

**Northeast Regional Ocean Council  
Ocean Planning Committee  
June 2019 Meeting**

June 4, 2019

Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office  
Gloucester, Massachusetts

**MEETING SUMMARY  
& DETAILED NARRATIVE**

# Contents

<b>Contents .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Summary.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>NROC OPC Meeting Detailed Narrative .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Welcome to Gloucester, MA and Tribal Blessing .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Review of Ocean Planning Activities Since November 2018 Meeting .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Northeast Ocean Data Portal Discussion .....	9
<b>Update on Federal Interagency Ocean Policy Committee Activities .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Discussion.....	10
<b>Offshore Wind in the Northeast .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Darryl Francois, BOEM Chief of Engineering and Technical Review Branch: Update on the status of offshore wind planning and leasing from NY to ME .....	10
Discussion.....	11
Deerin Bobb-Brott, Principal Assistant Director for White House Office: NEPA infrastructure (One Federal Decision).....	11
Michelle Morin, BOEM Chief of Environment Branch for Renewable Energy: BOEM’s implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act, including BOEM’s approach to assessing cumulative impacts and the implications of EO 13807 and related Department of the Interior Secretary’s Order on timelines and other aspects of the process.....	11
Discussion.....	12
Michele DesAutels, USCG First District: An update on the Port Access Route Study for the Areas Offshore of Massachusetts and Rhode Island.....	12
Discussion.....	12
Andy Lipsky, Acting Chief of Staff, NOAA Northeast Fisheries Science Center: Addressing fisheries science and monitoring and incorporating fisheries considerations into offshore wind planning ...	13
Discussion.....	13
State, tribal, and New England Fishery Management Council perspectives on the status of offshore wind development to date, lessons learned, and opportunities for the NROC OPC working groups: .....	13
<b>Afternoon Discussion Category 1: Regulatory Process and Timelines .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Afternoon Discussion Category 2: Cumulative impacts .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Afternoon Discussion Category 3: Data .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendices: .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix A: Meeting Registrants .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix B: Meeting Agenda .....</b>	<b>23</b>

# Summary

On June 4, 2019, the Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC) Ocean Planning Committee (OPC) hosted its Spring 2019 meeting. Approximately 100 people participated in the meeting throughout the day (see Appendix A for those participants who registered). The objectives of this meeting were to:

- Review NROC OPC activities since the last public meeting in November 2018.
- Obtain an update on federal progress implementing [Executive Order 13840](#), including the activities of the federal interagency Ocean Policy Committee, and consider potential implications for the northeast and the NROC OPC work plan.
- Obtain public and NROC input on specific topics related to offshore wind, given the importance of the issue in the region and the potential to inform planning for other offshore activities, with a particular focus on how the NROC OPC work groups can inform planning and management through the development of updated data products and the transfer of best practices and lessons learned.

The meeting began with presentations summarizing recent NROC OPC activities and providing updates on federal progress implementing EO 13840. Nick Napoli and Emily Shumchenia provided updates on the finalization of the [2019 NROC OPC Work Plan](#), the [2019 Northeast Ocean Data Portal Work Plan](#), and described progress since the last meeting in November 2018, including the establishment of terms of reference and responsibilities for the Best Practices Work Group and the Regional Data Work Group. The core of each work group, comprised of OPC members, will form within the next few months and will meet to begin implementing aspects of the NROC OPC Work Plan.

Deerin Babb-Brott, Principal Assistant Director for Oceans and Environment, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), provided updates on the activities of the federal interagency Ocean Policy Committee that was formed under EO 13840. Deerin summarized the work of the Ocean Policy Committee's Ocean Resource Management Subcommittee, who have been working with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to help summarize ocean data priorities across all regions (including the northeast) and to identify steps to make federal data for these priorities more available. The articulation of regional data needs and priorities via an initial report from BOEM and NOAA played a role in securing \$1.5M in the Fiscal Year 2019 Federal Budget for "Regional Ocean Partnerships (ROPs) or their equivalents" to address regional ocean data needs. (Nick Napoli noted that NROC proposed that its share of these funds be used to develop new and updated commercial fishing data products in collaboration with agencies and the industry.)

The remainder of the meeting focused on offshore wind development within the region, starting with presentations from BOEM, OSTP, the US Coast Guard (USCG), and NOAA.

- [Darryl Francois from BOEM](#) provided an overview of the status of offshore wind development in the region.
- [Deerin Babb-Brott reviewed EO 13807](#), "Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure Projects", including the requirements and guidance related to project review timelines and the elevation of issues to senior agency personnel.
- [Michelle Morin from BOEM](#) summarized the environmental review process for offshore wind energy projects, including efforts to coordinate agency and administration directives related to

project review, the identification of cooperating and participating agencies, timing of concurrence points and public comment periods, and the process BOEM uses to assess cumulative impacts.

- [Michele DesAutels from USCG](#) provided an update on the status of Port Access Route Studies (PARS) that will inform offshore wind development, including separate PARS for the MA and RI wind energy lease areas and for the Atlantic coast.
- [Andy Lipsky from NOAA fisheries](#) summarized activities to consider potential interactions between offshore wind development and the fishing industry, fisheries science, and marine wildlife surveys.

Following these presentations, representatives from the states, tribes, and the New England Fishery Management Council (NEFMC) shared their perspectives on offshore wind development in the region.

- States raised issues related to constrained timelines for review of environmental documents, the timing of consistency certification in the project review process, requirements for baseline and post construction monitoring, incorporating fisheries data into the NE Ocean Data Portal, and the process and timing of the Gulf of Maine Offshore Wind Task Force (GOM Task Force).
- Tribes expressed concern about the lack of clear guidance for tribal engagement in the processes and timelines described by EO 13807. Tribes also reiterated the value of the NROC OPC as a forum to collaborate with state and federal agencies in the region, but highlighted the need for better communication among all entities.
- NEFMC noted concerns about project timelines, constrained review periods, and approaches to assessing impacts. NEFMC also described recent internal efforts to better understand the status and development of offshore wind in the region, including by hosting an all-day public meeting on the topic in May 2019. The NEFMC also collaborates with NOAA on the environmental review of offshore wind projects through the Wind Energy Team.

Meeting participants spent the remainder of the day identifying and discussing issues related to offshore wind development. The intent was to identify issues that could inform the work plan and priorities for the NROC OPC work groups. Participants identified many individual issues that generally fall within three broad categories: (1) the regulatory process and timelines, (2) the assessment of cumulative impacts, and (3) the development and use of data. Each issue requires further exploration to better understand whether there is a specific role for an NROC OPC work group or whether it is an issue that a particular agency or group of agencies should address.

It is likely that regulatory process and timeline issues will be examined by the NROC OPC Best Practices Work Group, while data issues will be explored by the Regional Data Work Group. Those issues related to cumulative impacts will likely be considered by both of these work groups, given the overlap between data needs and the environmental review process.

### **(1) Regulatory Process and Timelines**

Much of the discussion throughout the day focused on the offshore wind regulatory process, including leasing, site assessment, environmental review, and permitting. Participants were able to better understand the various authorities and related practices for both lead and cooperating agencies and the impacts of constrained timelines on consultations and agency review periods. The following issues identified by meeting participants will be considered by the NROC OPC Best Practices Work Group:

- Adequate resources (staffing and financial) for federal agencies to effectively review projects: The number of projects that are likely coming over the next several years will only increase and compressed timelines exacerbate this issue; agencies are already maxed out with current projects.
- Timing of federal consistency certification from states in the BOEM process: Consistency certification is currently submitted with a project's Construction and Operations Plan (COP) and the state preference is to delay certification until the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the COP for each project is filed. This would require BOEM regulations to be altered.
- Review timeline for states on EIS and Notices Of Intent (NOI), which is less than 20 days: This is currently too short to review, write comments, and get leadership signoff.
- Timing of geotechnical and geological testing: Once site-specific surveys are completed, it is hard for developers to modify their layout due to the cost, providing a disincentive for identifying any potential alternatives.
- Clarification of the timing of the GOM Task Force process and the identification of opportunities to include stakeholders early and often and to incorporate meaningful participation from the fishing industry.
- Clarification of the process if there isn't concurrence from cooperating agencies on an environmental impact statement.
- Timeline for identifying tribal government representatives and for obtaining meaningful feedback on each stage of the process.
- Timeline for identifying leaders from the fishing industry and for obtaining meaningful feedback on each stage of the process.
- Timeline and best practices for public engagement.
- Timing of mitigations discussions and data necessary to support those discussions.
- Standards and guidelines for baseline data collection and monitoring, including:
  - Potential requirement of two years of pre-construction data
  - Timing of pile-driving activities and potential impacts of pile-driving and other site disturbances on baseline data collection.
  - Consideration of existing monitoring and assessment frameworks
- Impacts of wind development to long-term data collection efforts and their related time series when developing guidance for baseline studies and monitoring.
- Including sidescan sonar and other survey data in packages sent to states and other federal agencies for review.
- Timing of USCG transit analyses and recommendations related to routing measures in the leasing, site assessment, and construction phases.

## **(2) Cumulative Impacts**

Participants also identified potential issues related to the assessment of cumulative impacts, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). “Cumulative impacts” refers to the combined, incremental effects of human activity. Cumulative impacts assessments are complex and there are various challenges to developing them. This is especially the case for considering the impacts of offshore wind projects because there is limited data and experience in US waters and economic and technological factors are rapidly changing. The following broad issues were identified for further exploration:

- Additional understanding of and input into BOEM’s approach to assessing “reasonably foreseeable” cumulative impacts, as required by NEPA, by grouping offshore wind projects or lease areas into tiers according to the current development stage and likelihood that each will be further developed.
- Additional consideration of assessing cumulative impacts based on a conceptual approach of “full build-out”. As input into the process, NROC could identify several likely build-out scenarios that consider the range of possibilities in each offshore wind lease area and areas that may be leased in the future.
- Identification of other activities and impacts that are occurring or are likely to occur during the time period of offshore wind development. This could include increased ship traffic at LNG terminals, dredging and dredge material disposal, installation of submarine cables (for telecommunications and energy), changes in fisheries activity, expansion of aquaculture, potential for offshore sand mining, installation of High-Frequency Radar, and continued scientific research and monitoring activities.
- Additional consideration of how to incorporate anticipated wind technology changes (larger turbines; floating platforms; cable laying technology) and the potential change in footprint/impacts resulting from those changes.
- Consideration of how future project designs might change based on an assessment of the effects of current offshore wind developments.
- Consideration of how environmental reference points and impacts of climate change would be incorporated into impacts assessments.

## **(3) Data**

Participants discussed data priorities and needs related to offshore wind development and identified the following issues for additional exploration:

- Need for additional data on commercial fisheries interactions, including:
  - Higher resolution data for site or project specific decisions and discussions
  - Coordination between states, NEFMC, NOAA, and NROC on the development of fisheries data products
  - Modeling of changes in fisheries effort if areas are closed or inaccessible
  - Understanding climate change impacts on fisheries
- Availability, via the Northeast Ocean Data Portal, of data that are included in the Construction and Operations Plan from offshore wind developers or that are used in the Environmental Impact Statement, including:

- High resolution bathymetric, sidescan, and seafloor survey data from developers that would enable a better understanding of potential habitat impacts
- Proposed project footprint, turbine layout, and cable configuration
- Specific site on the Portal for each offshore wind project to support agency and stakeholder review and comment
- Guidance on baseline data gathering and pre- and post- construction monitoring, including:
  - Increased specificity to ensure consistency across projects
  - Coordination of requirements across jurisdictions and agencies
  - Consideration of existing monitoring frameworks such as the Atlantic Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (AMAPPS) and existing efforts to coordinate monitoring in the region, such as through the Integrated Sentinel Monitoring Network (ISMN)
- Increased understanding of the potential effects of offshore wind development on long-term data collection efforts and time series such as Northeast Fisheries Science Center bottom trawl survey and aerial surveys of marine mammals

The meeting concluded by summarizing immediate next steps, including:

- NROC will consider how to communicate the issues and challenges identified during the meeting.
- The NROC OPC work groups will be convened, research the issues identified during the meeting, and determine whether NROC has a specific role in developing data and best practices to inform the offshore wind development process.
- Subgroups, which may consist of additional topic-area experts outside of the OPC, may be convened to guide the development of specific datasets or issues.
- The Data Portal will continue to coordinate with BOEM and other agencies/entities to present timely data and information relevant to offshore wind development processes.

# NROC OPC Meeting Detailed Narrative

## Welcome to Gloucester, MA and Tribal Blessing

The June 2019 Northeast Regional Ocean Council (NROC) Ocean Planning Committee (OPC) Meeting was kicked off by Betsy Nicholson (NOAA Office of Coastal Management), who welcomed everyone on behalf of the host the Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office of the National Marine Fisheries Service. She then welcomed Michael Kickingbear Johnson of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation (Mashantucket Pequot) for a tribal blessing.

Ted Diers (NH Coastal Program), state co-chair of the OPC, then reviewed the agenda for the meeting, which was anticipated to highlight recent activities from NROC and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) followed by updates and discussions about offshore wind development in the Northeast.

## Review of Ocean Planning Activities Since November 2018 Meeting

Ted introduced Nick Napoli (NROC staff) who reviewed [NROC activities since the previous NROC OPC meeting in November of 2018](#). The outcomes of the November meeting included the re-establishment of the OPC as a voluntary forum for states, federal agencies, tribes, and the Northeast Fishery Management Council (NEFMC). The focus of the OPC is to identify regional data priorities and inform the development of related data products, identify and transfer best practices for regulatory and management decision-making, and to provide a regional forum for emerging and important issues (e.g., offshore wind). [The OPC work plan](#), which includes the [Northeast Ocean Data Portal work plan](#), was developed and approved by NROC. NROC also identified regional priorities and communicated them to the federal Ocean Policy Committee via of a letter to the White House.

NROC will be forming a Best Practices Work Group to identify and develop best practices for jurisdictional coordination, stakeholder engagement, the use of data and information in decision-making, and preapplication practices. These practices will consider existing agency guidance, stakeholder comments, practices identified in the Northeast Ocean Plan and other documents, and feedback through additional engagement with government and non-government representatives. The Best Practices Work Group will also be tasked with developing and implementing mechanisms and frameworks for those best practices; educating about and communicating best practices and their potential applications; and tracking and reporting on the use of best practices. This work group will be chaired by and include NROC OPC members with subgroups formed as necessary.

The Regional Data Work Group will be created to: provide timely updates and maintenance to the Northeast Data Ocean Portal; facilitate greater roles for data providers, agencies, and stakeholders; connect with and support federal and state efforts, including the federal interagency ocean policy committee; and to inform the identification and acquisition of sustainable funding sources. The Regional Data Work Group will be co-chaired by and include NROC OPC members and have many ad-hoc expert subgroups to provide advice on various data. Both work groups will identify priorities, develop proposals, and identify partners and experts to be included within work group activities.

Nick then provided an update on federal funding for regional ocean partnerships (ROPs), such as NROC. The Federal FY19 budget includes a total of \$1.5M for ROPs or their equivalents which equates to about \$150k for each region, including NROC. This allocation is currently proposed to increase to at least \$3.5M in FY20, pending finalization of the FY20 budget. NROC intends to use this money to update and



improve Northeast Ocean Data Portal data on commercial fishing activity in collaboration with industry participants.

Emily Shumchenia (NROC staff) provided an update on recent activity regarding the Northeast Ocean Data Portal. The Portal supports uses related to planning and management, regulatory and siting, and education and research. Recent updates on the Portal included BOEM renewable energy lease areas, proposed offshore wind project footprints and proposed cable routes, fishery management areas, the New England Fishery Management Council's (NEFMC's) clam dredge framework preferred alternatives, BOEM aliquots with offshore sand resources, aquaculture, communities at sea, and the RI geographic location description amendment. Upcoming releases include navigation data with improved cartography, Gulf of Maine bathymetry, offshore wind velocity, Atlantic large whale take reduction team (ALWTRT) regulated and exempted areas, deep sea canyons, and Marine-life Data and Analysis Team (MDAT) fish and marine mammal data. The updated fish data products reflect bottom trawl observations through 2017 using NOAA NEFSC code and methodology, address stakeholder feedback related to improving spatial resolution from 10 km to 2 km, include data products for the spring trawl, and will have standardized legends so that seasonal trawl data can be more easily compared.

The Portal team is also developing a 'Map Gallery' concept to increase site usability as the Data Explorer section becomes larger and more complex. The Map Gallery will present ready-made static and interactive maps of interest to users.

Emily highlighted that the senate delegation from Massachusetts and Rhode Island sent an unsolicited letter to BOEM inquiring about a number of aspects related to offshore wind development, including whether BOEM is using the Portal to inform their decision making. This is reflective of the rising public profile of the Portal. Emily also noted that since the November OPC Meeting, the portal team participated in or hosted 14 events and developed two new case studies (US Coast Guard and US Navy), which have been added to the website.

### **Northeast Ocean Data Portal Discussion**

Kathryn Ford (MA Department of Marine Fisheries) asked if any of the data that appear within draft Environmental Impact Statements (EIS), which are required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), or are submitted by lease holders, also appear on the Portal. Emily responded that, thus far, the Portal has included a page pointing to some of the data included in the draft EIS for Vineyard Wind and that there are plans and opportunities to collaborate more with BOEM and developers in the future.

Valerie Nelson (Water Alliance) asked if the Portal team would be updating fishing effort, landings, and economic data and if there will be involvement of other individuals beyond committee members.

Michael Kickingbear Johnson (Mashantucket Pequot) asked whether the Portal was GIS-driven and whether a user may generate a map showing cable runs, to which Emily answered a 'yes' to all. Michael also asked whether there were downloadable animations on the Portal, to which Emily responded that such animations could be generated, but that there were currently no animations available for download.

Mel Coté (US EPA) asked how the Portal differed from the Ocean Reporting Tool. Betsy Nicholson responded by characterizing the Ocean Reporting Tool as a broad, nationwide mechanism to view the Marine Cadastre data that offers different data displays and narratives as compared to the Portal, which is a finer-scale representation of data that includes but is not limited to the Marine Cadastre data. Betsy also noted that not every region has their own Portal like the northeast, which is why the Ocean

Reporting Tool is useful nationally. Emily added that the technical teams from the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic Ocean Data Portals and the Ocean Reporting Tool coordinate closely.

### **Update on Federal Interagency Ocean Policy Committee Activities**

Deerin Babb-Brott, Principal Assistant Director for Oceans and Environment, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, was invited to provide updates on activities of the federal interagency Ocean Policy Committee that was formed under EO 13840.

Deerin began by describing his connections to the northeast US and his admiration for NROC. He also added that the Portal provides not only accessible data, but a community around gathering, groundtruthing, and presenting those data. Deerin noted that a challenge for interagency cooperation is the size and complexity of the federal government. He offered that regional ocean plans, which characterize regional conditions and provide guidance to the many agencies, have helped to improve the national perspective on addressing regional issues and priorities.

Deerin referenced the ocean resource management (ORM) subcommittee and the ocean science and technology (OST) subcommittee as bodies underneath the federal Ocean Policy Committee that are working on issues that overlap with NROC. He specifically cited the ORM work related to the NOAA and BOEM collaboration to identify regional data needs. Deerin also described next steps related to facilitating the availability of federal data that are responsive to regional needs.

Moving onto the topic of regional ocean partnerships (ROPs), Deerin pointed out that Executive Order 13840 emphasized the role that ROPs play and raises the profile of ROPs. Deerin finished his remarks by encouraging the fine-grain conversations and lessons from within NROC and other regions to percolate upward to the national level.

### **Discussion**

Valerie Nelson (Water Alliance) asked if the One Federal Decision policy applied to strictly marine issues or all major infrastructure projects. Deerin responded that it applies to major infrastructure projects in general and that there will be more discussion of this later in the day.

Ted Diers (NH Coastal Program) asked if it is possible for federal agencies to provide data in a more refined state before sharing it. Deerin responded by first pointing out that the ORM is working to identify regional data priorities and is looking to regions for examples and case studies to help inform the plan for increasing access to federal data resources. The use of the Northeast Ocean Data Portal is a helpful proof of concept.

### **Offshore Wind in the Northeast**

In November 2018, the NROC OPC decided it would discuss one current or emerging offshore planning and management issue in the region during each of its meetings. For this meeting, the NROC OPC focused on offshore wind. The intent of this discussion was to obtain an update on the current status of offshore wind planning, leasing, and regulatory review and to inform the NROC OPC work groups about potential data products or best practices that can be developed or transferred throughout the region. Future meetings will cover other current or emerging issues.

### **Darryl Francois, BOEM Chief of Engineering and Technical Review Branch: Update on the status of offshore wind planning and leasing from NY to ME**

Darryl started his presentation by announcing that it has been one decade since the regulatory process for offshore wind went into effect and that the number BOEM staff dedicated to this issue has grown from 11 to 45, adding different areas of expertise to the team from fisheries to wind analysts. His [presentation](#) included summaries of the following:

- The Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Renewable Energy Authorization process
- The status of offshore wind development on the Atlantic coast
- The components of a Construction and Operation Plan (COP)
- How BOEM uses the Northeast Ocean Data Portal

## Discussion

Grover Fugate (RI CRMC) spoke on the subject of consistency certification as allowed under CZMA, citing concerns about the moving target that an evolving wind project presents and that it would be better if states could file after the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is submitted. He also suggested that BOEM require 2 years of pre-construction baseline data and for geotechnical work for foundation design to occur during the engineering analysis.

Priscilla Brooks (Conservation Law Foundation) asked what the timeline was for starting or convening the Gulf of Maine Offshore Wind Task Force and stated that she wished that the BOEM timeline encouraged more deliberate stakeholder engagement. Darryl said that for future Task Force processes, BOEM will follow guidance resulting from an analysis of previous Task Force engagement activity, which is available in an [online report](#). He expects an initial Gulf of Maine Offshore Wind Task Force meeting to occur later this year.

Michael Kickingbear Johnson (Mashantucket Pequot) asked who owned Skipjack Wind LLC and was informed that Orsted was the owner.

## Deerin Bobb-Brott, Principal Assistant Director for White House Office: NEPA infrastructure (One Federal Decision)

Deerin provided an overview of EO 13807 “Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure”, which is required for major infrastructure projects, affects project review timelines, and is an important factor in the environmental review process for offshore wind. His [presentation](#) included:

- An overview of EO 13807
- A definition for “major infrastructure projects” under the EO
- An overview of key elements of the One Federal Decision MOU
- Examples of the permitting dashboard for federal infrastructure projects
- A timeline for federal review of projects subject to EO 13807

## Michelle Morin, BOEM Chief of Environment Branch for Renewable Energy: BOEM’s implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act, including BOEM’s approach to assessing cumulative impacts and the implications of EO 13807 and related Department of the Interior Secretary’s Order on timelines and other aspects of the process

Michelle provided an overview of the environmental review process for offshore wind energy projects, including BOEM’s approach to analyzing cumulative effects. The presentation provided important context and details for the afternoon. [Michelle’s presentation](#) included summaries of:

- The renewable energy authorization process
- Efforts to coordinate across recent executive and secretarial orders related to infrastructure projects
- Regulatory timelines and concurrence points

- BOEM's process for assessing cumulative impacts

## Discussion

Grover Fugate (RI CRMC) asked if the federal Record of Decision (ROD) process could be paused until state permitting processes were completed. Michelle responded that states must provide concurrence before federal agencies can advance and that BOEM is advising developers to draft documents with respect to a more general 'construction envelope' to prevent the need for large amendments to NEPA documents.

Chris Boelke (NOAA NMFS) asked if timelines will be stretched to two years after Vineyard Wind and Michelle replied that, yes, agencies should count on a two-year process moving forward. Chris then asked where the Portal would be used to inform the NEPA process as led by federal agencies. Michelle said that the Portal is utilized for drafting COPs and that BOEM analysts use the Portal for drafting the EIS. She added that the maps generated on the Portal are used during public and scoping meetings as well.

Sue Tuxbury (NOAA) requested that discussions later in the day include how timelines across different agencies can become more aligned.

Tim Timmerman (EPA) wanted to revisit cumulative impacts and whether there is consideration for a big-picture, regional, full development scenario. Michelle replied that this scenario was not currently assessed by BOEM given their requirements, but that a discussion about this later in the day may be useful.

Tom Nies (NEFMC) asked Michelle to speak more about concurrence and how differences of opinion between agencies are resolved. Michelle responded by referring to the One Federal Decision framework that elevates these situations to higher-ranking officials for a more expedited resolution.

## Michele DesAutels, USCG First District: An update on the Port Access Route Study for the Areas Offshore of Massachusetts and Rhode Island

Michele began her presentation by defining the role of the USCG in making recommendations to BOEM on the topic of offshore wind development, including potential impacts to navigation safety and USCG missions (e.g. at-sea rescue, law enforcement, pollution response). [Her presentation](#) included overviews of:

- The USCG role in offshore wind process
- Port Access Route Study (PARS) for the MA/RI area
- PARS for North/South routes and East/West routes along the Atlantic Coast

## Discussion

John Williamson (Sea Keeper) spoke about how fishermen's concern about transit and fishing safety is not met with USCG guidance as yet. He asked what would happen if there was not concurrence between BOEM and USCG. Michele replied that USCG can only make recommendations and encouraged fishing communities to keep voicing their concerns to agencies and developers.

Kathryn Ford (MA Division of Marine Fisheries) asked if there would be a Gulf of Maine PARS study. Michele responded that the creation of the Gulf of Maine Offshore Wind Task Force may signal a start to that process.

Jim Boyd (RI CRMC) asked if USCG was considering potential compromises to search and rescue missions during their consultation with BOEM. Michele said that it is likely that both local search and rescue teams and USCG HQ will provide feedback to BOEM.

Anne Hawkins (RODA) asked if a project or corridor would need to be amended if a corridor passed through a wind energy lease area and Michele replied that USCG cannot authorize transit corridors, but can enforce traffic separation schemes or other routing measures and that would all be included within their recommendation letter to BOEM.

Priscilla Brooks (CLF) asked if there were any considerations for natural resources with PARS studies and Michele responded that routing measures require NEPA and cumulative impacts analysis, including those for marine mammals.

### **Andy Lipsky, Acting Chief of Staff, NOAA Northeast Fisheries Science Center: Addressing fisheries science and monitoring and incorporating fisheries considerations into offshore wind planning**

Andy began by underscoring that there is a goal to have a coexistence of sustainable fisheries and offshore wind and that, to make progress towards achieving this goal, the NMFS regional Wind Energy Team includes the NEFSC, GARFO, NOAA HQ, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and NEFMC staff. He also underlined that the role of NMFS is to provide scientific advice related to fisheries, fishing communities, marine mammals, endangered species, essential fish habitat, aquaculture, and the interactions between these areas for the purpose of informing decisions. [Andy's presentation](#) included an overview of:

- NMFS role in the offshore wind process
- NMFS role in developing baseline studies to inform offshore wind development
- NMFS role in understanding the effects of offshore wind to fisheries
- The potential impact of offshore wind development on NMFS scientific studies
- Challenges and opportunities to considering coexistence of fisheries and offshore wind

### **Discussion**

Jim Boyd (RI CRMCM) said that there is an opportunity for NMFS to advocate for fishermen, specifically regarding the potential limitations for fisheries research vessels within wind farms and that RI fishermen have asked for specific spacing and orientation of turbine rows. He directly asked if NMFS would advocate for a specific (e.g. 1 nm) separation. Andy replied that it is up to the discretion of the captain of the research vessel; whether sampling is conducted.

### **State, tribal, and New England Fishery Management Council perspectives on the status of offshore wind development to date, lessons learned, and opportunities for the NROC OPC working groups:**

Sharri Venno of the Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians spoke first on behalf of the tribes, who feel that NROC is a valuable organization and that they felt valued as a part of NROC discussion in general. Tribes also felt that NROC provided an opportunity to share their perspectives and have visibility among organizations included within the NROC audience. It is an opportunity for tribes to have a voice.

She was concerned, however, about the fast pace of offshore wind development and the overall lack of mention of how to engage the tribes. Recommendations from the tribal consultation document that had been previously developed by the tribes did not seem to be considered during presentations by BOEM and NMFS and there was an overall lack of understanding of whether tribes were being considered within these processes at all. Sharri drew a contrast between the accommodations being made to wind developers within the process to the lack of accommodation for tribes. She also highlighted how the tribes have different relationships with different agencies that use different consultation processes. The

tribes will be seeking clarity on how tribal engagement will be conducted as offshore wind moves forward.

Revisiting the lack of tribal engagement within the One Federal Decision framework, Sharri wondered how tribal trust resources were being protected. She felt that the tribes had been left behind as the many agencies came together and wanted to have meetings and consultation between the tribes and all agencies at once for a more meaningful dialogue.

Michael Kickingbear Johnson (Mashantucket Pequot) seconded Sharri's comments and emphasized the history of tribal lands, which this very meeting was held upon, and trust relationships. He stated that he was worried that there might be an erosion of trust that has only recently been rebuilt as agencies move forward on offshore wind without tribal consultation. He wanted meaningful consultation and dialogue between tribes and agencies.

Michael also expressed concern regarding the phrasing of tribal engagement as cooperation rather than the legal responsibility to interact and consult with tribes. He says that the tribes must take some blame for their lack of involvement and should continue to attend meetings as they have this day to be educated and interact with NROC members.

Ted Diers (NH Coastal Program) acknowledged the need for tribal consultation within the multiple timelines outlined in the earlier presentations and said there was potential for a tribal co-chair of the Ocean Planning Committee to help advance this and other priorities.

Tom Nies (NEFMC) emphasized that wind farms will impact fisheries access, habitat, and migration of species. It is unclear as to whether fishermen will be able to access wind farm areas. He spoke about how offshore wind has become a higher profile issue for the NEFMC, recently spending a full day during the most recent NEFMC meeting learning more about offshore wind development, how to engage within the development process, and providing an opportunity for developers, council members, and stakeholders to communicate. Tom was concerned, however, that impacts to surveys (as outlined by Andy Lipsky's presentation) and the ability to access resources were not receiving enough attention. This concern is compounded by the lack of resources to address these emerging issues (both in terms of time and money) and a lack of mitigation measures. Permitting timelines are currently difficult to make meaningful comments within, which is only exacerbated by numerous concurrent wind projects. He spoke about how the Wind Energy Team has helped to increase capacity, but not enough to make meaningful comments.

Tom concluded his remarks with a statement of how he was concerned at BOEM's approach towards cumulative effects analysis. He was concerned about the shortsightedness of the approach of assessing cumulative impacts based on tiers of likelihood that projects will go forward versus an assessment of potential full build out. He shifted focus to the difficulty that the fishing industry has interacting with multiple developers concurrently and was hopeful that the Responsible Offshore Development Alliance (RODA) and Responsible Offshore Science Alliance (ROSA) would help that situation. He was also curious about the ability of a workgroup to discuss different levels of acceptance and ideas surrounding wind energy.

Ted Diers (NH Coastal Program) expressed concern regarding permitting timelines, CZMA, and consultation in addition to monitoring. He emphasized the need for useful baseline data and how to obtain that data.

Grover Fugate (RI CRMC) added that there is no degree of uniformity regarding how to collect such baseline data and suggested that there be an emphasis on creating a standard method of doing so for the region. He also cited concerns regarding permitting timelines, especially for reviewing and

permitting cables, which triggers state review because cables have to run through state waters to come onshore. He also felt that once geotechnical work was completed by developers and the timetable was finalized, it created a situation where modifications were difficult and alternatives were developer-driven, which makes coexistence and negotiations with the fishing industry and others difficult.

Ted Diers (NH Coastal Program) said that NEFMC and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) are trying to engage about data acquisition and valuation and wanted to ensure that money allocated for wind energy data development leveraged other existing data collection. His concern was that fishermen and communities would pay the biggest price for any negative effects. Ted also said that permitting timelines and consultation must include meaningful stakeholder dialogue.

Ted then pivoted to outlining the goals for the afternoon, which included identification of specific areas for NROC to pursue and accomplish within a reasonable time frame. Based on the discussion during the morning, he organized the various issues into three categories for afternoon discussion. He identified the regulatory process and permitting timelines as one category of issues. Category two was cumulative impacts, including different approaches, data needs, and how it would be used given the imminent amount of offshore wind development. The third category was data, including pre- and post-construction monitoring. He wondered aloud if the project-specific monitoring data was proprietary; noting the increased survey vessel activity in lease areas over the past two years as visible in the vessel traffic data available on the Portal.

John Williamson (Sea Keeper) spoke about how he viewed lessons from public engagement as a potential priority topic and Ted responded that he felt that was a valuable aspect that could be applied across the three previously stated issues.

Valerie Nelson (Water Alliance) revisited the topic of concurrence and asked if congress, states, or tribes have any role and what would happen if concurrence could not be achieved. Ted felt this question could be addressed within the timeline issue discussions.

Betsy Nicholson (NOAA Office of Coastal Management) said she did not want this opportunity to go to waste. She felt that NROC had a captive audience and support at every level of government to make progress and that NROC should not lose sight of this window to provide recommendations for topics to pursue in short order. Ted echoed that that EO 13840 allowed NROC to outline priorities for federal cooperation.

### **Afternoon Discussion Category 1: Regulatory Process and Timelines**

Ted Diers (NH Coastal Program) began the discussion around Category 1 by outlining some more specific issues central to permitting timelines, including CZMA consistency determinations, tribal consultations, and opened the floor to other specific suggestions.

Meredith Mendelson (ME Department of Marine Resources) suggested NEFMC review and geotechnical survey timing as additional topics.

John Williamson (Sea Keeper) felt, as a fisheries liaison, that he was not able to get quality information without first identifying key fishermen who operate within lease area and suggested that NROC would be well-served to identify the problem solvers among this select group of individuals, inform them about potential issues and then connect them to decision-makers. Ted asked if there was a timeline for abiding by such an outlined process and John responded by saying it should be a task for the NROC work groups.

Grover Fugate (RI CRMC) revisited the timing of baseline data collection, expressing concern regarding the quality of baseline data may be affected by simultaneous construction in neighboring lease areas.

Meredith Mendelson (ME Department of Marine Resources) spoke about the difficulty in getting stakeholders to engage before the issue at hand becomes tangible (e.g. aquaculture siting) and that there is a “catch-22” of not taking issues seriously until the issue becomes seen as a problem. She wondered if there was a way to create opportunities to meaningfully engage early in the process of development.

Ted Diers (NH Coastal Program) asked if the tribes would be able to draft a preferred tribal consultation timetable that could be integrated into a larger permitting timetable. Michael Kickingbear Johnson (Mashantucket Pequot) said that tribes need to be there at the initial conceptual stage, but tribal capacity is an ongoing issue. Ted elaborated that integrating timelines will be difficult and being able to influence an integrated timeline will be important. Michael said that previous lack of inclusion because of a mis-identification as an inland tribe has led to a lack of inclusion and tribes would prefer to be engaged, even as a caution, in the future.

Kathryn Ford (MA DMF) said that her department usually has 20 days to complete reviews of any Notice Of Intent (NOI) or EIS and that getting the necessary information from PDFs and associated appendices (which may be redacted) may be difficult, so having this information available from developer EISs for GIS analysis would be helpful. She added that some data requests take months, which does not align with the review period.

John Williamson (Sea Keeper) gave an example of lobstermen interpreting sidescan imagery to identify the best siting route for a cable burial risk assessment as a positive outcome from fisherman involvement.

Sue Tuxbury (NOAA) echoed Kathryn’s comment, citing essential fish habitat (EFH) consultations that are required within 60 days. She also said that GARFO covering both the northeast and mid-Atlantic regions increases the likelihood of reviewing multiple projects at one time, further increasing the difficulty of providing comments. She added that the two-year timeframe will prevent effective early coordination on multiple projects.

Anne Hawkins (RODA) said that there was not enough talk about coordinating between states and BOEM to ensure that timing made sense and outcomes were not predetermined, given state renewable energy requirements and procurement processes also drive timelines.

Michael Kickingbear Johnson (Mashantucket Pequot) hoped to be able to review imagery from sonar early in the process to be able to hire help for analysis and also felt that mitigation should be included within any timeline.

Jim Boyd (RI CRMC) spoke about state CZM program certification and how consistency must be within a COP. He suggested that BOEM remove the requirement to have concurrence with state CZM program within the COP and have it included later in the process, after the draft EIS is issued. This would help states and developers come to concurrence on projects and remove the problem presented by an evolving project. Ted suggested that this might be a topic for a subcommittee to work on to evaluate the implications of both scenarios and the mechanisms to help resolve such issues.

Valerie Nelson (Water Alliance) spoke about the rapid progression of development and was concerned that a lack of general understanding of ocean conditions combined with a rush to build without proper consideration for those unknown conditions or impacts, which she deemed to be a common practice, would be dangerous. Ted added that improving information to be included within analysis from the outset and defining ‘complete information’ would be helpful.



Chris Boelke (NOAA NMFS) asked if this discussion was just about offshore wind or all ocean uses and Ted replied that it might be best to think about phasing discussions by recent importance, with offshore wind at the forefront.

Andy Lipsky (NOAA NMFS) said that there are already some efforts underway to develop a regional science framework, but understaffing has hindered progress. He cautioned to be mindful about not duplicating efforts or putting more pressure on those who are already overworked.

Meredith Mendelson (ME Department of Marine Resources) followed up on Andy's comment by suggesting that this might be an opportunity to request an increase in resources and staff across agencies to address the issues that are being discussed today.

Anne Hawkins (RODA) mentioned that the American Wind Energy Association may already have started a study on how to integrate permitting timetables.

Ru Morrison (NERACOOS) mentioned that NROC/NERACOOS collaboration on the Integrated Sentinel Monitoring Network may provide a framework for monitoring and data collaboration.

### **Afternoon Discussion Category 2: Cumulative impacts**

Ted Diers (NH Coastal Program) began by recalling the tiered approach to assessing cumulative impacts that was summarized that morning by BOEM and emphasized that buildout of lease areas is something to be conscious of, especially regarding the impacts of different levels of buildout.

Jim Boyd (RI) suggested that BOEM consider Ted's point and assess impacts from a low to high buildout, citing that the money involved should lead us to expect that these areas will be fully developed.

Ted asked if there would be some things for the Gulf of Maine Offshore Wind Task Force to consider as they begin the process.

Paula Kullberg (USACE) said that it was important to consider developing sufficient statistical analysis to tease out the impacts from wind project development and those impacts from naturally large variations over different time scales. Ted asked if there were reference locations to monitor the natural processes and Emily Shumchenia responded that there were.

Michele DesAutels (USCG) suggested that the working group identify those parameters of most importance. She added there is a challenge in evaluating impacts with concurrent activities within a given region.

Mel Coté (EPA) echoes the concern of concurrent activities and their ability to impact assessments and timelines. He added that external projects to wind, such as the Massachusetts Bay LNG terminal and deepening of navigational channels and dredge material deposition are examples of concurrent activities that should be considered.

Daryl Francois (BOEM) said that the rapid technological development within wind energy is another concern relative to how to properly conduct cumulative impacts analysis and emphasized the separation between quantitative and qualitative impacts.

John Williamson (Sea Keeper) said that, as a user not a planner, he felt that assessing impacts relative to the potential power output from areas may prove to be a more predictable place to begin. He also felt that design mitigations were also predictable, but that there was no policy for establishing triggerpoints for mitigation and that there should be a guidance document to establish mitigation consistency across the region.

Valerie Nelson (Water Alliance) reiterated her earlier point about a lack of caution and deliberation.

Onni Irish (Subcom) talked about how fishermen displacement could move effort onto cabled areas, which would increase the risk to Internet infrastructure. She recommended a 1 nm buffer around such existing cables.

Mike Marsh (EPA) echoed earlier sentiments and suggested the BOEM create a range of reasonable buildout scenarios with assumptions to analyze and that such analyses would inform the design of future wind energy projects. Peg Brady (NOAA NMFS) echoed this point about impacting design through analysis.

Anne Hawkins (RODA) added that some impacts do not require specificity and that fishing effort displacement would be a general example.

Priscilla Brooks (CLF) echoed the desire to incorporate some likelihood of buildout within analyses. She also wanted cumulative impacts to include those which occur across the entire eastern coast of the US. She added that these conversations underscore the need for baseline and ongoing monitoring for adaptive management. Mike Marsh (EPA) added that cumulative impacts should be done on different scales to address impacts on a regional level.

Michael Kickingbear Johnson (Mashantucket Pequot) asked where the definition of ‘cumulative effect’ came from and Michelle Morin (BOEM) cited the White House Council on Environmental Quality. Michael then wanted to know why this process and timeline felt so accelerated, to which Ted replied that regulations and their associated timeframe in addition to market forces each had a role to play.

Bill Kiley (Boston Water and Sewer Commission) said that offshore wind development could be an opportunity to improve fisheries production via engineered habitat that could increase harvest.

Michael Kickingbear Johnson (Mashantucket Pequot) asked if BOEM published the research costs that developers are paying for these projects and Michelle Morin (BOEM) said that there were no requirements for publishing that information. Michael followed by drawing a comparison to 5G technology, with accelerated timelines and a lack of vetting before development, and fears that the impacts of offshore wind may rival that of offshore oil and gas.

Tom Nies (NEFMC) suggested that the Portal could host a tool for forecasting fishing displacement using modeled outputs. He said there was a similar study conducted for marine protected areas years ago. Ted asked how existing data or methods could be used to inform current analyses. Nick Napoli (NROC staff) responded that there is a lot of information related to fisheries dependent data in the Portal and there are opportunities to continue to improve those data products and methods in collaboration with others. Valerie Nelson (Water Alliance) added that fishermen would provide valuable input as well. Ted replied that RODA and ROSA were working on integrating that fishermen knowledge within decision making and that Ted Ames has developed frameworks for engaging fishermen. Nick added that additional funding will allow for targeted improvements to data.

Sharri Venno (Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians) asked how a rapidly changing ecosystem might be addressed within cumulative impacts and Ted responded that it would be included as a stressor.

Priscilla Brooks (CLF) reiterated the need for best practices integration within conversations about timelines and asked if there was potential for creating an ad-hoc subgroup to address this issue. Ted said that it is possible to have a subgroup, but wanted to review the lessons learned from task forces on the federal level.

Bob LaBelle (NH citizen) said the NH chapter of the Environmental Business Council will be meeting in mid-October to discuss offshore wind and invited people to attend.

Pete Murdoch (USGS) reiterated the need to establish baselines before the projects start and that existing frameworks and programs should be leveraged. He added that the cost will be lower for doing so and will save money in the long run.

Valerie Nelson (Water Alliance) spoke about the MA fisheries partnership and that lessons from that venture included not being attentive to wind projects (and a resulting lack of comments), but wondered why dialogue with the stakeholders was not built into the process. She listed more concerns including the lack of fish data vetting and overall characterization of marine resources within lease areas. She emphasized a need for better science and process that included more respect.

### Afternoon Discussion Category 3: Data

A brief discussion at the end of the afternoon touched on the same data related issues and themes that were raised throughout the day. Data specific issues are included in many of the comments about the regulatory process and about cumulative impacts. The following primary data issues have been extracted out of the commentary throughout the day.

- Need for additional data on commercial fisheries interactions, including:
  - Higher resolution data for site or project specific decisions and discussions
  - Coordination between states, NEFMC, NOAA, and NROC on the development of fisheries data products
  - Modeling of changes in fisheries effort if areas are closed or inaccessible
  - Understanding climate change impacts on fisheries
- Availability, via the Northeast Ocean Data Portal, of data that are included in the Construction and Operations Plan from offshore wind developers or that are used in the Environmental Impact Statement, including:
  - High resolution bathymetric and seafloor survey data from developers that would enable a better understanding of potential habitat impacts
  - Proposed project footprint, turbine layout, and cable configuration
  - Specific site on the Portal for each offshore wind project to support agency and stakeholder review and comment
- Guidance on baseline data gathering and pre- and post- construction monitoring, including:
  - Increased specificity to ensure consistency across projects
  - Coordination of requirements across jurisdictions and agencies
  - Consideration of existing monitoring frameworks such as the Atlantic Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species (AMAPPS) and existing efforts to coordinate monitoring in the region, such as through the Integrated Sentinel Monitoring Network (ISMN)
- Increased understanding of the potential effects of offshore wind development on long-term data collection efforts and time series such as Northeast Fisheries Science Center bottom trawl survey and aerial surveys of marine mammals

# Appendices:

## Appendix A: Meeting Registrants

### Name, Affiliation/Organization

Deerin Babb-Brott, NROC  
Thomas Balf, Oceanvest, LLC  
Robert Ballou, RIDEM  
Ron Beck, Tetra Tech  
David Beutel, RICRMC  
Diane Borggaard, NOAA Fisheries  
Margaret (Peg) Brady, NOAA Fisheries  
Priscilla Brooks, Conservation Law Foundation  
Leann Bullin, U.S. Department of the Interior / Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM)  
Bruce Carlisle, Massachusetts Clean Energy Center  
Jesse Cleary, Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Duke University  
Ryan Clemens, NOAA Office of General Council  
Martin Cling, PTPPSED  
Phil Colarusso, US EPA  
Melville Coté, U.S. EPA  
Amanda Cousart, Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance  
Michele DesAutels, USCG  
Ted Diers, NH Department of Environmental Services  
Lisa Engler, MA CZM  
Susan Farady, University of New England  
Emily Farr, NMFS  
Marianne Ferguson, National Marine Fisheries Service  
Capt. Jeffrey Flumignan, USDOT / Maritime Administration  
Kathryn Ford, Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries  
Darryl Francois, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management  
Grover Fugate, CRMC State of Rhode Island  
Ben Galuardi, NOAA  
Melissa Gates, Surfrider Foundation  
Brian Gervelis, INSPIRE Environmental  
Lara Hakam, Hollings Scholarship Program/GARFO  
Elizabeth Hansel, Vineyard Wind  
Ben Haskell, NOAA  
Anne Hawkins, RODA  
Teri Henderson, MassAudubon  
Amber Hewett, National Wildlife Federation  
Christine Hirt, NOAA Office for Coastal Management  
Kirsten Holland, Massachusetts Clean Energy Center  
Heather Hopkins, Naval Undersea Warfare Center  
Onni Irish, SubCom  
Zach Jylkka, NOAA Fisheries  
Paula Kullberg, USACE  
Michael Kickingbear Johnson, Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Historic Preservation Office

Bill Kiley, Boston Water and Sewer Commission  
Bob LaBelle, public, NH citizen  
Joan LeBlanc, NROC  
Julia Lewis, Tetra Tech  
Andy Lipsky, NOAA  
Allison Lorenc, Conservation Law Foundation  
Rebecca Love, NOAA OCM  
Jay Mackay, US Army Corps of Engineers  
Kevin Madley, NOAA NMFS  
Matthew Mailloux, NH Office of Strategic Initiatives  
Lawrie Mankoff, Conservation Law Foundation  
Michael Marsh, USEPA  
Audra Martin, NEIWPC  
Daniel Martin, NOAA Office for Coastal Management  
Chris McGuire, The Nature Conservancy  
Frank McNeilly, Naval Undersea Warfare Center Division Newport RI  
Meredith Mendelson, Maine Dept of Marine Resources  
Ivy Mlsna, US EPA  
Michelle Morin, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management  
Mary Anne Morrison, Navy  
Ru Morrison, NERACOOS  
Peter Murdoch, US Geological Survey  
*Nick Napoli, NROC*  
Valerie Nelson, Water Alliance  
Becca Newhall, NOAA's Office for Coastal Management  
Betsy Nicholson, NOAA  
Thomas Nies, NEFMC  
Lauren Nutter, Udall Foundation- US Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution  
Katie O'Donnell, Subcom  
*Maggie Osthues, Meeting Staff*  
Todd Randall, USACE  
Hillary Renick, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management  
Katherine Renshaw, NOAA OGC  
Marta Ribera, The Nature Conservancy  
*Emily Shumchenia, NROC*  
Laura Singer, SAMBAS Consulting LLC  
Nick Sisson, NOAA Fisheries  
Ian Slayton, BOEM  
*Kevin Staples, NROC*  
Kimberly Starbuck, Urban Harbors Institute at University of Massachusetts Boston  
Peter Taylor, Waterview Consulting / Data Portal Team  
Brian Thompson, CTDEEP  
Timothy Timmermann, EPA  
Amy Trice, Ocean Conservancy  
Zoey Trombley, WDC  
Sue Tuxbery, NOAA  
Sharri Venno, Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians  
Pooh Vongkhamdy, NROC/NRCS

Keith Wichowski, Inspire Environmental  
Josh Wiersma, MFP  
Chris Williams, New Hampshire Coastal Program  
Holly Williams, WDC  
John Williamson, Sea Keeper  
Jeff Willis, RI Coastal Resources Management Council

## Appendix B: Meeting Agenda

**8:30 Registration**

**9:00 Welcome**

**Tribal Blessing**

**Introductions and Agenda Review**

Mel Coté, NROC Ocean Planning Committee Federal Co-Chair, Chief of the Surface Water Branch at U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1

Ted Diers, NROC Ocean Planning Committee State Co-Chair, Administrator of the Watershed Bureau of the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services

**9:15 Review of Ocean Planning Activities Since November 2018 Meeting**

Ted Diers and Mel Coté

Nick Napoli, NROC

Emily Shumchenia, NROC

*Co-chairs and staff will provide an overview of ocean planning activities since the last meeting in June 2018. The presentation will be followed by NROC and public input and questions.*

**9:45 Update on Federal Interagency Policy Committee Activities**

Deerin Babb-Brott, Principal Assistant Director for Oceans and Environment, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (invited)

*A presentation on the activities of the federal interagency Ocean Policy Committee will be followed by input and questions from meeting participants.*

**10:15 BREAK**

**10:30 Offshore Wind in the Northeast**

*In November 2018, the NROC OPC decided it will discuss one current or emerging offshore planning and management issue in the region during each of its meetings. For this meeting, the NROC OPC will focus on offshore wind. The intent is to obtain an update on the current status of offshore wind planning, leasing, and regulatory review and to inform the NROC OPC work groups about potential data products or best practices that can be developed or transferred throughout the region. Future meetings will likely cover other current or emerging issues.*

*The morning portion of the offshore wind session will include presentations that will provide context for discussions in the afternoon. This likely includes:*

- *An update on the status of offshore wind planning and leasing from New York through the Gulf of Maine*

*Speaker: Darryl Francois, BOEM Chief of Engineering and Technical Review Branch*

- An overview of [Executive Order 13807 “Establishing Discipline and Accountability in the Environmental Review and Permitting Process for Infrastructure,”](#) the related “One Federal Decision” Memorandum, and the implications for the regulatory and review process for offshore wind and other potential offshore infrastructure projects.

*Speaker: Deerin Babb-Brott, Principal Assistant Director for Oceans and Environment, White House Office of Science and Technology Policy*

- BOEM’s implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act, including BOEM’s approach to assessing cumulative impacts and the implications of EO 13807 and related Department of the Interior Secretary’s Order on timelines and other aspects of the process

*Speaker: Michelle Morin, BOEM Chief of Environmental Branch for Renewable Energy*

- An update on the Port Access Route Study for the Areas Offshore of Massachusetts and Rhode Island

*Speaker: Michele DesAutels, USCG First District*

- Addressing fisheries science and monitoring and incorporating fisheries considerations into offshore wind planning

*Speaker: Andy Lipsky, Acting Chief of Staff, NOAA Northeast Fisheries Science Center*

- State, tribal, and New England Fishery Management Council perspectives on the status of offshore wind development to date, lessons learned, and opportunities for the NROC OPC work groups

*Meeting participants will be given the opportunity to ask questions and provide brief input before lunch.*

**12:15pm**

**Lunch (provided)**

**1:00**

**Offshore Wind in the Northeast (continued)**

*After morning presentations and lunch, meeting participants will consider specific topics related to offshore wind where the NROC OPC may be able to provide information, data, or transfer best practices and lessons learned, including:*

- Public engagement
- Interjurisdictional coordination, including federal consistency with states and best practices for tribal engagement
- Use of data in decision-making and potential data needs to inform offshore wind development
- Cumulative impacts



**2:45**            **BREAK**

**3:00**            **Potential Areas of Focus for NROC OPC Work Groups**

*Meeting participants will consider priorities for the NROC OPC Work Groups based on the discussion throughout the day and considering other recent and potential offshore uses such as energy and telecommunications cables, aquaculture, ocean disposal sites, and the use of sand resources.*

*The Best Practices Work Group will focus on public engagement, interjurisdictional coordination, pre-application practices, and the use of data and information in decision-making.*

*The Regional Data Work Group will focus on maintaining and updating the [Northeast Ocean Data Portal](#). Potential discussion areas during the meeting could include data priorities related to characterizing commercial fisheries, marine transportation, and navigations and marine life and habitat.*

**4:00**            **Adjourn**