

## DOC Meeting Summary

**Date:** March 19, 2026

**Location:** Virtual Meeting

**Agenda:**

- **Introduction, Meeting Purpose, and Goals**
- **Caucus Breakout Discussions**
- **Cross-Caucus Discussion Items**
  - Overview of Program Design Progress to Date
  - Views from the Caucuses
    - Fishing Caucus
    - Developer Caucus
    - State Caucus
    - Discussion
- **Administrative Items**
  - Update and Next Steps for Subgroups
  - Data Limitations Memo Update
  - Update on Forthcoming Memo for Question Sets 1 & 2

**Actions**

- RFA to engage the state caucus for alignment with other caucuses' progress
- RFA to resolve memos on Data Limitations, Data Confidentiality/Security, and Decisions for Question Sets 1 & 2

**Participants**

<b>Commercial Fishing</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Developers</b>	<b>Ex-Officio</b>	<b>Observers</b>	<b>Project Team</b>
Beth Casoni	Brad Schondelmeier	Brian Krevor	Ursula Howson	Catherine McCall	Pat Field
Hank Soule	Erin Wilkinson	Rick Robins	Brian Hooker	Renee Zobel	Orran Brown, Jr.
Jeff Kaelin	Todd Janeski	Ross Pearsall	Douglas Christel	Andrew Lipsky	Olivia Burke
Lane Johnston	Joe Cimino	Samuel Asci	Emma Chaiken		Caroline Coccoli
Peter Hughes	Carrie Kennedy	Elizabeth Kordowski	Jayson Pollock		Laura Singer
Vincent Balzano	Julia Socrates		Morgan Brunbauer		Deirdre Boelke
Roy Diehl	Sebastian Velez				Sydney Gustafson
Bonnie Brady					Justin Wind
					Charlotte Goeb

## **1. Introduction, Meeting Purpose, and Goals**

The DOC Cross-Caucus meeting began with an overview of the meeting agenda. The RFA explained that each caucus would first talk about loss valuation and causation design considerations in separate breakout rooms, then convene to give respective caucus updates and discuss across caucuses.

## **2. Caucus Breakouts**

After the RFA provided an overview of the meeting agenda, the fishing, state, and developer caucuses entered separate breakout rooms to discuss set three design considerations on loss valuation and causation. The caucuses then reconvened after 45 minutes of individual discussion.

## **3. Cross-Caucus Discussion**

To begin cross-caucus discussions after the breakout sessions, the RFA provided an overview of the segments of the working draft framework, such as the expedited construction disruption and individualized review tracks.

The expedited construction disruption track would provide a one-time payment – potentially scaled based on spatial dependence – during the construction period without requiring proof of loss or causation, and would not preclude or offset any future payments for individualized loss.

The individual review track would allow claimants to seek compensation for lost revenue and potentially increased costs, both of which could be evaluated through comparing historic baseline performance (overall and in the project area) with overall performance during the claimed loss period. In the individual review track, causation would be evaluated through a reasonable attribution approach wherein OSW causation is presumed, and alternative causation factors are ruled out. The reasonable attribution approach may be tiered based on expected payment amount, with more scrutiny applied to higher value claims.

A fishing representative asked the RFA whether the historic baseline is established on a fleetwide or individual level, to which the RFA replied that the current framework would look primarily on an individual level with awareness of applicable fleetwide factors.

The DOC caucuses then updated the group on their respective positions established in the breakout sessions and prior caucus meetings.

### **a. Updates from Fishing Caucus**

The fishing caucus advocated for the following approach:

Compensation should be based on verifiable losses reflecting current and historic use of the project area and comparing verified financial metrics from a baseline. The program should compensate fully for verified lost revenue and additional expenses caused by the project and compensation should reflect the scale of verified loss. The program should not be liable for fishery management decisions, reduction in ex-vessel price, theoretical lost revenue, and additional expenses if no loss exists compared to the baseline. A reasonable attribution approach should establish if an impact

occurred, then assume OSW causation but assess non-wind related causation factors. An annual claim cannot exceed the highest historical revenue from the OSW project area.

The fishing caucus has agreement within the caucus on the following potential alternative causes:

- Dissimilar business owner conditions
- Fishing management changes
- Ex-vessel price changes

The fishing caucus has disagreement within the caucus on the following potential alternative causes:

- Interannual variability
- Changes in overall stock across its full range (via periodic stock assessment or coast-wide landings)
- Other (including weather and climate change)

#### **b. Updates from Developer Caucus**

The developer caucus updated the group by supporting a framework which reasonably and appropriately tests causation factors, focusing on factors known to affect fishing performance and revenue (e.g., interannual variation, management changes, and price changes). The developer caucus also expressed continued support for a framework that aligns with the design principles previously established by the RFA and DOC.

#### **c. Updates from State Caucus**

The state caucus expressed the need for ample time with design materials and concepts ahead of DOC meetings in order to provide meaningful feedback for designing a regional compensation program.

#### **d. Discussion**

Before the DOC began a groupwide discussion, the RFA highlighted the need for deciding how each loss valuation and causation mechanism works, what data can be used, and what factors reliably affect potential impacts and causation by OSW.

An *ex officio* member explored the question of whether factors such as natural disasters and COVID-19 should be accounted for when determining causation. One fishing representative reasoned that COVID-19 years may be excluded from the baseline comparison, and that if the baseline is extended long enough, natural disasters and weather should be accounted for and leveled. Other fishing representatives highlighted the varied impacts from COVID-19 on fisheries. While some fishers faced minimal impacts, others dealt with many, including logistic issues, increased costs, lower prices, and market decline.

The DOC also discussed how climate change may or may not be assessed when determining potential alternative causes of loss. A fishing representative argued that in some cases, climate change has impacted fishing performance positively with colder temperatures, which would not align with OSW impacts being attributed to climate change. An *ex officio* member explained that

climate change can cause the temperature to change both ways, and that including climate change as a potential alternative cause requires more consideration and likely would vary by species.

**4. Administrative Items**

After the group discussion, the RFA provided updates on the DOC subgroups on transferability, shoreside businesses, and expedited construction disruption. The RFA announced that they plan to share memos on data limitations and data confidentiality/security. The RFA also plans to set decisions for question sets 1 and 2 to the DOC soon.