Errata for the
Maryland Offshore Wind
Final Environmental Impact Statement

August 22, 2024

Bureau of Ocean Energy Management

Office of Renewable Energy Programs

Errata Overview

The following errata to the Maryland Offshore Wind Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) represent corrections related to technical errors and clarifications.

1. FEIS, Chapter 2, Page 2-5

The initial description of the Proposed Action in Section 2.1.2 did not include the meteorological (met) tower.

The corrected Section 2.1.2 with redline edits now reads:

> The Proposed Action (Figure 2-1) is to construct, operate, maintain, and decommission an up to 2.2-GW wind energy facility in the Lease Area, 10.1 miles (16.2 kilometers) off the coast of Maryland. The PDE would consist of up to 121 WTGs ranging from 14 to 18 MW each, up to four offshore substations (OSSs), 1 Met Tower, inter-array cables in strings of four to six linking the WTGs to the OSSs, and substation interconnector cables linking the OSSs to each other.

2. FEIS, Chapter 3, Page 3-6

Section 3.1, Table 3.1-1 does not include met towers as an offshore structure source and activity associated with the presence of structures impact producing factor.

The corrected Table 3.1-1 with redline edits now reads:

IPF	Sources and Activities	Description
Presence of structures	Onshore structures, including towers and transmission cable infrastructure • Offshore structures, including wind turbine generators, offshore substations, met towers, and scour/cable protection	Refers to the post-construction, long-term presence of onshore or offshore structures.

3. FEIS, Appendix A, Section A.3.3.2, pages A-14 to A-15

The FEIS incorrectly identified Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR) as a state cooperating agency.

The corrected list of State Cooperating agencies in Section A.3.3.2 with redlines now reads:

> **State Cooperating Agencies**
>
> ~~• MD DNR~~
>
> • Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC)

The corrected text in Section A.3.3.2 with redlines now reads:

> ~~MD DNR and~~ DNREC ~~are~~ is serving as a cooperating state ~~agencies~~ agency pursuant to 40 CFR 1501.8 because ~~they have~~it has special expertise with respect to potential impacts that may occur as a result of the Proposed Action.

4. FEIS, Appendix E, Section E.1.2, page E-2

The text describing missing and incomplete information included partial information on the status of the air modeling at the time of FEIS publication, and incorrectly stated that social cost of carbon was not included in the analysis.

The corrected Section E.1.2 with redline edits now reads:

> This EIS is missing air dispersion modeling results showing that actions will be under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) thresholds. The Applicant submitted a standard Offshore and Coastal Dispersion (OCD) modeling protocol to the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) on September 16, 2022. MDE responded December 27, 2022, that an alternative modelling protocol should be used. All alternative modeling protocols require approval by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region 3. On January 26, 2023, the Applicant, USEPA, and MDE met to discuss the alternative protocol review and approval process. The approval process, including receipt of data from USEPA, is expected to take approximately 2 months from submission. Additional mitigation measures may be identified during the best available control technology and modeling processes. On March 10, 2023, US Wind submitted the alternative modeling protocol to MDE, and submitted an OCS Air Permit Application on August 17, 2023. An alternative model request was approved by MDE on September 11, 2023, and the application was deemed administratively complete on January 4, 2024. As part of the technical review, and in response to requests from MDE, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Park Service (NPS) requested that the Lessee provide long-range air transport modeling. On May 23, 2024, US Wind provided a Class I AQRV air quality modeling protocol to address CALPUFF (a multi-layer, multi-species nonsteady-state puff dispersion model) long range transport modeling for assessing Class I area Air Quality Related Values (AQRVs). The nearest Class I areas to the Project are the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge (the Brigantine Wilderness Area) in New Jersey (126 km), and the Shenandoah National Park in Virginia (290 km). The Class I AQRV protocol was approved by USFWS and NPS on May 29 and June 4, 2024, respectively. The modeling is expected to be submitted in July 2024, and results will not be available for this FEIS. MDE anticipates issuance of the OCS air permits on or before January 4, 2025.
>
> Avoided emission calculations do not conform to updated USEPA Port Emission Inventory Guidance (EPA-420-D-22-011, April 2022). However, the Applicant has utilized the BOEM Offshore Wind Energy Facilities Emission Estimating Tool, Version 2.0 (BOEM 2021) (BOEM Tool), which calculates the avoided emissions by using the

EPA's AVERT modeling tool to obtain emission factors for the regional mix of conventional energy sources.

~~This EIS does not include an analysis of the social cost of carbon both with individual GHG (CO2, CH4, N2O) and with CO2e. However, the Applicant provided GHG emissions (CO2, CH4, and CO2e) from Construction and O&M.~~

Although a quantitative emissions inventory analysis of the region, or regional modeling of pollutant concentrations, using updated data over the planned project life (25-35 years) would more accurately assess the overall impacts of the changes in emissions from the Project, any action alternative would lead to reduced emissions regionally and can only lead to a net improvement in regional air quality. Pending issuance of an Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) air quality permit and confirmation that air dispersion modeling results show that actions will be under the NAAQS thresholds, the differences among action alternatives with respect to direct emissions due to construction, operation and maintenance (O&M), and decommissioning of the Project are expected to be small.

5. FEIS, Appendix E, Section E.1.4, page E-3

The text describing missing and incomplete information omitted the Indian River Bay Sediment Transport Modeling in the list of previous US Wind surveys.

The corrected Section E.1.4 with redline edits now reads:

Although there is uncertainty regarding the spatial and temporal distribution of benthic (faunal) resources and periods during which they might be especially vulnerable to disturbance, US Wind's surveys of benthic resources (COP Appendices II- B2, Suspended Sediment Transport Modeling Study Offshore Submarine Cable Installation; B3, Indian River Bay Sediment Transport Modeling; D4, Lease Area and Offshore Export Cable Corridors Benthic Report, 2021; D5, Onshore Export Cable Corridors Benthic Report, 2022; E1, Information to Support Essential Fish Habitat Assessment; K5, Preliminary Cable Burial Risk Assessment; and K7, Preliminary Cable Burial Risk Assessment Export Cable Corridor; US Wind 2022) and other broad-scale studies (Guida et al. 2017; Cutter et al. 2000; NOS 2015; BOEM 2011, 2012; Slacum et al. 2010; and Rutecki et al. 2014) provided a suitable basis for generally predicting the species, abundances, and distributions of benthic resources within the geographic analysis area. Uncertainty also exists regarding the impact of some impact-producing factors (IPFs) on benthic resources. For example, specific stimulus-response related to acoustics and EMF is not well studied, although there is some emerging information from benthic monitoring at European wind facilities and the Block Island Wind Farm in the United States that allows for a broad understanding of the impacts. Similarly, specific secondary impacts, such as changes in diets throughout the food chain resulting from habitat modification and synergistic behavioral impacts from multiple IPFs, are not fully known. Again, results of benthic monitoring at European wind facilities and the Block Island Wind Farm in the United States provide general knowledge of the overall impacts of these IPFs

combined, if not individually. Therefore, the analysis provided in this EIS is sufficient to support sound scientific judgments and informed decision-making related to the overall impacts. For these reasons, BOEM does not believe that there is incomplete or unavailable information on benthic resources that is essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives.

6. FEIS, Appendix G, Table G-1, pages G-4, G-6 and G-7

US Wind has not proposed tree clearing would be conducted between October 1 and March 31. The COP includes only a time of year restriction for tree clearing. US Wind removed beneficial reuse of dredge material from the COP as a project element. Instead, dredged material will be placed in an approved landfill.

The corrected Table G-1 with redlines now reads:

Resource Area Mitigated	**Project Stage***	**Mitigation and Monitoring Measure**	**Source**	**Anticipated Enforcing Agency**
Bats	C	Following consultation with DNREC ~~and USFWS~~, US Wind would ~~conduct~~ extend the restriction of tree clearing activities at the US Wind Substations location required for Project construction to ~~between October 1 and March 31. No tree clearing at the substation landfall would occur from~~ April 1 through July 31 to avoid or minimize impacts to northern long-eared bat during the summer maternity period.	COP, Volume II, Section 1.5 (US Wind 2024)	USACE, USFWS
Coastal Habitat and Fauna	C	Following consultation with DNREC ~~and USFWS~~, US Wind would ~~conduct~~ extend the restriction of tree clearing activities at the US Wind Substations location required for Project construction to ~~between October 1 and March 31. No tree clearing at the substation landfall would occur from~~ April 1 through July 31 to avoid or minimize impacts to northern long-eared bat during the summer maternity period.	COP, Volume II, Section 1.5 (US Wind 2024)	USACE, USFWS
~~Coastal Habitat and Fauna~~	~~C~~	~~US Wind would prioritize beneficial reuse of dredge material (i.e., wetland restoration, beach renourishment), based on the material characteristics and opportunities as they present themselves, over placement in offshore or onshore disposal areas.~~	~~COP, Volume II, Section 1.5 (US Wind 2024)~~	~~BSEE, USACE, DNREC~~

7. FEIS, Appendix G, Table G-1, page G-12

US Wind's July 2024 COP corrected the burial depth consistent with USACE's request. Additionally, US Wind has not included the second sentence in the mitigation measure the FEIS attributed to US Wind.

The corrected Table G-1 with redlines now reads:

Resource Area Mitigated	Project Stage*	Mitigation and Monitoring Measure	Source	Anticipated Enforcing Agency
Other Uses	C	Bury submarine cables at least ~~6.6 feet~~1.8 m (~~2 meters~~6 ft) below the maintenance depth of the Indian River Bay ~~authorized depth of any state or~~ federal navigation channel~~ or any waterway used for navigation~~. ~~If the existing bottom is deeper than the authorized depth, then the cables shall be buried at least 6.6 feet (2 meters) below existing depth.~~	COP, Volume II, Section 1.5 (US Wind 2024)	BSEE, USCG

8. FEIS, Appendix G, Table G-1, page G-13

The source identified for the visual resource monitoring plan measure was incorrect.

The corrected Table G-1 with redlines now reads:

Resource Area Mitigated	Project Stage*	Mitigation and Monitoring Measure	Source	Anticipated Enforcing Agency
Visual	C	US Wind will coordinate with BOEM to prepare and implement a scenic and visual resource monitoring plan that monitors and compares the visual effects of the wind farm during construction and operations/maintenance (daytime and nighttime) to the findings in this assessment and verifies the accuracy of the visual simulations (photo and video). This would include the monitoring of meteorological influences on turbine visibility and the frequency of ADLS activations.	COP, Volume II, ~~Section 1.5~~Appendix II-J1, Section 6.0 (US Wind 2024)	BSEE, USCG

9. FEIS, Chapter 3, Table 3.5.2-2, page 3-89; Chapter 3, Table 3.5.5-8, page 3-186; Appendix G, Table G-2, page G-40 to G-43;

The measures for EFH Conservation Recommendations described in detail in Appendix G and analyzed in Chapter 3 did not indicate that the measures resulting from this consultation are those Conservation Recommendations that have been identified as adopted or partially adopted by BOEM and USACE.

The corrected Tables 3.5.2-2 and 3.5.5.8 with redlines now read:

Measure	Effect
EFH Conservation Recommendations[1]	Minimize impacts to finfish, invertebrates, and EFH in Indian River Bay, other estuaries, and offshore environments, through restrictions on timing and location of Project activities and infrastructure; minimize acoustic impacts through mitigation and monitoring related to acoustic activities; minimize impacts of invasive species through monitoring.

[1] NMFS EFH Consultation letter dated May 2, 2024, provided EFH Conservation Recommendations for activities under BOEM's and USACE's jurisdiction. In a letter signed July 12, 2024, BOEM provided a detailed response to each EFH Conservation Recommendation under BOEM's jurisdiction. In a letter dated July 19, 2024, USACE provided a detailed response letter to each EFH Conservation Recommendation under USACE's jurisdiction. EFH Conservation Recommendations resulting from Section 305(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (i.e., EFH consultation) include only those Conservation Recommendations that BOEM and USACE are adopting or partially adopting as specified in the agencies' detailed response letters.

The corrected Table G-2 with redlines now reads:

Resource Area Mitigated	Project Stage*	Mitigation and Monitoring Measure	Source	Anticipated Enforcing Agency
Benthic resources, finfish, invertebrates, and EFH	C, O&M	*Recommendations to Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Estuarine Habitats (Indian River Bay and Inlet, Delaware and Sinepuxent Bay, Maryland)* 1. Locate the inshore export cable (IEC) entirely on uplands (Alternative C-2 in the FEIS) to avoid adverse impacts to EFH and other NOAA trust resources in Indian River Bay (IRB). 2. If dredging is authorized in IRB, restore the dredged footprint to pre-construction conditions with clean, compatible materials or with material removed during dredging. 3. Avoid trenching (without immediate backfill/infill), sidecasting, and other open-water disposal in open nearshore/estuarine waters, including in IRB. If open trenching is used, excavated materials should not be sidecast or placed in the aquatic environment. All materials should be stored on uplands or barges and placed	NMFS-proposed EFH Conservation Recommendations (correspondence dated May 2, 2024)[1]	USACE, DNREC, MDE

		back into the trench to restore the excavated areas, or removed to a suitable upland disposal site. Trenched areas should be restored to pre-construction conditions with native and/or clean, compatible material. 4. Avoid in-water work in Indian River Bay and Inlet from March 1 to September 30 to avoid and minimize impacts to EFH, federally managed species, their prey, and other resources under our purview including: i. Avoid in-water work in Indian River Bay from April 1 to September 30 to avoid impacts to nursery habitat for summer flounder, black sea bass, and numerous other estuarine-dependent species. ii. Avoid in-water work in Indian River Bay from March 1 to June 30 in Indian River Inlet and Bay to minimize impacts to diadromous fish migrations. 5. Avoid in-water work, including impact pile driving from February 15 to June 30 in Sinepuxent Bay to minimize impacts to migrating diadromous species. 6. Prior to commencement of in-water work within IRB, delineate areas of shellfish in accordance with the methods used by the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control. Maps of delineated shellfish beds should be provided to vessel operators to facilitate impact avoidance. 7. Avoid siting infrastructure, including cables, piers, and gravity cells for HDD entrance/exit pits in ecologically sensitive estuarine areas including, but not limited to, SAV beds, mudflats, tidal wetlands, shellfish beds/reefs. 8. Avoid anchoring or placing jack-up barge piles or spud cans in ecologically sensitive estuarine areas including, but not limited to, SAV beds, mudflats, tidal wetlands, shellfish beds/reefs. Habitat maps delineating these resources should be provided to vessel operators to facilitate impact avoidance. 9. Avoid excavation, cable installation, or the staging of equipment within tidal wetlands, SAV or mudflat. Where unavoidable impacts to SAV, wetlands or mudflats occur, provide compensatory mitigation in		

		accordance with 33 CFR Parts 325 and 332 "Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources," (Mitigation Rule) and NOAA's Mitigation Policy for Trust Resource). The plan should be submitted to our office (NMFS.GAR.HESDoffshorewind@noaa.gov) for review and include monitoring and maintenance/adaptive management plan, be monitored for a minimum of five years, and annual reports should be provided to our office. 10. Require vessels and barges float at all stages of the tide to minimize benthic habitat impacts from vessel operation/barge grounding. 11. Dewater all dredged material at an upland site for subsequent disposal in an upland location or to be reused to restore dredged areas. 12. Within IRB, capture and contain HDD drilling muds and dispose of these materials in an upland location. 13. Develop and implement a frac-out plan for all areas where HDD is proposed to be used. A copy of the final plan should be provided to NMFS HESD at NMFS.GAR.HESDoffshorewind@noaa.gov prior to construction.		
Benthic resources, finfish, invertebrates, and EFH	C, O&M	*Recommendations to Avoid and Minimize Impacts to Benthic Habitats (Offshore and/or Nearshore)* 14. Avoid impacts to areas of high relief sand ridge and trough complexes and large distinct bathymetric features by removing or relocating 11 WTGs, associated inter-array cables, and repositioning the corresponding OEC (as outlined in Alternative E in the EIS). 15. Avoid the placement of all infrastructure (cables, WTGs, OSSs, scour protection, met tower, etc.) in sensitive and ecologically important habitats including complex habitats, sand waves, biogenic habitats, including shellfish beds, aggregations, and reefs, hard and soft corals, and soft bottom habitats with dense emergent fauna (e.g. octocorals and pennatulids, tube dwelling anemones and structure forming amphipods and polychaetes). 16. Minimize the extent of inter array cables overlapping sand ridge and trough complexes and other bathymetric features	NMFS-proposed EFH Conservation Recommendations (correspondence dated May 2, 2024)[1]	BOEM, BSEE, USACE

		identified by NMFS as Areas of Concerns (Alternative E) by modifying the inter array layout configuration to reduce the extent of disturbance, leveling, or removal of complex habitats and benthic features, including sand waves (inclusive of sand ridge and trough complexes) due to site preparation and installation of cables, WTGs, and OSSs. The final inter array cable configuration, including modifications to reduce impacts to these important features should be provided to NMFS HESD at NMFS.GAR.HESDoffshorewind@noaa.gov. 17. The portion of the export cable corridor that overlaps with New Jersey Prime Fishing Areas (also identified as Areas of Concern in the EIS) should be microsited to minimize impacts/overlap with complex and heterogeneous complex habitat and sand waves. This may include micrositing or identifying areas outside the proposed cable corridor that would reduce overlap with the New Jersey Prime Fishing areas and associated complex habitats. 18. Microsite WTGs, OSSs, and cables to minimize impacts to small-scale habitat elements/features including areas identified as complex and heterogeneous complex habitats and sand waves. Soft bottom areas (identified by low multibeam backscatter returns) absent benthic features and biogenic/living resources should be targeted for micrositing. Multibeam echosounder backscatter and side-scan sonar data along with seafloor samples/visual surveys should be used to facilitate micrositing to avoid the above-mentioned habitats. 19. To the extent practicable, cables unable to avoid complex habitats and benthic features should cross mapped complex habitat areas (including complex and heterogeneous complex habitats) perpendicularly at the narrowest points and be sited along natural benthic contours within troughs/lows, to maximize cable burial while minimizing disturbance to local submarine topography. 20. Cables (interarray, interconnection, interlink, and export) should be installed		

		into the existing seafloor via jetting (i.e., jet trenching) or mechanical trenching with simultaneous lay and burial and laid in ways that maintain submarine topography and contours on medium (meter) to large (kilometer) scales; benthic features including megaripples and sand waves (inclusive of sand ridge and troughs and sand banks) should be maintained. 21. All cables should be sited to allow for full burial depth, prioritizing soft bottom habitat where full burial depth is likely to occur, to minimize permanent adverse impacts to existing benthic habitats from the placement of scour protection. 22. Avoid anchoring or placing jack-up barge footings and spud cans in sensitive and ecologically important habitats such as complex habitats, sand waves, shellfish beds and reefs, hard and soft corals, and soft bottom habitats with dense emergent fauna (e.g. octocorals and pennatulids, tube dwelling anemones). Multibeam echosounder backscatter and side-scan sonar data as well as all sampling data available for the lease area should be used to facilitate avoidance of these habitats. Habitat maps identifying or delineating these resources should be provided to vessel operators to facilitate impact avoidance. 23. Use dynamic positioning systems (DPS) or mid-line buoys on anchor chains to minimize adverse impacts to benthic habitats from anchor chains/chain sweep. 24. If anchoring for cable installation is necessary in areas with complex and heterogeneous complex habitats, large benthic features, including sand waves, ridge and trough complexes, sandbanks, and sand shoals, anchor lines should be extended to the extent practicable to minimize the number of times the anchors must be raised and lowered to reduce the amount of habitat disturbance. 25. In areas where scour protection is required, use Nature Inclusive Design principles, including natural or rounded engineered stone of consistent grain size that mimics the properties of existing pebble, cobble, and boulder sediments within the lease area and export cable corridors (OEC and		

		IEC) to minimize permanent adverse impacts of habitat conversion from scour protection. Any exposed surface layer should provide three-dimensional structural complexity that creates a diversity of crevice sizes (e.g., mixed stone sizes) and rounded edges (e.g., tumbled stone), and be sloped such that outer edges match the natural grade of the seafloor. Avoid the use of angular stone riprap or concrete mattresses. Should the use of concrete mattresses be necessary (e.g. cable crossings), bioactive concrete (i.e., with bio-enhancing admixtures) should be used as the primary scour protection (e.g., concrete mattresses) or veneer to support biotic growth. 26. Regrade any berm created from the cable installation that exceeds 4.5 ft. above the existing grade to bury the cable to match the existing grade/pre-construction conditions. 27. Avoid the use of plastics/recycled polyesters/net material (i.e. rock-filled mesh bags, fronded mattresses, scour protection mats) in all scour protection.		
Benthic resources, finfish, invertebrates, and EFH	C, O&M	*Recommendations to Minimize Acoustic Impacts* 28. Require the use of noise mitigating measures during pile driving to minimize impacts from offshore pile installation/driving. This may include using vibratory hammers, noise-impact reducing hammers, soft start/ramp up procedures and the deployment of noise dampening equipment such as bubble curtains that achieves a minimum 10 decibel (dB) attenuation. 29. Use additional noise dampening/mitigation measures during all impact pile driving within 13.6 kilometers (km) of any artificial reef sites/shipwrecks/fish havens (including "Old Grounds") to minimize impacts (noise above the behavioral threshold for fish) to areas where fish are known to aggregate. If sound field verification indicates the behavioral threshold for fish extends beyond the modeled 13.6 km, additional noise dampening/mitigation measures should be used. Additional noise mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to,	NMFS-proposed EFH Conservation Recommendations (correspondence dated May 2, 2024)[1]	BOEM, BSEE, USACE

		isolation casings, isolation casings with bubble curtains inside, and double-walled isolation casings. 30. Prohibit continuous pile driving for 24 hours/day. A minimum mandatory quiet period of at least 4 hours should be required per 24 hours to minimize effects from pile driving. 31. Provide acoustic monitoring reports that include any/all noise-related monitoring to NMFS HESD at NMFS.GAR.HESDoffshorewind@noaa.gov. 32. Notify NMFS HESD within 24 hours if any evidence of a fish kill during construction activity is observed. Prior to resuming pile driving activities, provide NMFS with information on modifications that will be made to reduce the risk of additional fish kills in the project area (i.e. an adaptive management plan).		
Benthic resources, finfish, invertebrates, and EFH	C, O&M, D	*Recommendations Minimize Impacts from Project Operation* 33. Require, as a Term and Condition of COP approval, the Lessee develop and implement a Lionfish Adaptive Management Plan. The plan should include regular monitoring for lionfish in the project area and identify mitigation options to reduce the proliferation of the invasive species. The plan should be provided to NMFS HESD at NMFS.GAR.HESDoffshorewind@noaa.gov for review and comment. The plan should be updated based on comments received by NMFS. 34. Bury high voltage subsea cables as deep as possible below the stable seabed to minimize impacts to habitats and species from exposure to anthropogenically elevated electromagnetic fields (EMFs) and heat. 35. Avoid any activities (i.e., site preparation) or placement of permanent infrastructure within 1000 ft. of any designated artificial reef sites, observed fish havens, Prime Fishing Areas (N.J. A.C 7:7-9-4), known shipwrecks, or other fish aggregation areas such as subway cars, tanks, or rail cars. 36. Require the implementation of preventive measures and spill plans to minimize the risk of contaminant emissions or accidental	NMFS-proposed EFH Conservation Recommendations (correspondence dated May 2, 2024)[1]	BOEM, BSEE, USACE

		release of chemicals, grout, lubricants, etc. that may adversely impact pelagic habitat. Such measures may include backup systems, secondary containments, closed loop systems, and/or recovery tanks. 37. Use aluminum (Al) sacrificial anodes instead of zinc (Zn) anodes to minimize the risk of water quality impacts via contamination.		
Benthic resources, finfish, invertebrates, and EFH	C, O&M	*Recommendations for Monitoring* 38. Develop an in situ project specific monitoring program to address impacts of the operation of the Maryland Wind Project on EFH. This monitoring recommendation is consistent with principles outlined in NOAA's Mitigation Policy for Trust Resources, which highlights the use of the best available scientific information, such as results of surveys and other data collection efforts when existing information is not sufficient for the evaluation of proposed actions and mitigation, or when additional information would facilitate more effective or efficient mitigation recommendations. The project specific monitoring program should include Benthic Habitat and Fisheries Monitoring Plans that measure, in situ, the stressors created by project operation on the ecosystem from operational noise, electromagnetic fields (EMF), wind wake effects, and the presence of structures. Studies should also evaluate the biological effects of those stressors on commercially important species in the project area such as black sea bass and whelk. Monitoring plans should include the collection of a minimum of three years of baseline data, during construction, and a minimum of five years of post-construction data collection. Plans should be incorporated into a comprehensive monitoring strategy and be provided to NOAA Fisheries GARFO and NEFSC for review and comment within 90 days of ROD issuance. A response to NOAA Fisheries comments should be provided. All data and metadata resulting from research and monitoring studies should be provided to NOAA Fisheries. These monitoring studies should be developed in partnership with NOAA	NMFS-proposed EFH Conservation Recommendations (correspondence dated May 2, 2024)[1]	BOEM, BSEE, USACE

		Fisheries and other scientific institutions to aid in addressing the following questions: a. What are the measurable levels of exposure of specific impact producing factors (IPFs; i.e., sound and particle motion, EMF, wind wake effects, presence of structure induced vertical mixing) within the project area during and post-construction? b. How do commercially important species (e.g. black sea bass) within the project area respond to the exposure to specific IPFs identified? c. To what extent has benthic habitat within the project area been converted or fragmented as a result of project construction? d. What are the measurable impacts on the regional hydrodynamic regime, and specifically the Mid-Atlantic Cold Pool, as a result of the presence of structures within the project area? e. Does the presence of novel hard structures (WTGs, OSS, and associated scour protection) change the distribution and abundance of exotic, invasive species, including the Indo-Pacific lionfish [Pterois volitans and P. miles]) in the project area? i. To what extent do the presence of structures in the wind farm facilitate colonization by exotics or invasive species? ii. What are the distributions and abundances of exotics or invasive species in the wind farm area broken down by structure and composition type (e.g., WTG, steel; scour protection, mattress)? iii. How do individual structures or wind farm as a whole change the thermal regime, especially in the context of facilitating overwintering/colonization of invasive lionfish? iv. Do lionfish exhibit age-specific habitat preferences on novel wind farm structures (i.e., do young-of-year lionfish prefer scour protection while		

		adult lionfish prefer vertical monopile)? 1. v. Do the presence of structures facilitate expansion (i.e., stepping stone effects) of exotics or invasives, including lionfish?		
Benthic resources, finfish, invertebrates, and EFH	C, O&M, D	*Recommendations for Reinitiating EFH Consultation* 39. The EFH consultation should be reinitiated: a. If the proposed action deviates in any substantive way from what is described in the EFH Assessment; b. If boulders are encountered during pre-construction or construction activities that require removal or relocation because the EFH Assessment does not currently consider boulder relocation activities or what would occur if boulders are encountered. c. If additional dredging in IRB beyond what is described in the March 22, 2024, is proposed. d. If dredging is proposed at the O&M facility in West Ocean City, MD. e. If dredged material placement locations are changed to include placing any dredged material in wetlands or other aquatic habitats, including any proposed beneficial use projects. f. Prior to decommissioning WTGs to ensure that the impacts to EFH as a result of the decommissioning activities have been fully evaluated and minimized to the extent practicable. Pre-consultation coordination with our agency related to decommissioning should occur early, at least five years prior to proposed decommissioning.	NMFS-proposed EFH Conservation Recommendations (correspondence dated May 2, 2024)[1]	BOEM, BSEE, USACE

[1] NMFS EFH Consultation letter dated May 2, 2024, provided EFH Conservation Recommendations for activities under BOEM's and USACE's jurisdiction. In a letter signed July 12, 2024, BOEM provided a detailed response to each EFH Conservation Recommendation under BOEM's jurisdiction. In a letter dated July 19, 2024, USACE provided a detailed response letter to each EFH Conservation Recommendation under USACE's jurisdiction. EFH Conservation Recommendations resulting from Section 305(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (i.e., EFH consultation) include only those Conservation Recommendations that BOEM and USACE are adopting or partially adopting as specified in the agencies' detailed response letters.

10. FEIS, Appendix G, page G-2; Appendix H, pages H-3 and H-4; Appendix I, page I-2 and Section I.1, page I-3

The text incorrectly refers to US Wind Inc. as US Wind, LLC in 5 locations.

The corrected section with redline edits in Appendix G, page G-2 now reads:

> The Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) assesses the potential biological, socioeconomic, physical, and cultural impacts that could result from the construction, operations and maintenance (O&M), and conceptual decommissioning of the Maryland Offshore Wind Project (Project) proposed by US Wind ~~LLC~~ Inc.(US Wind), in its Construction and Operations Plan (COP) (US Wind 2024[1]~~).~~ The proposed Project described in the COP and this Final EIS would be up to 2,000 megawatts (MW) in scale and sited 11.5 statute miles (mi) (18.5 kilometers [km]) off the coast of Maryland, within the area of Renewable Energy Lease Number OCS-A 0490 (Lease Area). The Project is designed to serve demand for renewable energy in the Delmarva Peninsula, including Maryland.

The corrected entry with redline edits in the list of abbreviations and acronyms in Appendix H, page H-3 now reads:

US Wind	US Wind~~, LLC~~Inc.

The corrected section in Appendix H, page H-4 now reads:

> US Wind~~,~~ Inc. ~~LLC~~ (US Wind) proposes to construct, operate, and eventually decommission the Maryland Offshore Wind Project (Project), which would consist of wind energy facilities generating up to 2,000 megawatts within the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) Renewable Energy Lease Area (Lease Area) OCS-A 0490. Figure H-1 shows the location of the Project, as well as other approved or planned offshore wind projects within the Delmarva Peninsula, including Maryland.

The corrected entry with redline edits in the list of abbreviations and acronyms in Appendix I, page I-2 now reads:

US Wind	US Wind~~, LLC~~Inc.

The corrected section with redline edits in Appendix I, Section I-1, page I-3 now reads:

> US Wind ~~LLC~~ Inc. (US Wind) proposes to construct, operate, and eventually decommission the Maryland Offshore Wind Project (Project), which would consist of wind energy facilities generating at least up to 2,000 megawatts within Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) Renewable Energy Lease Area (Lease Area) OCS-A 0490. The Project would be offshore of Ocean City, Maryland in the Delmarva Peninsula. The Project would include a maximum of 114 wind turbine generators (WTG) and 4 offshore substations (OSS), and one meteorological (met) tower positions on foundation support structures. Up to four offshore export cables would transmit electricity from the WTGs and OSSs to an onshore export cable corridor.