

MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH & WILDLIFE
MULTI-AGENCY OFFSHORE WIND MEETINGS WITH NORTH COAST FISHERMEN
WHARFINGER BUILDING
1 MARINA WAY
EUREKA, CA 95501
THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2022
9:00 A.M. – 12 P.M. PT
IN-PERSON MEETING

Meeting Participants

Participant	Organization
Ken Clark (call-in)	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
Amanda Cousart	California Coastal Commission
Margarita McInnis (call-in)	California Department Fish & Wildlife
Brian Owens	California Department Fish & Wildlife
Christopher Potter	California Department Fish & Wildlife
Jay Stanton	California Department Fish & Wildlife
Mark Danielson	California Energy Commission
Eli Harland	California Energy Commission
Max Liebergesell	California State Lands Commission
Jennifer Mattox	California State Lands Commission
Ken Bates	Commercial Fisherman
Patrick Burns	Commercial Fisherman
Nick Coliazas	Commercial Fisherman
Tom Fulkenson	Commercial Fisherman
Linda Hildebrand	Commercial Fisherman
Travis Hunter	Commercial Fisherman
Travis McDonald-Vellis	Commercial Fisherman
Jake McMaster	Commercial Fisherman
Skip McMaster	Commercial Fisherman
Paul Ranstrom	Commercial Fisherman
Shane Ranstrom	Commercial Fisherman
Ashley Vellis	Commercial Fisherman
Curt Wilson	Commercial Fisherman
Mike Okoniewski	Consultant (Pacific Seafood)

Facilitation Team Participants

Participant	Organization
CeCe Horbat	Kearns and West

Meeting Materials

- Humboldt Fishermen's Marketing Association (HFMA)
 - Wind Power Agenda
 - Letter to Larry Oetker, Executive Director HHRCD, dated October 23, 2019
 - EDP Renewables Letter | September 6, 2019
 - Woodley Island Gear Storage/District CDP Violations
- Humboldt Wind Energy Area Map (CDFW)
- Assembly Bill 525 Strategic Plan for Wind Energy Offshore California and Establishing Offshore Wind Megawatt Planning Goals (CEC)

Presentations

- Amanda Cousart, California Coastal Commission: Consistency Determination
- Eli Harland, California Energy Commission: AB 525 Strategic Plan
- Ken Bates, HFMA Meeting Agenda

DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

The purpose of the meeting was for state and federal agencies to share information and updates with fishing communities affected by the Humboldt Wind Energy Area (WEA) and to gather input and comments from fishing community participants.

Fishing Community Concerns and Comments

Over the course of the meeting, fishing community participants shared a variety of concerns, interests, suggestions, and questions with state and federal agency staff. Summaries of their comments, organized by key themes, are listed below.

Assembly Bill 525

- AB 525 requires the CEC to consider 12 factors when establishing the megawatt offshore wind planning goals. National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) report (page 4) shows the technical capacity for wind energy development from the energy perspective. However, this report does not factor in how capacity is impacted from a development perspective nor does the report account for marine sanctuaries. Fishing community participants were concerned to see these numbers and how this would impact the amount of wind energy developed in Humboldt Bay.

Accountability and Enforcement

- Fishing community participants expressed concern as to how wind energy projects will be held accountable under state policy as wind power projects proceed in Humboldt Bay.
- Ken Bates shared the context of past interactions leading to miscommunication between participants and state agencies interactions. Bates cited specific interactions of involving survey visits in July 2020 at the end of Dungeness crab season, questions around

mitigation funds, and cable fishing agreements questions where fishing community participants felt uninformed and unheard.

- Fishing community participants want to know what are the thresholds/triggers that would cause cease of a project – metrics are needed, and criteria and consequences need to be clear (before the lease sales).
- Fishermen asked for wind turbine anchors to not be allowed to contact the hard bottom.

Communication

- Both state agencies and the fishing community participants expressed the need for more efficient and accessible engagement (e.g., calls, letters, touchpoints) between each other and their own communities. Participants suggested agencies continue to reach out to fishermen and other fishing businesses beyond fishing associations. They also suggested agencies form communication opportunities to gather fishing communities as a larger West Coast effort (i.e., WA, CA, OR).
- Fishing community participants shared past experiences where state agency communication lacked and expressed future concerns about wind energy.
- Fishing community participants expressed concern about not having a specific contact to ask questions or report issues around fishing impacts in their community as offshore wind develops. Across the various agencies, both the California Coastal Commission (CCC), and State Lands Commission (SLC) described their roles in terms of enforcement.
 - CCC functions to uphold the Coastal Zone Management Act and SLC offered to investigate past situations mentioned by participants to understand lessons learned for future communication. There will be more direction, guidance, and protocols regarding conflict resolution after the development of a fishing agreement.
 - Regarding offshore wind management, the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE), BOEM's sister agency handles wind energy maintenance and safety concerns once wind turbines are in place.
 - Beyond direct contact with participants and at these meetings, state agencies continue to hold lines of communication between their agencies and with fishing concerns. State agencies hold biweekly meetings and meet with their own technical teams on a regular basis as none of the state agencies have their own offshore wind department.

Construction and Maintenance of Wind Energy Turbines

- Fishing community participants expressed concern around future port development for how wind turbine deployment could negatively impact fishing communities. North Coast roads can be difficult and sometimes inaccessible. Transporting materials for wind turbine construction may not be able to use roads, therefore resulting in water transportation, further disrupting fishing. Concerns around supply chain and infrastructure needs resulted in questions about where construction of the turbines would take place: local North Coast waters or somewhere overseas? State agencies answered, describing that the Construction Operations Plan (COP) would outline these details. Agencies shared that construction of parts may occur overseas and that the construction of the turbine would most likely take place in local waters. Supply chain concerns and expectations are considered and updated when constructing wind energy turbines. When fishing community participants inquired about wind turbine maintenance staff, agencies pointed to requirements and protocols that will be specified in the COP. One of the deliverables required by the legislature in AB 525 is for the CEC to develop a

plan to improve waterfront facilities to support a range of floating offshore wind energy development activities, including long-term operations and maintenance.

- After wind turbine construction, community benefit agreements are likely to be negotiated between the developer and the impacted communities during the COP development phase, but ideas for community benefits are welcomed.

Data

- Beyond modeling, without context to the unique area of Humboldt Bay and the North Coast, fishing community participants shared that data modeling may not show the impacts of fishing accurately. Creating a wind energy test case would be preferable for participants. Moving forward with a lease sale currently progresses with too many unknowns and BOEM should slow down the current wind energy timeline/process.
- Fishing community participants do not feel as if agencies are doing their due diligence because of the lack of local perspective and lack of site-specific data to move forward with lease issuances.
- According to fishing community participants, block maps do not accurately reflect the current fishing activity. Additionally, maps show trends and estimates that do not account for individual fishermen.
- When discussing modeling techniques, fishing community participants wanted to know how models incorporate realistic conditions and understandings of the local area. Models are based on survey data, other wind energy area sites, and other scientific information to provide the most accurate understanding of conditions. Models are meant to mimic local conditions by incorporating ocean specifics with data from other studies and locations. However, agencies did acknowledge that North Coast conditions may be different than modeling conditions.
- Fishing community participants inquired if CCC studies looked at the economic value in the fishing and wind energy industries. CCC stated there is a balance of benefits for both wind energy and the fishing industry. The CCC cannot predict a 100% accurate ramification of wind energy development impacts on participants. The CCC works on the development of fisheries and wind energy together and they will continue to be involved as the process continues.

Engagement

- Fishing community participants want to be able to influence and have a say in policymaking surrounding their livelihoods and communities. Due to too many unknowns, participants recommended BOEM wait to issue a lease and should focus on the Environmental Impact Statement first. Moving forward with the process feels rushed and fishing engagement feels like all agencies are checking a box. To avoid the feeling of helplessness, participants requested stronger relationships with agencies to protect coastal communities and to be kept in the loop regarding the next steps in wind energy development. As one fisherman was quoted, "If you're not at the table, you're on the menu."

Food Security /Seafood Impact of Eureka Fishing Industry

- Fishing community participants want the CCC to consider the importance of sustainability around food security within the larger global food market. As stated by fishing community participants, half of the state's groundfish are from the Eureka area. The groundfish fishery is the second most valuable in the state. Incorporating local fish into food emergency services can feed over two million people.

Harbor Infrastructure Impacts

- Fishing community participants stated that fishing agreements need dedicated funding for fishing organizations to protect fishing infrastructure (i.e., processing facilities, ice plants) and livelihoods.
- A participant made reference to a harbor infrastructure policy from 1982 which discusses the protection of fishing infrastructure.

Offshore Wind Energy- General Questions

- The dimensions of a floating offshore wind turbine will depend on which design the potential future development plans to use. For example, the IEA Wind 15 MW reference turbine has a hub height of 150m and a blade radius of 120m, making the total structure 270m (890 feet) tall. However, the radius around which vessels are able to safely navigate around a floating wind turbine would depend on how the US Coast Guard regulates navigation through a WEA, which could have more to do with the underwater layout of mooring lines and transmission cables from the floating platforms and substations that would be present in a floating wind farm.
- Fishing community participants asked about how wind energy production compares to other sources of energy. Compared to other sources of energy, terrestrial wind turbines and offshore wind turbines are larger in size and have a higher capacity factor. Offshore wind energy generation compliments solar, especially in evening hours and during winter months, thereby fitting in well with California's shifting peak load. There are also challenges with offshore wind energy compared to other renewables, including transmission constraints and competing coastal/ocean uses.
- Once wind energy is installed, fishing community participants asked if communities have a choice to purchase/not purchase energy from offshore wind. At this point in the process, there are no options to purchase or not purchase. The California Public Utilities Commission produces an integrated resource plan with portfolios that are given to transmission operators explaining wind energy purchasing protocols.
- Fishing community participants asked if a lack of purchase agreement from developers impacts a wind energy lease agreement. Agencies responded saying wind energy developers need to show proof of correction within 5 years.
- Fishing community participants inquired about the rules of engagement for decommissioning turbines. WEA leases are issued for a period of approximately 25-30 years and developers are required to have a decommissioning plan in place for the removal of facilities and clearing the seafloor of all obstructions by the end of the lease term. This information is detailed in a Construction & Operations Plan which must be approved prior to wind farm build-out.
- Fishing community participants wanted to know where offshore wind will land onshore. The interconnect point for the Central Coast is not yet determined and may not be determined until the COP phase. CCC and SLC share jurisdiction for the interconnect point. If any part of cables travels through ungranted sovereign lands then the SLC would be responsible for issuing a lease and would be the lead CEQA agency. If any parts of the alignment go through granted lands, then the local jurisdiction would also be responsible for issuing a lease, and if the alignment was completely in granted lands then the local agency would be the CEQA lead (absent legislation that dictates a state lead agency and/or state lessor regardless of granted land status).
- Fishing community participants asked if and when the energy from wind turbines will offset the amount of energy used to maintain them. Offset energy impacts are only estimates at this time. These estimates will become clearer when construction and operations plans are submitted.

Wind Energy Area

- Fishing community participants reminded agency staff that the Wind Energy Area overlaps with Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) areas. Within this area, fishing gear cannot contact the hard bottom.

Agency Discussion and Comments

Toward the end of the meeting, agency members asked questions about ways to engage with the fishing community. Summaries of their comments, organized by key themes, are listed below.

- Agency members asked meeting participants from the fishing community about any additional lines of communication (e.g., bulletin boards, message boards) state agencies should use to contact fishing community participants. Fishermen listen to weather radio announcements daily. Fishing community participants suggested ads in Angler-Marine Notices and flyers in supply shops like Englund Marine. Participants suggest going to places beyond fishing associations including businesses like processing plants.
- Agency members asked if fishing community participants were able to access lease documents from East Coast wind energy development as a resource of what's being done in other parts of the country around offshore wind development. CA agencies at the meeting encouraged those to look at East Coast development. In NY, six offshore wind leases recently sold for a total of about 4.4 billion dollars. The value of a lease in California would depend on many factors and is difficult to estimate at this time, especially without a proposed sale notice or lease documents, which are likely to differ from the recent NY auction. After BOEM issues a proposed sale notice with a 60-day comment period or longer, the proposed sale moves into the final sale.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m. PT.