

Responsible Offshore Science Alliance Council Kick-Off Meeting

Monday, September 28, 2020 | 9:30 – 12:30 ET

Meeting Summary

Meeting in Brief

On September 28, 2020, the Responsible Offshore Science Alliance (ROSA) held the first meeting of its Advisory Council. The Advisory Council has been formed to provide substantive direction and strategic guidance for ROSA. The Council is comprised of developers holding federal leases and representatives from commercial and recreational fishing industries, federal agencies, the New England and Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, and interested states. At this initial convening of the Council, ROSA:

- introduced the purpose, intent, scope and structure of the Council;
- provided space for partner organizations to share updates on ongoing fisheries and OSW research; and,
- held discussions to help determine ROSA’s research priorities in the short and long term.

Please click [here](#) to view the agenda and [here](#) to view the presentations.

Meeting Opening

ROSA Board of Directors Co-Chairs, Peter Hughes and Rachel Pachter, provided brief opening remarks, highlighting the white paper that led to the founding of ROSA, the diverse [membership](#) of the Council – with representation spanning offshore wind (OSW) developers, commercial fishermen, recreational fishermen, and state and federal agencies – and the exciting work ahead in the OSW arena. Council members represent Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina.

Before diving into presentations, ROSA Executive Director Lyndie Hice-Dunton reviewed the Council’s Code of Conduct, and attendees were invited to participate in a polling activity to answer, “What are you most excited about for the ROSA Council to accomplish in the coming year?”

Please see *Appendix B* for poll responses.

Presentation & Discussion: Purpose, Intent, Scope, and Structure of the ROSA Council

ROSA Executive Director Lyndie Hice-Dunton provided a brief presentation on ROSA’s objectives, organizational structure, governance, expectations of Council Members, and provided answers to frequently asked questions. Dr. Hice-Dunton emphasized the principles of collaboration, partnership, transparency, and communication underpinning ROSA’s objectives. She noted the roles of the Board of

Directors, Research Advisory Board, Advisory Council, and Executive Director. The Advisory Council will drive ROSA's direction and focus, including setting short- and long-term research goals. Council Members will serve as liaisons between ROSA and their organizations, agencies, companies, and networks, and Members will serve 3-year terms, meeting at least twice annually, with much of the substantive work occurring at the sub-committee level.

Dr. Hice-Dunton then addressed frequently asked questions about the Council, clarifying that ROSA and Responsible Offshore Development Alliance (RODA) are two separate organizations with some overlapping Board members and a strong working relationship. ROSA will also build a relationship with the emerging Regional Wildlife Science Entity (RWSE), which is focused on building a regional group to focus on wildlife issues related to offshore wind. She noted that ROSA is working to build its coordination with regional data portals and planning groups (NROC, MARCO, MACO, NERACOOS, MARACOOS), and increasing that collaboration will be a role for Council Members involved with those groups. Dr. Hice-Dunton highlighted that ROSA's role fills a key niche of regional collaboration that has not yet been met by other organizations, and that ROSA aims to coordinate with groups like NMFS and Fishery Management Councils to increase that collaboration. She emphasized the important role that the Advisory Council will play in helping ROSA avoid redundancy, as the diverse Council membership will be able to identify areas and opportunities for increased coordination and collaboration across agencies and groups.

Below are attendee questions and comments that followed Dr. Hice-Dunton's presentation. Attendee questions are bolded and answers from ROSA are italicized.

- **Regarding the language “evidence-based” decisions, can you speak more on the issue of bringing fishermen knowledge in on equal footing with agency or consultant data?**
 - *There will be some example projects reviewed in the coming presentations integrating fishermen knowledge with data collection. Another example is the Fisheries Knowledge Trust, which uses data from fishermen as part of a research process. We would like to get feedback from fishermen on things that ROSA should work on. If this is something that the Advisory Council feels we should prioritize, then that's certainly something that ROSA can work to improve.*
- **Do you envision the Council's role also being to tackle some of those socioeconomic questions?**
 - *ROSA will look to its Advisory Council to help determine where best to use our efforts. ROSA's projects and priorities will be jointly scoped and jointly steered.*
- **There are more research questions than we have funding. Could you tell us a little about potential funding sources for the research needs that we will be identifying?**
 - *Some funding is still to be determined, as expected, given how newly formed ROSA is. The Executive Director came onboard in February 2020, right before the impacts of COVID-19 made themselves known. ROSA has an operating budget and has had some cost savings due to lack of travel, which could be diverted to help fund research at a small scale. There is also potential in this first year to do a collaborative funding model, similar to how Rhode Island,*

Massachusetts, and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) have pooled funding to address collective issues.

- **I am curious about ROSA’s relationship with BOEM. In efforts past, BOEM has been responsible for guiding and funding coastal research related activities like we are talking about now. Will BOEM be cooperative here, working with us?**
 - *BOEM has a seat on ROSA’s Advisory Council, and ROSA has been working in collaboration with BOEM from the outset. It is important to remember that the role of ROSA is to coordinate regional science that informs policy in many ways. The research science and regulatory processes are separate but connected. ROSA’s goal is to do the best science possible to inform the regulatory process and help advise other agencies on research priorities to focus on in future funding opportunities.*

Presentation: Fishery Science around Offshore Wind Science Updates

Following the presentation by ROSA Executive Director Lyndie Hice-Dunton, representatives from state and federal agencies shared updates on fisheries science around offshore wind.

- *Julia Livermore* from the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management (RIDEM), Marine Fisheries, and *Mike Pol* from the Massachusetts Department of Marine Fisheries shared updates on the five research projects funded through the Southern New England Regional Science Pilot, a collaboration between BOEM, the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, and RIDEM. Following her brief overview, Ms. Livermore clarified that the goal of the larval lobster study in southern New England (project 2) is to expand work that has already been done on the topic. An attendee suggested that the pilot could send out regular updates on their work through ROSA.
- *Brian Hooker* from BOEM shared an update on U.S. Outer Continental Shelf Renewable Energy, highlighting BOEM’s Environmental Studies Program, which solicited study ideas most recently in the winter of 2019. Mr. Hooker highlighted the studies that have been completed or are underway in the areas of benthic habitat, fish telemetry, electromagnetic field (EMF) impacts, hydrodynamic modeling, private recreational fishing, and commercial fishing, directing Members to the [Environmental Studies Program website](#) for information on specific reports.
- *Doug Christel* from the NOAA Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office (GARFO) and *Andy Lipsky* from the NOAA Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) shared a brief update on NMFS fisheries and wind research to date, highlighting NMFS’s initial efforts, in collaboration with BOEM and NEFSC, to adapt multi-species bottom trawl surveys as well as NMFS’s efforts to improve sea scallop surveys in the region. NMFS’s ongoing work also includes supporting interagency and international science/data collaborations and serving as technical assistance to advance research on impacts in the fishing community, including efforts to develop standardized socioeconomic impacts studies for each project and lease area.
- *Greg Lampman and Morgan Brunbauer* from NYSERDA reviewed key fisheries research projects, including collaborations with ROSA, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), Tetra Tech, and Renewables Consulting Group (RCG). NYSERDA also highlighted its other fisheries work,

including its efforts with the Fishermen’s Gateway, which aims to improve and standardize communication between OSW developers and fishermen.

- Dr. Hice-Dunton rounded out the updates by sharing information on ROSA’s Interim Fisheries Monitoring Working Group, in collaboration with NOAA Fisheries NEFSC and GARFO, which aims to build upon existing BOEM guidance to highlight best practices and elements to improve future monitoring plan submissions. She reviewed the process for how the guidance will developed and presented in a template-style format focused on three key aspects of fisheries monitoring: monitoring plan objectives, sampling design, and sampling and analytical methods.

Prior to breaking, attendees were invited to participate in a polling activity to share any remaining questions about the Council and ROSA as well as any key takeaways from the overview presentations.

Please see Appendix C for poll responses.

Presentation & Discussion: Creating the Research Advisory Board

ROSA Executive Director Lyndie Hice-Dunton shared a brief presentation on the creation of the Research Advisory Board (RAB), stressing that the role of the RAB is to help identify scientific needs based on Council direction and committee work; review scientific input from communities; help develop consistent protocols and tools; review and assist with developing RFPs; and to peer review research projects. She noted that the formation of the RAB will be guided by the Council, sharing the Membership Criteria as outlined in the ROSA Framework and the proposed approach for creating the Board:

- Amend criteria based on Advisory Council feedback
- Open application process for anyone meeting criteria- online form and/or submission of resume/CV
- Develop broad list of experts that can be called upon as needed
- Form RAB Executive Committee to provide leadership

Dr. Hice-Dunton emphasized that participation in any part of ROSA does not preclude anyone’s ability to apply for participation in ROSA-funded research, and conflict of interest policies will be developed to help provide guidance.

Below are attendee questions and comments that followed Dr. Hice-Dunton’s presentation. Attendee comments and questions are bolded and answers from ROSA are italicized.

- **When we are looking at socioeconomic impacts, we must be looking at the economic impacts on the fisheries side.**
- **Instead of selecting fisheries based on their ability to work in collaborative processes, we could focus on those with experience in subject matters related to fisheries and monitoring.**
- **I agree with the approach and what was mentioned earlier as well. Developing the guidance for fisheries monitoring might be useful, but it does seem like a lot of bureaucracy. If we do develop interim monitoring guidelines, if this is a process you want to run a peer review through, these are the people you access. It may make sense to develop bins of expertise to identify if the RAB is top-heavy in one area versus another.**

- **Is there a next governance level above the Board responsible for appointing people? If it's collectively accepted, that structure can be helpful in making sure that you have broad representation.**
 - *That is another question for ROSA to grapple with. There is potential that we can use the Executive Committee as folks that help refine the RAB's membership or potentially a subcommittee tasked with helping fill the RAB. The ROSA Board is focused on the fiduciary responsibilities and overall good operations. The Advisory Council is the body driving scientific efforts, including identifying science advisors.*
- **Where will be the place of fishermen or fishing associations in collaborative research? Will there be a shortlist of fishermen based on the size of the boat necessary?**
 - *The membership criteria language we are currently using to guide these efforts is pulled from the ROSA framework document, but it raised a similar question for me. In the Interim Fisheries Monitoring Work Group, we have three fishermen that work in collaborative research, and ROSA is certainly open to working with fishermen and fishing organizations with collaborative research experience.*
- **Can you provide a clearer picture of what the RAB could look like? Would we want to go directly to pool of developed expertise to find members?**
 - *The membership makeup of the RAB is still to be determined, and ROSA welcomes feedback on its criteria for membership and proposed process to source interested members. The first step will be for the Advisory Council to help refine the criteria and process before we send it out broadly. ROSA is interested to hear what folks think about how that process should function. Some things we may learn as we go.*

Breakout Discussions: Key regional fisheries and OSW research priorities

ROSA Executive Director Lyndie Hice-Dunton shared general feedback received to date on topics or concerns for regional fisheries and OSW research. She reviewed the types of research that ROSA may address, grouped by guidance, tools, and templates; project- or issue-specific research and monitoring; and integrated regional research and overarching questions.

Attendees then were organized into breakouts to address the following questions regarding potential research priorities for ROSA in the short and long term:

- What are specific topics and efforts ROSA could tackle in the next year (assuming there are some funds available)?
- What are bigger, longer-term, research projects ROSA should consider building toward?
- What is the role of ROSA in socio-economic research (where vessels are fishing, economic impact determinations, compensation calculation methodologies)?

Below is a brief synthesis of the results of this conversation by question. Attendees worked in six small groups (organized by Council Members, Council Alternates and ROSA Board Members, and other participants) to identify potential research priorities.

What are specific topics and efforts ROSA could tackle in the next year (assuming there are some funds available)?

Discussion groups identified various topics and efforts for ROSA to address in the short term and provided some guidance on how ROSA should do so. Key discussion threads included:

- **Baseline work:** The importance of baseline assessment work was raised by many attendees, from both an environmental perspective and a fisheries perspective. Pre-construction baseline data will be necessary to understand long-term impacts.
- **Build on existing efforts & resources:** ROSA should move forward from the Synthesis of the Science event in October 2020 and develop a process to identify, outline, and prioritize research needs (e.g., species/habitats of concern, significant effects, etc.) ROSA should also take advantage of the research opportunities presented by the two OSW turbines in Virginia.
- **Communicating clearly and effectively:** Attendees noted that ROSA will play a role in communicating findings out in an accessible manner for the fishing industry and others who are time limited. ROSA should consider using social media outlets and create science results summaries, describing the ‘So What?’ factor of each project – what do we know now, what do we still not know? how do results change policies?
- **Data management & standardization:** ROSA could have a role to play facilitating data sharing through setting protocols and formats.
- **Existing project inventory:** There is support for ROSA developing an inventory of existing projects to easily show what is going on where. This inventory could include cost, timing, and a detailed breakdown of what the results mean for fisheries and OSW. It was also noted that it will be important to explore what has been guiding research conducted to date (e.g., criteria from RFPs, how research priorities are set and projects selected, decision-makers).
- **Impact assessments:** ROSA could create a broad framework to look at impact assessments (e.g., build off RODEO). Any shorter-term ROSA efforts will likely need to be underpinned by longer term efforts to address questions of impacts and change over time. Attendees noted that there is no current requirement to mitigate impacts – no consistent mitigation requirements across states/agencies/projects.
- **Importance of taking action:** For some, the most important thing is getting data now through on-the-water, cooperative research. It was suggested that ROSA not get too hung up on a perfect data sharing model, as it needs to collect pre-construction data. ROSA should get its needs together and start acting, focusing on data warehousing later. One suggestion: ROSA could develop a streamlined RFP process using Massachusetts’ priorities as a basis for regional scale.
- **Monitoring guidelines & framework:** A regional monitoring framework should be designed to integrate project-scale monitoring efforts. One suggestion is that, for the monitoring guidelines to have any weight with agencies and others, they would need to be co-created with consensus. It will be important that ROSA has buy-in from permitting agencies. Clear communication of

needs and objectives as well as adequate funding will be required to bring a regional monitoring framework to fruition. A participant shared that ROSA should proceed cautiously about its commitment to weigh in on projects (“It’s one thing to weigh in, upon request, over a fisheries monitoring plan by Project X but quite another to be asked to review EIS submissions for a project”).

- **Surveying:** ROSA could take on the initial work around the conversion of current surveys to future surveys, given changes that will be necessitated by wind development; integration/calibration across current and future. ROSA could develop a list of key species stock assessments and ecosystem science products that will be affected by survey adaptations.
- **Trawl surveys:** ROSA could address standardized fishing gear for monitoring as the field moves away from large trawl surveys. ROSA could also address concerns of impacts on federal trawl surveys.
- **Turbine design, location, and impacts:** Attendees suggested that ROSA look into impacts from turbine noise and cables as well as the location of turbines (e.g., can the turbines be located where they won’t impact commercial fisheries? Rather than compensate/mitigate, instead locate where it will not be a problem). It was also noted that ROSA could address standardized tools for turbine structures or data infrastructure for LiDAR buoys.

What are bigger, longer-term, research projects ROSA should consider building toward?

Discussion groups identified various topics and efforts for ROSA to address in the long term and provided some guidance on how ROSA should do so. Key discussion threads included:

- **Climate change and oceanographic issues:** Concerns about the integration/analysis of climate change and its effects on fisheries with wind farm effects on fisheries were raised, as it will affect fisheries synergistically. ROSA should also focus on understanding broader oceanographic changes (e.g., wind loss, water column changes, circulation, particle motion [in the hearing effects sense] – concussive pressure). Example: <https://asa.scitation.org/doi/10.1121/1.5021594>
- **Cold pool:** ROSA should address research focused on monitoring the cold pool.
- **Cumulative effects:** Attendees highlighted the importance of ROSA understanding cumulative effects – including noise and EMF (e.g., how to measure and integrate multiple stressors, evaluate cumulative impacts, across larger areas and longer time periods). It was noted that both ecological and socio-economic impacts should be pursued.
- **Ecosystem services:** ROSA could have the potential to look at ecosystem services and things like integrated aquaculture.
- **Evolving OSW infrastructure:** Attendees noted that different formats/types of technology, including floating, will have different effects (hydrodynamic, ecological, etc.) compared to existing ones; larger turbines may also have different impacts given their spacing. In the long run, a cabled ocean observing system is really possible, but for who pays for it. This is something ROSA should focus on in the longer term.

- **Fisheries infrastructure:** ROSA should be exploring alternative gear types for fishing in arrays.
- **Long-lived species:** ROSA research would need to cover at least one life span of species, as we realistically only have ~24 months of pre-construction data.
- **Mitigation & downstream impacts:** ROSA should address mitigation at the state and federal waters scale and work on mitigation for long-term survey adaptations. It was noted that ROSA will need to be vigilant about identifying issues and expecting the unexpected, as there will be things we cannot anticipate now.
- **Other geographies:** ROSA should continue dialogues with its European colleagues to build on their knowledge. ROSA should also explore how to bring other U.S. regions into discussion without the process being unwieldy. In various regions/areas, ROSA should think carefully about having a range of studies to represent different environments – ideally would pilot installations to learn.
- **Setting priorities:** ROSA should set priorities for time, space, scale, and research areas in order to adequately allocate its resources and plan for funding cycles.

What is the role of ROSA in socio-economic research (where vessels are fishing, economic impact determinations, compensation calculation methodologies)?

Across discussion groups, it was noted that ROSA should have a role in socio-economic research, and participants shared numerous ideas about what that role could look like, with many highlighting the complexity of this issue, especially as it relates to measuring impacts and determining compensation structures. Key discussion threads included:

- It was suggested that socio-economic research should be a longer-term goal for ROSA, and the importance of ROSA having strong baseline data was emphasized.
- It was suggested that ROSA could function as a forum for discussion of socio-economic research but not weigh in on information presented. ROSA could also support socio-economic research through the administration of RFP processes.
- Alternatively, it was posited that ROSA could step into the role of collecting socio-economic data from fisheries and agencies, similar to how information is collected in the Fisheries Knowledge Trust.
- It was noted that ROSA could utilize the Fishermen Gateway for information on specific fishing locations to use during siting determinations in order to minimize displacement (e.g., Gulf of Maine lobster fishery).
- It was noted that ROSA should include impacts from transmission cables in any impact assessment.
- It was commented that ROSA should mind the need to maintain fisheries and fishing communities as a key priority.

Wrap Up & Next Steps

ROSA thanked Council Members and attendees for their time and participation, reminding them to attend the October 2020 Synthesis of the Science event. ROSA highlighted the work to come in November 2020 and early 2021, with the next Council meeting set for November 23, 2020, to discuss the outcomes of Advisory Council and Synthesis of the Science meetings.

ROSA Board of Directors Co-Chairs, Peter Hughes and Rachel Pachter, ended the meeting with brief closing remarks of thanks and anticipation for the work ahead.

Appendix A: Council Member Attendance

- Katie Almeida
- Michelle Bachman
- Crista Bank
- Chris Batsavage
- Robert Beal
- Rick Bellavance
- James Bennett
- Ellen Bolen
- Bonnie Brady
- Patrick Campfield
- Cassie Canastra
- Doug Christel
- Joe Cimino
- John Clark
- Jennifer Daniels
- Greg DeCelles
- Peter deFur
- Willy Goldsmith
- Peter Hughes
- Lane Johnston
- Pamela Lafreniere
- Gregory Lampman
- Kirk Larson
- Andy Lipsky
- Julia Livermore
- Frederick Mattera
- George Maynard
- Catherine McCall
- Rachel Pachter
- Thomas Paladino
- Cheri Patterson
- Michael Pierdinock
- Mike Pol
- Kathleen Reardon
- Eric Reid
- Robert Ruhle
- Sarah Schumann
- Guy Simmons
- Mike Sissenwine
- Joel Southall
- John Toth
- Paul (Wes) Townsend
- Mike Waine
- Kevin Wark

Appendix B: Poll results for “What are you most excited about for the ROSA Council to accomplish in the coming year?”

- Creating a guidance document and common set of standards for monitoring
- Identifying regional research priorities
- Identifying data gaps and creating studies to address them!
- Getting a handle on the research needed to assess cumulative and regional impacts of OSW on marine resources
- Identify data needs, informational gaps, and future work that can be done in a collaborative way.
- Targeted research objectives with specific study plans to satisfy those objectives.
- Advance the conversation but prioritizing the biggest concerns/risks and retiring others where appropriate.
- Effects on commercial fishing efforts
- Cooperative development of scientific approach
- Learning the process
- PROVIDE INPUT FOR RESPONSIBLE SITING OF WIND TURBINES
- Establish a process to prioritize regional science studies.
- Defining clear regional research goals.
- Collaborate to design effective and coherent scientific research and monitoring strategies
- Collaboration between science, regulations and public interest
- Developing *concrete* research recommendations to support co-existence of offshore wind and healthy (commercial and recreational) fisheries. Also finding ways to maintain NOAA's critical fisheries research/surveying efforts as wind comes online.
- Setting an agenda for regional scientific studies.
- Reaching consensus on a clear, prioritized research agenda
- Identifying some big picture questions and hypotheses that we can collectively work towards answering/investigating
- Identifying research needs to address issues impacting fishing industry stakeholders related to offshore wind energy.
- Scientific investigations by a range of organizations
- Establish consensus among stakeholders and give guidelines to all included
- Fisheries/OSW research priorities
- Establish standards for a regional approach to monitoring studies and an agreed upon method for data sharing.
- Identifying research needs
- Collaborative research across fisheries and industry

- Coming up with ideas to address knowledge gaps around offshore wind development and its impacts on the marine environment
- Becoming the central coordinating/collaboration body for OSW and fisheries.
- Facilitating research driven by fishing industry concerns, & operating as an independent organization that makes research and monitoring data publicly available
- collaboration on data gaps/needs and setting up guidance on fisheries monitoring programs, including data collection and format standards
- Much needed coordination among the many agencies and organizations working on wind!
- Coordination of research and monitoring of fisheries impacts resulting from offshore wind energy areas.
- To have local science be the backing for OSW standards in our area
- Answer unanswered questions regarding the true impact of OSW to traditional fishing grounds.
- Prioritize research to better understand fisheries impacts.
- Organizing regional studies related to wind energy
- An opportunity for the recreational for hire sector to inform science needs and offer our experience on the water each day.
- Communicating that ROSA is a shared, inclusive platform
- Achieving alignment/agreement amongst all key entities with regard to OSW related science/research that addresses questions/issues at appropriate scale.
- Research Advisory Board
- A better understanding of our aquatic environment and the relationship between the commercial fishing industry and wind energy developers.
- How we can meet the commercial and recreational fishing communities needs with all offshore development
- Identify parameters for research (e.g., hypothesis-based, identified metrics, statistical power) that should be done immediately in and around lease areas to facilitate identification of potential impacts.
- Establish sound protocols to facilitate positive (mutually beneficial) integration of offshore wind generators in our local marine environment.
- Synthesis and communication of existing fisheries science related to wind energy development. For example, North Sea/European science findings and fishery lessons learned. Identifying remaining science gaps to address in U.S. waters.
- Identifying current research work and identifying future needs.
- Initiate regional research, monitoring recommendations/guidance to inform pre-construction monitoring

- identifying options to address ongoing fisheries science concerns regarding wind impacts.
- Incorporate best science and fishery expertise to inform offshore wind energy development.
- Coordinated information on issues related to offshore wind and fisheries. I also look forward to the results of the research gaps analysis.
- To make certain that the science that is gathered is actually considered and utilized.
- Receive quality input from commercial fishermen and raise awareness among the industry about this effort and how they can shape it.
- Focus the questions about the fisheries impact of offshore wind
- Working with the fishing industry and science.
- advancing a regional understanding of the interaction between wind development and fisheries
- Updated compilation and consolidation of offshore wind and fisheries research
- Vetted and agreed to monitoring framework that will be used to guide osw developments
- Cooperation, useful research
- Regional based guidance on impact study designs
- Alignment on research priorities at a regional scale.
- Being able to identify regional research needs
- Protect wildlife
- Collaboration between industry and fisheries surveys to clearly define protocols and survey goals
- Answer some questions about potential ecological impacts of wind farms

Appendix C: Poll Results for Outstanding Questions & Takeaways from Overview Presentations

Outstanding questions about the Council or ROSA:

- How will decisions be made if consensus isn't reached?
- How will we come to final decisions/opinions?
- How can Massachusetts contribute to this effort, and how can Massachusetts benefit from this effort?
- I want to know if there will be more open meetings/if all the meetings will be open
- Too early to tell but how are we proposing to manage input from 40 +/- people?
- Concerned of long-term impact to pelagics and marine mammals prior to construction
- How to integrate state or project-based interests into a regional science framework
- What are the goals for the Advisory Council and how do they fit in with Research Council?
- None really - looking forward to "meeting" members that I don't already know.
- Who will conduct the research on the water and will the results be open to all?
- "What authority does ROSA actually have in guiding the development?"
- Who is funding these efforts?"
- I am new to the process and issues, I'm here to listen and learn.
- Will ROSA conduct any research directly or will it only identify needs, coordinate funding, and fund projects?
- Practical steps
- How will it interact/overlap with all of the research efforts going on along the east coast? How will it communicate its efforts/progress with the fishing community?
- Work in progress
- To identify research priorities, how will disagreements be addressed (voting/consensus/other?)
- How will the research objectives be prioritized?
- Process and functionality
- Will the AC be prioritizing research needs?
- Looking forward to seeing how the Council, two boards and subcommittees work cohesively.
- Future expectation regarding meeting schedule. How many meetings per year.?
- How will ROSA organized research be used in wind development process from permitting to operations?
- What will be asked of council members, time commitment.
- What will my role be? What can I do to help make this more successful
- What will be my role in representing Delaware on the ROSA Advisory Council?

- Will ROSA really have an impact?
- How do we ensure cross collaboration with other efforts
- How will they/we engage with other actors in the space?
- Information
- Thinking about it.
- Will the process work to support a complicated collaboration
- Where will collected data be housed
- How does it work
- Will ROSA or the council have any authority to ensure that protocols and implementation of data collection are followed

Key takeaways from presentations:

- The need for more research
- A lot of work has been done and is being done that we need to be familiar with. how do we stay up to speed?
- Studies seem focused on important topics
- There is LOT going on already, which is great, but looking forward to one central location for summaries and data sharing.
- Studies being conducted to address fishing community and science needs.
- There's a lot going on and a lot to track! But it's all good!
- There's a lot of research already underway
- Helpful to get the organizational picture
- There are many projects already planned or ongoing.
- Moving slowly in the right direction
- Understanding ROSA
- There is a lot of great research being done and there are strings of coordination between the projects. Looking forward to ROSA tightening those strings.
- This is just a beginning
- Can ROSA house a running list of the status of these research efforts? It would benefit to have this centralized to minimize duplication of effort
- It's fantastic to see so many entities working together
- I appreciate the efforts (both planned and underway) to ensure that data is standardized / interoperable. That would be a huge step forward for our region.
- There's a lot going on and it's not coherent, not sufficiently resourced, and ROSA could play a major role in helping to address linkages.
- There's a good foundation of information, studies and engagement from which to start.

- I am so excited about the template-style guidance! This is what we all need, and asap. Thank you for prioritizing this.
- There's a lot underway already and this a good overview of collaboration. How does fisheries science (not specific to OSW) feed in? Also data collected by developers?
- Lots of organizations (NMFS, BOEM, NYSERDA, etc.) means coordination will be key
- There are a lot of exciting research initiatives going on, but the timelines seem to indicate that in many instances the pace of development is faster than the pace of the research to inform that development...
- Lots of good research, but is there an overarching strategic plan. The guidance for monitoring was a small, but worthwhile step in that direction.
- ROSA is already fulfilling advisory role right out of the start gate. Regional impact study funding at oceanographic scale is a key future challenge.
- Research has started BUT development is progressing faster, we do not have a baseline for the activity ongoing. This promises to be a great tool for places other than southern NE. It will have no impact on fed reg reform = 5 year process.
- There is a lot of research already underway in various stages
- New OW & Fisheries research supported by BOEM and others is valuable in improving our learning curve in U.S. waters. Set high priority on adapting and maintaining existing fisheries surveys, and a medium priority on new surveys.
- Many different efforts are under way at present and I wish to see a list
- There are a lot of great projects happening - we need to figure out a way to integrate the results and making sure we are all collectively aware of major findings.
- There is a lot going on
- A lot of great research has already been funded. important to coordinate and avoid duplication
- Quite a bit of work and need for research coordination across federal and state
- A lot of work is already being done!