

DOC Meeting Summary

Date: July 11, 2025

Location: Virtual Meeting

Objectives: Introduction to guiding principles of regional design; discussion and understanding of each caucus' position on eligibility considerations; and alignment on next steps for engagement and design development.

Agenda:

- Welcome
- Recap of Engagement on Eligibility
- Meeting Purpose, Goals and Guidelines
- Guiding Principles to Regional Design
- Discussion on Eligibility Components
- Review of Upcoming Engagement Schedule
- Adjourn

Actions

- RFA to circulate the Menti-link, TEAMS chat notes and principles and guidance document
- DOC primary members to fill out Menti poll on the questions discussed in this meeting
- DOC members and alternates to provide comments on the principles and guidance document
- RFA to send fishing caucus meeting summary to fishing caucus members

Participants

Commercial Fishing	States	Developers	Ex-Officio	Project Team
Beth Casoni	Brad Schondelmeier	Brian Krevor	Brian Hooker	Pat Field
Bonnie Brady	Erin Wilkinson	Emily Rochon	Doug Christel	Orran Brown, Jr.
Hank Soule	Todd Janeski	Rick Robins	Emma Chaiken	Olivia Burke
Jeff Kaelin		Ross Pearsall	Jayson Pollock	Jan Matthiesen
Jerry Leeman		Samuel Asci	Jeremy Magliaro	Caroline Coccoli
Joe Gilbert				Laura Singer
Lane Johnston				Sydney Gustafson
Sam Martin				Kris Ohleth
Vincent Balzano				Joli Millner
				Charlotte Goeb

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.

2. Activity Update

The project team introduced Samuel Asci as the new developer member (taking over from Doug Copeland), and Deirdre Boelke as the local engagement officer for the Mid-Atlantic. The RFA team noted that Deirdre and Caroline will lead the in-person engagement for the week commencing July 21, 2025.

3. Guiding principles to regional design

The RFA highlighted that the draft principles have emerged from common themes highlighted in caucus meetings, from existing compensation funds and broader discussions. The RFA acknowledged that the DOC had not reviewed these yet and asked that the DOC provide comments after the meeting.

The group discussed the applicability of current guidance developed for fixed offshore wind to floating projects. The method for calculating fund contributions may need to differ due to potentially variable access conditions, though the general structure for distributing funds should still apply. A focused, cross-caucus conversation was recommended to address floating-specific considerations, with consensus that compensation should be viewed within the broader context of developer responsibilities like mitigation and resilience.

The project team initiated a more detailed discussion on comprehensive claims design, also known as the 90/10 rule, which emphasizes that the goal of the program is to cover most cases while allowing for limited exceptions and an eventual appeals process to avoid the inefficiencies of trying to accommodate every individual scenario. DOC members emphasized the need for context when considering a regional compensation program, as it relates to other potential mitigation efforts for each project. DOC members and alternates raised questions about language such as “restrained flexibility,” and recommended a review for clarity and consistency. Attendees agreed that the principles should be formalized, incorporated into the draft protocol, and published on the program website.

4. Discussion of eligibility components

Eligibility has been discussed during stakeholder outreach, in caucus discussions and at the last DOC meeting. The project team developed a draft protocol, to determine who will be able to submit a claim into the regional process, based on initial conversations with stakeholders. This has been continually refined using caucus-level feedback.

During this time, committee members have had the opportunity to develop an understanding of eligibility components based on existing programs and federal guidelines, as well as the perspective of others in their caucus group. This DOC meeting was an opportunity for each

caucus to evaluate their positions and fine-tune their approach based on the other caucuses, to establish consensus, where possible.

Look back period for a fishermen's history in an affected area to assess whether that history is qualifying.

The group discussed the appropriate milestone for determining the program's look-back (or "control date" used in fishery management practice). It was agreed to remove "issuance of BOEM's ROD" from the options list since the final COP Approval with Terms and Conditions is the actual "permit" for the project.

Some emphasized that a later date offers a more accurate snapshot of fishing activity but potentially increases the risk oversubscription to the regional program, potentially by individuals who did not experience financial harm, while earlier dates reduce that risk but may be less reflective of current conditions. Additionally, if the Terms and Conditions are set and construction does not proceed for several years, the lag time between the control date and construction can be lengthy and introduce other anomalies, such as not capturing more recent fishing activity. Although there was emerging support for a longer look-back period, aligning with the 90/10 rule and accounting for fisheries with long-lived species, attendees raised concerns about how this decision could influence state negotiations with developers and state sovereignty.

How far back in time from the lookback date should fishing activity be considered and how many of those lookback years should a fisherman have fished in the affected area(s).

There was emerging agreement for a longer duration to evaluate fishing history to better reflect the natural cycles and closures in certain fisheries. Discussion highlighted the potential need to have variable time horizons linked to fishery to account for management closures. While 3-7 years are typically observed in current funds, discussion generally pointed towards a longer time period for the regional design. Concerns were raised about the availability of reliable data beyond 10 or 20 years, the administrative burden of managing a longer look-back period, and the importance of aligning the look-back approach with the program's guiding principles, to ensure fairness and feasibility, was highlighted.

How frequently within a year must a fisherman have fished the affected area(s)?

There was a discussion on balancing fairness, inclusivity, and administrative burden. Four potential criteria were proposed: (1) still actively fishing, (2) fishing within a certain number of years back from a control date (generally 2 to 3 in other programs), (3) a minimum number of active years within that window, and (4) frequency and/ or level of effort in the area. Participants emphasized the need to clarify the "bar" for eligibility versus later claims processing—recognizing that a high bar for one could allow a lower bar for the other or vice versa. Attendees also suggested defining what qualifies as "significant" fishing, considering permit status, revenue, trip diversity, and whether criteria should be project-specific or regional.

The group raised concerns about how to handle displacement and variability across fisheries, noting that some generate high revenue with few trips, while others require more consistent effort, with some suggesting a project- or fisheries-specific approach to determining an eligible

frequency of annual fishing. Questions remain about whether thresholds like a 10% activity level per wind farm area should apply or the fishery footprint data could be used to identify the most likely eligible species. Further cross-caucus discussion is needed.

Permit value, revenue and transferability of fishing history

Discussion on how the value of a permit is closely tied to its fishing history, and many sales are based on that history. A new owner's access to historical data isn't always automatically transferred and it often requires the previous owner's permission, leading to inconsistencies. Though with limited new permits issued the history does frequently transfer through contract.

Attendees expressed emerging support for allowing some carefully managed transferability in the program, but with caution about exceeding the intent of compensation and encouraging adverse behavior. Some warned that limiting transferability could devalue permits, but there were also concerns about the legal complexity of revenue claims, especially when vessel ownership and revenue don't align, especially considering Federal regulations concerning changes in permit ownership. The group emphasized designing a system that supports ongoing fishing, not one based on expected losses.

Data hierarchy

The group discussed spatial data sources for assessing fishing activity. In addition to VTR and VMS, externally verified chart plotter data, observer data, groundfish at-sea monitor, and study fleet tow-level data were highlighted as valuable additions. Attendees had some concerns on AIS limitations and noted that this would likely need to be supplemented with other data sources.

Shoreside

Despite limited discussion time, there was general agreement from DOC members that processors should be included but upstream businesses would need more discussion. A working group was proposed to explore this further, focusing on impacts tied to first-sale transactions.

Crew

The RFA noted that there is near cross-caucus consent that crew will not submit direct claims to the compensation program. Rather, vessel owners may include crew as part of their claims. The RFA will continue to discuss how best to integrate compensation for vessel crew members into the Program protocol.

5. Next steps

The project team ended the meeting by providing a quick introduction to loss eligibility and valuation (key focus area for the next quarter) and a reminder on the in-person stakeholder engagement beginning July 21.