’s argument is that they cannot complete environmental analysis before a call area is determined.
- Larry proposed editing principle 3 to include socioeconomic impacts and ecosystem effects.
- Dale shared that the cumulative impacts in WA are much higher than in CA and OR given the limited area along the WA coast that has the potential for offshore wind energy development. BOEM must consider cumulative impacts well before leasing is completed.

- Larry also noted that cumulative impacts vary and differ between the impacts from a single turbine array/development and a full scale coastwide offshore wind buildout over time. He suggested keeping the term “cumulative” in the third principle to capture the wide range of potential impacts.
- Nives stated that the third principle is similar to what was outlined in Oregon related to data collection and stakeholder engagement. She suggested making it more clear at the beginning that a programmatic assessment is needed.
- Brian Polayge (not present) provided text comments and said that a programmatic assessment could be a non-starter for BOEM.
- Larry shared that the state also has authority to “say no” by not issuing a consistency certificate under the Coastal Zone Management Act.
 - Casey clarified that the state can object, but it is not “saying no”. Federal agencies can appeal an objection to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce.
 - However, Casey noted that the state can use the federal consistency determination to influence projects and add certain design criteria.
- Dale shared that the WCMAC should support the Coast Guard fairway zone proposal which would provide protections against fixed structures.
- Larry suggested adding “leasing process” to all references of permitting to capture the full spectrum of BOEM decisions.
- Nives suggested shortening principle 4 to make it more concise.
- Henry stated that principle 5 should point back to previous principles related to transparency and engagement.
- Dale suggested language be included to have BOEM show how local input was integrated into decision making.
- Larry proposed removing the statement about using fishing locations and other types of data because there are so many examples and we don’t want to be limiting.
- Larry said that specific laws should be added to principle 6 including ORMA, Fisheries Protection Standards, OCSLA (specifically, the congressional policy statement).
 - Dale and Larry stated that hyperlinks to the laws should be added so people can readily access them.

Principles of Engagement

Below are preliminary principles of engagement that could be provided from WCMAC and directed to the Governor’s office and state agencies. **Edits from the 10/27/22 OSW Technical Committee meeting have been incorporated.**

Goal: Finalize the draft principles of engagement by November 29th for the December WCMAC meeting.

Overall edits:

1. Providing more details and context (where appropriate) will be important. These recommendations will be submitted with an opening statement/letter that describes why WCMAC is putting forth these principles of engagement and how WCMAC believe these recommendations should be used.

- Letter could allude to the sentiment that lack of timely engagement happened in Oregon, and it would not be acceptable in Washington.
- Letter will set the spatial scale (Washington Coast, Pacific Coast)
- Letter will discuss the fishery use protection standards.

Table 1. Revised Principles of Engagement

Draft Principles of Engagement	
1	<p>The BOEM process should be transparent. There have been concerns in other regions about the transparency of decision making during offshore wind planning processes, including transparency regarding data sources and transparency in permitting decisions and the engagement processes. WCMAC recommends a transparent public engagement process that clearly articulates the overall process and when key decisions are going to be made – such as announcement of call areas, leasing, permitting, and engagement opportunities.</p>
<p>Principle #1 - It was discussed that “transparency” has many different facets and we may need to elaborate on what is meant by a transparent process. Do we feel that the definition as stated captures what is meant by a transparent process?</p>	
2	<p>Consistent and timely engagement is provided by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) and Washington State. This means meeting multiple times a year with affected stakeholders, and agencies, and that appropriate consultation is done prior to important decision-making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1: WCMAC supports a joint planning or coordination agreement that includes stakeholder interests in lieu of an intergovernmental task force. • Option 2: WCMAC believes any joint planning efforts must incorporate stakeholder input and engagement and supports the formation of a stakeholder working group or joint planning effort to participate in and inform the BOEM process. • WCMAC expects BOEM and the State to include robust government-to-government consultation and engagement with Tribes.
<p>Principle #2 - Two options for consideration regarding stakeholder involvement in the BOEM process. Committee should select an option that is preferred.</p>	
3	<p>WCMAC believes that a programmatic EIS is needed to ensure that large scale and cumulative environmental, socioeconomic impacts, and ecosystem effects are analyzed. This would help provide necessary data and information needed to inform decision making.</p> <p>Information and data used in offshore wind decisions (e.g., leasing) by BOEM, the state, and other relevant agencies related to offshore wind development must be informed by stakeholder perspectives and key data/information. If relevant information is unavailable, WCMAC expects that BOEM and the state</p>

Draft Principles of Engagement	
	address research needs and/or will describe how uncertainty is integrated into decision-making.
Principle #3 - edits involved reframing the recommendation for a programmatic EIS – stating why WCMAC believes one should be done, but not explicitly stating that it should be done before leases are issued. This principle was rearranged to highlight that large scale and cumulative impacts should inform decision making.	
4	<p>The state and BOEM need to integrate local and community knowledge into the decision making used throughout the leasing and permitting process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple forums for meaningful engagement and multiple methods of information dissemination must be provided. WCMAC expects that public forums, working groups, and fisheries advisory bodies will be formed as needed to ensure robust public engagement. Additionally, multiple opportunities for input need to be provided so that the affected public can participate. • Meetings must be accessible and conducted in a way suitable for the intended audiences. The state and BOEM must meet communities where they are at and respect local timing considerations, such as fishing seasons. This could mean hosting both in-person meetings for smaller communities or holding hybrid meetings for others. It is critical that engagement support and facilitate dialogue between the impacted communities, the state and BOEM. • BOEM should be transparent as to where local and community knowledge has been recognized in the decision-making processes.
Merged principle #4 and #5 and refined the points on community engagement.	
5	<p>The state and BOEM should review relevant laws and policies (e.g., ORMA, Fisheries Protection Standards, OCSLA) to guide and inform engagement.</p>
Principle #5 - Edited to fix typos and include relevant laws and policies. The relevant laws and policies would be hyperlinked in final version.	
6	<p>TBD, if any</p>

A draft opening statement that incorporates points made by the committee will be included in the upcoming 11/17 Meeting Agenda Packet.

Workplan Development

We did not get to this portion of the agenda; however, this will be a focus once the draft principles of engagement are finalized.



WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

OSW Technical Committee Meeting Summary

November 17, 2022 | 2 – 4 PM

Meeting Highlight

- Revisions to the draft Principles of Engagement were discussed and the next iteration is included below (*Table 1. Revised Principles of Engagement*). The upcoming 11/29 meeting will be the final meeting to discuss the Principles of Engagement before the 12/14 WCMAC meeting.
 - Please send line edits or comments on the revised Principles of Engagement and Accompanying Letter draft to Nicole prior to the November 29th OSW TC meeting.

Meeting Summary Contents

Attendees 1

Engagement and Offshore Wind Process 2

 Revised Principles of Engagement 2

 Accompanying Letter Draft 4

Meeting Summary 6

 Welcome and Agenda Overview 6

 Principles of Engagement Discussion 7

 Next Steps 11

Attendees

- Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing Rep (TC Co-Chair)
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing Rep (TC Co-Chair)
- Doug Kess, Pacific County Marine Resources Committee
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultant
- Ann Skelton, Pacific County Marine Resources Committee
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Arthur “RD” Grunbaum, Grays Harbor Marine Resources Committee
- Nives Dolšak, Educational Institution Rep
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia Consulting Group
- Alle Brown-Law, Cascadia Consulting Group
- Jimmy Kralj, ESA



Engagement and Offshore Wind Process

Revised Principles of Engagement

Below are preliminary principles of engagement that could be provided from WCMAC and directed to the Governor’s office and state agencies. **Feedback from the 11/17/22 OSW Technical Committee meeting have been incorporated.** Please note that not all edits discussed are reflected below due to level of specificity or due to being better suited for future recommendations pertaining to data needs and gaps.

Goal: Finalize the draft principles of engagement by November 29th for the December WCMAC meeting. **Please send any line edits or comments to Nicole prior to the 29th meeting.**

Table 1. Revised Principles of Engagement

Draft Principles of Engagement	
1	<p>The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) process must be transparent. WCMAC recommends a transparent public engagement process that is timely and aligns with the sequential review of environmental considerations and clearly and repeatedly articulates the overall process and when key decisions are going to be made (e.g., announcement of call areas, designation of wind energy areas, leasing, permitting, and engagement opportunities).</p> <p>There have been concerns in other regions about the transparency of decision making during offshore wind planning processes, including transparency regarding data sources, permitting decisions, and the engagement processes. WCMAC believes that for BOEM to achieve transparency in their process, the following principles of engagement would need to be followed.</p>
<p>Principle #1 – This principle was reorganized to highlight the recommendation for a transparent engagement process and how this process must align with sequential review of environmental considerations (this would include processes such as NEPA).</p> <p>The Committee also discussed the need to state that this principle, which highlights transparency, is an overarching need that can be achieved in part by adhering to the following principles of engagement.</p>	
2	<p>BOEM and the state need to provide consistent, timely, and meaningful engagement opportunities. This means meeting multiple times a year with key affected communities, stakeholders, rightsholders, and agencies, and that appropriate consultation with these groups is done prior to important decision-making such as siting, leasing, and permitting decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 1: WCMAC supports a joint planning or coordination agreement that includes affected stakeholders’ and state and federal agencies in lieu of an intergovernmental task force.

Draft Principles of Engagement

- Option 2: WCMAC believes any joint planning efforts must incorporate stakeholder input and engagement and supports the formation of a stakeholder working group or joint planning effort to participate in and inform the BOEM process.
- Option 3: WCMAC supports a joint planning or coordination agreement that includes affected stakeholders', state, and federal agencies to inform the BOEM process. WCMAC recommends an alternative approach to standard intergovernmental Task forces that includes participation of affected stakeholders.
- WCMAC expects BOEM and the State to include robust government-to-government consultation and engagement with Tribes.

Principle #2 – The beginning was expanded to include rightsholders and examples were added to elaborate on what is meant by “important decision making”.

Three options for consideration regarding stakeholder involvement in the BOEM process are included.

- Option 1 was identified as the preferred option for most TC members and was expanded to make clear that this option would include state and federal agency representative on the joint planning effort.
- No changes recommended for Option 2.
- Option 3 was **added** to capture the point made in Option 1, but to offer alternative language that elaborates on the need for an alternative approach be developed for Washington.

Please note that it is not the intention for all options to be presented to the full WCMAC if consensus can be reached amongst the OSW TC.

3

BOEM, the state, and other relevant agencies must engage with key stakeholders and coastal community members to inform and vet the data and information used in decision making (e.g., siting and leasing). Utilizing current research, data, and information is of paramount importance to inform the understanding of large scale and cumulative environmental, socioeconomic, and ecosystem impacts from offshore wind development. WCMAC strongly recommends that a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) be initiated to comprehensively evaluate these potential impacts to the California Current region.

If relevant information is unavailable, WCMAC expects that BOEM and the state address research needs and/or will describe how uncertainty is integrated into decision-making, such as the designation of avoidance areas.

Principle #3 – Originally, the need for a PEIS was the opening point for this principle. However, recognizing that this list of recommendations is for **principles of engagement**, and not addressing data needs/gaps, the insertion of WCMAC advising a PEIS be conducted has

Draft Principles of Engagement

been **integrated into the need for BOEM to engage with key stakeholders and community members to inform and vet current data and information.**

Additional language was added to highlight the importance of using the most current and informed data to understand ecosystem and socioeconomic impacts.

- 4** **BOEM and the state need to integrate local and community knowledge into decision making used throughout the leasing and permitting process.** WCMAC believes this can be achieved by:
- Providing multiple forums and methods for meaningful engagement and information dissemination. WCMAC expects that public forums, working groups, and fisheries advisory bodies will be formed as needed to ensure robust public engagement. Additionally, multiple opportunities for input need to be provided so that the affected public can participate.
 - Ensuring meetings and workshops are accessible and conducted in a way suitable for the intended audiences. The state and BOEM must meet communities where they are at and respect local timing considerations, such as fishing seasons. This could mean hosting both in-person meetings for smaller communities or holding hybrid meetings for others. It is critical that engagement efforts support and facilitate dialogue between the impacted communities, the state, and BOEM.
 - Being transparent and sharing where local and community knowledge has been recognized in the decision-making processes.

Principle #4 – Added in workshops as a method of meaningful engagement. Bullet points were slightly modified to flow better, and the key sentence was underlined.

- 5** **BOEM and the state should review relevant laws and policies to guide and inform engagement.** WCMAC expects that BOEM will describe to affected stakeholder and coastal communities how projects will comply with these laws.
- Examples of relevant laws and policies include:
- [Ocean Resources Management Act](#)
 - [Fisheries Use Protection Standards](#)
 - [Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act](#)
 - [Local Shoreline Master Programs](#)

Principle #5 – Added language to identify an action that would be expected from BOEM in relation to reviewing relevant laws and policies. Added Local Shoreline Master Program as an example of relevant laws and policies.

Accompanying Letter Draft

- Letter would be formatted using the WCMAC template and modeled similar to previous letters to the governor (see the [WCMAC 2021 Recommendations](#) for example).

- The principles of engagement recommendations will be submitted with an opening statement/letter that describes why WCMAC is putting forth these principles of engagement and how WCMAC believe these recommendations should be used.
 - Letter could allude to the sentiment that lack of timely engagement happened in Oregon, and it would not be acceptable in Washington.
 - Letter will set the spatial scale (Washington Coast, Pacific Coast)
 - Letter will discuss the fishery protection standards.

SUBJECT: Washington Coast Marine Advisory Council 2022 Offshore Wind Principles of Engagement

Dear Governor Inslee,

The members of the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) wish to thank you for your continued support in building a resilient coastal Washington. Presently, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) has received two unsolicited lease requests to develop offshore wind projects off the coast of Washington. As representatives of coastal partners and interests that will be most impacted by offshore wind development, members of the WCMAC have developed a suite of recommendations and expectations about how coastal communities should be meaningfully engaged by BOEM as it advances its review and consideration of these requests.

WCMAC was created, in part, to provide recommendations to the governor, Legislature, and state and local agencies on coastal resource management issues ([43.143.060 RCW](#)). The governor's office requested WCMAC identify and recommend key principles of engagement related to the BOEM offshore wind leasing and permitting processes. This request came in the wake of an unsolicited lease request from [Trident Winds](#) (292 square miles). This was then followed by an additional unsolicited lease request for an even larger offshore wind farm from [Hecate Energy](#) (403 square miles). The growing interest in developing offshore wind energy off our coast calls for timely and strong leadership to set the state's expectations for BOEM to conduct robust engagement efforts with affected communities.

In August 2022, WCMAC formed the Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee to execute two main objectives:

1. Provide recommendations on principles of engagement to the state and BOEM.
2. Review existing data and community research needs considering the offshore wind unsolicited lease requests.

At the December 2022 WCMAC meeting, members came to consensus on a list of key principles of engagement that would be necessary for BOEM and the state to follow to ensure a transparent, meaningful, and inclusive engagement process (*Approval TBD*). We believe that these recommended principles represent broad engagement standards that BOEM should

follow and must be further developed collaboratively amongst BOEM, the state, and Washington's coastal communities.

Additionally, WCMAC members have noted past challenges and shortcomings of BOEM's engagement efforts with coastal stakeholders in other Pacific states during similar leasing and permitting processes. As such, these principles of engagement convey the importance of avoiding these pitfalls in Washington. Washington must urge BOEM to understand that timely and meaningful engagement with coastal communities is required. The state must also confirm that BOEM understands this requirement is due in large part to our state's [Marine Spatial Plan](#) (MSP) which explicitly states that offshore wind development must not have significant adverse impacts to defined important, sensitive, and unique areas (ISUs) and must comply with established protection standards for fisheries. As such, new ocean uses involving offshore wind development must demonstrate that a proposed project will have no adverse effects on an ISU located within or adjacent to the project site. Projects must also demonstrate no likely long-term significant adverse effects to fisheries and that all reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize social and economic impacts to fishing and fish dependent communities.

The WCMAC membership is committed to supporting these principles of engagement using our capacity as a group and through the organizations we represent. To ensure BOEM fulfills these principles of engagement, we ask you to consider the following requests:

- Present these recommendations to BOEM leadership to make clear how the state expects BOEM to engage with coastal communities throughout offshore wind leasing and permitting processes.
- Commit to work with WCMAC and relevant state agencies to further develop and implement our Principles of Engagement.
- Other?

We appreciate your leadership, as well as the expertise and energy of state agency staff, which enables WCMAC to serve as a conduit for creating sustained partnerships that address the most pressing issues facing coastal Washington ecosystems and communities. Please give your support to our voices so that our Washington coast can be resilient, thrive, and continue to contribute strongly to the state's prosperity.

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Agenda Overview

- Nicole reviewed the 10/27 OSW Meeting Summary Draft and asked if anyone had any edits. She noted that Larry had sent in edits, which were reflected in the current Meeting Summary draft.
- Larry noted several edits to the Summary.

- On page 1, the second hollow bullet: "By default these zones would prevent offshore wind development within the fairways."
- On page 3: Adding "local" to "state and tribal governments, as well as "or provide other opportunities for joint planning or coordination agreement as provided in CFR 585.102." I want it to be understood that this is proposed in BOEM's own guidelines, and that there is a difference between a small t "taskforce," versus a big T "Task Force." A big T "Task Force" is what happened in Oregon. I wanted to show that there is a basis for what I'm asking to do, or what some of us collectively are asking to do.
- On page 4: Editing the sub-bullet to read: "Larry also noted that cumulative impacts vary and differ between the impacts from a single turbine array/development and a full scale coastwide offshore wind buildout over time."
- Mike mentioned the importance of evaluating cumulative impacts, particularly socioeconomic and ecosystem effects. There is a big difference between 4-5 wind farms and 45 wind farms, for fishermen and the environment.

Principles of Engagement Discussion

Principle 1

- Casey asked who had suggested adding the word "sequentially," and why?
 - RD summarized his suggestion, saying that "sequentially" reflects a sequential review of steps; BOEM should sequentially look at these things, similar to NEPA, ORMA, and in some respects, SEPA.
 - Casey understood what RD was trying to include, but thought it was confusing in this sentence.
 - RD was open to any wordsmithing that would make that clearer.
- Larry appreciated what RD was recognizing – that transparency is more than a statement or a collection of meetings, which may or may not satisfy a box-check by BOEM. That doesn't mean that they've listened or responded to any comments that were submitted. "Sequentially" gets at the idea that BOEM claims they are transparent, but how can they create a process that is responsive to the meetings they have conducted?
 - RD agreed with what Larry said.
- Larry suggested adding "leasing and permitting processes" after offshore wind in the first sentence and add "designation of Wind Energy Areas (WEAs)" after call areas in the last sentence.
- Mike shared that there needs to be serious consideration, dialogue, communication, building a bridge to find meaningful solutions to problem areas – is as important as transparency to the process. As of now, we've asked a lot of questions of BOEM and gotten no response. The transparency was there: they just told us they weren't going to answer the questions. Engagement is more than just transparency itself; I look at it as a medium instead of an action. It is what takes place after they provide transparency that I think matters.
 - Nicole thanked Mike for his comments and noted that the later principles go farther to define meaningful engagement.

- Dale agreed with what Mike said, mentioning that there's more to this than transparency. It has to do with the responsiveness of BOEM, and BOEM hasn't been responsive. He proposed adding the language: "with open consensus-building discussions before decisions are made." BOEM must listen to what's going on and try to incorporate it in a consensus-based process, like we do at WCMAC.
 - Mike agreed with Dale's comments about asking for a consensus-driven process.
 - Larry added that the key part of transparency is the response to participants that offer comments within the engagement process. With OR and CA, when hundreds of comments were sent to BOEM, BOEM never offered any specific answers to the submitted comments/queries. BOEM must create a mechanism to account for where all the comments go, and who is responding to them. I've seen EIS processes where the overseeing agencies (like DOE, ECY) would answer each comment that was submitted, and there seems to be nothing within what BOEM claims as a "transparent process" that captures that necessary piece of engagement.
 - Nives asked, in the chat, if what we meant by transparency was a regular feedback loop on how they incorporate feedback?
 - Nives added that one essential element is that BOEM respond and show how they've incorporated the feedback. She also mentioned that Principle #2 captured what Mike was asking for.
- Nicole noted that transparency is a theme that runs throughout the next several Principles of Engagement. She asked if people were interested in noting that the elements of transparency are addressed in other principles.
 - RD suggested including a sentence says: "Including but not limited to those items cited below."
 - Casey suggested "elements of transparency are further described below."
 - Larry countered that we need to better elaborate what transparency would mean, either in process or result, in Principle 1.
 - Jimmy suggested editing the sentence that starts with "WCMAC recommends a transparent public engagement process..." to say "engagement process that is timely, aligns with the sequential review of environmental considerations, and clearly and repeatedly articulates..."
 - Larry stated we must demonstrate that each principle brings its own solutions to its own posed problem, but also points back to the original issue of transparency.

Principle 2

- Larry requested that we reference the CFR in Principle 2, to show there is a basis for non-governmental stakeholder groups to be involved in BOEM's engagement. In the 585.211B Siting Requirements/Area Identification Requirements, BOEM states "We will do this in consultation with federal, state, local, tribes, and other interested parties." "Other interested parties" would be WCMAC. Either way, BOEM must actively and meaningfully engage with this stakeholder group.
 - Larry added that BOEM's existing guidelines dictate that "other interested parties" are included in that decision-making, particularly for the most important decision

points, like siting. Yet, “other interested parties” are excluded from BOEM’s (capital T) Task Force. Larry suggested that it is important for WCMCAC to request the (small t) task force in lieu of the (capital T) Task Force, because the (small t) task force could include other interested parties (aka non-governmental stakeholders).

- Mike offered a slightly different view on Option 1 versus Option 2. WDFW could convene a stakeholder group of recreational and commercial fishermen who could work as an advisory body (a (small t) task force). We are learning on these state agencies to protect our interests, the state’s interests, and maintain the laws – it would be a real advantage to have non-agency stakeholders as part of that group.
- Mike suggested that the language of “affected parties” rather than “interested parties,” because anyone could be an interested party.
- Larry added that any taskforce should not preempt what is already a requirement in the MSP: that the WDFW will conduct industry discussions. Those would be under the auspices of WDFW and would be in addition to the theoretical (small t) task force. A (small t) task force would not preempt WDFW or other agencies to convene a stakeholder group through their agency. The only reason he referred to the 585.102 and 585.211B guidelines is because those are *BOEM’s* guidelines, and seem to present an opportunity for WCMAC to be involved.
- Dale mentioned how important it is that we have knowledgeable stakeholders at the table. In 2021, at the Oregon Task Force meeting, BOEM showed fishing harvest maps that only showed 10% of the total harvest area, and no one on the OR Task Force questioned that map. That’s why it’s important to have someone who is familiar with the circumstances and is willing to speak up.
- **Nicole asked for each committee member’s option preference:**
 - Dale preferred Option 1, as long as we clarify the “affected” stakeholders.
 - Doug preferred Option 1, and liked Dale’s edit.
 - RD preferred Option 1, and liked Dale’s edit. He suggested “affected stakeholders and other interests,” to expand it enough.
 - Corey did not have a preference at this time.
 - Nives did not want to give up the potential for two processes and thus had a slight preference for Option 2.
 - Mike leaned towards a hybrid option with stakeholders and related agencies convening in addition to the WDFW advisory process.
 - Larry preferred Option 1 and clarified that “in lieu of” means in lieu of a (capital T) Task Force that *only* includes government representatives and excludes any affected stakeholders. Larry noted that the WDFW advisory process would be especially important if we don’t do Option 1.
 - Dale agreed with Larry’s comment.
- Nives asked if tribes should be addressed in the beginning sentence. Do we need to add “right holders” in addition to “stakeholders” in the top?
 - Larry responded that this shouldn’t be exclusive of tribal treaty rights. However, CFR 585.102 specifically lists tribal participation in a (capital T) Task Force (it calls

for state, local, and tribal government participants). We are trying to add in the affected stakeholders that are non-governmental. If it is helpful to re-assert that tribal governments can be in the (small t) task force, we can.

Principle 3

- Mike noted that the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is not a replacement for a project EIS. The project EIS is not going to cover the cumulative impacts that a programmatic EIS would cover. They are meant to go hand in hand.
- Dale seconded Mike's comment, noting that when there are environmental, social, and ecosystem effects, they must be thorough analyses, not just check the box.
 - Nicole noted that this Principle talks about data needs (like the programmatic EIS) *and* recommends any information and data used is informed by stakeholder perspectives.
 - Dale agreed, mentioning he wants to ensure there is sufficient data/scientific inquiry. We must make sure there is more certainty in the decision-making, rather than allowing uncertainty to reign.
- Larry added that the PEIS is a fundamental piece of the Principles of Engagement. When you look at the comments submitted to BOEM up and down the coast, by so many different and diverse stakeholder groups, there is an echoing request for a Programmatic EIS for these projects. It's fundamental that we make this request.
 - Larry recommended that we insert a sentence or capture the concept that this PEIS and its included data must satisfy analysis requirements in MSP guidelines. PEIS must provide sufficient data to allow comparison to enforceable policies and MSP guidelines.
- Mike commented that uncertainty is usually accompanied by a buffer in fishing. We want to prescribe that, in decision-making, high uncertainty should lead to a more cautious approach to the projects themselves.
- Casey noted that language about meeting MSP guidelines may be redundant as it is implied by words "necessary data and information."
- Casey suggested that this principle be separated into two separate principles. The bolded sentence at the top makes it seem like whole principle is about a Programmatic EIS. We don't want to bury the lead that information and data is incredibly important to decision-making and process.
 - Doug stated he felt ok to combine these two things.
 - RD noted that, for the individual stakeholder who is less familiar with review processes, it would be helpful to expand the language so it is clear that the PEIS must be comparable to MSP guidelines.
 - Nives liked both portions of text and wanted to keep them.
- Dale suggested that we add stronger language at the start – "believes" isn't a strong enough word, we could change believes to "needs."
 - Larry agreed that we should be more explicit at the start. There are a host of other entities who have requested a PEIS, and these statements might help us feel more comfortable about strengthening our language.

- Dale noted that BOEM has clearly stated in the past that they will not change their process to include a PEIS. That doesn't mean we have to roll over and let it be. BOEM has set up a process where they can't fail but to lease ocean.
- Doug suggested that we simplify the language: "WCMAC believes there must be a Programmatic EIS to ensure.."
- Larry agreed with Doug's suggestion.
- Nicole asked if these changes ("WCMAC believes there must be...") capture a stronger request?
 - Larry added that WCMAC could also "*Request*" or "*Recommend*." He welcomed anything that would strengthen that language, with the fundamental understanding that WCMAC wants and requests a PEIS.
 - Mike agreed, the more forceful we are the better – we can't force BOEM, but we can certainly recommend that it must be done.
 - Dale agreed that "recommends" is much stronger than believes.
- Mike argued that separating Principle 3 is a better way to go. He stated that research and the need for data is of paramount importance, and it fits into more aspects of the Principles of Engagement than just a PEIS or an EIS down the road. The research is needed; there are many environmental systems (temperature, upwelling, chlorophyll) that need a better understanding.
 - Nicole agreed that this principle could be separated, as it would allow both principles to stand out.
- Larry suggested that we add "prior to leasing" after "ecosystem effects are analyzed" in the first sentence.
 - Nives agreed, noting that Massachusetts has also requested a programmatic EIS *prior to leasing*.

Principle 4

- Mike stated that any information about fishing or fishing practices needs to be vetted by fishing community experts that are currently fishing *and* that have historical knowledge. BOEM's data and mapping, whether done by a working group or advisory body, needs to be means-tested and vetted by prolific fisherman who know what's going on and have some historical background as well.
- Mike suggested that we add "workshops," because he's found workshops to be one of the most effective engagement methods.

Principle 5

- *Did not have enough time to discuss Principle 5.*

Next Steps

- Nicole noted that the last OSW Technical Committee meeting before the December WCMAC is on 11/29. Nicole will share the revised document before the meeting so people can read through the changes and come to the meeting ready to discuss further.

- Casey added that the Committee only has two more hours, so we really need to focus on fine-tuning. We can't make major changes at this point, please do your homework in advance, so you can come with specific, minor tweaks.
- Mike asked if we could reserve three hours on 11/29. Larry agreed.
- Nicole responded that three hours is a long meeting, and we don't want to exclude folks who can't attend. The next meeting will be facilitated with this timing in mind, and the goal is to reach consensus on the principles of engagement as a committee.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

OSW Technical Committee Meeting Summary

November 29, 2022 | 10:30 AM – 12:30 PM

Meeting Highlights

Final revisions to the draft Principles of Engagement were discussed and the Committee agreed to present the draft Principles to the full WCMAC in the December WCMAC meeting.

Meeting Summary Contents

Attendees	1
Engagement and Offshore Wind Process	1
Final draft Principles of Engagement	1
Draft Letter	3
Meeting Summary	5
Appendix A – PEIS & cumulative impact analysis requests	10

Attendees

Voting Members

- Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing Representative (TC Co-Chair)
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing Representative (TC Co-Chair)
- Arthur "RD" Grunbaum, Community Seat
- Brian Polagye, University of Washington, Energy Seat
- Corey Niles, WDFW, Agency Representative
- Michele Conrad, Coastal Economic Development Seat
- Nives Dolsak, Educational Institution Seat

Non-Voting Members

- Alicia Mahon, PNNL
- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Henry Bell, Coastal Planner, Ecology
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants

Facilitation Team

- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia
- Jimmy Kralj, ESA
- Alle Brown-Law, Cascadia

Engagement and Offshore Wind Process

Final draft Principles of Engagement

Final Draft Principles of Engagement	
1	<p>The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) process must be transparent. WCMAC recommends a transparent public engagement process that provides sufficient time for BOEM to understand stakeholder and coastal community concerns and aligns with the sequential review of environmental considerations and clearly, and iteratively articulates the overall process and when key decisions are going to be made (e.g., announcement of call areas, designation of wind energy areas, leasing, permitting, and engagement opportunities).</p> <p>There have been concerns in other regions about the transparency of decision making during offshore wind planning processes, including transparency regarding data sources, permitting decisions, and the engagement processes. WCMAC recommends that for BOEM to achieve transparency in their process, the following principles of engagement would need to be followed.</p>
2	<p>BOEM and the state need to provide consistent, timely, meaningful, and responsive engagement opportunities. This means meeting multiple times a year with key affected communities, stakeholders, rightsholders, and agencies, and that appropriate consultation with these groups is done prior to important decision-making such as siting, leasing, and permitting.</p> <p>Option 1</p> <p>WCMAC supports a joint planning or coordination agreement that includes affected stakeholders and local, state, and federal government executives and agencies in lieu of a limited participation intergovernmental task force. WCMAC also expects BOEM and the State to include robust government-to-government consultation and engagement with Tribes.</p> <p>Option 2 (Majority of OSW Technical Committee members preferred Option 2)</p> <p>WCMAC supports a joint planning or coordination agreement that includes affected stakeholders and local, state, and federal government executives and agencies to inform the BOEM process. WCMAC recommends an alternative approach to standard intergovernmental task forces that includes participation of affected stakeholders. WCMAC also expects BOEM and the State to include robust government-to-government consultation and engagement with Tribes.</p>
3	<p>BOEM, the state, and other relevant agencies must engage with key stakeholders, fishing industries, and coastal community members to publicly inform and vet the data and</p>

Final Draft Principles of Engagement	
	<p>information used in decision making (e.g., siting and leasing) to establish and verify data and areas of potential conflict. Utilizing current research, data, and information as well as filling data and information gaps is of paramount importance to inform the understanding of large scale and cumulative environmental, socioeconomic, and ecosystem impacts from offshore wind development. WCMAC strongly recommends that a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) be initiated and completed before leasing to comprehensively evaluate these potential impacts to the region and the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem.</p> <p>If relevant information is unavailable, WCMAC expects that BOEM and the state address research needs and/or will describe how uncertainty is integrated into decision-making, such as the designation of avoidance areas.</p>
4	<p>BOEM and the state need to integrate local and community knowledge into decision making throughout the leasing and permitting process. WCMAC believes this can be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Providing multiple forums and methods for meaningful engagement and information dissemination.</u> WCMAC expects that public forums, working groups, and fisheries advisory bodies will be formed as needed to ensure robust public engagement. Additionally, multiple opportunities for input need to be provided so that the affected public can participate. • <u>Ensuring meetings and workshops are accessible and conducted in a way suitable for the intended audiences.</u> The state and BOEM must meet communities where they are at and respect local timing considerations, such as fishing seasons. This could mean hosting both in-person meetings for smaller communities or holding hybrid meetings for others. It is critical that engagement efforts support and facilitate dialogue between the impacted communities, the state, and BOEM. • <u>Being transparent and sharing where local and community knowledge has been recognized and incorporated in the decision-making processes.</u>
5	<p>WCMAC expects that decision makers will review and apply relevant laws and policies, which will be used to guide and inform engagement with BOEM, and that those laws and policies will be made readily available to the public.</p> <p>Examples of relevant laws and policies include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marine Spatial Plan for Washington's Pacific Coast • Ocean Resources Management Act • Local Shoreline Master Programs • Fisheries Use Protection Standards • Important, Sensitive and Unique Areas Protection Standards • Other Enforceable Policies under the CZMA • Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act

Draft Letter

SUBJECT: Washington Coast Marine Advisory Council 2022 Offshore Wind Principles of Engagement

Dear Governor Inslee,

The members of the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Council (WCMAC) wish to thank you for your continued support in building a resilient coastal Washington. Presently, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) has received two unsolicited lease requests to develop offshore wind projects off the coast of Washington. As representatives of coastal partners and interests that will be most impacted by offshore wind development, members of the WCMAC have developed a suite of recommendations and expectations about how coastal communities should be meaningfully engaged by BOEM as it advances its review and consideration of these requests.

WCMAC has been operating as a forum for a wide range of coastal stakeholders with a variety of interests, inviting tribal participation in meetings and engagement processes, for nearly a decade. It was created, in part, to provide recommendations to the governor, Legislature, and state and local agencies on coastal resource management issues ([43.143.060 RCW](#)). The governor's office requested WCMAC identify and recommend key principles of engagement related to the BOEM offshore wind leasing and permitting processes. This request came in the wake of an unsolicited lease request from [Trident Winds](#) (292 square miles). If developed, Trident Wind would be one of the largest floating offshore wind developments along the West Coast and anywhere in the world. This was then followed by an additional unsolicited lease request for an even larger offshore wind project from [Hecate Energy](#) (403 square miles). The growing interest in developing offshore wind energy off our coast calls for timely and strong leadership to set the state's expectations for BOEM to conduct robust engagement efforts with affected communities.

In August 2022, WCMAC formed the Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee to execute two main objectives:

1. Provide recommendations on principles of engagement to the state and BOEM.
2. Review existing data and community research needs considering the offshore wind unsolicited lease requests.

At the December 2022 WCMAC meeting, members came to consensus on a list of key principles of engagement that would be necessary for BOEM and the state to follow to ensure a transparent, meaningful, and inclusive engagement process. We believe that these recommended principles represent broad engagement standards that BOEM should follow and must be further developed collaboratively amongst BOEM, the state, and Washington's coastal communities and affected stakeholders.

Additionally, WCMAC members have noted past challenges and shortcomings of BOEM's engagement efforts with coastal communities and affected stakeholders in other Pacific states during similar leasing and permitting processes. Previous engagement processes have been too rapid, have not provided early nor sufficient notice of engagement opportunities, and BOEM's past engagement efforts have lacked adequate information to ensure coastal communities and affected stakeholders can make informed decisions. As such, these principles of engagement convey the importance of avoiding these same pitfalls in Washington. Washington must urge BOEM to understand that timely and meaningful engagement with coastal communities and affected stakeholders is required. The state must also confirm that BOEM understands this requirement is due in large part to our state's [Marine Spatial Plan](#) (MSP) which explicitly states that offshore wind development must not have significant adverse impacts to defined important, sensitive, and unique areas (ISUs) and must comply with established protection standards for fisheries. As such, new ocean uses involving offshore wind development must demonstrate that a proposed project will have no adverse effects on an ISU located within or adjacent to the project site. Projects must also demonstrate no likely long-term significant adverse effects to fisheries and the ecosystems fisheries depend on, and that all reasonable steps are taken to avoid and minimize social and economic impacts to fishing and fish dependent communities.

The WCMAC membership is committed to supporting these principles of engagement using our capacity as a group and through the organizations we represent. To ensure BOEM fulfills these principles of engagement, we ask you to consider the following requests:

- Present these recommendations to BOEM leadership to make clear how the state expects BOEM to engage with coastal communities throughout offshore wind leasing and permitting processes.
- Commit to work with WCMAC and relevant state agencies to further develop and implement our Principles of Engagement.
- Make clear to BOEM that WA stakeholders feel that the BOEM task forces convened to date have **not** been effective at incorporating affected stakeholder priorities in the leasing process and that significant changes to the process are required.

We appreciate your leadership, as well as the expertise and energy of state agency staff, which enables WCMAC to serve as a conduit for creating sustained partnerships that address the most pressing issues facing coastal Washington ecosystems and communities. Please give your support to our voices so that our Washington coast can be resilient, thrive, and continue to contribute strongly to the state's prosperity.

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Agenda Overview

- The 11/17 OSW Meeting Summary was held for review until next meeting, to leave sufficient time for review of the Principles of Engagement.

Principle 2

- Larry had suggested edits based on CFR 585.102, which outlines the BOEM task force process with state, local, and tribal governments.
 - Casey questioned the language of “federal government executives.”
 - Larry answered that the CFR specifically says, “executives from local, state, tribal, and federal governments.” He wanted to capture the CFR’s existing language while not excluding agency participation, because the CFR doesn’t specifically mention agencies, so he added in agencies and kept the “executives” language.
 - Casey understood Larry’s concern but expressed that the sentence is slightly confusing as is.
- Corey (in chat) noted a grammatical edit (delete an apostrophe on stakeholders).
- **Option Preferences:**
 - Michele preferred Option 3.
 - RD preferred Option 3 as long as we have the next bullet that includes the tribes.
 - Larry splits his vote between Option 1 and Option 3.
 - Brian preferred Option 3.
 - Corey abstained.
 - Dale preferred Option 1, as long as it includes the public and fishing interests.
 - Mike preferred Option 3. Option 1 seemed to leave a possibility for not including affected stakeholders.
 - Nives preferred Option 3.
- The Committee will suggest Options 1 and 3 to the full WCMAC and incorporate the line edits in the version that will be presented.
- Corey commented that the Committee seems to be expressing that the overall engagement and decision-making timeline cannot be rushed, and that we need to add language that explains this.
- Larry mentioned that he offered an edit to the last bullet (on tribal participation), which suggested WCMAC recognize that the tribes can, at any time, participate in this process with the WCMAC. Tribes are always welcome to be involved with WCMAC, if they choose to be.
 - Casey shared that Ecology has recently reached out to the tribes, to make sure they are aware and welcome to participate.

- Larry responded that this will be a public document as much as it is an internal document, so we should include this recognition of tribal participation.
- Nicole suggested that we include that recognition in the letter to the Governor.
- Henry agreed (in chat) that including this in the cover letter makes sense.
- Dale noted that “timely, meaningful engagement” does not fully cover what we want to do. WCMAC has missed multiple opportunities for public comment in the last several months. Our quarterly meeting schedule doesn’t allow us to engage with these opportunities. We must figure this out, so the entire process doesn’t pass us by.
- Corey mentioned that BOEM asked the State of Oregon how they wanted to do planning, and how long planning should take. Corey asked the Committee if there was a length of time that felt adequate. We want meetings to align with decision-making points.
 - Dale proposed that WCMAC’s meeting schedule must change so WCMAC can be timely and responsive as a group.
 - Larry appreciated Corey’s comment but noted that there is a distinction between timely responses and setting a timeline. We don’t want to box ourselves into a timeline, but we want to have more timely responses where it seems appropriate. This is captured in the red text explanation of the Principles.

Principle 3

- Mike commented that fishing experts need to vet and confirm BOEM’s data and maps, because in previous BOEM engagement processes, BOEM used inaccurate data to evaluate fisheries impacts. Without review from fishermen, the engagement isn’t meaningful. His edits add this fisheries review/vetting process.
 - Corey noted that the WDFW fisheries stakeholder engagement process includes this kind of review. There’s no harm in including this in the Principles.
- **Option Preferences:**
 - Nives shared that the above option is too long and might lose readers’ attention. She preferred the below option, or moving key text from Mike’s suggestion to the context paragraph that begins with “Utilizing current research...”
 - Dale agreed with Mike’s additions in the above option; it’s very important to elaborate on vetting information with fishing experts. He preferred the more specific option, so that BOEM can’t do the same process they’ve done in other places.
 - Michele supported the language and intent of Mike’s comment. She inquired about the reference to landing data, since that is unlikely to be a data source that BOEM would use in siting decisions or selection of call areas. She proposed removing the word “landing,” because the intent is to have the fishing community review any data used by BOEM.
 - Mike agreed that “landing” could be removed.

- RD agreed with Michele's edit, and Nives' comment about not making this too long, and perhaps incorporating this into the bottom portion.
- Larry supported Mike's comment about BOEM's past data, noting that data gaps have allowed BOEM to make false claims. He suggested the following edit to incorporate Mike's comments: "BOEM, the state, and other relevant agencies must engage with key stakeholders, **fishers/fishing industry**, and.... **to establish and verify data and areas of potential conflicts.**"
 - Mike agreed with Larry's suggestion but added that the vetting process should be done **publicly**. Previously, BOEM has been selective and private about who they've talked to.
 - Dale agreed with Mike about getting the right people to the table.
- Nives noted in the chat that if we keep the below section, we should include a public review of data used in BOEM selection process, and suggested the language of "utilizing current data, filling in the gaps, and publicly reviewing the data used..."
- The Committee agreed on the edited language.

Principle 4

- Larry added language to clarify that data should specifically be "incorporated."
- Nives and RD gave thumbs up, and no one had additional comments.

Principle 5

- Larry noted that we can include a link to the enforceable policies under the CZMA. Nicole also confirmed that all the hyperlinks would be live.
- Casey suggested we include one link to an Ecology website or document that summarizes the enforceable policies.
 - Henry provided the enforceable policy links to include:
 - Website: <https://ecology.wa.gov/Water-Shorelines/Shoreline-coastal-management/Coastal-zone-management/Programs-policies/Federal-consistency>
 - Document: <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/SummaryPages/2006013.html>
- Corey proposed edits to the language about BOEM's compliance with the laws, noting that we want to encourage a state and federal discussion with BOEM, rather than allowing BOEM to describe to us what will happen. We want an independent state review process.
 - Larry agreed with Corey. He added that what the state considers consistent with our enforceable policies is not determined by BOEM. There will be a state-led process to determine whether any proposed projects comply with Washington's enforceable policies, and that decision will be up to the state, not BOEM.

- Nicole clarified that this language specifically refers to each policy's rules of engagement with stakeholders, rather than consistency certification.
 - Larry responded that we don't want BOEM to have the final say on whether or not projects are in compliance with the enforceable policies.
 - Henry agreed with Nicole's clarification. These policies should be guiding and informing engagement, which is very different than BOEM reviewing a state's enforceable policies. That process is well established. The question here is whether we want policies to inform BOEM's engagement.
- Henry mentioned that it is good to leave the bullet "enforceable policies under the CZMA" because that leaves it open for changes in the future.
- Nives asked (in chat) if the state's review and decision accomplish what we are trying to do in this Principle.
 - Larry noted that it is important for BOEM to consider these laws/policies at the outset. We are placing a responsibility on BOEM, even though they will not be the final determiners of that consistency. We're not substituting BOEM's look at the laws for the state's evaluation of the laws.
 - Nives expressed concern that if we create principles for processes that already exist, they might take weight away from the principles.
 - Larry suggested removing the references to BOEM and state that these laws should be referenced and utilized throughout the engagement processes.
 - Corey responded that the public should understand what the laws are and how they're going to be evaluated. He suggested the language: "WCMAC expects that the public understand relevant laws and policies, which will be used to guide and inform engagement."
 - Larry commented that this needs to be more inclusive and suggested "WCMAC expects the public and decision-makers will identify/review relevant laws and policies, which will..." or "WCMAC expects the public and decisionmakers will review laws and policies, which will be used to guide and inform engagement with BOEM."
 - Nives suggested (in chat) the words review or utilize.
 - RD suggested (in chat) "... review and apply relevant laws"
- Dale noted that, in past experiences, he's had trouble understanding each Agency's interpretation of the policies' meaning, since they often differ.

Principle 1

- Dale suggested that we need a stronger word than "believes" in the last sentence. Nives proposed "expects," and Larry proposed "recommends."
- No additional edits were proposed.

Principle 2 (Revisit)

- Corey noted he would argue that BOEM is being transparent now, and the Committee's concern is actually about the speed at which decisions are being made. The only word that conveys that concern is "meaningful" engagement, which communicates our need for slower timelines.
 - Ann suggested (in chat) that we add language about meeting a sufficient number of times.
 - Larry cautioned against setting a timeline, since BOEM sticks to their own timeline whether they have adequate data and public comment, or not. We don't want to put ourselves in the same trap, so the emphasis should be on "timely" engagement, rather than timelines.
- Larry suggested that "meaningful" could be interpreted quite broadly and with varied results. He suggested: "BOEM and the State need to provide consistent, timely, meaningful, and responsive engagement opportunities."
- Nives reflected that both the words "adequate" and "meaningful" are open to interpretation and asked if we could suggest an arbiter review the engagement/data and give confirmation that BOEM could move on to the next step. Perhaps that arbiter could be WCMAC?
 - Nicole responded to Nives' suggestion, saying that we might have to hold this Principle back before sending to the full WCMAC.
- Corey responded to Larry's concerns, noting that Larry seems to not be concerned about a timeline in general, but about too short a timeline.
- Michele clarified that Corey and Larry are saying two different things. Corey addressed that the overall process should take whatever time is necessary to work through the issues, ensure that BOEM understands what the stakeholder concerns are, and that stakeholders understand how BOEM is planning to address these concerns. Larry's focus on "timely" means that there is adequate time, advance notice, and understanding on the part of the stakeholders. Michele suggested these ideas both need to be captured here. The language in Principle 1 could be edited to: "public engagement process, that provides sufficient time for all parties to sequential review of environmental considerations."
 - Michele noted that the engagement process should be iterative. It should provide adequate time for stakeholders to understand the process and for BOEM to understand and address stakeholder concerns.
- Mike noted that transparency also includes taking stakeholder concerns into account in a transparent way. The parties involved should feel that they have a say in the outcome.
- RD shared (in chat) that the final adequacy of the process would presumably be determined through litigation.

Consensus Vote on finalizing the Draft Principles of Engagement

- Can the Committee move forward without objection to present these as draft principles to the full WCMAC in December?
 - Yes, all in agreement to share these with the full WCMAC (5 Thumbs Up, 0 Thumbs Down).

Letter to the Governor

- Larry suggested an addition: "If developed, Trident Wind would be one of the largest floating offshore wind developments along the West Coast and anywhere in the world."
 - Mike agreed with Larry's addition.
- Larry suggested an addition to fifth paragraph, in the last sentence: "and the ecosystems that fisheries depend on."
- Corey noted that BOEM gives a lot of deference/weight to what the Governor thinks. We want to emphasize that what we're asking for: that the Governor ask BOEM to engage with WCMAC in the process.
- In the third bullet on the final page of the letter, Corey suggested adding more context about WCMAC's concerns with the previous engagement processes: timelines are too fast to make an informed decision, and engagement has been ineffective.
 - Dale agreed with Corey's suggestion.
- Nicole noted that we will incorporate a note that tribal engagement is voluntary and we have extended the invitation to tribes.

Next Steps

- Nicole summarized that she will incorporate these edits and make clean version for the December WCMAC discussion guide. Additionally, she will add the suggestions into the Governor's letter.
- Nicole will follow up via email to organize OSW Committee meetings in 2023.
- Casey thanked everyone for their time and effort on the Principles of Engagement.

Appendix A - PEIS & cumulative impact analysis requests

During the development of the Principles of Engagement, Larry Thevik provided the following summary of several examples of PEIS and Cumulative impact analysis requests from a variety of stakeholder and interested entities. Larry noted that this list excludes Seafood industry requests for the same (which are numerous).

Oceana: We urge a Programmatic EIS that considers BOEM's offshore wind energy program throughout the California Current ecosystem. Until such a comprehensive analysis is conducted,

neither the government nor the public will have the information to properly assess the tradeoffs associated with offshore wind development in this area

Defenders of Wildlife: BOEM has ample precedent for preparing and EIS early in the commercial wind leasing and permitting process. The agency routinely prepares Programmatic EISs for Five-Year Oil and Gas Leasing Programs and lease sales.

Quileute, Quinault, Hoh: The cumulative impacts to salmon from such dams were unforeseen at the time of construction, and the minimal mitigation conducted (i.e. fish ladders) proved ineffective over time, leaving fish unable to migrate up or down these river systems. Looking to the current proposal, we are mindful that the California Current is a designated Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) and the "river" that supports the ecosystems of the west coast.

AMERICAN BIRD CONSERVANCY: An Environmental Impact Statement is Appropriate, Rather Than An Environmental Assessment Appropriate siting is far and away the most important aspect of minimizing the environmental impacts of wind energy facility development and operation. For this reason, an environmental impact statement (EIS) is appropriate now, in the early stages of planning for this WEA, to ensure that this location is reasonable for development, i.e., impacts to wildlife will be minimal. More in-depth analysis at the outset of this process would not only provide an opportunity to ensure that impacts of this new industry are minimized, but this would reduce the chances for stakeholder conflict later in the review process. A Robust Analysis of Cumulative Impacts is Needed The rapid pace at which OSW energy planning and development is occurring does not allow for meaningful learning about impacts with sufficient time to adjust practices as additional facilities are being built. A robust cumulative impacts analysis should be conducted for wind energy planning in the U.S. Pacific that takes into account the risks of collisions with turbines, displacement, and barrier effects, and how these interact with other industrial activities with regard to impacts on birds. A cumulative impacts assessment should encompass port development to support the OSW industry, if needed, as this is related and may result in substantial environmental and social impacts.

OCEAN FOUNDATION: The Humboldt Wind Energy Area (OSW "Proposed Project") needs a full NEPA process, including preparation and public review of a full Environmental Impact Statement, to be done now, not just an incomplete Environmental Assessment (EA).

Submitted by the Natural Resources Defense Council, National Audubon Society, Whale and Dolphin Conservation, Humboldt Baykeeper, Ocean Conservation Research, Surfrider Foundation: Cumulative impact is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.

OCEANA: We urge a Programmatic EIS that considers BOEM's offshore wind energy program throughout the California Current ecosystem. Until such a comprehensive analysis is conducted, neither the government nor the public will have the information to properly assess the tradeoffs associated with offshore wind development in this area. At a minimum, BOEM must consider the

impacts of the full project as a lease is an irretrievable commitment of resources the practical effect of which will result in the installation of a large floating offshore wind facility off California

DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE: BOEM has ample precedent for preparing and EIS early in the commercial wind leasing and permitting process. The agency routinely prepares Programmatic EISs for Five-Year Oil and Gas Leasing Programs and lease sales, despite the fact that such actions are taken well in advance of site-specific exploration or development and production activities. Leasing for offshore wind development is no different; leasing is a necessary preliminary step that will influence future planning and permitting decisions. An EIS is needed to analyze the reasonably foreseeable environmental consequences of issuing commercial wind leases in the Humboldt WEA. Not only is such analysis required to meet the requirements of NEPA, but such analysis will provide important information regarding impacts and alternatives at a point in the process where meaningful decisions can be made to avoid or reduce significant impacts.

Quileute, Quinault, Hoh: 8/22/22 Letter to BOE--Comments regarding "Guidelines for Mitigating Impacts to Commercial and Recreational Fisheries on the Outer Continental Shelf Pursuant to 30 CFR Part 585," Docket ID, BOEM-2022-0033: The cumulative impacts to salmon from such dams were unforeseen at the time of construction, and the minimal mitigation conducted (i.e. fish ladders) proved ineffective over time, leaving fish unable to migrate up or down these river systems. Looking to the current proposal, we are mindful that the California Current is a designated Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) and the "river" that supports the ecosystems of the west coast. The proposed series of large offshore wind projects off the west coast must consider cumulative impacts to the overall west coast ecosystem, not just the local project area. Projects of the scale proposed will have local and regional impacts over time that have yet to be determined. It is the responsibility of BOEM, not proposed developers, to slow the leasing and permitting process for west coast offshore wind development to enable BOEM and affected communities to develop full understandings of the immediate and long-term environmental, socio- economic and Treaty impacts of constructing, operating and eventually decommissioning these massive facilities, including those being placed in the California Current LME.

Makah: Oregon Call areas: BOEM2022-0009-0001 See attached Specific PEIS request: Cumulative Impacts--Need for Programmatic EIS for West Coast: we recommend that BOEM conduct a programmatic EIS for proposed offshore energy development on the West Coast to better understand the cumulative impacts of offshore energy development on the California Current ecosystem. We understand that BOEM has previously conducted a PEIS for offshore renewable energy in 2009 after it was added to BOEM's authorities. The scale and scope of the proposed technology for offshore renewable energy has evolved considerably since this time, as our understanding of climate change impacts in the marine environment--making the 2009 EIS largely obsolete. Most of the technology being proposed for the West Coast (floating offshore wind) doesn't exist at anywhere near the scale of the proposals we are seeing. We want to emphasize that NOAA is conducting an extensive EIS process as part of analyzing Aquaculture Opportunity Areas on the West Coast. The Makah Tribe has also had to undergo extensive EIS

processes in order to exercise the treaty right to whale, which have much smaller-scale and more spatially-limited scope of impacts.

OREGON WILD: BOEM-202-0009-001; There are six proposed "Call Areas" for offshore wind development on the U.S. West Coast, all of which are within the globally significant California Current ecosystem which is used by a wide variety of fish & wildlife. The cumulative impacts of development in all these areas considered together should be studied in a programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) before any decisions are made. A West Coast-wide Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) is necessary before identifying Wind Energy Areas to avoid piecemeal permitting and to make sure that siting is informed by a cumulative-impacts analysis. Seabirds, whales and fish range widely across multiple areas now under consideration for wind development. A PEIS will provide a transparent consideration of larger, ecosystem wide issues and it can be done in a way that does not delay the process and could lead to better outcomes.

**Portland Audubon · American Bird Conservancy · Oceana · Surfrider Foundation
Kalmiopsis Audubon Society · Cape Arago Audubon Society · Audubon Society of Lincoln
City Lane County Audubon Society · Umpqua Valley Audubon Society · Salem Audubon
Society Audubon Society of Corvallis · Rogue Valley Audubon Society · Klamath Basin
Audubon Society East Cascades Audubon Society · Redwood Region Audubon Society ·
Native Fish Society Oregon Wild · Oregon Chapter of the American Cetacean Society ·
Coast Range Forest Watch Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition:** Prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Pacific Coast FOSW projects before identifying WEAs off Oregon to ensure full consideration of the high-value biological resources and oceanographic dynamics in the CCLME off Oregon (pp. 10-13)

Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC): Sept: 2021 letter to BOEM; "that the direct and indirect effects of wind energy areas on fisheries, habitats, and ecological resources should inform all wind energy scoping process and must do so in advance of leasing, permitting, and construction phases of wind energy development" **PFMC-2022-0009-0001:** the Council believes more focused analysis and engagement is necessary before WEAs are identified. Adverse effects on fishing communities are likely to be irreversible and long-lasting. BOEM should take the time to ensure that the decision on how to meet wind energy goals while minimizing adverse impacts to fisheries is open, transparent, and thorough. Lastly, the Council understands BOEM is unlikely to switch to a programmatic approach to environmental impact analysis, but nonetheless echoes the belief that it would be an improvement. The current process leaves detailed environmental impact analysis to the very end, and again, when the time and funding expended effectively forecloses the consideration of alternative project locations and when an action alternative would appear to be all but a foregone conclusion. A programmatic approach would better account for reasonably foreseeable wind energy acreage needs and improve public understanding of the likely cumulative impact to the California Current and its fishing communities.

Conduct a comprehensive cumulative effects analysis during the Area Identification phase to examine the likely combined effects of all activities associated with individual lease sales and

multiple lease sales on ocean processes and habitats on the Oregon Coast and the California Current Ecosystem

ODFW Comments on Oregon Call Areas: ODFW recommends that BOEM (and/or partners) conduct a robust cumulative effects analysis evaluating the effects of multiple activities on ocean processes and habitats on the Oregon Coast and throughout the California Current Ecosystem (Affected Environment) as soon as possible, and no later than during NEPA. This analysis should encompass all proposed, existing or reasonably foreseeable offshore wind sites off California, Oregon, and Washington, and spatial designations other than OSW that also may affect existing resources or existing uses within the Affected Environment.

California Coastal Commission: Comments on Humboldt Call and WEAs: The Commission agrees that a primary focus for this CD is to analyze effects of lease exploration activities—such as site characterization and assessment—and that it is not possible at this time to analyze the precise effects that future construction and operation of offshore wind projects will have on coastal resources. However, it is reasonably foreseeable that the leases will lead to construction and operation of at least some offshore wind facilities. It is also feasible to describe, at least at a high level, the types of impacts that such facilities could have on coastal resources. Review of this consistency determination is the state's opportunity to examine the impacts of offshore wind development at a programmatic level and to assess whether the Humboldt WEA is an appropriate place to site offshore wind in California.

On behalf of Whale and Dolphin Conservation, Natural Resources Defense Council, National Wildlife Federation, Center for Biological Diversity, National Audubon Society, and NY4WHALES, and our members and supporters, we submit these comments on the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) Call for Information and Nominations (Call) for Commercial Leasing for Wind Energy Development on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Offshore Oregon: We recommend BOEM conduct a PEIS to ensure a comprehensive and transparent analysis to identify suitable WEAs. The area covered by this analysis should be advised by this Call, and incorporate review of areas that may be proposed to the west of the current Call Area boundaries, beyond a depth of 1,300 m, as siting development in deeper waters may reduce conflict with especially vulnerable marine life and with existing ocean uses. A PEIS would also analyze cumulative impacts to at-risk species, especially important given the additional offshore wind locations planned elsewhere on the West Coast. For species that utilize large areas of the California Current Ecosystem (CCE), including large whales and migratory seabirds, development in multiple parts of their habitat, especially if one or more of those areas is essential for foraging, breeding, or any activity critical to a species' survival, can exacerbate risk. A cumulative impacts analysis is crucial to identify and understand the collected risk.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee Meeting Summary

January 17, 2023 | 1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- The Technical Committee reflected on successes in 2022.
- Mai Aoki presented Ecology's proposed data needs assessment framework, and TC members discussed pressing data needs, mapping updates, and goals for 2023.

Participants

Voting Members

- Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing representative (TC Co-Chair)
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing representative (TC Co-Chair)
- Nives Dolšak, Educational institution representative
- Brian Polagye, Energy representative
- Arthur "RD" Grunbaum, Coastal Conservation group representative
- Michele Conrad, Coastal Economic Development Seat

Non-Voting Members & Facilitators

- Alicia Mahon, PNNL
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia
- Alle Brown-Law, Cascadia
- Jimmy Kralj, ESA

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Agenda Overview

Nicole welcomed attendees to the Technical Committee meeting and asked if anyone had questions or edits to the Meeting Summaries for the 11/17/2022 or 11/29/2022 committee meetings.

- Larry asked if he could send any edits to Nicole in the next few days. He appreciated that the 11/29 Meeting Summary included other entities' submitted comments on the BOEM engagement process. He asked if the statements were shared with the full WCMAC.
 - Nicole noted that finalized technical committee summaries are always attached to the quarterly WCMAC meeting discussion guide, so the statements would be included there.

Announcements

- Alicia shared information about an upcoming webinar on the Transmission Siting and Economic Development Grants program, hosted by the Grid Development Office. Webinar information will be distributed to the rest of the technical committee after the meeting.

OSW Technical Committee Objectives & Review Progress to Date

- Nicole reviewed the Technical Committee (TC) objectives (see status table in Discussion Guide).
- Nicole thanked everyone for working on and finalizing the Principles of Engagement. The final letter of principles of engagement was sent to the Governor's office.
- Casey celebrated the committee's successes thus far and thanked everyone for their work on the principles of engagement.
- Dale commented that one overriding TC objective should be to do no harm to our coastal communities, as they exist today.
 - Larry agreed with Dale's comment. The fundamental purpose of the MSP, besides presenting data, was to find areas off our coast that would potentially offer opportunities for alternative uses but would not interfere or cause harm to existing ocean uses. We were charged to find areas where there was *minimal* impact on existing uses before an alternative use would then be allowed.
 - Casey discussed that an objective of "do no harm" would be a difficult standard to hit. Washington's laws and policies are intended to minimize any long-term impact. The objective of reviewing existing data and research needs acknowledges that we can't look at new ocean uses without data in hand to test and ensure we are minimizing impacts. We are driving to those standards, that's why the work we will do in the coming year is incredibly important, to see that we live up to those standards.
- Larry noted that, in the Discussion Guide's objectives table, the third bullet should expand to say "...ORMA, enforceable policies under the CZMA, and other relevant ocean use policies."
 - Nicole mentioned that the objectives are intentionally broad as we determine our next steps.
- Brian noted that he was surprised by the amount of money spent for the BOEM lease sale in California. He had assumed that amount to be the anticipated lifetime payment to BOEM, but it is actually money out the door today for the potential to develop. Brian was surprised by how large this value was considering the lack of market for offshore wind energy in California. Additionally, he reviewed Washington's 2021 State Energy Strategy (the state's projected energy use to 2050). For Washington to try and meet its clean energy goals, it must replace fossil generation. Per the 2021 State Energy Strategy, all additional electricity is forecasted to come from expanded transmission lines from Montana and Wyoming. Washington's electrical capacity does not change. Under any potential constraint conditions, then some offshore wind energy would be needed to generate sufficient electricity. Under this scenario, offshore wind would come into use around 2040.
 - Larry appreciated Brian's input and added that what Brian summarized is something that we need to include in our data needs. Particularly, information on the expectations of need, alternatives, and potential cost of OSW off the coast of WA.

- Larry also agreed with Casey’s comment on how important data collection and analysis will be. However, Larry argued that there is a difference between *minimal* impacts and *minimizing* impacts. Minimizing impacts does not come close to minimal impacts. We must be careful to not be trapped by use of the word “minimizing.”
- Dale added that one of his largest concerns is for getting new, young fishermen into our business. Our next generation of fisherman are going to feel impacts from floating OSW that we don’t feel today. How are we going to study the long-term impacts, which will be on the next generation of fishermen? The information, as we look ahead, will be impossible to nail down. We must use a precautionary approach, because as Larry said, there is a big difference between “minimal” impacts and “minimized” impacts.
- Mike commented that fishermen are the best resource to speak about the impacts of OSW on the fishing industry. We need that qualitative information to go along with the quantitative data collection, because data collection alone can be spotty. There are two things that keep getting left out of discussions: the ecological impacts of offshore wind development, and the potential impacts on food security.

Data Needs / Data Gaps Assessment

- Nicole noted that the Committee has a longer timeline with the second objective (data needs) than the timeline for the principles of engagement. A final deliverable for this objective could be a letter of recommendation to the governor, but that’s not the only possible outcome.
- Mai explained Ecology’s proposed approach for identifying data needs. The approach focuses on four topics: biology, ecology, socioeconomics, and culture. Much of this work was informed by a data assessment completed by Ecology in 2020. From the data gaps identified through that process, Ecology will focus on those related to potential ocean use conflicts. The purpose of this data gaps assessment is to identify and prioritize information needed to assess the potential impact of new ocean activities.
- Larry asked for the documents developed by Mai to be distributed to the technical committee. He also noted that he summarized some data needs at the December WCMAC meeting, and would like follow up on some of the suggestions he made. Additionally, Larry reminded the Committee that updating our marine resources maps and identifying areas of conflict between potential and existing uses was not discussed during the 2020 data assessment.
- Brian suggested an additional question that asks, “Why is this data need is a priority?”
 - Mai answered that she will include this question for consideration. Much of the “why” will come from whether the data will help the state evaluate future projects.
- Dale raised recent examples from the East Coast about negative impacts from offshore surveys and wind development on whales and other marine mammals. When we get to the ocean, data needs that are necessary are next to impossible to acquire. Some of the data needs that need to be developed are impossible to gather. He noted the challenge of these uncertainties.
 - RD agreed with Dale and Larry’s comments.
- Michele appreciates what Mai presented. She explained that the information presented by Mai outlines the initial steps to identify data that is currently available and data that is still needed. This effort is not an attempt to capture all sources of information, but this provides a useful starting point in finding a path to move forward.
- Nives noted the areas that she has more experience in, and is happy to help with. She thanked Mai for planning a schedule for the year.

- Mike agreed with Dale’s comments about the whale deaths on the East Coast. It emphasizes the importance of cross-referencing data and information with fishermen, to assess the cumulative impacts of new industrialization in the ocean.
- Larry asked when the Committee will discuss updates to the use maps (such as including DOD flyways), and when the work to update resource and use maps would occur?
 - Mai stated that this would be included under known information since it has already been developed and only needs updating.
- RD shared (via Chat) that he was greatly impressed by a demonstration of Delf3D and ran across this: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352340919312764>. Perhaps we could get this model to present the WA coast.
- Nives noted (via Chat) that for the socioeconomic and culture topic areas, we have a starting point with the Puget Sound Partnership data/indicators:
 - Cultural wellbeing: <https://vitalsigns.pugetsoundinfo.wa.gov/VitalSign/Detail/21>
 - Economic vitality: <https://vitalsigns.pugetsoundinfo.wa.gov/VitalSign/Detail/22>
 - Good governance: <https://vitalsigns.pugetsoundinfo.wa.gov/VitalSign/Detail/23>
 - Sense of place: <https://vitalsigns.pugetsoundinfo.wa.gov/VitalSign/Detail/24>
 - Stewardship: <https://vitalsigns.pugetsoundinfo.wa.gov/VitalSign/Detail/25>
- Dale discussed that crab is the only commercial species that can support Washington’s coastal communities over time. However, in use mapping, crab fishing was weighted the same as recreational activities. Therefore, the use maps do not adequately map the needs of our coastal communities. In addition, maps used in Oregon during the offshore wind planning process inaccurately represented fishing uses along the Oregon coast. Dale noted the importance of being able to ground-truth information related to existing fishery-dependent communities, to ensure we have viable coastal communities and coastal ports.
 - Mai shared that analyzing existing maps will be a step after this first step of identifying data needs and data gaps. These issues are important to consider during that map analysis phase.
- Mike noted that he is concerned about what we might be missing, particularly since what’s happening in Washington is on an unprecedented scale.
- Nives asked which data needs to be georeferenced (mapped) as opposed to data that can be aggregated coast-wide? For data that must be georeferenced, we have to determine the location and scope of that analysis.
- Larry appreciated Nives’ question. He clarified that the mapping updates he has referred to meant adding *new* map layers that currently do not exist in the MSP maps. For example, adding more avian species, DOD flyways, critical habitat, and the California Current system. Thus, he is not asking to update present maps, but to identify gaps in our current maps and fill those gaps.
- Dale noted that the WCMAC does not have the budget to develop the amount of data required for a thorough analysis. He noted the potential to request additional funding from the legislature to develop the data but expressed frustration about the WCMAC’s ability to react in a timely, responsive manner, which may pose a barrier to requesting more funding.
 - Casey thanked Dale for his comments, and explained that Ecology is taking the potential impacts and threats from offshore wind as seriously as possible. We are trying to be ahead of the OSW process, particularly by identifying the data, information, and research that we need to inform decision-making, before BOEM starts their process. If there’s available information, we want to get it, and if there is data that doesn’t exist, we want to collect it.

- Dale explained that the uncertainty around the timing of BOEM's process, and whether we have enough time to develop the data needs investigation, is one of his biggest concerns. Fishing and coastal communities should be a priority.
- Nicole expressed that she understands Dale's urgency, but stated that the Committee has time to create a robust planning effort to identify the data gaps and needs.
- Casey noted that there are some elements that are not present in the Marine Spatial Plan data viewer, like military use, however there is already existing data that can be added. Improvements will be made to data at the *same time* as these discussions, not only when the discussion process is done.
- Nives asked (via Chat) where the MSP map viewer is.
 - Casey shared the map viewer link: <http://mapview.msp.wa.gov/default.aspx>
- Mike suggested that oceanographic dynamics should fall under the ecological focus area.
 - Casey agreed and informed the Committee that physical oceanography will fall under the ecology category.
- Larry added that we need to find and collect the information and data that does exist. There's a lot of emerging research from the North Sea that we can draw from.
- Nicole and Mai will work together to send the data needs proposal to the Committee for members to respond to and reflect on.

Additional Focus Areas

- Dale reiterated his request for a review of the original WCMAC legislation, and legislation related to coastal resources, in order to determine the legislative intent behind the various laws.
- Mike noted the importance of asking fishermen where they fish and involving coastal communities in the BOEM engagement process. He suggested hosting coastal meetings at the community level, because making short comments in a BOEM meeting doesn't create any constructive progress.
 - Nicole added that this speaks to the Recommended Principles of Engagement about vetting data with fishermen.
- RD, Dale, and Larry reiterated that Mai's proposal should be sent around to the Committee so they can review. All meeting materials should be distributed prior to future meetings.
- Brian noted the need to consider timing issues. For example, if we plan to forecast out to 2050, it would be challenging to have accurate ecological information on a timeline that long.
- Larry made final comments. First, he noted that ORMA requires proposals have an identified national need as well identified alternatives to the proposal. Second, he mentioned that we need to get started filling serious data gaps. Third, he shared that we need to expand our present definition to include the entire California current ecosystem when we examine cumulative impacts.

Next Steps:

- Nicole will send around Mai's proposal.
- The Committee now has recurring meetings on the third Tuesday of every month, from 1 – 3 PM. Please let Nicole know if you have any conflicts.

Appendix A. Data Gap Prioritization -WCMAC

Purpose: To obtain input from WCMAC and coastal stakeholders and communities on high priority data gaps that are essential for assessing potential new ocean uses.

Process: WCMAC and Coastal stakeholders and communities will review data gaps that have been identified as important, building off a 2020 data assessment effort by Ecology. Review of data gaps will also include a review of whether information contained in the Marine Spatial Plan should be updated. The assessment will focus on prioritizing data gaps that will help the State review potential future ocean use projects. Specifically, these are data needs relevant to:

- Avoid ocean use conflicts.
- Evaluate compliance and consistency with enforceable policies.

The data gaps have been organized by topic and grouped into four categories: Biology, Ecology/Physical Oceanography, Socioeconomics, and Culture. Approximately two Technical Committee sessions (1 hour per meeting) are dedicated to each category.

Each session will discuss a topic's:

- Relevance
- Known Information (MSP and General)
- Unknown Information (General, Offshore Wind, and Offshore Aquaculture)

After identifying any additional data needs, the discussion will shift to prioritizing the data gaps and categorizing each as "High Priority," "Medium Priority," or "Low Priority." Below are questions for participants to consider as we assess each topic.

Questions:

- Are there any important data gaps missing from the list?
- Which data gap should be addressed first? Consider:
 - o Need
 - o Frequency of change
 - o Feasibility
- Are you aware of currently available data/research that addresses a data gap?
- What are key research suggestions?
- If possible, should the information be added to the MSP Data Viewer?

All "High Priority" data gaps will be further ranked and prioritized after all categories have been reviewed.

Outcome: Identify high priority data needs and prepare a Letter of Recommendation to the Governor.

UPCOMING

Feb. 21, 2023 WCMAC Monthly Offshore Wind Technical Committee Meeting: Review Biology Category

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee Meeting Summary

February 21, 2023 | 1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- The Technical Committee began the data needs assessment by discussing four topics in the biology category: benthic invertebrates, forage fish, groundfish, and marine mammals.
- Technical Committee members generally prioritized impacts from offshore wind over species distribution, abundance, or other baseline data.
- Technical Committee members emphasized the interconnected nature of ocean data, and are interested in understanding cumulative impacts to the ecosystem as a whole.

Participants

- Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing representative (TC Co-Lead)
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing representative (TC Co-Lead)
- Brian Polagye, Energy representative
- Arthur “RD” Grunbaum, Coastal Conservation group representative
- Michele Conrad, Coastal Economic Development Seat
- Corey Niles, WDFW, Agency representative
- Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia
- Alle Brown-Law, Cascadia
- Jimmy Kralj, ESA

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Agenda Overview

- Larry provided edits to the January 17 meeting summary. He revised the reference to his statement about the word minimizing to read: “We must be careful not to be trapped by use of the word minimizing.”
 - Nicole confirmed the edit was made.
- No further edits to the Meeting Summary; the summary was finalized.

Data Gap Prioritization & Biology Category Overview

- Nicole reviewed the ground rules for discussion.
- Mike asked Mai to define what the Biology category encompasses for the discussion.

- Mai noted that the Biology category includes direct impacts to the species itself, such as behavior, distribution, and abundance. The Biology category will not include impacts to fisheries that depend on the species.
- Mike asked if phytoplankton would fall under the Biology category.
 - Mai answered that marine phytoplankton aren't included in this discussion, but noted this for later discussions.
- Larry expressed concerns about having a conversation about biology alone, because biology cannot be disconnected from ecological or oceanographic impacts.
 - Mai noted the approach for the data gaps assessment was to break discussion into topics, but the technical committee can address oceanographic or ecological impacts on species in future discussions.
- Mai reviewed the data process and desired outcomes for the Biology data gaps category.
 - The purpose of this process is to identify high priority data needs (particularly for ocean use conflicts) and potentially develop a recommendation letter to the governor.
 - This data gaps assessment process builds off an Ecology data assessment done in 2020. The foundation for the technical committee's assessment will be data gaps that were identified as **high priority** in that assessment.
 - There will be a second Biology discussion during the March OSW Technical Committee meeting.
- Brian shared a database of research recommendations for offshore wind impacts, compiled by U.S. Offshore Wind Synthesis of Environmental Effects Research (SEER): <https://tethys.pnnl.gov/pacific-offshore-wind-environmental-research-recommendations>.
 - Casey acknowledged that Ecology has looked at this resource from SEER.

Data Gap Discussion: Benthic Invertebrate Community

- Mai provided an overview of the category and known information from the Marine Spatial Plan related to shrimp, Dungeness crab, deep sea coral, and sponges.
- Mike suggested adding ocean transport for invertebrate species as a data gap. He noted the important movement of crab larvae (megalops) into shore areas. There may be a data gap related to any potential interference from offshore wind on ocean currents and transport of species.
 - Larry agreed with Mike's suggestion; the current list of data gaps does not capture the larval life stages of invertebrate species. The health of these species is dependent on riding ocean currents. He agreed that we should add a data gap about the larval stage of development, perhaps by including invertebrate larval stages in the "impact of movement barriers created by offshore wind" data gap.
 - Dale added that, for Dungeness crab, crab larvae move into estuaries to develop, and this movement could be greatly impacted by offshore wind. He shared his experience that juvenile crabs tend to move in October.
 - Mai will add the ocean transport of larval stages data gap to the "impact of offshore wind on the benthic community" data gap.
- Mike suggested adding the impact of electromagnetic fields/electric currents from cables on crab movement.
- Larry noted that this discussion demonstrates the crossover between data areas and the importance of not losing sight of how interconnected each topic is. He also shared that the phrase "movement barriers" is slightly confusing, and suggested fleshing out what some barriers may be, before deciding if they affect the benthic species over time.

- Mai clarified that “movement barriers” refers to physical structures.
- Larry said that it is limiting to define movement barriers as only related to physical structures. He added that, while structures impact the movement of invertebrate species, he believes that the more serious impact of offshore wind will be on the California current itself, which will also limit the movement of invertebrate species.
- Brian commented that we are organizing the data gaps assessment by receptors. When we start thinking about the impacts of offshore wind, it might be better to focus on the stressors.
 - Mike asked for clarification between a stressor and receptor.
 - Brian shared:
 - Stressor: A stress/effect produced (e.g., noise, EMF, additional hard structure, energy removal) by OSW (or anything else)
 - Receptor: Something being affected by the stressor in the marine environment (invertebrates, marine mammals, seabirds)
 - When assessing stressor-receptor interactions, it’s important to consider the context (someone banging cymbals next to your head while you’re sleeping has a much different implication than when a drummer does it at a concert), as well as how the baseline is changing (e.g., what effect does energy removal by wind turbines have relative to changes in atmospheric winds associated with climate change?).
- Mike mentioned two papers that study ocean transport in Washington.
 - Mai asked for Mike to email her the two papers that he discussed.
- Larry noted that the NMFS comments submitted to BOEM on the Oregon Call Area are very relevant to this conversation. NMFS stated: “Primary biological productivity in eastern boundary current ecosystems, like the California Current Ecosystem, is highly dependent on upwelling processes, and NMFS would be concerned about OSW farm design and siting that does not adequately minimize the potential effects of operations on upwelling. Given the uncertainties around the impacts to oceanographic processes from offshore wind energy development, we recommend a conservative approach to identifying a suitable conservation buffer.” <https://www.regulations.gov/document/BOEM-2022-0009-0001> includes all comments on the Oregon Call Area.
- RD shared that the Army Corps of Engineers has several benthic studies for the Grays Harbor Estuary, which could be used as some baseline information. He also suggested adding in the impact of sea level rise and the impacts of surge in the near future.

Data Gaps Prioritization: Benthic Invertebrates

Revised list of data gaps, based on technical committee discussion. Additions from committee discussion are italicized:

Benthic Invertebrate Community	Abundance, distribution, health, and trend of benthic invertebrates
	Abundance, distribution, health, and trend of corals and sponges
	Relationship between benthic invertebrates and environmental parameters.
	Impact of movement barriers created by offshore wind (<i>Including ocean transport of larval and juvenile stages of invertebrate species and impact to benthic species inhabiting the seafloor during its adult stage</i>)
	<i>Impact from electromagnetic fields created by offshore wind cables</i>

- Dale recommended that the committee focus on geographic areas along the WA Coast where industrial development is possible. There is only a small portion of the coast that could allow for development.
 - Larry agreed with Dale; there are constraints where development can occur on our coast, and this impacts the amount of effort we expend on research.
- Larry noted that if the “impact of offshore wind on the benthic community” data gap included “impacts of offshore wind development on the California Current ecosystem,” he would think that is highest priority.
 - Mai noted that California Current will be included in the oceanographic category.
- Brian added that the data gaps of highest priority are those related directly to offshore wind. He would place high priority on the unknown information where we don’t understand the offshore wind stressor and would place low priority on the baseline species distributions as these change over time and can be very difficult to track.
- Michele commented that we track trends for some benthic invertebrate species (NMFS and others collect that information and produce an annual report), and we understand the relationships, in some cases, between invertebrates and environmental factors. She agreed with Brian that the high priority data gaps are the effects of offshore wind on species biology and broader ecosystem functions.

Data Gap Discussion: Forage Fish

- Mai provided an overview of the category, which includes surf smelt, Pacific sand lance, and Pacific herring, and reviewed known information from the Marine Spatial Plan, including maps of spawning areas.
- Mike suggested adding the impact of the physical presence of offshore wind on forage fish.
 - Mai noted that she would add “Impact of offshore wind’s physical structures” as a data gap.
 - Brian added that the physical structure of offshore wind turbines could create artificial reefs that attract organisms.
 - Mike noted that if the towers attract predator fish (like rock fish), that might scare forage fish away.
- Larry agreed with Brian; some studies show that artificial ocean structures can create artificial reefs over time. He recommended that the data gap about potential displacement should also include when species modifies their behavior.
 - Mai added this to the “impact of movement barriers created by offshore wind” data gap.
- Larry suggested adding a data gap about the impact on offshore wind on forage fish habitat.
 - Mai added this as a new data gap in the list.
- Dale commented that fishing data is likely to help show species abundance, because the fishing fleet covers most of the WA coast and goes where species are most likely to be located. He noted that these systems are complex, and some fish may be in a location for only a few minutes a day. The logbooks could provide us with additional information.

Data Gaps Prioritization: Forage Fish

Revised list of data gaps, based on technical committee discussion. Additions from committee discussion are italicized:

Forage Fish	Abundance, distribution, health, and trend
-------------	--

	Impact of movement barriers created by offshore wind (<i>including potential species displacement and behavior modification</i>)
	Impact of offshore wind on spawning and growth (<i>including impact to drifting and recruitment during larval phase</i>)
	Impact of noise and vibrations from offshore wind
	<i>Impact of offshore wind on forage fish habitat</i>
	<i>Impact of offshore wind's physical structures on benthic species</i>

- Brian suggested that the impact of noise and vibrations could be low priority. Past studies have shown that offshore wind operations have a fairly low acoustic footprint. This does not account for pile driving, however.
 - Larry added that different phases of offshore wind development present different noise/vibration impacts, and impacts might differ in Essential Fish Habitat, Unique and Sensitive Areas, and/or in designated Critical Habitat for protected and other marine species.
 - RD noted that noise and vibrations will be constant once established, so the cumulative effects of noise and vibrations need to be studied.
 - Brian responded that, for construction activities, he believes that geophysical surveys and vessels involved have already been studied. We understand the noise/vibration sources relatively well, but the impacts of these on forage fish would be something he would put in a "medium" priority category.
- Mai asked Larry what his highest priority would be, and Larry prioritized impacts from offshore wind to the overall ecosystem.
- Mike shared that his highest priority data need is anything that would disrupt ecosystem food production and spawning across trophic levels.

Data Gap Discussion: Groundfish

- Mai provided an overview of the category and reviewed known information from commercial fishing maps, maps of rocky reefs, and monitoring completed by NMFS, tribes, and state fisheries managers.
- Mike suggested cross-checking abundance data with NOAA fisheries stock assessments.
- Larry noted that in the MSP, Map 5 shows the ecological importance of certain areas for groundfish. However, this map uses data from 2016. Larry asked what role the existing maps from the MSP are playing in this data gaps assessment.
 - Mai noted that it's helpful to know if the existing maps from MSP are still useable or applicable.
 - Larry asked if Map 5 was based on habitat, or based on where species and fishing activities occur.
 - Corey answered that the data was based on species distribution models and logbook data. The only two data sets that were habitat-focused were for rocky habitats and kelp habitat.
 - Larry noted that the maps looked at where fish populations had been, more than where they were expected to be.
 - Corey shared that the shelf break is an active spot; Dale agreed.
- Michele shared the annual report on the status of the California Current Ecosystem from NOAA's Integrated Ecosystem Assessment team: <https://www.pcouncil.org/documents/2023/02/h-1-a-cciea-team-report-1-electronic-only-2022-2023-california-current-ecosystem-status-report-and-appendices.pdf/>. Included is a

spatial analysis of potential conflicts within the two BOEM call areas off Oregon with nine commercial and recreational fisheries, and six NMFS surveys summarized in Section 4.2 (pp. 25-26) and Appendix Q (p. S-80).

- Larry commented that NMFS recommended to BOEM that there be no development in any areas shallower than and including the 200-meters isobath contour, because that is such a high activity area for all species. They also recommended a 50 m bathymetric buffer beyond the 200-m isobath, because of “the high productivity straddling that depth where we expect humpbacks to be foraging.” See NMFS comments here: <https://www.regulations.gov/comment/BOEM-2022-0009-0178>.

Data Gaps Prioritization: Groundfish

Data gaps list was not revised, as committee members did not suggest adding any other gaps.

Groundfish	Abundance, distribution, health, and trend
	Impact of offshore wind on biodiversity and community structure (including species behavior)
	Impact of offshore wind to the larval phase
	Impact of electromagnetic fields from offshore wind

- Brian noted that there have been several studies about the impact of electromagnetic fields (particularly from Europe), so this data gap would be lower priority for him, compared to some of the other unique impacts.
- Dale suggested that Ecology refer to fishing logbooks to see where these species are being caught, as those areas indicate where species are feeding. He reiterated the importance of including all fishing activity in data sets, since the Oregon process only took the top 10% of fishing activity into account.
- Mike posited that the impact of electromagnetic fields is a gap, because we don’t know the distance between offshore wind structures. However, his highest priority is the impact of offshore wind on the larval phase.
- Larry commented that there are many different cable characteristics (for example, suspended cables in the array, cables that are on the ocean floor). As a fisherman, he used to use an electromagnetic field to attract salmon, so we don’t fully understand what the potential effects from electromagnetic fields are.
 - Dale agreed with Larry, noting that he also used electric currents. There were more fish brought to market with those electric current devices than without them.

Data Gap Discussion: Marine Mammals

- Larry suggested that the MSP needs to be updated with critical habitat data for humpback whales and sea turtles.
- Larry mentioned that NOAA stock assessments are not always published every three years, though they are supposed to be.
- Mike suggested adding a data gap about the impact of survey methodology on marine mammals. Developers usually survey potential sites for offshore wind suitability, but the technology used for surveying could impact marine mammals.

Data Gaps Prioritization: Marine Mammals

Revised list of data gaps, based on technical committee discussion. Additions from committee discussion are italicized:

Marine Mammals	<i>Sensitivity to habitat changes</i>
----------------	---------------------------------------

	Impact of offshore wind on ocean migration and distribution (displacement, attraction)
	Impact of offshore wind on marine mammal behavior
	Impact of offshore wind's power transmission cables (including installation)
	Impact of movement barriers created by offshore wind
	Entanglement and collision risk from offshore wind
	Impact of noise and vibrations from offshore wind
	<i>Impact of offshore wind surveying methodology/technology on marine mammals</i>

- Prioritization was delayed for the next meeting. Mai asked committee members to review this list and think about which of the marine mammal data gaps are high priority.
- Michele commented that we've got a comprehensive list for assessing potential offshore wind effects on marine mammals, which she agreed are of high priority.
- Larry suggested that we add in known constraints (or prohibitions) to development off the coast of Washington.
 - Nicole noted that the technical committee could discuss this, but it would be separated from the Data Gap prioritization assessment that Mai is leading.
 - Larry shared that he believes a huge data gap is the constraints for development off our coast. For example: DOD flyways, PAC-PARS fairways proposal, usual and accustomed tribal areas, marine sanctuary.
- Dale agreed with Larry, particularly highlighting the USCG fairways proposal, which bars other development proposals in that area. He argued that the committee will waste time if we don't narrow our focus to where OSW can occur. The USCG, tribal areas, marine sanctuary – all are off limits to development.
 - Nicole responded that this exercise is contributing to Ecology's broader data gap prioritization effort, which includes not just offshore wind, but any potential ocean conflicts. Nicole will follow up with Dale and Larry about how to include those potential constraints in the conversation.
 - Dale reminded the committee that Washington is the only state in the nation whose MSP prioritized and protected fishing, and we cannot lose sight of this intent.

Next Steps

- Nicole will send the Meeting Summary to the Committee.
- We will determine next steps for the Biology Part 1 data gap prioritization. The goal was to have the Committee identify the top ten data gaps within this category. Nicole may follow-up with a survey to determine priorities.
- Nicole will follow up with Dale and Larry about incorporating the constraints/areas of prohibition for offshore wind.

Appendix A. Data Gaps Prioritization - Biology Category (Part 1)

Gaps added by the technical committee are *italicized*.

Prioritization

The following data gaps were identified as high and a lower priority during the meeting by Committee members. However, this list is **not final** and further prioritization or changes of the data gaps included below may occur.

High Priority	Lower Priority
Abundance, distribution, health, and trend of benthic invertebrates	Impact of noise and vibrations from offshore wind on forage fish, including noise and vibrations from construction
Impact of offshore wind on the benthic community, including species abundance, distribution, and potential to attract other species	Impact of electromagnetic fields from offshore wind on groundfish
Impact of offshore wind on distribution and abundance of forage fish species (including potential displacement <i>and/or modifications to species behavior</i>)	
<i>Impact of offshore wind on forage fish habitat</i>	
Impact of offshore wind on biodiversity and community structure of groundfish (including abundance and distribution (impact during larval phase))	
Impact of offshore wind's power transmission cables (including installation) on groundfish.	

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee

April 18, 2023

1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- The Technical Committee undertook a brainstorming exercise using breakout room discussions. The Committee discussed data gaps and updates for the MSP, other OSW efforts to track, information that WCMAC needs to develop a greater understanding of OSW, and how best to fulfill the Committee's Objective #2.
- Based on the discussion, the consulting team will create an action plan for the Technical Committee. The plan will be ready for the next Committee meeting.

Participants

- Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing representative (TC Co-Chair)
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing representative (TC Co-Chair)
- Corey Niles, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Paula Culbertson, MRC
- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Arthur "RD" Grunbaum, Coastal Conservation group representative
- Brian Polagye, UW
- Mike Nordin, Manager of Grays Harbor and Pacific Conservation Districts
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Heather Hall, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Rich Doenges, Ecology
- Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia
- Alle Brown-Law, Cascadia
- Jimmy Kralj, ESA

Meeting Summary

Finalizing 2/21 Meeting Summary

- Larry provided context for his requested edit in the January 17 meeting summary. He had revised a sentence to read, “We must be careful not to be trapped by the use of the word ‘minimizing.’” Prior to the MSP, there were statutory instructions about what should be included in a Marine Management Plan. Plans must include a series of maps that summarize key ecological aspects, environmentally sensitive areas, human uses of marine waters (particularly areas of high value), and appropriate location for energy production with *minimal* impacts. We need to recognize the difference between minimal impacts and minimizing impacts.
- Larry requested an edit to the February 21 meeting summary, in the “Data Gaps Prioritization: Forage Fish” section. He thought that the OSW TC spoke significantly about the impacts to the California Current system. He requested clarification on idea that the Technical Committee is trying to prioritize a potential impact assessment. Larry stated that the Technical Committee cannot prioritize without knowing the data. He also disagreed with the suggestion (from the February 21 meeting) that the impacts of acoustic noise, vibration, and electromagnetic fields are a lower-priority data gap, due to existing research on these impacts. Larry shared that he does not agree that we stated, as a committee, that noise and EMF impacts were low priorities. Those two are towards the top of the list.
 - Nicole noted that the February 21 Meeting Summary summarizes the data prioritization exercise that we initiated in our last meeting, but that we’ve pivoted away from that prioritization exercise.
 - Mike Nordin commented that we might have data, but if it doesn’t bring us anywhere, it’s insufficient. In Oregon’s marine planning, they had data but it wasn’t sufficient.
- Mike Okoniewski noted that vessel noise, bow pressure, and shadows all impact schools of sardines. Marine species are sensitive to acoustic noise and vibration, along with pressure and shadows.
- Nicole reviewed the Ground Rules.
- Dale shared that WCMAC is responsible for creating and carrying out the agenda. He is unsure how the Technical Committee had gotten to this agenda today.
 - Casey noted that the full WCMAC formed the OSW technical committee and gave the Technical Committee two tasks: (1) principles of engagement, and (2) data and community research needs assessment. He acknowledged that the first data needs assessment exercise was too complicated, and that the agenda today is an opportunity to brainstorm and build agendas for the OSW TC and the full WCMAC. We want to know what we should spend time on, and what issues we should be focusing on.
- Dale requested that WCMAC review the legislation that created WCMAC and the MSP. We haven’t adequately addressed that in the past, and it’s appropriate that we review the legislation for new members. There are three pieces of legislation because the Washington legislature didn’t believe we were on the right path. Washington is the only state that undertook marine spatial planning to protect fishing and coastal communities. Every other state undertook marine spatial planning to prepare for ocean energy off their coasts.

- Larry echoed Dale's comments about the legislative language that led to the formation of the WCMAC and the MSP. He recommended we write a summary of the legislation.
 - Nicole noted that the consulting team is currently developing a legislative summary.
- Larry asked if the WCMAC members could identify what research needs and data gaps they believe exist, and then the Technical Committee could assess that list to start identifying data gaps and needs.
- Corey responded to Dale's comments about WCMAC legislation. The state turned those policies into the Enforceable Policies of the Marine Spatial Plan. That is where the legislation ended up, and that is where it will apply most directly in Marine Spatial Planning.
 - Larry agreed with Corey but noted that Dale is getting at the why. Why did Washington come up with these enforceable policies? That's where the originating legislation can provide the context for the product that you're pointing to. That's where it merits more explanation for why and how we got to those enforceable policies.

Breakout Room Discussions

- Nicole reviewed the breakout room exercise.
- Larry commented on the OSW TC Objectives. In reference to objective number two, he shared that our data and community research needs are broader than just the unsolicited lease requests. We can review existing data and community research needs for OSW more generally, prompted by the unsolicited lease requests. However, we shouldn't confine this conversation to the two unsolicited lease requests, since this is a dynamic process, and we don't want to get the idea that our data needs are responsive to the specifics of the two unsolicited lease requests that are on the table. Those are prompting this larger conversation about data gaps and needs to OSW more generally.
 - Nicole reminded the Committee that the objectives were approved by the full WCMAC. If we want to edit them, we would have present them to the full WCMAC.
- **The Technical Committee went through the breakout room exercise. A synthesis will be provided in the next meeting packet in the form of a draft Objective #2 Action Plan.**

Closing

- Dale flagged that we do not currently have a clear understanding of how WA state will interact with BOEM. He shared that Washington needs to do it differently than any state; we need to include fishing and public interests, and we need to efficiently collaborate with BOEM.
- Dale also noted that WCMAC is charged with mediating disagreements. We've never discussed how this would occur and we would need to plan for that in advance of any BOEM actions.

Next Steps

- Next meeting is May 16. The facilitation team will work on **synthesizing an action plan and will include it in the upcoming meeting packet.**

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee Meeting Summary

May 16, 2023
1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- The Technical Committee reviewed the draft Action Plan. The Committee discussed the need to bring experts in to present on priority actions included in the Plan and maintain an ongoing list of data gaps.

Participants

- Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing representative (TC Co-Lead)
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing representative (TC Co-Lead)
- Michele Conrad, Coastal Economic Development Seat
- Brian Polagye, Energy representative
- Arthur “RD” Grunbaum, Coastal Conservation group representative
- Mike Nordin, Grays Harbor Conservation District representative
- Rich Doenges, Department of Ecology representative
- Corey Niles, WDFW representative
- Doug Kess, Pacific County MRC
- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Paula Culbertson, Wahkiakum MRC
- Brandii O’Reagan, WA Sea Grant
- Casey Dennehy, Department of Ecology
- Mai Aoki, Department of Ecology
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia
- Jimmy Kralj, ESA

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Agenda Overview

- Dale requested the OSW Technical Committee focus on the interface between Washington and BOEM, WCMAC’s founding legislation, and the US Coast Guard Fairways.
- Mike N. suggested the Committee meet more frequently, or have longer meetings, to thoroughly review the Action Plan elements.

- Larry agreed with both Mike and Dale, and requested that the Committee meetings be recorded.
- Larry provided edits to the February Meeting Summary. In the Forage Fish discussion, Larry did not reference Marine Protected Areas. It should read as follows: "...impacts might differ in Essential Fish Habitat, Unique and Sensitive Areas, and/or in designated Critical Habitat for protected and other marine species."
- Mike O. provided comment on the February Meeting Summary. Mike noted that, concerning marine mammals, there is a possible relationship between whale deaths on the East Coast and survey techniques for offshore wind siting.

Objective 2 Action Plan Development – Phase 1

- Jimmy introduced the Draft Action Plan, which was based on the April Committee meeting discussion. The Action Plan's purpose is to guide the Committee through the implementation of Objective 2, and it includes three action areas: (1) Updates to MSP Data Viewer, (2) Review of Offshore Wind Efforts in Other Locations, (3) Information to Improve WCMAC Understanding of Offshore Wind Issues. Within each area, there are several actions for the Committee to take over the next several months. However, there are several limitations, including the time and resources the Technical Committee has available. To address these limitations, the facilitation team suggested soliciting presentations from outside experts and the Technical Committee serving as a forum for these topic areas. Jimmy asked for Committee member feedback and thoughts.
- Mike N. commented that he feels there is more the Technical Committee could do than is listed in the Action Plan. Considering limitations, he suggests the Committee could recommend the Governor halt offshore wind development until these critical questions are answered.
- Jimmy noted that the Action Plan currently includes all the actions that the Technical Committee brainstormed during the April meeting. However, some of the actions are outside of the Committee's capacity, like "review port infrastructure." For actions that exceed Committee capacity, we can invite subject-matter experts to present to the Technical Committee to better understand the topic or issue.
- Larry agreed with Mike Nordin's comment about delaying development if we don't have the data. He noted that Objective 2 is to identify "data and community research needs considering the OSW Energy unsolicited lease requests," but Larry commented that these lease requests are unlikely to go through. He suggested Objective 2 be edited to not include the unsolicited lease requests, since these are unlikely to be the proposals we analyze, and instead the Committee undertake a case study on one specific proposal.
 - Jimmy responded that this is meant to communicate a sense of urgency, but we have some time before BOEM begins engagement. We should take advantage of this time to better prepare for when that engagement comes.
- Larry commented that the Action Plan does not include potential cumulative impacts to the California Current ecosystem.
 - Jimmy suggested we invite an expert to present on the California Current ecosystem. Larry suggested asking them how the California Current has been considered in other OSW processes.
- Larry shared that the Committee needs to have the opportunity to address the recurrent themes from public comments on offshore wind development.

- Rich noted that EIS processes include an initial scoping of potential impacts. He suggested the Committee focus on and prioritize the most significant impacts. Prioritization could be informed by outside experts.
- Dale commented that the Action Plan does not include the cost of OSW to consumers. He suggested that the Committee consider the potential costs of OSW, particularly for coastal communities. Additionally, the Committee should look at the cumulative impacts of energy to coastal communities. He shared that fishermen have lost 99% of their harvestable access since the 1970s – 80s. He is very concerned about OSW's impact on coastal and port communities, and the Committee should look at how best to protect these communities.
 - Mike N. suggested that the Committee contact MIT and request an analysis of power costs before OSW versus projected power costs with OSW.
- Mike O. agreed with Larry and Dale's comments, particularly the environmental impacts that Larry discussed and the cost to the public that Dale shared.
- Doug shared that the data gaps related to the California Current won't be resolved in a definitive way, but instead will need to be an ongoing process because there is new information all the time.
- Mike N. suggested three analyses: (1) MIT analysis on power costs (for the public) before OSW and potential power costs after OSW; (2) Economic analysis on the local economic impact from loss of sustainable current uses versus economic gain/loss from OSW; (3) An alternative analysis for energy production, costs of OSW vs other potential, to consumer gain. Mike N. noted that these analyses have been needed for years, but previous approaches were too broad to be useful. In the short term, he recommends bringing in experts to the Technical Committee, and in the long term, he recommends these specific analyses be conducted.
- RD asked about the potential for a pilot study about OSW's impact when placed in Washington waters.
- Michele supported additional presentations on priority areas, and agreed with comments from Larry, Dale, and Mike O. She commented that we are continuing to learn about different ecological processes and the impacts to marine life. It may be difficult to identify someone to speak, for example, on the cumulative impacts on the California ecosystem.
 - Jimmy suggested a two-pronged approach – first, inviting experts with relevant expertise to present on clear and well-defined areas of interest to the Committee, and for topics with data gaps and greater uncertainty (i.e., little to no available information), the Committee then recommends these areas as research priorities.
 - Michele agreed and suggested that the Committee should continue to track discussions on the marine planning process, and discussions with BOEM.
- Larry emphasized the idea of a case study, rather than analyzing the specific projects. ORMA could be utilized for the case study.
- Casey shared that Ecology is still working on the data gaps analysis, and based on this discussion, cumulative impacts, fisheries, ecological impacts, and economic cost of OSW all sound like priority items for the Committee.
- Mike N. supported Larry's idea of a case study. He noted that BOEM often says they will only displace a small portion of ocean uses, but this neglects to acknowledge how displacement of existing uses impacts the resources we depend on. Additionally, BOEM has not considered cumulative impacts, including economic impacts.
- Dale commented that the Committee should prioritize the list of actions, and for actions that have existing information, identify an expert to speak to the Committee, and for actions without existing information, the Committee can look for groups that are working

to address this gap. Dale also shared that we need to consider Washington's unique characteristics and constraints throughout this process.

- Mike O. recommended that the Technical Committee should meet more than once a month.
- Corey shared that the Washington Department of Commerce would be a good place to start, regarding an analysis of economic impacts.
- Larry suggested that the Committee should review the many public comments from Oregon and California OSW processes.

Objective 2 Action Plan Development – Phase 2

For additional discussion notes, see Meeting Focus Areas table below.

- Dale noted that it can be difficult to solicit people to present in a Committee meeting.
- Corey noted the WA Department of Commerce has staff that could present on what the state has analyzed so far.
- Larry requested that the Technical Committee compile the public comments from Oregon and California processes to build out reoccurring themes or find existing research that others have put forward.
 - Brandii agreed that this is something Sea Grant would be well positioned to do. She also noted that the Oregon Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia Board looked into wind energy impacts on ocean currents. She could go through board records to see who spoke about that.
- Larry commented that maintaining a list of data gaps is important, and this Action Plan could be a living document. As the Committee learns from other people, the document could be updated as new data gaps are identified.
- Nicole reviewed the consolidated list of actions around agenda themes as a potential next step for this effort:
 - **Meeting Focus Areas:**
 - MSP
 - OSW and Fisheries
 - BOEM
 - OSW Siting/Development Considerations
 - Lessons Learned
 - Economics
- Larry noted the input and summary actions of committees is useful, but it's important to not just stop there.

Next Steps

- The Technical Committee will present an update on the Action Plan to WCMAC at June meeting.
- Facilitators will revise the Action Plan based on OSW TC feedback received.
- Next meeting will be held 6/20 from 1-3pm.



Table 1. Meeting Focus Areas

Agenda Theme	Agenda topics	Notes from 5/16 Meeting
MSP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify new data layers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map each individual tribal Usual and Accustomed Fishing Area. • Examine opportunities to incorporate the National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) spatial suitability model into the data viewer. • Consider ways in which to display potential fisheries displacement impacts by reviewing how other socioeconomic information is displayed in the data viewer. • Hecate Offshore Wind proposal area. 2. Identify necessary updates to existing data layers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add new and existing designated critical habitat areas, including for Southern Resident Killer Whales, Humpback Whales, and Leatherback Sea Turtles. • Recommend changes to currently used models. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Ex: The model used to produce the Energy Suitability: Wind Energy layer with a model should include a “0” value. The model used to produce the current layer does not include a “0” value. • Vessel traffic fairways data and associated constraints on development. 3. Explore improvement to user interface, tools, and functionality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it easier to change the transparency of different data layers. 4. Other considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider ways in which to display observation-poor data (e.g. short-tailed albatross is an Endangered Species Act listed species, but observations are rare in Washington). • Development constraints associated with Department of Defense operating areas. 	
OSW and Fisheries	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Track efforts and outcomes from the National Academies of Sciences Standing Committee on Offshore Wind Energy and Fisheries. 2. Examine potential displacement effects on fisheries as a result of offshore wind development. Cumulative Impacts. 	<p>Item 1 - This body has not really produced much. Could invite Steve Joner for a briefing?</p> <p>Item 2 will not capture the economic dynamics nor the oceanographic dynamics. This is such a tiny piece,</p>

Agenda Theme	Agenda topics	Notes from 5/16 Meeting
BOEM	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitor response to the Pacific Fishery Management Council's request to BOEM to reinstate its call area identification process in Oregon. 2. Consider inviting a BOEM representative to discuss the implications of floating offshore wind facilities with existing ocean uses. 3. Enhance understanding of BOEM's leasing process and its connection to CZMA consistency requirements and other laws. What is the state role in BOEM's process? 	<p>and instead needs to be looked at as total economic output.</p>
OSW Siting/Development Consideration	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify projections for climate-related changes in wave and weather patterns that have been used to plan OSW in other locations. 2. Review existing port infrastructure, requirements, and limitations to facilitate offshore wind development for relevant ports on the Washington Coast. 3. Examine the potential effect of offshore wind development on vessel traffic patterns. 4. Assess connections between offshore wind and tribal treaty rights, as well as any potential impacts to these rights. 	
Lessons Learned	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Examine efforts used in other locations to assess impacts from offshore wind on nearshore tide patterns, upwelling, and geologic hazards. 2. Track development progress in other states and regions like California, Oregon, the Gulf of Mexico, the East Coast, and Europe (specifically focused on floating offshore wind). Focus on sites and offshore wind energy areas with characteristics similar to those in Washington. 3. Review examples of offshore wind planning efforts and their connection to existing ocean uses to determine lessons learned. Identify pitfalls to avoid and other information to help inform efforts in Washington 4. Identify areas where offshore wind and existing ocean uses coexist with positive outcomes for both uses. 	<p>Item 5 - This overview is something Sea Grant could do.</p>

Agenda Theme	Agenda topics	Notes from 5/16 Meeting
	5. Public Comment overview. Identify recurrent themes.	
Economics	1. Identify research focused on the social implications and impacts of offshore wind development. 2. Improve understanding of the economic considerations behind offshore wind development and operation including power purchase agreements and consumer impacts. 3. Investigate potential effects of offshore wind development on energy transmission in the Pacific Northwest and potential effects to coastal communities.	Include the cost of energy to consumers.
Potential presentation	1. Consider emissions contributions and other environmental impacts associated with the offshore wind industry.	Point of origin.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee

August 15, 2023
1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- Heather Mann provided a presentation to the OSW TC regarding the letter from the Oregon Governor and Congressional Delegation to BOEM requesting a pause in offshore wind leasing activities.
- The Committee reviewed the Objective 2 Action Plan and determined a pathway for initial items to discuss.

Participants

WCMAC & TC Members

- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing representative (TC Co-Chair)
- Brian Polagye, Energy representative
- Rod Fleck, City of Forks (WCMAC Co-Chair)
- Corey Niles, WDFW representative
- Arthur “RD” Grunbaum, Coastal Conservation group representative
- Paula Culbertson, Wahkiakum County MRC
- Michelle Conrad, Economic Development Representative
- Rich Doenges, Department of Ecology representative

TC Members & Facilitators

- Heather Mann, Midwater Trawlers Cooperative
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Heather Hall, WDFW
- Brandii O’Reagan, WA Sea Grant
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Taylor Magee, Cascadia
- Jimmy Kralj, ESA
- Nick Hart, ESA

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Agenda Overview

- Jimmy started the meeting and began with a round of introductions for the benefit of facilitation staff and to introduce the committee to Heather Mann, who would be giving a presentation later in the meeting.

Updates and Announcements

- Jimmy discussed an updated process for finalizing the draft meeting summaries, shifting the editing process to take place via email rather than during the meetings. Meeting summaries would still be reviewed and finalized by committee members, but by shifting the edits outside of meetings, up to 15-20 minutes of each meeting could instead be used to discuss other topics.
- Larry T. asked why a service (opportunity to edit meeting summaries) is being removed, when some committee members have asked for more meetings or meeting time. Larry thinks that the opportunity to provide revisions is useful to help add clarity and was concerned that the opportunity would be lost if the editing process was moved to be email-based.
 - Jimmy replied, clarifying that only the first round of edits would be moved to email, and that an updated draft that incorporates those edits would be circulated to the group and later approved.
 - Larry clarified that he would still like the opportunity to explain edits before a larger group.
 - Casey D. stepped in to explain that part of the purpose of this change in approach is to adequately manage the facilitation contracts with ESA and Cascadia. Currently, meetings have been running over the budgeted amount, which is OK so far, but we need to ensure that the budget is able to last the duration of the contract. During the previous facilitation contract, the facilitation team had roughly 18 months to spend the budget; in this contract, they have 24 months with the same budget, so resources are tight. Casey further shared that previous research into increasing funding for the WCMAC found that such a process would be very difficult as WCMAC is currently receiving funding amounts in line with other advisory boards under the Governor's office. Considering those constraints, it is important to try and be as efficient as possible with the meeting time available.
 - Larry noted that he had submitted edits on June 20 and July 18.
- Jimmy shared an update on the shared resource folder for the Offshore Wind Technical Committee. Dropbox will likely be the platform used for this resource folder and Nicole will continue to advance the project when she returns from time off. Another update can be expected soon. There have been challenges in finding an online platform that works for different agency staff.
 - Larry T. shared that he fully supports this effort and hopes that it can come online soon to support the group.

Presentation on Oregon Offshore Wind and Letter to BOEM (Heather Mann)

Heather Mann presented to the committee on the current state of affairs regarding offshore wind in Oregon. Heather M. is the director of Midwater Trawlers Cooperative and is an active leader in the grassroots effort (Protect US Fishermen) demanding increased engagement and accountability from BOEM as offshore wind call areas have been developed and announced in Oregon. Recently, these efforts have culminated in the Oregon congressional delegation and the Oregon governor sending letters to BOEM requesting increased engagement and a pause in leasing for offshore wind in Oregon.

This presentation was recorded, and Heather M. has offered to make her slides available to the Technical Committee. Please find these resources at the links below:

[Presentation Recording](#)
[Presentation Slides](#)

Following her presentation, Heather M. responded to questions from the members of the Technical Committee.

- Rich D. asked a series of questions.
 - The group in Oregon has asked that BOEM explore depths beyond 1300m for offshore wind development. Does BOEM say such development would be feasible?
 - Heather M. replied that both BOEM and developers have said that it would be possible, but not profitable. East Coast call areas include areas that are deeper, but no energy areas have been located there.
 - Why 1300m?
 - Heather M. replied that there are fewer fishing operations beyond 1300m which would naturally decrease conflicts with fishing operations.
 - BOEM has been represented as uncaring in your portrayal. Are they changing? What is lacking?
 - Heather M. shared that fishermen have been used to operating under the Magnuson Stevens Act, which is very transparent and straightforward while dealings with BOEM have been the opposite which has created challenges and adjustments. She reports that BOEM is still learning, a task made more difficult by staff turnover at BOEM. The outcome of the current pause will likely be telling in this regard.
 - Is BOEM collaborating with NMFS?
 - Heather M. replied that yes, they are collaborating, however, NMFS is being pressured to advance the process from all sides and is operating with limited resources.

- Do you see any way that commercial fishing can coexist with offshore wind, what kind of information would be needed to feel comfortable saying so?
 - Heather M. replied that nothing has come out to date suggesting that offshore wind is necessary to supplement renewable energy development and that onshore solutions can and should be maximized. Additionally, offshore wind would effectively preclude fishing operations in and around the wind farms presenting the most obvious barrier to compatibility, and the U.S. Coast Guard and Department of Homeland Security will be the ones who ultimately make decisions about operations near wind farms.
 - Heather M. emphasized the importance of learning from the projects that are moving forward and doing studies before construction as much as possible rather than retrospectively. A programmatic EIS from NMFS would help as well.
 - Larry T. asked about BOEM offering Wind Energy Areas despite the calls for a pause, and what those offerings mean for the pause.
 - Heather M. shared that those WEAs had previously been shown to some Tribes in Oregon who were asked not to share them more widely. After the letters from the Oregon Governor and Congressional Delegation, BOEM stopped showing the WEAs.
 - Heather said that her belief is that BOEM thinks that by releasing the WEAs, stakeholders will be assuaged in their concerns, but she suspects that Oregon state agencies will reject the findings included in the WEA assessments.
 - Further, the release of WEAs does not start the clock on leasing activities, and the Oregon state government has been asking for a prolonged public comment period.
 - As the pause has not been publicly announced, it is possible that BOEM could continue to move forward, however, it is not currently expected that they would do so as it would likely cause a mess.
 - Mike O. commented that NMFS + NOAA put out a document on Oregon Call Areas Docket 20220009. Are you familiar with this document? NOAA fisheries has requested utilization of Best Available Science, responsible behavior, decrease in conflicts, are these things occurring?
 - Heather M. replied that these things are not occurring in Oregon or elsewhere.
 - Are NOAA and NMFS voices being ignored?
 - Heather M. replied that yes, they are, environmental groups as well.
- Heather M. shared a few closing thoughts with the group:
- Before she presents at the September WCMAC meeting, Heather would like to know what other questions technical committee members have.

- Please send these questions to Heather directly (heathermunromann@gmail.com), or Nicole (nicole@cascadiaconsulting.com) before the September meeting.

Revisiting the Enforceable Policies Discussion

Jimmy briefly elaborated on discussions about Enforceable Policies under the Coastal Zone Management Program that came up during the July meeting. Jimmy noted that in Sept. 2020, a WCMAC special meeting on CZMA Consistency was held with presentations from Ecology and NOAA. Jimmy shared that the presentations and meeting summary have been sent to the Technical Committee and asked that members review these offline and submit additional questions before the next meeting. In particular, Jimmy noted that OSW TC members may have more specific questions about how BOEM engages in that process, as that was not covered in the WCMAC special meeting.

- Larry T. shared that he appreciates the opportunity to revisit and further explore this topic as it is complicated to understand with many pieces coming together to influence federal actions that have coastal impacts. He asked a pair of questions:
 - The CZMA includes a reference to a Geographic Location Description (GLD) to connect federal actions outside of state waters to enforceable policies. Does Washington qualify to claim enforceable policies on federal projects without a GLD?
 - Casey D. responded to this question, stating that the state is still looking at a GLD and options regarding how and when to do so. Further, the state does have the option to review without a GLD. On the East Coast, many states do not have GLDs and industry has promised and followed through on voluntary consistency with states.
 - Casey D. shared that the state also has the opportunity to review an unlisted federal action which Washington would certainly do if no GLD was in place and industry had not committed to comply voluntarily.

Objective 2 Action Plan

Jimmy noted that the OSW TC will provide an update on the Objective 2 Action plan with the WCMAC in September and prepare a full plan for approval in December. Jimmy noted that in order to begin advancing the topics included in the Action Plan, today's focus would be on identifying those actions that might be readily address with currently available information and resources. Four items were presented for consideration in the discussion:

1. Enforceable Policies
 - a. *See above section for discussion of this action*
2. Information on the Washington State Strategic Energy Plan

- a. Enhance understanding of how offshore wind developments fit into the state’s clean energy strategy, possibly including a presentation from Norah Hawkins at the Department of Commerce
3. Updates to the Marine Spatial Plan (MSP) Data Viewer
 - a. Identifying which updates are necessary and how to find the information to add to the data viewer.
4. Identifying lessons learned from other locations
 - a. This includes those learned from Heather M.’s presentation and from the Governor’s delegation trip to Europe

Discussion on these initial action items and others followed:

- Larry T. asked for clarification on the process and how this discussion fits into the larger action plan process as a whole. He noted that Ecology and the facilitation team put out a lengthy document and he thought the idea was to go through that document and identify places to improve or expand it, whereas now the scope is being constrained to short-term actions. His understanding of the process was that it was working towards a framework of questions that need to be asked.
 - Jimmy replied that through previous meetings and discussions, the OSW TC has developed a robust action plan with a long list of actions for the committee to consider. Today’s discussion represents a first step in moving forward on some of those tasks which have been identified already, specifically focusing on those that can be accomplished with available resources. Jimmy clarified that this is not a shift in approach, but rather a first attempt at advancing some of the tasks identified through the process to-date.
- Larry T. then laid out a few action items, as follows:
 - Support for four actions above, noting specifically the lessons learned from Heather M.’s presentation.
 - Support for the continued work of getting the document library functioning.
 - Support for the creation of a catalog of comments to BOEM, as well as a suggestion that Sea Grant might be able to help with this.
 - Support for a review of processes in the state, rather than a focus on specific projects such as the unsolicited lease requests.
 - Support for reaching out to the DOD and getting a summary or guidance related to their guidelines for development and mapping that could be incorporated into the Data Viewer
 - Paula C. shared that maps from the DOD were presented early on when the Quinault Tribe was considering an offshore wind project. Paula is unsure of where that map is now, but it may already exist, in addition to substantial other research related to that project/process.
 - Larry T. replied that those maps are in the possession of the Technical Committee but are from conversations between

- DOD and the developer whereas he would like to see what the DOD would put forward on their own.
- Paula C. agreed, and just wanted to make it clear this wasn't a process that would start from zero.
 - Casey D. confirmed that there has been contact with the DOD and that they (Ecology) are hoping to include some data in the mapping viewer with the ongoing migration process. Casey noted that working with the DOD is always challenging due to classified information.
- Mike O. supported the above actions, noting that these were a good start. Mike reiterated his previous request for an analysis of data gaps, particularly with respect to environmental and ecosystem impacts and especially with regard to phytoplankton and other 'small' things.
 - Jimmy shared that Mai (with Ecology) is currently leading a process to identify these data gaps and that future updates can be expected. Jimmy noted that the Technical Committee could likely rely on this parallel process rather than spinning up its own.
 - RD G. asked about how the Technical Committee might think about unintended consequences, remembering a previous discussion about cumulative effects over 30-50 years. RD also suggested the use of a "strawman" project to explore these questions.
 - Jimmy shared that Mai's approach is similar to the pressure/stressor approach that had been discussed previously.
 - Corey N. echoed these thoughts, sharing that considering stressors and pressures could be a way to probe long-term and cumulative impacts.
 - Corey N. also supported the discussion of lessons learned (action 4 above), highlighting the evident need for authentic engagement gleaned from Heather M.'s presentation.
 - Heather H. gave the list of preliminary actions a 'thumbs up', with an emphasis on the context that could be provided through a presentation on the State Energy Plan.
 - Rich D. suggested learning from other states, particularly with regards to impacts on commercial fishing, shorebirds, and other aquatic life.
 - Mike O. supported the stressors approach to evaluating long term impacts discussed previously and suggested a closer relationship between the Technical Committee and the work ongoing related to data gaps at Ecology.
 - Jimmy agreed that more regular updates on the data gaps project could be beneficial.
 - Larry T. refocused on his previous comment, that the Action Plan is much broader than the initial steps being discussed at this moment. Larry considered a strawman poll of ocean users/committee members to identify which data gaps they are concerned about, particularly to help inform the development of the action plan so that it can encompass more and longer-term/bigger picture issues.

Finally, Larry cautioned the idea of having a final action plan prepared by December as an increased focus on the plan would be necessary.

- Jimmy replied, clarifying that the “final” action plan will be more of a roadmap to highlight what is important with broad-brush approaches. As individual actions are considered, finer details will be determined by the committee.

Action Items

Jimmy closed the meeting by sharing the next steps for the Technical Committee and action items for members:

- Committee members should review the Sept. 2020 meetings and share any questions with Nicole.
- There will be a progress update on the work completed by the Technical Committee at the upcoming WCMAC meeting in September.
 - Larry T. asked what the process for preparing the progress report will be, noting that Heather M.’s presentation will be a component but that discussion will be needed to figure out what else should be presented.
 - Jimmy replied that it will be an informal update and that the facilitation team will be taking the lead.
- Heather M. will be presenting again at the WCMAC meeting in September. If Committee Members have further questions, please send them to Heather directly or Nicole before the September meeting.
- Casey D. will be out on family leave until November. In the interim, other Ecology staffers will fill his role.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee

October 17, 2023

1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- The Committee reviewed the Objective 2 Action Plan and determined it is not ready to be shared with the full WCMAC at the December meeting.
- In breakout groups, the Committee brainstormed ideas and questions for the proposed Governor’s Office offshore wind study and the WA State Energy Strategy.

Participants

WCMAC & TC Members

- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing (TC Co-Chair)
- Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing (TC Co-Chair)
- Brian Polagye, Energy representative
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Arthur “RD” Grunbaum, Coastal Conservation group
- Rich Doenges, Department of Ecology
- Nives Dolsak, UW
- Matt Niles, State Parks

TC Members & Facilitators

- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Brandii O’Reagan, WA Sea Grant
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Jay Krienitz, ECY
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia Consulting
- Alle Brown-Law, Cascadia Consulting

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Agenda Overview

Nicole welcomed everyone to the OSW TC meeting and reviewed the agenda and ground rules.

- Dale commented that he would like to discuss the offshore use maps, and how he’d like them to be updated, such as including the US Coast Guard fairways. He noted the importance of these maps for newer members.

- Dale also requested that the TC discuss the cost of OSW in an upcoming meeting. He added that multiple developer groups have withdrawn their proposals on the East Coast and are asking for significantly more money than original purchase agreements had outlined.
- Nicole replied to Dale's comments that these action items are both highlighted in the Objective 2 Action Plan which will be covered in the latter half of the meeting.
- Nives commented that some TC members have inquired about current research on coastal communities and offshore wind and she shared that OSU/ Pacific Marine Energy Center recently received a \$2.5 million grant to study how communities in CA and OR view OSW development. A [brief writeup can be found here](#).

Updates and Announcements

August Meeting Summary & OSW TC Shared Folder

Nicole shared that she sent the final August meeting summary via email and the Facilitation Team is currently working to upload the summary to the shared folder.

- Larry commented that he appreciated the answer to Dale's questions, and seconded the need to dive deeper into those topics.
 - Larry shared that he endorses the final August summary, and notes that it was sent late to receive review.
 - Larry raised concerns regarding the shared folder, noting that there weren't any meeting summaries in there and it was challenging to navigate. He had thought the folder would be a 'documents library,' or a depository for information that could be shared easily with the members of WCMAC, the technical committee, and the public. He also raised the following questions:
 - How do we find the page without a prompting link?
 - What do I do to get there?
 - How do we submit data to the documents library?
 - How does the public access the documents library?
 - Where is the link to the library in the action plan itself?
 - Nicole replied to Larry's questions and comments; the facilitation team can create a "How-To" document that answers those questions. Nicole will respond to them as a follow-up, but briefly, the facilitation team and Ecology staff had determined that the folder would be an OSW TC shared folder and not a public access folder because it will have draft items waiting for revision/ feedback. There is an option to make some folders public and others private, which we can explore. In regard to adding materials to the document library, TC members may suggest things to the group and provide those items to the facilitation team for upload.
 - Larry replied that he wasn't sure who determined that access to the documents library would be limited/ private. To his understanding the folder would act as a library of information for WCMAC members at large, the OSW TC, and the public to stay informed on

what may happen of our coast rather than a folder for the OSW TC only.

- Nives shared that UW did not receive the grant she applied for, but OSU received \$2.5M to research how coastal communities feel about offshore wind.
 - Brian Polagye shared that UW is also involved in that study and that Shana Hirsch is UW's lead.
 - Nives will reach out to Shana to determine if there's any WA work being included in the study.
 - Brian replied that to his understanding it mostly includes OR and CA because OSW work is further along there.
- Dale supported Larry's comments about the documents library, and would appreciate a streamlined access process.
- **Next Step:** The Facilitation team will streamline the shared folder to ensure easier access.

Vote on Meeting Scheduling:

- The majority of OSW TC members shared that they would prefer option 2 of more frequent and shorter meetings (2 hour-long monthly meetings, except during months with full WCMAC meetings). Many shared that they would like the flexibility to extend or adjust time depending on agenda needs.
- Some members shared that they would like the ability to call a meeting outside of previously scheduled meeting times if the need is there.
- For a full list of votes by members, see [Appendix A](#).

OSW TC Updates

Data Gap Prioritization Update

Mai provided an update on Ecology's data gap prioritization process, sharing that they have been interviewing subject matter experts from state and federal agencies, academic institutions, and organizations. They are currently refining the list of data gaps. They are also conducting tribal outreach. Mai shared that the list of data gaps evolves as they speak with each expert, and that she is considering reaching out again to experts they spoke with early on, to get feedback on data gaps that have been added later in the process.

- Mai provided an example of the data gap prioritization for marine birds. They had originally identified general data gaps, related to OSW and offshore aquaculture. They then edited the list based on conversations with experts. At the moment, the top two data gaps are: general status, abundance, distribution, and trends, plus collision with OSW.
- **Next Steps:** Mai will continue interviews for all categories. She is currently seeking experts in socioeconomics and culture and refining the list of data gaps.

Technical Committee member questions on Ecology's data gap prioritization update:

- Brian shared that he understands why collision is near the top of risks but is curious how to verify the risk of collision without improved monitoring methods, as these are difficult to adapt.
 - Mai replied that monitoring methods are ranked lower because they came up in later interviews, which is why she wants to reach out to early experts

again. Those who ranked items higher are currently involved in the field resulting in bias towards certain risks. Ultimately, rankings are determined by the number of experts placing risks at specific rankings. Mai commented that she will follow up with Brian.

- Mike O. commented that in regard to migratory paths, there's a lot of general use of the word migratory, and that on the other hand there are juveniles that move offshore. Mike would also like to see migratory paths, phytoplankton, and foraging on the list, and asked Mai to share the PowerPoint with the TC.
 - Mai replied that foraging is included, however phytoplankton is not included, as it is indirectly addressed through foraging and affected behavior.
 - Mike commented that essential fish habitat includes the idea of food and spawning, and is surprised that a major food source for the pyramid is left out.
- Larry commented that there may be some treaty tribes missing from the list of tribes on Mai's list.
 - Mai replied that the tribes mentioned are ones she has started conversations with. She has reached out to all coastal treaty tribes and is still waiting to hear back from some.
- Larry shared that he felt surprised over the lack of reference to protected avian species, and that he sees a big gap in this data. He noted that he is unsure what "accepted levels of change" looks like for an ESA-listed and protected species such as the short-tailed albatross. He shared that interaction with this species was stated as a continued "conservation concern" in commercial fishing management and that concern was reiterated and passed to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council in 2019. Those interactions should be a continued and crossover concern when it comes to potential blade collisions of ESA listed avian species with OSW developments. He also echoed the forage question previously from Mike O.
 - Mai replied that the data gaps apply to all birds, including protected species.
- Corey commented that the OSU research grant felt narrow, and it could be beneficial if Nives helped the TC better understand what it would take to tackle some of these questions. What resources are needed? How much research can be done, and how much do these things really cost? Corey shared that he would be interested in learning more about the \$2.5M OSU project to help us think through what resources would be needed for WA.
- Rich asked if Mai would contact Shoalwater Tribe as well.
 - Mai replied that she reached out to the Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe and is waiting to receive a response.

Sea Grant Update

Brandii provided a Sea Grant update, sharing that there has been a request for Sea Grant to help gather the public comments and questions that have arisen during BOEM engagement processes in CA and OR. She shared that collating those items into a database is a larger effort than Sea Grant has capacity for, but she is looking for grants

that may provide funding. They are reaching out to CA and OR to find out if they're already completed this type of work, and if they'd be willing to share with the group.

WCMAC Meeting Topics

Alle provided an overview of the WCMAC meeting topics that have been flagged for follow up. TC members were split into two breakout groups to brainstorm questions and prompts related to how the Governor's Office is evaluating a strategy that would include hiring a contractor to perform a several-month study recommending an OSW Washington specific planning and engagement process *and* the WA State Energy Strategy. The following sections summarize the discussion and questions members developed during the breakout rooms.

Governor's Office Proposal

- Looking at existing public venues for evaluating initiatives such as the Parks Commission, how does any initiative to get public feedback dovetail with those existing forums?
- When the Governor's Office makes contact with BOEM, they need to ensure that both the public and fishing interests are being considered. For example, in Coos Bay, without public opinion being shared it's difficult to discern how coastal communities feel about OSW development.
- Need to place existing state marine planning and permitting processes side by side to clearly outline which tools are at our disposal, and which to draw on in multiple use situations.
- Tribal engagement is key to this process at both federal and local level.
- Considering Ecology's role of support for engagement to the WCMAC committee and providing locally-based technical information, what is the regulatory capacity, and what work may ECY staff do for that?
- Who are the stakeholders? How does BOEM's process look different from an alternative OSW process?
- Seems as though there won't be any OSW development in WA unless WA were to ask for it, if that's the case, how do we ensure a process unlike OR?
 - Would like more than 3 meetings with BOEM, unlike in OR.
- Would like to build off WCMAC rules of engagement.
- Review identified engagement requirement process in MSP, fisheries, stakeholder group, and other engagement built into MSP.
- How would the consultant process integrate with WCMAC?
 - Tons of information in federal comments.
 - Library of information that they should start with, NGOs and fisheries.
 - Consultant would benefit from WDFW and WCMAC experience.
- Would want to see the State and BOEM outreach process aligned.
- What needs to go into state coordination agreement?

WA State Energy Strategy

- WCMAC OSW members would need a brief on what the plan/strategy covers.
- How does OSW fit with the state's net zero goals and clean energy strategy?
- What are the economics of the strategy, including ratepayers?

- The energy strategy outlines affordable renewable energy to WA coast. It highlights no petroleum energy, what does that look like for the coast? How are the different strategies accounting for climate change? What are the hydroelectric power streamflow implications?
- What data is missing?
- How often is the strategy updated?
- At what point did the strategy begin considering onshore wind and onshore solar, and when did those become part of the power grid?
- What is the political feasibility and community support for the strategy, and was that considered? Or did they only consider load and grid capacity?
 - How did that feature into writing the strategy?
- In Southern OR, they were looking into putting transmission capacity near Grays Harbor, how does this initiative interact with the state energy capacity? The regional energy strategy seems to be eating up WA capacity.
 - The energy strategy is considering transmission on a regional scale.
 - They envision new large capacity interconnects being built between Washington and Montana/Wyoming, yet there's not a lot of historical precedence to have that going well. Does not necessarily attribute cost and feasibility of overcoming likely public opposition.
 - How to reconcile the amount of large capacity transmission required under the energy strategy with the states inability to build large scale transmission projects in past years?
 - Baseline scenario: doesn't add significant generation capacity in WA, all significant load growth is almost entirely served by wind and solar from Wyoming and Montana.

Objective 2 Action Plan

Nicole described the Objective 2 Action Plan background, including the four priority themes for near-term actions, and noted that we are looking to identify the 2024-2025 priorities. She noted that this Action Plan is intended to provide direction for the Technical Committee and allows WCMAC to remain flexible as new information is available or new needs arise.

Technical Committee Discussion:

- Corey shared that the Governor's Office has decided to move forward with a study on OSW and community engagement, and that decision came after the TC discussed this Action Plan. Which of the efforts here would interact with their engagement process/ study? Corey recommended that we should look at the timeline of that effort and match everything up.
- Larry shared that the TC is not ready to share the Action Plan with the full WCMAC. He has submitted various edits and has yet to see them incorporated, and he requested an in-depth discussion on this document, including line-by-line review and revisions.
 - Nicole replied to Larry's concerns, noting that the TC has walked through the table as a group on multiple occasions, and has approved the approach outlined in the Action Plan as a group. Nicole agreed that we

can go over the document line-by-line in the November meeting, after incorporating any feedback from this meeting.

- Larry replied that he will submit possible edits, considering he didn't see much from his original edits in August. Nicole will follow-up with Larry directly.
- Larry requests an edit to Table 1 (OSW Data and Community Research Needs Identified to Date). On Item 1 under "OSW and Fisheries," he noted that the National Academies of Science's committee has not been very effective, and this item should also include outcomes from entities like NOAA NMFS and the Pacific Fishery Management Council.
- Nives shares that in response to what Larry is saying, we should pause and respond to the TC's concerns, while still meeting the timeline given by WCMAC.
- Brian commented that he liked the idea of adding a timeline to the prioritized themes, which will allow us to identify those that are easier to address. He agreed that the plan is not ready for the full WCMAC, and it's important to add Next Steps and narrow down a priority list.
- Dale shared that the TC hasn't explored the need for OSW in Washington. The TC does not know how much energy WA State needs and does not know how much WA-produced energy is being shipped out of the state. One of the items in the law is based on need, and that need won't be met in the ocean if there is a more efficient and cheaper alternative. Dale recommended that the TC look at the entire WA State Energy Strategy and identify energy needs for now and the future. We are not using our current capacity, so that is something to look at before finding new ways of spending.
 - Nicole replied that that is helpful in shaping the State Energy Strategy agenda item and prompting the future speaker.
 - Dale also commented that we need to identify the cost of energy, and what the cost is to consumers.
- Rich shared a few comments on the State Energy Plan. He recommended that the TC look at WA State's future energy needs, current hydroelectric sources and the implication of climate change on these sources and help identify data gaps. He noted that there needs to be more information on fisheries, migratory birds, and ESA-listed species. He agreed with the suggestion to add timelines to the Action Plan.
- RD agreed that the group is not ready to share the document and would like to add timelines.
- Mike O. agreed with Dale that the cost of these projects (both OSW and transmission improvements) has not been adequately discussed. Contractors are withdrawing contracts and there are six governors requesting higher federal subsidies. He shared that we still need to address the data gaps for hydrological and ecological elements. There is no current investigation and BOEM will not investigate, because it would disrupt their timeline goal, therefore they are going ahead with the project anyway. Mike commented that the coastal tribes are taking action and writing letters to BOEM, and we should take a further look at the comments from tribes.

- Nicole shared that based off of TC feedback, the document isn't ready. We will look into these notes and comments and revise where it makes sense. At our next meeting, we will go line-by-line, so please come to the meeting ready to discuss revisions.

Next Steps and Closing

Next Steps

- Facilitation team will streamline the shared folder to ensure easier access.
- Ecology will continue the data gap prioritization interviews for all categories.
- Sea Grant will continue to look for grants that may provide funding for collating public comments. Sea Grant will reach out to CA and OR about this work.
- Facilitation team will revise the Objective 2 Action Plan based on discussion.
 - Nicole will reach out to Larry about his edits to the Action Plan.
- Nives will send her proposal for studying coastal communities and issues with OSW.
 - Nicole will follow up with Nives about the OSU proposal.

Closing Comments

- Dale shared that he won't be able to attend the November OSW TC meeting (on November 21).

Appendix A

OSW TC meetings will not take place in the same month as WCMAC meetings. With that in mind, what is your preference for meetings moving forward?

- Option 1: Fewer, longer meetings: Quarterly, 3-4 hours in length.
- Option 2: More frequent, shorter meetings: Monthly (except during months when a WCMAC meeting is occurs), 2 hours in length.

First Name	Last Name	Meeting Vote
Ann	Skelton	No preference
Brandii	O'Reagan	No preference
Brian	Polagye	Option 2
Larry	Thevik	Option 2; thinks it should be 2.5 hours
Mike	Okoniewski	Option 2
Nives		Option2
RD	Grunbaum	Option 2; Recommended having the flexibility for additional meetings as needed.
Rich	Doenges	Option 2
Corey	Niles	No strong preference; Option 2 preferred
Matt	Niles	No strong preference; Option 2 preferred
Dale	Beasley	Option 2; Agreed with the note about having additional meetings as needed.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee

November 21, 2023

1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- **Oregon Wind Energy Areas (WEAs) Update:** Members discussed recent activities in Oregon concerning BOEM’s Draft WEAs, the process to date, and the opposition from various stakeholders regarding OSW development along the coast.
- **Objective 2 Action Plan Review:** The TC began to review and provide feedback on the Objective 2 Action Plan.

Participants

WCMAC Members

- Larry Thevik, Commercial fishing (TC Co-Chair)
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Rich Doenges, Department of Ecology
- Nives Dolsak, Educational institution
- Michele Conrad, Coastal economic development group

TC Members & Facilitators

- Heather Hall, WDFW
- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Dale Beasley, Commercial Fishing
- Arthur “R.D.” Grunbaum, Coastal Conservation group
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Brandii O’Reagan, WA Sea Grant
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Nicole Gutierrez and Alle Brown-Law, Cascadia Consulting

Meeting Summary

Nicole welcomed everyone to the OSW TC meeting and reviewed the agenda and ground rules.

Updates and Announcements

- Nicole shared that she would continue to send OSW meeting summaries via email, as well as linked in the Shared Folder. She also noted that the Shared Folder is for WCMAC and OSW TC members only, as it’s linked to people’s individual emails.

- The next OSW TC meeting will be in January 2024, and Nicole shared the potential TC meeting dates for 2024.
- Larry raised concern about the purpose of the Shared Folder, noting that he thought it was intended to serve as documents library to help inform all stakeholders, including the public. The information currently in the Shared Folder is not private and is already shared publicly, so he asked why this resource can't be shared more broadly.
 - Nicole replied that folder is shared with all WCMAC members and TC members, and is not intended to be a public resource. If the Shared Folder were to be shared more broadly, there would be more oversight required, and at this time that is not the intention of the Shared Folder. This is an important topic, so we can continue to discuss the use of the folder.
- Dale echoed Larry's feelings, noting that what we're doing isn't secret.
 - Nicole replied to Dale that the Shared Folder is not meant as a public resource and is supposed to be internal to WCMAC members.
- Ann asked what the protocol is for the Shared Folder.
 - Members should send resources to Nicole via email.

Update on Oregon Wind Energy Areas (WEAs)

- Mike O. updated the technical committee about Oregon's most recent OSW letter to the Governor (which was organized by Heather Mann). ODFW is beginning to look at the 1,156 comments that came in from BOEM's two Draft WEAs. Those comments are predominantly opposing OSW development on the coast, and there were three public meetings for the Draft WEAs, with many comments opposing OSW. The meetings were contentious, with many comments in Brookings coming from longtime residents. OR agencies also wrote a letter to the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) and BOEM.
- Larry highlighted that in OR, BOEM put out a request for information on two draft WEAs, and there have been considerable comments asking that BOEM look at broader areas outside the WEAs including water depths beyond 1,300 meters and have expressed concern over BOEM's process. Various agencies and stakeholders have asked BOEM for more information and impact analysis to be completed to determine the viability and effects of OSW development - including OR Tribal Sovereigns, WA Treaty Tribes, NOAA, ODFW, and PFMC. Larry added that supply chain and cost issues have prompted developers to back out of agreements, and there have been requests for more subsidies. The fundamental message from all OR entities is that there should be no further action on the final WEAs until these issues have been resolved. There was also the use of an NCCOS suitability report in the determination of the Draft WEAs done by the National Centers for Coastal Ocean Sciences (NCCOS). Part of the study was initially represented in several previous meetings to include looking into ecosystem impacts, upwelling impacts, cumulative impacts and multiple data layers that the NCCOS suitability model would present. The resulting suitability report in the WEA demonstrated that none of these impacts were looked at or addressed, and there were obvious data layer exceptions and exclusions. There is continued skepticism on lack of research which hasn't been much diminished by BOEM, the Draft WEAs and/or the NCCOS modeling. The PFMC has been integral in promoting the need for greater

understanding of the impacts OSW developments may have on our oceans before proceeding with the process. As Mike O. mentioned, there is a new letter to the Oregon Governor, and there is an ad-hoc working group recently formed to advise the Oregon Governor.

Questions & Discussion

- Rich asked if there was a WCMAC equivalent in Oregon, and if so, how they were engaged.
 - Larry replied that there is the OR Territorial Sea Plan, but there isn't an entity specifically charged with presenting policy recommendations like WCMAC. The OR Territorial Sea Plan has presented an organized gathering of information and concerns through ad hoc processes. Larry said it was a bit outside his knowledge to answer.
 - Rich replied that he might follow up with Heather Mann to see who is leading this effort.
 - Larry commented that ODFW and PFMC have both played major roles in this process, including communicating with BOEM.
 - Ann shared that the non-profit Oregon Shores Conservation Coalition has also been active and has submitted testimony and letters about OSW.
- Dale added that the Oregon legislators held six coastal meetings in Oregon about a year ago, and they received similar feedback. Dale attended meetings in Newport and Coos Bay, Oregon, and noted that the sentiment was nearly 100% opposition to OSW development off the OR coast. He also noted the diversity of attendance in those meetings, saying it wasn't just the fishing community but other OR coast community members as well.
- Corey shared that he's part of the PFMC's Marine Planning committee, and he doesn't believe that OR has a direct analogy to WCMAC. The BOEM Taskforce in Oregon has frustrated all stakeholders and community members. The Washington Governor's Office is hiring a consultant to determine a new route for interacting with BOEM. Corey recommended looking at the PFMC's materials, including reports and meeting summaries. He noted that BOEM's suitability analysis came late, and the PFMC had to work quickly to try and understand it. However, their analysis did move the WEAs out of the major fishing grounds. We still don't know what the indirect impacts on habitats or fisheries are. We would want better sequencing in WA if it were to move forward.
 - Nicole will put the PFMC reports in the Shared Folder.
 - Corey replied that you can see all the MPC materials from November under Agenda Item C.3, and "MPC Report 1" and "Supplemental Report 2" would be the main products of the MPC. <https://www.pcouncil.org/briefing-book/november-2023-briefing-book/#c.-administrative-matters-toc-9532a15a-3b54-43e5-b63b-ea9add311552>.
- Mike O. shared that many species go through life cycles that take them hundreds of miles up and down the coast, and the currents are very important to that movement. BOEM has not addressed any of the full cycle effects. As frustrating as BOEM has been, this isn't necessarily reflective of their staff with whom he's had productive conversation.
- Nicole asked the TC if they wanted to keep this as a standing agenda item.

- Larry answered that it is essential to continue monitoring the Oregon process and that we need regular updates. There exists this idea that impacts and need for mitigation actions is confined to discussions about displacement and areas that cannot be used by fisheries/ fishers. That conceptual framework is too confining and that OSW development will carry hydrodynamic and ecosystem changes, which effects resources that fishermen and marine ecosystems rely on, and must be included in NCCOS suitability modeling.. There are more areas that need further study, and while BOEM said they needed more research, and admitted this takes time, they are moving ahead with the process without completing the research.
- Corey shared that it's important to think about this. He also agreed with what Larry said, but pointed out that BOEM has a mandate from the President and Congress. BOEM is trying to go about this the best way they can, but there isn't a NEPA document answering every uncertainty. There's a lot of criticism about the displacement of fishing grounds, but now BOEM has responded to that by moving the WEAs.
- Larry replied to Corey saying he never said they needed to answer every question, but there were many general questions that were not addressed. And pointed out Washington was not singled out as part of the President's plan.
- Corey responded that the question will be: which questions can we ask BOEM to address? NEPA and federal laws allow agencies to act within their discretion, so how do we take up all those questions and fit it into BOEM's process, and do better than other states? We've been listing all these questions without acknowledging what BOEM is doing better, which can come off as unresponsive.
- Nicole asked if there is an output WCMAC can work towards?
 - Corey replied that the output is the same as the Governor's Office's RFP for the consultant to help us with.
- Larry shared that we need to look back at the Principles of Engagement and our letter to the Governor. One of the statements in the Principles of Engagement is "utilizing current research, data, and information, as well as filling gaps is paramount to answering impacts from OSW development. WCMAC strongly recommends that a cumulative analysis be initiated and completed before leasing." As we move forward with the next steps, we shouldn't overlook the data needs. There is an output that we recommend in the Principles of Engagement, and we're trying to get to that through this process.
- Mike O. shared that he understands Corey's argument, and what we don't yet understand is the cumulative impacts of OSW. He compared OSW development to what happened to the Columbia River salmon when they built dams. That was legal, and up to the agency's discretion, but was it the right thing to do? Are we in a similar place now?
- Corey shared that he, Mike, and Larry are all in agreement and on board regarding cumulative impacts. The Marine Planning Committee report laid out what is plausible /doable in terms of understanding the CA Current Marine Ecosystem. What are the big questions we have, and how do we get scientific experts to answer them? What can we do to fit it within the BOEM process?

- Dale reminded the group that WA is unique in its characteristics. There was also a discussion of the Rafeedie decision and the implications of this decision, in addition to potential displacement and impacts from floating OSW on coastal communities.
- Larry commented that everyone but BOEM agrees that a cumulative impacts analysis is needed. Regarding the Rafeedie Shellfish decision, one of the effects of the Decision on the management of the crab fishery caused a shift and concentration of fishing effort by non-tribal fishers south of the adjudicated Usual and Accustomed Areas (U&As) of the Coastal tribes. The majority of the state fleet now concentrates effort in the remaining 38 miles of the Washington coast, to the south of the U&As, causing intense fishing in that area and increased competition and decreased profitability. The Rafeedie decision requires co-management, which has affected the area by concentrating non-tribal fishing spatially. Increased spatial demand and effects in that southern coastal area is now coupled with the possibility of further confinement of space by OSW being sited within that area.
- There was discussion about the need to understand tribal perspectives, although tribal representatives have been invited to the WCMAC, they may be more interested in government-to-government interaction and relationships. Larry noted that we have a number of public statements and comments from coastal Tribes regarding Oregon and California OSW, so even if they aren't able to have in-person representation on WCMAC, we do have tribal public statements about the BOEM process and OSW development process on West Coast.
 - Nicole shared that there is a tribal comment letter folder in the Shared Folder.

Objective 2 Action Plan Review

- Larry asked a question about the statement “Objective 2 does not explicitly state that WCMAC seeks to identify data gaps.” He stated that it *implicitly* says so if not explicitly. In the Principles of Engagement, the OSW TC recommend filling data gaps. When Objective 2 states “community research needs,” Larry believes it meant both existing data and new data, to fill in those gaps. Larry requested that this language shouldn't limit our discussion to only the existing unsolicited lease requests. He thinks the unsolicited lease requests have prompted and caused a temporal need to understand the potential impacts of OSW off the coast of WA, but our discussion should not be limited to the unsolicited lease requests alone.
 - Nicole commented that we've been taking the broader and general approach and was interested to hear if TC members felt that should be changed.
 - Larry replied that we don't need to change the Objective, but we should understand that the language may be limiting. He argued we shouldn't change the objective, as long as it's recognized that there are other options that might be generated, such as a WEA (Wind Energy Area) proposed by BOEM might be different than the areas the unsolicited lease requests have previously described.
 - Larry also disagreed that Ecology should identify data gaps. He believes WCMAC should also be doing this. Larry requested the TC do a strawman

poll about what people believe data gaps to be, and then cross reference that with Ecology's process. Larry believes the WCMAC's charge includes—under community research needs—the consideration of what some of the data gaps are, by this body and not just Ecology.

- Nicole commented that there are potentially no edits to Objective 2.
- Corey recommended changing the section “review cumulative impacts and needs.” He’s unsure what community research needs are, and regarding the unsolicited lease requests, BOEM said they won’t move forward until they hear from WA’s Governor. Carrie has said that they will work on a planning process for what OSW off the coast of WA may look like, and that’s the priority for this group to advise on. This is not a technical committee that can tell us what the most important data gaps are, as we’re not experts. We need to build an understanding of potential cumulative impacts in OR, CA, and WA; this is what our group should spend its time on. The Governor is hiring a consultant to design what an engagement process would look like, and to determine what scientific needs would go with that process.
- Larry replied that he never said we should prioritize these data gaps, rather, he wants to use the TC’s skill and expertise to identify potential data gaps. He agreed with Corey that there is no need to revise, as long as we understand that this is a broader conversation.
- RD shared his support for a general and overarching objective that allows for new things to develop, which can help with future thinking and capturing new potentials as things develop.
- Corey proposed the TC look at BOEM’s planning process rather than just the unsolicited lease requests and appropriateness of OSW off the coast. He agreed with Larry that it might broaden and include other areas, rather than just the unsolicited lease request.
 - Larry responded that he does not like that language, as it suggests we have a planning process established by BOEM and the State of WA. BOEM has stated that there are no planning processes in WA; they’re waiting to see if the Governor starts a planning process.
 - Larry suggested the following revision: “Review existing data and community research needs, **prompted by** the unsolicited lease requests.” However, he also noted that if the language is already vague enough, we might not need to change it.
- Corey commented that this is a Governor’s advisory council. The Governor’s representative said they want to think about a planning process for OSW. If WCMAC wants to advise on OSW, that is the most direct question to WCMAC. Carrie said that they wanted to think about the appropriateness of OSW and what a potential planning process could look like.
- Larry commented that if we want to reword this Objective, then we’ll need to spend more time on it.
- Nicole followed up by asking, if the TC doesn’t feel strongly about editing the language of the Objective, does the group feel okay with our current Objective?
- Mike O asked if the intent was for the TC to add some language that may satisfy Corey and Larry’s conversation.

- Nicole replied that if members want to revise the language and present that to the full WCMAC, it would be great to discuss what those edits would look like.

Next Steps

- OSW TC will continue the Objective 2 Action Plan revision process in January.
 - May require an additional meeting be held if we want to ensure we can move forward with the Action Plan. The goal is to present the plan to the full WCMAC and have it approved.
- The Facilitation Team will revise the Action Plan based on the discussion.
- Nicole will send new meeting invites for the 4th Tuesday of the Month.
- Next OSW TC meeting is January 23, 2024.