

**Minerals Management Service
Regional Stakeholder Meetings
Salem, Oregon
October 16-17, 2006
Meeting Notes**

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Maureen Bornholdt, program manager of the Department of Interior's Minerals Management Service (MMS) Renewable Energy and Alternate Use Program on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS), described the intent of the regional stakeholder meetings. Through Section 388 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, the Department of Interior has the authority to regulate renewable energy and alternate use projects on the OCS. MMS is currently developing the Renewable Energy and Alternate Use Program and intends to use the regional stakeholder meetings to learn who the stakeholders are in the Pacific Northwest, what issues and concerns the local stakeholders have with development of renewable energy on the OCS, what the present and estimated future energy sources are, and who the regulators are. This information will be used by MMS in the development of the Renewable Energy and Alternate Use Program.

MMS plans to issue a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the Renewable Energy and Alternate Use Program in February 2007 and the Final PEIS at the end of the summer 2007. MMS will convene a strategic studies plan workshop in spring 2007, develop a strategic studies plan by fall 2007, and will discuss regional planning at that point.

Jon Taylor, facilitator from Kearns & West, led the attendees in an open discussion covering the following topics: stakeholders, issues and concerns, energy profile, current and future technologies, and state and local regulations. What follows is a summary of the individual attendees' remarks. Representatives of MMS neither solicited nor received any collective advice or recommendations from the attendees as a whole.

Stakeholders

Meeting attendees identified additional stakeholders who should be involved in future communications and meetings for the Renewable Energy and Alternate Use Program. These stakeholders are listed in Appendix 1.

Issues and Concerns

Meeting attendees identified major issues and concerns regarding development of the Renewable Energy and Alternate Use Program.

Permitting Issues/Concerns:

- Concerned that renewable energy permitting process may not cover information needs of all required permits, requiring applicants to deal with multiple permitting processes instead of a one-stop-shop process.
- Concerned that permitting process design may not accommodate a two-tiered process for permitting (one for pilot projects, and one for commercial projects) that acknowledges

the difference in technologies, especially regarding any potential size limitations. Concerned that detailed NEPA requirements would be required regardless of pilot or commercial project permitting.

- Concerned that permitting may not allow for installation of pilot or test phase projects, and that it may take significant time to permit commercial renewable energy projects, prohibiting developers from gathering any data in the short term from pilot or test phase projects.
- Concerned that the process may require that all testing facilities, whether they are bottom-founded or of short duration (1-2 days), for wave energy technologies must undergo permitting and review.
- Concerned that the permitting process accommodate testing the grid connection of wave energy technologies to ensure that they will work with the utility's system.
- Concerned that the permitting process may not facilitate expedited permitting to allow for grid-tied and non-grid-tied projects, or accommodate multiple array testing.
- Concerned that the uncertainty in permitting wave energy technology is the combination of the array of buoys, cables, grid tie, and the effect. Concerned that a demonstration pilot project that does not include an array of devices cabled, connected, and interacting with the grid, will not provide enough gained knowledge. Ideally, if a demonstration project is successful, you could keep the cables where they are and connect additional installations to them.
- Concerned that MMS does not clearly define what being connected to the grid means, including whether it matters how much energy is being conveyed. Developers are concerned that without this knowledge utilities will not be able to make investments in these new technologies.
- Concerned that there is not a clear FERC/MMS process to identify and manage regulatory/jurisdictional overlaps and a means to keep the stakeholders up to date on that process.
- Concerned that the cost of going through the licensing/permitting process tends to be burdensome on agencies.
- Concerned that the local people and local governments who have much of the knowledge of local areas may not be involved in permitting and planning.
- Fishermen are concerned about the economic tradeoffs between project installment and effects on natural resources, and may consider forming fishing organizations along the coast that have the right to negotiate binding legal agreements.
- Oregon Solutions Process is a good model for collaborative licensing/permitting.
- MMS does not clearly define its role: will MMS simply regulate or will it have a planning component?
- MMS would benefit from using resources from all relevant federal agencies when gathering data and developing the Renewable Energy and Alternate Use program.
- A collaborative approach with FERC would benefit MMS by combining strengths and experience from the two organizations.
- Unclear direction from MMS as to whether adaptive management might result in the removal of renewable energy activities on the OCS so that investors are aware of risks.
- Long-term permits (fifty years or more) may not be realistic for this program.
- Concerned that the regulatory process will not include a method for addressing new issues that were not recognized at the time of license issuance, as well as during relicensing.

- Concerned that MMS may not institute a policy for fair revenue sharing among local governments, especially for situations in which the equipment might be coming from one county and service vessels coming from another county.
- Concerned that the MMS process may not require a plan for project removal and a bond to cover decommissioning/removal of projects.
- Concerned that MMS is unclear on how they will assess bottom-founded facilities given the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals determination that no bottom contact activities should take place in areas of Essential Fish Habitat.
- Concerned that MMS environmental evaluations examine all impacts including the controversial and deleterious effects of aquaculture (a potential alternate use of OCS platforms).

Environmental Issues/Concerns, Impacts, and Mitigation:

- Concerned for loss of fishing grounds and means to address the issue.
- Concerned that tools, such as fishing agreements, to address additional issues that arise during permitting won't be available or developed.
- Developers are concerned about the source for outside funding to determine environmental or fishing impacts.
- The development of aquaculture under the Renewable Energy and Alternate Use Program raises concerns.
- Concerned about Array effects of multiple buoy installations, testing is very important.
- Concerned about adequate coordination with the fishing fleet and others about siting projects in areas that have traditional fishing, recreational fishing, or commercial fishing grounds.
- Concerned that adequate baseline data may not be collected prior to project installation.
- The Georgia Strait natural gas pipeline crossing in northern Puget Sound involved a survey performed using a remotely operated vehicle. This project may provide insights into collection of baseline data.
- The Pacific Cable Crossing in the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary may provide information on the difficulty of burying cables.
- Concerned that different state and federal agencies and NGOs help develop maps identifying important fishing areas, environmentally sensitive areas, and other sensitive regions so that developers can be aware of potential issues as they develop sites.
- Any impacts to tribal fishing must be recognized and dealt with. Both tribal councils and administrative offices should be engaged to ensure awareness of issues.
- Coordinate and consult with others who have experience in designing and implementing adaptive management programs.
- Concerned for the full protection of the environment and habitat and existing industries that currently use the region.
- Concerns include the general environmental and seabed overview, what data to collect, how to analyze that data and how to read it as time passes (e.g. how to read collected data through the filter of the cyclical nature of the Pacific Marine environment).
- Potential impacts to water quality (such as potential oil and grease releases from hydraulic equipment, aesthetics, and recreation) are concerning, as are effects on fish and wildlife such as habitat and migration, impairment of circulation and navigation, impacts from construction, and cumulative impacts from multiple projects.
- Specific concerns include protection of fish and wildlife and their habitats, harvest, and enjoyment of fish and wildlife: 1) Direct impacts to fish, birds, marine mammals; 2)

Reduction of habitat, and habitat productivity (including power lines, and oil/chemical spill prevention); 3) Reduction of fishing opportunities; 4) Hazards to people fishing; 5) Adequate evaluation of impacts; 6) The ability to address new impacts as they are identified; 7) Disruption of fish and wildlife migrations; 8) How will issues associated with species listed under the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Migratory Bird Act be addressed; 9) How will issues with endangered species listed by the State of Washington be addressed; 10) How does the Magnuson - Stevens Act affect decisions; 11) Mitigation for unavoidable negative impacts on fish, wildlife and their habitats; 12) Will fish and wildlife enhancements be required, as with the Federal Power Act?; 13) Reimbursement of costs to state agencies for participation in permitting/licensing processes, as with the Federal Power Act.

Other Issues/Concerns:

- Concerned that there be clear communication with fishermen, through a port-wide or county-wide communication system, to notify them of any changes that may occur in coastal waters while they are away on fishing trips.

Energy Profile

Meeting attendees described the current energy profile on the west coast and discussed related policies, obstacles, and energy forecasts.

Incentives/Policies:

- The anticipated implementation of a renewable portfolio standard (RPS) in Oregon will add to the pressure to increase the diversity and content of renewable resources.
- Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) has an allocation process for the Columbia River System which requires accounting for renewable energy use and development through a two-tiered system. This creates a need for diversification of energy portfolios. Additionally, an initiative in Washington that is expected to pass will require renewable energy development (15 percent by 2020).
- There are robust incentives in Oregon for ocean energy development which could be significant drivers for the industry. There is a business energy tax credit (BETC) of 35% for renewable energy projects, currently capped at \$3.5M project cost. Legislation proposed by the governor would increase that to 50% of a project cost of up to \$10M, which triples the value of the tax credit. In addition, Energy Trust in Oregon has several policies in development that will become a factor.
- The Oregon governor created a Renewable Energy Feasibility Fund through the Office of Economic Development which will help local governments and smaller research projects assess the early stages of project feasibility.

Forecasts/Planning:

- Local planning to increase renewable energy use and development is becoming more and more popular; there is a huge demand for renewable energy. A study by the California Energy Commission found 37,000GW of potential for offshore wave energy, which is more than half of the installed capacity of California as a whole. Offshore wind will likely become more popular in the United States, especially in progressive coastal states. A study commissioned by the Community Environmental Council found a potential of about 275,000 GWh per year in the offshore region of Santa Barbara County

alone – almost one hundred times the electricity used in Santa Barbara County each year. Even without deepwater offshore wind turbine technologies, there is significant potential in our region from shallow to medium-depth ocean areas, though not on the scale of deepwater offshore wind.

- BPA will be releasing a Record of Decision in a little more than a year regarding tiered rates. The Northwest Planning Council forecasts 20-year planning and is expecting 6000MW of new renewable energy in the next twenty years, a lot of which will be wind integration. There will be constraints with transmission. BPA is working on a resource adequacy plan for the region to determine where resources will come from and where they will be sited.
- It is estimated that five or six 100MW wave energy projects off the Oregon coast could be developed in the next ten years. Three projects will likely be developed within the state territorial seas and two projects developed on the federal OCS. From Newport south, and especially in Northern California, there are many more sites that may be developed in state territorial seas, while in Washington it will be much more likely to have development along the OCS.
- There is between 13,000MW and 14,000MW of available ocean power off the Oregon coast. According to PGE, approximately 2000MW of that power could be brought in without expanding the grid which is a financial incentive to development.
- The current mix of energy resources in Oregon includes hydropower (from the federal BPA dam system) with significant additional energy derived from thermal resources (coal, natural gas) and coal. Oregon sells hydropower to other parts of the country and imports a fair amount of coal and natural gas. The state has a small percentage (about 3-4%) of consumption from utility-scale renewable energy, primarily wind energy. Average energy consumption is growing at 1.5%/year and is primarily based on economic growth and population increases. The current proposal for the Oregon RPS mandates that 25% of the total load from large-scale utilities be met by renewable energy in 2025, which in practice assumes that all new load growth be from renewable energy. A stakeholder process is currently underway to craft that legislation, and it will be a critical driver to the development of renewable energy in the state. The Oregon Innovation Council, established by the 2005 legislature, identified wave energy as one of the top energy sources, bringing a \$5M package of incentives to develop this resource. Additionally, a significant portion of funds have been earmarked for OSU's wave research center. In terms of load growth over a ten-year horizon, perhaps 5-7% of the total load can be met by ocean renewables, specifically wave energy. It is not likely that offshore wind will be a significant part of the Oregon energy portfolio any time soon due to the aesthetic issues and the fact that the OCS gets deep relatively quickly off the Oregon coast. However, Oregon does not rule out the possibility of offshore wind projects.
- The first few projects along the Oregon coast will likely be within the state territorial seas because of the cost required for transmission and due to less interference with marine traffic.
- An initiative on the bill in Washington State would require utilities to have 15% of their portfolio from renewable sources by 2020 (does not include existing hydropower projects). There are eleven kinetic hydropower projects being proposed in the Puget Sound, two of which propose installing over 1600 generators in the Sound. Most of the population in the state is near the Puget Sound, so utilities and the speculators will look to develop there first rather than on the OCS.

- The current energy mix in Washington mostly comes from hydropower, in addition to coal, natural gas, wind, and biomass. There is a lower population on the outer coast and therefore less capability for development, but the southern area of the state and around the mouth of the Columbia River has a greater capacity for development.

Transmission:

- In Oregon, conveying power east to west is very difficult and there are not the same constraints moving from west to east. This provides additional urgency to develop ocean energy projects on Oregon's west coast.
- Significant investments in transmission will be required in order to bring renewable power to the grid.

Obstacles:

- One of the economic obstacles for development of offshore renewable energy is the above-market cost of technologies coming out of the gates. Current fossil fuel subsidies are adding to that problem.
- The depth of the buoy for the wave energy technology will determine how far offshore the technology must be installed, as the length of the transmission cable is highly expensive. That cost will be a limiting factor for installations on the OCS.
- FERC will not allow delivering power to the grid until the project is fully licensed; only test facilities can produce power.

Present and Future Technology

Meeting attendees described current and future ocean and wind energy technologies.

- Current wave energy technologies include oscillating water columns (either at sea on platforms or onshore), point absorbers (buoys anchored to the sea floor), and attenuator systems.
- Wave energy and wind energy should not be put in the same category because the technologies are at very different stages of development.
- Several companies and NREL are working on deepwater offshore wind technologies, either floating or anchored. These technologies may be both technically and economically feasible in the not too distant future.
- In the future, hydrogen may be generated offshore and shipped to the mainland.
- The Fred Olsen Group in Norway is using floating platforms as a stable base for a buoy-like wave energy system. This technology may be a candidate for the MMS Alternate Use program.
- Oregon State University (OSU) has been involved with the People of Oregon for Wave Energy Resources (POWER) group in which the government and private industry work together to promote wave energy in the state. OSU has proposed a research and development center that would be located off the coast of Newport with the assistance of Lincoln County. Additionally, OSU is conducting research into energy technologies that convert linear motion from waves into electricity. Worldwide, there are two wave energy plants proposed in Portugal and one in Spain.
- OSU is developing a different wave energy technology than the traditional hydraulically generated system by using a high-density magnet system. Other new technologies may involve cables or other elements of bringing the energy to the grid.

- Ocean Power Technology uses wave energy devices that require fifty-meter depth, which in Oregon will wind in and out of the state territorial seas.

State and Local Regulations

Meeting attendees identified applicable state and local regulations that MMS will need to be aware of when developing the Renewable Energy and Alternate Use Program. Additionally, attendees discussed associated permitting issues.

Interface between Federal, State, and Local Regulations

- Developing a strong relationship between state regulators and public utilities commissions will be crucial to ensure that the connection between coastal and offshore permitting is smooth.
- Oregon's Territorial Sea Plan has a two-tiered process that separates experimental pilot processes and commercial scale processes which may be a useful template for MMS.
- It would be helpful if MMS resolved jurisdictional overlap issues with FERC.
- Local regulations on bottom contact will affect buoy installation.
- Coordination and consultation should include the Essential Fish Habitat designated by the Pacific Fisheries Management Council.
- Some projects require federal consistency review under Federal Coastal Zone Management Act. State/local authorities bring together requirements incorporated in the state's coastal management program. These templates for seamless integration of requirements can be found in 15 CFR 930.
- FERC has federal pre-emption for energy facility siting. On seabed leasing, each state has lands commissions that have proprietorship of the seabed. Under the Energy Policy Act, activity of leasing the OCS is granted to MMS. The Clean Water Act allows states to act at the level of federal agencies to certify that water quality standards are met. The federal Coastal Zone Management Act allows states to ensure consistency between proposed coastal activities and state law. California and Washington have state environmental policy acts and Oregon has a territorial sea plan to regulate environmental processes. California and Oregon have ocean policy bodies. Fisheries are regulated by the California Department of Fish and Game, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, as well as the Pacific Fisheries Management Council. Seabirds and waterfowl are regulated by the California Department of Fish and Game, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Marine mammals are governed by the same three state agencies and the National Marine Fisheries Service. Vessel safety is regulated in all three states by the U.S. Coast Guard. There should be analogous authorities inside and outside the state territorial seas in order to create a seamless permitting process.
- There is concern that there be communication between cities and counties on the Oregon coast to ensure consistency of state and local permitting with federal regulations.
- The enforceable policies of Washington's Coastal Zone Management Program are the State Environmental Policy Act, Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA), Shoreline Management Act, and Energy Facility Site

Evaluation Council (FSEC). Washington's FSEC provides a one-stop-shop for permitting energy projects. Oregon's FSEC has slightly different regulations.

- Once projects enter state waters in Washington they must comply with the Clean Water Act, the hydraulic code (requiring a Hydraulic Project Approval), state aquatic land leasing, and Shoreline Management Act permits.
- There will need to be coordination with BLM and USFS regarding their federally-owned lands along the Oregon coastline.
- On the Washington coast there is a requirement to consult with Indian tribes to ensure that the regulations mesh with treaty and tribal rights. The tribes must be consulted as they have the authority on seabed sand with natural resources.
- The Oregon Beach Bill regulates any alterations on the beach.
- Washington requires a permit from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife for any construction in aquatic habitats. A process called the Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application (JARPA) coordinates all the permitting required by local agencies into a single form.
- Consider county ordinances and permits requirements.
- Coordinate with other federal agency efforts regarding ocean observations to avoid duplication of efforts and in order to benefit from sharing these resources.
- For ocean planning there are county commissioners, port authorities, and other stakeholders involved in Oregon's Ocean Policy Advisory Council that could be useful for continued planning and consultation.
- The Bureau of Land Management's wind program EIS or the Department of Interior's movement towards a geothermal permitting process may be useful models.
- The California State Lands Commission exercises jurisdiction over state waters between the shore and federal waters. The coastline is managed by the California Coastal Commission and local governments concurrently. A number of other agencies also play a role in coastline regulation, such as the State Water Resources Control Board (part of the Resources Agency) and its regional water quality control boards throughout the state. Additionally, a number of air pollution control districts exercise jurisdiction over air quality issues on the coast as well as throughout California. A number of other less well known agencies have some role in offshore resource regulation, including: Department of Boating and Waterways; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game; Department of Forestry and Fire Protection; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Energy Resources, Conservation and Development Commission; Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response; San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission; State Coastal Conservancy.

General Permitting Suggestions:

- Another Federal agency has ceded, jurisdiction to an Oregon state agency in the past.
- There are a number of jurisdictions in California who have crafted relatively seamless regulatory structures that MMS could use as precedents.
- In Oregon there is tremendous cooperation between stakeholders, the fishing industry, developers, regulators, and others, for current ocean technology, which would be useful to continue in the development of offshore regulations and permitting.
- The Oregon governor's Oregon Solutions Team is a good model for collaboration to involve local stakeholders.
- Participate in regional planning efforts, especially in regard to information sharing.

Conclusion and Next Steps

Maureen Bornholdt thanked the attendees for participating in the session and noted that these meetings will establish the foundation for a working relationship. Maureen encouraged the participants to contact MMS with further questions or input. The regional summary and attendance lists from the two Salem, Oregon meetings will be posted on the MMS website.

Appendix 1: Additional Suggested Stakeholders

Industry Stakeholders:

- Gamesa, Inc.
- Aquantis
- GE Wind
- Cape Wind
- Columbia Power Technologies
- Peregrine Power, LLC

Local Stakeholders and Non-Governmental Organizations:

- Professor Dan Kammen, University of California Berkeley
- Professor Severin Borenstein, University of California Berkeley
- Professor Asfaw Beyene, San Diego State University
- Sardine fishermen
- Oregon State University Whale Research Program
- Ocean Policy Advisory Council
- American Fisheries Society
- Wildlife Society
- University of Oregon Ocean and Coastal Law Department
- University of Washington School of Marine Affairs
- Port of Alsea, OR
- Port of Tillamook Bay, OR
- Port of Siuslaw, OR
- Port of Port Orford, OR
- Port of Portland, OR
- Port of Nehalem, OR
- Port of Bandon, OR
- Port of Brookings Harbor, OR
- Port of Port Orford, OR
- Oregon International Port of Coos Bay
- Port of Garibaldi, OR
- Port of Gold Beach, OR
- Jefferson County, WA
- Grays Harbor County, WA
- Pacific County, WA
- Waihkaikum County, WA
- City of Westport, WA
- City of Ocean Shores, WA
- City of Long Beach, WA
- City of Ilwaco, WA
- City of Aberdeen, WA
- City of Forks, WA
- Port of Grays Harbor, WA
- Port of Ilwaco, WA
- Port of Chinook, WA
- Port of Willapa Bay, WA

- Astoria, OR
- Warrenton, OR
- Gearhart, OR
- Seaside, OR
- Cannon Beach, OR
- Rockaway Beach, OR
- Garibaldi, OR
- Tillamook, OR
- Pacific City, OR
- Lincoln City, OR
- Newport, OR
- Toledo, OR
- Waldport, OR
- Yachats, OR
- Florence, OR
- Reedsport, OR
- Port Orford, OR
- Bandon, OR
- Coos Bay, OR
- North Bend, OR
- Gold Beach, OR
- Brookings, OR
- Oregon State Public Interest Research Group
- West Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations
- Fishermen Marketing Association
- Newport Shrimp Producer's Co-op
- Mid-water Trawler Cooperative
- Whiting Cooperative
- Consortium for Oceanographic Research and Education (CORE)
- Joint Oceanographic Institutions (JOI)
- Oregon State University Marine Resource Management Program
- OGI School of Science and Engineering
- Lewis and Clark Law School Environmental Law Program
- Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries (DOGAMI)
- Western Fishboat Owners Association
- American Fishermen's Research Foundation
- International Pacific Halibut Commission
- Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
- North Pacific Anadromous Fish Commission
- Pacific Salmon Commission
- Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
- Women's Fisheries Network
- Marine Fish Conservation Network
- Marine Mammal Center
- National Audubon Society
- Oceana
- West Coast Seafood Processors Association

- At-Sea Processors Association
- American Sportfishing Association
- Golden Gate Fishermen's Association
- National Association of Charterboat Operators
- National Marine Charter Association
- Recreational Fishing Alliance
- Sportfishing Association of California
- United Anglers of Southern California, Inc.
- North Pacific Fishery Management Council
- Western Pacific Fishery Management Council
- Small Boat Commercial Salmon Fishermen's Association
- California Salmon Council
- Salmon For All
- United Salmon Association
- Puget Sound Gillnetters Association
- Fishermen's Marketing Association
- Pacific Whiting Conservation Cooperative
- California Fisheries and Seafood Institute
- Sea Urchin Harvesters Association
- FishResearch.org
- Depot Bay Near Shore Action Team
- Newport Charter Boat Association
- Newport Shrimp Association
- England Marine Supply
- Dorrymen's Association
- Washington Rural Electric Cooperative Association (WRECA)
- Alaska Power Association (APA)
- Washington PUD Association (WPUDA)
- Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems (UAMPS)
- Wyoming Rural Electric Association (WREA)
- Public Power Council (PPC)
- American Public Power Association (APPA)
- Association of Yukon Communities (AYC)
- Montana Electric Cooperatives Association (MECA)
- Idaho Consumer-Owned Utilities Association
- Oregon Municipal Electric Utilities (OMEC)
- Oregon PUD Association (OPUDA)
- Oregon Rural Electric Cooperatives Association (ORECA)
- National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA)
- Northern California Power Agency (NCPA)
- Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperatives Association (GCSECA)
- Colorado Association of Municipal Utilities (CAMU)
- Northwest Requirements Utilities
- Western Area Power Administration
- Western Governors Association
- Western Electricity Coordinating Council
- Oregon Environmental Council

- Washington State Parks & Recreation Commission
- Port of Peninsula
- Washington Trollers Association
- Columbia River Crab Fishermen's Association

Agency and Government Stakeholders:

- U.S. Coast Guard
- Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
- Olympic National Park
- Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
- Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission
- Oregon Parks and Recreation Commission
- Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
- California Department of Parks and Recreation
- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Oregon State Historic Preservation Office
- California State Historic Preservation Office
- Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
- NOAA Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management
- Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee (MAFAC)
- Alaska Department of Fish and Game
- Big Lagoon Rancheria
- Smith River Rancheria
- Manchester/Pt. Arena Rancheria
- Blue Lake Rancheria
- Elk Valley Rancheria
- Trinidad Rancheria
- Resighini Rancheria
- Table Bluff Rancheria
- Rohnerville Rancheria
- Hoopa Valley Tribe
- Stewarts Point Rancheria