

**Errata for the
Revolution Wind Farm and Revolution Wind Export Cable Project
Final Environmental Impact Statement**

August 15, 2023

**Bureau of Ocean Energy Management
Office of Renewable Energy Programs**

Errata Overview

The following errata to the Revolution Wind Farm and Revolution Wind Export Cable Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) represent corrections related to technical errors, omissions, or clarifications.

1. FEIS, Executive Summary, Page ES-11 of Table ES-2. Comparison of Alternatives and Overall Cumulative Impacts by Alternative:

Addition of orange coloration for cells and tracked changes text “**(Major** adverse for NARW)” for the Marine Mammals No Action Alternative Cumulative impact and “**(Major** adverse for NARW)” for all other Marine Mammals action alternatives Cumulative impacts to include species-specific information for North Atlantic right whale (NARW) that is presented in Ch. 3.15. The corrected table with redlined edited text now reads:

Table ES-2. Comparison of Alternatives and Overall Cumulative Impacts by Alternative

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Air quality – Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current air quality trends and sources of air pollution would be moderate adverse.	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*
Air quality: – Cumulative impacts*	Minor to moderate adverse; minor to moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Bats: Alternative impacts	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be negligible adverse.	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse
Bats: Cumulative impacts	Negligible adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Benthic habitat and invertebrates: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be minor to moderate adverse.	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*
Benthic habitat and invertebrates: Cumulative impacts*	Minor to moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*
Birds: Alternative impacts	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Birds: Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Coastal habitats and fauna: Alternative impacts	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be negligible adverse.	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse
Coastal habitats and fauna: Cumulative impacts	Negligible to minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Commercial fisheries and for-hire recreational fishing: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current trends would be moderate to major adverse for commercial fisheries and minor to moderate adverse and minor beneficial for for-hire recreational fishing.*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*
Commercial fisheries and for-hire recreational fishing: Cumulative impacts*	Moderate to major adverse for commercial fisheries; minor to moderate adverse and minor beneficial for for-hire recreational fishing*	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse
Cultural resources: Alternative impacts	Continuation of individual IPF impacts to cultural resources from past and current activities would be negligible to major negative. [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]
Cultural resources: Cumulative impacts	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]
Demographics, employment, and economics: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current trends would be moderate to major adverse and minor to moderate beneficial.*	Negligible to moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*
Demographics, employment, and economics: Cumulative impacts*	Major adverse; minor to moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*
Environmental justice: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current trends would be negligible to major adverse and negligible to moderate beneficial.*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*
Environmental justice: Cumulative impacts	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse
Finfish and essential fish habitat: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be moderate adverse.	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*
Finfish and essential fish habitat: Cumulative impacts*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Land use and coastal infrastructure: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current trends would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*
Land use and coastal infrastructure: Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Marine mammals: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be moderate adverse for all marine mammals except for the North Atlantic right whale (NARW). Continuation of population trends and human-caused stressors would be major for NARW.	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*
Marine mammals: Cumulative impacts*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)
Navigation and vessel traffic: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be minor to moderate adverse.	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Minor to moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Minor to moderate adverse
Navigation and vessel traffic: Cumulative impacts	Minor to moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Other marine uses: aviation and air traffic: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be negligible adverse.	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse
Other marine uses: aviation and air traffic: Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Other marine uses: land-based radar: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be negligible adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Other marine uses: land-based radar: Cumulative impacts	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Other marine uses: military and national security: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be negligible adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Other marine uses: military and national security: Cumulative impacts	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Other marine uses: scientific research and surveys: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be moderate adverse.	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse
Other marine uses: scientific research and surveys: Cumulative impacts	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse
Other marine uses: undersea cables: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be negligible adverse.	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse
Other marine uses: undersea cables: Cumulative impacts	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse
Recreation and tourism: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Recreation and tourism – Cumulative impacts*	Minor adverse	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*
Sea turtles: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*
Sea turtles: Cumulative impacts*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Visual resources: Alternative impacts	Continuation of impacts to viewsheds from past and current activities would be negligible to moderate adverse.	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse
Visual resources: Cumulative impacts	Moderate adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse
Water quality – Alternative impacts	Continuation of current water quality trends and sources of pollution would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Water quality – Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Wetlands and non-tidal waters: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current wetland resources trends and sources of pollution would be negligible adverse.	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse
Wetlands and non-tidal waters: Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse

* Resources with beneficial impacts are denoted by an asterisk, and alternatives within those resource rows with beneficial impacts are denoted by a bolded blue outline and an asterisk.

† The term “adverse” has a specific meaning under NHPA Section 106 regulations (in 36 CFR 800.5) and, therefore, to remove confusion in the Cultural Resources section, the terms “negative” and “beneficial” are used in the identification of impacts under NEPA.

2. FEIS, Section 2.3.1, Page 2-89: Table 2.3-1. Comparison of Alternatives and Overall Cumulative Impacts by Alternative:

Addition of orange coloration for cells and tracked changes text “**(Major** adverse for NARW)” for the Marine Mammals No Action Alternative Cumulative impacts and “**(Major** adverse for NARW)” for all other Marine Mammals action alternatives Cumulative impacts to include species-specific information for NARW that is presented in Chapter 3.15. The corrected table with redlined edited text now reads:

Table 2.3 1. Comparison of Alternatives and Overall Cumulative Impacts by Alternative

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Air quality – Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current air quality trends and sources of air pollution would be moderate adverse.	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*
Air quality: – Cumulative impacts*	Minor to moderate adverse; minor to moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Bats: Alternative impacts	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be negligible adverse.	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse
Bats: Cumulative impacts	Negligible adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Benthic habitat and invertebrates: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be minor to moderate adverse.	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*
Benthic habitat and invertebrates: Cumulative impacts*	Minor to moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*
Birds: Alternative impacts	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Birds: Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Coastal habitats and fauna: Alternative impacts	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be negligible adverse.	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse
Coastal habitats and fauna: Cumulative impacts	Negligible to minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Commercial fisheries and for-hire recreational fishing: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current trends would be moderate to major adverse for commercial fisheries and minor to moderate adverse and minor beneficial for for-hire recreational fishing.*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*	Negligible to major adverse; minor beneficial*
Commercial fisheries and for-hire recreational fishing: Cumulative impacts*	Moderate to major adverse for commercial fisheries; minor to moderate adverse and minor beneficial for for-hire recreational fishing*	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse
Cultural resources: Alternative impacts	Continuation of individual IPF impacts to cultural resources from past and current activities would be negligible to major negative. [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]
Cultural resources: Cumulative impacts	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]	Negligible to major negative [†]
Demographics, employment, and economics: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current trends would be moderate to major adverse and minor to moderate beneficial.*	Negligible to moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*	Minor beneficial*
Demographics, employment, and economics: Cumulative impacts*	Major adverse; minor to moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*	Major adverse; moderate beneficial*
Environmental justice: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current trends would be negligible to major adverse and negligible to moderate beneficial.*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*	Minor to moderate adverse; negligible to moderate beneficial*
Environmental justice: Cumulative impacts	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse
Finfish and essential fish habitat: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be moderate adverse.	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*
Finfish and essential fish habitat: Cumulative impacts*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*	Moderate adverse; moderate beneficial*

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Land use and coastal infrastructure: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of current trends would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*
Land use and coastal infrastructure: Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Marine mammals: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be moderate adverse for all marine mammals except for the North Atlantic right whale (NARW). Continuation of population trends and human-caused stressors would be major for NARW.	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial*
Marine mammals: Cumulative impacts*	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)	Moderate adverse; minor beneficial* (Major adverse for NARW)
Navigation and vessel traffic: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be minor to moderate adverse.	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Minor to moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Minor to moderate adverse
Navigation and vessel traffic: Cumulative impacts	Minor to moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Other marine uses: aviation and air traffic: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be negligible adverse.	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse
Other marine uses: aviation and air traffic: Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Other marine uses: land-based radar: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be negligible adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Other marine uses: land-based radar: Cumulative impacts	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Other marine uses: military and national security: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be negligible adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Other marine uses: military and national security: Cumulative impacts	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse	Moderate adverse
Other marine uses: scientific research and surveys: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be moderate adverse.	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse
Other marine uses: scientific research and surveys: Cumulative impacts	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse	Major adverse
Other marine uses: undersea cables: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be negligible adverse.	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse
Other marine uses: undersea cables: Cumulative impacts	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse	Negligible adverse
Recreation and tourism: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current trends would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Recreation and tourism – Cumulative impacts*	Minor adverse	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*
Sea turtles: Alternative impacts*	Continuation of population trends and continuation of effects to species from natural and human-caused stressors would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*
Sea turtles: Cumulative impacts*	Minor adverse; minor beneficial*	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Visual resources: Alternative impacts	Continuation of impacts to viewsheds from past and current activities would be negligible to moderate adverse.	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse
Visual resources: Cumulative impacts	Moderate adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse	Negligible to major adverse
Water quality – Alternative impacts	Continuation of current water quality trends and sources of pollution would be minor adverse.	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse
Water quality – Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse

Resource	Alternative A (No Action Alternative)	Alternative B (Proposed Action)	Alternative C (Habitat Alternative)	Alternative D (Transit Alternative)	Alternative E (Viewshed Alternative)	Alternative F (Higher Capacity Turbine Alternative)	Alternative G (Preferred Alternative)
Wetlands and non-tidal waters: Alternative impacts	Continuation of current wetland resources trends and sources of pollution would be negligible adverse.	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse	Negligible to minor adverse
Wetlands and non-tidal waters: Cumulative impacts	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse	Minor adverse

* Resources with beneficial impacts are denoted by an asterisk, and alternatives within those resource rows with beneficial impacts are denoted by a bolded blue outline and an asterisk.

† The term “adverse” has a specific meaning under NHPA Section 106 regulations (in 36 CFR 800.5) and, therefore, to remove confusion in the Cultural Resources section, the terms “negative” and “beneficial” are used in the identification of impacts under NEPA.

3. FEIS, Section 3.5.2.6, Mitigation, Table 3.5-2. Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations for Bats (Appendix F, Table F-2), Mitigation Measure: Avian and bat monitoring program Page 3.5-27:

In the fourth row, Avian and bat monitoring program, description column, item a. multiple edits to clarify which tasks “must” occur and which tasks “may” occur. Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“a. Monitoring. Revolution Wind ~~must~~1) must install acoustic monitoring devices for bats for 2 years; 2) must install Motus receivers within the wind farm; 3) may include refurbishment of up to two onshore Motus receiver stations ~~and may include;~~4) providinge funding for up to 150 Motus tags per year for up to 3 consecutive years, or equivalent; and ~~4~~5) conduct a 1- to 2-year cross-project radar study to measure migrant flux rates, flight heights, and marine bird avoidance.”

4. FEIS, Section 3.7.2.6, Table 3.7-3. Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations for Birds (Appendix F, Table F-2), Mitigation Measure: Avian and bat monitoring program, Page 3.7-37:

In the fourth row, Avian and bat monitoring program, description column, item a. multiple edits to clarify which tasks “must” occur and which tasks “may” occur. Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“a. Monitoring. Revolution Wind ~~must~~1) must install acoustic monitoring devices for bats for 2 years; 2) must install Motus receivers within the wind farm; 3) may include refurbishment of up to two onshore Motus receiver stations ~~and may include;~~4) providinge funding for up to 150 Motus tags per year for up to 3 consecutive years, or equivalent; and ~~4~~5) conduct a 1- to 2-year cross-project radar study to measure migrant flux rates, flight heights, and marine bird avoidance.”

5. FEIS, Section 3.9.2.6, Mitigation, Table 3.9-30. Additional Mitigation and Monitoring Measures for Commercial Fisheries and For-Hire Recreational Fishing (Appendix F, Table F-3), Mitigation Measure: Federal survey mitigation guidance, page 3.9-92:

Deletion of “eight” and replace text with “nine” in the first sentence and the third sentence of first paragraph and addition of text to end of second sentence in second paragraph at end of last sentence to add “; and (i) seal survey.” Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“There are 14 NMFS scientific surveys that overlap with wind energy development in the northeast region and ~~eight~~nine of these surveys overlap with the Project. As per NMFS and BOEM Survey Mitigation strategy actions 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 2.1.1, and 2.1.2 (Hare et al. 2022), within 120 calendar days of COP Approval, the Lessee must submit to BOEM a draft survey mitigation agreement between NMFS and the Lessee. The survey mitigation agreement will describe how the Lessee will mitigate the Project impacts on the ~~eight~~nine NMFS surveys. If after consultation with NMFS NEFSC, BOEM deems the survey mitigation agreement acceptable, the mitigation will be considered required as a term and condition of the Project’s COP approval.

As soon as reasonably practicable, but no later than 30 days after the issuance of the Project’s COP Approval, the Lessee will initiate coordination with NMFS NEFSC to develop the survey mitigation agreement described above. Mitigation activities specified under the agreement will be designed to mitigate the Project impacts on the following NMFS NEFSC surveys: (a) Spring Bottom Trawl survey; (b) Autumn Multi-species Bottom Trawl survey; (c) Ecosystem Monitoring survey; (d) NARW aerial

survey; (e) Aerial marine mammal and sea turtle survey; (f) Shipboard marine mammal and sea turtle survey; (g) Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog survey; and (h) Atlantic sea scallop survey; and (i) seal survey.”

6. FEIS, Section 3.12.2.6 Mitigation, Table 3.12-5. Additional Mitigation and Monitoring Measures for Environmental Justice, Mitigation Measure: Environmental justice outreach planning, Page 3.12-47:

Deletion of text last sentence in description column “Revolution Wind shall summarize and report to BOEM outreach and engagement efforts with environmental justice communities, and outcomes of engagement within 60 days after completion of onshore facilities construction.”

7. FEIS, Section 3.13.2.2.2, Cumulative Impacts, Offshore Activities and Facilities, EMF, Page 3.13-40:

Deletion of the last sentence in the first paragraph “However, as stated previously, future offshore wind energy projects are anticipated to use HVAC transmission, which produces lower EMF HVDC transmission”.

8. FEIS, Section 3.13.2.4.3, Cumulative Impacts, Offshore Activities and Facilities, EMF, Page 3.13-81:

Deletion of text at end of first paragraph “if HVAC is used, or moderate adverse if HVDC is used. However, as stated previously, future offshore wind energy projects are anticipated to use HVAC transmission, which produce lower EMF than HVDC transmission. Much of the available research on EMF exposure, including some of the more current science, considers the effects of HVDC. The effects presented here would be the worst case.” The corrected text with redline edits now reads:

“EMF: The Proposed Action is not expected to produce significant EMF effects, as discussed in Section 3.13.2.2.2. BOEM anticipates that future offshore wind energy projects in the GAA would use HVAC transmission and apply similar design measures to avoid and minimize EMF effects on the environment. While uncertainties remain, future actions that produce EMF effects on the order of those generated by the Proposed Action are unlikely to have significant cumulative effects on finfish. Additive effects from multiple cables are likely to be limited to specific areas where cable routes cross. The Project’s network of submarine cable (i.e., RWEC, IAC, and OSS-link cable) and cables from other planned and potential future projects could cross existing submarine assets, resulting in cables on the seafloor surface with secondary protection. EMF levels sufficient to cause limited behavioral effects on finfish could occur in highly localized areas. These effects would be unlikely to significantly alter finfish behavior in ways that measurably affect any species at the population level. Cumulative EMF impacts resulting from the Proposed Action in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable activities would therefore result in minor adverse effects on finfish from exposure to detectable levels of EMF in limited areas ~~if HVAC is used, or moderate adverse if HVDC is used. However, as stated previously, future offshore wind energy projects are anticipated to use HVAC transmission, which produce lower EMF than HVDC transmission. Much of the available research on EMF exposure, including some of the more current science, considers the effects of HVDC. The effects presented here would be the worst case.~~”

9. FEIS, Table 3.13-13. Mitigation and Monitoring Measure Resulting from Consultations for FinFish and Essential Fish Habitat (Appendix F, Table F-2), Mitigation Measure: Periodic underwater surveys, reporting of monofilament and other fishing gear around WTG foundations, Page 3.13-117:

Addition of text to first sentence in **Description** column “of the total installed foundations annually.” The corrected table cell with redlined edited text now reads:

“The Lessee must monitor potential loss of fishing gear near WTG foundations by surveying at least 10% of the total installed foundations annually. Revolution Wind must report the results of the surveys to BOEM (at renewable_reporting@boem.gov) and BSEE (at marinedebris@bsee.gov) in an annual report, submitted by April 30 for the preceding calendar year. Annual reports must be submitted in Microsoft Word format. Photographic and videographic materials must be provided on a portable drive in a lossless format such as TIFF or Motion JPEG 2000. Annual reports must include survey reports that include the survey date; contact information of the operator; the location and pile identification number; photographic and/or video documentation of the survey and debris encountered; any animals sighted; and the disposition of any located debris (i.e., removed or left in place). Required data and reports may be archived, analyzed, published, and disseminated by BOEM.”

10. FEIS, Table 3.13-13. Mitigation and Monitoring Measure Resulting from Consultations for FinFish and Essential Fish Habitat (Appendix F, Table F-2), Mitigation Measure: Passive acoustic monitoring, long-term, Page 3.13-118:

Addition of text to first sentence in **Description** column “for up to” and deletion of text “(at least” and deletion of text “(or as may be extended)”. The corrected table cell with redlined edited text now reads:

“Use PAM buoys or autonomous PAM devices to record ambient noise, marine mammals, and cod vocalizations in the Lease Area before, during, and immediately after construction for up to ~~(at least~~ 25 years of operation ~~(or as may be extended)~~ to monitor Project noise.”

11. FEIS, Section 3.15.2.3.1, Construction and Installation, Offshore Activities and Facilities, Table 3.15-10. Estimated Number of Marine Mammals Experiencing Behavioral Effects from Construction-Related Activities, Page 3.15-37:

Correction of numbers in Table 3.15-10 to match numbers provided in the *Revolution Wind Updated Densities Memo*, version 2, Table 51, dated August 2022. The corrected table with redline edits now reads:

Table 3.15-10. Estimated Number of Marine Mammals Experiencing Behavioral Effects from Construction-Related Activities

Functional Hearing Group	Species	Year 1 (construction)	Year 2 (construction)	Year 3 (O&M)	Year 4 (O&M)	Year 5 (O&M)	Current Stock Abundance	Number of Individuals Exposed as Percent of Stock Abundance
LFC	Blue whale ^s	3	1	1	1	1	402	1.7%
	Fin whale ^s	10144	162	162	162	162	6,802	2.40.8%
	Humpback whale	26385	465	465	465	465	1,396	32.07.5%
	Minke whale	363344	105	105	105	105	21,968	1.78%
	North Atlantic right whale ^s	50	32	32	32	32	338	18.316.8%
	Sei whale*	2120	2	2	2	2	6,292	0.45%
MFC	Atlantic spotted dolphin	87	29	29	29	29	39,921	0.5%
	Atlantic white-sided dolphin	312	28	28	28	28	93,233	0.5%
	Bottlenose dolphin	375211	6529	6529	6529	6529	62,851	1.0%0.5%
	Common dolphin	10,5214,532	1,821659	1,821659	1,821659	1,821659	172,974	10.34.1%
	Pilot whales*	27	9	9	9	9	68,139	0.1%
	Risso's dolphin	4330	6	6	6	6	35,215	0.2%
	Sperm whale ^s	8	2	2	2	2	4,349	0.4%
HFC	Harbor porpoise	1,283	33	33	33	33	95,543	1.5%
Phocid pinnipeds	Gray seal	1,073	49	49	49	49	27,300	4.6%
	Harbor seal	2,669	109	109	109	109	61,336	5.1%

Source: Hayes et al. (2021, 2022); LGL (2022).

Note: Estimated number of individuals is based on established TTS and behavioral thresholds. TTS thresholds were used to determine exposure estimates to temporary hearing impairment from UXO detonation, while all other exposure estimates are based on the established behavioral thresholds for intermittent and continuous noise (refer to Table

3.15-5). Based on information available as of February 2023 (Orsted 2023), the effects associated with UXO detonation are likely overestimated here because the analysis assumes detonation of thirteen 1,000-pound (454-kg) explosives with 10 dB of noise attenuation at locations with non-overlapping impacts.

[§] Listed under the ESA.

* Group includes both long-finned and short-finned pilot whales. Short-finned pilot whales are considered to be rare within the Lease Area because s preferred habitat is not present.

12. FEIS, Section 3.15.2.3.1 Construction and Installation, Offshore Activities and Facilities, Page 3.15-40:

Edit deletion and correction of text in first paragraph second sentence for number of harbor porpoise, gray seals, and harbor seals to match data provided in Table 3.15-10. The corrected text with redline edits now reads:

Specifically, up to eight humpback whales, ~~459~~ harbor porpoise, ~~two-three~~ gray seals, and ~~four-five~~ harbor seals could be exposed to PTS impacts from these activities.

13. FEIS, Section 3.15.2.3.2, Operations and Maintenance and Decommissioning, Offshore Activities and Facilities, Noise: Table 3.15-11. Estimated Number of Marine Mammals Experiencing Behavioral Effects from Postconstruction High-Resolution Geophysical Survey Activities, Pages 3.15-49 to 3.15-50:

Correction of numbers in Table 3.15-11 to match numbers provided in the *Revolution Wind Updated Densities Memo*, version 2, Tables 51 and 52, dated August 2022. The corrected table with redline edits now reads:

Table 3.15-11. Estimated Number of Marine Mammals Experiencing Behavioral Effects from Postconstruction High-Resolution Geophysical Survey Activities

Functional Hearing Group	Species	Estimated Number of Individuals Exposed to Behavioral Level Noise Effects Postconstruction HRG Surveys (4 years total)	NMFS Stock Abundance	Number of Individuals Exposed as Percent of Stock Abundance
LFC	Blue whale*	4	402	1.0%
	Fin whale*	648	6,802	0.19%
	Humpback whale	18420	1,396	13.214%
	Minke whale	4020	21,968	<0.012%
	North Atlantic right whale*	12	338	3.6%
	Sei whale*	8	6,292	0.1%
MFC	Atlantic spotted dolphin	116	39,921	0.3%
	Atlantic white-sided dolphin	112	93,233	0.1%
	Bottlenose dolphin	260116	62,851	0.24%
	Common dolphin	7,2842,516	172,974	4.215%
	Pilot whales†	36	68,139	0.1%
	Risso’s dolphin	24	35,215	0.1%
	Sperm whale*	8	4,349	0.1%
HFC	Harbor porpoise	132	95,543	0.2%

Functional Hearing Group	Species	Estimated Number of Individuals Exposed to Behavioral Level Noise Effects Postconstruction HRG Surveys (4 years total)	NMFS Stock Abundance	Number of Individuals Exposed as Percent of Stock Abundance
Phocid pinnipeds	Gray seal	196	27,300	0.7%
	Harbor seal	436	61,336	0.7%

Source: Hayes et al. (2021, 2022); LGL (2022).

* ESA-listed species.

† Group includes both long-finned and short-finned pilot whales. Short-finned pilot whales are considered to be rare within the Lease Area because preferred habitat is not present.

**14. FEIS, Section 3.15.2.4.1, Construction and Installation, Offshore Activities and Facilities, Noise:
Table 3.15-12. Comparison of Maximum Underwater Noise Injury and Behavioral Effects Exposure Extent and Duration (number of sites/days) by Marine Mammal Hearing Group from Revolution Wind Farm WTG and OSS Foundation Installation, Proposed Action, and Proposed Configuration for Alternative C*, Page 3.15-62:**

Edit deletion and correction of text in Table 3.15-12 footnote* for installation rate number of one pile/day. The corrected text with redline edits now reads:

* Installation scenario for a 12-m monopile is 10,740 strikes/pile at an installation rate of three piles/day. Installation scenario for 15-m monopile is 11,563 strikes/pile at an installation rate of ~~up to two one~~ piles/day. All piles installed with a 4,000-kJ hammer with an attenuation system achieving 10 dB sound source reduction.

**15. FEIS, Section 3.15.2.5.1, Construction and Installation, Offshore Activities and Facilities, Noise:
Table 3.15-15. Comparison of Maximum Underwater Noise Injury and Behavioral Effects Exposure Extent and Duration (number of sites/days) by Marine Mammal Hearing Group from Revolution Wind Farm WTG and OSS Foundation Installation, Proposed Action, and Proposed Configuration for Alternative G*, Page 3.15-68:**

Correction of number of days required for pile driving for Alternative G (deletion of “28” and addition of “29”) and Alternatives G1-G3 (deletion of “24” and addition of “25”) in Table 3.15-15. Edit deletion and correction of text in table footnote* for installation rate number of one pile/day. The corrected table with redline edits now reads:

Table 3.15-15. Comparison of Maximum Underwater Noise Injury and Behavioral Effects Exposure Extent and Duration (number of sites/days) by Marine Mammal Hearing Group from Revolution Wind Farm WTG and OSS Foundation Installation, Proposed Action, and Proposed Configuration for Alternative G*

Noise Exposure Type	Hearing Group	Threshold Distance for WTGs (feet)†	Threshold Distance for OSSs (feet) ^{‡,§}	Proposed Action	Alternative G	Alternatives G1–G3
Peak injury	LFC	< 33	< 33	102 sites/ 35 days	81 sites/ 28 <u>29</u> days	67 sites/ 24 <u>25</u> days
	MFC	–	–			
	HFC	525	361			
	Phocids	–				
Cumulative injury	LFC	4,954–8,727	3,084–5,873			
	MFC	0–66	–			
	HFC	4,396	2,723			
	Phocids	787–1,444	33–1,214			
TTS and behavioral effects	LFC	11,909–12,336	11,516–11,877			
	MFC	0–12,041	0–11,909			
	HFC	11,877	11,483			
	Phocids	11,909–12,467	11,549–12,303			

* Installation scenario for a 12-m monopile is 10,740 strikes/pile at an installation rate of three piles/day. Installation scenario for 15-m monopile is 11,563 strikes/pile at an installation rate of ~~up to two piles~~one pile/day. All piles installed with a 4,000-kJ hammer with an attenuation system achieving 10 dB sound source reduction.

† Threshold distances are the distance in feet from the sound source where the identified type of exposure could occur. Values are the range threshold distances for monopile installation modeled by Kusel et al. (2023) across modeled sites during summer conditions.

§ Threshold distances for OSSs apply to two of the structures identified for each of the alternatives presented.

16. FEIS, Section 3.15.2.7, Mitigation, Table 3.15-17. Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations for Marine Mammals (Appendix F, Table F-2), Mitigation Measure: DRAFT NMFS BiOp Reasonable and Prudent Measures (RPMs) and Terms and Conditions (T&Cs), Page 3.15-78:

Deletion of text in second row, **Description** column, last sentence “North Atlantic Right Whale”. Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“These measures include adherence to mitigation measures specified in the final MMPA ITA to minimize impacts during pile driving and UXO detonation; compliance with requirements for vessel operations within the Delaware River and Delaware Bay included in the Incidental Take Statements provided with the Paulsboro Marine Terminal Biological Opinion (dated July 19, 2022); reporting requirements related to effects to, or interactions with, ESA-listed species; submittal of required plans (e.g., PSO Training Plan for Trawl Surveys, Passive Acoustic Monitoring Plan, Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring Plan, Cofferdam Installation and Removal Monitoring Plan, Alternative Monitoring Plan/Night Time Pile Driving Monitoring Plan, Sound Field Verification Plan, ~~North Atlantic Right Whale~~-Vessel Strike Avoidance Plan) to NMFS GARFO with sufficient time for review, comment and approval; and conducting on-site observation and inspection to gather information on the effectiveness and implementation of measures to minimize and monitor incidental take.”

17. FEIS, Table 3.15-17. Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations for Marine Mammals (Appendix F, Table F-2), Mitigation Measure: Passive acoustic monitoring, long-term, Page 3.15-81:

Addition of text to first sentence in **Description** column “for up to” and deletion of text “(at least” and deletion of text “(or as may be extended)”. The corrected table cell with redlined edited text now reads:

“Use PAM buoys or autonomous PAM devices to record ambient noise, marine mammals, and cod vocalizations in the Lease Area before, during, and immediately after construction for up to ~~(at least~~ 25 years of operation ~~(or as may be extended)~~ to monitor Project noise.”

18. FEIS, Section 3.15.2.7, Mitigation, Table 3.15-17. Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations for Marine Mammals (Appendix F, Table F-2), Mitigation Measure: Vessel Speed Requirements, Page 3.15-88:

Correction of the listed states in the first sentence by deletion of “New Jersey”, “Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia” and addition of “Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts”. Edited text is shown in redline tracked changes and now reads:

“Between November 1st and April 30th, all vessels, regardless of size, must operate at 10 kts or less when traveling between the lease area and ports in ~~New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia~~ Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts;”

19. FEIS, Section 3.17, Table 3.17-3. Additional Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Under Consideration for Other Marine Uses (scientific research and surveys) (Appendix F, Table F-3) Page 3.17-20:

Deletion of “eight” and replace text with “nine” in the first sentence and the third sentence of first paragraph and addition of text to end of second sentence in second paragraph at end of last sentence to add “; and (i) seal survey.” Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“There are 14 NMFS scientific surveys that overlap with wind energy development in the northeast region and ~~eight~~nine of these surveys overlap with the Project. As per NMFS and BOEM Survey Mitigation strategy actions 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 2.1.1, and 2.1.2 (Hare et al. 2022), within 120 calendar days of COP Approval, the Lessee must submit to BOEM a draft survey mitigation agreement between NMFS and the Lessee. The survey mitigation agreement will describe how the Lessee will mitigate the Project impacts on the ~~eight~~nine NMFS surveys. If after consultation with NMFS NEFSC, BOEM deems the survey mitigation agreement acceptable, the mitigation will be considered required as a term and condition of the Project’s COP approval.

As soon as reasonably practicable, but no later than 30 days after the issuance of the Project’s COP Approval, the Lessee will initiate coordination with NMFS NEFSC to develop the survey mitigation agreement described above. Mitigation activities specified under the agreement will be designed to mitigate the Project impacts on the following NMFS NEFSC surveys: (a) Spring Bottom Trawl survey; (b) Autumn Multi-species Bottom Trawl survey; (c) Ecosystem Monitoring survey; (d) NARW aerial survey; (e) Aerial marine mammal and sea turtle survey; (f) Shipboard marine mammal and sea turtle survey; (g) Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog survey; and (h) Atlantic sea scallop survey; and (i) seal survey.”

20. FEIS, Section 3.19.2.3.1, Construction and Installation, Offshore Activities and Facilities, Footnote 3, Page 3.19-25:

Addition of text “Nighttime pile driving would only be conducted if the Nighttime Pile Driving Monitoring Plan is Approved by BOEM and NMFS.”

21. FEIS, Section 3.19.2.5.1, Construction and Installation, Offshore Activities and Facilities, Noise: Table 3.19-8. Comparison of Maximum Underwater Noise Injury and Behavioral Effects Exposure Extent and Duration (number of sites/days) to Sea Turtles from Revolution Wind Farm WTG and OSS Foundation Installation, Proposed Action, and Proposed Configuration for Alternative G*, Page 3.19-45:

Correction of number of days required for pile driving for Alternative G (deletion of “28” and addition of “29”) and Alternatives G1-G3 (deletion of “24” and addition of “25”) in Table 3.19-8. Edit deletion and correction of text footnote* for installation rate number of one pile/day. The corrected table with redline edits now reads:

Table 3.19-8. Comparison of Maximum Underwater Noise Injury and Behavioral Effects Exposure Extent and Duration (number of sites/days) to Sea Turtles from Revolution Wind Farm Wind Turbine Generator and Offshore Substation Foundation Installation under the Proposed Action and Alternative G*

Exposure Type	Threshold Distance (feet)†	Proposed Action	Alternative G	Alternatives G1–G3
Peak injury	–	102 sites/ 35 days	81 sites/ 28-29 days	67 sites/ 24-25 days
Cumulative injury	98–820			
Behavioral or TTS	1,903–2,920			

* Installation scenario for a 12-m monopile is 10,740 strikes/pile at an installation rate of three piles/day. Installation scenario for a 15-m monopile is 11,563 strikes/pile at an installation rate of ~~up to two piles~~one pile/day. All piles installed with a 4,000-kJ hammer with an attenuation system achieving 10 dB sound source reduction.

† Threshold distances are the distance in feet from the sound source where the identified type of exposure could occur. WTG values are the range threshold distances for monopile installation modeled by Kusel et al. (2023) across modeled sites and seasonal conditions. Maximum threshold distances for WTG and OSS monopiles are 689 and 820 feet, respectively.

22. FEIS, Section 3.19.2.6, Mitigation, Table 3.19-9. Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations for Sea Turtles (Appendix F, Table F-2), Mitigation Measure: DRAFT NMFS BiOp Reasonable and Prudent Measures (RPMs) and Terms and Conditions (T&Cs)*, Page 3.19-50:

In the first row, **Description** column, last sentence. Deletion of text “North Atlantic Right Whale” edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“These measures include adherence to mitigation measures specified in the final MMPA ITA to minimize impacts during pile driving and UXO detonation; compliance with requirements for vessel operations within the Delaware River and Delaware Bay included in the Incidental Take Statements provided with the Paulsboro Marine Terminal Biological Opinion (dated July 19, 2022); reporting requirements related to effects to, or interactions with, ESA-listed species; submittal of required plans (e.g., PSO Training Plan for Trawl Surveys, Passive Acoustic Monitoring Plan, Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring Plan, Cofferdam Installation and Removal Monitoring Plan, Alternative Monitoring Plan/Night Time Pile Driving Monitoring Plan, Sound Field Verification Plan, ~~North Atlantic Right Whale~~-Vessel Strike Avoidance Plan) to NMFS GARFO with sufficient time for review, comment and approval; and conducting on-site observation and inspection to gather information on the effectiveness and implementation of measures to minimize and monitor incidental take.”

23. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-1 Environmental Protection Measures (EPMs) Committed to by Revolution Wind, LLC (Applicant Proposed Measures), EPM Number MM-10, Page F-8:

In the **Description of Environmental Protection Measures Committed to by Revolution Wind, LLC (VHB 2023)*** column, item 11. Deletion of text “of at least one foundation installation” and replacement text with “will be taken for the first three monopile foundations.” Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“11. Sound source verification measurements will be taken for the first three monopile foundations ~~of at least one foundation installation~~”

24. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-2 Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations, BOEM-proposed Bird and Bat Mitigation Measures, item 4, O&M, Avian and Bat Monitoring Program, Page F-20:

In the **Description of Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations** column, item a. multiple edits to clarify which tasks “must” occur and which tasks “may” occur. Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“a. Monitoring. Revolution Wind ~~must~~ 1) must install acoustic monitoring devices for bats for 2 years; 2) must install Motus receivers within the wind farm; 3) may include refurbishment of up to two onshore Motus receiver stations; ~~4) and may include~~ providing funding for up to 150 Motus tags per year for up to 3 consecutive years, or equivalent; and ~~45~~ 5) conduct a 1- to 2-year cross-project radar study to measure migrant flux rates, flight heights, and marine bird avoidance.”

25. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-2 Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations, Draft NMFS Biological Opinion Terms and Conditions from NMFS issued June 16, 2023†, item 3, Construction and installation, O&M, decommissioning, UXO detonation, Page F-26:

In the **Description of Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations** column, item a. deletion of text “outside” and replacement text with “inside” in the last sentence. Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“a. Establish a clearance zone for sea turtles extending 500 m around any planned UXO detonation. Maintain the clearance zone for at least 60 minutes prior to any UXO detonation. This requirement expands the size of the clearance zone identified by BOEM as part of the proposed action. Revolution Wind must ensure that there is sufficient PSO coverage to reliably document sea turtle presence within the clearance zone. In the event that a PSO detects a sea turtle ~~outside~~ inside the 500 m clearance zone, detonation will be delayed until the sea turtle has not been observed for 30 minutes.”

26. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-2 Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations, Draft NMFS Biological Opinion Terms and Conditions from NMFS issued June 16, 2023†, item 10, Construction and installation, Review of plans, Page F-31:

In the **Description of Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations** column, item e. deletion of text “North Atlantic Right Whale” in the item title. Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“e. ~~North Atlantic Right Whale~~ Vessel Strike Avoidance Plan.”

27. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-2 Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations, BOEM-proposed Mitigation and Monitoring Measures in National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Biological Assessment (BA)†, item 5: Construction, O&M, and decommissioning, Passive acoustic monitoring (PAM), Page F-33:

Addition of text to first sentence in **Description of Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations** column “for up to” and deletion of text “(at least” and deletion of text “(or as may be extended)”. The corrected table cell with redlined edited text now reads:

“Use PAM buoys or autonomous PAM devices to record ambient noise, marine mammals, and cod vocalizations in the Lease Area before, during, and immediately after construction for up to (at least 25 years of operation (or as may be extended) to monitor Project noise.”

28. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-2 Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations, BOEM-proposed Mitigation and Monitoring Measures in National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Biological Assessment (BA) †, item 23, O&M and decommissioning, Vessel speed requirements, Page F-39:

In the **Description of Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations** column, first sentence: correction of the listed states in the first sentence by deletion of “New Jersey”, “Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia” and addition of “Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts”. Edited text is shown in redline tracked changes and now reads:

“Between November 1st and April 30th, all vessels, regardless of size, must operate at 10 kts or less when traveling between the lease area and ports in New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts;”

29. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-2 Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations, BOEM-Proposed Monitoring Measures Developed in Conjunction with Cooperating Agencies, item 1, O&M, Periodic underwater surveys, reporting of monofilament and other fishing gear around WTG foundations, Page F-41:

In the **Description of Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Resulting from Consultations** column, addition of the text “of the total installed foundations annually” at the end of the first sentence. Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes and now reads:

“The Lessee must monitor potential loss of fishing gear near WTG foundations by surveying at least 10% of the total installed foundations annually.”

30. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-3 Additional Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Under Consideration, Additional BOEM-proposed Mitigation Measures, item 2, Construction, installation, and decommissioning, Environmental justice outreach planning, Page F-51 and F-52:

In the **BOEM’s Identification of the Anticipated Enforcing Agency*** column deletion of text “BOEM and BSEE” and replacement text with “EPA and or RIDEM”.

In the **Description of Additional Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Under Consideration** column, deletion of last sentence of paragraph: “Outreach and engagement efforts with environmental justice communities, and outcomes of engagement, shall be summarized and reported to BOEM within 60 days after completion of onshore facilities construction.”

31. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-3 Additional Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Under Consideration, Additional BOEM-proposed Mitigation Measures, item 9, Planning, construction and installation, O&M, decommissioning, Federal survey mitigation, Page F-53:

In the **Description of Additional Mitigation and Monitoring Measures Under Consideration** column deletion of text “eight” and replacement text with “nine” in first sentence and the third sentence of first

paragraph and addition of text “; and (i) seal survey.” to end of second sentence in second paragraph. Edited text shown in redlined tracked changes now reads:

“There are 14 NMFS scientific surveys that overlap with wind energy development in the northeast region and ~~eight-nine~~ of these surveys overlap with the Project. As per NMFS and BOEM Survey Mitigation strategy actions 1.3.1, 1.3.2, 2.1.1, and 2.1.2 (Hare et al. 2022), within 120 calendar days of COP Approval, the Lessee must submit to BOEM a draft survey mitigation agreement between NMFS and the Lessee. The survey mitigation agreement will describe how the Lessee will mitigate the Project impacts on the ~~eight-nine~~ NMFS surveys. If after consultation with NMFS NEFSC, BOEM deems the survey mitigation agreement acceptable, the mitigation will be considered required as a term and condition of the Project’s COP approval.

As soon as reasonably practicable, but no later than 30 days after the issuance of the Project’s COP Approval, the Lessee will initiate coordination with NMFS NEFSC to develop the survey mitigation agreement described above. Mitigation activities specified under the agreement will be designed to mitigate the Project impacts on the following NMFS NEFSC surveys: (a) Spring Bottom Trawl survey; (b) Autumn Multi-species Bottom Trawl survey; (c) Ecosystem Monitoring survey; (d) NARW aerial survey; (e) Aerial marine mammal and sea turtle survey; (f) Shipboard marine mammal and sea turtle survey; (g) Atlantic surfclam and ocean quahog survey; and (h) Atlantic sea scallop survey; and (i) seal survey.”

32. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-4, Draft NMFS Proposed Incidental Take Regulations (ITR) Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) issued to BOEM for consideration on June 5, 2023, General Conditions, Vessel Strike Avoidance Measures 2, item xvii, Page F-56:

In the **Description of Measures that may be Required by Other Authorizations and Permits Issued to the Lessee** column, item xvii) deletion of text “New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia” and replacement text with “New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts”. Edited text shown in redlined tracked changes now reads:

vii) Between November 1st and April 30th, all vessels, regardless of size, would operate port to port (specifically from ports in ~~New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts~~New Jersey, New York, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia) at 10 kns or less, except for vessels while transiting in Narragansett Bay or Long Island Sound which have not been demonstrated by best available science to provide consistent habitat for North Atlantic right whales;

33. FEIS, Appendix F, Table F-4, Draft NMFS Proposed Incidental Take Regulations (ITR) Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) issued to BOEM for consideration on June 5, 2023, General Conditions, Vessel Strike Avoidance Measures 2, item xviii, Page F-57:

In the **Description of Measures that may be Required by Other Authorizations and Permits Issued to the Lessee** column, item xviii) deletion of text “North Atlantic Right Whale” in first sentence. Edited text is shown in redlined tracked changes now reads:

“xviii) Revolution Wind must submit a ~~North Atlantic right whale~~ vessel strike avoidance plan 90 days prior to commencement of vessel use.”