



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

**Joint Industry Task Force
Meeting Summary
Philadelphia, PA
January 13, 2020**

The Joint Industry Task Force met at the DoubleTree by Hilton Philadelphia Center City, in Philadelphia, PA on January 13, 2020. Attendees included Task Force members: Katie Almeida, Rodney Avila, Crista Bank, Bonnie Brady, Jenny Briot, Beth Casoni, Doug Copeland, Tom Dameron, Jen Flood, Joe Gilbert, Martin Goff, Eric Hansen, Peter Hughes, Meghan Lapp, Fred Mattera, Elizabeth Marchetti, John O’Keeffe, Gerry O’Neill, Rachel Pachter, Ruth Perry, Eric Reid, Rick Robins, Guy Simmons, Christen Wittman. Derek Miller and Bob Vanasse (Stove Boat Communications) also attended a portion of the day. The meeting was supported by: Pat Field (CBI), Anne Hawkins (RODA), Fiona Hogan (RODA), and Lane Johnston (RODA).

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Introductions

The facilitator welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Agenda Item 2: RODA and Wind Industry Brief Updates

Equinor staff updated the task force on the planned meeting it was co-hosting with RODA on the next day with fishermen to discuss layouts for the Empire Wind project. Equinor will be undertaking offshore surveys in the spring and summer.

Orsted staff also noted they have had meetings with fishermen, co-hosted with RODA, to discuss layouts in NJ on January 16 & 17 for the Ocean Wind project.

EnBW staff informed the group that they have a new fisheries liaison, Beth Casoni, and they are putting together their communications plan. ENBW does not have a project yet but is focused on future NY planning areas. Their new FLO will be starting to make trips formally over the next few weeks. Their FLO mentioned the Massachusetts Lobster Association annual weekend would have two days of offshore wind workshops.

RODA staff encouraged all participants to use the task force list serv. RODA grew in membership since the last task force meeting especially in the Gulf of Maine and West Coast. There were no current plans for West Coast task force meetings yet and staff was interested in hearing from developers on how to move forward in that region. There has been increased communication from state agencies, e.g. today there were two requests to join the layout meetings but we declined on the understanding that these meetings were focused on direct industry-to-industry communications. RODA staff wants to discuss how to best coordinate with all the states. RODA staff is working on planning the State of Science workshop for May or June



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

2020 for commercial fisheries with BOEM and NMFS. The workshop would cover survey impacts, lessons learned from Europe, and other topics.

The facilitator informed the group there was a similar entity to ROSA but different because it is focused on wildlife (birds, bats, marine mammals), and there is a planning workshop for January 31 in Boston. This effort is coordinated by NYSERDA, BOEM, Fish & Wildlife staff, eNGOs, developers, and state agency members. BOEM also held its first Gulf of Maine task force in NH on December 12, 2019.

Agenda Item 3: Focused Topic to Advance Joint Action – Navigational Aids

Navigational aids referenced in BOEM's proposed guidance document included marking on towers, AIS, and lights. BOEM released this draft document with limited information for context. The group chose to discuss what might be missing from their guidance. RODA staff noted that the task force had planned to form a sub-group to work on navigational aids but the BOEM report delayed that work. The intention for the sub-group was to come up with standards that exceeded the minimum required by the USCG, but would focus on surface-level markings and therefore not address those set by the FAA for flight.

Issues discussed included the following:

- *Turbine Markings:* In Europe, the numbers were thought to be 1 meter in height. Members discussed the need for lettering larger than 1 m given viewing such lettering in Europe visible on all sides, the need for a common nomenclature across projects and across agencies (markings need to match on the turbines, the AIS, and NOAA charts), and the need for reflective paint for the lettering (or lit, as noted below). The identifying number would be the only writing on the turbine that needed to meet this size requirement because there would be other markings, e.g. depth, on the turbines that shouldn't be as large. A fisherman thought that NOAA was putting generic numbers on the electronic charts so they may need to be contacted to comply with the consistent numbering. For AIS, the task force discussed that the AIS identification number that appeared on the plotter should match the number on the pole.
- *Turbine lighting:* Developers noted much of this issue is driven by existing regulations (IALA) and these regulations should be circulated to the group. The members agreed every structure should be lit to be visible at the surface. Developers noted to avoid distance impacts, the lights have a 3 nm range. Some suggested 12 nm visible lighting on project "corners." For Block Island some fishermen remain concerned about visibility in foggy conditions with the 3 nm lights or seeing lights in salt build up on the wheel house during storms. Because of potential outages, it was suggested reflective painted letters plus lit foundations would provide another level of safety. Concerns including



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

intensity of light from turbines “blinding” captains, the potential for attracting fish like bait fish or squid, and potential other changes to the micro-environment due to lighting. Fishermen asked how maintenance is handled to ensure lights are always working. A developer stated that in the US if a light is out a report needs to be filed and companies have a limited time to fix it. One developer explained that its first project was planned to be a combination of 5 (for significant structures) and 2 (for non-significant structures), which is based on the IALA standards. A fishery representative asked if the technology that turns on individual turbine lighting, or an entire row of turbines, when a vessel gets too close was available for use. One developer noted that in the US that did exist where if a vessel comes within 500 ft of a turbine additional lighting would turn on. FAA lighting requirements for aircraft are not a particular concern of this group.

- *Turbine foundation painting.* Members discussed the painting of the foundation, typically up to 50 to 70 feet, with yellow. The actual height from surface varies depending on how the tower is constructed and its transition piece connecting the foundation to the turbine. If the minimum height of the yellow transition piece was 40-50 ft fishermen noted one would have line of sight from the wheelhouse and suggested picking a set distance above surface for consistency.
- *AIS:* The group discussed how AIS should be installed for projects. Developers had heard mixed opinions on whether AIS should be installed on each turbine. Fishing industry members were generally in favor of AIS being installed on every turbine for navigating in bad weather and assuming radar interference risks in arrays. Developers asked whether that would clutter the chart plotter. One developer agreed to try to simulate charts with AIS on every turbine, having it only on the corners of an array, and other more complete options. The group discussed the range of AIS dependent on both transmission and receiver power (AIS A and B). One developed informed the group that in the Gulf of Mexico they were required to put AIS on anything that moved. If AIS chart clutter was a concern, a fisherman suggested that developers could hand out thumb drives as an overlay for charts and that would allow limiting AIS technology to help distinguish between moving vessels and non-moving turbines. A fishery representative asked whether AIS could be turned on and off in a search and rescue situation to help identify where the collision occurred. RODA staff informed the group that the USCG couldn't put in a flight plan until called into action, which was why there was no preset to load showing the turbines.
- *Allisions:* A fishery representative requested that there also be a sensor that notifies the USCG or relevant organizations in the event of a collision because the vessel might not be able to call for help at that point. Developers stated it was not common to hit a fixed structure but any collision would cause vibrations that would trigger an alarm. There are



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

also CCTV cameras that are monitored by staff that could be checked. The fishery representative wondered if the developers monitored the AIS of any vessel and would it be helpful if all vessels had to keep their AIS on. It wasn't clear when BOEM would issue guidance but the task force can take feedback to USCG and BOEM.

- *Next Steps:* Ruth, John, Rodney, Fred, Tom, and Crista volunteered to comprise the work group to develop a survey on navigational aids. John also volunteered to look into an AIS simulation. It was suggested that they also survey some of the recreational fleet since they have faster boats, AIS might be particularly helpful to them. The HMS AP might be an appropriate group to ask for that feedback. Developers said there were a few documents that they could share on the issue, and requested that a USCG representative come to a task force meeting to help explain the issue. They also suggested identifying navigational aid options that are set in regulations versus those with more flexibility. The sub-group will get together before the next task force meeting. Developers will circulate relevant documents and potentially reach out to the USCG and BSEE.

Agenda Item 4: Focused Topic to Advance Joint Action – Fisheries Liaisons & Representatives

The group discussed how the current general structure, set by BOEM guidance, of fishery representatives (FR) and liaisons (FLO) is working.

There were divergent comments regarding the effectiveness of the FLO/FR structure. One fisherman said he considered the FLO/FR process to not be working in full; certain FLO/FRs have not provided answers to questions they promised to provide. Some FRs had never been to sea, which was considered an impediment to understanding feedback from fishermen or understanding their issues. Another fishery participant considered the process to be very disjointed and discouraging. He also had difficulty finding information on the FLO/FRs, like who they are. He suggested that there be a centralized location where the public can find information.

Developers informed the group that some communities insisted that certain individuals be used, which put them in a difficult situation. They thought BOEM was trying to create a two-way communication system to lessen impacts during construction. One person said he considered talking to FRs to be like a black box because there was no feedback, which differed from the task force meeting. Another felt communication has improved over the last 10 years and thought the first responsibility for the FR should be to industry. Some fishery representatives stated that they didn't want FLO/FRs to approach individual captains on the



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

dock but preferred they reach out to the dock manager, who have a lot of expertise. Other employees on the dock frequently had a lot of work to do, especially if offloading.

A fishery representative pointed out that it's difficult to know what developers had partnered with whom on these projects; there should be a centralized location where folks go to a map of the proposed lease areas and learn who is involved and relevant contact information. Developers questioned how that should be done, individually or via the Marine Cadastre.

An FLO considered the interactions between developers and fishermen to be both effective and productive based on personal experience and suggested the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council wind energy website, organized jointly with NEFMC to be a potential location for information on projects. Some people had heard that the Councils did not intend to use the website for additional information like that.

A FR considered the problem to be that they are paid by developers, which negatively affects credibility and asked how RODA maintains credibility despite receiving money from developers. RODA staff explained that the developers' money only went to fund the task force and that was a clear delineation and there were no NDAs signed. A fishery representative thought it was an ongoing dialogue to educate fishermen that RODA is fisheries-specific and developers are not members of RODA. The developers put money into the task force and ROSA but it is an ongoing conversation with membership to ensure there is no conflict of interest. It was also asked if the suggestion was not to compensate FRs. A fisherman thought getting responses from FRs was the major problem. Developers said they had FRs review their communications plan and had them track changes; that is something they wanted to compensate them for because they've spent time on it. How long it can take to answer a question can vary if highly detailed information is needed from engineers, for example.

A fishery representative noted how quickly certain FLOs responded to questions. The rep supported maintaining FLO/FRs because industry needs this conduit. Another fishery representative thought a lot of fishermen didn't know who their FR was and had never had an FR reach out to her. She didn't think it was a transparent process because it was unclear what happens to the information as nothing was documented. She also thought people were using RODA as a FR. One developed suggested drafting a "common ground" document to help ensure feedback is received and fishermen understand what happens to their advice. Developers noted that to be more efficient for fishermen, FLOs were holding monthly port meetings in New Bedford and Point Judith. An FLO informed the group that everything was documented including every conversation they have and it's up to the FLO/FR to follow up. A fishery representative didn't think it was useful to talk to a FR who didn't have on the water experience because they couldn't understand what industry was saying.



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

One developer said they could create a fact sheet on the science and asked if RODA thought it had the necessary information to answer questions if fishermen were treating them like a FR. RODA staff said they are asked questions about specific projects all the time and if staff ever didn't have the answer they would direct them to people who did. A fisherman said trust was a big hurdle for fishermen to get over and supported a central location for information that RODA was heavily involved with.

In summary, ideas for the TF to consider working on further were:

- A central repository or means for fishermen to identify their FRs and FLOs;
- A more common, consistent approach to FLOs, for instance, how they are contracted to ensure independence, role of NDAs, what their qualifications are, and so forth;
- Clearer means for fishermen about how their feedback is considered and used;
- The creation of fact sheets and other common materials from a “trusted source” on key issues across projects;
- Jointly proving BOEM feedback on their current guidance.

Agenda Item 5: Centralized Project Information Hub

Stove Boat presented a proposal to establish a centralized information hub for all offshore wind development.

- This would not be limited to a website with information but could also include a mobile app and other components.
- Users would have the ability to look at the information as a map or lease area or company.
- Each project level would have a listing of project name, developer name, former project names, short description of the company, procurement information, status of project, FR contact information, link to developers website, COP/DEIS links, section with notices to mariners, and description related to fisheries research.
- Secondary information could include lease size, term, links to lease documents, states information e.g. fisheries working group, and information could be available via Boatracs.
- Developers could quickly fill out that information and keep it up to date as much as possible.
- Geofencing could be used so that you get information when you enter an area.

The fishery representatives in the room generally thought this was a great idea and could create a more universal way of sharing information. Several ideas were discussed.



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

- A fishery representative requested a frequently asked questions section because individuals don't know if anyone else has already asked their question. A FAQ section would also help with transparency since everyone would know that questions were being asked and answered. One developer thought this could be a great product coming out of the task force. Another cautioned that technical information will vary from project to project, e.g. concrete mattress dimensions will vary by project. Others agreed that there would be boundaries on some information but could post generally what components are and how they are used.
- A fisherman was concerned that it might be hard getting information to boats because Boatracs is expensive, costing 30 cents per message with a per character fee on top of that and suggested installing a cell phone repeater on the wind farm. The wind farms are connected to shore via the cable but it was unknown if the cable could handle the signal. A developer said the technology existed but was probably not as good as we would want - additionally it's expensive and unreliable.
- A fishery representative didn't think the information had to be too specific, it just had to provide general information and a contact for anyone who had additional questions.
- A fishery representative thought that a third party was necessary to complete this because of the required frequent updates that RODA is not equipped to do.
- One developer questioned whether they would have to update the same information in two locations. Stove Boat staff suggested there could be a point person for each developer so data gaps don't happen. They were interested in hearing if the group thought making it interactive was a good idea or how they wanted the information presented.

Next Steps: The group recommended that the consultant proceed with the short-term work of further scoping and detailing this work and the associated estimated price. The facilitator agreed to coordinate with the parties on how best to fund this activity.

Agenda Item 6: Task Force Process Check-In

The facilitator noted that the first task force was in June 2019 and now was a good time to take a step back and see what was working and what may be improved. The following points were made.

- A developer said they were not sure what the task force was accomplishing and would like the group to find common ground on issues.
- A fisherman wanted to see a product coming out of the task force; currently it seemed like the wind industry was ticking a box. It was clear that the members of the task force agree on topics and could make a joint statement to BOEM and USCG on what they want to see for lighting and markings, for example.



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

- One developer agreed and thought there was some low hanging fruit that could provide that co-existence communication to regulators but wasn't sure how to handle the harder things.
- Another developer thought this was a big issue because developers get a lot of internal pressure and want support or recognition when they've done something positive for fishermen.
- A fishery representative considered the task force to be a good place to try and find something everyone could agree on. Another fishery representative was uncomfortable with the conversation and considered commonality in communication to be good. He hoped we could hang our hat on something now like navigational aids.
- Another fishery representative was feeling good about the task force's work after this 3rd meeting and through it would take time for progress to be made. It was important to identify tasks to charge the sub-group with to bring the navigational aid discussion forward.
- Another developer suggested giving some target objective dates for when the group wanted to get to a position of consensus on issues. Another considered the work done to date to be good but questioned if it was enough.
- The educational forum held in October 2019 was considered valuable but the staff noted that there are additional activities outside of the task force that are supported by it, such as RODA co-convening meetings regarding layouts or other topics when requested by developers.
- Another developer suggested developing a plan to get work done in between meetings that would also allow for the work to come out to the public in a positive way.
- A fishery representative thought this discussion needed to happen and was optimistic about participation in the navigational aids survey. His organization would also submit to RODA a list of their top 10 concerns and would like to see some work done identifying what issues are set via a regulation, versus those that may be resolved by consensus without regulatory changes. At that point, the group could negotiate solutions.
- One developer thought it would be good to discuss this further and there would be opportunities to collaborate; mitigation might be too project-specific but the group could use the task force as a way to show the communities that issues were being discussed. A fishery representative thought that if the task force was identifying problems and trying to get ahead of them, then he could support it.
- RODA staff asked the task force how to get the conversation going and keep it going because it was hard to make progress when there were so many different opinions and very little dialogue amongst task force members between meetings. A developer suggested setting clear milestones, scope, and deadlines for the navigational aid sub-group. The facilitator had counted 6 volunteers for that sub-group and they would develop the survey on AIS, lettering, and guidance to get data back from fishermen through the survey. The sub-group would also think about developing a set of proposals



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

to bring back to the group. It was unclear how long the simulations of AIS installation would take or what the milestones for that should be.

- A developer asked if there is any additional information that could be gathered and worked through the task force, maybe the top 10 list would be a good thing work on. The task force can discuss tactics on a range of issues but the group needed to think of ways to generate information and bring it back. A fishery representative suggested that potential process items that could be improved might be company-specific, such as seeing an issue with a representative and could bring that back to higher ups at the developers. A developer stated they wanted to avoid mistakes by having that opportunity to hear advice from task force members regarding representatives.
- A developer asked whether it was appropriate for the task force to discuss any issue that RODA takes on. The facilitator and others clarified that RODA has multiple jobs; some are related to the task force and joint collaborative space with developers, but it is also a member-based organization that is bound to represent its members on a range of topics. A developer said there should be open communication on what the task force has actually decided to work on. A fishery representative noted that the task force had agreed that the task force shall identify initial priority areas and establish progress. The facilitator referenced the task force charter, 4.3b in the TORs, which stated that participation in the task force otherwise incurs no restriction on a member's ability to speak on their personal behalf or that of their employer. A developer considered the Jones Act to be a good discussion topic for a future task force meeting so that each sector could better understand the other's positions, since there was significant lack of clarity at this time.

To begin to summarize this dialogue and take action, a fishery representative suggested the sub-group could take 2 weeks to develop the navigational aids survey and then allow another month to get the results. That would leave time to compile it and give it to RODA for presentation. The Task Force also agreed to reach out to members to identify the "top 10" issues to work on building off of the original scoping of topics from last summer. The facilitator suggested that the centralized website could potentially be worked on before the next task force meeting in April. Stove Boat staff said it would take 3-4 weeks to develop the plan once they received the go ahead. With regards to the survey, a fisherman suggested reaching out to the Council's Advisory Panels to broaden the scope by using their expertise. RODA staff had done a transit survey with NYSERDA that it circulated through the Councils and other channels and got very strong participation, so it had some ideas on how to do that and suggested to focus the survey on fully formed ideas and those that the task force might be able to address.

A developer thought the task force needed something but wasn't sure how to do it, whether it was having smaller calls but the task force needed some additional information or feedback. The work produced needed to be useful to the task force. The facilitator stated it was important to document the work being done but there's a challenge of transparency. It's difficult if part of



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

the group thinks they're successfully completing the task but another group says it's not what they wanted. A couple of developers suggested more frequent updates, e.g. monthly email or call, to keep all task force members apprised of what RODA is producing. One developer thought the combination of emails and calls might work best; if there was a call associated with that it would give members time to talk about it.

Next Steps: The group recommended the following next steps to improve the work of the TF:

- Advance the navigational aids survey
- Conduct a TF members survey of key issues to work on together in 2020
- Provide more frequent updates of the TF's work and efforts
- Advance a common communications tool for fishermen as discussed

Agenda Item 7: General Topic on Improving Engagement – How do we engage better around array design and turbine layout?

The facilitator asked the group what we are learning about engaging each other about design arrays and how to improve on that.

A fishing representative asked about the difference between spreading out an array to accommodate fishing vs designing a tightly packed array to minimize square footage. One developer considered it to be a range and would depend on the wind direction. Some of the New England leases have more uniform wind direction but it can still vary. If turbines are clustered too close together you can generate a lot of energy but you can strain turbine motors. Spacing should be done in a way that maximizes production but minimizes operational costs to the extent possible. A developer informed the group that the USCG was not partial to clustering; they would need to be consulted if the task force made a recommendation to cluster turbines. Turbine locations are dropped in cases of archaeology or geology conflicts.

A fishery representative thought it was important for developers to be in touch with the fishing industry early and often because costly surveys were being done before fishermen could raise issues or concerns. A developer stated this was a "slippery slope" for the meeting; it was an area where developers think they're listening but the fishing industry don't think they are. The fishery representative requested more communication so the industry could understand why a certain layout was chosen. A developer thought it was unfortunate that developers are arbiters in areas that they should not be; agencies have been fairly reluctant and are pushing back on developers to figure it out.

Agenda Item 8: New Topic: Regional Transmission



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

Developers explained that BOEM had left a space where people can submit unsolicited bids related to offshore renewable energy transmission so if there is an unsolicited bid they need to see if there is competitive business. Normally BOEM wouldn't regulate transmission but that's an agreement with FERC. The recent proposals for NY/NJ and Southern New England qualify under this unsolicited process.

RODA staff discussed those two unsolicited right of way proposals. RODA did submit a comment letter on the NY/NJ bid supporting a well-planned transmission system if it reduces structure in the water and compels an advance planning process that minimizes impacts to fishing. An FR informed the group that MA is heading toward mandatory regional transmission. A developer explained that if a company gained right of way with transmission cables it could force developers to increase their costs, cause delay and might not be reliable. It was considered the equivalent of handing someone else the extension cord to get the power to shore. An FR was concerned allowing regional transmission could make it harder to know who to contact if there was interaction between fishing gear and cables. A developer was concerned as the task force was not an advocacy organization; it could say that regional transmission shouldn't be privatized but unless there was a fact-based position the task force was not the right group to discuss this.

A fishery representative wondered if this was another project that could be undertaken by the task force and reach agreement before presenting conclusions. A developer considered the transmission issue to consist of two parts – location and who can own it. Developers could probably agree to location but not who would own transmission cables.

RODA and a developer agreed to look into the charter language to see if a transmission developer would qualify to join the task force. A developer considered the issue to be about bringing in cable providers or other people that aren't lease or permit holders and suggested asking an unbiased provider to talk about the technology. A fisherman thought getting an unbiased 3rd party to describe what's entailed would be helpful. A developer offered to do that – the task force can invite the cable people to describe how the technology works. Another developer wondered if a portion of every task force meeting should be dedicated to education because that was a valuable use of time.

Next Steps: The group recommended the following next steps:

- Determine if transmission companies meet the definition of a TF member;
- Hold a future educational session on transmission and cabling
- Determine if, how and when the TF should publicly weigh in on this issue



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

Agenda Item 9: Next Steps, Next Meeting, Next Topics

RODA staff reminded the group that they had discussed a simulation about lanes and markings and asked if they should plan the next meeting around a simulator location, possibly in Baltimore. A developer said they might be able to set up a specific array design within the simulator and different platforms within a lease area. Although, it might not be possible to do that by April. Fishery representatives could bring senior captains to the simulation session. It was unknown at the time if parameters could be changed in the simulator during the demonstration.

The group agreed on the following do list before the next task force meeting.

Outcome	Actions	When	Who
Navigational Aid specific recommendations for TF consideration and action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare a survey on Navigational Aids • TF reviews survey briefly • Distribute survey broadly to fishermen through multiple channels • Gather existing relevant regs from various entities (BSSE, ILLA, BOEM) and distribute to TF • Collect, collate, and synthesize survey data • Simulate, if possible, AIS in different configurations in sample array, if possible • Draft propositions for TF consideration • Disseminate recommendations in draft to TF before next meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan 28 • Feb 1 • Feb1 • Feb 15 • March 15 • March 15 • April 1 • April 7 	<i>Coordinator:</i> Lane <i>Committee:</i> Ruth, Fred, Rodney, John, Christen, Tom
Information Hub Scope of Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RODA arrange contract with firm to draft detailed scope for Info Hub at 50 hours and \$10,000 • Firm complete task and disseminate to TF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feb 1 • March 1 	Annie and Contractor
Updated list of “top 10” issues for TF consideration for further work and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disseminate 2019 list of issues • Create and disseminate short survey of top 10 issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feb 1 • March 1 	Annie, Lane and all RODA participants



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance

creation of a 2020 Work Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide summary of issues gleaned from individual company outreach • Compile survey results from RODA members and TF Developer members for top issues • Disseminate synthesis of key issues to TF • Hone a draft work plan based on results for TF consideration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 15 • April 1 • April 7 • April 7 	
Participatory simulation of captaining through a wind array	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrange details with simulator company • Gather fishing vessel data, if possible, to simulate at least one or a few kinds of fishing vessels • Arrange participation around a future TF meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 1 • April 1 • April 1 or later 	John O'Keefe, Orsted
Summary of 2019 TF Work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare a summary of TF work • Disseminate to WG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 March 	Annie and Lane
TF Members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review task force membership qualifications to determine whether transmission developers qualify 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 April 	Annie and Lane
Future TF agenda items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabling and regional transmission • FLOs and FRs and communication 		

ROSA update

Task group members active in ROSA informed the group that the ROSA board was in place and they were very close to making an offer for an Executive Director. Some of the developers money had gone into the account to date and the next phase was getting the ED started. A fishery representative thought the ED would need some leadership on the task force part and the board. The representative thought specific ROSA projects could be identified by mid-summer but they needed to put a laundry list of projects together and bring in scientists to help refine that list. NMFS is also working on addressing impacts on the trawl survey. RODA staff didn't think that NMFS considered the task force to be the right group to draft specific recommendations for resolving challenges with the survey impacts. A fisherman considered the survey to be a very important issue because of its impact on overall catch and hoped there would be some kind of update to the task force or at least through ROSA.



Responsible Offshore Development Alliance