

California Coastal Commission

**California Offshore Wind Energy Fisheries
Working Group Meeting #7**

November 25, 2025

Introduction

In accordance with [Condition 7c of the California Coastal Commission's \(CCC\) concurrence](#) the five offshore wind energy lease sales issued by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) and [Senate Bill 286](#) (SB 286), the CCC convened the seventh California Offshore Wind Energy Fisheries Working Group meeting over two days on September 3 and 4, 2025. The goal of the California Offshore Wind and Fisheries Working Group is to develop a statewide strategy for avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of impacts to fishing and fisheries that prioritizes fisheries productivity, viability, and long-term resilience. The strategy is expected to include protocols for communication; best practices for surveys and data collection; a methodology for comprehensive socioeconomic analysis of direct and indirect impacts to fishing; a framework for compensatory mitigation for unavoidable impacts; and a fishing agreement template that memorializes the elements of the strategy.

Meeting Objectives

The seventh meeting of the Working Group included the following objectives:

- Review and discuss draft Statewide Strategy Introduction chapter.
- Receive overview of subgroup progress and discuss and provide input on draft text and work products being developed by the subgroups.
 - Subgroup 4: Tribal Fisheries
 - Subgroup 5: Methodology for Comprehensive Project-Level Socioeconomic Analysis
 - Subgroup 6: Framework for Compensatory Mitigation
- Discuss objectives and timing for WG meeting #8, and identify interim tasks to WG members, subgroup members, and support staff as needed.

Working Group members provided feedback on the updated Framework for Compensatory Mitigation draft documents. Further, the group discussed the Tribal Fisheries Agreement, updates to the Methodology for Comprehensive Project-Level Socioeconomic Analysis, and Statewide Strategy Introduction chapter and definitions. A high-level summary of what was shared is included in the following sections.

Meeting Date, Time, and Location

In-person in Sacramento (California Natural Resources Agency Building), with a Zoom call-in to listen.

Wednesday, September 3, 2025

9:00 am – 5:00 pm PT.

Thursday, September 4, 2025

9:00 am – 5:00 pm PT.

Meeting Format

This meeting was conducted in-person at the California Natural Resources Agency Building in Sacramento over two days. On day one, Working Group members heard updates and provided input on the Introduction draft document prepared by Coastal Commission Staff. The Working Group had a presentation from Northern Economics about the Methodology for Comprehensive Project-level Socioeconomic Analysis. The Working Group also heard updates from the Tribal Fisheries subgroup. After lunch, Tribal Fisheries subgroup members participated in a Tribal Fisheries Working Session

while fisheries representatives participated separately in a fisheries caucus. Additionally, Subgroup 6, Framework for Compensatory Mitigation, members provided updates and the Working Group discussed the updates to the documents. On day two, the Working Group discussed changes made overnight to the Methodology for Comprehensive Project-level Socioeconomic Analysis and further changes to be made. The Working Group also discussed definitions for the strategy. In the afternoon, Working Group members discussed the Framework for Compensatory Mitigation and the role of Fisheries Agreements. Before adjourning the meeting, Working Group members confirmed the next steps for the existing subgroups and expressed their interest in participating in the subgroups and drafting teams.

Meeting #7 Key Topics and Themes

Statewide Strategy Introduction

Major themes of the input and comments received by Working Group members on the draft of the Introduction:

- The Working Group discussed updating language in the Introduction to say leaseholders will apply the Statewide Strategy, as opposed to comply with the Statewide Strategy.
- Working Group members discussed what it means for the Statewide Strategy to be used as a framework and how exactly the CCC will be using it. The group discussed several text modifications to make clearer that the Statewide Strategy will be used as guidance.
- State Lands Commission staff noted that they will coordinate with CCC staff to update some language around their regulatory requirements.

Statewide Strategy Definitions

Major topics and comments from Working Group members related to the definitions in the Statewide Strategy are included below:

- Working Group members suggested several updates be made to the definitions document, including accurately citing definitions, using definitions consistently across documents, and whether using terms included in codes and regulations should be the preferred definitions.
- The Working Group provided feedback on the Resiliency Administrative Entity and Regional Resiliency Committee definitions. Some members suggested using an acronym for these terms throughout the Statewide Strategy. Other members asked if the definition should include information about the roles of the Resiliency Administrative Entity and Regional Resiliency Committee, while others shared that detailed information about these entities should not be included in the definition itself.
- Working Group members discussed the definitions for Offshore Wind (OSW) Project Area and OSW Impact Area. Some noted that these terms are used differently in the socioeconomic analysis and should have a separate definition.

Subgroup 4 – Tribal Fisheries Agreement

Major topics and comments from Working Group members are included below:

- A Tribal representative expressed gratitude to the CCC for their work on the Tribal Fisheries Chapter and how the chapter includes ways to support the varying interests of every Tribe.
- Working Group members suggested referencing the agreement that is being developed between CADEMO and the Tribes in this Working Group process.

- Working Group members asked how Tribal Fisheries are defined and suggested including it in the list of definitions in the Statewide Strategy. Holly Wyr noted that the Tribal Fisheries definition was developed with significant engagement with Tribes. Jenna Tourjé-Maldonado noted that commercial fishing was separated as clearly as possible from subsistence fishing in the definition, but that this separation can be complicated.

Subgroup 5 - Methodology for Comprehensive Project-Level Socioeconomic Analysis

Major topics and comments from Working Group members related to the work of Subgroup 5 are included below:

- Working Group members discussed the point in which economic impacts are assessed, and whether that occurs before or after avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures are implemented.
- Several members asked if the socioeconomic analysis could inform the proportion of funds that would be allocated to direct compensation and the resiliency fund. Some members asked if the resiliency fund could address long-term impacts.
- Working Group members discussed the purpose of each of the steps in the methodology and whether later steps are not needed. Some members noted that later steps in the methodology provide important context that inform whether the compensation number needs to be updated.
- Several Working Group members recommended that the socioeconomic analysis look at reasonably foreseeable impacts.
- Working Group members discussed how the methodology will value the loss of the fisheries resources over time and how to determine the duration of impacts. Some shared concerns that the methodology may not adequately address impacts related to the loss of fisheries resources over time, while Northern Economics noted these impacts are included the social impact analysis.
- Working Group members also discussed challenges with having an adaptive management compensation program. CCC staff shared that the CCC could build an adaptive management plan into their decision-making process that could be included in a compensation program.

Subgroup 6 – Framework for Compensatory Mitigation

Major topics and comments from Working Group members related to the draft documents, negotiations, and process for compensatory mitigation are included below:

- Resiliency Fund
 - Working Group members suggested the CCC have an oversight role throughout the compensatory mitigation process. Members discussed whether the CCC should have a role in selecting members for the Regional Resiliency Committee, identifying and establishing the Resiliency Administrative Entity, and reviewing how resiliency funds are spent in accordance with the charter.
 - Working Group members expressed differing perspectives on whether direct compensation or resiliency funding is a preferred method for compensatory mitigation.
 - Some members noted concerns about not being able to identify a Resiliency Administrative Entity through a competitive solicitation process or not being able to establish the resiliency program. Several Working Group members suggested ways to

address these concerns, including having a structure in place for developers or the state to select a Resiliency Administrative Entity to run the resiliency program if needed.

- Working Group members shared concerns about the selection of members for the Regional Resiliency Committees and what entity should have the ultimate decision-making authority to select members.
- Some members asked if the Resiliency Administrative Entity should have the ultimate decision-making authority on the selection of resiliency fund projects, while other members shared that the Resiliency Administrative Entity's role should be ensuring resiliency funds are being spent properly. Working Group members discussed the Regional Resiliency Committees having the primary responsibility in selecting resiliency fund projects.
- Direct Compensation
 - Working Group members discussed several updates to the language in the direct compensation document around reporting requirements. CCC suggested dividing the section into two sections on public reporting and reporting to agencies for oversight. Members also discussed the best ways to share information about the compensatory mitigation program with the public and what kinds of information should be included in the various reports.
 - Several Working Group members share concerns about the loss of fishing access due to port development for offshore wind. CCC shared that the port developers would address those impacts and that loss would be handled by the applicant developing the ports and that CCC is one of several permitting agencies that would review those submissions.
 - Working Group members discussed how to differentiate costs associated with losing fishing grounds, fuel costs, and unrecovered fishing income. Some members shared that this differentiation between costs does not need to be determined in the Statewide Strategy, and others noted that these costs can be covered by either direct compensation or resiliency fund program. Some members noted some of these costs may be informed by the socioeconomic analysis, while others shared there may be challenges with quantifying the loss of fishing grounds.
 - Working Group members discussed how to prove loss and costs for the purpose of submitting a claim for compensation. Several members noted the issue of proving loss and costs can be determined during the compensation program design, while some members shared it may be helpful to include some guidance on what can be used to prove loss in the Statewide Strategy.
- Negotiations and Compensatory Mitigation Process
 - Working Group members discussed the proposed process for structuring the resiliency program during each phase of the offshore wind development timeline. Several Working Group members discussed where the characteristics of the Regional Resiliency Committee are defined, with some members noting the characteristics may be defined in multiple documents.
 - Working Group members discussed whether negotiations would occur for each offshore wind project and some noted challenges with having multiple regional committees. CCC noted that they are committed to determining if new committees are needed or if additional seats can be added to existing committees as new offshore wind projects are developed.

- Working Group members discussed the topic of establishing the Regional Resiliency Committees and the Resiliency Administrative Entity. Members expressed varying perspectives on whether the Resiliency Administrative Entity should have a role in selecting the Regional Resiliency Committee members and issues related to conflicts of interest and representation amongst the fishing community. Generally, members noted the need to ensure there is buy-in for the process of establishing each of the committees, and that transparency is key to success. Most Working Group members agreed that the CCC could have a role in selecting members for the Regional Resiliency Committee.
- Working Group members discussed the process for negotiations and the role of the fishing community throughout the negotiations. Members discussed the need to incorporate meaningful engagement with fishing communities and opportunities to provide input and feedback on the socioeconomic analysis and compensation number. Working Group members also discussed including a third-party review of the socioeconomic analysis, if needed.