

WCMAC **Offshore Wind Technical** **Committee**

2024 Meeting Summaries



WASHINGTON
COASTAL
MARINE
ADVISORY
COUNCIL



Meeting Summary Contents

Meeting Summaries 2024

January 23, 2024

March 26, 2024

April 23, 2024

June 25, 2024

July 23, 2024

August 27, 2024

October 22, 2024

Please see the 2022-2023 OSW TC Meeting Summaries here: [2022-2023 OSW TC Meeting Summaries](#)

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee

January 23, 2024

1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- Carrie Sessions, Governor's Office, provided updates on the consultant team that was hired to further investigate an OSW engagement process with BOEM in WA.
- Brandii O'Reagan, WA Sea Grant, shared key findings related to OSW from a Sea Grant seminar that took place in December.
- The TC debriefed the December WCMAC meeting's State Energy Strategy presentation & Trident Winds update.
- The TC continued review on the Objective 2 Action Plan

Participants

WCMAC Members

- Brian Polagye, Energy industries or organizations
- Carrie Sessions, Governor's Office
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Katie Arkema, Science organization
- Larry Thevik, Commercial fishing (TC Co-Chair)
- Matt Niles, State Parks
- Michele Conrad, Economic development
- Mike Nordin, Pacific MRC
- Nives Dolsak, Educational institution
- Rich Doenges, Department of Ecology
- Rod Fleck, North Pacific MRC

TC Members & Facilitators

- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Brandii O'Reagan, WA Sea Grant
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Heather Hall, WDFW
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia Consulting Group
- Taylor Magee, Cascadia Consulting Group

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Agenda Overview

Nicole welcomed everyone to the OSW TC meeting and reviewed the agenda, noting the ground rules are included in the meeting packet. Carrie shared that she had to leave at 1:20 due to a legislative session, and the Governor's Office Update was moved up on the agenda.

Updates and Announcements

Governor's Office Update

- Carrie shared that the Governor's Office has hired a consultant, Gridworks, to begin discussions with tribes, WCMAC, and other OSW stakeholders to develop a planning and evaluation process for OSW. The work will begin in the next week or two, and the consultant will be under contract for six months. The bulk of their work will be in discerning what a transparent engagement process with BOEM may potentially look like, and getting an *idea* of the data and science gaps and how sequencing those may look. Carrie noted that she's hoping they will attend the February WCMAC meeting, and they're currently checking the consultants' schedules.
- Carrie then asked for any questions the group may have:
 - Larry thanked Carrie for the information and noted that he appreciated acknowledgement that the BOEM process is flawed. He raised concerns that looking into the BOEM process may speed up the process of engagement with BOEM, and asked if the Governor's Office was planning on engaging with BOEM after this process.
 - Carrie replied that their approach will depend on what the consultants find.
 - Brandii informed Carrie that Sea Grant held a conference in Rhode Island where they brought together Sea Grant Representatives from across the country to discuss OSW and impacts to marine species, fishermen, and the communities affected by OSW. There is a summary document detailing the outcomes of these conversations, which Brandii will forward to Carrie.
- Katie commented that there was legislation Senator Whitehouse put forward to improve the BOEM process, and that it would be good to look at that. She then asked Carrie if there were plans to engage the scientific community.
 - Carrie replied that it may be insightful to engage the scientific community regarding the science and data gaps.
 - Katie also commented that many in the social science community and PNNL have been following various sustainable development processes and noted that the BOEM process is missing key pieces of engagement that is present in other plans. She said she'd be happy to be in contact with the consultant to provide this insight.
 - Carrie thanked Katie for that insight and noted she would follow up.
- Michele asked if WCMAC members should expect to be contacted by the consultants.
 - Carrie replied that will be determined.
- Mike N. commented that he'd like to know more about the science community being a stakeholder, as he views them as more of an asset or information source. He also commented that the social science community is broad and was curious who Katie had in mind from these groups.
 - Carrie commented that it's important to the Governor's Office to engage with as many people as possible who have an insight into OSW.
 - Mike N. commented that Marine Resource Committees are very important, and there aren't many on the WA coast. When gathering input from

stakeholders, those who are from direct coastal communities should have a weighted opinion on the matter.

Announcements

- Nicole noted that the Final October Meeting Summary was sent to the OSW TC members and can be found in the Shared Folder.
 - Larry said he'd like hot links to meeting summaries accessible to the full WCMAC and the public.
 - Nicole replied that she can talk with Ecology and see if standalone summaries can be added to the EZ View page.

OSW TC Updates

Sea Grant Update

- Brandii provided a Sea Grant update, sharing an overview of a recent three-day conference that was held in Rhode Island. The conference brought together Sea Grant representatives from across the county to discuss OSW development and focused on various topics.
 - The representatives were organized into four regions, and each provided an overview of OSW development. All regions shared similar challenges and concerns, especially regarding commercial fishing and tribal relations (where they existed).
 - A session focused on marine mammals and fish demonstrated that too much is unknown regarding the impacts of OSW on marine habitats. While some data shows no negative impacts from OSW to certain species, such as whales, this data is too new to provide solid answers.
 - From communities who build OSW or communities that have OSW developments sited, impacts to the job market were positive in some cases. Key takeaways included needing early planning for local job trainings to ensure local communities were accessing these jobs.
 - In some cases, fishermen were left out of conversations entirely, resulting in the loss of entire key fishing areas. The identified need for increased transparency throughout the process, and local knowledge and input before maps are drawn and decisions made.
 - Fishmen spoke at the conference and shared that halfway through certain OSW processes, the Rhode Island Forum for Fishermen was established to highlight this important stakeholder group. The establishment of the group created an avenue for fishermen to be heard and demonstrated a need for inclusion at the beginning of OSW processes.
 - In areas where OSW is occurring, communities are supportive of the potential economic benefits but concerned over the unknown environmental impacts, and the BOEM engagement process.
- Brandii also shared that OSU recently received funding for a four-year grant which will explore the community benefits of OSW development on the West Coast. She noted that the study will focus on CA, but the Grays Harbor, WA area was also highlighted.
- Questions / Comments:

- Mike N. commented that there are no economic benefits to coastal communities with OSW development. He then asked Brandii if Sea Grant was looking at any alternative energy processes.
 - Brandii replied that Sea Grant serves as a conduit of information and not actively researching other opportunities. Formal requests for additional research must be made by UW and they would need to find a fellow for that work.
- Rod commented that a few members had discussed small onshore wind and solar installations with Carrie, and the importance of accessing sustainable power for small coastal communities. These discussions are often overshadowed by large scale array discussions.
 - Brandii noted that this was great to hear, as Sea Grant is often unaware of land-based initiatives.
- Larry thanked Brandii for her updates. He asked if Sea Grant could go through the public comments received on the OR OSW projects. He also asked about any research into the long-term effects of OSW and upwelling.
 - Brandii replied that there is a Sea Grant fellow tasked with collecting all the comments and entering them into a searchable database, but she has no timeline update. She noted that projects on the East Coast were initially slated for long term research on OSW, but the requirement diminished into 1-year of funded research. She noted that this can't happen on the West Coast, and long-term research should be required.
 - Larry commented that BOEM is not looking at any cumulative effects. They are just now beginning to look at upwelling effects into 2025, however many projects are slated for development and lease sales before then.
- Michele thanked Brandii and asked her to elaborate on the 4-year Grays Harbor study by OSU.
 - Brandii replied that she knows very little about the project, but the study is focusing on community benefits of OSW. Community benefits reference the “perks” or benefits that an OSW company will offer to communities, such as community infrastructure or payments to fishermen over lost fishing areas. She noted that the research is mostly looking at community benefits in CA but will also survey the residents of Grays Harbor and see what they might like community benefits to look like.
- Larry commented that community benefit agreements are more for mitigation of impacts.
 - Brandii also noted that if you negotiate community benefits before you know the effects, you can't properly mitigate.
- Mike N. commented that he had to leave the meeting early but wanted everyone to keep the Ilwaco community in their thoughts after the recent fire.
 - Heather Hall provided a resource in the chat [Fundraiser by Ilwaco Tuna club : Support those who lost pots in the Ilwaco fire \(gofundme.com\)](#)
- Brandii also noted that UW recently received funding for a study, unrelated to Sea Grant.

- Casey commented that current legislation is proposed for funding that looks into the upwelling effects of OSW.
- Katie (in the chat): This program may be of interest to this group because it funds research on diverse renewable energy technologies (land-based solar, small-scale wind etc.) and is designed for coastal community energy resilience. This is funding the work that Rod mentioned with the Makah Tribe. [About the Energy Transitions Initiative Partnership Project | Department of Energy](#)

WCMAC December Meeting Debrief

- Nicole reoriented the group to the December WCMAC meeting, and asked the group to provide any reflections on the OSW discussion items from that meeting-the Trident Winds presentation and the WA State Energy Plan.
- Larry noted that it was a lot of information to take in, and it was interesting to see the contrast between Alla and Jeremy's presentation on OSW development on the West Coast. On the administrative goal of 30 GW by 2030, WA is not included as a region/state to support that goal. Jeremy shared that CA is mandated to generate 25 GW of power by 2045- a huge production of power which diminishes the need for OSW power in both OR and WA. He also shared that the WA wind energy resource is less appealing than the resource in CA, however, Alla claimed that the wind resource produced by WA by southerly winds in the winter made up for that gap. He noted that wind energy advocates continue to discuss wind energy in terms of plate capacity, but what turbines actually produce will likely be significantly less. He commented that the idea of the potential production capacity of 20 GW of OSW off the WA coast was not realistic and it didn't account for constrained areas. 6-7GW was much more feasible, however would likely still have to be sited in high intensity fishing areas.
- Rod commented that he appreciated Larry's feedback and noted that the different perspectives shared were helpful. Rod also shared that he wanted more information on how OSW could mitigate energy needs and energy growth- as some dots are not connecting. He also noted that most OSW is sited in rural communities, so ensuring that state benefits are reflected at the local level is crucial.
 - Nicole commented that there is an opportunity to better understand how OSW will mitigate GHG emissions to meet the state goals.
- Larry shared that the presenters gave confusing information about the current transmission potential on WA coast. The argument was made that existing transmission lines could conduct OSW energy; however, the substations are not suitable for these loads, and there is no current local infrastructure that could transfer these larger energy loads to the grid.
- Katie commented that there is a West Coast wide transmission study, and she'd be happy to connect with them to provide more information.
 - Nicole replied that she will follow up on this topic.

Objective 2 Action Plan

- Nicole introduced the agenda item. She noted that they will continue to review the Objective 2 Action Plan, and pick up where they left off at the November meeting which was determining if a new objective is needed. The group went through the document and provided feedback and edits, reaching "Table 1. OSW Data and

Community Research Needs.” Nicole added edits made by the OSW TC to the Objective 2 Action Plan document, [here](#).

- Comments / Edits:
 - Heather asked how they would prepare themselves to respond to the governor / consultant, and if that aligns with their objectives. Wants to ensure meaningful engagement with the short consultant contract.
 - Larry said he felt concerned that the role of WCMAC and consultant was not identified, and they need to ensure the consultant adheres to the WCMAC Principles of Engagement.
 - Larry asked to replace the word “prioritize” with “identify” throughout the document.
 - Larry asked if the red text in the objective would need authorization from the full WCMAC.
 - Nicole replied that it would not require authorization, however adding the phrase “prompted by” would require their approval.
 - Larry and Rod shared that they felt the “prompted by” text was important in providing context to the document.
 - Nicole replied that they can provide more context and state the intention of the plan, outside of the Objective 2 box.
 - Rod replied that this offers flexibility in our wording and intent.
 - Corey commented that he doesn’t see a need to nit-pick this item, and the OSW TC should focus on crafting questions for the consultant. He also added that #1 and #3 of Objective 2 are similar and could be combined.
 - Nicole shared with the group that she wants to ensure TC alignment on Objective 2 and that it fits the TC’s goals.
 - Katie echoed what Larry shared and doesn’t want to narrow this document to the very specific unsolicited lease requests. She wants it made clear in the elaboration that this objective isn’t solely about responding to those requests, and more broadly about OSW on the West Coast.
 - Nicole noted that this document was intended to be broad and encompass all OSW projects.
 - Michele commented that, to Corey’s Point, you could combine #1 and #3, as the MSP is the implementation of ORMA policies.
 - Heather echoed this.
 - Nicole noted that we will clarify the intent of the Action Plan, that it’s a broad document that seeks to provide a roadmap for the TC.
 - Larry would like to add hot links to meeting summaries in the Action Plan Development Background.
 - Nicole replied that the April and May meeting summaries could be linked as a public resource.
 - The group reached Table 1. OSW Data and Community Research Needs (identified to date) where many comments were received. Nicole noted that this is not meant to be comprehensive but to provide an overview.
 - The following comments we collected for the MSP Data Viewer row of the Table.
 - Larry commented to emphasize “new” in “identify new layers to include”.

- Larry commented in the “other considerations” piece that while sightings of short-tailed albatross may be limited, the impacts of their potential interference and blade collisions with OSW turbines would be severe.
- Larry commented the “constraints” piece identified by BOEM in the NCOSS modeling is narrow, and we need to understand what constraint means in the BOEM context and when compared to our idea of constraints and potential barriers to developments in WA.
- Michele commented (in the chat): RE: the BOEM "constraints" referenced in Table 1, BOEM is using the NOAA National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) spatial suitability model to determine suitable locations for OSW development. The NCCOS model assigns scores and Dept of Defense and Pac PARS (USCG) areas receive a score of zero and are identified as "constraints," which means "no go."
<https://coastalscience.noaa.gov/science-areas/offshore-wind-energy/>

Next Steps and Closing

Next Steps

- The next full WCMAC meeting is February 14th.
- The next OSW TC is March 26th 1-3pm.

Closing Comments

- Mike O. commented that Larry’s comments about the BOEM constraints are very important, and we need to clarify what is meant by constraint.
 - Nicole replied that we will discuss how we want to define constraints in relation to the MSP data viewer in the next meeting.
- Nicole thanked everyone before ending the meeting at 3:00pm.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee
March 26, 2024 | 1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- OSW Technical Committee members provided feedback to Gridworks about the intentions behind WCMAC's Principles of Engagement, lessons learned from other states' engagement processes with BOEM, and what meaningful and transparent engagement looks like.
- Key themes from this discussion include:
 - BOEM must meaningfully include and engage with affected stakeholders and communities in the engagement process.
 - Meaningful and transparent engagement includes regular and repeated engagement opportunities, with relevant materials shared in advance, and meetings have opportunity for public comment and engagement.
 - Meaningful and transparent engagement means that public feedback is incorporated into the decision-making process and responded to.
 - Washington's enforceable policies are a key pathway for the state to impact BOEM's process if it isn't adequately involving stakeholders.

Participants

WCMAC Members

- Brian Blake, Commercial fishing
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC
- Katie Arkema, Science organization
- Larry Thevik, Commercial fishing (TC Co-Chair)
- Matt Niles, State Parks
- Michele Conrad, Economic development
- Nives Dolsak, Educational institution
- Paula Culbertson, Wahkiakum MRAC
- Phil Anderson, Recreational fishing
- Rod Fleck, North Pacific MRC

TC Members, Staff, and Guests

- Alle Brown-Law, Cascadia Consulting Group
- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Brandii O'Reagan, WA Sea Grant
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Heather Hall, WDFW
- Kate Griffith, Gridworks
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Mara Machulsky, Hoh Tribe
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Nicole Gutierrez, Cascadia Consulting Group
- Peggen Frank

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Announcements

- Nicole Gutierrez welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the March meeting agenda. She noted that the November 2023 meeting summary was finalized. The facilitation team is still accepting comments on the January 2024 meeting summary through the end of March.
- Larry Thevik requested that Technical Committee (TC) meeting summaries are uploaded somewhere where the public can view them.
 - Nicole replied that OSW TC meeting summaries are already shared publicly on Ecology's [WCMAC EZ View page](#) as appendices in the full WCMAC meeting packets, but moving forward the facilitation team will also upload a compilation PDF that includes all OSW TC meeting summaries in one document.

OSW Updates

- Nicole reviewed highlights from BOEM's presentation at the February WCMAC meeting and asked if anyone had additional updates or reflections to share.
 - Katie Arkema shared that she followed up with the BOEM Representative after the BOEM presentation at the February meeting. She asked if it's a requirement for BOEM to convene an interagency task force, or if we can convene our own task force. Please see [Appendix A](#) to see a copy of the correspondence that Katie shared out during the meeting.
- Larry reminded the OSW TC that BOEM moved forward with the Oregon Wind Energy Areas (WEAs) despite over a thousand public comments and calls to hold. After the final WEA announcement, BOEM put out a 30-day comment period on the Environmental Assessment. Many of the groups that have recurrent concerns asked for more time to make comments on the scoping period of the Environmental Assessment, but BOEM did not grant additional time. Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) sent a letter related to the latest comment period, noting that they have previously requested a deliberative approach and remain concerned with BOEM's truncated timeline. Larry concluded that we continue to see BOEM putting decisions before data. BOEM's target is to have a public sales notice and Oregon lease areas up for sale by October.
- Corey reflected on the WCMAC February meeting, noting his opinion that the Gridworks project is working to answer how Washington state could better lead the BOEM process and address some of the concerns raised by other states. What could this joint coordination and planning look like? How do we braid together our state's management framework with BOEM's process? How can we make the process better than what we've seen in Oregon and California?

Gridworks Engagement (*Kate Griffith, Gridworks*)

Kate Griffith shared that Gridworks wants to dive deeper into WCMAC's Principles of Engagement and think about how to braid the State's process with BOEM's process. Kate led the following discussion.

Technical Committee Discussion

- Kate asked, for those who were involved with developing the OSW TC's Principles of Engagement, what led to those principles?

- Larry replied that the Biden Administration did not identify WA as a location for OSW development in [their 2030 OSW target](#). This gave us the opportunity to watch the OSW process unfold elsewhere. Through observing other states' processes, the TC identified recurrent concerns with BOEM's process such as the lack of and need for more data, the need for cumulative impacts analysis, and the need for a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (or something similar) before leasing decisions.
 - Corey shared that the Principles were an intermediate exercise to identify what wasn't working in other states. He recognized that the Principles would need to be translated into something more concrete if BOEM came to WA.
- Kate asked the group to expand on Principle 2, which calls for a "joint planning or coordination agreement." What would this look like?
 - Michele commented that this language refers to an agreement between BOEM and state agencies. Essentially, our understanding of the current BOEM process is that when a state requests a task force, the members of the task force only include state agencies. What we wanted to communicate in Principle 2 is that a task force should also include affected stakeholders, who are not currently included in the BOEM process.
 - Larry commented that the TC witnessed how ineffective the Task Force process had been elsewhere. He noted two reasons for Principle 2, including:
 - TC members felt the BOEM Task Force process was flawed; in other states there were very few Task Force meetings and it had been a very closed-off process with limited public input or access. We viewed the Task Force as a failed process and were searching for alternatives.
 - Within BOEM's federally mandated responsibilities, there's language about a "joint planning or coordination agreement" in lieu of a Task Force ([30 CFR § 585.102\(e\)](#)). The TC used this regulatory language in the Principles of Engagement as an alternative to the BOEM Task Force process, and then built upon it to determine what a "joint planning or coordination agreement" would involve. The TC advocates that this should include stakeholder involvement from the get-go.
 - Corey shared that, in addition, other state's task forces always received very little notice of a BOEM decision, announcement, or public comment opportunity. It's extremely difficult for task forces to review and respond to technical documents in a short time frame.
 - Rod shared he is concerned that BOEM's process has been consistently exclusive.
 - Larry noted that, in Oregon, the BOEM Task Force meetings were scant, with only six meetings since 2011. Task Force meetings also never included time for public comment. Larry feels that the Oregon Task Force process was not inclusive, often times uninformed, and did not provide for public comment.
- Kate shared that the Principles' recommendation, "WCMAC recommends an alternative approach.." reads like WCMAC is recommending a **non**-intergovernmental process. However, the red flags raised by WCMAC could be problems with any engagement process, intergovernmental or not. What other ideas for that kind of advisory body did you have in mind?
 - Corey noted that WCMAC hasn't gotten to that level of detail yet.
- Kate asked if TC members had ideas about an advisory body now.
 - Michele shared that the TC thought BOEM's authority to have something other than an intergovernmental Task Force may be limited. Based on [the cited regulation \(30 CFR § 585.102\(e\)\)](#), a joint planning or coordination agreement fell within the BOEM authority as an alternative to the intergovernmental Task Force. We weren't

- necessarily thinking that it would be something completely different from the intergovernmental Task Force.
- Michele commented that, based on the MSP, WDFW would establish a fishery-specific advisory body about OSW. The OSW TC was trying to establish a broader stakeholder body that included affected communities along the coast and not just affected fishermen (who would already be included in WDFW's fisheries advisory body).
 - Corey agreed. WDFW has a fisheries stakeholder process, but asked how do we braid that together? The MSP says that the State wants a cumulative impacts analysis before the leasing stage. Corey also noted that there are at least two different processes at play here: the Coastal Zone Management Act consistency process and the Fisheries Use Protection Standards. Our MSP requires a fisheries stakeholder advisory process to help the state evaluate the Fisheries Use Protection Standards and ORMA.
 - Katie Arkema shared that she wasn't involved with the development of the Principles, but she thinks it's worth explicitly noting that there are different elements to consider about the organization of such a task force. One element is the membership (recognizing it needs to be inclusive of all stakeholders, not just agency and tribal representatives) and another is who leads the engagement. If there are opportunities for this engagement to not be led by BOEM, that is worth considering. What would that process look like? What are the opportunities to be involved? What are the mechanisms for listening to input? This is where WA can be clear; it shouldn't only be BOEM involved in the analysis, we can have co-developed science and engagement to inform each stage of the process. Katie thinks we should involve a task force in each stage of the process, through construction and monitoring. There should be a clear feedback loop, so input is continually fed back into the process for future decision-making.
 - Larry appreciated Michele's summary of the WDFW fisheries stakeholder requirement in the MSP. His opinion is, if we pursue a relationship with BOEM, it should not be integrated into the MSP planning process and WCMAC forum. It should be its own separate process. We might even find that the different processes come to different conclusions about OSW. There is an information void that is not being filled, and the MSP is supposed to provide that data. Larry thinks the MSP process would be outside of the BOEM Task Force process.
 - Kate asked if the group had any concerns with WDFW taking concerns from the fisheries stakeholder body to the BOEM Task Force.
 - Larry shared that he views these as separate. The MSP process includes a fisheries stakeholder advisory meeting and the Ocean Caucus. The BOEM Task Force is separate from these. You would still have stakeholder participation within this other communication framework.
 - Rod shared that the Principles of Engagement were created with the hopes that BOEM would be an engaged, willing, and collaborative partner. The concern is that we may be too optimistic about BOEM's participation. How do we ensure WA's needs and wants are clearly articulated, fully formed, and developed from Day 1 of a BOEM process. He wondered if we should ask the state's engineers to do some "if-when" analysis. WCMAC can start thinking about utilizing BOEM's process to the fullest benefit for WA.
 - Kate asked for clarification about Rod's comments. She heard two recommendations: one, there's an opportunity for WCMAC to course correct if BOEM isn't an engaged and collaborative partner. Second, the WA

- Attorney General could begin looking procedurally at where those off-ramps might be.
- Rob clarified that we need a Plan B. The Principles of Engagement are our Plan A, so what is our Plan B if BOEM isn't collaborative? What can we implement instead so WA isn't at a disadvantage? Rod recommended that we work with DNR, WDFW, and Ecology to analyze where the onshore connection for OSW energy would occur. What are the impacts, concerns, and obstacles for onshore grid connection?
 - Corey commented that we need to understand how the enforceable policies and consistency operate and then work backwards from there. The enforceable policies set the federal legal framework and create a major role for the state in this conversation. The state can evaluate if a proposed project/use is consistent with ORMA.
 - Michele agreed with previous comments made and responded to Rod's questions about a Plan B. The Principles of Engagement (Principle 2 in particular) are what we are hoping BOEM would agree to. If BOEM is not willing to engage in a process as we've outlined here, these principles still serve as expectations for the state agencies and the Governor's Office to follow. Thus, our Plan B is that the Principles still stand, and we expect the Governor's Office and state agencies to interact and engage with stakeholders according to the Principles, then take our input to BOEM.
 - Larry agreed with Michele. He also mentioned that he and Corey discussed the enforceable policies and the potential for WCMAC to course correct if an engagement process unfolds that they don't agree with. Is there any serious way that the state could interact with and modify BOEM's behavior? The Coastal Zone Management Act and the enforceable policies are potential places where the state can influence BOEM's actions if BOEM is far afield of these principles. Larry believes that if Ecology doesn't issue a consistency certificate for OSW, the decision goes to U.S. Secretary of Commerce.
 - Kate noted that the Principles of Engagement document shares the need for meaningful and transparent engagement (Principles #4, #2, #1). What does meaningful and transparent mean to you, or what are tangible examples of engagement that could have been more meaningful and/or transparent?
 - Larry shared that in Oregon, BOEM received over 1000 public comments asking for more time and data collection but didn't answer any of these concerns. Larry commented that "meaningful" is an exchange; when we have objections, the agency should respond. BOEM currently has not responded to posed questions. In terms of transparency, when BOEM announced the Oregon call area designations, they held a Task Force meeting only one day prior, which isn't enough notice. There have been many opportunities for public comment at milestones, but little response to the comments submitted. And contrary to that, the Task Force meetings don't have an opportunity for public comment. Despite requests for public comment period extension, BOEM did not extend.
 - Larry also commented that tribal consultation has been inadequate according to public tribal comments and submitted comment documents.
 - Michele shared that "meaningful" means adequate time to review agendas, briefing materials, and technical documents. It also includes multiple opportunities to engage with BOEM. If BOEM doesn't want to engage with stakeholders and affected communities, then there needs to be adequate time for the state agencies to conduct stakeholder engagement processes and solicit public input to take to BOEM in the interagency task force. "Transparent" means accessible meetings, shorter travel times/distance to meetings, remote/virtual options, opportunity for actual

- engagement and not just observation, and opportunity for public engagement and comment on the process. If BOEM isn't willing to be on a task force that includes stakeholders –even though that is what we're asking for– is there a way for the public and stakeholders to engage in this process?
- Paula noted that “meaningful” refers to ensuring we are shown the full picture of OSW – not just pieces of the process that BOEM is responsible for. When sitting in on previous meetings, questions have been raised about transmission and BOEM will deflect those questions to another department. BOEM has an obligation to share the full picture with us and bring in any other relevant agencies, so we are fully informed.
 - Corey commented that the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) is a great example of an open and transparent process. The analysts, scientists, and decision makers are all meeting in public and articulating their rationale.
 - Kate confirmed with Corey that in this example, meaningful and transparent means everything from analysis to decision-making is happening in a forum that the public can observe and engage with.
 - Phil agreed; PFMC is a forum for transparent and meaningful interaction with the communities affected by an action and offers substantial and repetitive opportunities for impacted entities to engage in the process. He noted that, for most government entities, meaningful engagement does not mean that every issue or concern raised by the affected community is going to be resolved in a manner that's acceptable. The important piece is that the action-taking agency works diligently in a meaningful public dialogue with the people and communities impacted by whatever the proposed action is. They are obligated to incorporate the concerns and comments into decision making to the maximum extent possible. Transparency is being able to see the information that's being used to evaluate the action, to be able to comment on the analysis and materials, and to be able to bring new information into the decision-making process.
 - Heather Hall asked how the WCMAC can provide more input to Gridworks.
 - Kate replied that there are a few avenues. First, she's engaging with WCMAC members outside of WCMAC meetings. Gridworks' report is due to the Governor's Office on June 15, and a public comment period is required prior. Kate is working with Ecology to determine if attending another WCMAC meeting is possible within the project timeframe. There will be a public comment opportunity that WCMAC can participate in.
 - Larry commented that time constraints placed on Gridworks' project are a concern, and Gridworks should request more time from the Governor's Office.

Closing and Next Steps

Nicole reviewed actions items from the meeting:

- OSW TC members can reach out to Kate Griffith (kgriffith@gridworks.org) directly with questions or further comments.
- Ecology and the facilitation team will coordinate with Kate about future discussions with the WCMAC or OSW TC.
- The facilitation team will circulate the OSW TC Action Plan via email and likely return to it in April.
- OSW TC members can send edits to the January meeting summary by Friday, March 29.
- The next OSW TC meeting is scheduled for April 23, 2024.

Appendix A: BOEM Correspondence

Question: Is it a requirement to initiate a BOEM interagency task force in order to move through the process or is it possible to hold a different task force, say spearheaded by the state, instead of the BOEM interagency task force which limits participation to just agencies?

BOEM answer: Per 30 CFR Part 585.102, BOEM will provide for coordination and consultation with the Governor of any State, the executive of any local government, and the executive of any Indian Tribe that may be affected by a lease, easement, or ROW under this subsection. BOEM may invite any affected State Governor, representative of an affected Indian Tribe, and affected local government executive to join in establishing a task force or other joint planning or coordination agreement in carrying out our responsibilities under this part. Outside of a BOEM-organized task force, the state can organize a task force and include additional participants if so desired. Traditionally, the task force is mostly active throughout the first phase of planning, unless there is the desire to keep the task force as a communication mechanism after leases have been executed. After lease execution, there are stipulations for the lessee to organize and fund continued engagement with tribes, fishermen, and other stakeholders.

Question: I noticed in your slides that the rainbow process diagram looks little different than I've noticed in the past. On the far left there is now a brown block with state process. Is that a recent change in the formal process?

BOEM answer: The rainbow diagram slide indicates only a change to the illustration, and not a change to the process. The BOEM and State coordination for planning has always been the first step in the planning process.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee
April 23, 2024 | 1pm – 3pm

Meeting Highlights

- The OSW TC discussed nominations for new TC co-leads. The TC is nominating Matt Niles to join Larry Thevik as co-lead.
- The OSW TC discussed and edited the Objective 2 Action Plan.

Participants

WCMAC Members

- Brian Blake, Commercial Fishing
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing (TC Co-Lead)
- Michele Conrad, Economic Development
- Mike Nordin, WCMAC Vice Chair, Pacific Conservation District
- Paula Culbertson, Wahkiakum MRC
- Rod Fleck, WCMAC Chair, North Pacific MRC

TC Members, Staff, and Guests

- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Dale Beasley, Crab fishing representative
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Nicole Gutierrez & Alle Brown-Law, Facilitation

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Announcements

- Nicole Gutierrez welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the April meeting agenda. She noted that the January 2024 meeting summary was finalized. The facilitation team is still accepting comments on the March 2024 meeting summary through the end of April.
- Ecology has posted a full OSW TC meeting summary document (2022-2023) to the [WCMAC EZ View page](#). This was in response to Larry Thevik's request that TC meeting summaries are uploaded somewhere where the public can easily view them.

Co-Lead Call

- The OSW TC currently has one co-lead (Larry) and can have two to three. Nicole shared asked if there were any WCMAC members on the call that are interested.
- Mike Nordin asked if Brian Blake is interested in being co-lead.
 - Brian Blake replied that he isn't sure if he has time to serve as co-lead.
- Nicole shared that Matt Niles confirmed that he's available and interested in serving as a co-lead on the OSW TC (Matt was not able to attend this meeting). The facilitation team

confirmed that they will put him forward as a TC co-lead nominee for the May WCMAC meeting.

OSW Updates

- Larry shared that Gridworks hosted a hybrid meeting on March 28th, with participants from Oregon, Washington, and California, to discuss OSW development. In that meeting, participants shared:
 - Desire for the Governor of WA not to engage with BOEM at this time, and instead continue exploring the data gaps and explore other processes occurring in CA and OR before an official process kicks off.
 - WA was not identified to meet Biden's OSW mandate.
 - Desire for a programmatic EIS before leasing.
- Larry continued that WA should continue to explore the Principles of Engagement, enforceable policies, and community and data research needs. On April 18th, a PFMC Marine Planning Committee meeting, BOEM announced that it intends to move forward with its timeline to hold public lease sales off of OR in October 2024, despite the many calls to slow the process down.
- Paula Culbertson shared that she attended a WA Sea Grant webinar on electromagnetic fields generated by the cables off the coast of Long Island. The cables do not emit a lot of electricity, but they do emit electromagnetic fields which can impact animals that use electromagnetic fields for navigation (i.e. sharks and skates). It's interesting that they are proposing to run a cable through the Doves to Portland, running power through river from onshore wind farms.
- Corey Niles commented on the Oregon Governor's letter which asked BOEM not to move forward with any construction now while they go through this roadmap exercise. OR passed a bill calling for this roadmap to be produced.
- Larry commented that it's interesting how it's back to the BOEM's specious argument and claim of not being able to identify potential impacts related to OSW decisions until construction and operation plans are in hand. Despite numerous and diverse calls to slow this process, BOEM has indicated no interest in slowing the march to a Public Sales Notice (PSN) in October 2024. It is good that the OR Governor is saying not to move forward with the COP, which will follow a PSN, but it misses the point—the need to ask more questions and secure answers before any leasing.
- Larry commented on the Objective 2 Action Plan, noting that he has been advocating for replacing the term “prioritizing” with “identifying” when describing focus areas. He also noted, in relation to proposing a change to the Objective 2 language, he recalled Nicole suggesting in the January meeting that we can add contextual explanation about Objective 2 rather than changing it. We don't want to ask for a specific language change, but instead can show how we interpreted the objective. It was noted that we can return to this section once drafted.

Objective 2 Action Plan

- The OSW TC reviewed the Objective 2 Action Plan and made edits throughout. **The edits can be viewed in the updated “WCMAC_OSW_ActionPlan_20240524” word document attached to the OSW TC email.**
- It was noted that we should refer to Objective 1 and the Principles of Engagement recommendations in the introduction.
- Mike N. suggested adding a broader “comprehensive planning process” data and research need theme for assessing the need/feasibility of OSW off the coast of WA. He shared that a

comparison study comparing offshore energy with other clean, renewable energy should also be added.

- Members discussed OSW in the context of alternative energy sources, power transmission needs, energy costs, and the need for a more comprehensive comparative study on all renewable energy sources to define what is most effective for Washington. There was a need identified to review the Net-Zero Northwest study materials that were presented by Evolved Energy at the December 2023 WCMAC meeting.
- A comprehensive planning process theme was added to the Data and Community Research Needs section.

OSW Siting/Development Consideration Theme:

- Larry commented that the OR Call Area identification process had a number of considerations that should be used before identifying a site. He noted that the objective of the OSW Siting/Development theme was unclear and shared that in NOAA's NMFS response to call areas in OR, they said that BOEM 'must' consider effects of upwelling on OSW and what those potential changes to upwelling might do to the ecosystem before identifying Wind Energy Areas (WEAs). The June 28, 2022, letter to BOEM-2022-0009 also suggested extending the considered area.
 - Nicole replied that we can potentially narrow down this theme. Fisheries are covered in a separate theme and have some ecosystem needs identified outside of the current theme (OSW siting/development).
- Mike O. commented that the CA Current, impacts to ecosystem, and more should be part of OSW siting considerations.
 - Nicole replied that these are covered under the OSW and Fisheries theme – but we can consider reorganizing.
- Larry commented that he was unsure which direction to go in. It either needs to be really broad or identified differently. Consider "Other OSW Development Considerations" taking the "siting" out of it.

Note: the OSW TC moved onto the next theme without finalizing review/input on the OSW siting/development theme. Review will be continued at a later meeting.

OSW and Fisheries Theme:

- Michele commented that the term "communities" under this theme may be too broad.
- Dale commented that there needs to be protection and preservation of existing sustainable uses, such as fishing off the coast (RCW 43.143.060(2B)). A near term action is a review of the enforceable policies.
- Larry commented that for #1, the OSW TC suggested that was a limited scope to only include national Academy of Sciences Standing Committee on Offshore Wind Energy and Fisheries. It should consider other research sources and information inputs (for example, PFMF, Tribal sovereigns, NOAA-NMFS, and more).

Note: the OSW TC did not complete their review of this theme and will continue their review at a future meeting.

Closing and Next Steps

Nicole reviewed actions items from the meeting:

- The next WCMAC meeting will be hybrid on May 8th WCMAC will be nominating Matt Niles for OSW co-lead.
- The facilitation team will take feedback on the OSW TC Action Plan and revise before next meeting.
- The next OSW TC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 25, 2024, from 1-3 pm.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee
June 25, 2024 | 1pm – 3pm

Participants

WCMAC Members

- Brian Blake, Commercial Fishing
- Brian Polagye, Energy Industry
- Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC
- Katie Arkema, Science Organization
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing (TC Co-Lead)
- Matt Niles, WA State Parks (TC Co-Lead)
- Mike Nordin, WCMAC Vice Chair, Pacific MRC
- Molly Bold, Coastal Port
- Paula Culbertson, Wahkiakum MRC
- Peter Steelquist, Coastal Recreation
- Phil Anderson, Recreational Fishing

TC Members, Staff, and Guests

- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Dale Beasley, Crab fishing representative
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Nicole Gutierrez & Alle Brown-Law, Facilitation

Meeting Summary

Welcome & Announcements

- Nicole welcomed everyone, reviewed the meeting agenda, and led roll call. She requested feedback on the March and April Technical Committee meeting summaries.

Gridworks Report Takeaways/Impressions

Report link: [Gridworks Final Report and Recommendations](#)

- Casey restated the goal of this conversation: set the WCMAC up for a successful special meeting on July 10th. This TC meeting can help refine what potential WCMAC recommendations could be, so attendees should think about what recommendations would be able to pass the WCMAC with full consensus.

- Larry spoke to the letter he submitted to Gridworks in response to their Draft Report (Appendix A). He commented that the report was well-researched and as thorough as it could be given time constraints. He noted that Gridworks changed the order of their recommendations in their final report, so the numbering differs from his letter. He also noted two recent Tribal letters about the BOEM engagement process – these letters were shared with the OSW TC via email, and can be found here: [05-30-24 Comment from Makah Tribal Council](#), and [06-14-24 Comment from Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians](#).

The following impressions and takeaways on the Gridworks Final Report were shared by TC members and do not represent consensus.

- Many members shared that, overall, Gridworks did a good job of bringing all the information they collected into the report, in a short amount of time. The amount of engagement and perspectives integrated into the final report were noted and appreciated amongst TC members.
- Recognition was shared regarding how much the report focuses on the need for Tribal engagement and consultation.
 - Gridworks shared that “there is a need for Tribes and stakeholders to define what constitutes a benefit to their own communities and assurance that any benefits of offshore wind flow to their communities,” (on page 36 of the report).
- OSW TC Takeaways
 - Washington is not ready to begin a BOEM OSW leasing process. Multiple TC members agreed that it is too soon to engage formally with BOEM, and there is a lot of work to be done prior to a BOEM process, if one occurs.
 - The cost considerations for OSW are very uncertain (both cost to consumer and cost to government). In particular, the cost to ratepayers is not well-documented.
 - The cost required to build state capacity, particularly on the research and development side, could be significant. The consortium suggested would take substantially more money than has previously been invested into this by state or federal government. The [National Offshore Wind Research & Development Consortium \(NOWRDC\)](#) is a similar consortium on the East Coast. Pricing these recommendations out would be a helpful next step.
 - WCMAC was not mentioned much in the report – which was surprising.
 - It seems like the research funding suggested in this report would go to the entities that stand to financially benefit from OSW, and the best course of action is to hold and not engage with BOEM. If state and federal leadership want to pursue OSW off the Washington coast, it is not clear how these recommendations would help.
 - The report fails to mention specific state agency approvals concerning land transmission line needs. It would be helpful to reference state agency approval steps in this process.

- The research consortium would be particularly important to implement, as we don't have a good understanding of the cumulative impacts of built-out OSW on the California Current ecosystem.
- Washington should focus on onshore wind energy opportunities, because offshore wind will significantly negatively impact fishing, particularly young fishermen. It was emphasized that Washington doesn't need to implement the recommendations outlined in the report, because implementing them will lead to engaging with BOEM.
- A reflection was shared that this report was prepared for a governor who is leaving office, so there is concern on how this report will be used due to administration change.
- This report helps us prepare for the possible event that WA does have to engage with BOEM. Overall, this report is an important internal preparation strategy for the state. The best way to protect ourselves from entering a flawed engagement process like other states experienced is to prepare for the potential outcome.

Gridworks Report Recommendations

For the detailed versions of the following recommendations, please refer to Section 4 of the [Gridworks Report](#). **The following feedback on the Gridworks Final Report recommendations were shared by TC members and does not represent consensus.**

During the discussion of Recommendation 1, Larry noted that the report recommendations are not in a specific order based on priority.

Recommendation 1 Feedback

Recommendation #1

Gridworks recommends the Governor's Office engage in meaningful consultation on offshore wind issues with Washington Coastal Tribes and other Tribes that may be impacted by offshore wind. We recommend consultations follow Millennium Agreement guidelines, such as interaction between state and government officials with comparable decision-making authority as well as open, two-way dialogue and information sharing between the state and Tribes. In addition to these tenants of government-to-government consultation, Gridworks recommends the state's offshore wind consultation efforts include representation from the Governor's Office, the Washington Dept. of Ecology, the Dept. of Commerce, and the Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, including leadership and technical staff, to engage in on-going, iterative government-to-government consultations about the cross-sector topics involved in offshore wind—from energy issues to impacts to natural resources. Conversations may not always require all agencies or staff to participate, however points of contact should be well established in case questions arise that participants in a meeting on a given topic cannot address. To accomplish this type of meaningful tribal engagement, the Governor's Office could organize an offshore wind consultation leadership team including cabinet agency leadership as well as technical staff. Designating specific staff to engage in consultations on offshore wind issues could also support meaningful engagement through direct relationship-building between the state and Tribes.

The consultations contemplated by this recommendation are expected to start before and run parallel to federal or state offshore wind planning and analysis work, allowing the results of government-to-government engagements to feed into and impact state and/or federal deliberations and outcomes, as appropriate. For example, Washington Tribes may elect to collaborate with a state offshore wind task force (Recommendation 3), but likely only in addition to government-to-government consultation. The purpose of these government-to-government engagements is to discuss and seek agreement on subjects that would include:

- the protection and mutually beneficial stewardship of offshore lands and resources protected by Treaty rights, Executive Orders, and the state's legislative directives related to Tribes,
- the protection of cultural resources and practices,
- the creation of pathways for sharing information and costs to participate in offshore wind discussions, and
- the recognition of and respect for the rights of all sovereigns to assure the health, safety, and welfare of their citizens.

Additionally, these consultations would streamline information exchange between the state and Tribes to inform any offshore renewable energy planning and evaluation efforts. This recommendation is separate from the pre-decisional government-to-government engagement we recommend BOEM undertake with Washington's Coastal Treaty Tribes and other Tribes that may be impacted by offshore wind development and that is required through the U.S. federal government's trust responsibility to Tribes.



- This engagement is seen as a parallel process to the federal consultation process with Tribes. The State and the Tribes should/could engage in addition to, not as an alternative to, the federal process.
- This recommendation hinges on how the Tribes would want to proceed. It was noted that members would want to hear from the Tribes about this language.
- This recommendation is a foundational piece and imperative to success. The federal government has a trust responsibility to the Tribes. The state has the opportunity to engage in a co-management relationship with the Tribes. Washington has a long history of working with the Tribes on issues of common concern, particularly in the natural resource arena. It is important development of a co-management relationship with the Tribes on this issue, so we can work together in common in ensuring that our ocean resources are preserved and protected for long term.
- A TC member shared that they have heard from a Tribal representative that BOEM's tribal engagement has been inadequate thus far. WA could help the federal government meaningfully engage with Tribes - potentially the state could attend meetings with BOEM and Tribes.
- There was agreement that this recommendation is slightly confusing. WCMAC may want to provide feedback on this recommendation and ask for a clearer distinction between the required federal consultation (what BOEM should already be doing, and what the Tribes has said is not happening) and the additional consultation and engagement that the Governor's Office could conduct with Tribes. Additionally, this recommendation should include engaging tribes on what broader steps they want to take to address climate change.

Recommendation 2 Feedback

Recommendation #2

Washington state should consider development of or support for a regional research consortium that provides independent expert analysis and peer review of, guidance for, and prioritization of data-gathering, research, and analysis informing responsible offshore wind development off the Pacific Coast. Research to develop a baseline understanding of the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem and to then understand offshore wind impacts to Washington Tribes and communities as well as fisheries and other natural resources will be a complicated conversation. Such a conversation will likely draw on researchers and efforts from across the Pacific Coast, requiring substantial time and funding. The prioritization of data-gathering, studies, or pilot efforts to conduct research is outside of our scope and expertise, however we recommend Washington form or support the formation of an entity drawing on West Coast-wide research expertise to scope the additional data gathering and studies, such as cumulative impact analyses. Washington would need to effectively plan for and evaluate offshore wind impacts to the marine environment and coastal communities.

A preliminary list of research study needs identified by participants in our process for consideration include:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cumulative impacts of West Coast offshore wind development • potential impacts to the California Current Large Marine Ecosystem • changes in upwelling • changes to surface-level mixing • changes to larval drift/ocean transport • impacts to stratification • impacts to thermocline • wake effects of turbines • a project's natural disaster resiliency or impacts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • forage effects • seabird impacts, including blade collision • endangered and protected species/habitat impacts • phytoplankton impacts • electromagnetic field effects • impacts to marine mammals and migration • impacts to birds and pollinators • impacts to fish migration in ocean and upstream into inland rivers, such as the Columbia River | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acoustic noise impacts on ocean life • social/socio-economic impacts to coastal Washington and inland communities, including behavioral health impacts on Tribes • fishing production (including stock surveys) • impacts to/dislocation of other ocean uses • impacts to the ecological value of natural resources • broader impacts and benefits of clean energy generation replacing fossil fuel generation |
|---|---|---|

An initial list of organizations or entities to consider for inclusion on the consortium are Washington Department of Ecology, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the University of Washington and other Washington-based academic research groups, Oregon State University, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission, Tribes, independent or nonprofit researchers and organizations, federal organizations including BOEM, National Labs, NOAA, NMFS, and DOD, and other relevant state agencies and researchers.



- Overall, support was expressed for this recommendation and agreement on how important regional research will be regarding OSW development.
- There was discussion about the dams constructed on the Columbia River system as an example of infrastructure that was put in without considering cumulative impacts.
- There was agreement that Washington should be a leader in developing an understanding of OSW impacts to the entire West Coast and California Current ecosystem.
 - Washington should work with Oregon and California on this research, and Washington can take a lead role in advocating for research funding.
- It was strongly encouraged that public access to as much research and information as possible should be ensured, noting that OSW developers can frequently limit access to their proprietary research.
- This research must include the impacts of transmission-related infrastructure and port infrastructure. This recommendation should include more distributional effects of offshore wind infrastructure. It needs to include the relationships between entire OSW ecosystems (turbines, transmission, ports), communities, and the marine resources they depend on.
- It was flagged that BOEM will not do this type of research, particularly not about cumulative impacts.
- There were concerns shared about the effective structure of a research consortium and the funding needed to carry out such a broad analysis. The federal government has a responsibility to fund this research before taking any OSW action.

Recommendation 3 Feedback

Recommendation #3

Washington state should take an active role in determining and articulating its policy priorities relative to offshore wind development off the state coast prior to a BOEM process, including any timelines for considering offshore wind development. To inform articulation of the state's policy priorities by decision-makers, the state could remain flexible and take multiple routes.

Given the early nature of offshore wind discussion in Washington state, Gridworks recommends the state form a new offshore wind planning and analysis task force to inform decision-making and policy articulation by the governor, Legislature, or administrative agencies. This task force could be led by the Washington Dept. of Ecology and include representation from Dept. of Natural Resources, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, Dept. of Commerce, EFSEC, and the Utilities and Transportation Commission as well as Tribal governments, Tribal-led organizations, local governments, interested federal agencies such as the Dept. of Defense, and representatives of impacted groups including the fishing and maritime industries, labor organizations spanning marine industries to electrical infrastructure, conservation, and other impacted viewpoints.

The planning and analysis task force would provide information, including technical analyses and policy or value recommendations, that would be used to inform policy decisions by the governor, the Legislature, and decision-making state agencies like Ecology regarding offshore wind development off the Washington Coast and enable the state to represent those priorities in a BOEM process and other offshore wind leasing or siting efforts. This task force could also enable active public education efforts around offshore wind and any future state or federal processes related to offshore wind development.

The state planning and analysis task force should study, consider, and elucidate the following issues and perspectives:

- How offshore wind resources off the Washington Coast could contribute to Washington's energy resource need,
- How offshore wind resources off the Washington Coast could contribute to regional or national energy resource need,
- How development of offshore wind resources off the Washington Coast may impact existing ocean resources, current marine uses, Tribes, and local communities, with consideration given to the full lifecycle of offshore wind projects, and
- How Washington might avoid and/or minimize potential impacts and realize optimal benefits.



- The bullet points at the end of Recommendation 3 all tend to be answered in the positive/affirmative. These bullet points don't include as much nuance as they need to. They should be re-worded or added to.
 - There was agreement amongst TC members, the language presumes a need for OSW energy. Yes, offshore wind could contribute, but does it have any value relative to Washington's energy resource needs and the costs it may bring?
 - The questions could be worded more in terms of potential trade-offs. For example: What are the positive and negative effects of OSW to WA, the West Coast, the nation, and the globe? What are alternatives to this action? This is a very challenging research and management question because of all the factors and multiple scales and sectors involved, but worth working to better articulate and address these questions.
- This recommendation should potentially include a Proceed/Do Not Proceed decision point for Washington. Washington needs to examine our state and regional energy needs, review the scientific research on OSW impacts, and come to a Go/No-Go decision in the process.
- There were concerns with the make-up of the task force, particularly regarding the federal agencies and their involvement. The structure of how we will prepare ourselves and make recommendations to policymakers needs more thought, clarity, and appropriate representation from state, Tribal, and affected entities.
- It was flagged that, overall, recreation should be explicitly included as a stakeholder group/affected party throughout all the report recommendations. And that the report should include shoreline and coastal terrestrial areas as existing ocean resources, not just the ocean itself.

Recommendation 4 Feedback

Recommendation #4

Washington State should develop a concept framework for responsible offshore wind development in order to encourage and elevate priorities around responsible offshore wind development. The concept framework could draw from the examples of offshore wind road maps in Maine, California, and Oregon, however Washington will most likely want to develop its own concept framework based on Washington's unique considerations and policy objectives, such as:

- expectations for tribal engagement in offshore wind development discussions;
- expectations of community and stakeholder engagement in offshore wind development discussions;
- expectations for realizing Washington economic development opportunities;
- recommendations for BOEM best management practices;
- additional data and research collection needed alongside or prior to project development;
- expectations for project community benefit agreements outlining assurances that local communities will benefit from offshore wind development;
- expectations for labor agreements outlining assurances that certain labor standards will be met during the life of the project;
- expectations for avoidance of or mitigation for various impacts;
- expectations of modifications to offshore wind operational permits to reduce environmental impacts; and
- outlines for the nature and impact thresholds of off-ramps to inform whether the state or federal government should halt consideration of offshore wind projects, among other topics.

The concept framework could provide a set of guidelines or it could act as an enforceable document, depending on the state's priorities. This effort could also develop additional work products, such as draft community benefit agreements or minimum requirements of what community benefit agreements should offer.

If the state engages in a federal leasing process, the concept framework could be useful in encouraging BOEM to include specialized lease provisions, such as bid credits for community benefit agreements or best management practices in its leasing process. The concept framework could also inform off-ramps for the BOEM process from BOEM's planning and analysis phase through site assessments and project development.



- There were strong concerns with the language of this recommendation, which presumes a need for mitigation of conflict, rather than avoiding those conflicts in the first place.
- The referral to "community benefits agreements" (CBAs) are concerning as well; they're often used as an inadequate fix-all for all the negative impacts caused by OSW. How can you describe a CBA as a solution to a problem that we have yet to identify? BOEM claims it cannot identify impacts until leases and COPs are in hand, and yet CBAs quantify what mitigation for those unknown impacts should be. The focus should be on avoiding conflicts, and where we can't, acknowledging that there will be costs which cannot be compensated for with community benefits agreements.
 - There was agreement amongst TC members on CBAs not necessarily being the desired outcome.
- It was noted that this recommendation needs to include job and workforce considerations. Coastal communities were promised manufacturing and assembly jobs, but these are often going to Puget Sound instead of the coast. If fishing is eradicated to a large degree by OSW, it won't help to have jobs in Seattle or Tacoma. Many coastal communities depend on fishing industry jobs.
- It's worth looking at this report through the lens of if this process moves forward off the coast of Washington, what do we want to prepare for? It's worth thinking about how CBAs could be a mechanism for getting what communities want through this process. For example, CBAs could help guarantee that the energy generated goes straight to coastal communities and build more energy resiliency on the coast. Despite the problems with CBAs, it was cautioned against ignoring them completely. However, they should not be interpreted as a fix-all or effective solution to potential negative impacts and need for mitigation.

Recommendation 5 Feedback

Recommendation #5

Prior to entering a BOEM leasing process, Washington state should perform a thorough investigation and comprehensive catalog of Washington's legal authorities under Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) enforceable policies and other jurisdictional authorities pertinent to potential siting and permitting of offshore wind within the BOEM process. For example, the state could review, document, and produce a summary report of all relevant authorities over transmission siting and associated infrastructure in state jurisdictional waters and lands as well as any other siting and permitting authorities likely relevant to offshore wind. The state should also examine whether the state wants to pursue a geographic location description designation to its CZMA enforceable policies to increase the state's ability to ensure enforceable policies are met, or whether other enforceable policies would be helpful for the state. Undertaking this review will position the state to influence federal offshore wind leasing and development processes, from the start of a BOEM planning and analysis process through leasing, site assessments, and construction. It will also inform state leadership, Tribes, and stakeholders of the state's role and authority in offshore wind planning and development.

- Overall, support was expressed for this recommendation.
- A TC member expressed strong support for the suggestion to pursue a geographic location description designation.
- It was shared that this recommendation should include an investigation of the Shoreline Master Plan and how the Shoreline Master Plan can be included in the CZMA analysis. Right now, it's not part of the jurisdictional authority.

Recommendation 6 & 7 Feedback

Recommendation #6

If Washington enters a BOEM process, Washington state should develop advisory body requests for BOEM to meet in BOEM's consideration of offshore wind leasing off the Washington Coast, such as an intergovernmental task force or another body. Discussions with Tribes conducted to-date have indicated that Tribes would not view participation in a BOEM advisory body as a substitute for government-to-government consultations regarding treaty rights or BOEM's trust responsibilities. Therefore, these recommendation options should be considered as additional to state and federal government-to-government consultation.

R6-Option A: Washington State asks BOEM to establish an intergovernmental task force for consideration of Washington offshore wind through BOEM's authorities under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) exemption for "intergovernmental committees." Per restrictions on FACA-exempt committees, membership would be limited to Tribes, state, federal, and local governments, however Washington should require much stronger standards for public engagement (see Recommendation 7) in the BOEM process, such as guidance for public access to information and mandatory feedback from BOEM on issues stakeholders raise both in and outside of task force meetings. In this option, BOEM would manage the intergovernmental task force under an agreement with Washington ideally via a memorandum of understanding or another agreement that creates reasonable timelines for public involvement and accountability to stakeholders.

R6-Option B: Washington State asks BOEM to establish a new committee instead of an intergovernmental task force that would include stakeholders such as the fishing and maritime industries as well as state, federal, and Tribal decision-makers under the FACA provisions for groups established to advise a state government or through the FACA committee approval process. Washington state should define expectations for stakeholder and governmental engagement through an MOU or another agreement with BOEM (see Recommendation 7). As with the intergovernmental task force, this body would be designed to advise BOEM's activities for offshore wind leasing but would not be created as a decision-making body. It could improve the inclusivity of BOEM's advisory bodies by allowing voices to the table who are non-governmental representatives of industries like the fishing and maritime industries.

R6-Option C: Washington State requests BOEM form a traditional intergovernmental task force and, separately, either uses the Washington Coastal Marine Advisory Committee or establishes a new committee such as the state task force in Recommendation 3 to advise BOEM's Washington state agency task force members specifically on the offshore wind issues discussed in a BOEM intergovernmental task force. This state-led group runs parallel with a BOEM task force and is formed without expectations for BOEM leadership of the group. Instead, state agency staff on the BOEM task force carry recommendations informed by stakeholder feedback into a BOEM process/intergovernmental task force. Washington State would be responsible for stakeholder engagement and carrying back information to stakeholders. Washington State and BOEM establish an MOU or another agreement to outline procedural aspects.



Recommendation #7

If Washington State enters a BOEM leasing process, Washington State should develop specific guidelines, such as through an MOU or another agreement, to ensure BOEM's interactions with Tribes, stakeholders, and the public during a BOEM leasing process in Washington are inclusive, comprehensive, and meaningful. While BOEM's task force/advisory body is an important aspect of BOEM's process, it is not the sole public engagement vehicle for BOEM's process, particularly as the intergovernmental task force has historically been limited to government representatives and federally recognized Tribes. Our intention in recommending the state pursue guidelines for is to improve the BOEM process to be more meaningful, engaging, and transparent to Washington Tribes and stakeholder voices. Improvements Washington should pursue could also be applied to any state process examining offshore wind, including those that are state-led, and are further detailed in Section 4 of this report.

- Washington is not included in current federal OSW mandates. So, the only way we would be involved with OSW would be if the state opens the door and invites BOEM in. It is therefore appreciated that Gridworks re-worded this language to include "If Washington enters a BOEM process..." in both Recommendation 6 and 7.
- Of the options outlined in recommendation 6, members expressed that - at this time - it would not make sense to pursue any of them. However, when comparing them, Option B would be preferred.
 - Under Option B, it was suggested that an option where the state asks BOEM to use a committee that is designated/selected by Washington be added, instead of BOEM establishing their own committee.

Closing

- For the next OSW Technical Committee meeting (July 23), Larry asked that the TC consider the recommendation in Recommendation 5 to request the formation of a geographic location description for the State of Washington.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee
July 23, 2024 | 1pm – 3pm

Participants

WCMAC Members

- Brian Polagye, Energy Industry
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Katie Arkema, Science Organization
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing (TC Co-Lead)
- Matt Niles, WA State Parks (TC Co-Lead)
- Mike Nordin, WCMAC Vice Chair, Pacific MRC
- Paula Culbertson, Wahkiakum MRC
- Rod Fleck, WCMAC Chair, North Pacific MRC

TC Members, Staff, and Guests

- Ann Skelton, Pacific County MRC
- Brandii O'Reagan, WA Sea Grant
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Nicole Gutierrez & Alle Brown-Law, Facilitation

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Announcements

- It was announced that the March, April, and June TC meeting summaries are still open to TC member feedback and edits. The facilitation team will finalize these by the August TC meeting, so please send any edits by August 27.
- Final meeting summaries are uploaded to the OSW Shared Folder and the [EZ View webpage](#).

OSW Updates

- Larry Thevik shared that BOEM has proceeded with a Request for Information, which is the next step towards leasing wind areas off Oregon, despite many stakeholders requesting that BOEM does not move forward. Public comments can be found on <https://www.regulations.gov/document/BOEM-2024-0022-0001>, and Larry highlighted comments from the Surfrider Foundation in particular.
- Brian Polagye attended the 7/23 SEER webinar on oceanographic impacts from OSW. He commented that it was a valuable webinar, and recommended the

recording, available here: <https://tethys.pnnl.gov/events/oceanographic-responses-offshore-wind-first-principles-potential-effects>.

- Mike O. also attended and noted that he would have liked some empirical data rather than modeling. He thought they did a great job explaining the complexities and dependencies on marine hydrodynamics.
- Brian P. noted that some of the research was looking at tidal energy in the UK relative to climate change, not offshore wind energy. The presenters are doing ongoing work on cumulative effects of offshore wind in UK waters.
- It was flagged that the webinar presenters could potentially be invited to the Core Team *if* the topic/discussion need is relevant and timely.
 - Brian P. noted that if Dr. Beth Scott is willing to present, she is very knowledgeable about the studies that have been done in the UK. She's leading two of the largest projects on cumulative effects of offshore wind in UK waters.
- Nicole expressed thanks to the Technical Committee for the June TC discussion on the Gridworks recommendations, prior to the 7/10 special meeting. Nicole shared that the facilitation team will share out the special meeting summary via the listserv.

Objective 2 Action Plan

- The TC reviewed the Action Plan and had the following discussion.
- Larry requested RCW 43.372 (Marine Waters Planning) and WAC 173-26-360 be mentioned in the Introduction section's third paragraph, to help orient people to the legislative context in which we are operating. Additionally, this legal framework helps the TC measure how well we're doing related to those charges.
- Larry shared that Pacific Fisheries Management Council has an easily accessible tab on their website with all their letters to BOEM concerning the processes in OR and CA.

Data and Community Research Needs

- Larry would like this section to mention the Gridworks report's list of data needs and the Ecology Gaps Assessment. He suggested that TC members review these two lists as individuals and thereafter as a group, identify any additional data needs, and conduct a straw poll to identify what TC members think the key data needs are.
 - Mike N. and Mike O. agreed with Larry.
- Katie asked how the Action Plan can reference where there's already progress or research efforts happening to address some of these data needs. She suggested that the TC identify additional opportunities to be involved, such as helping shape what questions people are asking, connecting with the broader WCMAC network, finding funding opportunities, and more.
- Larry commented that we need to identify what the questions are, then identify the data that we need to answer those questions. Those are separate processes, and we need to identify the questions first.

- Larry noted that Recommendation 2 (West-Wide Research Consortium) from the Gridworks Report would help answer these questions and data needs. WCMAC should be involved with that process, if it were to happen.
- Rod shared that he likes where this is going. As the TC develops such questions or identifies gaps, Rod noted that we need to be realistic about what we can do and clarify our highest priority actions. He also suggested that the Action Plan should specifically call out the Climate Commitment Act (depending on its future) as a potential funding source that the WCMAC could point to, to help fund these initiatives.
 - Mike N., agreed, but cautioned against citing the Climate Commitment Act alone, since it's a contentious issue right now. It could be listed as one potential funding source among some other examples as well.
- Katie encouraged the TC to think beyond just influencing the BOEM process, though that's important. There is opportunity to play an important role in the OSW space no matter what happens with the BOEM process. We need to identify gaps and unanswered questions so that even if the BOEM process moves forward in Washington, we can influence what monitoring actions are taken, what research is prioritized, etc.
 - Mike O. and Rod agreed with Katie, it's important to go beyond the BOEM process.
- Katie asked about the difference between the Phases in "Action Plan Development Background" and the "Future Action" tables in "Data and Community Research Needs." Katie would like more clarification about the scope of the OSW TC.
 - Nicole clarified that the Action Plan Development Background section just details how the TC has developed this Action Plan. The phases are not tied to any future actions. Nicole noted that we can update this section to include recent TC meetings.
 - Nicole suggested doing a work session in the August TC meeting on the Data/Research needs.
- Larry commented that he wants to know what the questions are. So many stakeholders, sovereigns, and community members have asked BOEM to investigate these uncertainties and questions. Larry encouraged the TC to first identify what the questions are and acknowledge what we don't know. He shared that the available science doesn't answer many of the questions that we're posing.
- Mike N. added that, in his experience, the "best available science" often means that BOEM can cherry-pick the science they want to use. So, he cautioned that "best available science" doesn't answer many of our questions.
 - Larry agreed; BOEM is only obligated to use the "best available science," which means they will pick and choose between what's already available. Larry commented that BOEM will never do a cumulative impact analysis, because they're not obligated to do that; they're only obligated to use the available science.
- Nicole shared that, based on people's comments, it seems like the Data and Community Research Needs section may need to be restructured. She

suggested that the facilitation team reorganize this section to reflect the potential flow/sequence that the TC discussed today. The sequence people have described is: First, review the Gridworks and Ecology data needs lists, combine them with the data needs the TC has already identified, and clarify additional needs. Conduct a straw poll of TC members. Then, review the enforceable policies and better understand how enforceable policies would interact with the BOEM process.

- Larry emphasized that the TC needs to do more clarification of the research needs. The Action Plan should have a hyperlink to the enforceable policies. Finally, the TC should explore and better understand the Geographic Location Description (GLD) and its impacts in/on Consistency Reviews (as mentioned in Gridworks Recommendation 3). Larry suggested that, potentially, the TC could recommend to WCMAC to request Ecology secure a GLD.
- Katie recommended that the TC nail down an approach. She agreed with Larry that it's important to articulate the research questions. However, she noted that it's unclear if that's happening as part of developing this Action Plan, or if that's happening after the action plan is finalized. The TC needs to clarify what their approach is for implementing the action plan. She added that the research needs identified in the action plan so far could be called example gaps, which acknowledges that we'll develop them further.
- Corey built on Larry's comment about articulating the questions, asking: how does this document help us move forward? How does this fit in with where the state goes next? Should we lay out questions that stakeholders and others have?
- Larry commented that he fundamentally believes we must start with the questions. As the WCMAC TC, we should recognize these research needs within this Action Plan. He shared that this document could help frame what the potential West-Wide Research Consortium would answer, so it's important to identify the questions to consider upfront.

Next Steps

- Nicole identified the following action items:
 - Facilitation team will incorporate these edits and present a streamlined Action Plan in August that is more aligned with sequenced next steps.
 - Facilitation team will follow up with the TC co-leads about the updates to the action plan before the August meeting.
 - The August meeting will be an Action Plan work sessions to get the document into a more finalized state.
- Next meeting is August 27, from 1 – 3pm.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee
August 27, 2024 | 1pm – 3pm

Participants

WCMAC Members

- Brian Blake, Commercial Fishing
- Brian Polagye, Energy Industry
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Garrett Dalan, Grays Harbor MRC
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing (TC Co-Lead)
- Rod Fleck, WCMAC Chair, North Pacific MRC

TC Members, Staff, and Guests

- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Nicole Gutierrez & Alle Brown-Law, Facilitation

Notes

OSW Updates

- Larry recognized and expressed appreciation to Rod and Nicole for the thoughtful letter capturing WCMAC's consensus on the Gridworks product and recommendations.
 - Rod noted that the Governor's Office received the letter, and they are starting to think through potential next steps.
 - Larry noted that Carrie Sessions, Governor's Office representative, suggested that this might be a time to identify some specific action the WCMAC might take. There also may be some things Governor Inslee has the capacity to work on before leaving office, such as reinvigorating the proposed legislation for research on the oceanographic impacts of OSW.
 - Nicole commented that the September WCMAC meeting will include a discussion of Gridworks' Recommendation 2 (Research Consortium).
- Larry shared Tribal letters on OSW that were presented to the PFMC Marine Planning Committee. The letters demonstrate the Tribes' significant concerns about offshore wind efforts continuing off the West Coast without further impacts analysis done. [Watch the Marine Planning Committee recording here.](#)
 - Mike O. shared that the Makah Tribe are working closely with NOAA-NMFS on some of the questions they have for OSW.

- Larry updated that BOEM is likely to continue with Public Sales Notices in Oregon in October, despite all the public objections.
- Brian Polagye shared that there was a recent blade failure at Vineyard Wind. There have also been two blade failures in the UK – all failures are in blades from the same manufacturer. In the US, they shut down all turbines in the farm and issued a pause on all construction with those blades. This was a more extreme reaction than the UK's response.
- Brian Polagye shared that US Dept. of Energy's wind office does have call open for a [Floating Offshore Wind Center of Excellence](#) that will likely involve institutions in OR and CA (and maybe WA), but the funding is limited (under \$5M) and will be spread over a range of engineering, environmental, and socioeconomic topics and over multiple years.
 - Mike O. commented that \$5 M is limited. Brian P. agreed.

Objective 2 Action Plan

General Comments

- Larry appreciated the new timeline section in this draft, particularly having specific focuses for each meeting.
- Corey asked how the Action Plan responds to recent events, particularly the Gridworks recommendations? How does the Action Plan fit in with progress being made at the state level?
 - Larry responded that the Gridworks report was not meant to supplant the processes put in place by the WCMAC. It will have some potential to modify our processes, as we continue to consider our charge from the greater WCMAC. Larry doesn't see a reason to incorporate the Gridworks report into this Action Plan more than what we've already done.
- Brian P. approves of the plan, particularly the addition of the timeline. He recommended, in the Data and Community Research Needs section, moving the Economics section above the Comprehensive Planning Processes.

Introduction Section

- Larry asked for clarification about “developing meeting agendas” in Paragraph 1 of Introduction.
 - Nicole explained this language references how the Action Plan will help guide the development of agendas for this Technical Committee.
 - Larry suggested deleting “developing meeting agendas.”
- Larry asked for clarification about “tracking BOEM comment periods.” He suggested it say: “tracking comments received during BOEM comment periods.”
- Rod asked if the Intro Section could reference offshore energy more broadly, rather than just offshore wind. Could we use a footnote like the recent WCMAC letter to the Governor?
 - Larry noted that offshore wind has been the impetus of this Technical Committee but recognized that this might impact other offshore energy sources in the ocean. He supported adding a footnote similar to the letter to the Governor.

- Mike O. suggested that “address” means taking action beyond just gathering the data/community research needs. That isn’t within the scope of the TC.
- Mike O. noted that BOEM takes comments continually, not just during formal comment periods.
- Larry made an addition to the second bullet “Reviewing RCW...” He suggested the following addition: “...expanding scope of focus to ensure WCMAC consider and follow these legislative mandates going forward.”

Objective 2 Section

- No concerns from Garrett or Corey.
- Larry had no suggested changes to this section. He agreed with Nicole that quite a lot of time has passed since WCMAC created this Objective. We’ve learned a lot in the process and our perceptions have changed over time. He noted a need to understand the impacts that could affect us moving forward.

Technical Committee Scope and Approach

- Brian B. had no edits or concerns. He liked the way it’s laid out.
- Rod had no edits or concerns.
- Larry asked that the “serve as a forum” bullet include Gridworks, Ecology, National Marine Fisheries, and Tribes, since all these entities have also compiled data gaps and needs.
 - Mike O. noted that many environmental groups have also commented on research needs.
 - Larry agreed.
- Larry noted that it’s not likely that Tribal sovereigns will enter into the State/stakeholder engagement process, but Tribes have published comment letters that the TC can reference. The TC should catalogue these comments over time.
- Larry noted that for meeting summaries to serve as a resource, we would need to develop a publicly accessible resource folder or website for people to use.
 - Larry suggested that Ecology’s EZ View site for the WCMAC could be a useful place to catalog resources.

Data and Community Research Needs

- Brian B. had no edits or concerns.
- Larry added a clarification MSP Data Viewer section, in the sub-bullet about observation-poor data. He commented how important it is to incorporate short-tailed albatross in the MSP Data Viewer.
 - Mike O. noted that there are direct events (like collision with a turbine) and indirect events (like species having to avoid wind farms and using more energy).
- Brian P. suggested moving Economics section above Comprehensive Planning Processes section.
- Larry made updates to the “Efforts and outcomes” bullet in the Offshore Wind and Ecosystem/Fisheries Impacts section.

- Larry added “or if” to “identify areas where, **or if**, offshore wind and existing ocean uses coexist...” in the Lessons Learned section.

Next Steps

- Goal to finalize the Objective 2 Action Plan in October OSW TC meeting and present the Action Plan to the full WCMAC in December.
- Next OSW TC Meeting: October 22, 2024.

WASHINGTON COASTAL MARINE ADVISORY COUNCIL

Offshore Wind (OSW) Technical Committee
October 22, 2024 | 1pm – 3pm

Participants

WCMAC Members

- Brian Polagye, Energy Industry
- Corey Niles, WDFW
- Katie Arkema, Science Organization
- Larry Thevik, Commercial Fishing (TC Co-Lead)
- Michele Conrad, Coastal Economic Development
- Mike Nordin, WCMAC Co-Chair, Pacific MRC
- Rod Fleck, WCMAC Chair, North Pacific MRC

TC Members, Staff, and Guests

- Brandii O'Reagan, WA Sea Grant
- Casey Dennehy, Ecology
- Mai Aoki, Ecology
- Mike Okoniewski, Pacific Seafood Consultants
- Nicole Gutierrez & Alle Brown-Law, Facilitation

Notes

Introductions & Housekeeping

- Nicole welcomed everyone, reviewed the agenda, and led roll call.
- Nicole reminded attendees to send any edits to the OSW TC August 2024 meeting summary. At the end of the year, the facilitation team will compile all of the TC meeting summaries to upload to Ecology's EZ View page.

OSW Updates

- Mike Nordin shared that the WA Association of Conservation Districts have a renewable energy subcommittee, and they are coming up with an internal policy to work on renewable energy issues statewide.
- Larry Thevik reminded OSW TC members that Washington is not part of any federal offshore wind mandates, nor is it included in the State Energy Strategy until 2050. On September 18, the Governor released a statement that Washington is not planning to engage with BOEM. He also shared that there is continued Tribal opposition to OSW. Oregon Tribes filed a lawsuit, then OR

Governor Kotek withdrew from the BOEM taskforce, noting that the state must have roadmap and enforceable policies in place.

- Larry noted that the Action Plan is still incomplete at this time, and that the TC should continue reviewing/working on the Action Plan, because of the significant changes in the landscape of OSW. He encouraged that an update to the WCMAC be provided in December, rather than an approval of the Action Plan.
- Katie Arkema shared that PNNL's West Coast Offshore Wind Transmission Study is concluding. That work focuses on exploring the influence of different transmission options and configuration for offshore wind on the West Coast. PNNL and National Renewable Energy Laboratory led the study, with support from Dept. of Energy. Katie suggested that the OSW TC may be interested in a presentation on those results and can help connect the PNNL leads with the facilitation team. This study is not related to the BOEM leasing process.
 - Mike N. would love to have a presentation on this subject. He also requested the TC circle back on economic studies and feasibility studies that analyze the need for OSW or offshore energy. He supported feasibility studies to be completed before any further research is done, to understand the most feasible renewable energy methods for Washington State. Washington already has renewable energy and some of the lowest energy costs.
 - Katie noted that the presentation could include technical economic expertise about transmission.
 - Mike O. would like to see displacement counted as a cost of any project.
 - Brian Polagye shared that the 2045/2050 timeline numbers for OSW in Washington are the results of an economic study that showed offshore wind would *likely* be the lowest cost generation option for Washington by that timeline, considering likely load growth (electrification, AI data centers, etc.). However, that's an economic forecast with significant uncertainty. It accounts for the whole West Coast energy supply/demand.
- Brandii O'Reagan shared that Sea Grant is in different stages of discussing OSW in different communities. The nationwide Sea Grant coalition created an OSW "learning group" to share lessons and discussions from different regions. It includes a West Coast sub-group. Brandii will share any relevant info and/or speakers with the OSW TC. There also was a Sea Grant-wide informational meeting about possible payment programs to fishermen for loss of activities in wind areas.
 - Mike O. asked if the payment programs went further down the economic chain to include processors, retail? Or fishermen only?
 - Brandii confirmed they are considering the entire supply chain but haven't gotten farther than having to quantify the fishermen scope of impact.
 - Mike N. advocated against this, noting that if you take commercial fishing out of our community, you destroy at least one-third of the community.
 - Brandii shared that this program was created for East Coast fishing communities that already have OSW in place. There's no assumption that the same process will happen on the West Coast.

- Larry added that the impacts to fisheries are not just in displacement, but also in ecosystem effects and loss of ecosystem services. He shared that monetary payments won't capture these losses, and at the OSW community meetings he's attended, people have spoken strongly against the idea that BOEM and developers can mitigate their way out of the impacts that may or may not come with OSW development.

Objective 2 Action Plan

The OSW TC meeting focused on review and refinement of the Objective 2 Action Plan. Edits were integrated into the draft plan and discussion is summarized below.

Discussion: How should we move forward with Action Plan?

- The TC came to agreement that the Action Plan should be presented as a status update rather than a finalized document at the December WCAC meeting, emphasizing its role as a living, adaptable guide for OSW TC's future work.
 - TC members agreed that sharing a status update with WCMAC in December would be valuable to gather WCMAC input, assess the Technical Committee's direction, and align TC priorities with the current OSW landscape in Washington.
 - This is an opportunity to identify what we want to know, understand, or track about offshore wind, and take advantage of the opportunity of offshore wind starting in California.
- TC members noted that the TC should consider how changes in the Governor's administration early next year may influence the plan's implementation and direction.
- Larry reflected that the TC recognized that while the unsolicited lease requests prompted these discussions, they were not the sole focus of the data and community research needs identified by the TC. He suggested that the OSW TC may not need to meet as frequently, since there is less urgency than originally thought, and it will be beneficial to see what the Governor's provisos are. The provisos might fulfill some of the themes and tasks of the TC.
- Nicole added WCMAC will discuss 2025 work planning in December, and the TC's direction and focus could be a part of that conversation as well.
- Larry suggested that potentially, WCMAC could eliminate the "unsolicited lease request" portion of Objective 2 and instead consider the impacts that OSW could bring. This could be an action item in the December meeting.

Discussion: Edits to the Action Plan, or any major red flags?

- TC members identified that the Timeline section was too rigid, and requested it be changed to Sequencing or "Meeting Sequence and Focus."
- A question was posed about the potential Governor provisos, how far into the next Governor's administration will that budget proviso continue?
 - Corey answered that the state legislature would have to pass any provisos, and they would determine the timeline for a proviso.
 - Michele added that the House and the Senate can submit separate budgets that can be totally different from the Governor's budget. A proviso is a budget item, rather than a policy item. Every odd year is when major

policy items can be introduced by the legislature. There are some policy items introduced that may be irrespective of the governor's budget.

- Related to the Action plan objective, Larry commented that, if BOEM refunds the unsolicited lease requests, then that would provide sufficient evidence to update Objective 2. Maybe not at the December WCMAC meeting, but in early 2025?
- Corey asked if WCMAC could provide comment directly to the legislature about the provisos.
 - Larry appreciated Corey's suggestion, and agreed that WCMAC could provide support and testimony for the provisos. He hopes the proviso about state authorities would clarify the weight and requirements of ORMA.
 - Mike N. added that the legislative session often moves quickly, so it would be helpful for WCMAC to authorize a WCMAC representative to testify for the provisos in person. This could be lined up in advance.
 - Rod agreed with Mike, noting that the House Budget Appropriations might have a budget hearing component where we could provide testimony.
- Larry asked Mai for an update about the ECY Data Gap review and when the report may be available.
 - Mai answered that there are no updates, the final report timing will depend on the ADA Accessibility process.

Next Steps:

- **Decision from Discussion:** The TC will give a status update to WCMAC at the December meeting on the Action Plan and OSW TC progress, focusing mostly on looking ahead. Goal to get WCMAC feedback about how the TC should move forward.
- Facilitation team will work with TC Co-Leads to prepare for the December discussion.