

DOC Meeting Summary

January 9, 2026, 9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., ET

Location: Virtual Meeting

Attendees:

RFA: Orran Brown, Jr., Sydney Gustafson, Justin Wind, Joli Millner, Charlotte Goeb, Pat Field, Olivia Burke, Jan Matthiesen, Deirdre Boelke

DOC and Ex-Officio: Beth Casoni, Bonnie Brady, Brad Schondelmeier, Brian Krevor, Carrie Kennedy, Doug Christel, Elizabeth Kordowski, Emma Chaiken, Erin Wilkinson, Hank Soule, Jeff Kaelin, Joe Cimino, Joe Gilbert, Julia Socrates, Lane Johnston, Peter Hughes, Rick Robins, Ross Pearsall, Roy Diehl, Sam Asci, Todd Janeski, Ursula Howson

Observers: Morgan Brunbauer, Tom Dameron, Lisa Engler, Julia Logan

Agenda:

- 1. Introduction, Meeting Purpose, and Goals**
- 2. Caucus Updates**
- 3. Primary Design Questions (Set 1)**
 - a. Construction Period Definition
 - b. Decommissioning/Recommissioning
 - c. Reminder of Consensus-Based Decisions Presented 12/19
- 4. Subcommittee Focus**
 - a. Transferability
 - b. Shoreside
- 5. Preview for 1/21 DOC Meeting: Claimant Eligibility Questions (Set 2)**

Discussion:

Introduction

- Roll call of members and alternates present
- Overview of meeting agenda

Caucus Updates

1. Developer Caucus
 - Emily Rochon stepped down, Sam Asci moving to member, one alternate position open
2. Fishing Caucus
 - Noted that they have revisited the original principles and that the caucus have put together some documents which will be posted to the website to reflect the comments

- put forward. They include questions that this project won't answer but articulating their concerns as they are still important for the broader context
3. State caucus
 - No updates
 4. DOC Cross-Caucus Subgroups
 - Working on shoreside eligibility, transferability protocol

Primary Design Questions

1. Construction Period Definition
 - The DOC discussed the definition of the construction period, focusing on the need for clarity to determine compensation and disruption processes. The RFA explained the importance of defining the construction period for the expedited construction disruption process and highlighted considerations such as potential compensation step-downs and pre-construction activities. There was some support for using the term “nameplate capacity,” and some concerns about how delays could extend or interrupt the construction period and how those situations would be handled under a capacity-based definition.
 - The DOC discussed the start and end of construction in relation to seabed disturbance and power to the grid. While some concerns were raised about pre-construction disturbances, the RFA highlighted that the scope excludes pre-construction activities and the NEPA process would require changes. The RFA confirmed that fishermen will be able to file claims during both construction and operations and individualized reviews would still be available. Concerns were raised about ensuring there were enough funds both claim types and there was agreement to clarify the definitions further.
 - The DOC agreed to have a subgroup on expedited payments to review the construction definition, address how variability and uncertainty in construction timelines could be incorporated into an expedited program and identify and describe how pre-construction disturbances are dealt with (note that this is outside the RFA scope). There was a suggested language change that could state that demonstrable losses will be compensated “as long as there are funds available,” while recognizing the need to address situations where construction is paused, extended, or restarted.
2. Decommissioning/Recommissioning
 - Introduction of topic: Invitation for feedback on potential protocol on recommissioning
3. Status of Consensus on Set 1 Questions
 - The DOC reviewed and discussed the Set 1 questions, focusing on areas of alignment and those requiring further conversation. Additional feedback, some of which was beyond the original scope, had been received from the fishing and developer caucuses.

- There was some individual feedback on the definition for various business types (e.g., “commercial fishing businesses” should be “commercial fishing vessel businesses”). The caucuses agreed to review and send feedback to the RFA. The group also discussed the claim accrual period and geographic eligibility requirements for claimants, noting that these aspects were still under development.
- The fishery caucus confirmed that they will share a document on their ideas around crew compensation by 1/21 and the States noted the importance of ensuring state licenses and federal licensing vessels are included.

Subcommittee Focus

1. Transferability

- The subgroup updated the DOC on their discussions around fishing history permit transfer, generally agreeing that during the lookback and construction phases, full fishing history should transfer unless the history is lost, in which case it resets at transfer. For the operations period, there were some questions about whether previous owners can refuse to share history data, the need to consider disruption payments during construction, and whether rule design fairly accounts for whether new owners who would have more knowledge about potential offshore wind impacts.
- Discussions highlighted some concerns on the terminology (“transfer” vs. “sale”) and how inheritance exceptions should work. More clarification is needed on how internal business transfers are handled, and the importance of considering both buyer and seller impacts on permit value. Given the complexity, particularly around how value is defined, the subgroup will reconvene in January to discuss further.

2. Shoreside Businesses

- The subgroup gave an update that included defining shoreside support businesses into downstream and upstream categories, with downstream businesses supporting commercial fishermen through the first point of sale. They established criteria for economic losses, including lawful support of fishing businesses, time frame before offshore wind development, demonstrable economic loss, and causation by offshore wind. They also proposed compensation for downstream businesses based on displacement, disruption, or closure, reduced fishing volume, and other operating costs, with a discretionary review for other loss types and outlined documentation requirements for establishing eligibility and losses, noting these would be revisited after further discussions with the full DOC.
- There was a discussion around the potential inclusion of pack houses and action houses although further discussion is required.

3. It was agreed to establish a data subgroup to explore data accessibility and requirements.

Preview for 1/21 Meeting: Claimant Eligibility

The RFA highlighted the expectations for the next DOC cross-caucus discussion, presented the agenda and questions, and requested that the DOC consider these questions ahead of the 1/21 meeting.

Administrative Items

- Reminder for fishing reps to submit time for 2025 by 1/15/26
- DOC Cross-Caucus Discussion: 1/21, 10:30am-11:30am
- Open Zoom Webinar: 2/2, 4pm-5:30pm
 - State caucus members to receive link and cover letter to distribute through listservs
 - RFA to circulate Zoom link

Meeting closed.