



## NEW BEDFORD PORT AUTHORITY

123 MacArthur Drive TEL (508) 961-3000  
New Bedford, MA 02740

[WWW.PORTOFNEWBEDFORD.ORG](http://WWW.PORTOFNEWBEDFORD.ORG)

February 7, 2023

### VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

[Comments@offshorewindpower.org](mailto:Comments@offshorewindpower.org)

RE: Regional Fund Administrator RFI

The Port of New Bedford is the most economically valuable fishing port in the country. It is also the home of the region's first purpose-built offshore wind ("OSW") shoreside servicing facility. This uniquely positions the New Bedford Port Authority ("NBPA") in addressing and commenting on the relationship between the two industries. New Bedford is committed to ensuring that offshore wind advances efficiently while continuing to promote and protect the continued success of commercial fishing enterprises. **There is no port in United States that has more interest, or has more at stake, than the port of New Bedford relative to this particular Regional Fund Administrator (RFA) Request for Information (RFI).**

Commercial fishing is a \$5.5 billion dollar industry in the United States and the Northeast alone is responsible for 30% of landings. New Bedford ex-vessel landings alone are almost half a billion dollars (\$451m in 2019) with over \$300 million from the scallop industry alone.

That number does not consider the countless jobs and shoreside economy supporting the industry. A 2019 economic impact study of the Port of New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbor conducted by Martin Associates and Foth-CLE Engineering Group calculated that 39,697 jobs and \$11 billion in total economic contribution are provided by our local seafood and commercial fishing industry. A total of \$162.8 million of direct, induced, and indirect state and local tax revenue was generated by processing activity at the Port of New Bedford with another \$391.1 million of federal taxes. In addition, \$228.3 million of state and local taxes and \$608.2 million federal taxes were supported due to economic activity of the related users using the Port of New Bedford.

As we detail further in these comments, New Bedford faces perhaps the greatest direct and indirect impacts from losses to commercial fishing resulting from the development of offshore wind than any other port in the northeast.

Currently there is no federal framework that requires offshore wind developers to compensate fishermen for the likely physical and economic damages they will incur. Those include gear loss, habitat degradation, loss of essential fishing grounds and new logistical or operational constraints in areas leased for wind farms — all of which will cause serious economic challenges to the fishing industry.

We support OSW along our coastline as an affordable, clean, and growing source of power and we will continue to ensure that the Port of New Bedford plays a critical role in its responsible development. We also commend offshore wind developers who have already taken steps to establish their own compensation programs for fisheries. Yet, the lack of clear, uniform, enforceable requirements will allow developers to take the least expensive path most favorable to them.

**To have a truly legitimate and sustainable fisheries compensation fund program, any proposed framework, and the corresponding administrative process to distribute the funds, must be codified in federal law through an act of Congress.** As an example, the Fishermen's Contingency Fund was established over forty years ago in the U.S. Treasury by *43 U.S. Code § 1842 – Fisherman's Contingency Fund* to compensate fishermen for economic and property losses caused by oil and gas obstructions on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf.

Just recently, Massachusetts Senator Ed Markey and Congressman Seth Moulton announced that they will introduce legislation similar to the aforementioned Fisherman's Contingency Fund that aims to address this issue. This legislative proposal is a welcome first step in ensuring there is a consistent and equitable system in place to assess, award and distribute funding for fishery compensation tied to offshore wind development. The proposed legislation also attempts to remedy the current state-by-state or project-by-project strategy for fishery compensation. A streamlined federal response is an excellent mechanism to codify the framework and goals that is being proposed in this (RFI). We also are cognizant that federal legislation must go through an extensive vetting process and may take upwards of a year to be enacted. Therefore, it is imperative that BOEM adopts the final version of this framework, in a timely manner, as guidance moving forward. One ongoing debate about such a mitigation and compensation program is the source of funds to capitalize the effort. Generally, it is presumed that a combination of future federal lease proceeds and additional contributions from offshore wind developers will fund the program. However, given that the federal government has already received in excess of \$5 billion from the previous offshore wind lease auctions, there is more than enough available funding to provide the initial capitalization of the program today. Indeed, the revenues the federal government has taken in should be the first funds made available for impacts resulting from this federal policy. It is an entirely appropriate use of those funds. Any other use or application of these revenues must only be considered after sufficient funding is allocated to address and mitigate the consequences of the leasing of federal land for offshore wind.

We recognize that federal legislation will likely be necessary in order to direct the US Treasury to allocate previously collected lease proceeds to the compensation program. Such a mechanism should be prioritized in order to provide immediate original capitalization of the compensation program, which can be added to from a share of future federal lease auction proceeds. This should be established and codified prior to seeking additional contributions from offshore wind developers to a compensation fund, given that they are the source of the billions of revenues the federal government has already collected.

## 1. Intended Purpose of a Compensation Program

We wholeheartedly agree with the intended purpose of a regional framework to advance a fisheries compensation fund. The development of offshore wind is moving along at a rapid pace with multiple lease areas in current development or anticipated in the coming years. Each of these developments are owned and operated by several different entities. The fishing community views offshore wind development in its entirety. Therefore, it is imperative that (1) an all-encompassing, simple, fair, and transparent mitigation fund is developed to lessen the burden on our fishermen. Members of the commercial fishing industry are already understandably concerned about offshore wind development and given the manner in which commercial fishing has been regulated by the federal government, they are skeptical of those agencies positioned to regulate offshore wind and its inevitable impacts.

The list of fundable activities presented in this document on (pg. 11) is an extensive and appropriate measure of the compensatory actions. Based on our experiences here in the Port New Bedford, we suggest that cooperative research, support for participation in the management process, and funding to offset devaluation or loss of income are the most important activities to focus on. Furthermore, we urge you to address the issue of the probable increase in insurance costs or the potential of loss of access to insurance within the leased wind areas as well as consider the following fundable actions in addition to the activities listed in the (RFI):

- Assist in providing capital/funding for marketing campaigns to promote fishery products to increase demand for locally-produced food and increase fisheries' viability and profitability;
- Subsidies in the form of a fixed reduction of fuel prices to reduce fuel costs to fisherman and alleviate potential wind farm impacts to profitability;
- Additional/supplemental employment opportunities to fisherman as guards/patrols, data collectors for research & environmental assessments and other services (joint data collection/impact studies);
- Coordinating construction schedule taking into account high use areas, seasonality, and closure periods;
- Financial support for fisheries enhancement programs. Mitigation shouldn't end and compensation begin after project siting measures have been accomplished;
- Port infrastructure to prepare for offshore wind and maintaining the structural resources for the fishing industry.

We recommend that the scoping document state that the Regional Fund Administrator shall, rather than "could" expand its scope under this framework to fund transition, adaptation, and resilience as it is unclear when, or if, additional funds will become available in the future.

We continue to encourage extensive coordination and collaboration with fishing industry stakeholders to expand the scope of this program based on data, research and real-life experiences, rather than simply relying on National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) defined impacts. This program must proactively be developed to understand the on-going needs of the fishing community and build in the flexibility needed to address unforeseen impacts that are inevitable with any new industry.

## 2. Anticipated Losses and Costs

We agree with this all-encompassing list of potential lost revenue (Table 1). Yet, we presume the explanation for gear loss and associated lost fishing not being included is that gear loss programs are already established and being managed by the early OSW developers themselves. This may prove to be problematic as the fishing industry views offshore wind in its entirety. Most fishermen do not – and should not be expected to – discern between each separate OSW wind project area. The burden of time, effort and process should not fall on fishermen to identify the separate and appropriate program of each developer which applies based on the location of gear loss or damage. Any gear loss program already established should be a shared standardization under the same umbrella; a collaborative plan for damage to fishing gear from structures or cables, with an appropriate protocol for proof of damage, cost, down time, etc. Furthermore, it must be made clear that any gear loss or loss of fishing is eligible for compensation during the construction and decommissioning phase of these projects as well.

One of our biggest concerns is the up or downstream effects to shoreside businesses and the potential devaluation of these businesses. This, coupled with ex-vessel landings, will be a major potential lost revenue that although complicated, must be defined appropriately. Again, it important to develop a proper economic multiplier of ex-vessel landings to cover shoreside income loss based on the cumulative effects of all east coast OSW development. With over 30 seafood processing businesses and a robust array of warehouses, fuel, ice houses, shipyards, settlement houses, legal and other professional support services, mechanics and distributors, the Port of New Bedford sees over 150 out of state fishing vessels from Maine to North Carolina land their catch here in our Port. These upstream and downstream businesses are part of the entire seafood supply chain, dependent on harvests from areas being converted for OSW, and should not be undervalued. **Shoreside income loss determinations must be analyzed on a port-by-port basis based upon the actual losses incurred, not geographic proximity to a particular project.**

The clearest justification for a port-based impact and compensation analysis can be seen in the development of the wind areas in the New York Bight. While those developments will be offshore of New York and New Jersey, and the electricity generated will go to those states as well, the fishing impacts to those two states will be negligible. The Bight is home to some of the most prosperous scallop fishing grounds, which are harvested to vast degree by fishing vessels from New Bedford, Massachusetts. As we summarize later in this comment letter, the percentage value of landings from this area in New Bedford dwarfs any other port in the region. Thus, a state-by-state approach for compensation would not only disproportionately reward certain states, but it could also have a devastating impact on the ports and communities that will bear the brunt of losses caused by offshore wind development.

Although touched upon in this RFI, it is important to note that there will also be indirect losses from OSW development. Most notably, to fully reach the Biden Administration's climate change goals there would need to be 25-30 ports to take part in marshaling, construction and operations and maintenance activities. Although we have seen investment on the federal and state level for infrastructure improvements, build-out of these facilities is becoming an expensive

proposition, particularly with the technological evolution of the industry requiring ever changing shoreside capabilities – ever heavier load bearing, vastly more open-air laydown space, larger manufacturing facilities to name a few. Furthermore, infrastructure improvements are vital to find and prepare enough space and resources for our fishing industry to continue to thrive. Financial assistance from OSW developers for port infrastructure should be part of any compensation program.

On another note, we suggest that the RFI, and any guidelines BOEM develops for that matter, should amend the definition, or avoid the use of the word “decommission.” The word “decommission” as used in BOEM’s regulations suggests that these wind lease areas will be removed from service after some period and the seabed returned to its original pre-construction state. While this technically, in a vacuum, may be correct, we are sure that if OSW development is as successful as we hope, the structures will be replaced with new technically advanced assemblies. “Decommission” gives a false sense to the fishing industry, and others, that OSW will cease to exist after 30 or so years. It also suggests a massive deconstruction and removal effort that in itself will likely take decades – effectively the reverse of all the current construction methods and steps – and generate an entirely new wave of disruption and loss to the commercial fishing industry and the ocean environment – likely requiring its own stand-alone compensation program at that time.

### **3. Regional Geographic Scope**

We believe a regional or cumulative approach to fund administration is essential as we continue to stress that an individual payor (developer), each with their own rules goals, will seek the least costly and burdensome system of mitigation compensation. The very nature of commercial offshore fishing is a regional one. Therefore, a regional approach, although imperfect, is the best chance to achieve efficiency and effectiveness. This regional approach must be unified in the sense that it is fairly based on actual impact on fisheries, rather than a “one size fits all” model or equal distribution. As aforementioned, distribution models must be calculated on a port-by-port foundation based on landings, data, economic output, and employment. Those most affected shall be prioritized for mitigation and compensatory actions.

A single-project approach is fundamentally deficient because cumulative impacts of multiple OSW developments across our entire coastline, will produce collective impacts to fishing industries and the communities supporting them, not to mention the regional biological effects on our collective ocean resources. Impacts will only grow in scope and force as more plans are built out.

### **4. A Unified Regional Fund**

We have concluded, based on our extensive outreach to the fishing community and relevant stakeholders, that, separate, project-by-project approaches simply would not be feasible or advance the desired goals the fishing industry is seeking. A common set of rules and procedures established by this process would not only minimize the burden of fishermen seeking compensation but will give OSW developers clear expectations for planning and development

purposes. Such a regional fund would also rid them of the administrative burden of distributing appropriate compensation to the relevant parties. A unified “one stop shop” will prove advantageous to the fishing industry and the offshore wind industry, alike. Ease of participation and use will also likely reduce the potential for legal conflicts between the wind industry and commercial fishing. Furthermore, separate fund categories under this unified regional fund may prove to be more practical by delineating between mitigation and compensation directly to fishermen, and funds directed to shoreside businesses and research development (i.e an Innovation Fund). In fact, as a feature of Vineyard Wind’s Fisheries Mitigation Plan, agreed to be the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was a Fisheries Innovation Fund created to promote co-existence between offshore wind development and longstanding fishing activities focused on shoreside businesses, new technologies, and studies on the impact to fishery resources. This may serve as a model for the region as whole. <https://www.mass.gov/doc/5212020-memorandum-of-agreement-vineyard-wind-1-fisheries-mitigation/download>

Similar to the impacts on landings, the impacts to shoreside businesses will be disproportionately in ports that rely heavily on fishing grounds in particular lease areas that may be geographically distant from those ports. As mentioned above, the clearest example is the fishing grounds in the NY Bight. Reductions in either access to the areas or depletion of the species to be harvested, will have a direct negative impact on the processors, fuel, and other services in the Port of New Bedford.

## **5. Key Qualities of an Administrator**

By managing and distributing fisheries compensatory mitigation funds, and administrator must have extensive fishing industry experience knowledge and understanding of the overall impacts offshore wind will have on fishermen and the ecosystems they rely on. To have the credibility in the eyes of the stakeholders, and those most affected, is the best means to have sustainability, for both industries, for the foreseeable future. Any administrator must be seen by the fishing industry as detached sufficiently from the federal regulatory structure in order to be “fair” in the administration of the funds. Commercial fishing is one of the most heavily regulated industries, the more an administrator is tied to either BOEM, NOAA or NMFS, the less the fishermen will trust the process.

## **6. Key Tasks of an Administrator**

We acknowledge that the main task of a regional fund administrator is to manage the “money in money out” aspect of the program. In doing so, we endorse Option 1 (pg.16) Design First, Hire Second protocols. It is our opinion that it will be difficult to find a fund administrator with the extensive experience necessary to finalize how the compensation fund would operate. We have faith that the states, in consultation with the fishing industry, OSW wind developers, BOEM, NOAA and the research community can continue to collaboratively expand on the work that has already been done. All while continuing to have flexibility by engaging in robust stakeholder engagement, driven by the fishing industry and those supporting mitigating the impacts OSW will have on the industry. Establishing a governing board to which the administrator would

report to and have the power to hear and rule on appeals, would be preferable as part of this overall program.

It is also critical that the tasks set forth by the states to the administrator, in regard to funding, must have the force and effect of law. One-time lump sum payments to this fund will not cover all the anticipated losses and costs proposed in the RFI and other effects that may be added based on comments received from this RFI. Sources of funding, whether through developers alone, or in conjunction with Congressional action, must be flexible, reliable and on-going. It will take years to completely understand the biological, social, and economic impacts OSW wind development will have on the fishing community and those that rely on its output.

## **7. Technical Considerations for Fund Administration and a Compensation Framework**

### **7.1 Eligibility for Compensation**

Eligibility for compensation must begin and end with life of the project(s), from the awarding of leases until fisheries are no longer affected. We note that BOEM has frequently attempted to limit financial compensation to fishermen to a period of five (5) years after the project is in operation. This is based on a clear misunderstanding of the impact of offshore wind on commercial fishing and a misplaced notion that fishermen can simply “adapt” and fish somewhere else. Study after study has indicated that fishermen have been catching the same species in the same places for hundreds of years. Fishermen are the displaced prior user of the OCS, it should not be up to them to “adapt” to an encroachment on their use. There is no new habitat being created for the fishermen to fish in. Quite the opposite is true for the scallop industry, wind installations and their associated scour pads are creating habitat for scallop predators where it did not exist before. Developers are not going to agree to pay for lost revenue for the duration of a project and fishermen are not going to “adapt” within 5 years. We suggest a payment system that compensates fully for lost income for a period of at least ten (10) years after project completion and then diminishes by a percentage each year thereafter.

It is also vital that the project area for the purposes of compensation also include marshalling, staging, construction, and operations and maintenance areas (ports). Eligibility for compensation, to be determined through this framework, must include the potential claimants listed in (7.1) as well municipalities and other stakeholders who support and provide resources for the fishing industry through community benefit agreements.

### **7.2 Evidence of Impacts and Burden of Proof**

We strongly believe that the “burden of proof” must lie with developers to prove to the fishing community that they are not causing environmental or economic harm on a macro level (minus gear-loss claims). To the greatest extent possible this must be done before development is allowed to proceed further. The uncertainty about the total impacts of wind energy development is a major reason why the fishing industry distrusts the current process. The fishing industry

deserves a complete understanding and sound science of the impacts on habitats, safety and navigation, and the social and economic impacts to fisheries and the ports they rely on. With that said, research and data development must be funded by OSW yet not driven by OSW. It is important that funding from all regional developments shall go to a collective research strategy utilizing our academic institutions, the experiences and knowledge of our fishing communities, research that has and will be conducted by developers, as well as NOAA. Having one unified data collection process will address limitations to singular methodologies that are currently being used absent of the advent of OSW development.

It is important that any base line for compensation be created with the input of the fishing industry and not based on the data provided by the developers or BOEM. In several EIS statements, BOEM has stated that the “no-build” option for a project will have the same impact on commercial fishing as the full build. BOEM and the developers base this assertion on what they perceive as the inevitable decline of commercial fishing because of NOAA regulations, offshore development and climate change. This mentality cannot be a part of any compensation structure. As noted above, independent ongoing scientific surveys and research must be a part of the equation. Fishermen will respect the research if it is done correctly. Fishermen will not participate in an exercise where they are presented with an attempt to lessen the amount paid to them based upon speculation.

### **7.3 Administrative Fees**

Preferably, administrative fees should be covered outside of the mitigation funds as suggested in the RFI. Monies set aside for administrative purposes should be built into the overall agreement between the state and developer, subject to revision on an agreed upon time frame. We would have some concern in funding administrative fees through an escrow account where compensation funds are deposited, in the sense that there is currently uncertainty in the funding mechanisms and length of the funding commitments. There should be no fees associated with the making of a claim. It should not cost the fishermen to get payment for their own lost income. There may be a fee for an appeal if necessary.

### **7.4 Data Verification**

Vessel specific information can be obtained by each vessel from NOAA and submitted to the administrator to demonstrate a catch history in the area in question and any revenue decline associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of any wind area (as stated earlier, the definition of wind area for the purposes of compensation must, at a minimum, include all abutting areas). As indicated in the scoping document, there may need to be coordination with NOAA on this as any compensation fund based on NOAA data will likely tax already limited NOAA resources. It does not appear to be possible to leave it to the states to handle data verification as the state entities involved may not have access to the full range of data necessary for a claim. While we agree that existing entities must be used for the data, it is also probable that state entities do not have the statutory authority to share data with the administrator or participate in the fund administration.



## **8. Appeals Process**

Any appeal of the decision of an administrator should go to a review board or committee. The final appeal of a decision could be an arbitrator. Any application for compensation from the fund could contain an agreement by both the developer and fisherman to arbitration as the final decision.

## **9. Governance Structure**

### **9.1 Governing Board Membership**

In this interest of credibility and transparency we endorse (Option #3). A co-led governing board:

Membership on the board should be made up of representatives for all the regional states. It is important to note that the impact of offshore wind is not necessarily geographic. In other words, the true impact of any particular project, for the purposes of compensation, may be felt several states away from the state closest to the installation. Care must be taken in setting up the structure of the governing board to allow those states that suffer substantially more impact with a weighted vote. Perhaps an increased number of seats could go to the states most effected based on number of commercial fishing vessels and percentage of landings in ports relative to their state compared to others.

### **9.2 Governing Board Relation to the Regional Fund Administrator**

It is difficult to conceive of an existing entity that would possess all the traits required to be an administrator. It is far more likely that there is an entity that has some of the traits and can learn the rest. Trusts are a good starting point. Non-profits are more problematic as they frequently have a mission statement that could place them in conflict with one of the stakeholders in the process. It seems that the intent would be to issue an RFP for an administrator to be initially funded by the states. Several states have prohibitions on funding and appropriations for non-profits and other entities. This may not be a sustainable model unless codified at both the federal and state level.

### **9.3 Limitations**

The ideal place for requiring the developers to compensate for losses by other users of the OCS would have been in the leases themselves but we are now 23 leases into the offshore wind lease program and there is no fisheries mitigation framework or funding. As we have stated earlier, the ideal mechanism for fisheries compensation is some form of codification on the federal level. Absent that, cooperation from the developers and BOEM to agree to language in a project's COP that requires participation in the Regional Administrator framework would be extremely helpful.

BOEM possesses the statutory authority to review compliance with a COP, and the associated assumptions regarding impact therein, on a yearly basis or such other time period they decide. A commitment by BOEM to building reference to the Administrator framework would give the states a strong enforcement and funding mechanism. BOEM has been clear that they cannot “compel” payment or hold the funds, but they can certainly incorporate compliance with outside compensation mechanisms.

As you know, the primary source of state level influence on the offshore wind developers is the consistency analysis under the EIS framework. A secondary area of influence is the power purchase bidding and contracting mechanisms. The one glaring problem with this is that the process tends to be geographically centered. That is, the state(s) with the most influence are closest in distance to the area they are commenting on or contracting with. In the case of compensation for lost revenue from commercial fishing, geography has little to do with the impact of the loss. The bulk of the dollar value of loss for the areas in the NY bight or other areas off of New York and New Jersey will occur in Massachusetts in the Port of New Bedford. Case in point, a 2018 Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management study, *Spatiotemporal and Economic Analysis of VMS Data – NY Call Areas* tabulates the landings from the NY Bight Call Areas, and breaks down the impacts by port for the Fairways North, Fairways South and Hudson North areas (due to data limitations, RI DEM did not analyze the Hudson South area). The volume of fish from these areas that were landed in New Bedford speaks directly to the threat these wind areas would have on New Bedford's maritime economy:

**Revenue Impacts of NY Bight Call Areas to New Bedford Landings**

(RI DEM *Spatiotemporal and Economic Analysis of VMS Data – NY Call Areas*, 2018)

Call area	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total
Fairways North	\$4,354,076.82	\$1,225,436.15	\$2,577,906.87	\$7,257,608.36	\$1,012,223.80	\$2,365,528.85	\$18,792,781
Fairways South	\$1,872,925.94	\$4,548,157.70	\$1,121,143.81	\$4,486,961.36	\$598,665.44	\$515,296.51	\$13,143,151
Hudson North	\$15,021,268.6	\$8,473,892.11	\$3,938,295.05	\$32,942,373.5	\$6,351,741.71	\$24,542,965.75*	\$91,270,541
						<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$123,206,473</b>

\*2016 includes \$2,541,670.25 of landings from the Town of Fairhaven, MA

While the RI DEM study does not have data on the Hudson South area, Appendix C of the NOAA letter estimates that the six-year landings for Hudson South area was \$115,379,000.<sup>1</sup> Of that total, \$98,532,000 (85%) of the revenue was derived from scallops, which are primarily offloaded in New Bedford. [RIDEM Division of Marine Fisheries](#)

---

It is also important to note that any leverage the states have over the developers tends to be short lived. It is not ongoing leverage throughout the life of the project. For this reason, the assumption, absent federal codification or cooperation, must be that there will be only one future “bite at the apple” when it comes to funding for fisheries mitigation from the developers. Any initial funding must be sufficient to cover all of the mitigation necessary from the beginning. As stated above, it should be the first priority of previously generated lease proceeds to capitalize the program. Once there is no leverage, there is no compelling reason for the developers to keep putting money in once they are up and running. All future lease auctions must clearly define the share of revenues allocated to the compensation program first, before any other budget use of the funds can be approved.

#### **9.4 Advisory Boards, Committee or Panels**

The idea of advisory boards, committees or panels is a good one. There are two issues to address in connection with such entities:

- The panels in question should be comprised of representatives of the fisheries and ports most affected by the wind area in question.
- Care must be taken to make sure that the make-up of any panel has sufficient representation that has the best interests of fishermen as their primary interest. Frequently there is an assumption that entities like NOAA, NMFS, Regional Management Councils, and state DMF departments have the interests of fishermen at heart. While many of these agencies consider the interests of fishermen, their primary interest is fish, not fishermen.

#### **Conclusion**

Fishermen across the United States, and especially here in the Northeast, strongly value their way of life and the resources available to make a good, honest living. It goes without saying that there is fear of the unknown when it comes the disruptions offshore wind development will have on their industry. It is incumbent on us to develop a regional framework for mitigation, which may hopefully be codified into a national framework. This framework includes ongoing scientific and economic analyses, technical aspects of fishery management and ecosystems, and socio-economic values, all with the direct and substantial participation of our fishermen. Lastly, any mitigation discussions must consider the protection of the workers, on the vessels, in the processing facilities, throughout shoreside businesses, and the communities supporting them

Impacts from offshore wind will only grow in scope and intensity as more projects are built out. A single-project mitigation approach is fundamentally deficient since cumulative effects of multiple OSW developments across a region will produce combined impacts more severe than the additive effects of any one single project. A cumulative approach should be taken to all components of individual projects from siting to mitigation. We are pleased that this (9) state initiative, establishing a framework for a regional fisheries compensation fund, is at this stage and are appreciative for the opportunity to take part in these discussions. We remain available to

assist in any way moving forward. Most importantly, we hope that the work you are doing here developing this important framework will act as a basis for future Congressional action.

As the Executive Director of the New Bedford Port Authority, please accept these comments on behalf of the City and Port of New Bedford.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "G. M. Carr". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of each name being capitalized and prominent.

**Gordon M. Carr**  
Executive Director  
New Bedford Port Authority

Cc:

Mayor Jonathan Mitchell

Senator Ed Markey

Senator Elizabeth Warren

Congressman William Keating

Congressman Seth Moulton

Governor Maura Healey

Secretary Rebecca Tepper, MA Exec. Office of Energy & Env't Affairs