

PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING

Vineyard Wind SEIS Public Meeting

Virtual Public Meeting, Day 2

June 30, 2020

1:00 p.m.

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Hello, everyone, my name is Christine Davis; I want to thank you for joining us today.

I'm with ERM, a third party contractor working with the BOEM staff on the environmental review of the Vineyard Wind Project. I'm here to help you facilitate and guide you through this meeting today. So I appreciate you taking time to share your thoughts with us during the meeting. The purpose is to gather your input on Vineyard Wind's proposed offshore Wind 1 Project, and more specifically, on settlement to the draft environmental impact statement.

Your input will be used to refine and finalize the final environmental impact statement on this project. As such, we're recording and have court reporters documenting this meeting for the public record.

We learned during the first meeting that some might want to ask questions right away. So please note that we use the Zoom and Q & A functions to the Zoom Q & A function on the bottom of your screen to address questions, and the chat function

to address technical issues.

If you're on the phone, and you have a technical issue, please press Star 0. I'll talk more about Zoom in just a few minutes. But before we go any further, I'd like to welcome Bill Brown. Bill Brown is the Chief Environmental Officer from the Office of Renewable Energy Programs at the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, or BOEM as we will refer to it today. Bill will formally welcome everyone to this meeting, Bill.

BILL BROWN: Hello, everyone. As we just heard, my name is Bill Brown. I am the Chief Environmental Officer of BOEM, actually for everything BOEM does in the Department of the Interior. And I thank you for joining us today, today's public meeting. I'm sorry that we can't be together in person, but I hope that you and your families and friends are all safe and healthy.

On the other hand, we were fortunate to have technology like this as an alternative. So who are we? BOEM is the federal agency that oversees development of federal offshore energy and mineral resources subject to environmental safeguards. Because of the nearly 2.5 billion acres of the

1 nation's Outer Continental Shelf or OCS, and that's
2 a little more than the total land area of the United
3 States, it's a big job and includes offshore wind
4 and other renewable energy resources.

5 We have been working for over 10 years with
6 states, tribes and diverse stakeholders to identify
7 the best areas for offshore wind development. Now we
8 have 16 active leases on the Atlantic, from Cape Cod
9 to Cape Hatteras, and we foresee development of
10 nearly 22 gigawatts of electrical power,
11 contributing to state goals of almost 30 gigawatts.
12 That's a a whole lot of power. Under these leases,
13 we have approved 10 site assessment plans. And we
14 are currently reviewing seven construction and
15 operation plans that we call COPS. We expect up to
16 eight additional COPS submitted for our review in
17 the next 12 months. We've hired new staff and we're
18 using third party contractors to help manage the
19 growing workflow.

20 The first turbines ever on the outer
21 continental shelves were installed in this past
22 month, offshore Virginia, the coastal Virginia
23 Offshore Wind Project, and we anticipated dozen
24 commercial scale wind farms during the coming

1 decade. We want to make sure these projects are done
2 right with thoughtful consideration of all ocean
3 uses: Wind energy, commercial fishing, maritime
4 navigation and more. There will be impacts and our
5 goal is for all users to coexist successfully.

6 Our task requires getting the best
7 information we can, analyzing impacts and
8 alternatives well, and identifying needed
9 mitigation. We want to establish a strong foundation
10 for all projects going forward. These public
11 meetings are an opportunity to help us meet this
12 goal and hear from you about the Vineyard Wind
13 Project, in particular. Vineyard Wind is the first
14 commercial offshore wind project analyzed under the
15 one federal decision process. We have modified our
16 approach as we work through the process, which we
17 believe will facilitate future project permitting.
18 But note BOEM received over 300 comments from
19 stakeholders and cooperating agencies on the
20 Vineyard Wind draft environmental impact statement.
21 Some of these requests for a more robust analysis of
22 cumulative effects.

23 As a consequence of these comments, we
24 prepared a supplement to the draft environmental

1 impact statement for the proposed Vineyard Wind 1
2 Offshore Energy Project. When we opened the
3 document for public comment on June 12th the
4 supplement expands to reasonably foreseeable future
5 offshore wind development scenario in the draft EIS
6 and analyzes the effects in that scenario. That
7 supplement also analyzes previously unavailable
8 fishing data, a transit lane alternative proposed
9 by the fishing community and changes to the
10 constructions and operation plan since the draft EIS
11 was published. This enhanced analysis to both
12 support and serve as a model for reviewing future
13 projects. That's why your comments on the supplement
14 are vitally important.

15 We are making an effort to hear from
16 everyone concerned. This is one of five virtual
17 public meetings we're having during the comment
18 period, and your input will help us get this right.
19 We are committed to the permitting process that
20 minimizes user conflicts and establishes a strong
21 foundation for wind projects moving forward. Thank
22 you and stay well. And now I would like to invite
23 Lisa Engler, Director of the Massachusetts Office of
24 Coastal Zone Management to offer her remarks.

1 LISA ENGLER: Thank you, Bill. Good
2 afternoon. On behalf of Energy and Environmental
3 Affairs Secretary Kathleen Theoharides, we are
4 pleased to welcome the Bureau of Ocean Energy
5 Management for today's public meeting on the
6 supplement to the draft environmental impact
7 statement for the Vineyard Wind 1 Project. Joining
8 me from fellow Massachusetts agencies are Bruce
9 Carlile from the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center
10 and John Logan from the Massachusetts Division of
11 Marine Fisheries. We're looking forward to the
12 presentations and the opportunity to hear your
13 comments and input to this federal review process
14 for this project.

15 Global Climate Change presents a serious
16 threat to the Commonwealth environment, residents,
17 communities and economy. Governor Baker has
18 expressed the need for action, stating, "The
19 magnitude of the impacts from climate change
20 requires all of us to put aside politics and act
21 together quickly and decisively. We still have the
22 opportunity to check the severity of future impacts
23 by aggressively reducing greenhouse gas emissions
24 and adapting to the changes that are ongoing."

1 With the 2008 Global Warming Solutions Act,
2 Massachusetts became one of the first states in the
3 nation to require carbon emission reductions of at
4 least 80% below 1990 levels by 2050, with interim
5 targets every decade. In addition, in December of
6 last year, Governor Baker committed the Commonwealth
7 to net zero emissions by 2050. Meeting these targets
8 will include effort and commitment by both the
9 public and the private sectors and will require
10 changes to business as usual. Responsibly cited,
11 developed and operated offshore wind will be key to
12 meeting these carbon emission reduction targets. For
13 more than a decade, we have worked closely with our
14 federal, state, local and tribal partners through
15 BOEM's intergovernmental Task Force on offshore
16 energy in the planning, siting, leasing and review
17 of potential offshore wind projects on the Outer
18 Continental Shelf.

19 We have also worked closely with
20 stakeholders through state forms fisheries and
21 habitat working groups on offshore wind and in
22 community based meetings and discussions. The
23 fishing industry is a critical partner in the
24 development of offshore wind, and we value the

1 opportunity to use these venues for important
2 dialogue and feedback in the responsible development
3 of offshore wind.

4 In 2017, as directed by state legislation,
5 Massachusetts issued a competitive request for
6 proposals for offshore wind energy, and in 2018
7 selected the Vineyard Wind Project, which will
8 result in significant greenhouse gas reductions at a
9 highly competitive price. The Federal National
10 Environmental Policy Act review process led by BOEM
11 is a critically important component in our
12 collective responsibility to avoid, minimize and
13 mitigate potential adverse effects. And in the case
14 of the Vinyard Wind Project the SEIS has provided a
15 broader substantive basis for reviewing the project
16 within the context of other offshore wind
17 development.

18 The cumulative analysis included in the
19 SEIS ensures that potential impacts beyond the
20 individual project are evaluated. In parallel to the
21 BOEM review, the Vineyard Wind Project was reviewed
22 by state agencies, including the Massachusetts
23 Department of Environmental Protection, the Energy
24 Facility Siting Board, the Massachusetts Department

1 of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act
2 Office, the Department of Public Utilities, and the
3 Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management.
4 This Massachusetts State review is now complete.

5 Thank you all for joining us today. Your
6 participation is so important as we continue to work
7 with agencies, stakeholders and local communities in
8 the review of the BOEM commercial leasing,
9 construction and operations process. And with that,
10 I'll turn it back over to Christine.

11 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you, Lisa. Looking
12 at today's agenda, now BOEM will provide a project
13 overview, we'll discuss the environmental review
14 process and next steps. We'll open meetings for
15 public comment and testimony, and then we'll close
16 by answering questions.

17 As a reminder, the focus of the meeting is
18 to receive public comments. So let's spend the bulk
19 of our time together today on that agenda item. As
20 noted on the screen, everyone who would like to
21 provide comments today will need to please press
22 Star 1 and speak with a live operator to get in our
23 queue. Even if you've preregistered, you'll need to
24 press Star 1. Please note that it may take the

1 operator a little bit of time to get to you. So
2 please be patient.

3 Again, the steps for everyone who wants to
4 speak including the preregistered people is to press
5 Star 1, wait to speak to the live operator. And so
6 if you've not already you might want to do so now or
7 anytime prior to the public comment. So that we can
8 provide as many of the interested parties as
9 possible the opportunity to provide their comments,
10 we ask that you keep your comments to approximately
11 five minutes. As an attendee, you're not going to
12 be on camera today, but your voice will come through
13 on the phone. Only BOEM, ERM presenters and I will
14 be on video. Please note that the oral comments
15 provided will be on the record and this entire
16 meeting is being recorded and projected on the
17 screen.

18 Okay, next slide, please. All right, so you've
19 heard me refer to the Q & A and chat functions,
20 those of you online should be able to see the icons
21 on the bottom of your screen. If you click on the Q
22 & A icon, you'll see a box pop up for you to type in
23 a question. We'll answer the bulk of the questions
24 at the end of the public testimony to maximize our

1 time for public comments. Some questions with short
2 answers may be addressed right away, but for others,
3 we'll have subject matter experts ready to respond
4 in person later in the meeting. Do not be alarmed if
5 you don't see your question right away. The
6 questions will show up when we answer them verbally
7 during the Q & A session.

8 As briefly noted earlier, please only use
9 the Zoom chat function to notify us of the technical
10 issue with Zoom or the audio. And if you're on the
11 phone, press Star 0 speak with the operator if
12 you're having audio problems. Later on, we'll use
13 Zoom chat to list the order for public comment.
14 We'll only use the hand raising function if we need
15 to call on you at some point. Anytime you have
16 technical challenges using Zoom, you can continue to
17 participate in this meeting by phone at 188-606-7043
18 participant code 6516733#. If you want to give
19 public testimony and have not already done so,
20 please press Star 1 to speak to a live operator to
21 get in the queue. And regardless of whether you
22 signed up or not, or preregistered, you'll need to
23 test with our live operator.

24 Does anyone have any questions specifically

1 about Zoom or the phone line that you'd like to ask
2 at this time? If so, click on the Q & A and I'll
3 glance over there. All right, we'll give it just a
4 minute more. All right. I think at this point, I
5 will turn it over to you Jennifer Bucatari from the
6 Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. Jenn will explain
7 the environmental review process and provide an
8 overview of the supplement to the draft EIS. After
9 her presentation we'll begin the public testimony.
10 As a reminder to sign up for public comments later
11 in this meeting, please press Star 1 to get in the
12 queue, and you can enter your questions in the Q & A
13 box at any time.

14 So with that, we'll turn it over to Jenn.

15 JENNIFER BUCATARI: Hey, thank you,
16 Christine. Welcome everyone to the Vineyard Wind
17 supplement to the draft environmental impact
18 statement. Also known as the SEIS virtual public
19 meeting. We appreciate your participation in this
20 meeting and look forward to hearing your comments
21 following the summary presentation.

22 My name is Jennifer Bucatari, and I'm one
23 of the environmental coordinators on this project.
24 To the greatest extent possible we are working to

1 maintain services to the American people and our
2 stakeholders, consistent with evolving guidance
3 provided by the CDC, and state and local health
4 authorities. As such, we are moving forward with our
5 public meeting in a virtual environment in order to
6 provide information to our public in the safest and
7 most efficient way possible, and to receive feedback
8 from our stakeholders. These public meetings while
9 virtual are an opportunity for public involvement
10 and an opportunity to provide comments on the
11 supplemental EIS. BOEM has developed a virtual
12 meeting room web page, the address we've seen here
13 on the slide, you've likely visited this page to
14 register but either way we encourage you to explore
15 this page and the additional content that we have
16 there. This content includes posters and
17 presentations to mimic the stations that we normally
18 have at an in-person meeting. The posters seen here
19 on this slide will lay a brief summary of important
20 topics to our stakeholder.

21 The presentations on the virtual meeting
22 room webpage, as seen here on this slide, are
23 summaries of impacts to several key topics or
24 resources. The presentations were developed and

1 recorded by the BOEM subject matter expert, who also
2 developed the supplemental EIS impact analysis for
3 that resource.

4 The National Environmental Policy Act, or
5 NEPA, is a law requiring federal agencies to assess
6 the environmental effects of their proposed action
7 and reasonable alternatives. The NEPA process
8 collects relevant information for the decision maker
9 to either approve, approve with conditions or
10 disapprove a plan. Through the NEPA process, an
11 environmental impact statement or EIS must be
12 prepared if the agency is proposing a major federal
13 action that may significantly affect the quality of
14 the human environment. The purpose of the analysis
15 is to outline the impact of a proposed project on
16 its surrounding environment. The process also
17 includes public scoping, public comment periods, and
18 an analysis of reasonable alternatives and
19 cumulative effect.

20 BOEM's renewable energy leasing and
21 development process occurs in four phases. For the
22 Vineyard Wind 1 Project, we are in the fourth phase,
23 which includes conducting an environmental review of
24 the lessees construction and operations plan or COP.

1 The draft EIS was published for public review in
2 December of 2018. And a supplement to the draft EIS,
3 the SEIS, was published on June 12th, 2020. The
4 Vineyard Wind 1 proposed project location is seen
5 here, and is 12 nautical miles at its nearest point
6 to land. The project is situated southeast of
7 Martha's Vineyard. The proposed cable landfalls are
8 in two locations on Cape Cod, Lewis Bay or New
9 Hampshire Avenue.

10 A brief background on the project is
11 presented here. The development of the SEIS began
12 following public hearings that were held in
13 February, 2019. As mentioned, comments from public
14 and stakeholders requested an expanded cumulative
15 analysis and an analysis of fishing data that was
16 previously unavailable to BOEM.

17 In addition, updates to the Construction
18 and Operations Plan were submitted by Vineyard WInd
19 on January 31st, 2020, and March 9, 2020. BOEM
20 developed the supplemental EIS to address comments
21 from the public and stakeholders to expand the
22 cumulative analysis, to analyze previously
23 unavailable fishing data, to analyze a new
24 alternatives and project changes. As mentioned, in

1 January and March of 2020 Vineyard Wind submitted
2 updates to the Construction and Operations Plan,
3 which included changes to the project envelope and
4 onshore substation. The updates included an
5 expansion of the turbine capacity to include up to
6 14 megawatt turbine. The total project capacity
7 remains the same at 800 megawatts. And the change to
8 the turbine capacity does not result in a change to
9 the footprint or to the minimum turbine capacity,
10 which is still eight megawatt. The proposed
11 project include up to 106 wind turbine locations
12 with up to 100 wind turbines. These turbines may be
13 either all monopile foundations or 50% monopile and
14 50% jacket foundation.

15 Vineyard Wind also submitted changes to the
16 onshore substation. For the expanded onshore
17 substation, the total approximate area of ground
18 disturbance would be 7.7 acres, which is 1.8 acres
19 greater than the area analyzed in the draft EIS. The
20 notice of availability for the supplemental EIS was
21 published on June 12 2020 in the Federal Register.
22 We're holding a series of five virtual public
23 meeting as seen here. The comment period will close
24 after 45 days on July 27th, 2020. For additional

1 project-related info please see the project website
2 seen here. To be most helpful comments should be as
3 specific as possible. On substantive comments
4 discusses the accuracy of the information to just
5 alternate methodologies and the reason or reasons
6 why they should be used, provides new information
7 relevant to the analysis, identifies a different
8 source of credible research, which if used in the
9 analysis, could result in different effects, or it
10 provides clarification where needed.

11 The table on this side outlines the notable
12 sections of the supplemental EIS, including where
13 you can find information about the environmental
14 analysis, cumulative impact scenario, the project
15 design envelope, and the status of environmental
16 consultation. While the SEIS includes analysis of
17 the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed
18 project, the focus of a supplement is on the
19 expanded cumulative impact scenario, a new
20 alternative and information that has changed or
21 become available since the issuance of the draft is
22 in 2018.

23 This inverted triangle represents the
24 different levels of reasonably foreseeable

1 development that we considered in the cumulative
2 scenario. A bar usually encompasses the bar below
3 it, but the lower bars will often be duplicative
4 rather than additive. For example, Vineyard Wind at
5 the bottom, Vineyard Wind 1 is already included in
6 the one above it, the 5.4 gigawatts of construction
7 and operations plans submitted or approved. The
8 previous standard for the scope of reasonably
9 foreseeable offshore wind development was based on
10 projects permitted and added to this projects
11 entering the construction permitting process.

12 This time, we began by examining the
13 greatest number of possible projects, and then
14 eliminated offshore development that would be
15 unreasonable to consider based on the lack of state
16 demand or technical inability. The top bar is the
17 total Atlantic offshore wind technical resource
18 potential. This bar represents how much wind energy
19 is available on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf
20 or OCS with present technology. Such a build out is
21 not only materially and physically impossible, but
22 also the amount of energy exceeds the demand of the
23 entire eastern United States; thus this level was
24 not determined to be reasonably foreseeable.

1 The second bar down from the top is the
2 technical resource potential of the Atlantic call,
3 wind energy and lease areas. Call areas or areas
4 that have not been named and are still being
5 evaluated for whether they are suitable to be
6 offered for lease. There's no guarantee that such
7 areas will make it to the leasing stage. Therefore,
8 evaluating construction on them is premature, and
9 this level of development was not considered
10 reasonably foreseeable at this time.

11 The third dark bar down from the top is
12 fate capacity commitment. While the peer system in
13 the draft EIS looked at development from a
14 regulatory and project perspective, in this
15 scenario, we examined future projects from a state
16 demand perspective. This number has grown over the
17 last several months, and is currently about 29
18 gigawatts with recent additional commitments from
19 New Jersey. This exceeds the technical resource
20 potential of existing Atlantic leases with existing
21 technology and includes New York commitments that
22 have been made in anticipation of future leasing
23 occurring. Therefore, this level of development was
24 deemed not reasonably foreseeable at this time.

1 The fourth bar from the top is the
2 technical resource potential of the existing
3 Atlantic leases. State capacity commitments are not
4 evenly distributed along the coast and perhaps
5 surprisingly are not tied to the existing available
6 leased capacity within transmission range. For
7 example, the state capacity commitments of New York
8 and New Jersey exceed the technical resource
9 potential of leases within that transmission range
10 for those two states. Also there are going to be
11 going to be conflicts such as with cultural resource
12 site, historical site, essential fish habitat and
13 navigation, as examples that will make developing
14 the entire technical resource potential of the
15 existing land Atlantic leases impossible. Therefore,
16 this this level of development is not considered
17 reasonably foreseeable.

18 The fifth bar from the top and all those
19 follow below it make up our reasonably foreseeable
20 cumulative scenario. This includes any projects with
21 awarded off take, any projects that have entered or
22 announced their intention to enter the permitting
23 process, and of course any approved project.
24 Basically, if a project has a name, it is included

1 here. After considering all projects with award
2 construction operations plan, or that had been
3 announced, there is still some state capacity
4 leftover that has not been awarded. This potential
5 for additional future development beyond named
6 projects is also accounted for and analyzed in this
7 scenario.

8 If you would like additional information on
9 the cumulative scope or to hear this presented
10 again, please visit the virtual meeting room web
11 page to listen to a presentation on this subject.

12 The proposed action is the construction,
13 operation, maintenance and eventual decommissioning
14 of an up to 800 megawatt wind energy facility on the
15 Outer Continental Shelf. Offshore Massachusetts
16 within the proposed project area and associated
17 export cables would occur within the range of design
18 parameters outlined in the Vineyard Wind
19 Construction and Operations Plan, subject to
20 applicable mitigation measures.

21 Alternative B excludes the New Hampshire
22 Avenue landfall location to potentially reduce
23 impact on environmental and socioeconomic resources.
24 On June 26th, 2020 Vineyard Wind informed BOEM that

1 they are no longer pursuing the New Hampshire Avenue
2 landing site. While the New Hampshire New Hampshire
3 Avenue site was included in the construction and
4 operations plan, Vineyard has obtained all of the
5 state and local permits necessary to bring the cable
6 on shore at the Cobalt Beach landing site.

7 Alternative C excludes surfact occupancy in
8 the northernmost portion of the proposed project
9 area to potentially reduce impact from the proposed
10 projects and to reduce potential conflicts with
11 existing ocean uses, such as marine navigation and
12 commercial fishing.

13 Alternative D-1 would require a minimum of
14 one nautical mile by one nautical mile spacing
15 between wind turbine generators and the lanes
16 between them. This alternative would potentially
17 reduce conflict with existing ocean users, such as
18 commercial fishing, and marine navigation.

19 Alternative D-2 would require a layout in
20 the east-west direction, east-west orientation, and
21 all of the turbines in the east-west direction would
22 have a minimum spacing of one nautical mile between
23 them to allow for vessels to travel between
24 turbines, and to reduce conflicts with existing

1 ocean users such as commercial fishing.

2 Alternative E reduces the project size no
3 more than 84 turbine. This alternative would
4 potentially reduce impact on existing ocean users
5 and on environmental resources. due to the fore
6 foundation.

7 Alternatives F, the new alternative, would
8 would include a vessel transit lane through the wind
9 development area, in which no surface occupancy
10 would occur. Any turbine presently planned for this
11 area will be moved further south in the wind
12 development area. This alternative could potentially
13 facilitate transit of vessels through the project
14 area from southern New England port to fishing areas
15 on Georges Bank.

16 Alternative G is the no action alternative.
17 In this alternative the proposed project would not
18 be approved and any potential environmental and
19 socioeconomic costs and benefits associated with
20 the proposed project would not occur. However,
21 impacts from reasonably foreseeable future offshore
22 wind and non-wind related activities would still
23 occur or could still occur. And this alternative is
24 required to be analyzed under NEPA.

1 Since the draft EIS was published, a new
2 alternative has been added and analyzed in the
3 supplemental EIS. Alternative F, the vessel transit
4 lane alternative, includes a new vessel transit lane
5 in response to the January 3rd, 2020 responsible
6 offshore development alliance known as RODA layout
7 proposal. The RODA proposal includes six total
8 designated transit lanes, each at least four
9 nautical miles wide, as seen in the figure here.

10 Although the proposal includes six total
11 transit lanes, only one intersects the Vneyard Wind
12 project as shown in this figure. As mentioned, the
13 purpose of the proposed northwest to southeast
14 transit corridor would be mainly to facilitate
15 vessel transit from southern New England ports,
16 primarily New Bedford, to fishing areas on Georges
17 Bank. The transit lane would have no occupancy and,
18 therefore, the turbines that would have occurred in
19 these areas would not be eliminated, but instead the
20 displaced turbines would be shifted south within the
21 Vineyard Wind lease area. The layout shown in this
22 figure, this figure is in Appendix A, as an apple,
23 .7-17. This figure is shown for illustrative
24 purposes only. It does not guarantee that the

1 positions identified by the black dots are
2 buildable. The layout is based on the all developer
3 agreement for east-west orientation and one nautical
4 mile by one nautical mile spacing. The positions
5 shown do not necessarily represent future turbine
6 location.

7 The intent of this figure is to show the
8 potential displacement of turbines if all six
9 transit lanes were to occur, the turbine locations
10 within the pale yellow lanes would not be utilized.
11 Under the current cumulative scenario, a
12 displacement of all of these turbine locations is
13 not feasible. And, therefore, the addition of all
14 six transit lanes would lead to elimination of some
15 of the turbines that could have occurred within
16 these lanes.

17 Our impact analyses include biological,
18 physical and socioeconomic resources, as seen here.
19 The subject matter experts that analyzed impacts to
20 these resources are also on this webinar, and will
21 answer questions later in the meeting.

22 The resources on the previous slide are
23 also seen in the summary table found in the
24 executive summary. This table summarizes the overall

1 direct and indirect and overall cumulative impact
2 for each resource. The following five slides have
3 the summaries for additional resources not seen
4 here. I will discuss the impact levels for specific
5 resources in more detail in a few slides, but wanted
6 to orient you to the table and some key elements to
7 the analyses here. More detailed analyses and impact
8 levels for future offshore wind activities may be
9 found for each resource in chapter 3, and in the
10 tables in appendecies A, as in apple, and B, as in
11 boy. The color coding in the table indicates if the
12 highest impact level is minor, moderate or major
13 with green being minor, yellow moderate, and orange
14 major. You can find the definition of these impact
15 levels in table 1.2-3 and Appendix B as in boy of
16 the SEIS. In addition, there is a poster on the
17 project virtual meeting page, which details the
18 impact level definition.

19 For resources with a direct and indirect
20 impact level of negligible or minor the impact
21 analyses have been moved to Appendix A, as in apple.
22 This was done to meet the page limit goals outlined
23 in the Department of Interior's Secretarial Order
24 3355.

1 To understand the cumulative impact for
2 each resource, BOEM analyzed the effects of the no
3 action alternative, which includes baseline
4 conditions, ongoing activities of all types, and
5 future offshore activities other than wind. We then
6 followed this with an analysis of future offshore
7 wind activities and the potential cumulative effects
8 of the proposed action and action alternative.

9 Resource impact levels seen here include terrestrial
10 and coastal fauna, coastal habitat, benthic
11 resources, and fin fish invertebrates and essential
12 fish habitat. Additional resource impact levels, as
13 seen here, include marine mammal, sea turtles,
14 demographic employment and economics and
15 environmental justice.

16 We will talk about notable differences
17 between alternatives in future slides. Resource
18 impact levels seen here include cultural, historical
19 and archaeological resources, recreation and tourism
20 and commercial fisheries and for hire recreational
21 fishing. Resource impact levels seen here include
22 land use and coastal infrastructure and navigation
23 and vessel traffic. Resources seen here include
24 other uses. Other uses includes research and

1 surveys, military and national security, aviation
2 and air traffic, cable and pipelines and radar
3 systems. Resources seen here include air quality,
4 water quality, bird and bat. All of these resources
5 are included in Appendix A, as in apple.

6 Here we'll discuss the direct and indirect
7 impacts of the proposed action. As summarized in the
8 executive summary table, and assessed in detail in
9 chapter 3 of the supplemental EIS BOEM determined
10 that for most resources direct and indirect impacts
11 were negligible to moderate and some major short and
12 long-term impacts. The proposed action or certain
13 action alternatives could have major direct or
14 indirect impacts on environmental justice
15 communities and other uses.

16 Somebody on the line I think needs to mute
17 their phone. Sorry, I'm hearing some background
18 noise.

19 The following major impacts of these
20 resources are anticipated. Major direct impacts on
21 environmental justice communities could occur from
22 the proposed action and alternatives other than B, F
23 and the no action alternative G. The placement of
24 cable and maintenance within Lewis Bay associated

1 with the New Hampshire Avenue landfall sites will
2 lead to potential effects on vessel traffic and to
3 environmental justice populations that rely on
4 subsistence fishing or employment and income from
5 marine businesses. This impact would lessen to
6 moderate under alternative B, which would exclude
7 the use of the New Hampshire Avenue landfall
8 location.

9 As mentioned on the alternative slide,
10 slide 18, Vineyard Wind is no longer pursuing the
11 New Hampshire Avenue landfall location. Alternative
12 F leads to lower direct and indirect impacts for
13 environmental justice due to reduced impacts related
14 to allisions and collisions and the presence of the
15 transit lane. The reduced risk of collisions or
16 allisions would lessen the impact on marine
17 businesses, and also on the low income and workers
18 employed in these industries. By reducing the impact
19 on these businesses, alternative F would have a
20 smaller incremental impact on environmental justice
21 populations, although those impacts would remain
22 negligible to moderate.

23 The direct and indirect impacts for other
24 uses was determined to be major for scientific

1 research and surveys for the proposed action and all
2 action alternatives. The placement of structures
3 within the wind development areas pose a
4 navigational hazards to survey aircraft and vessels
5 and restrict access to survey location. This would
6 impact the statistical design of surveys and cause a
7 loss of information leading to major impact. The
8 analysis of other resource areas listed here found
9 that direct and indirect impacts were also minor to
10 moderate beneficial from the proposed action and
11 action alternatives.

12 Here we will discuss the cumulative impact
13 of the proposed action in addition to ongoing
14 activities, future offshore non-wind activities and
15 future offshore wind activity. For most resources
16 cumulative impacts were minor to moderate with some
17 major short and long-term impacts.

18 Major cumulative effects could occur to
19 commercial fisheries and for hire recreational
20 fishing for the proposed action and all action
21 alternatives. Here the impact rating is driven
22 mostly by changes due to fish distribution and
23 availability associated with climate change, reduced
24 stock levels due to fishing mortality, and permanent

1 impact through the presence of structures such as
2 cable protection measures and foundations from
3 offshore wind activity. Major cumulative impact on
4 navigation could occur as a result of the presence
5 of structures, which increases the risk of
6 collisions and allisions under the proposed action
7 and all the alternatives with the exception of D-2,
8 F with D-2 and then no action, which is G. That
9 impact level becomes moderate under D-2 with a one
10 by one nautical mile uniform grid layout, and under
11 alternative F, the vessel transit lane alternative,
12 when paired with D-2, due to the large spacing
13 between structures and the regular layout.

14 Major cumulative impacts on scientific
15 research of surveys, as mentioned on the previous
16 slide under the other uses sections of the
17 supplemental EIS, could occur as a result of the
18 proposed action and all action alternatives due to
19 the presence of structures, which could hinder
20 surveys within the project area. This is similar to
21 the direct and indirect impacts but greater in
22 magnitude due to the cumulative scenario.

23 In addition, there would be major
24 cumulative impacts on military and national security

1 uses as a result of the proposed action and action
2 alternatives other than D-2 and F with D-2 due to
3 the navigational complexity from structure presence,
4 which would increase the difficulty to conduct or
5 direct the operation. The major impact level goes
6 down to moderate for search and rescue operations
7 under alternative D-2 or alternative F when paired
8 with D-2, due to the uniform grid in D-2 for the
9 vessel transit lane with the uniform grid, which
10 would be alternative F with D-2.

11 For some of these resources, there are also
12 minor beneficial cumulative impacts. Such as for
13 coastal habitats, recreation and tourism, land use
14 and coastal infrastructure -- land use and coastal
15 infrastructure and demographics, employment and
16 economic.

17 This is the proposed schedule that you will
18 see on the permitting dashboard. However, that
19 schedule could change based on comments received.
20 For example, if someone identifies a significant
21 issue that we did not consider in the draft EIS or
22 supplemental EIS that requires new analysis. There
23 are also ongoing complications, including the
24 Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection

1 Act, the National Historic Preservation Act and the
2 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management
3 Act complications that need to be completed prior to
4 the signing of the record of the decision. BOEM is
5 working with agencies to incorporate new project
6 changes into existing consultation. Additional
7 details about ongoing and completed consultations
8 may be found in Appendix C of the SEIS. BOEM's
9 Vineyard Wind web page includes a variety of
10 informative documents, including Vineyard Wind's
11 construction and operations plan, copies of the
12 drafts and the supplemental SEIS, including a large
13 print version of the supplemental EIS, and a link
14 to the virtual meeting room web page. Within the
15 virtual meeting room web page, as I mentioned, you
16 will find posters and presentations along with some
17 additional posters I didn't mention that highlight
18 key topic areas or resource areas, like our how to
19 comment in poster.

20 I want to thank you for your attendance and
21 your future participation today. We look forward to
22 your comments and your questions. And with that,
23 I'll hand it back over to Christine.

24 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you, Jenn. So

1 today, you have an opportunity to provide comments.
2 We've got instructions that we've tried a couple
3 different times, that are also on your screen. As
4 you can note, the comments will be open until July
5 27th, 2020. You can provide comments on the SEIS by
6 using regulations.gov, providing oral testimony
7 today or at any of the other public meetings, and by
8 mailing comments the Office of Renewable Energy
9 Programs at the address provided on the slide, and
10 on the Vineyard Wind meeting page, virtual meeting
11 page. If you haven't already done so, and would like
12 to provide comments, please press Star 1 now and ask
13 to speak to our operator. After you press Star 1
14 you'll have to be patient with Zoom, we have one
15 operator today and a number of people on the line.
16 We appreciate your patience with that.

17 If you prefer to submit your comments
18 electronically, visit <http://www.regulations.gov>
19 and search for docket number BOEM,
20 B-O-E-M,-2020-0005. Next click comment here. Coments
21 may also be submitted by mail with envelopes that
22 are labeled Vineyard Wind supplements with draft
23 EIS, addressed to the program manager at the office
24 of renewable energy, Bureau of Ocean Energy

1 Management. The address is 45600 Woodland Road,
2 V-a-m-o-r-e-p or V as in Victor, a as in apple, m as
3 in Mary -o-r-e as in echo, p as in Paul, at
4 Sterling, Virginia 20166. Comments must be
5 postmarked no later than July 27th, 2020.

6 BOEM doesn't consider any anonymous
7 comments, so please include your name and address as
8 part of your submittal. All comments will be made
9 part of the public record and may be publicly posted
10 without change. You may also submit your comments
11 online at regulations.gov.

12 Please also take a minute or two now to
13 submit any questions that you might have about the
14 presentation just heard from Jenn, the SEIS in
15 general or about BOEM up in the Q & A box at the
16 bottom of your screen. We'll respond to those
17 questions after public comment.

18 So let's get to the public comments. Next
19 slide, please. If you're filing comments today, your
20 remarks will be recorded, transcribed and entered
21 into the administrative record. So even though you
22 may see your name in the chat box on your screen, if
23 you're online, please state your name slowly and
24 spell your first and last name for us. So that the

1 court reporter and those of us that are only on via
2 phone today can hear your name clearly and
3 accurately. Also, if you'd like please indicate any
4 organization you're affiliated with, if applicable.
5 The comments today provided will be taken into
6 consideration by BOEM to update the final EIS and
7 they'll be recorded and also publicly posted.

8 Please be mindful of time so that everyone
9 has the opportunity to speak. I'll ask you to wrap
10 things up at about the five minute mark. If you need
11 more time, we'll put your name at the end of the
12 queue. This will allow everyone the opportunity to
13 speak at least once and if time allows we will give
14 you another chance.

15 Please note if your comments are lengthy,
16 you can also submit them in writing, as both written
17 and oral comments are being considered equally. We
18 will take briefly 15 speakers, but only after
19 everyone who is interested has had a chance to speak
20 at least one.

21 After identifying the first speaker we will
22 note who is next to speak. In addition to putting
23 the speaker's names in the chat box on the screen,
24 I'll call out names for those on the phone.

1 Typically, I'd like to greet you when you arrive at
2 a meeting on purpose in person, but since I can't do
3 that today, I won't be able to hear you pronounce
4 your name. So I sincerely apologize in advance if I
5 mispronounce anyone's name, I know that everybody
6 likes to have their name and hear their name
7 properly pronounced, and I ask you for your patience
8 and understanding.

9 I'll commit to gathering all the questions
10 and comments today and the other meetings and
11 respond to them as appropriate in the final EIS. So
12 with that, let's begin with our first speaker, and
13 if you start looking at the chat box on the screen
14 -- let's see if we have the names on the chat box.
15 Yes, we do. Okay, so I'm seeing that there is an
16 individual with the first name, but I'm not going to
17 attempt, the last name Taylor. Second individual C,
18 again a challenging B-r-a-g-a, after that Linda
19 Lancaster, Eric P. and Daniel F. So I in just a
20 moment, we'll turn it over to the first individual.
21 Again, please remember to state and spell your name
22 for us. Thank you. With that, N. Taylor, please.
23 Give it just a minute, is N. Taylor available?

24 NOLI TAYLOR: Can you hear me? Hello?

1 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Great, go ahead, thank
2 you.

3 NOLI TAYLOR: Okay, great. Thank you. My
4 name is Noli Taylor, N-o-l-i T-a-y-l-o-r, and thank
5 you to everyone at BOEM for offering us the
6 opportunity to submit public comment on the SEIS
7 today. I live in the town of Aquinnah on Martha's
8 Vineyard, and the Vineyard Wind development will be
9 distantly visible from my street and other lease
10 areas are even closer to the shores near our home.

11 I strongly support the Vineyard Wind
12 development and the ongoing development of offshore
13 wind in our region. I'm a mother with two young
14 children, and I believe that climate change poses
15 the greatest threat to their future. Our kids are
16 the 17th generation in their family to be born on
17 Martha's Vineyard. And I want this to be a place
18 where my kids and the next 17 generations can
19 continue to live. But the hazards of climate change
20 from sea level rise to increased storm threats and
21 more threaten their chances to continue to call this
22 island home.

23 Vinyard Wind has spent a decade
24 researching, studying and planning how to build

1 their offshore wind development in a way that is as
2 safe as possible for marine life and our fishing
3 fleet. We have friends and relatives who are
4 commercial fishermen on the island and it was a
5 comfort to me to learn that the Coast Guard reviewed
6 Vineyard Wind's plans and deem them safe for
7 commercial fishing.

8 The changes Vineyard Wind has made in
9 response to concerns from the commercial fishing
10 industry are critical. The Vineyard's fishing
11 heritage is important as is the livelihood of our
12 relatives and neighbors. But nothing threatens the
13 future of fishing and farming here more than climate
14 change. And the only way we can tackle the issue of
15 climate is to stop burning fossil fuels as soon as
16 possible and replace them with renewable energy
17 sources. The greatest contribution our region can
18 make to this transition is to move forward with
19 offshore wind safely but also quickly.

20 Another challenge that young people face
21 who want to stay living on the Vineyard is the
22 ability to find good year-round jobs. Vineyard Wind
23 has committed to base their operations and
24 maintenance facility into Berry Harbor, and to offer

1 offshore wind technician training to Island students
2 at the Martha's Vineyard Regional High School.
3 Diversifying our local economy is key to helping
4 young people stay on the island, and these jobs will
5 help us in that effort. It asks something of those
6 of us who live along the coast to support a
7 development of this scale near our homes. But it is
8 something we need to do, and we're ready for it.

9 Time is up for us to find other ways to get
10 off of fossil fuels. And these wind developments are
11 crucial to changing the way we get our electricity
12 so that we can give the next generation and the life
13 in the oceans a chance at a livable future. Thank
14 you.

15 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you very much, Noli.
16 And just a note to some folks, we are putting names
17 up in the chat room five at a time. Otherwise, we
18 would fill up our chat room and whatnot. So please
19 use, again, the Q & A for questions and then the
20 chat room for any difficulties. So we'll use the
21 chat room now to put the names in, and like I said,
22 if you have questions about the products that you'd
23 like us to answer at the end of the Q & A, please
24 that use that Q & A box for those of you online at

1 Zoom.

2 Okay. With that, I'm going to turn it over
3 to the next speaker. First name with the letter C
4 and the last name, B-r-a-g-a, and go ahead and
5 provide your comments please.

6 YAIMA BRAGA: Hi, can you hear me?

7 CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine.
8 Thank you.

9 YAIMA BRAGA: Okay, great. Good afternoon.
10 My name is Yaima Braga. I'm a little bit misspelled
11 there. So it's Y-a-i-m-a, last name Greg a
12 B-r-a-g-a, and I apologize in advance. I have my one
13 year old in the background so if you hear her,
14 that's what it is.

15 So yes, good afternoon, I work at Green
16 Energy Consumers Alliance, we're a Boston-based
17 nonprofit aimed at harnessing the power of energy
18 consumers to feed the transition to a low carbon
19 future. And I'm speaking today in support of the
20 development of Vineyard Wind 1 and all future
21 offshore wind projects in the United States.

22 Offshore wind is essential for the
23 achievement of Massachusetts and by extension all of
24 New England safe, clean energy goals. We are aware

1 that the projects and the scale of the Vineyard Wind
2 are bound to have some effects on the environment
3 and applaud Vineyard Wind for their efforts to
4 mitigate those as much as possible. They have along
5 with other major developers agreed to the proposed
6 action D-2 which is the east-west one nautical mile
7 wind turbine layout that will create hundreds of
8 dozens of lanes for the commercial fishing industry.
9 And we believe this is the best course of action as
10 it allows the project to be viable in order to bring
11 much needed clean power to the region at low cost to
12 ratepayers. At the outstanding low price of \$74 per
13 megawatt hour for year one Vineyard Wind 1 will be
14 very competitive in the New England electricity
15 market.

16 In New England high prices dominate the
17 market in the winter, as heating gets prioritized
18 over electricity generation. So it's the highest
19 priced resources get used usually the most polluting
20 sources, dirty fuels, such as coal and oil, swinging
21 up emissions in the winter. Actual wind has a high
22 winter capacity factor, compared to other types of
23 renewables in New England. For example, since it has
24 been online the 30 megawatts Block Island wind farms

1 has achieved wintertime capacity factors of over 50
2 percent. Vineyard Wind and other large actual wind
3 farms that are proposed in the region have even
4 better wind time wind energy resources. Having
5 hundreds or thousands of megawatts of offshore wind
6 online will decrease the likelihood of encountering
7 high winter prices in the future.

8 Once they're built, offshore wind farms could
9 use electricity for free, unlike natural gas plants.
10 That means that the lower the price of buying
11 electricity for the entire grid. So we call this
12 phenomenon price suppression and it's a benefit also
13 achieved by onshore wind, solar and energy
14 efficiency.

15 And lastly, I'd like to point out that
16 offshore wind and other renewables have the benefit
17 of producing zero emission electricity. It will help
18 us decarbonize our grid as we continue to electrify
19 operations such as heating and transportation. We
20 hope that BOEM and the federal government look at
21 the benefits of Vineyard Wind 1 from the development
22 of clean energy, savings to ratepayers and also to
23 the economic boom it is sure to bring to the region,
24 as hundreds of new jobs will be created, and allow

1 the project to move forward. Thank you.

2 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you very much.

3 Okay, next I have Linda L. and then after that Eric
4 P. and Daniel S. So Linda Lancaster, Eric P. and
5 Daniel S.

6 Linda, at this time we welcome you to
7 provide your comments, please.

8 LINDA LANCASTER: Thank you. Can you hear
9 me?

10 CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine.
11 Thank you so much.

12 LINDA LANCASTER: My name is Linda
13 Lancaster, it's spelled L-i-n-d-a,
14 L-a-n-c-a-s-t-e-r, and I'm a member of the South
15 Shore and Cape Chapter of the Citizens Climate
16 Lobby.

17 Thank you for the opportunity to speak in
18 support of building Vineyard Wind without further
19 delay and with the existing 1.1 mile turbine layout
20 plan. I oppose the addition of two to four mile
21 transit lanes within wind farms, which the U.S.
22 Coast Guard has determined is unnecessary, and which
23 would needlessly reduce the amount of electricity
24 Vineyard Wind can produce.

1 Massachusetts needs clean energy and
2 offshore wind is New England's biggest untapped
3 clean energy source. Our economy needs the hundreds
4 of local jobs Vineyard Wind will create. And our
5 ratepayers need the energy cost savings Vineyard
6 Wind will bring. In 2018 Massachusetts sent \$18
7 billion out of state to buy fossil fuels. Vineyard
8 Wind will keep more of this money in Massachusetts,
9 where it will be channeled into jobs and the
10 consumer economy.

11 Increasing the amount of clean energy in
12 Massachusetts has other benefits as well. Cleaner
13 air will reduce the adverse health impacts from air
14 pollution caused by fossil fuel plants. It will help
15 protect our fisheries and reduce ocean acidification
16 that is hurting our shellfish industry. And who
17 knows, some European offshore wind farms have become
18 tourist destinations. Maybe Vineyard Wind will
19 become a tourist attraction in the future.

20 In conclusion, Vineyard Wind has been
21 studied to death, it's time to build it and get the
22 southeast Massachusetts economy going in the right
23 direction, which is up. Thank you so much for your
24 time.

1 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you for your
2 comments. All right, up next we have Eric P. and
3 then Daniel S. And as you see, we've got a few more
4 names posted after that on the chat box online and
5 I'll say them out loud for those of you on the
6 phone. So Eric P., Daniel S., individual first name
7 that starts with a Z. last name Drake, William H.
8 And then David B. So, Eric, you're up next with your
9 comments. Eric P. Let me know if we can hear Eric at
10 this time.

11 We'll pause on Eric. Perhaps we'll go
12 ahead to the next individual, Daniel. If you get
13 Eric back, I will take him back into the queue.
14 So let's go ahead with Daniel Seidman. Daniel, are
15 you available?

16 DANIEL SEIDMAN: Yes, ma'am, I am.

17 CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right, Daniel.

18 DANIEL SEIDMAN: And you did say my name
19 right but that's because they misspelled my last
20 name. It's S like Sam, E like echo, I like India, D
21 like David, M like Mary, A like alpha, N like
22 November. I am on the Vineyard Wind Board and was
23 originally on the initial MV Co-op, which was put
24 forth by a fella that passed away not too long ago,

1 and this was sort of his dream to bring fossil fuel
2 -- or fossil-free energy to the island. And I want
3 to thank BOEM for their extensive research. I know
4 it did cause some consternation for some folks when
5 there was a cumulative impact document that was
6 going to be prepared and has now been prepared.
7 Obviously, offshore wind or marine renewable energy
8 devices, as some people refer to them, MREDS, are
9 going to be a major source of energy, at least on
10 the coast going forward. It does make sense to look
11 at the cumulative impact. So I do thank you for
12 doing that.

13 We have worked closely with the local
14 fisheries, the official groups that are on the
15 island and on the Cape. We have listened to them and
16 that was one of the reasons that the one by one
17 transit lanes were suggested and were adopted by
18 Vineyard Wind. As somebody else said, the Coast
19 Guard has said that lanes much more than that really
20 don't add to anything. So I would also agree that
21 just doing the one by one transit lanes would
22 accomplish the goal. When you develop offshore
23 wind, you have, you know, initially two phases that
24 need to be looked at, the initial construction phase

1 and how that affects the benthic, the soil or the
2 bottom of the ocean for lack of a better term, and
3 also the pelagic the water column of water. So
4 during development, there can be -- there's, you
5 know, the concern about noise. And, again, when BOEM
6 was on the island of Martha's Vineyard, they had
7 some wonderful posters showing different animals,
8 mammals, seals, fish, et cetera, and how noise at
9 what distance from the construction site the noise
10 would have an effect on them. That same sort of
11 information is also available in a report done by
12 Bergstrom, et al., which was done in 2014, which
13 does talk about the noise level. And also about
14 cables and electromagnetic current, et cetera,
15 talks about benefits some of the detriments. And
16 then the second stage is once the items, the
17 turbines are in production, how does that affect the
18 life in the ocean around it. So there was another
19 report on that that was done by Bergstrom. I'm sorry
20 by Bailey, excuse me, done in 2014, assessing
21 environmental impacts of offshore wind farm lessons
22 learned and recommendations for the future. That's
23 by Helen Bailey, Kate L. Brooks, and Paul M.
24 Thompson, that's in 2014. Also an excellent article.

1 Anytime you do anything, there's always
2 going to be benefits and detriments. We are not
3 going to be able to eliminate all detriments, but
4 what Vinyard Wind has tried to do and will do is to
5 take the best information on -- at the time of
6 construction on how to minimize sounds if at all
7 possible. There are air curtains that can be put in
8 place as one way to decrease the sound levels. And
9 there are several other newer techniques that have
10 come into play since 2014. The other report I did
11 mention was Bergstrom, which is the effects of
12 offshore wind farms on marine wildlife, a
13 generalized impactic assessment. That's Lena or Lana
14 Bergstrom, Lana Kautsky -- I'm sorry, I'm murdering
15 these names I'm sure. Torleif Malm, Rutger
16 Rosenberg, Mangus Wahlberg, Natassja Capetillo and
17 Dan Wilhelmsson. These are mainly from the Swedish
18 University of Agriculture Sciences. That one talks
19 more about the cable, et cetera, and how there are
20 some temporal spatial extents, the pressure
21 associated with those. Again, there are always going
22 to be detriments when you build something. What BOEM
23 is trying to do as well as Vineyard Wind is to try
24 and mitigate those as much as possible while

1 providing what is a fossil fuel resource that will
2 go many years into the future. When the first wind
3 farm went up, it was two kilowatts, I believe. Now
4 we're talking about 14 per turbine. So the amount of
5 turbines to generate the same amount of power is
6 being reduced over time with a reduced the number of
7 platforms, then obviously you reduce the impact on
8 the life in the ocean and also the benthic impact on
9 the soil and subsurface.

10 So we again believe this is a good project.
11 We have reached out, we listen, and we look forward
12 to moving ahead with this to provide power.

13 CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right, thank you very
14 much. I noticed that Daniel had some materials that
15 he was referencing, and if you have support
16 materials like that, I would recommend that
17 potentially you post that to the comments
18 electronically or via mail. We'll have that screen
19 up again in a little bit when we get done to the
20 public -- at the end of the public comment period.
21 But just so you know, go to [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov), look
22 for the docket BOEM, B-O-E-M-2020-0005, and you can
23 post supplements or comments that you provide today
24 or additional comments. So thank you.

1 With that, I will turn it over to the next
2 speaker. First initials V., last name Drake, and
3 then looking at the rest of the queue, we've got
4 William H. David B., Gary H. and John H. So with
5 that I'll turn it to V. Drake and please state and
6 spell your name because we we've got some names here
7 that we've been not getting our spellings correct
8 and apologies again and thank you for your patience.

9 ZIVEN DRAKE: Excellent. Thank you,
10 Christine. I appreciate it. Good afternoon. My name
11 is Ziven Drake. That is indeed spelled correctly on
12 your screen. I am a member of local Union 56,
13 Commercial Divers and Pile Drivers. And I am also --
14 I work for the North Atlantic State Carpenters
15 Training Fund. So I do a lot of our recruiting and
16 retention of newer members looking to join the
17 trades here in Boston and elsewhere throughout New
18 England, and when I speak to young divers, none of
19 them want to go dive in the Gulf of Mexico on oil
20 rigs anymore, they are all incredibly excited at the
21 potential for offshore wind.

22 I had the honor of taking the offshore
23 survival training class offered through Mass
24 Maritime and the Global Wind Organization. And I

1 have a statement from a young diver. She also took
2 the class with me, she is one of our youngest
3 members at Local 56. And she put together a very,
4 very poignant statement that I absolutely second, so
5 I would like to read that on her behalf.

6 This is a statement from Natalie MacDonald,
7 member in good standing of Local Union 56 Commercial
8 Divers and Pile Drivers. "I'm a 20 year old female
9 pile driver who has taken the training required to
10 be able to work on building offshore wind farms. To
11 imply that I do not care about the future of our
12 planet, the animals that live there, or the people
13 who also work in these waters for a living is
14 totally incorrect. I see what we've done to our
15 planet through years of reliance on fossil fuels,
16 and, yes, no solution is perfect. But here we have
17 the opportunity to lead the way to build turbines in
18 a way that takes into account wildlife, fishermen
19 and local residents. There's no perfect solution to
20 supply the energy demands of the growing world, but
21 these turbines along with other clean energy
22 solutions are the future. You can resist the change
23 and demand that, as an industry, fishing should be
24 given precedence over turbines for ocean space. But

1 you cannot deny that your industry has also had dire
2 negative impacts on the waters you claim to be here
3 to protect. Overfishing, habitat destruction and an
4 industry that has become one dominated by large
5 conglomerates cannot possibly sit here and say that
6 they are doing right by our planet. Yes, the project
7 could affect people's livelihoods. But it could also
8 put us one step closer to having cleaner energy
9 while also showing the rest of the United States
10 that we are serious about the future we want to
11 secure for future generations. Change is hard. Not
12 all the world embraced the Industrial Revolution.
13 But nonetheless it prevailed. We are now at the
14 point where we can make a very positive change in
15 our planet when it comes to creating clean energy,
16 creating jobs in a growing field, and we need to
17 take a stand against increasingly large fishing
18 entities that claim to be working for the best
19 interests of their employees and not just to take
20 all they can from our oceans. We can all share the
21 oceans, but we have to be willing to work together,
22 to concede a little on both sides, and to do what we
23 can to make the world a cleaner and more sustainable
24 planet. I deserve to be able to work just as much as

1 local fishermen and we should be able to work
2 together. This world is too often about pitting
3 everyone against each other. Speaking as perhaps
4 one of the youngest voices investmented in this
5 project, we should show the world what collaboration
6 and cooperation can look like." Thank you.

7 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you, and I'm going
8 to ask you to do me a couple of favors, and one of
9 them is can you spell your name for the court
10 reporter and then also, you read a letter by
11 Natalie, if you can state and spell her name to just
12 so we can get those accurately spelled into the
13 record, that would be super helpful.

14 ZIVEN DRAKE: Yes, ma'am. My name is
15 spelled Z-i-v-e-n D-r-a-k-e. Natalie's name is
16 spelled N-a-t-a-l-i-e M-a-c-d-o-n-a-l-d.

17 CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right, thank you very
18 much. Just going to pause for a minute give folks a
19 couple of reminders. We are looking at questions and
20 answers that are on the bottom, we've got a number
21 of subject matter experts that will be taking a look
22 at those questions and answering them at the end of
23 the public comment period. Also, we've got a few
24 more names that are posted that we're going to go

1 forward with. As a reminder, if you haven't done so
2 already, please press Star 1 and wait to speak to
3 the operator to get into the queue. And I think
4 those are some of the housekeeping things that I
5 wanted to just touch on.

6 As I'm looking forward at the list I see
7 William H., David B., Gary H. John H., so I'm
8 wondering if William Hamner is available next to
9 speak. Can we potentially get William on the line?

10 WILLIAM HAMNER: Hello, can you hear me?

11 CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine.
12 Thank you. If you can state and spell your name,
13 thank you.

14 WILLIAM HAMNER: Sure I'm William Hamner.
15 H-a-m-n-e-r. My family has owned a home in Chilmark
16 for 40 years. I am also the representative of a
17 company in Texas called Offshore Wind Power System
18 of Texas and I'm their New England representative.
19 And my main concern to communicate here is that the
20 environmental impact statement is significantly
21 defective in its consideration of reasonable
22 alternatives regarding the type of technology to be
23 installed. NEPA requires that all reasonable
24 alternatives to a project be considered. The project

1 as proposed specifies that the turbines will be
2 installed either on monopile or jacket foundations.
3 No consideration is given to another technology
4 which eliminates the impacts that those technologies
5 have. Monopiles and jacket foundations require that
6 they be driven into the seabed. This creates
7 significant impacts for sound and for disruption of
8 the benthic habitat.

9 The resulting foundations are also
10 permanent, they cannot be moved quickly if they are
11 causing problems in the future. In the offshore
12 industry for over 50 years another technology has
13 been used to install large things offshore, they are
14 called mobile jack up platform. These are floating
15 platforms on which structures are assembled on shore
16 and loaded out into place, and then the legs of the
17 structure are lowered down to the seabed and then
18 the structure is raised up on the legs. This
19 eliminates completely the need for pile driving.

20 Almost all of the environmental impacts in
21 the EIS are related to pile driving, and there is no
22 mention at all that there is another technology that
23 is proven, has been used for decades and eliminates
24 that impact completely. This is a real problem

1 because it results in not only the necessity of
2 mitigating the impacts of pile driving, but the
3 technology currently proposed, which is monopiles
4 and jackets, requires the use of an offshore
5 construction ship to lift the turbines and install
6 them on top of the structure. Those ships do not
7 exist in the United States, they will have to come
8 from Europe where they are already built. They add
9 hundreds of millions of dollars to a project, thus
10 raising the cost of the electricity that is produced
11 and that is a burden to the ratepayers. And the
12 ships themselves have significant impacts. They have
13 to have a port, they create air pollution and other
14 types of pollution when they are in use. Whereas,
15 the mobile jack up platform requires no ships at
16 all.

17 The entire system is assembled on shore and
18 a tugboat simply tows the whole unit out and
19 installs it in a couple of days. Similarly, when it
20 is time to decommission the wind farm, and this has
21 not been addressed in the EIS to my consideration,
22 when the foundation jackets are removed, if they are
23 driven into the seabed they have to be cut out or
24 blown up and that creates impact. Whereas, a mobile

1 jacket platform simply lifts its legs up
2 and floats back to it. So the EIS, which apparently
3 is entire EIS, is focused on the disruption impact
4 from the use of turbines, and there is no mention of
5 this other technology.

6 Now, to be clear, go to mobile jack ups on
7 Google and look at it, you will see literally
8 thousands of pictures of these mobile jack ups. We
9 have also created a website called
10 Windbaseoffshore.com, whic you can see, where the
11 design of the jack up platform from our company in
12 Texas has already been built and installed in the
13 ocean off its reef holding a meterological tower,
14 which was done six years ago by the Eon Offshore
15 Wind Farm Company in Norway and Sweden. So this
16 technology is proven, it exists, it has been
17 demonstrated. It eliminates most of the risks that
18 are already addressed the EIS, and BOEM's director,
19 Walter Cruickshank, and the National Renewable
20 Energy Laboratory all know this and has been
21 informed of it for over five years. We are baffled
22 why this has not been addressed as a reasonable
23 alternative in the EIS.

24 To be clear, we are not opposing the wind

1 farms at all. But we are very concerned that the
2 public is not being given adequate information about
3 reasonable alternatives that the proposed technology
4 for selling the turbines obviously has significantly
5 more environmental and construction and demolition
6 with it than the alternative technology we think is
7 better. The fishermen are more at risk with the
8 proposed technology because if something happens in
9 the area the wind farm those devices will not be
10 moved. Whereas, if they are floating with the mobile
11 jack up platforms literally it takes two days to
12 move it to somewhere else that has large impact.

13 Finally, the technologies proposed are unproven.
14 No one says in that EIS that monopiles or jackets
15 will be used. No monopile has ever been installed in
16 the ocean with a 14 megawatt turbine in moderate or
17 deeper water, it is absolutely not known if that
18 will work. Whereas, the jack up will hold up to
19 10,000 tons. That is how install them around the
20 world. So considering that we have unproven
21 technology proposed, there is no reasonable
22 alternative for those screening the EIS, I believe
23 -- we want this to go forward, to be clear we want
24 the wind farm to go forward as fast as possible, but

1 it is almost certain in our opinion that it will be
2 challenged in court because a potential effect on
3 impacts on light whales, an endangered species,
4 that will be negatated until the latest technology
5 is used. Thank you for your attention.

6 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you for your
7 comments. Okay, next I've got David B., after that
8 Gary H., John H., Brandon B. and Margaret D. So I
9 will turn it over to David to begin your comments.

10 DAVID BORRUS: Hi. Can you hear me?

11 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yes, I can hear you just
12 fine. Thank you.

13 DAVID BORRUS: Okay. My name is David
14 Borrus. I see on the screen My name is spelled
15 incorrectly, so I'll spell it. Last name
16 B-o-r-r-u-s. I am the business manager for Pile
17 Drivers and Divers Local 56. I know you've heard
18 from some of my members just previously and I know
19 there's been written comments submitted as well.

20 We represent over 500 men and women who are
21 skilled marine trades workers. We have been
22 advocating on behalf of offshore wind for the better
23 part of 16 years. And we have developed a
24 relationship with several of the developers of

1 offshore wind. And we have followed the development
2 of Vineyard Wind very closely, we are training our
3 members to go to work in this in this field. You
4 heard from two who just completed the GWO course in
5 March. So we're committed to this. And we believe
6 that the -- you know, the permitting process has
7 been long, and we understand the need to be
8 thorough. And we are aware that there's a
9 significant amount of opposition that has come from
10 the commercial fishing community. We understand that
11 they are, you know, an essential part of the
12 Southeastern Mass economy. Jobs offshore, jobs
13 onshore, and we recognize their cultural
14 contributions to Massachusetts as well. However,
15 the ocean is a shared resource. All of us have an
16 opportunity to make a living there, marine
17 construction workers as well.

18 The fishermen have advocated on behalf of
19 themselves very well, have received some \$17 million
20 in funds, I believe from Vineyard Wind, for
21 essentially for work they haven't done yet. We're
22 still waiting for the opportunity to go to work. So
23 to that effect, I'd like to speak to the permit
24 primarily today. The original delay was caused,

1 there was a delay, in August of 2019, I believe,
2 based on the spacing of the monopiles and Vineyard
3 Wind has redesigned its entire grid to allow for one
4 nautical mile between each turbine monopile and the
5 Coast Guard chimed in and said this is acceptable,
6 this is more than enough space for people to transit
7 the turbine site, the designated lease area, whether
8 they're fishermen or pleasure boaters. The U.S.
9 Coast Guard strongly believes this is a good, good
10 layout. So we think this is the one to go with.

11 We have heard that there's opposition that
12 there is a request for a four nautical miles
13 corridor and we're opposed to that. There would add
14 extensive costs to the project. Already Vineyard
15 Wind has agreed to do new borings at the one
16 nautical mile mark, and that's expensive to begin
17 with, but then to add the additional costs for all
18 the cabling and the additional engineering needed to
19 do this, this is going to needlessly delay the
20 project but may imperil its financial viability. And
21 at this point, we don't need that, we need to get
22 out there and put some turbines up. The Coast Guard
23 approves this is good plan, we'd like to see this
24 project go forward. And we're here to support the

1 implementation of the SEIS as it stands and issue
2 that permit. So on behalf of the pile drivers and
3 divers of Local 56, we strongly support the
4 application of Vineyard Wind for a permit to
5 proceed. Thanks very much.

6 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you for your
7 comments. Next step, we've got Gary H., John H.,
8 Brandon B. and Margaret D. I'm going ask everyone,
9 please, as those of you that are on Zoom can see,
10 please state and spell your name, we realize that
11 we've had some challenges getting the spelling of
12 names correctly, and we want to make sure that our
13 record is just as accurate as we can possibly make
14 it, so you can help us out by stating and spelling
15 your name for us. So with that, I will turn it over
16 to Gary and go ahead with your comments, please.

17 GARY HARCOURT: Yeah, it's Gary Harcourt,
18 and it's spelled right, G-a-r-y H-a-r-c-o-u-r-t. I'm
19 a resident of Oak Bluffs, I'm a renewable energy
20 advocate, and I also served on the board of Vineyard
21 Power Cooperative on Martha's Vineyard. I'm
22 generally in favor of renewable energy as an
23 important solution to climate change. And there's no
24 question that climate change is one of the greatest

1 threats to the coastal regions of New England, the
2 United States and, in fact, the world. The rate of
3 climate change continues to increase exponentially.
4 But, unfortunately, the rate at which renewable
5 offshore projects are being approved has stalled
6 over the last two decades. And climate change is
7 coming at us like a freight train down a mountain
8 with no brakes, and we have to move. As a nation
9 we've been dragging our feet on offshore wind and
10 really we've stepped forward and get something done.

11 The research that's been done to date is
12 exhaustive. I believe that this project has been
13 looked at up, down, sideways and every way it could
14 possibly be. I think that everyone's done a great
15 job. I think that the developer, Vineyard Power,
16 power has done a really good job in making
17 concessions and trying to do this in a responsible
18 manner. As a supporter of our local fishermen, I'm
19 happy that fishermen add a voice and the project
20 developers made massive changes that they reflected
21 initially, changes in layout, changes in spacing.
22 And I firmly believe that this successful
23 implementation of this project will improve our
24 climate and improve our fisheries. The one mile

1 turbine spacing in the revised layout is generous
2 and is adequate, and I see no reason to reduce the
3 project size for additional transit lanes and in no
4 case should a four mile corridor be required. I
5 mean, let's face it, Vineyard Sound itself is only
6 three miles and navigable in only two miles. Cape
7 Cod Canal is only 480 feet wide at its narrowest,
8 roughly one 10th of a mile. And in 2015, the world's
9 largest cruise ship, which at the time was 644 feet
10 long sailed through the canal without issue, and
11 massive freighters pass through that canal
12 regularly, 480 feet wide.

13 I just heard Mr. Hamner speak of the jack
14 up foundations. Clearly, the developers are aware of
15 all available technologies, they do use jack up
16 platforms to work on the turbines, they use them to
17 go out and do the testing of the sea bottom. And I'm
18 also sure everybody trying to sell a foundation will
19 say that theirs is the best. But, I mean, if you do
20 look up jacked up wind arms, you'll find out that
21 it is not really proven technology for large wind
22 farms. Neither are floating platforms or even cold
23 fusion for that matter.

24 We also regularly hear on the news that our

1 federal government is fast tracking new oil and gas
2 exploration and pipelines. And we don't ever hear
3 that they're fast tracking offshore wind, but it's
4 time that we start to move in that direction. And
5 this is not fast tracking. This has been looked at
6 for decades and this particular project for many,
7 many years, and I would ask that we approve it as
8 quickly as possible with no restrictions. Thanks.

9 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you for your
10 comments. All right. Next we have John H., then
11 Brandon B., Margaret D., David D., and Sarah G. So
12 with that, I turn it over to John, please state and
13 spell your name, please. John, are you with us?
14 Give John just one more minute. John, if you are
15 hearing me but not able to speak, please press Star
16 1 and maybe we can get you back in the queue, and
17 I'll take this moment just to say that for anyone
18 that's new, we do have more names in the queue than
19 we're able to show on the screen, but in few minutes
20 if you haven't seen your name, please do press Star
21 1 and speak to the operator to get added to us. If
22 you haven't done so already now would be a great
23 time. We have a few names after Sarah. So if after
24 the group of names after Sarah you don't see yours

1 you might want to do that too. All right.

2 I just see you now if John H. is available.

3 JON HARTZBAND: Yes, I am. Can you hear me?

4 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yes, I can hear you
5 great. Go ahead and begin your time.

6 JON HARTZBAND: Sorry about that.

7 CHRISTINE DAVIS: No worries. Go ahead.

8 JON HARTZBAND: My name is Jon, J-o-n, got
9 the name right, Hartzband, H-a-r-t-z-b-a-n-d. Thank
10 you for the opportunity to contribute. Thank you for
11 the opportunity to contribute my thoughts here. I
12 live on Martha's Vineyard with my wife and my two
13 children. And we as a family support renewable
14 projects, including offshore wind, and hope to see
15 these projects move forward for a variety of
16 reasons. The obvious reason to support these
17 projects, including our local Vineyard Wind project,
18 is for long-term environmental benefits, to help
19 slow the devastating impacts of climate change, to
20 move away from our dependence on fossil fuels.

21 We have an opportunity to be on the
22 forefront of a new industry harvesting clean,
23 renewable sources of energy. This is not only a win
24 on the environmental front, but a huge win on the

1 economic front. The global pandemic has had a
2 unique ability to find weak spots in almost every
3 aspect of life. Here on Martha's Vineyard, and I
4 think in most coastal communities, we are heavily
5 dependent on service sector jobs, restaurants and
6 bars, catering, hotels, taxi drivers, retail stores,
7 the list goes on and on. And there was 13 percent
8 unemployment in our country, 20 percent, probably
9 more than 20 percent here in Martha's Vineyard.

10 This is an unbelievable opportunity to
11 create good paying year-round jobs that do not rely
12 specifically on tourism. This is not only true for
13 Martha's Vineyard, but up and down the East Coast of
14 the United States in every coastal community. I
15 believe that the Vineyard Wind estimate is 3600 jobs
16 over the life of the project. That has enormous
17 economic benefits to local communities, well-paid
18 year round stable jobs. I think the industry as a
19 whole is estimating 80,000 jobs, which again, it's
20 just an enormous benefit to these local communities.
21 We are in an incredibly unique time. And I think
22 developing renewable sources of energy and
23 supporting these projects and industries is a win
24 for both the environment in which we are all

1 responsible, and our economic stability.

2 Thank you so much for your time, my time, your time.

3 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Okay, looking
4 forward, I've got next step Brandon B., Margaret B.
5 and then David D. and Sarah G. So I'll give it just
6 a minute and we'll see if we can get Brandon on the
7 line. Brandon by chance are you available? Then we
8 have quite a few people on the phone today, so I
9 just want to be patient with our operator to see if
10 she can get Brandon B. up next, please.

11 All right. I don't know that Brandon is
12 with us any longer, so let's move forward to
13 Margaret and if we get Brandon back we'll bring him
14 back into the queue. So I'm looking at Margaret D.
15 Margaret Downey by chance. Can we bring Margaret
16 online to provide comments?

17 MARGARET DOWNEY: Hi, can you hear me?

18 CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine,
19 if you could state and spell your name, Margaret,
20 that would be great. Thank you.

21 MARGARET DOWNEY: Hi. My name is Margaret,
22 M-a-r-g-a-r-e-t, Downey, D-o-w-n-e-y. So good
23 afternoon, everyone, as I said my name is Margaret
24 Downey, and I am the administrator of the Cape Light

1 Compact Joint Powers Entity, which is an entity
2 representing all 21 pounds, up to 15 pounds on Cape
3 Cod and 6 pounds on Martha's Vineyard. I'm here
4 today to provide comments on the Bureau of Ocean
5 Energy Management's, BOEM's SEIS, supplemental
6 environmental impact statement, for the Vineyard
7 Wind's offshore energy project.

8 I want to start out by thanking the federal
9 and state agencies and all of the stakeholders who
10 have participated in the many aspects of the review
11 of the offshore wind project. Thank you for your
12 time and your effort, especially during a global
13 pandemic. The fact that we were able to continue to
14 move this conversation forward says a lot about the
15 commitment and interest of all of the parties and
16 stakeholders involved, and so behalf of the Cape
17 Light Compact, thank you. The Cape Light Compact has
18 been working to address the impacts of climate
19 change on Cape Cod and Martha's Vineyard for our
20 energy efficiency and power supply programs for
21 almost 20 years. The Cape Light Compact supports the
22 development of offshore wind in the Eastern United
23 States and recognizes the need and importance of
24 offshore wind in meeting clean energy and our

1 emission reduction goals. If the state of
2 Massachusetts is to meet the emissions reductions in
3 the Global Warming Solutions Act, offshore wind must
4 move forward in a timely and responsible manner. As
5 the administrator of the Cape Light Compact, I
6 support the findings of the SEIS and believe the
7 SEIS demonstrates that offshore wind projects can
8 move forward in a responsible and environmentally
9 sound manner in the waters of the eastern United
10 States.

11 Thank you for your time and consideration
12 this afternoon. I appreciate the opportunity to
13 offer my comments are in support of the offshore
14 wind industry. Thank you very much.

15 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. All right,
16 next we have David D. Sarah G., Kara S., Daniel W.,
17 and then Richard D. And I believe those are the
18 names that we have available to us right at this
19 time. If you don't see your name on the list, please
20 press Star 1 and wait to speak to the operator and
21 make sure your name is on the queue. And if you've
22 just gotten inspired and want to provide comments,
23 now would be a great time to as we get close to the
24 end of of the list of names that we have available.

1 So with that, I will turn it over to David.
2 David, if you can state and spell your name, please.

3 DAVID DOW: My name is David Dow. D-a-v-i-d
4 D-o-w. And I'm a retired marine scientist,
5 grassroots environmental activist living in
6 Falmouth, Massachusetts. My written comments on the
7 the Vineyard Wind SEIS focused on the cumulative
8 effects assessment of 20 wind farms along the
9 Atlantic seaboard on marine biota and their
10 habitats. A promo of the Martha's Vineyard Wind
11 Project will provide a template for other wind
12 farms, potentially generating 22 gigawatts of
13 renewable electricity.

14 These other wind farms will range from
15 North Carolina through Maine. The cumulative effects
16 succession is based upon a northeast continental
17 shelf ecosystem conceptual model, which assumes the
18 system is in a steady state net equilibrium,
19 ignoring climate change and ocean noise effects. I
20 have been involved in a dialogue on North Atlantic
21 Right Whale deaths from entanglement to the American
22 American lobster gear in New England and Canadian
23 waters. Both the whales and the lobsters have
24 migrated further offshore or northeastwards as

1 coastal waters become warmer and noisier. North
2 Atlantic Right Whales females breed in the winter
3 off the southeastern U.S. Atlantic seaboard, and
4 both sexes migrate into Northeastern waters from
5 spring to early fall to feed.

6 Northwest Atlantic Right Whale critical
7 habitat under the Endangered Species Act runs from
8 Northern Florida-Georgia coastal waters through
9 Maine. Thus, they overlap with a range of the
10 proposed 20 wind farms. NOAA Fisheries manages
11 lobsters in federal waters, that's 3 to 200 miles
12 under the Magnuson-Stevens Sustainable Fisheries
13 Act. Marine mammal NGOs and some scientists are
14 pushing for ropeless lobster fishing gear, or closed
15 areas to lobster pots when North Atlantic Right
16 Whales are in the vicinity. Thus, there's a lot of
17 controversy between commercial fishing interests and
18 constituents interested in restoring North Atlantic
19 Right Whale populations. NOAA Fisheries will begin
20 an environmental assessment process in the fall of
21 2020 to come up with a plan to reduce North Atlantic
22 Right Whale mortality from lobster gear
23 entanglements and reduce impacts from other human
24 stressors such as climate change, ocean noise,

1 seasonal hypoxia, shifts in essential fish habitat,
2 alteration of the marine food chain, and how the
3 other human uses of the ocean, which include wind
4 farms.

5 Having commented on the Council
6 Environmental Qualities proposed changes to the
7 National Environmental Policy Act, I have two
8 potential concerns about the BOEM SEIS on wind farms
9 along the Atlantic seaboard conflicting with the
10 NOAA Fisheries EIS on north array brightwell
11 mortality from lobster gear entanglements under the
12 Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered
13 Species Act. The BOEM cumulative effect analysis of
14 20 wind farm for fin fish and shellfish, marine
15 mammals, benthic organisms and bottom sediments,
16 fishery regulations, seabirds, et cetera,
17 acknowledges the impacts can range from minimal to
18 maximum depending on other human uses of the same
19 ocean ranges.

20 The North Atlantic Right Whale death limits
21 per year from entanglements and ship strikes is less
22 than one animal per year, given the recent deaths
23 exceeding births, and the poor condition and many,
24 many breeding age females from entanglements. The

1 Martha's Vineyard Wind SEIS contains alternatives
2 F-1 and F-2, based on comments submitted by RODA to
3 reduce the number of wind turbines and allow
4 navigation channels through the wind farm footprint.

5 The proposed marine mammal NGO proposals to
6 NOAA fisheries for ropeless lobster gear enclosed
7 areas when the North Atlantic Right Whales are
8 present, which have a much greater impact on the
9 lobster fishing industry. Scientific studies are
10 underway to provide better understanding of these
11 challenges. Recently NOAA Fisheries released the
12 2020 status of ecosystem reports for the
13 Mid-Atlantic and New England regions, which made
14 BOEM in developing the SEIS, I made some
15 suggestions in my written comments on the use of
16 vulnerability analysis and scenario analysis as
17 interim tools to evaluate the effect of wind farms
18 on marine biota and their habitat as we await the
19 completion of scientific studies and their
20 publication and development of appropriate policies
21 and regulations, which can be a time-consuming
22 process. Thank you for listening to my comments.

23 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next up we'll
24 have Sarah G. and then Kara Smith, Daniel W.,

1 Richard D. and we have Brandon B. back in the queue.

2 I have two quick announcements before we go
3 to Sarah, and that is, one, if you would like to
4 speak, please press Star 1 and speak to the
5 operator. And then also, we are still taking
6 questions and answers, we'll have a question and
7 answer period after the public comment testimony is
8 complete, and so please use the Q & A box for that.
9 We have subject matter experts that are monitoring
10 that and they're getting prepared to answer your
11 questions. So if you can put them in advance that'll
12 give them a chance to find the information that
13 you'd like to hear.

14 So with that, I'm going to turn it over to
15 Sarah G. If you could state and spell your name,
16 please.

17 SARAH GRISCOM: Hello, can you hear me?

18 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yes, I can hear you just
19 fine, thank you.

20 SARAH GRISCOM: Oh, good. My name is Sarah
21 Griscom. That's S-a-r-a-h. Last name, G-r-i-s-c-o-m.
22 I am calling and commenting on behalf of the
23 Pleasant Bay Community Boating. We are located in
24 Harwich on Cape Cod. And I also am a member of the

1 Cape Cod Climate Change Collaborative as well as the
2 Chatham Climate Action Network. So I'm very much
3 interested in any kind of way to move quickly to
4 decarbonize our energy sources and slow climate
5 change. We support the work documented in the SEIS
6 and appreciate the careful work of BOEM. And now
7 it's time for offshore wind energy, and it's time to
8 move ahead with it. And that's the end of my
9 comment. Thank you.

10 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. All right, up
11 next, you've got Kara, Daniel, Richard and Brandon.
12 And I believe that gets us to the end of the list.
13 So, Kara, would you please announce yourself and
14 spell your name, please. We will give it just a
15 minute, I know I'd seen her in the chat, so Kara
16 Smith, or you might need to press Star 1 again,
17 hopefully, that's not or, you know, there's a
18 potential that you'll need to do that. We'll try and
19 get to you.

20 Okay, I'll move forward down with Daniel W.
21 Daniel, if you state and spell name, please.
22 Daniel, are you with us?

23 DANIEL WOLF: How about now?

24 CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine

1 now. Thank you.

2 DANIEL WOLF: Yeah, I don't know whether
3 they can mute me or I have to unmute or whatever.
4 But anyway, Christine, it's great to talk to you.
5 And thank you so much for holding these hearings.
6 Just by way of background, my name is Daniel Wolf.
7 D-a-n-i-e-l W-o-l-f. I'm the founder and currently
8 the CEO of Cape Air, which is the largest regional
9 airline -- actually, largest commuter airline in the
10 United States. But we're based here on Cape Cod, and
11 we've been around for 32 years. Also, by way of
12 background, I served three years in the
13 Massachusetts State Senate representing Cape Cod,
14 and the islands in Martha's Vineyard in Nantucket.
15 During that time, I did a lot of work in and around
16 renewable energy and specifically around offshore
17 wind and was involved in some of the legislation in
18 Massachusetts and working with BOEM. So again, I
19 thank you very much for the opportunity to talk
20 today. I've served on the board of the Association
21 to Preserve Cape Cod. One of the leading
22 environmental organizations on the Cape. Currently
23 serve on the board of the Center for Coastal
24 Studies. And I see in the queue, the next speaker is

1 actually the Executive Director of the Center for
2 Coastal Studies, Rich Delaney. So I'm going to
3 yield my time to him very quickly.

4 I do want to state that there -- I think as
5 the studies have shown, there will be no adverse
6 impact on aviation in the area. So I just want to
7 get that taken care of first when I speak, but the
8 main reason I wanted to call today and weigh in is
9 that we submitted testimony back in April of 2018.
10 And so here we are two years later, and not a whole
11 lot has changed, unfortunately, here we are I'm
12 going to be submitting the same written testimony
13 again today after I talk to you verbally. But what I
14 do want to say is what has happened in the last two
15 years is we're a lot closer to the electrification
16 of air transportation. And one of the things that
17 Cape Air has been acutely aware of is that as we get
18 closer to actually being able to move people through
19 the air in a carbon free way, aircraft and aviation
20 account for about two and a half percent of global
21 climate change emissions. As we get closer to doing
22 it responsibly and in a carbon free way, we really
23 need sources of renewable energy to provide the
24 electricity to move our aircraft. And we have talked

1 repeatedly to Vineyard Wind about procuring in the
2 future electricity from them to power our aircraft.
3 It is essential that we have that opportunity.
4 Otherwise, what an irony it would be if we're moving
5 aircraft around with electricity, but doing it from
6 coal, that's just not acceptable. So we really need
7 industrial scale, large source of of electricity in
8 order to power our aircraft and to power all of
9 transportation and air transportation.

10 So specifically, today, again, in addition
11 to the written testimony, I just want to weigh in
12 that from an environmental standpoint, from a
13 business standpoint, you've heard so many good
14 people advocate relative to the beneficial impacts
15 on an economy that is really, really hurting a lot
16 of people right now, there are so many reasons why
17 this is an important project and why now is the time
18 to get it done. And I, again, to my good friend,
19 Rich Delaney, who's up next in the queue defer the
20 rest of my time and, again, Christine, thank you so
21 much.

22 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. All right.
23 Next, we'll move forward with Richard D. Richard,
24 can you state and spell your name, please. And then

1 after that, we'll have Brandon. And I believe we're
2 getting close to the end. So if you haven't already
3 done so, please press one and wait for the operator
4 to get into the queue so we can make sure that we
5 get you in. Thank you. With that, Richard.

6 RICHARD DELANEY: Thanks very much,
7 Christine. It's Richard Delaney. R-i-c-h-a-r-d
8 D-e-l-a-n-e-y. I'm the President of the board of
9 directors of the Cape Cod Climate Change
10 Collaborative. And as Dan just mentioned, the
11 President of the Center for Coastal Studies.

12 The Collaborative is an interesting group.
13 It's actually a large coalition of organizations,
14 businesses, and citizens all committed to mitigating
15 the climate crisis on Cape Cod and the islands. Now,
16 they are all volunteer, it's a nonprofit group. That
17 includes very effective leaders and leadership from
18 virtually every sector of our community: the
19 business sector, local and regional planning groups,
20 the financial sector, building and housing sector,
21 the transportation, renewable energy, and right on
22 down the line, including our faith community and our
23 educators. And the key is we are all working
24 together to achieve a net zero emissions goal for

1 Cape Cod in the islands. So you probably couldn't
2 find a more representative group or cross-section
3 of a coastal community.

4 We have worked to develop and shared with
5 all an action plan and a set of specific pathways
6 that we believe will lead to the goal of net zero
7 emissions on Cape Cod by 2050. A lot of those
8 examples are quite exciting. Dan Wolf just mentioned
9 one of the most exciting that Cape Air has made a
10 commitment to bring on electric airplanes as part of
11 that solution.

12 So the absolute key, however, to achieving
13 that net zero goal has got to be the substantial
14 offshore wind production starting immediately with
15 the Vineyard Wind. So we have reviewed the SEIS and
16 we believe that it thoroughly covers all related
17 issues that should be approved without delay, and
18 after that the subsequent final approvals for the
19 Vineyard Wind Project to be issued as soon as
20 possible. And subsequently I just would add a couple
21 of specific comments. We do support the east-west
22 one nautical mile wind turbine spacing alternative
23 without transit lanes, additional transit lanes,
24 that's alternative D-2. We believe this will reduce

1 conflicts within the existing ocean users, such as
2 commercial fishing and marine navigation. And I
3 would note that the Coast Guard has agreed with that
4 and stated that additional transit lanes are
5 unnecessary.

6 We also support alternative B for the cable
7 landing, that's at Colwells Beach landfall. And I
8 also like to note that Vineyard Wind has been
9 extremely responsive and inclusive in all events
10 with all interested parties in developing its plans
11 for this project. And this really in many ways set
12 the standard for corporate responsibility in this
13 kind of development. I only would point you to the
14 one prime example that we've been very interested
15 in, which is an extensive work done with
16 conservation groups to develop innovative and wide-
17 ranging protections for the North Atlantic White
18 Whale.

19 So in conclusion, we believe the SEIS
20 provides a well-documented set of facts and
21 analyses, they address all relevant issues and we
22 urge that it be approved without further delay. And,
23 furthermore, we urge BOEM do this and take all other
24 actions to move offshore wind development in general

1 up and down the east coast forward as fast as
2 possible. I keep thinking, we've heard some
3 comments from various sectors about the potential
4 negative impacts on whales and fisheries from this
5 project, but I think we all know the most
6 devastating threat to whales and fisheries and
7 ourselves is the rapidly warming climate and ocean
8 waters. So the development of this offshore
9 renewable wind energy projects and projects up and
10 down this coast is the key part of an urgently
11 needed response to this threat, and I thank BOEM
12 for it's continued leadership in moving us forward.
13 Thank you very much for this chance to comment
14 today.

15 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Okay, next
16 we're going to have Brandon and Kara. So Brandon and
17 Kara, thank you very much for your patience and
18 working through this with us. We appreciate it very
19 much. As I am seeing it right now they are, let me
20 just do a real quick check, I believe the last folks
21 we have on the queue -- Yep. So if you are
22 interested in speaking after Brandon or Kara,
23 please press Star 1 now. And we'll get you in the
24 queue. And then also continue to get the Q and A's

1 for those of you on Zoom using the Q & A function on
2 your screen.

3 So with that, I'll turn it over to Brandon.

4 BRANDON BURKE: Hello, can you hear me?

5 CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine.

6 Thank you.

7 BRANDON BURKE: Wonderful. Thank you so
8 much. As I mentioned, my name is Brandon Burke, last
9 name is spelled B-u-r-k-e, and my first name is
10 spelled correctly. I'm the Policy and Outreach
11 Director for the Business Networks for Offshore
12 Winds.

13 The Business Network is the only 501(C)(3)
14 nonprofit organization that is exclusively focused
15 on the development of the U.S. offshore wind
16 industry and its domestic supply chain. Since 2012
17 the network has brought together business and
18 government, both domestically and internationally,
19 to educate and enable American businesses of all
20 sizes to enter the U.S. offshore wind market. The
21 network uses the voice of its diverse membership
22 comprised of the full spectrum of the offshore wind
23 supply chain to educate and support federal, state
24 and local policymakers to advance the development of

1 the U.S. offshore wind industry. And, in fact, the
2 network since its inception has been a proud partner
3 of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and, in
4 fact, on June 11th of this year, Acting Director of
5 foam Walter Cruickshank appeared on the network's
6 IPF livestream virtual conference to communicate
7 directly to industry about the supplement to the EIS
8 that we're here to talk about tonight. The network
9 looks forward to continuing its successful
10 partnership with BOEM, and we would like to thank
11 BOEM for conducting these virtual public meetings
12 about the SEIS under the challenging circumstances.
13 And as we can see, with my own comments here, I
14 really do want to speak from personal experience and
15 say it's a Herculean high and achieved effort to
16 execute virtual events like this. So we recognize
17 your effort and coordination here.

18 The business that offshore winds serves as
19 the convener of the offshore wind supply chain,
20 responsibly developed U.S. offshore wind projects
21 are truly world class infrastructure projects and
22 present a once in a generation opportunity for
23 Americans. Vineyard Wind and other offshore wind
24 projects like it that are currently under review at

1 BOEM serve as unparalleled engines of economic
2 development and, more importantly, economic
3 recovery. And this is at a time when Americans need
4 this most, particularly in light of the ongoing
5 COVID-19 crisis and record unemployment. There are
6 40 million Americans that are out of work right now.
7 The Department of the Interior approval of Vineyard
8 Wind's construction and operations plan will unleash
9 a wave of investment. More importantly, disapproval
10 will begin a domino effect that will ultimately put
11 tens of thousands of hardworking Americans from
12 across the economic spectrum and from literally all
13 walks of life -- just for example, some of whom
14 we've heard from today, the building trades, vessel
15 captains and deckhands, accountants, dock workers,
16 economists, welders, divers, aircraft pilots,
17 atmospheric and marine scientists, truck drivers,
18 attorneys, crane operators, project managers,
19 mechanics and every imaginable engineering
20 discipline, among many other occupations, will go
21 back to work as a result of Vineyard Wind and other
22 offshore wind projects.

23 Vineyard Wind will also significantly
24 contribute to energy security and improve local air

1 quality in New England. We at the business network
2 for offshore wind look forward to submitting more
3 substantive written comments and, once again, thank
4 the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for the
5 opportunity to comment today. We look forward to
6 continuing to partner with BOEM to support the
7 robust growth and responsible development of the
8 U.S. offshore wind industry. Thank you very much
9 for your time.

10 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you for your
11 comments here. Kara, hopefully we can get you up now
12 and and provide an opportunity for you to provide
13 comments. Yeah, of course.

14 KARA SMITH: Hi. Can you hear me?

15 CHRISTINE DAVIS: We can hear you just fine.
16 Thank you so much.

17 KARA SMITH: Great. Thank you so much. My
18 name is Kara Smith, and I'm a member of the
19 Chappaquiddick Wampanoag Tribe of Martha's Vineyard,
20 formerly known as Noepe. Thank you again for making
21 this process transparent to the public. I appreciate
22 the opportunity to be heard. The Chappaquiddick
23 Wampanoag sustained the ecology of the region for
24 more than 10,000 years prior to colonization. So I'm

1 certainly in favor of sustainable energy. By the
2 same token, I'm concerned with the impact on the
3 endangered marine life, the seabed and erosion.
4 Those impacts appear clearly assessed.

5 Now, Mr. Hemner's comment raises some
6 concerns that are new to me. I do not see any
7 assessment of cultural impact of the Vineyard Wind,
8 for instance, the windmills will dominate views from
9 wave screen and the north neck high ground. These
10 grounds are where we hold ceremonies from our lost
11 ancestors and rising sun. Growing up, I found a
12 great deal of solace and communion with my ancestors
13 looking out at the horizon. For 10,000 years with
14 experience, this view has been unaffected by
15 man-made structures. I'm compelled to speak in the
16 interest of preserving our traditions for my
17 children.

18 My questions are, which category assesses
19 cultural impacts? And how do you plan to mitigate
20 these impacts? Thank you.

21 CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you for your
22 comments, Kara. I don't have anyone else in the
23 queue at this time. So I'm just going to pause and
24 give it a few minutes to see if anyone else wants to

1 press Star 1 at a time to provide comments to the
2 operator, and we'll get you into the queue. Also I
3 remind folks that we do have that Q & A function at
4 the bottom of the screen if you're on Zoom. And we
5 will be having three additional public meeting. I
6 cannot believe it, but it's July already, starting
7 tomorrow. So there'll be three meetings later. One
8 later this week and then two next week. So I'm just
9 going to pause one more moment here, and not seeing
10 anyone else. So all right, with that I am going to
11 close the public comment period at 2:58 eastern time
12 and we'll move forward with the Q & A section.

13 So two way communication is very much a
14 priority for BOEM. At this time, we're going to try
15 and answer the questions that we have seen, that
16 we've already gathered and if you have some more
17 that you'd like us to answer, please continue to use
18 that Q & A function for the next 15 to 20 minutes or
19 so. Some of you have already entered the questions.
20 We will take time to answer them. We've got some
21 dedicated subject matter experts that have been
22 watching the box and are prepared to answer your
23 questions.

24 Additionally, I encourage you to visit the

1 frequently asked questions on the virtual meeting
2 webpage. And so there's a lot of information that
3 you can see on that site as well. At this time, I'm
4 going to turn it over to Isis Farmer with BOEM. And
5 she's going to address the questions that we
6 received and open the meeting up for further
7 questions. As a reminder, you can use the Zoom
8 function to submit your questions at any time. Isis.

9 ISIS FARMER> Thanks for the introduction,
10 Christine. My name is Isis Farmer, and I am an
11 environmental coordinator here at the Bureau of
12 Ocean Energy Management. And with Jen one of the
13 co-leads for the Vineyard Wind 1 Project's
14 supplemental environmental impact statement.

15 So we're going to get started with
16 answering your questions and answers. So I am going
17 to start with some general questions that we
18 received earlier in the evening. So, Michelle, would
19 you mind turning on your camera, unmuting line and
20 introducing herself. Hi,

21 MICHELLE MORIN: Hi, thank you. My name is
22 Michelle Morin. I'm the Chief of BOEM's environment
23 Branch for Renewable Energy. Great. So the first
24 thing that we received is, will you continue to

1 provide online public presentations and public
2 comment periods like this one permanently? These
3 issues are important to many more than can take the
4 time to be there in person. Thank you for this
5 online forum.

6 Thank you. Yes, I think these are going
7 very well. I'm very proud of our virtual meeting
8 room and invite everyone that hasn't looked at it,
9 to please do so. We are having this format of
10 meeting because of the COVID-19 crisis. But we have
11 heard a lot of positive feedback, and so we will
12 consider doing something similar in the future.

13 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Michelle. And the
14 next question that I have for you is what financial
15 assurances has Vineyard Wind provided to BOEM for
16 purposes of decommissioning at the end of the lease
17 area?

18 MICHELLE MORIN: Yes, thank you. So a
19 leasee is required to return their lease area to the
20 previous condition, meaning that in this case
21 Vineyard Wind would have to remove or decommission
22 everything that it installs and clear the seabed of
23 any obstructions that were created from the project.
24 But prior to commissioning, Vineyard Wind must

1 submit a bond to BOEM to cover decommissioning and
2 an estimate BOEM's estimate for this bond. We assume
3 the need to contract work and all cost with
4 engineering and permitting for decommissioning, and
5 we don't include adjustments, say, for like salvage
6 value. And our estimate would include removing all
7 structures, meaning foundations, cables, gower
8 protection to at least 15 feet below the seabed.

9 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Michelle. So the
10 next question I have is actually for me, so I'll
11 take this one. And the question is, how will BOEM
12 address the impacts of future construction and
13 operations plans submitted that conflict with
14 previously submitted construction and operations
15 plans that are currently under review. For example,
16 lease areas are limited in size. So the siting is
17 limited, but the generator size may change and
18 reduce/slash expand the desired location. With most
19 multiple construction and operations plans these may
20 conflict. How do you plan to analyze such
21 submissions?

22 So for each construction and operations
23 plan, it's important to acknowledge that, you know,
24 BOEM will go through -- each project submitted will

1 go through its own project specific environmental
2 analysis. So while the cumulative impact scenario
3 that's being used for the Vineyard Wind supplemental
4 environmental impact statement will be used as a
5 guide for analysis of future offshore wind projects,
6 BOEM will continue to update and refine the scenario
7 based on the best available information. With
8 respect to changes in turbine sizes, a leasee is
9 limited to their lease area for placement of
10 proposed turbines. So changes to turbine sizes may
11 change the number of individual turbines within a
12 single lease. So for more information about the
13 assumptions we made about future offshore wind
14 development, please see Appendix A of the
15 supplemental EIS. And specifically page A, and
16 that's A as in apple, -9 specifically goes into more
17 detail about construction and operation of future
18 offshore wind projects.

19 So for the next question, I'm going to go
20 to Jenn Bucatari. Jenn, would you mind turning on
21 your camera and unmuting your line?

22 JENN BUCATARI: Hi, everybody. Jenn
23 Bucatari, I'm another NEPA coordinator. I'm
24 coordinating the Vineyard Wind, the EIS.

1 ISIS FARMER: And I'm going to make sure
2 that anyone aside from Jenn or myself should mute
3 their line, if you please.

4 JENN BUCATARI: Thank you.

5 ISIS FARMER: Okay. so, Jenn, the question
6 that I have for you is, as there may be both
7 positive and negative impacts on resources, how did
8 BOEM weigh the positives and negatives to come up
9 with a single score, negligible, moderate, et
10 cetera, to get a score for a resource?.

11 JENN BUCATARI: Thanks, Isis. Our subject
12 matter experts, or we call them SMEs, considered
13 each applicable impact-producing factor when
14 determining the overall impact level for a resource,
15 because the impact level is an expert determination
16 that utilizes the impact level definition that you
17 can find in Appendix B, as in boy, of the SEIS, and
18 the impact level is determined then by our SMEs with
19 input from the agencies with expertise for the
20 resource.

21 The overall impact level isn't determined
22 by adding the negative and positive impact. Instead,
23 it's determined by considering the overall impact of
24 all the impact-producing factors from the proposed

1 project and from ongoing activities, future
2 non-offshore wind activities to future offshore wind
3 activities on a resource. The analysis and
4 determination considers the timing and the magnitude
5 of each of these impacts to determine the overall
6 impact level appropriately. For any of these
7 additional detail analyses about these impact levels
8 and the impact-producing factors, please see the
9 additional tables that we have in Appendix A, as in
10 apple, and B, as in boy, of the SEIS.

11 ISIS FARMER: Thanks, Jenn. Okay, we want to
12 try the next question. So, the question is general
13 nature. And so I'll start with the first part. And
14 then I'll also ask for Arianna, if you wouldn't mind
15 unmuting your line and turning on your camera.

16 So I'll read go ahead and read the
17 question. A friend had a question but not the time
18 to participate today. In summary, will this SEIS be
19 used to guide the development of all future offshore
20 wind projects, at least in the southern New England
21 area, and how will BOEM consider the guidelines from
22 the MARIPARS study?

23 So for the first part of the question, I
24 think I partially answered that in my previous

1 response. We will use the cumulative impact
2 analysis, that scenario that we use as sort of a
3 guideline moving forward for future projects. But
4 it's really important that we have comments on our
5 cumulative impact scenario. And so we really invite
6 you to submit your comments, and review the
7 cumulative scenario and see, you know, let us know
8 if there's anything that needs to be updated or
9 changed, if there's any inaccurate information I
10 think that we should incorporate into the final EIS
11 and potentially other projects moving forward. So
12 for the next part of the question, Arianna, could
13 you address the portion about MARIPARS?

14 ARIANNA BAKER: Absolutely, thank you, Isis,
15 and good afternoon, everyone. So for anyone who's
16 not familiar now, MARIPARS, as it's closely referred
17 to, is Massachusetts and Rhode Island Port Access
18 Route Study that was conducted by the Coast Guard
19 over the last calendar year. So while MARIPARS is a
20 study and not a rulemaking. Coast Guard is the
21 federal government's navigational safety expert and
22 as they are a cooperating agency in the
23 environmental impact statement process under One
24 Federal Decision, the Coast Guard is involved in

1 the development of those supplemental environmental
2 impact statements that we are discussing today. And
3 they will continue to be involved in developing the
4 final environmental impact statement. So, while due
5 to the publication timelines, we have referenced
6 the draft MARIPARS report in the supplemental
7 environmental impact statement, we will also be
8 referencing the final MARIPARS report in the final
9 environmental impact statement. And I should note
10 that the recommendations from the final MARIPARS
11 report mirror alternative D-2 in the supplemental
12 environmental impact statement.

13 ISIS FARMER: Thanks, Arianna, and would
14 you mind introducing yourself? I can't recall if we
15 did.

16 ARIANNA BAKER: I didn't, no, apologies.
17 So, my name is Arianna Baker, and I'm the navigation
18 analyst here at BOEM.

19 ISIS FARMER: Thank you. Okay, we also
20 received a couple of questions about cumulative, our
21 cumulative impact scenario. So, Ian, would you mind
22 turning on your camera and unmuting your line?

23 IAN CLAYTON: Hello, can you hear me?

24 ISIS FARMER: Yes. I can hear you just fine.

1 IAN CLAYTON: All right. My name is Ian
2 Clayton, I'm a physical scientist at BOEM.

3 ISIS FARMER: Thanks, Ian. So the question
4 I have for you is what will be the cumulative impact
5 in terms of lost power capacity to all developers in
6 the Massachusetts wind energy area due to the
7 proposed compromise of a one by one nautical mile
8 turbine layout, alternative D-2?

9 IAN CLAYTON: So I have -- stick with me
10 here -- I have an answer, but there's a long walk to
11 it. So the difference in power capacity would be
12 directly related to the size of the turbine
13 generator that would be built, and it gets
14 complicated due to factors involving optimal
15 spacing. So, a wind farm laid out with energy
16 extraction in mind would be spaced between five and
17 eight or so, depending on the designer rotor
18 diameters apart, so how large the blade bases are
19 really. So, the spacing that is optimum depends on
20 the rotor diameter, and also a turbine field will be
21 arranged in a scattered, randomized layout to avoid
22 wind weight. And so it depends on the turbine size
23 as to what the ideal spacing would be. The
24 dimensions of a 12 megawatt turbine is about 722

1 feet for the rotor diameter and so that would be a
2 spacing ideally of .6 to .95 nautical mile.

3 I don't want to get too off in the weeds
4 here. What it comes down to is in alternative A of
5 this proposal there already with that layout is some
6 deviation from that ideal layout. And so there was
7 something given up there. And then if you compare it
8 to, say, an average of .7 nautical mile spacing
9 between turbines, you'd be giving up something like
10 1000 positions, potential positions within the
11 Massachusetts, Rhode Island lease area. And so
12 you're talking about, you know, several gigawatts,
13 maybe even as much as 12 gigawatts will be a 12
14 megawatt turbines on average for all those
15 positions. But that number will be smaller if
16 turbines continue to grow and continue to be larger.
17 So at the heart you can't put an exact figure on it.
18 But it's some, yep.

19 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Ian. The next
20 question I have is for Brian Hooker. Brian, would
21 you mind turning on your camera, unmuting your line
22 and introducing yourself?

23 BRIAN HOOKER: Sure. Hi, Isis. My name is
24 Brian Hooker. I'm a biologist with the Renewable

1 Energy Program.

2 ISIS FARMER: Great. So the question I have
3 for you, Brian, is please explain the various
4 fishery mitigation funding packages by the state of
5 Rhode Island, Massachusetts, by Vineyard 1.

6 BRIAN HOOKER: Sure, I'd be happy to answer
7 that. So in Appendix B, we discuss it in the main
8 text of the the SEIS as well. But the easiest way
9 the most concise place to find it is in Appendix B,
10 table 3.11-5. And in there we describe the two
11 formal mitigation packages that were negotiated
12 between Vineyard Wind and the state of Rhode Island
13 in the state of Massachusetts.

14 So for the state of Rhode Island, there is
15 a \$4.2 million direct compensation fund to be held
16 in escrow to compensate for any claims of direct
17 impacts Rhode Island vessels or Rhode Island
18 fisheries interest in the project area. Also in
19 Rhode Island, there is a 12 and a half million
20 dollar Rhode Island Fisherman's Future Viability
21 Trust. The trust is to further the policies of the
22 Ocean Special Area Management Plan with respect to
23 continued viability and success of Rhode Island's
24 fishing industry to support and promote the

1 compatibility of offshore wind with commercial
2 fishing interests. With more detail in the SEIS, but
3 as you can see, it's a broader fund rather than
4 direct compensation for revenue or gear loss.

5 In Massachusetts, they have a similar kind
6 of break between two different funds. There is a
7 \$19.2 million direct downstream and cumulative
8 compensation fund that's held in escrow for
9 folks -- for domestic based fishermen to apply
10 toward, and then in addition to that, they've also
11 have a Fisheries Innovation Fund is a \$1.75 million
12 fund to support programs and projects that ensure
13 safe and profitable fishing, continue as Vineyard
14 Wind and other future offshore wind projects are
15 developed in northern Atlantic waters. So again,
16 that's in table 3.11-5 and Appendix B.

17 I'll also note that we talk more about
18 mitigation more broadly in the DEIS, so if you
19 remember this, in the supplement to the DEIS. So it
20 doesn't replace with DEIS. We talk about more
21 broadly like some other general programs that
22 Vineyard Wind has committed to have funding
23 available for impacted entities from other states.
24 But they're not as formal as what has been agreed to

1 via these negotiations between Rhode Island and
2 Massachusetts. And that was it, Isis.

3 ISIS FARMER: Thank you. Brian, And the
4 next question, I'm going to go back to Arianna.
5 Arianna, would you mind turning on your camera and I
6 umuting your line? Thank you.

7 So another question that came in: for
8 comparison, how wide are the shipping lanes into New
9 York Harbor? And I'm assuming that this is in
10 reference to the lanes that we discussed in talking
11 about alternative F.

12 ARIANNA BAKER: Yeah, so the specific New
13 York shipping channels formerly termed traffic
14 separation scheme. There's three traffic lanes
15 allowing movement into New York Harbor from points
16 south, from points east and from point southeast. So
17 at the widest part, furthest from the harbor, these
18 lanes start at an average of about 13 nautical miles
19 wide, and they have an average of about a three
20 nautical mile wide separation zone between the
21 inbound and outbound lane. And then they shrink to
22 an average of slightly over three nautical miles
23 wide near the entrance to New York Harbor with about
24 an average of a 1.15 nautical mile separation zone.

1 So, similarly, there are other nearby lanes
2 that are also intended to be deep draft traffic near
3 the Massachusetts and Rhode Island lease areas. They
4 include the traffic separation schemes for both
5 Narragansett Bay, which is 11 nautical miles long
6 and four nautical miles wide, and Boston which is
7 127 nautical miles long and four nautical miles wide
8 as well.

9 So both of those lanes also include a one
10 to two nautical mile separation zone in the middle
11 between opposite directions of traffic. They're also
12 used by a larger traffic volume and a larger
13 individual backflow size than would ever really
14 appear in the entirety of the Rhode Island-
15 Massachusetts waste areas post-construction. In
16 those areas, the largest licensed commercial fishing
17 vessels found to be used in the area is about 138
18 feet.

19 ISIS FARMER: Great. Thank you, Arianna.
20 Okay. And for the next question, we're going to go
21 to Michelle, would you turn on your camera and your
22 line?

23 MICHELLE MORIN: Thank you, Isis.

24 ISIS FARMER: Thanks, Michelle. So the

1 question for you is at its initial public meeting,
2 and I'm assuming he's referring to the meeting now
3 -- the virtual public meeting that we held last
4 Friday, BOEM stated that the Coast Guard concurred
5 with BOEM's Alternative Analysis and that BOEM's
6 assignment of major as a potential cumulative impact
7 to navigation. It's the Coast Guard's analysis to
8 support its concurrence documented in BOEM's record?
9 If not, when will it be posted?

10 MICHELLE MORIN: Thank you, Isis. So the
11 navigation analysis, as we previously said, was
12 prepared collaboratively with and reviewed by the
13 Coast Guard as a cooperating agency. There's not a
14 formal concurrent document. The Coast Guard
15 comments are captured during that cooperating agency
16 review, and that all goes into the administrative
17 record. We don't typically post those sort of back
18 and forth on our website with other documents.

19 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Michelle. So now
20 we're going to go into some questions about marine
21 mammals. So, Kyle and Ian, I'm going to ask that you
22 both turn on your camera and unmute your line. But
23 I'm going to start with Ian for this one question.

24 Okay, to start with Ian, here's the

1 question: How many piles driving vessels will be
2 present/operating offshore? Will multiple pile
3 driving events occur concurrently? What is the
4 anticipated separation distances? And if so, How
5 were these events addressed in the cumulative impact
6 assessment? Ian, we will start off with you.

7 IAN SLAYTON: Yeah, I'm going speak to this
8 from the perspective of a cumulative scenario and
9 Kyle will, you know, get more specifically.

10 So the assumptions that were made about
11 vessels were done to capture the highest impact
12 level foreseen based on present information and
13 technology for the industry as a whole. And so this
14 isn't like a forecast or prediction, but rather a
15 projection based on current known plans in
16 technology. And so in terms of pile driving vessels,
17 it's assumed that in the scenario, all projects and
18 all development will solve vessel procurement
19 challenges and meet current schedules and timelines.
20 So each project that we know of will be able to find
21 the pile driving vessels they need to meet their
22 timeline and things progress on schedule. And if
23 there's something comes to pass, then the amount of
24 development occurring and the timing of the

1 development will be somewhat less impactful than
2 what we analyzed. And so we're not really putting a
3 number on the vessels so much as we are talking
4 about the development and assuming they have
5 adequate vessels. And so, in table 3.5-2, on page
6 B-33, which is an appendix B, we have -- we show the
7 number of projected potential concurrent pile
8 driving days possible for neighboring and nearby
9 projects. And those are groups of regionally. So,
10 for example, Massachusetts, Rhode Island is a group.
11 And so that information is used to look at the
12 incremental contribution, and I emphasize that, of
13 the proposed project, that is Vineyard Wind 1
14 proposed project in this scenario. And so this
15 information can be used for considering future
16 development. It's not, it's not, you know,
17 predicting it necessarily so much as projecting it.

18 So, sorry, my notes here are jumping
19 around. And it's important to keep in mind that the
20 Vineyard Wind proposal is the only development
21 that's being approved, disapproved or approved
22 conditions in this current NEPA analysis. So the
23 scenario is more of a thought device to help
24 consider Vineyard Wind's potential footprint within

1 this emerging industry, and as part of whole, the
2 whole of activities on the OCS, but Kyle can speak
3 more specifically to how that's considered with the
4 scenario that we constructed and had him and others
5 consider.

6 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Ian. So, Kyle,
7 I'm going ask if you can introduce -- start out by
8 introducing yourself and then just respond.

9 Kyle, I think you're on mute still. No
10 worries we're just going hold here for just a second
11 while Kyle gets his audio back on. Okay. I think
12 we're going to maybe give Kyle a second to reconnect
13 his line.

14 So how about we move on to a question that
15 we received on cultural resources in Section 106. So
16 I'm going to ask Brandi Carrier if you wouldn't mind
17 turning on your video and unmuting your line. And
18 would you mind starting by introducing yourself?

19 BRANDI CARRIER: Hi, Isis, my name is
20 Brandi Carrier, and I'm an archaeologist with the
21 Renewable Energy Program.

22 ISIS FARMER: Thanks, Brandi. And the
23 question for you is which category assesses visual
24 cultural impacts? And that was a comment -- a

1 question that we receive during our comment period
2 today.

3 BRANDI CARRIER: Sure, I can answer that.

4 So the supplemental environmental impact statement
5 addresses visual impacts to cultural resources,
6 which of course include traditional cultural
7 practices. It's section 3.9 of the document.

8 The development of future offshore wind projects, we
9 know we've introduced new, modern and intrusive
10 visual elements to the fuschias of cultural
11 resources along the southern coast of Rhode Island
12 and Massachusetts, which also includes Martha's
13 Vineyard, Nantucket and the adjacent islands like
14 Chappaquiddick. The SEIS supplemental environmental
15 impact statement also reflects input from BOEM's
16 essential and ethics consultation. And these have
17 included, of course, the Chappaquiddick Wampanoag
18 Tribe as a consulting party. And this consultation
19 prompted BOEM to identify Chappaquiddick Island as
20 the separate traditional control property that may
21 be impacted visually by the introduction of
22 structures that are out of character with the
23 tribe's traditional uses.

24 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Brandi. And as a

1 follow up question to that one, how does Vineyard
2 Wind plan to mitigate visual cultural impacts?

3 BRANDI CARRIER: Sure. Historic properties
4 visual impact assessment for the proposed action
5 determines that the construction of the wind turbine
6 generators would adversely affect three historic
7 properties, and Chappaquiddick Island TCP, which I
8 mentioned a moment ago, is one of those.

9 The study also determined that the scale,
10 the extent and the intensity of these impacts would
11 be partially mitigated by environmental and
12 atmospheric factors. These are things like cloud
13 haze, fog, sea spray, vegetation and wave height
14 that would partially or fully screen the wind
15 turbine generators during various times throughout
16 the year.

17 In addition, the proposed action was found
18 to only affect southern views from these resources
19 and the study also indicates that viewers would not
20 be able to see any wind turbine generators from
21 approximately 59 percent of the locations within the
22 Chappaquiddick TCP or traditional cultural property
23 due to topographic and other landscape features.
24 Again, these are hills, ridges, vegetation and

1 existing buildings. The proposed action would
2 further mitigate these visual impacts by taking the
3 following actions: Avoiding the use of three turbine
4 locations in the northwest corner of the wind
5 development area. In other words, so close to the
6 islands, including Chappaquiddick. The use of
7 non-reflective pure white and light gray paint on
8 offshore structures, and then funding a mitigation
9 plan to resolve impacts pursuant to section 106
10 under a memorandum of agreement. So creative
11 mitigation methods and concepts for ways to minimize
12 and mitigate these visual impacts are being
13 considered under the section 106 review process
14 that's ongoing and that will continue and be
15 completed alongside the NEPA schedules, so
16 approximately December of this year.

17 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Brandi. Do you
18 think maybe there was another question, you know,
19 more generally about cultural resources? And about
20 cultural resource 30?

21 BRANDI CARRIER: I did not see that when I

22 -- ISIS FARMER: Could you read it to me?

23 BRANDI CARRIER: Oh, yeah, no problem.

24 Here, I think there was just some general

1 information, general questions about maybe cultural
2 resources in general. And so we have some notes here
3 about marine cultural resource surveys within the
4 Vineyard 1 development area.

5 ISIS FARMER: If it's not a question, you
6 can move along.

7 BRANDI CARRIER: Yeah, again, I can speak to
8 that very generally. So the there were marine
9 cultural research surveys conducted throughout the
10 area potential effects in the offshore and the
11 onshore areas where the project will have seabed or
12 ground disturbing impact. All of the shipwrecks that
13 were identified as the result of the surveys will be
14 avoided. Surveys also identified 34 Paleo landform
15 features that are dated to the time of human
16 occupation. While we haven't found any evidence of
17 archaeological sites within those Paleo land form
18 features, they are considered to possess the
19 possibility of having those sites inside them. And
20 as a result, you know, we consider those something
21 that needs to be addressed. So the project is going
22 to be able to avoid 19 of those 35. The remaining 16
23 the project will not be able to avoid, and as a
24 result of that we're going to be engaging with

1 tribal stakeholders through the section 106 process
2 to identify suitable mitigations that would allow
3 the tribes to have voice and decision-making
4 authority and involvement and engagement in the
5 project as we make decisions about how to
6 appropriately mitigate those potential effects.

7 ISIS FARMER: Thank you for that additional
8 information, Brandi. Okay, and then we also have a
9 question on visual impacts. Ben, would you mind
10 turning on your camera and unmuting your line as
11 well as introducing yourself?

12 BEN SUSSMAN: I'm happy to do that. My name
13 is Ben Sussman. I'm an impact assessment specialist
14 with ERM, a consultant to BOEM on this project,
15 visual impact specialist as well. So the question is
16 more broadly, does the new visual impact analysis
17 include images of the turbines on clear days from
18 Nantucket and Muskeget or Tuckernuck Islands, as
19 well as nighttime views including any necessary
20 lighting?

21 So various sections of the supplemental EIS
22 discussed the direct and indirect visual impacts of
23 the proposed action on a variety of resources. This
24 includes employment and economics in Section 3.7 of

1 the supplemental EIS, cultural and historic
2 resources in Section 3.9, as we just heard Brandi
3 discuss in quite a bit of detail, and recreation and
4 tourism in section 3.10. The simulations that are
5 used to analyze these potential impacts include the
6 large -- larger 14 megawatt turbines for the
7 proposed actions, as well as simulations of
8 cumulative visual impacts of the proposed action
9 along with reasonably foreseeable other actions as
10 presented in Appendix A. Vineyard Wind provided
11 both daytime and nighttime simulations of these two
12 categories, including both proposed action alone and
13 the overall combination of proposed action with
14 cumulative actions from multiple locations on the
15 islands. This includes Nantucket and Martha's
16 Vineyard. Martha's Vineyard in locations that are
17 considered to be representative of many of the
18 observation points on those islands. The locations
19 for individual simulations are representative of the
20 coast lines in particular, including Aquinnah on the
21 south and South Beach on Martha's Vineyard and
22 Madaket Beach on Nantucket.

23 ISIS FARMER: Thanks, Ben. Do you want
24 Kyle back on the line? If not, we do have a few

1 more questions that we'll go through before coming
2 back to him.

3 Okay, we'll just pause here for a second
4 and go back up to some of our additional questions
5 that have come in since we started our Q & A. Okay.
6 So, Michelle, looks like we have one question for
7 you. But I see Eric, thanks for turning on your
8 camera and unmuting your line. Does the permit allow
9 the foundations to be designed to repower the wind
10 turbine generators to a larger size as technology
11 advances?

12 MICHELLE MORIN: Yes, thank you. So, we
13 would consider these kind of requests on a case by
14 case basis. And this -- as you can see in the EIS we
15 analyze a design envelope, and then the purpose of a
16 design envelope is to allow for improved advances in
17 technology. If Vineyard Wind down the road, if the
18 project was approved, and Vineyard Wind down the
19 road wanted to use an even larger turbine that was
20 outside the scope of the EIS, that would trigger a
21 revision to the construction and operation plan,
22 which would then trigger a new review and approval
23 process.

24 ISIS FARMER: Thanks, Michelle. So it looks

1 like we may have Kyle back on the line.

2 Kyle, would you try turning on your camera
3 and unmuting our line?

4 KYLE BAKER: Can you hear me now?

5 ISIS FARMER: We can, great.

6 KYLE BAKER: Oh, sorry about that. There
7 was a problem somehow. Yeah, so following back on
8 Eric K.'s question about how we're going to analyze
9 impacts to the mammals. First off, my name is Kyle
10 Baker, I am a marine biologist with BOEM's Office of
11 Renewable Energy Programs, I'm a subject matter
12 expert in mammals and turtles. Yeah, so we did look
13 at the impacts of the current pile driving. And the
14 way we did that was we looked at the maximum number
15 of potential overlapping construction days in the
16 neighboring project areas. And we defined
17 neighboring project areas as those over kind of big
18 geographic regions such as Massachusetts, Rhode
19 Island, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland and
20 Virginia. And look at the total construction days,
21 and generally how far animals can travel and swim
22 over that time. And it seems reasonably conservative
23 to look at these big areas that way as neighbors
24 where they could be potentially exposed to

1 construction from two or more projects.

2 So the Rhode Island, Massachusetts area has
3 a greatest potential for concurrent contracting to
4 occur, on the total number of potential concurrent
5 construction days ranges from 16 to 103 days. If one
6 foundation was put in a day, or eight to 50 days if
7 two foundations are installed per day, depending on
8 the year only -- in relation to the Vinyard WInd
9 Project only the Southfork Wind Farm may be
10 constructed currently, and that has a limited number
11 of turbines proposed, so potentially it could be
12 eight to 16 days of concurrent construction between
13 Vidyard Wind and Southfork Wind Farm. Additionally,
14 under the cumulative scenario, Delaware and Maryland
15 have the potential for 11 days in concurrent pile
16 driving, and there's no concurrent pile driving
17 reflected in any of the other remaining areas based
18 on schedule.

19 So, yeah, so we did assess that in the
20 SEIS. And we looked at the hearing impact, the
21 behavioral impact, and I think you mentioned,
22 there's a table in the SEIS, table 3.5-2.

23 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Kyle. We
24 appreciate that. And so there was also another

1 question about infrasound. And so the question was,
2 there are comments on the Federal Register for the
3 supplemental EIS about the infrasound disturbances.
4 Can you outline what this is, and if it was analyzed
5 as part of this SEIS, not the supplemental EIS, in
6 the draft EIS for this project? Are there
7 impacts of concern?

8 KYLE BAKER: Yeah. So we're still looking
9 at those comments. We will consider all comments we
10 receive. I can't say -- we did consider some of the
11 impacts of infrasound in the SEIS. There are sounds
12 sounds below that which humans can hear, but some
13 animals can, just barely whales. Some sounds I
14 think --

15 ISIS FARMER: I think your audience cut
16 out, unfortunately.

17 KYLE BAKER: Only for sounds that can be
18 created by the operation of the -- (Loss of Audio)
19 Hello?

20 ISIS FARMER: Yeah, we can hear you now but
21 you're cutting in and out a little bit.

22 KYLE BAKER: Okay, apologies. Can you hear
23 me now?

24 ISIS FARMER: I can.

1 KYLE BAKER: Okay, sorry about that. Yeah,
2 so I was saying the wind turbine generators can
3 create some levels of infrasound. Some of it can be
4 transmitted via vibrations on the tower on the
5 actual water. BOEM has taken measures of that
6 through our science program. And that sound reaches
7 background levels within 50 meters of the turbines,
8 that it doesn't travel very far.

9 There has been reports periodically in the
10 news about the dangers of infrasound on people in
11 ear and there's really no scientific evidence that
12 happens. And that does not occur. But we have
13 considered the impacts of the wind turbines
14 generating noise in the SEIS and we're taking a
15 closer look at the comments and incorporating more
16 information that there may be.

17 KYLE BAKER: Okay. Thank you. It looks like
18 for Ian and Kyle, there's another follow up question
19 that asks: All other offshore wind projects aside,
20 specifically how many Vineyard Wind pile driving
21 vessels are anticipated to be active during
22 construction? How is this scenario addressed in the
23 supplemental EIS? And if you need a moment, we do
24 have a couple other questions that we could go back

1 to before coming back here.

2 KYLE BAKER: Yeah, I think we can answer
3 that now. There's no more than two piles or two
4 foundations proposed to be solved today. There is a
5 limit on the number of jack up vessels so it's
6 unclear whether there'll be one or two jack up
7 vessels available. But despite of whether there's
8 one or two, there'll be no more than two monopiles
9 installed per day or a jacket.

10 ISIS FARMER: Okay, thank you, Kyle.
11 Okay. And so we only have a few more questions left.
12 I'll go back to Michelle for one, and I think this
13 is somewhat similar to one of the questions you
14 answered before, but the question is: Will the BOEM
15 permit require cooperation with research projects
16 that are approved by BOEM? If they do not violate
17 warranties and are performed with appropriate safety
18 measures?

19 MICHELLE MORIN: Yes, thank you, Isis. We
20 have to consider this on a case by case basis. We
21 will need more detail to answer this question. Are
22 there but generally activities that don't conflict
23 with the lessee's activities? Would it be
24 prohibited? And we would consider the use of

1 offshore wind facilities to host research equipment.
2 In that case, we'll work with the lessee and we
3 strongly encourage research activities in these
4 areas to be coordinated with the lessee.

5 ISIS FARMER: Thank you. And there's
6 another question for you, Michelle, about
7 decommissioning. And the question was: Will the
8 decommissioning bond required be adjusted to match
9 increasing costs over the years as costs will
10 certainly rise as time passes?

11 MICHELLE MORIN: Thank you. The estimate
12 for the bond is in today's dollars, but our
13 regulations allow us to go back and increase the
14 amount of financial assurance if we determine the
15 decommissioning cost has increased. So basically, we
16 reserve that right to update the estimate at any
17 time during the lifetime of the project.

18 ISIS FARMER: Okay, thank you. Okay, just
19 scanning our last remaining questions here. We
20 appreciate your patience.

21 Okay. There is a question about what impact
22 does ADLS offer with respect to cultural/new
23 impacts? And this ADLS stands for aviation detected
24 lighting systems. And so I'm assuming, Ben, would

1 you mind turning on your camera and unmuting your
2 line?

3 BEN SUSSMAN: Sure. So the simple answer is
4 that ADLS would reduce visual impacts, whether they
5 are visual impacts on cultural resources or visual
6 impacts on anything else. Basically, as opposed to a
7 standard red flashing light that you might see on
8 top of any kind of transmission tower now. ADLS
9 would only activate if an aircraft got near enough
10 to need the lights to be activated, and so they
11 would remain dark the vast majority of the time and
12 only luminate a very small percentage of the time.

13 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Ben. Looks like
14 the last question that we have is maybe a
15 clarification on a previous question. And the
16 question is repowering is accomplished after the
17 wind farm is constructed. So if 10 years into the
18 project they decide they want to upgrade to another
19 wind turbine generator, will BOEM allow this to be
20 planned for now? At the moment this construction
21 and operations plan has already expanded to include
22 the largest form turbine generators that may be
23 available at the time of construction. But they are
24 growing in size rapidly. It would be to the

1 developer's advantage to design for repowering
2 midlife, as has been happening in terrestrial wind
3 farms. Is this being considered as part of the
4 construction and operations plan? And, Michelle,
5 would you mind turning on your camera and unmuting
6 your line?

7 MICHELLE MORIN: Hi, that's a very good
8 question. That was not specifically proposed in the
9 COP or considered in the supplemental EIS. But there
10 has been nothing preventing a leasee to talk about
11 that and their costs and us to analyze that in our
12 environmental impact statement.

13 ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Michelle. And by
14 going back through our questions, I believe those
15 are the only ones that we have.

16 CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right. Good deal,
17 Isis. Just a quick reminder to folks, if you want
18 to try and ask a question yet, because it's in the
19 last closing moments of the meeting, do go to the
20 Zoom function on the bottom of the Q & A box and
21 enter them now. Otherwise, we can go to the next
22 slide. We can show other ways to participate in the
23 process, and you can click on that next slide. That
24 would be great.

1 Here we go. So it's completed or just about
2 to complete the second meeting. And he's got a
3 meeting with one on Thursday and two next week. And
4 you can see where we've got. And I've read this
5 aloud on the record earlier, where you can submit
6 comments electronically and in writing. Just doing a
7 quick check on the Q & A box before calling this
8 meeting complete. I'm not seeing anything there.

9 So thank you everyone for participating
10 today and getting used to new technology and ways of
11 doing things. I want to thank you personally for the
12 time and participation in this process, and when to
13 turn it back over to Bill Brown for some closing
14 remarks. So have a great week, stay safe and be well
15 and I'll turn it over to Bill.

16 BILL BROWN: Yeah, I'll keep it brief.
17 Again, I'm Bill Brown, the chief environmental
18 officer at BOEM, and I receive environmental science
19 assessment regularly for all of BOEM's activities on
20 the OCS, including the wind energy development off
21 the Atlantic coast.

22 I thank you for joining us today. I think
23 it's been a great meeting with great questions. And
24 we look forward to hearing more from you. BOEM is

1 committed to protecting our oceans and coasts and
2 the communities that depend on them and to the
3 future of offshore winds also. Please remember that
4 public comment period on this supplement to the
5 draft EIS is open through July 27th. Thank you again
6 and stay well, and Good evening.

7 OPERATOR: Thank you for your participation
8 in today's conference. You may disconnect at this
9 time.

10 (The Meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.)

11 - - - -

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

County of Norfolk, SS

I, Darcy Lee Schramm, a Professional Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that the foregoing Public Information Meeting was taken before me on June 26, 2020. The said testimony was taken digitally and transcribed under my direction. To the best of my knowledge, the within transcript is a complete, true and accurate record of said Meeting.

I am not connected by blood or marriage with any of the said parties, nor interested directly or indirectly in the matter in controversy.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and Notary Seal this 8th day of July, 2020.

Darcy Lee Schramm

My Commission Expires:

April 4, 2025

