DOCKETED			
Docket Number:	17-MISC-01		
Project Title:	California Offshore Renewable Energy		
TN #:	246362		
Document Title:	Presentation - BOEM-Funded California Regional Ports Assessments		
Description:	Presentation from the SLC "California Port Studies" for the Oct 6, 2022 CEC AB 525 Staff Workshop		
Filer:	susan fleming		
Organization:	State Lands Commission		
Submitter Role:	Public Agency		
Submission Date:	10/5/2022 4:40:04 PM		
Docketed Date:	10/5/2022		

## **BOEM-Funded California Regional Ports Assessments**

### Basis of Analysis: 10.6.22 Update

- Initial outreach to 17 ports to determine how many port sites are required to meet AB 525 deployment targets (low, med, high)—sites ranked
- Assess physical, operational, and regulatory capabilities and constraints of port facilities and infrastructure and potential port infrastructure upgrades
- Draft Report 11/4, Final Report 12/2

Year	Target Deployment					
	Low		Medium	High		
Rate	0.5 GW/yr	1 GW/yr	1.5 GW/yr	2 GW/yr	2.5 GW/yr	
2030	1 GW	2 GW	3 GW	4 GW	5 GW	
2035	3.5 GW	7 GW	10.5 GW	14 GW	17.5 GW	
2038	5 GW	10 GW	15 GW	20 GW	25 GW	
2045	8.5 GW	17 GW	25.5 GW	34 GW	42.5 GW	
2048	10 GW	20 GW	30 GW	40 GW	50 GW	
2050	11 GW	23 GW	33 GW	44 GW	55 GW	

#### Activities Considered:

- Staging and Integration Facility (S&I)
- Operations and Maintenance Facility (O&M)
- Construction Support Facility
- Manufacturing / Fabrication Site (MF)



## **Deployment Targets**

#### > Step 1: Determine Deployment Targets

- Determine low, medium, high GW rates for 2030 and 2045
- This is the demand that the OSW industry and ports would have to meet
- Additional sources of deployment goals:
  - > Governor Newsom's Letter to CARB (July 2022):
    - o 20 GW by 2045
  - > CEC Updated AB 525 Report (August 2022):
    - $_{\odot}$   $\,$  2–5 GW by 2030  $\,$
    - $_{\circ}$   $\,$  25 GW by 2045  $\,$
- **Takeaway** BOEM TO2 GW deployment targets are generally in line with other published GW goals

Year	Target Deployment					
	Low		Medium	High		
Rate	0.5 GW/yr	1 GW/yr	1.5 GW/yr	2 GW/yr	2.5 GW/yr	
2030	1 GW	2 GW	<mark>3 GW</mark>	4 GW	5 GW	
2035	3.5 GW	7 GW	10.5 GW	14 GW	17.5 GW	
2038	5 GW	10 GW	15 GW	20 GW	25 GW	
2045	8.5 GW	17 GW	<mark>25.5 GW</mark>	34 GW	42.5 GW	
2048	10 GW	20 GW	30 GW	40 GW	50 GW	
2050	11 GW	23 GW	33 GW	44 GW	55 GW	

## **Port Inventory**

#### Step 2: Determine Available Port Sites

- Conduct outreach to 17 ports to determine potentially available port sites for OSW development
- Categorize potentially available port sites based on requirements for each site type
  - Staging and Integration
  - Manufacturing / Fabrication
  - Operations & Maintenance
- This is the capacity that existing ports have to meet the state's GW goals / demands
- Step 3: Compare GW goals w/ Available Port Sites
  - Takeaway Determine how many port sites are required to meet AB 525 GW deployment targets (low, medium, high) for 2030 and 2045

Floating Offshore Wind Turbine	Approximate Criteria for Staging & Integration	Approximate Criteria for Component Manufacturing	Approximate Criteria for O&M
Acreage, minimum	30 – 100 acres	30 – 100 acres	5 – 10 acres
Wharf Length	1,500 ft	800 ft	300 ft
Minimum Draft at Berth	38 ft	38 ft	20 – 30 ft
Draft at Sinking Basin	40 – 100 ft		
Wharf Loading	> 6,000 psf	Up to 6,000 psf	100 – 500 psf
Uplands / Yard Loading (for WTG components)	> 2,000		



# ALTERNATIVE PORT ASSESSMENT

California State Lands Commission

AB 525 Offshore Wind Workshop | Oct 6, 2022



- Identify potential waterfront locations between San Francisco and Long Beach to support offshore wind
- Screen and rank potential staging and integration (S&I) and operations and maintenance (O&M) sites for development



# S&I Screening Criteria

#### Step 1: Preliminary Criteria

Exclude: State Parks National Forests CA MPAs Airspace Restrictions Military Bases Residential Areas Islands 18 Sites

#### Step 2: Engineering Criteria

#### Consider:

Water Depth Natural Coves Protected Harbor Prox. To Road/Rail **13 Sites**  Step 3: Environmental Criteria Consider:

Permitting Marine Fisheries Aquatic Vegetation Wetlands Biological Resources Tribal Considerations Environmental Justice **Rank Top 4 Sites** 

\*Includes green and brownfield sites and coastline within the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary \*Criteria listed in tables does not reflect all applicable criteria

California State

# **O&M Screening Criteria**

#### Step 1: Preliminary Criteria

Include: Piers Harbors Wharfs Marinas Co-locating with and existing large facility **41 Sites** 

#### Step 2: Engineering Criteria

#### Consider:

Wave Protection Navigable Depth / Width Current Use Distance to Morro Bay WEA (<160 mi) **13 Sites** 

#### Step 3: Outreach

#### Outreach:

Gauge interest from current operators

## Rank Top 4 Sites based on

outreach and cost estimates

\*Criteria listed in tables does not reflect all applicable criteria

California State Lands Commission



- Continue screening for environmental factors for S&I sites
- Continue outreach to potential O&M site owners
- Conduct high-level cost estimates for top 4 sites S&I and O&M Sites
- Final report estimated to be published late November / early
  December





AB 525 (PRC Sec. 25991.3)



# THANK YOU & QUESTIONS

Max Liebergesell, Sea Grant Fellow Division of Environmental Planning and Management max.liebergesell@slc.ca.gov 650.346.7591

**@CAStateLands** 

