

California Coastal Commission

**California Offshore Wind Energy Fisheries
Working Group Meeting #8**

November 4 and 5, 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](#), the CCC convened the eighth California Offshore Wind Energy Fisheries Working Group (Working Group) meeting over two days on November 4 and 5, 2025. The goal of the 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 Statewide 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 eighth meeting of the Working Group included the following objectives:

- Review updated documents and gather Working Group levels of support on:
 - Introduction
 - Subgroup 3: Best Practices for Avoidance and Minimization of Impacts
 - Subgroup 4: Tribal Fisheries Chapter and Tribal Fisheries Agreement
 - Subgroup 5: Methodology for Comprehensive Project-Level Socioeconomic Analysis
 - Subgroup 6: Framework for Compensatory Mitigation
 - Templates for a Fishing Agreement
- Discuss next steps and follow up action or support needed after Working Group Meeting #8

Working Group members provided feedback on the updated Framework for Compensatory Mitigation, Tribal Fisheries Chapter and Tribal Fisheries Agreement, Methodology for Comprehensive Project-Level Socioeconomic Analysis, and shared levels of support on the Statewide Strategy. A high-level summary of what was shared is included in the following sections.

Meeting Date, Time, and Location

In-person in Sacramento (California State University, Sacramento), with a Zoom call-in to listen.

Tuesday, November 4, 2025
9:00 am – 5:00 pm PT.

Wednesday, November 5, 2025
9:00 am – 5:00 pm PT.

Meeting Format

This meeting was conducted in-person at the California State University, Sacramento over two days. On day one, Working Group members recapped progress to-date and heard updates about next steps for the Statewide Strategy. The Working Group received an update from Northern Economics on the Methodology for Comprehensive Project-level Socioeconomic Analysis. The Working Group also

heard updates from the Tribal Fisheries subgroup. After lunch, there was a Tribal Fisheries Working Session for the Tribal Fisheries subgroup and separately, a fisheries caucus. Additionally, the Framework for Compensatory Mitigation subgroup provided updates, and the Working Group had a discussion on the updated document. On day two of the meeting, the Working Group discussed changes made overnight to the Framework for Compensatory Mitigation document. The Working Group also discussed changes the Coastal Commission made to the Introduction of the Statewide Strategy. In the afternoon, Working Group members discussed the Template for Fishing Agreements. Additionally, the Coastal Commission shared next steps for the Statewide Strategy with Working Group members. Working Group members were invited to share questions, comments, and perspectives throughout the meeting.

Meeting #7 Key Topics and Themes

Statewide Strategy Introduction

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

- Working Group members discussed the description of California fisheries and provided suggestions to improve the accuracy of the description.
- A Working Group member highlighted the need to conduct an evaluation of the progress of decarbonization in California and potential impacts of offshore wind on ratepayers.
- Working Group members discussed clarifying a statement about economic and other impacts to fisheries because of offshore wind development.

On Day 2 of the meeting, Working Group members provided updated levels of support on the document. Members present shared general support and qualified support. Following the meeting, two Working Group members who missed the meeting provided their support for the document.

Subgroup 4 – Tribal Fisheries Chapter and Tribal Fisheries Agreement

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

- Working Group members asked how the Tribal Fisheries Agreement would be used in the offshore wind development process. CCC staff noted that this would be dependent on each project and Tribe.
- Working Group members asked about examples of Tribes that engage in commercial fishing and how that is addressed in the Statewide Strategy.
- Subgroup 4 members discussed the graphics to be included in the Tribal Fisheries Chapter, including:
 - Options for the Venn diagram that provide a visual distinction between Tribal fisheries and commercial and for-hire fisheries.
 - The updated version of the Timeline and Developers Engagement with Tribes graphic.
- Subgroup 4 members discussed the remaining edits to the Socioeconomic Impact Methodology for Tribal Fisheries and Offshore Wind Projects in California document.

On Day 1 of the meeting, Working Group members in Subgroup 4 provided their levels of support on the document. Members present shared general support. Following the meeting, one Working Group member who missed the meeting provided general support for the document.

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 asked about the role of Steps 2 and 3 in the Northern Economics report methodology in identifying the numeric value of compensation.
- Working Group members asked for clarification on the various project phases and the site assessment, surveys, and studies that are involved at each phase.
- Working Group members discussed the various disruptions such as displacement and economic impacts that may occur during site assessment surveys.
- Working Group members asked about the process, specifically for site surveys, should a lease be transferred to another developer.
- Working Group members discussed the changes in technology used for site assessment surveys and how to capture the potential impacts that may arise.
- Working Group members discussed decommissioning and agreed on modified language to reflect that it has both temporary and potential long-term consequences.

On Day 2 of the meeting, Working Group members provided their levels of support on the document. Members present shared general support and qualified support. Following the meeting, two Working Group members who missed the meeting provided their support for the document.

Subgroup 6 – Framework for Compensatory Mitigation

Major topics and comments from Working Group members related to the Framework for Compensatory Mitigation chapter are below:

- Working Group members discussed how impacts are evaluated based on information provided in the Construction and Operations Plan (COP), environmental review documents, and the project's consistency with the enforceable policies of the California Coastal Management Program.
- Working Group members discussed the role of the Fishermen's Working Group during the identification of and assessment of impacts that will be used to inform the compensatory mitigation program. The Working Group also discussed whether the Fishermen's Working Group would have a role in convening meetings and decided that this would be done in coordination with the CCC.
- Working Group members discussed the concept of refunding unused compensatory mitigation program funds to developers. CCC suggested avoiding this, while lessee representatives noted that unused funds could be used for a reserve or a contingency fund. Several fishing representatives expressed concerns about unused funds being used inappropriately. Working Group members agreed to add a general statement about discouraging inappropriate incentives.
- Working Group members discussed the relationship between the Resiliency Administrative Entity (RAE), the Regional Resiliency Committee (RRC), and CCC. Some members noted that there should be a role for the RAE to evaluate cumulative impacts and support coordination with the regional committees. Fishing representatives shared the importance of regional

representation on the RRCs and ensuring adequate fishing representation on both the RRC and RAE. Working Group members had differing opinions on how much authority the RAE should have over the RRCs, but confirmed that the RRCs would ultimately decide on the resiliency projects.

- Working Group members discussed the split between the direct compensation and resiliency funds. Several fishing representatives emphasized the importance of the resiliency fund to address long-term impacts. CCC shared that they can discuss how to best split the compensation between the resiliency and direct compensation funds in the Fishermen's Working Group.

On Day 2 of the meeting, Working Group members provided their levels of support on the document. Members present shared general support and qualified support. Following the meeting, two Working Group members who missed the meeting provided their support for the document.

Template for Fishing Agreements

Major topics and comments from Working Group members related to the Template for Fishing Agreements are included below:

- Working Group members discussed the title of the document, noting that it may be confusing to be written as-is if it does not actually include a fishing agreement. Working Group members supported renaming the document [Fishing] Agreement Templates for the Statewide Strategy. Some members suggested providing some additional detail in the document to describe what the items in the outline would be used for.
- A Working Group member asked if the agreements that were developed by fishermen prior to the Working Group process could be included somehow in the Statewide Strategy. The member shared that including prior agreements created before the Working Group would be fair because of what is stated in SB 286 and what the Ocean Protection Council (OPC) identified as a necessary part of this process.
- Working Group members discussed the agreement between the CCC and developers. Several members suggested that the agreement acknowledge fishing communities as third-party beneficiaries, while lessee representatives shared concerns that this would make it difficult to finance their projects. The group agreed that this issue could be included as a note for the CCC to consider.
- The Working Group discussed the agreement between the CCC and RAE. Some members asked how Tribal fisheries would be included in the agreement.
- Working Group members discussed the RRC Charter and asked for clarification on the role of agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) in reviewing nominations. CCC staff confirmed that the agencies would provide information on any existing violations as well as impacted fisheries in a given project area.

On Day 2 of the meeting, Working Group members provided their levels of support on the document. Members present shared general support and qualified support. Following the meeting, two Working Group members who missed the meeting provided their support for the document.