



## MEETING SUMMARY

BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT  
**PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR OIL AND GAS  
DECOMMISSIONING ACTIVITIES ON THE PACIFIC OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF**  
**PUBLIC MEETING**  
NOVEMBER 15, 2022  
11 A.M. – 1 P.M. PT  
VIRTUAL MEETING

### I. Introduction

As part of the public comment process, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) hosted two virtual public meetings to present the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS or “Draft”) and gather public input on the content of the Draft. This summary covers the second of the two meetings (the first took place on November 10, 2022).

The meeting was held remotely via webinar using the Zoom platform. Fifty-two participants attended. Government participants included representatives from federal and state agencies, and local governments. Participating members of the public included representatives from industry, academic and research institutions, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations (CBOs), and the media. The meeting began at 11 a.m. and ended at 12:10 p.m. Staff remained available online until 1:01 p.m.

The meeting recording and transcripts are available at: <https://www.boem.gov/regions/pacific-ocs-region/oil-gas/pacific-oil-and-gas-decommissioning-activities>.

Meeting objectives:

- Provide information to the public on the Draft PEIS.
- Answer questions related to the Draft PEIS.
- Solicit public comment on the Draft PEIS.
- Next Steps for PEIS Process.

This document summarizes key outcomes and next steps from the meeting. It focuses on public comment input received rather than the formal presentations made. It is not intended to be a detailed transcript. Kearns & West (K&W) facilitated the meeting.

This meeting summary is organized into the following sections:

- I. Introduction
- II. Draft PEIS Meeting Highlights
  - A. Welcome and Opening Remarks
  - B. Overview of BOEM Decommissioning Draft PEIS
  - C. Clarifying Questions and Oral Responses
  - D. Public Input Opportunity (Listening Session)
  - E. Closing Remarks
- III. Appendices
  - A. Agenda
  - B. Public Participant List
  - C. Public Clarifying Questions and Oral Responses
  - D. Comments and Questions from the Public Input Opportunity
  - E. Poll Results

## II. Draft EA Meeting Highlights

### A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

#### 1. *Jenna Tourje, Facilitator with Kearns & West*

The meeting opened with a welcome to participants, followed by a summary of meeting objectives and guidance on navigating the Zoom Webinar. The facilitator presented two polls for the participants: the first identified participant affiliations, and the second determined the number of participants planning to provide oral comments at the meeting. Appendix E contains polling results.

Mrs. Tourjé-Maldonado explained the question and answer and public comment portions. She noted that the question and answer portion is open for questions related to the environmental NEPA process and questions outside of that scope will be noted by the BOEM and BSEE teams. The public comment portion is an opportunity to provide official comments on the record.

#### 2. *Richard (Rick) Yarde, Regional Supervisor, Office of Environment, BOEM Pacific Regional Office*

Rick Yarde thanked the public for joining the meeting. He noted that the draft PEIS is out and available for public comment. Mr. Yarde explained the authority of BOEM's Office of Environment and BOEM's directives to prepare the environmental impact statement. He noted that BSEE is the decision-making authority on the PEIS. Mr. Yarde explained how participants could provide public comments and welcomed comments on how to make analyses better for decommissioning applications and oil and gas infrastructure in California.

#### 3. *Bruce Hesson, Regional Director, BSEE, Pacific Regional Office*

Bruce Hesson welcomed participants to the first of two public meetings on the decommissioning PEIS in the Pacific Region. He explained BSEE's authority to enforce safety and environmental activities in the Pacific OCS. He noted BSEE's authority to enforce obligations of offshore oil and gas platforms and associated facilities in federal waters. Mr. Hesson stated that BSEE initiated a PEIS in July 2021, and that BSEE is assisting BOEM in the environmental analysis as BSEE is the decision maker over

decommissioning activities. He noted that the environmental analysis will provide critical information on decommissioning activities. And finally, Bruce Hesson shared, BSEE staff will consider all comments received today or in writing on the PEIS.

4. *Theresa Stevens, Senior Project Manager, Regulatory Division, Los Angeles District, North Coast Branch ACOE*

Theresa Stevens welcomed participants to the meeting and stated that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) was invited as a cooperating agency to address NEPA compliance on the PEIS. She stated the USACE has no current action, but the PEIS will inform the permit process for future activities in the future. Additionally, Theresa explained, the USACE is determined to understand impacts on the environment. Under the federal permit program, Theresa Stevens shared, the Corps is responsible for actions in federal waters, and they have a responsibility to analyze impacts prior to making a permit decision. Lastly, she noted the USACE will accept and consider all comments received today on the draft PEIS.

## B. Overview of the BOEM Pacific OCS Decommissioning Draft PEIS

*Linette Makua, NEPA Coordinator, Environmental Analysis Section, BOEM's Pacific Regional Office*

Linette Makua presented an overview of BOEM's planning approach for oil and gas platform decommissioning, background on the infrastructure, and an overview of the PEIS. She provided information on the oil and gas platform locations and the pacific coastline. Ms. Makua then overviewed a simplified platform diagram, images, and the history of offshore federal infrastructure installations.

Linette Makua highlighted the process for decommissioning and noted that a working group was formed to develop a citizen's guide to offshore oil and gas decommissioning in federal waters off California. She noted that conductor removal is a separate analysis already taking place, which is described in Appendices B and C of the draft PEIS. Ms. Makua highlighted the differences between a PEIS and EIS, stating that the PEIS does not approve decommissioning activities, nor does it require consultation. A PEIS evaluates the effects of broad proposals or planning-level decisions, Linette Makua noted, whereas EIS are site-specific. Additionally, she stated, BSEE will analyze input exactly as received in later site-specific NEPA analyses.

Linette Makua then highlighted the chapters of the PEIS beginning with Chapter 1 on Purpose and Need, which is to ensure safe and environmentally sound decommissioning activities. She reviewed Chapter 2 which describes the alternatives and the proposed action such as complete removal of platforms, partial platform removal, partial removal and upper jackets placed as an artificial reef, and no action. Linette Makua described the alternatives in detail and noted associated regulations. Ms. Makua provided an overview of Chapter 3 which includes the four resource impact levels (negligible, minor, moderate, and major) and various biological, physical, and sociocultural impacts. She noted that these studies will be consulted on through the Section 106 process, and BOEM's preferred mitigation method is avoidance. Ms. Makua then described Chapter 4, which covers cumulative impacts and environmental consequences, such as noise, habitat loss, sanitary waste, and space-use conflicts, amongst others, noting that tables 4.1-1 and 4.1-2 would include the full potential consequences. Impact analyses considered reasonably foreseeable future activities such as offshore wind development, offshore

military training, commercial shipping and navigation, commercial and recreational fisheries, and aquaculture, amongst others.

Ms. Makua noted the 42 research and studies conducted on oil and gas decommissioning offshore California that are included here: <https://www.boem.gov/Selected-BOEM-BSEE-Research-Decommissioning-CA/> which will inform BOEM's assessment. She explained the process to provide public comments and noted the deadline is December 12, 2022, at 8:59 Pacific Time. Linette Makua asked that further questions on the BOEM Decommissioning Draft PEIS process be directed to her at [linette.makua@boem.gov](mailto:linette.makua@boem.gov).

### C. Clarifying Questions and Oral Responses

Participating members of the public asked clarifying questions related to the draft PEIS process. BOEM provided oral responses during a designated Public Clarifying Question session that covered such topics as:

- Members of the public asked about requests for a 45-day comment extension on the draft PEIS.
- Members of the public asked about the lower jacket potentially representing an artificial reef and if partial removal would be considered an artificial reef.
- Members of the public asked about the Santa Ynez Unit sale from ExxonMobil to Sable Offshore and changes to expectations for decommissioning plans and timelines.
- Members of the public asked under what legal authority (federal regulation or statute) can Alternative 2 be implemented.
- Members of the public asked about an updated analysis of suitable and available Jones Act vessels required for decommissioning to be made in the final edition of the PEIS.
- Members of the public asked if the presentation slides will be available for download at a future date.

Appendix E contains the questions and responses.

### D. Comments and Questions from the Public Input Opportunity

Mrs. Tourjé-Maldonado invited participants to provide oral public comments. A summary of the public comments organized by key themes is provided below.

- Public comment period extension. Extend the public comment period to 45 days to allow for a full review of the draft PEIS.
- Management of debris/shell mounds. Fully analyze impacts associated with alternatives 2, 3, and 4 which allow mounds to be left in place. Some issues in California related to debris led to an extensive legal record that should be cited in the PEIS. Analyze the effects of remaining shell mounds beyond a 30-year timescale.
- Analyze impacts on marine/biological productivity for each alternative. Analyze impacts on invasive species and marine productivity for unremoved platforms long-term. Additional analysis is needed around leaving pipelines in place. Cite studies that describe long-term infrastructure impacts on marine species.
- Fishing impacts. Identify the impact of fishing and productivity in the remaining structures.

- Threatened and endangered species. Include all threatened and endangered species such as marine mammals or avian species in the environmental consequences section.
- Consider re-purposing platforms. Utilize remaining platforms for recreational diving, ecosystem services, and sustainable fishing and aquaculture. Transform oil platforms into a “green” lighthouse to generate energy and conduct energy research.
- Improve water quality. Preserve platform substructures to maintain marine biology attached to the structure.

Appendix D lists public comments.

## E. Closing Remarks

Richard Yarde thanked participants for their time and comments. Noted comment period extension – department is seriously considering it. He encouraged participants to submit further comments via mail and email and the federal register, and to visit <https://www.boem.gov/regions/pacific-ocs-region/oil-gas/pacific-oil-and-gas-decommissioning-activities> to and view meeting recordings.

Mr. Yarde noted the next steps in the PEIS process and that the public comment period ends December 12, 2022, at 11:59 p.m. EST / 8:59 p.m. PST. Comments can be submitted through Regulations.gov under the docket number BOEM-2021-0043. Comment period extension requests are being considered and updates will be posted on the website.

Mrs. Makua noted that the final PEIS would come out around June 2023, and a final decision will be made in late summer of 2023.

Thanked BSEE and USACE for being partners in the PEIS process.

### III. Appendices

#### A. Agenda

## Public Meeting for the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Oil and Gas Decommissioning Activities on the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf **Public Meeting**

### Agenda

**November 15, 2022**  
**11:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. PT**

**Registration:**

[https://kearnswest.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_cA4tqC8bTIOqRd1YBzseXQ](https://kearnswest.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_cA4tqC8bTIOqRd1YBzseXQ)

#### Meeting Objectives

- Provide an overview of the PEIS and briefly cover the NEPA process
- Answer questions related specifically to the NEPA process
- Solicit public comment on the Draft PEIS
- Next Steps for PEIS Process:
  - o December 12<sup>th</sup> - PEIS comment closes
  - o Follow website for updates
  - o Final PEIS will be released around May/June 2023
  - o Decision Document expected to be complete in Summer 2023

Time	Agenda Item	Presenter
3:00 – 3:10 pm	Welcome and Webinar Guidance	K&W Facilitator: Jenna Tourje-Maldonado
3:10 – 3:15pm	Introductory Remarks	Rick Yarde (BOEM) Bruce Hesson (BSEE) Theresa Stevens (USACE)
3:15 – 3:35 pm	Overview of BOEM Decommissioning Draft PEIS	Linette Makua (BOEM)

<b>3:35 – 3:55 pm</b>	<b>Q&amp;A</b> <i>Clarifying questions on the NEPA process</i>	Rick Yarde & Linette Makua
<b>3:55 – 4:55 pm</b>	<b>Public Comment</b>	K&W Facilitator: Jenna Tourje-Maldonado
<b>4:55 – 5:00 pm</b>	<b>Closing Remarks</b>	Rick Yarde (BOEM)

## B. Public Participation List

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Type of Affiliation</b>
Alexandra	VanAntwerp	NMJ	Other
Ann	Bull	UCSB	Academia
Azsha	Hudson	EDC	Non-governmental organization
Becky	Ota	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)	Government
Brandon	M	Government	Government
Brian	von Herzen	Climate Foundation	Non-governmental organization
Carrie	Roach	Carrie	Community-Based Organization
Christopher	Potter	CDFW	Government
Corianna	Flannery	CDFW	Government
Erin	Meyer-Gutbrod	University of South Carolina	Academia
Heather	Richards	E&E News	Press
Ingrid	Biedron	BOEM	Government

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Type of Affiliation</b>
Jamshid	Gharib	Fugro	Business/Industry
Jason	Gerdes	U.S. EPA	Government
John	Smith	TSB Offshore Inc.	Business/Industry
Jonathan	Wallace	Chevron	Business/Industry
Julia	Chunn-Heer	Surfrider	Non-governmental organization
Justine	Kimball	OPC	Government
Kassem	Maged	Deme	Business/Industry
Katherine	DeHart	USCG	Government
Kristen	Hislop	Environmental Defense Center	Non-governmental organization
Lars	Herbst	Consultant	Business/Industry
Linda	Phillips	League of Women Voters of California	Non-governmental organization
Maria	Wiener	USCG	Government
Mark	Weisz	CS Marine Constructors, Inc.	Business/Industry
Mary	Nishimoto	Joint Oil/Fisheries Liaison Office	Other
Molly	Troup	Santa Barbara Channelkeeper	Non-governmental organization
Nicole	Bogan	Bogans Basin	Business/Industry
Rebecca	Trujillo	Chevron	Business/Industry



First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Type of Affiliation
Rebecca	Garcia-Malone	Curtin Maritime	Business/Industry
Richard	Charter	Coastal Coordination Program, The Ocean Foundation	Non-governmental organization
Ryan	Davis	Americas Green Corps	Non-governmental organization
Sara	Dearman	Chevron	Business/Industry
Simon	Poulter	Padre Associates, Inc.	Business/Industry
Tamara	Murray	N/A	Other
Tyler	Buckingham	American Shoreline Podcast Network & Coastal News Today	Press
Wesley	Horn	CCC	Government
William	Arnold	BSEE	Government

### c. Clarifying Questions and Oral Responses

Participants asked clarifying questions in the Zoom Q&A box after both presentations. Descriptions of questions and responses for both sessions are listed below. These are intended for reference and are not intended to be verbatim.

#### *Questions*

1. Can the public comment period be extended for a full 45 days?
  - a. BOEM and BSEE are considering the extension and will make a decision shortly.
2. Can the lower jacket potentially represent an artificial reef and can partial removal be considered for an artificial reef?
  - a. The proposed alternatives represent an entire spectrum of a range of environmental impacts. BOEM will continue to clarify this.
3. How does a Santa Ynez Unit sale from ExxonMobil to Sable Offshore change BSEE/BOEM's expectation for POCS decommissioning plans and timelines?
  - a. The PEIS is an umbrella term for all decommissioning projects that will occur.
4. Can you please explain under what legal authority (federal regulation or statute) can Alternative 2 be implemented?

- a. This is explained in Alternative 2. Alternative 2 regulations, 30 CFR Part 250 Subpart Q 1728-1731 overview the legal authority of Alternative 2.
5. Will an updated analysis of suitable and available Jones Act vessels required for decommissioning be made in the final edition of the PEIS?
  - a. Question was noted for later response.
6. Will these slides be available for download at a future date?
  - a. Yes, they will be posted in a couple weeks after they are made 508 compliant.

## D. Comments and Questions from the Public Input Opportunity

The following comments were received during the meeting. These are summaries of the comments received and are not intended to be verbatim.

1. We'd like to request an extension of the comment period by 45 days.
2. Fully analyze impacts associated with Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 which allow mounds to be left. There is some experience with these issues in California that led to an extensive legal record that should be cited in the PEIS. Need to analyze the impacts on biological productivity for each option and analyze the impacts of invasive species for unremoved platforms.
3. There is interest in a longer timescale beyond 30 years in understanding the effects of shell mounds.
4. Once removal takes place, the benefits of the PEIS noted is an increase in recreational fishing. What is the impact of fishing and productivity in these structures?
5. Environmental consequences didn't include all threatened and endangered species such as marine mammals or avian species.
6. If the top 100 feet of the platform tends to be most productive, how will removal affect marine productivity? Additional analysis is needed around leaving pipelines in place and studies should be cited for how infrastructure impacts in the long term.
7. Are proposals considered for the upper jacket to be relocated in the Santa Barbara channel to provide ecosystem services? This could provide recreational diving, ecosystem services, and sustainable fishing. The upper jacket can be provided in shallower waters.
8. Transform the oil platform into a green lighthouse. This creates a model to be studied for how to generate energy at the site, move the energy to shore, and recycle the infrastructure. Preserve one platform for an energy model for energy research.
9. Repurposing the platforms can provide opportunities for aquaculture research.
10. Removal of the substructure of the platform will decrease marine productivity which improves water quality.
11. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would allow the industry to leave debris mounds and not allow for sufficient cleanup. Note that alternative 2 would allow the lower jacket to be left in place. This can only be done if under a federal state reef program. Who will be responsible for this?
12. Alternatives analysis and impact to invasive species was well done, as well as the analysis on fish populations regarding localized vs. regional.
13. Look more closely at leaving mounds in place long-term. There are concerns about toxic contamination related to Chevron platforms that were removed. BOME should also analyze the risk of seismic events and tsunamis that will leave toxic waste.

14. How can pipeline decommissioning be done so it doesn't contaminate the marine environment with what is in the pipelines? There should be a more robust discussion on cleaner engine boats and barges to reduce diesel fuel and positively impact the climate. Mitigation measures of burned fuels should also be analyzed.
15. Re-purposing platforms for aquaculture possibilities. Sea urchin vessels are qualified to conduct aquaculture on platform legs. Keep the jackets up to the surface and top side to grow abalone, scallops, and mussels for food.
16. There should be more discussion on the use of platforms for desalination and future renewable energy sources, which may be utilized in the future to help with climate change.

## E. Poll Results

### *Participant Affiliation*

<b>Affiliated Group</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Community-Based Organization	6%
Academia	6%
Other	6%
Non-Governmental Organization	11%
Business/Industry	28%
Government	44%

### *Public Comment: Are you planning to provide a public comment today?*

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Yes	2%
No	62%
Maybe	35%