

## DOC Meeting Summary

**Date:** March 31, 2025

**Location:** Virtual Meeting

**Objectives:** Reintroductions, commencement of program design discussion, and alignment on future communications and meetings.

### Agenda:

10:00 a.m.	Welcome, Meeting Purpose, and Reintroductions
10:30 a.m.	Activity Update (Issues of concern, meetings to date, stakeholder engagement plan, frequency of communications, website, onboarding packets)
11:00 a.m.	Design Components
11:05 a.m.	Life Cycle of a Claims Program
11:20 a.m.	Design Elements: Eligibility
12:50 p.m.	Future Meeting Schedule
1:00 p.m.	Adjourn

### Decisions

- DOC agree to the stakeholder engagement plan with no further updates

### Actions

- RFA to circulate outstanding survey questions on the topic of eligibility
- RFA to circulate finalized stakeholder engagement plan and upload to the website (no updates since the draft was circulated)
- RFA to circulate an updated onboarding packet
- RFA to inform the DOC on next focused engagement cycle (4/28-5/9) with locations and request for in-person meeting with DOC members and wider stakeholder network (where appropriate)
- RFA to circulate draft bios for the website and DOC to provide comments

### Participants

<b>Commercial Fishing</b>	<b>States</b>	<b>Developers</b>	<b>Ex-Officio</b>	<b>Project Team</b>
Beth Casoni	Brad Schondelmeier	Brian Krevor	Brian Hooker	Pat Field
Bonnie Brady	Carrie Kennedy	Doug Copeland	Doug Christel	Orran Brown, Jr.
Hank Soule	Erin Wilkinson	Emily Rochon	Emma Chaiken	Olivia Burke
Jeff Kaelin	Joe Cimino	Rick Robins	Jayson Pollock	Jan Matthiesen
Jerry Leeman	Julia Socrates	Ross Pearsall	Morgan Brunbauer	Caroline Coccoli
Joe Gilbert	Todd Janeski	Ruth Perry	Ursula Howson	Laura Singer
Lane Johnston				Sydney Gustafson

Roy Diehl				Justin Wind
Sam Martin				Joli Millner
Tom Dameron				Charlotte Goeb
Vincent Balzano				

### **1. Welcome, Meeting Purpose, and Reintroductions**

The project team welcomed the attendees, reiterated meeting etiquette and purpose, and provided an overview of the meeting’s agenda. Each attendee provided a reintroduction of their background and role in the DOC to the group.

### **2. Activity Update**

The project team provided an activity update to the attendees, noting that a memo was recently circulated which provided more information on the topics covered and the number of meetings held over the last three months. The RFA team confirmed they would send these updates every 2-3 months, alongside more regular communication updates by email.

In response to common concerns raised in engagement efforts, the project team covered a few issues, including the relationship between “money-in” and “money-out”; the role of resilience in a compensatory mitigation fund; the hierarchy of mitigation efforts; and the legal basis for a regional claims process.

The project team gave updates on their engagement efforts by providing an overview of meetings-to-date, news on the project’s website, and a summary of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

The attendees reviewed a draft Onboarding Packet for DOC members, which provoked discussion about the Terms of Reference and legal exposure.

### **3. Design Components**

Transitioning towards the meeting’s main discussion, the project team reviewed the relationship between compensation and mitigation as it relates to the RFA project. The project team emphasized that while the scope of these specific RFA discussions is compensation, it is expected that conversations on how this interacts with mitigation will continue.

### **4. Life Cycle of a Claims Program**

The project’s design team presented a life cycle diagram of a claims program. The flow chart showed the typical process of claims programs, highlighting the complexity and different components that will need to be considered throughout this work. This encouraged discussion about guidance and accessibility concerns for claim submission.

### **5. Design Elements: Eligibility**

The project team introduced the DOC survey process, noting that the survey was not a final vote on design components, but rather a way to gauge ideas and opinions. It was explained that this topic had been coming up in small group or 1-2-1 discussions and that the project team wanted to discuss this with the DOC before creating some more concrete options or approaches which could be discussed in more detail.

The survey proposed questions about eligibility requirements for the claims program. Thorough discussion followed each polling question. Attendees discussed potential eligible participants (i.e. vessel owners, captains, crew, etc.), home ports, landing ports, fishing history, and shoreside businesses. There was agreement on the inclusion of crew members as eligible applicants in the claims program.

The survey ended with discussions about the structure of the fund and integration of existing compensation funds. The RFA team agreed to share survey questions that weren't discussed in the meeting so that DOC members could provide additional written feedback.

## **6. Future Meeting Schedule**

The project team ended the meeting with a brief discussion about future DOC meeting schedules and duration. The DOC provided feedback on potential dates for the next quarterly meeting, narrowing down to the week of June 2 (before the NEFMC) or the week of June 9.

The project team noted that the DOC discussion will help inform further refinement of the eligibility components, and that they intend to hold webinars over the next couple of months to discuss this component further. Alongside continued engagement, the project team noted that they are planning a two week in-person engagement activity from April 28 focusing on Virginia, North Carolina in week 1, with details for week 2 still to be confirmed. DOC members will be informed of the RFA's plans and they are encouraged to suggest meetings with their sectors – either individually or in a group.