DOC Meeting Summary

Date: August 3, 2026

Location: Virtual Meeting

Meeting objectives:

- DOC members have a shared understanding of the content in the Home Stretch Memo
- DOC members and the RFA team have a clearer understanding of where the DOC caucuses are and aren't aligned on key issues. On topics where there are different views, the RFA Team will note those perspectives.
- DOC members have opportunities to suggest options that could address remaining points of disagreement
- DOC members understand the next steps, including public input and finalizing the protocol.

Agenda:

- **Introduction, Meeting Purpose, and Goals**
- **What comes after this meeting – How we'll finish the work**
- **Key issues requiring attention**
    a. How to calculate historical performance and compare it to claim-year performance (individual tracks)
        i. Different approaches to averaging and looking back in time.
        ii. Whether to have separate approaches for cyclical fisheries and less cyclical fisheries
        iii. How to use overall vessel revenue versus project-area revenue
        iv. Role of revenue (gross/net) verses landings
        v. Reflections and takeaways from the caucuses on recent collaborations
    b. How to implement the calibration steps:
        i. Claimant Effort (What happens when effort is down because the vessel doesn't fish in the project area and has no workable alternatives to making up the days elsewhere?)
        ii. Fisheries Performance
    c. Expedited track for operations
        i. Under what circumstances could a claimant use the track, and come back later to seek an individual claim?
    d. Other issues?

- **Confirming Next Steps**

Participants

Commercial Fishing	States	Developers	Ex-Officio	Observers	Project Team
Beth Casoni	Brad Schondelmeier	Brian Krevor	Ursula Howson	Catherine McCall	David Plumb
Hank Soule	Erin Wilkinson	Rick Robins	Brian Hooker	Julia Logan	Orran Brown, Jr.

Joe Gilbert	Todd Janeski	Ross Pearsall	Douglas Christel		Olivia Burke
Lane Johnston	Joe Cimino	Jennifer Flood	Emma Chaiken		Caroline Coccoli
Peter Hughes	Carrie Kennedy		Jayson Pollock		Laura Singer
Vincent Balzano	Julia Socrates		Morgan Brunbauer		Deirdre Boelke
Roy Diehl			Wright Frank		Sydney Gustafson
Bonnie Brady					Justin Wind
					Charlotte Goeb

Introduction, Meeting Purpose, and Goals

- The meeting opened with an overview of the agenda and expectations. The RFA noted the many constructive caucus and small group discussions that had taken place since the previous full DOC meeting and acknowledged the significant work completed by DOC members with the RFA. The group reviewed the objectives for the meeting, the need to align on expectations for the remainder of the project, and the areas where consensus exists or differs.
- The RFA explained that the work is moving toward a critical end point for DOC involvement around November, with continued discussion and technical work able to feed into the public comment period.

What comes after this meeting – How we'll finish the work

- The RFA outlined the proposed timeline: weave in work from shoreside business and transferability subgroups over the next few weeks, release a draft framework in late August or early September supported by in-person engagement, conduct public comment through September and October, summarize comments after the comment period closes, hold a final DOC meeting in early November, and release the final regional framework in early December.
- DOC members raised concerns that a 45-day public comment period would not be long enough. The RFA team said that they would likely extend it to 60 days. Some DOC members suggested it should be even longer.
- The RFA confirmed that the DOC would see draft materials before they are shared publicly.
- The RFA team clarified that subgroup treatments are expected to be ready for the late-August draft framework, while detailed calculation and computation work would continue in parallel.

Key issues requiring attention

a. How to calculate historical performance and compare it to claim-year performance

- The RFA team reminded the DOC that this discussion is not about eligibility (what qualifies someone to submit a claim requesting compensation) but demonstration of proof of actual economic impact caused by OSW.

- Hank Soule and Brad Schondelmeier described recent work to model project-area revenue variability, including a focus on using standard deviations to evaluate individual vessel variability across a ten-year lookback, with acknowledgment of other possible methods (median absolute deviation, plain average, best three years of 10, etc.). They highlighted that any revenue-loss assessment should be scaled to effort, such as days fished compared with days absent, and there was a suggestion to use economists or socio-economic analysts to expand the statistical treatments. This discussion acknowledged different ways to weight historic performance, including weighting for recency, weighting for "best of" years, or other hybrids. Hank and Brad supported continued exploration of a potential formulaic approach, indicating the value of a clear explanation of rationale and possibly a spreadsheet that stakeholders can use to illustrate the approach. The RFA will evaluate opportunities for small group conversations to continue around these core framework concepts.
- Several participants emphasized the importance of grounding the approach in real data from a commercial fishing business.
- The DOC also discussed whether the framework should rely on revenue, landings, or a combination of both. The RFA noted that revenue captures financial impacts but may require careful treatment of gross versus net revenue, because operating costs may need to be associated with revenue figures. Landings data may help smooth market variability and reflect productivity but could present its own limitations when translating pounds landed into economic impacts.
- The RFA provided clarification on the "90-10 Rule" rule, emphasizing that the referenced 10% is not meant to exclude that population from receiving compensation for eligible losses, but is instead meant to provide a means for the 10% of eligible businesses or fishermen to receive compensation for their documented losses through an exceptions process, even though their circumstances may not fit neatly within the framework rules.

b. How to implement the calibration steps

- The group considered claimant effort and fisheries performance. Some fishing caucus participants emphasized their opinion that displacement from fishing grounds and lack of access to viable alternative fishing grounds should be appropriately reflected in the framework.
- The group also discussed fishery management actions and other causes of performance change. The RFA noted that the framework needs a procedure for identifying types of changes to the fishery may be in play during a relevant period. The group also discussed the possibility for situations where a fishery would have exceeded historical performance and whether a claimant might experience a larger potential loss than a simple down-year comparison to historic performance would show.
- Concerns were raised that the effort calibration could prevent people moving towards the individualized claim route. However, there was agreement on the need to ensure that the framework supports those most impacted, and the RFA noted that unique cases outside the standard process would be possible candidates for "exception" treatment. The fishing caucus shared concern that some of these cases may be more common than a narrow exception pathway would accommodate.

c. **Expedited track for operations**

- It was noted that the fishing caucus had originally raised the idea, but more recently expressed concern that expedited payments could reduce funds available for individualized claims. The RFA highlighted that the expedited track would only make sense if there were a cap, and that the framework needs to ensure the fund is not diluted for those most in need. This is currently the intent.

- There was a discussion on possible approaches, and the RFA highlighted that making it more complex would increase the administrative costs.
- Members of the DOC indicated that persons who accept expedited operations compensation should not be foreclosed from pursuing an individual operations review claim, and the RFA described how there could be a procedure to offset an earlier expedited payment, though having a two-touch process would add administrative cost.
- The RFA noted that the expedited operations track is intended to offer earlier, lower-friction access to compensation with the two-year sunset and individual payment cap intended to reduce risk of fund dilution. Members of the DOC continued to raise concerns that the expedited track could dilute total available funds.

d. Other issues?

- Participants recognized that the final framework may not align with every caucus position but emphasized the importance of documenting the discussion record and rationale for key decisions. The RFA noted that the project website could be used to upload further materials and capture relevant context from the process.
- The group also noted the importance of documenting the RFA rationale whilst not inserting into the rationale opinion statements from the different caucuses.

Confirming next steps

The RFA will continue refining the framework, incorporate relevant subgroup outputs and discussion points, share draft materials with the DOC before public release, and continue technical work with the appropriate small groups. The public comment period and potential in-person engagement will provide further opportunities for input before the final regional framework is released. The RFA team is actively planning additional opportunities for feedback during the public comment period and is seeking input and support from DOC members to participate in external meetings and calls when available.