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CHRISTINE DAVIS: I want to thank everyone for joining us today. I am with ERM, the third-party contractor working with the BOEM staff on the environmental review of Vineyard Wind 1 Project. I'm here to help facilitate and guide us all through this meeting.

We appreciate you taking time to share your thoughts with us.

The purpose of today's meeting is to gather your input on Vineyard Wind's proposed offshore Wind 1 Project, and more specifically, on the supplement 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 are recording and have court reporters documenting this meeting for the public record.

We've learned from the previous meetings that someone asked questions right away. So if you're on Zoom, please note that
we will use the Zoom $Q$ \& A function to address questions, and the chat function to address any technical issues you might have.

I'll talk about Zoom in a few
minutes, but before we go any further, $I$ would like to welcome Jim Bennett.

Jim Bennett is the Program
Director of the Office of Renewable Energy Programs at the Bureau of Ocean Energy

Management. And Jim will formally welcome everybody.

Jim?
JIM BENNETT: Thank you,
Christine. Good afternoon, everyone. Can you hear me okay?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: We can hear you just fine.

JIM BENNETT: On behalf of the Department of Interior, $I$ want to thank you all for joining us for today's public meeting. Again, my name is Jim Bennett, and I'm the Program Manager for the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, or BOEM, offshore renewable energy program.

It's unfortunate that we can't be together today here in person. I hope that you and your families and friends are all safe and healthy, given our current situation.

On the other hand, this is the last of five virtual public meetings, and we are fortunate to have technology that allows us to create effective alternatives to in-person public meetings.

Our team has put together a system that will enable us to continue our dialogue in this new virtual format to help inform our decision.

So who are we? BOEM is the
federal bureau within the Department of Interior that oversees the expeditious and orderly development of energy resources on the Outer Continental Shelf. It is a big job that's almost 2.5 billion acres of the nation's Outer Continental Shelf, including -including -- it's larger, in fact, than the total landmass of the U.S., including Alaska.

So it is indeed a big job, and
BOEM has a strong history of meeting our
nation's growing energy needs. Our responsibilities include the development of renewable energy resources, essentially offshore wind.

Our authority was given us to in 2005, in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. And in 2009, we put a regulatory regime together. And over the past 10 years, we've been working with states, with stakeholders, with industry, and the public to identify the best areas for offshore wind development.

To date, we have 16 active leases on the Atlantic from Cape Cod to Cape Hatteras. Every state has at least one federal Outer Continental Shelf renewable energy lease in place.

These leases have the capacity of almost 22 gigawatts of electricity to contribute to the state goals of almost 30 gigawatts in the region.

For these leases, we have approved 10 site assessment plans, or SAPs, and we're currently reviewing seven Construction and Operation Plans, or COPs. These SAPs and COPs
are both formal steps in our regulatory process to get from leasing offshore to the generation of electricity.

We anticipate receiving up to
eight additional COPs over the next 12 months. Again, it's a big job. We've hired new staff. We're using third-party contractors to help manage this growing workload. There's a lot going on.

In addition, our first deal in the water for the Outer Continental Shelf occurred just in the last few weeks with the Coast of Virginia Offshore Wind Project, or CVOW. We fully anticipate a dozen or more commercial-scale wind farms during the decade. And we are also examining additional leasing in the areas such as the Gulf of Maine, the New York Bight, the Carolinas, and on the West Coast as well as out in Hawaii.

But we want to make sure that
these projects are done right. Our objective is to ensure that offshore wind, commercial fishing, maritime navigation and other uses of the ocean can be pursued successfully. This
does not mean that there won't be any impact. There will be impact. But our goal is that all users can successfully coexist. Our task is to obtain the best available information, conduct sound scientific and environmental analysis, estimate impact, and identify appropriate mitigation. This will allow us to establish a strong foundation for all projects going forward. And these public meetings are an opportunity to help us meet that goal and for us to hear from you to that end, particularly with regard to the Vineyard Wind Project.

Vineyard Wind is the first commercial offshore wind project analyzed under the One Federal Decision process. We have worked through this process for the first time. We've adapted our approach, and which we believe this approach will allow permitting of future projects to run more smoothly.

BOEM has received over 300
comments from stakeholders and cooperating agencies on the Vineyard Wind Draft Environmental Impact Statement, or draft EIS.

Some of these comments requested a more robust analysis of cumulative impacts.

As a result, on Friday, June 12th, we formally released a supplement to the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Vineyard Wind 1 offshore energy project.

The supplement to the draft EIS expands the reasonably foreseeable future offshore wind development scenario and analyzes the effects of that scenario. The supplement to the draft also analyzes previously unavailable fishing data, a transit lane alternative proposed by the fishing community, and changes to the Construction and Operations Plan that have occurred since the draft EIS was published.

These updates are a direct result of comments we received from numerous stakeholders including state and local governments, federal agencies, industry, and the public. This enhanced analysis will serve as a model for the review of future projects. That's why it's vitally important for
decision-making that you all carefully review the supplement to the draft EIS and provide us with your comments.

We are making every effort to hear from you. As I mentioned, this is the last of five virtual public meetings that we are holding throughout the open comment period. Your input will help the Department of Interior and BOEM meet our goal of getting this right. We remain committed to a permitting process that minimizes user conflicts and establishing a strong foundation for wind projects moving forward.

Thank you and stay well. Now, I would like to welcome a representative
from the State of Massachusetts.
Let me turn this over to Lisa Engler, Director of the Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management.

Thank you.
LISA ENGLER: Thank you, Jim.
Good evening, everyone. Again, my name is
Lisa Engler, and I'm the Director
for the Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone

Management.
On behalf of Energy and
Environmental Affairs and Secretary Kathleen Theoharides, we are pleased to welcome the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for today's public meeting on the supplement to the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Vineyard Wind 1 Project.

Joining me from fellow
Massachusetts agencies are Nils Bolgen and Kirsten Holland from the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center, and Kathryn Ford for the Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries.

We are looking forward to the presentations and the opportunity to hear your comments and input to the federal review process for the Vineyard Wind 1 Project.

Global climate change presents a serious threat to the Commonwealth environment, residents, communities and economies. Governor Baker has expressed the need for action stating "The magnitude of the impacts from climate change requires all of us to put politics aside and act together quickly
and decisively. We still have the opportunity to check the severity of future impacts by aggressively reducing greenhouse gas and adapting to the changes that are ongoing."

With the 2008 Global Warming
Solutions Act, Massachusetts became one of the first states in the nation to require carbon emission reductions of at least 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050 with interim targets every decade. We are on track to meet our 2020 goal of a 25 percent reduction from 1990.

In addition, in December of last year, Governor Baker committed the Commonwealth to net zero emissions by 2050 . Meeting these targets will include efforts and commitments by both the public and the private sectors and will require changes to business as usual. Responsibly sited, developed, and operated offshore wind will be key to meeting new carbon emission reduction targets.

For more than a decade, we have worked closely with our federal, state, local and tribal partners through BOEM's
intergovernmental task force on offshore
energy in the planning, siting, leasing, and review of potential offshore wind projects on the Outer Continental Shelf. We have also worked closely with stakeholders through state-formed and habitat working groups on offshore wind, and in community-based meetings and discussions.

The fishing industry is a critical partner in the development of offshore wind, and we value the opportunity to use these venues for important dialogue and feedback in the responsible development of offshore wind.

Under Governor Baker's leadership, the Energy Diversity Act was passed in 2016 to allow for the solicitation of 1600 megawatts of offshore wind. This led to the successful procurement of the Vineyard Wind 1 Project in 2018, which will result in significant greenhouse gas reductions at a highly competitive price.

Massachusetts has continued to lead the development of the offshore wind market in the U.S. In 2018, Massachusetts passed additional legislation that doubled the
amount of offshore wind energy solicitation to 3200 megawatts. The development of the offshore wind market will lead to substantial economic development in the Commonwealth and in the region bringing necessary clean energy that will provide significant greenhouse gas emissions reduction.

The Federal National Environmental
Policy Act review process lead by BOEM is a critically important component in our collective responsibility to avoid, minimize, and mitigate potential adverse effects. And in the case of the Vineyard Wind 1 Project, the SEIS has provided a broader substantive basis for reviewing the project within the context of other offshore wind development. The cumulative analysis included in the SEIS ensures that potential impacts beyond this individual project are evaluated.

In parallel to the BOEM review, the Vineyard Wind 1 Project was reviewed by state agencies, including the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, the Energy Facility Siting Board, the

Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act Office, the Department of Public Utilities, and the Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone

Management. This Massachusetts state review is now complete.

Thank you all for virtually
joining us today. Your participation is so important as we continue to work with agencies, stakeholders, and local communities in the review of the BOEM commercial leasing production and operations process.

And with that, I'll turn it back over to Christine.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you, Lisa. Looking at the agenda now, BOEM will provide a project overview. We'll discuss the environmental review process and the next steps. We'll open the meeting for public testimony and then close by answering questions. We'll get to the public testimony probably in about a half hour, 45 minutes from now, and then, like I said, close with questions.

As a reminder, the focus of our
meeting is to receive public comments, so we'll spend the bulk of our time together on that agenda item. Everyone who would like to provide comments today will need to press Star 1 and speak with a live operator in order to get in the queue. Even if you're preregistered, you'll need to press Star 1. Please note that it might take the operator a little bit of time to get to you, so please be patient. Again the steps for everyone who wants to speak today, including the preregistered people, is to press Star 1, wait to speak to a live operator. If you've not already done so, please do so now or any time prior to the public comments.

So that we can provide as many
interested parties as possible the opportunity to provide public comments, we ask that you keep your comments to approximately five minutes. And that -- you're not going to be on camera today, but your voice will come through on the phone. Only the BOEM, ERM presenters and $I$ will be on video. And please know that the oral comments provided will be
on the record, and the entire meeting is being recorded.

With that, I'm going to give some tips on Zoom.

For those of you that are online, you'll see that -- you've heard that we've talked about the $Q$ \& $A$ and chat functions. At the bottom of your screen, you'll see a $Q$ \& A icon, and you'll see that a box will pop up for you to type in a question. We'll answer the bulk of the questions at the end of the public testimony in order to provide the maximum amount of time on public comment. Some questions with short answers might be addressed right away. But for the bulk of them, we will have the subject matter experts, who are listening in right now, respond in person later on in the meeting.

Don't be alarmed if you don't see your question right away. The questions will show up as we answer them verbally during the Q \& A question -- during the $Q$ \& A session.

As briefly noted, we're only going to use the Zoom chat if you have a technical
issue. And then later on, we'll use it to post the order for public comment. We'll only use that "raise your hand" if we need to call on you.

If at any time you have technical challenges using Zoom, please note you can continue to participate by phone. The number is 1-888-606-7043, and the participant code is 6516733\#. If you want to give public testimony and have not already done so, please press Start 1 to speak to our live operator and get into the queue, regardless of whether or not you signed up to speak.

All right. And with that, does anyone have any questions about zoom or the phone line, that you would like to submit at this time? We'll give it just a break, and I'll check in with Isis and see if we have anything that we need to address.

ISIS FARMER: (Inaudible.)
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. All
right. So at this point, I'm going to
turn it over to Jennifer Bucatari
from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management.

She'll explain the environmental review process and then provide an overview of the supplement to the draft EIS. After her presentation, we'll begin that public testimony.

So as a reminder, just -- you know, to provide comments later on, please make sure you press Star 1 to get into the queue.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Jenn.

Jenn?
JENNIFER BUCATARI: Sorry about that.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: No worries.
JENNIFER BUCATARI: Trying to find my video for a minute.

Hi everyone, thank you for coming. Welcome to the Vineyard Wind supplement to the draft Environmental Impact Statement virtual public meeting.

As Jim mentioned earlier, BOEM is the federal bureau within the Department of the Interior that oversees development of our
energy and mineral resources subject to environmental safeguards.

We cover the nearly 2.5 billion acres of the nation's Outer Continental Shelf, or as we call it, OCS, including the development of marine minerals, oil and gas, and renewable energy resources.

We appreciate your participation in this meeting, and we look forward to hearing your comments following the summary presentation.

As Christine mentioned, my name is Jennifer Bucatari, and I'm one of the environmental coordinators for this project.

To the greatest extent possible, we are working to maintain services for the American people and our stakeholders consistent with the evolving guidance provided by the CDC and state and local health authorities. As such, we are moving forward with our public meetings in a virtual environment in order to provide information to our public in the safest and most efficient way possible and to receive feedback from our
stakeholders.
These public meetings, while virtual, are an opportunity for public involvement and an opportunity to provide your comments on the Supplemental EIS.

BOEM has developed a virtual meeting room web page; address is seen her at the top of this slide. You likely visited this page to register for the public meetings, but either way, we encourage you to explore the page and the additional content that we have there.

The content includes posters, as you see here on this slide, and presentations. And the intent is to mimic the poster stations, or the stations that we would normally have at an in-person meeting. The posters seen her relay a brief summary of important topics to our stakeholders.

The presentations that you see on this slide are the ones that are also on the virtual meeting web page. These are summaries of impacts to several key topics or resources. The presentations were developed and recorded
by BOEM's subject matter expert who also developed the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement impact analyses for that resource.

The National Environmental Policy
Act, or $N E P A, ~ i s ~ a ~ l a w ~ r e q u i r i n g ~ f e d e r a l ~$ agencies to discuss the environmental effects of their proposed action and reasonable alternatives. The NEPA process collects relevant information for the decision-maker to either approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the plan.

Through the NEPA process, an
Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, must be prepared if the agency is proposing a major federal action that may significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The purpose of the analysis is to outline the impact for a proposed project on its surrounding environment. The process also includes public scoping, public comment period, and an analysis of reasonable alternatives and cumulative effects.

The process also includes public
scoping, public comment period, and an analysis of reasonable alternatives and cumulative effects.

BOEM's renewable energy leasing
and development process occurs in four phases. For the Vineyard Wind 1 Project, we are in the fourth phase, as you can see here. This includes conducting an environmental review of the lessees' Construction and Operations Plan, or COP. The draft EIS was published for public review in December of 2018 . And the supplement to the EIS, the SEIS, was published on June 12 th, 2020 .

The Vineyard Wind 1 proposed project location is seen here, and is 12 nautical miles at its nearest point to land. The project is situated southeast of Martha's Vineyard. The proposed cable landfalls are in two locations on Cape Cod, Lewis Bay or New Hampshire Avenue.

A brief background on the project
is presented here. The development of the Supplemental EIS began following public hearings that were held in February of 2019 .

Comments from public and stakeholders requested an expanded cumulative analysis and an analysis of fishing data previously unavailable to BOEM. In addition, updates to the Construction and Operations Plan were submitted by Vineyard Wind on January 31st, 2020 , and March 9th, 2020.

BOEM developed the Supplemental EIS to address comments from the public and stakeholders, expand the cumulative analysis, analyze this previously unavailable fishing data, a new alternative, and project changes.

As mentioned, in January and March of 2020, Vineyard Wind submitted updates to their Construction and Operations Plan, which included changes to the projects envelope and onshore substation. The updates included an expansion of the turbine capacity to include up to 14 megawatt turbines. The total project capacity remains at 800 megawatts. And the change to the turbine capacity does not result in a change to the footprint or minimum turbine capacity, which is
megawatts. The proposed project
includes up to 106 wind
turbine locations with up to 100 wind turbines. Up to 12 jacket foundations may be used, 10 for the turbine foundations and up to two for the electrical service platform. Any remaining foundation would be monopile.

Vineyard Wind also submitted changes to the onshore substation. For the expanded substation, the total approximate area of ground disturbance would be 7.7 acres, which is 1.8 acres greater than the area analyzed in the draft EIS.

The notice of availability for the Supplemental EIS was published on June 12th, 2020, in the Federal Register. We are holding a series of five public meetings, as seen here, and we are at this fifth meeting. The comment period will close after 45 days on July 27th, 2020 .

For additional project related infor please see the project website as seen here.

To be most helpful, comments
should be as specific as possible. A substantive comment discusses the accuracy of the information; suggests alternate methodologies and the reason or reasons why they should be used; provides new information relevant to the analysis; identifies a different source of credible research, which, if used in the analysis, could result in different effects, or provides clarification where needed.

The table on this slide outlines some notable sections of the Supplemental EIS including where you can find more information about the environmental analysis, cumulative impact scenario, the project design envelope, and the status of environmental consultation. While the Supplemental EIS includes analysis of the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed projects, the focus of the Supplemental EIS is on the expanded cumulative impact scenario, the new alternative, and information that had changed or become available since the issuance of the draft EIS in 2018 .

This inverted triangle represents the different levels of reasonably foreseeable development we considered in the cumulative scenario.

A bar usually encompasses the bar below it, but the lower bars will often be duplicative rather than additive. For example, Vineyard Wind is already -- Vineyard Wind 1 is already included in the 5.4 gigawatts of Construction and Operations Plans submitted or approved, which is the second bar from the bottom.

The previous standards for the scope of reasonably foreseeable offshore wind development was based on projects permitted, and added to this, projects entering the construction permitting process. This time, we began by examining the greatest number of possible projects and then eliminated offshore development that would be unreasonable to consider based on lack of state demand or technical inability.

The top bar is the total Atlantic offshore winds technical resource potential.

This bar represents how much wind energy is available on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf with present technology. Such a build-out is not only materially and physically impossible, but also the amount of energy exceeds the demand of the entire Eastern United States. Thus, this level was not determined to be reasonably foreseeable.

The second bar down is the technical resource potential of the Atlantic Call Wind Energy and lease areas. Call areas are areas that have not been leased and are still being evaluated for whether they are suitable to be offered for lease. There is no guarantee that such areas will make it to the leasing stage; therefore, evaluating construction on them is premature, and this level of development was not considered reasonably foreseeable at this time.

The third bar down is state capacity commitments. While the tier system in the draft EIS looks at development from a regulatory and project perspective, in this scenario, we examined future projects from a
state demand perspective. This number has grown over the last several months and is currently about 29 gigawatts with recent additional commitments from New Jersey. This exceeds the technical resource potential of existing Atlantic leases with existing technology, and includes New York commitments that have been made in anticipation of future leasing occurring; therefore, this level of development was deemed not reasonably foreseeable at this time.

The fourth bar from the top is the technical resource potential of existing Atlantic leases. State capacity commitments are not evenly distributed along the coast and, perhaps surprisingly, are not tied to existing available lease capacity within transmission range. For example, the state capacity commitments of New York and New Jersey exceed the technical resource potential of leases within transmission range. Also, there are going to be conflicts, such as with cultural sites, historical sites, essential fish habitat and navigation that will make
developing the entire technical resource potential of existing Atlantic leases impossible; therefore, this level of development is not considered reasonably foreseeable.

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

After considering all projects with awards, Construction and Operation Plans, or that have been announced, there's still some state capacity left over that has not been awarded. This potential for additional future development beyond named projects is also accounted for and analyzed in this scenario.

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

Alternative A, the proposed action alternative, is the construction, operation, maintenance, and eventual decommissioning of an up to 800 megawatt wind energy facility on the Outer -- Outer Continental Shelf.

Offshore Massachusetts, within the proposed project area, and associated export cables would occur within the range of design parameters outlined in the Vineyard Wind Construction and Operations Plan subject to applicable mitigation measures.

The additional alternatives and no-action alternatives are seen here. Alternative $B$, the Covell Beach landfall alternative excludes the New Hampshire Avenue landfall location to potentially reduce impacts on environmental and socioeconomic resources.

On June 26th, 2020, Vineyard Wind informed BOEM that they are no longer pursuing the New Hampshire Avenue landing site. While
the New Hampshire Avenue site was included in the Construction and Operations Plan, Vineyard Wind has stated -- has obtained all of the state and local permits necessary to bring the cable on shore at the Covell Beach landing site.

## Alternative C excludes surface

 occupancy in the northernmost portion of the proposed project to potentially reduce impacts from the proposed project and to reduce potential conflicts with existing ocean users such as marine navigation and commercial fishing.
## Alternative D-1 would require a

minimum of
one-nautical-mile-by-one-nautical-mile spacing between wind turbine generators and all the lanes between them. This alternative would potentially reduce conflicts with existing ocean users, such as commercial fishing and marine navigation.

Alternative D-2 would require a layout in an east-west orientation, and all of the turbines in the east-west direction would
have a minimum spacing of one nautical mile between them to allow for vessels to travel between turbines and to reduce conflicts with existing ocean users such as commercial fishing.

## Alternative E reduces the project

size to no more than 84 turbines. This alternative would potentially reduce impacts on existing ocean users and on environmental resources due to the fewer foundations.

Alternative $F$, the new
alternative, would include a vessel transit lane through the wind development area in which no surface occupancy would occur. Any turbine presently planned for this area will be moved further south in the wind development area. This alternative could potentially facilitate transit of vessels through the project area from Southern New England ports to fishing areas on Georges Bank.

$$
\text { Alternative } G \text { is the no-action }
$$

alternative. In this alternative, the proposed project would not be approved and any potential environmental and socioeconomic
costs and benefits associated with this proposed project would not occur. However, impacts from reasonably foreseeable future offshore wind and nonwind related activities could still occur. This alternative is required to be analyzed under NEPA.

Since the draft EIS was published,
a new alternative has been added and analyzed in the Supplemental EIS. Alternative $F$, the vessel transit lane alternative, includes a new vessel transit lane in response to the January 3rd, 2020, Responsible Offshore Development Alliance, also known as RODA, layout proposal.

The RODA proposal includes six total designated transit lanes, each at least four nautical miles wide, as seen in this figure here on the right. Although the proposal includes six total transit lanes, only one intersects with the Vineyard Wind Project, as shown in this figure. As mentioned, the purpose of the proposed northwest to southeast transit corridor would be mainly to facilitate vessel transit from

Southern New England ports, primarily New Bedford, to fishing areas on Georges Bank. The transit lane would have no occupancy, and therefore, the turbines that could have occurred in these areas would not be eliminated but instead would be displaced and shifted south within the Vineyard Wind lease area.

The layout shown in this figure,
which is also within Appendix $A$, as in apple,. 7.17 of the Supplemental EIS is for illustrative purposes only and does not guarantee that the positions identified by the black dots are buildable. The layout is based on all the developer agreements for the east-west orientation and one-nautical-mile-by-one-nautical-mile spacing. The positions shown do not necessarily represent future turbine locations, but the intent of this figure is to show that the potential displacement of turbines if all six transit lanes were to occur.

The turbine locations within the
pale yellow lanes would not be utilized. Under the current cumulative scenario, displacement of all these turbine locations is not feasible, and therefore, the addition of all six transit lanes would lead to the elimination of some of the turbines that could have occurred within these lanes.

Our impact analysis included biological, physical, and socioeconomic resources as seen here on this slide. The subject matter experts that analyzed the impacts to these resources are also in this public meeting and will answer questions later.

These same resources are also seen in the summary table found in the executive summary of the Supplemental EIS. This table summarizes the overall direct and indirect and the cumulative impacts for each resource.

The following five slides have the summaries for additional resources not seen here.
I will discuss the impact levels for specific resources in more detail in a few
slides, but wanted to orient you to the table and some key elements to the analyses here.

More detailed analyses and impact levels for future offshore wind activities may be found for each resource in Chapter 3 of the Supplemental EIS, and in tables -- in

Appendices A, as in apple, and B, as in boy.
The color coding in the table indicates if the highest impact level is minor, moderate, or major, with green being minor, yellow moderate, and orange major. You can find the definition of the impact level in table 1.2-3 in Appendix B, as in boy, of the SEIS.

In addition, there is a poster on the virtual meeting web page which details the impact level definition.

For resources with a direct and indirect impact level of negligible or minor, the impact analysis has been moved to Appendix A. This was done to meet the page limit goals outlined in the Department of Interior's Secretarial Order 3355.

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

Resource impact levels seen here on this slide are terrestrial and coastal fauna, coastal habitat, benthic resources, and finfish, invertebrates, and essential fish habitats.

Additional resource impact levels seen on this slide include marine mammals, see turtles, demographics, employment, and economics, and environmental justice.

Again, I'll speak about any
notable difference between alternatives in future slides.

Resource impact levels seen here include cultural, historical, and archeological resources, recreation and
tourism, and commercial fisheries and for-hire fishing -- and for-hire recreational fishing.

Resource impact levels seen on this slide include land use and coastal infrastructure and navigation and vessel traffic.

The resource seen on this slide is other uses. This resource includes research and surveys, military and national security, aviation and air traffic, cable and pipeline and radar systems.

And finally, the resources seen on this slide include air quality, water quality, birds and bats. All of these resources are included in Appendix $A$, as in apple.

Here we will discuss the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action.

As summarized in the executive summary table, and assessed in detail of Chapter 2 -- in Chapter
of the Supplemental EIS, BOEM determined that for most resources, direct and indirect impacts were negligible to moderate with some major short and long-term impacts.

The proposed action or certain action alternatives could have major direct or indirect impact on environmental justice communities and other uses. The following major impacts to these resources are anticipated:

Major direct impacts on
environmental justice communities could occur from the proposed action and alternatives other than B, as in boy, the Covell Beach landfall Alternative $F$; $F$, the vessel transit lane alternative; and the no-action alternative, which is G.

The placement of cable and maintenance within Lewis Bay associated with the New Hampshire Avenue landfall site would lead to potential effects on vessel traffic and to environmental justice populations that rely on subsistence fishing or employment or income from marine businesses. This impact would lessen to moderate under Alternative B, the Covell Beach landfall alternative, which would exclude the use of the New Hampshire landfall location.

As mentioned on the alternative slide, Slide 18, Vineyard Wind is no longer pursuing the New Hampshire Avenue landfall location.

Alternative $F$, the vessel transit lane alternative, leads to lower direct and indirect impacts for environmental justice due to the reduced impacts related to allisions and collisions from the presence of a transit lane. The reduced risk of collisions or allisions would lessen the impacts on marine businesses and also on the low-income workers employed in these industries. By reducing impact on these businesses, Alternative $F$ would have a smaller incremental impact on environmental justice populations, although those impacts would remain negligible to moderate.

The direct and indirect impacts for other uses was determined to be major for scientific research and surveys for the proposed action and all action alternatives.

The placement of structures within the wind development area pose a navigational
hazard to survey aircraft and vessels and restrict access to survey locations. This would impact the statistical design of surveys and cause a loss of information leading to major impact.

Analysis of the other resource areas listed here from the direct and indirect impacts were minor to moderate -- were minor to moderate beneficial from the proposed action and action alternatives.

Here we'll discuss the cumulative impacts of the proposed action, in addition to ongoing activities, future offshore nonwind activities, and future offshore wind activities.

For most resources, cumulative impacts were minor to moderate with some major short and long-term impact. Major cumulative effects could occur to commercial fisheries and for-hire recreational fishing for the proposed action in all action alternatives. Here, the impacted rating is driven mostly by changes to fish distribution and availability associated with climate change, reduced stock
levels due to fishing mortality, and permanent impact due to the presence of structures such as cable protection measures and foundations from offshore wind activity.

Major cumulative impacts on
navigation could result as -- could occur as a result of the presence of structures which increase the risk of collisions and allisions under the proposed action and all the alternatives, with the exception of $D-2$, the east-west and one-nautical-mile-turbine layout; $F$, the vessel transit lane alternative with $D-2$; and the no-action, which is $G$.

The impact level becomes moderate under D-2 with a one-by-one-nautical-mile uniform grid layout; and under Alternative F, the vessel transit lane alternative, when paired with $D-2$, due to the large spacing between structures and the regular layout.

Major cumulative impact on
scientific research and surveys, as mentioned on the previous slide, is under other uses in the Supplemental EIS, could occur as a result of the proposed action and all action
alternatives due to the presence of structures which could hinder surveys within the project area. This impact is similar to the direct and indirect impact but greater in magnitude due to this cumulative scenario.

In addition, there will be major cumulative impacts on military and national security, also found under other uses as a result of the proposed action and action alternatives, other than $D-2$, the east-west and one-nautical-mile turbine layout; and Alternative $F$, the vessel transit lane alternative when paired with $D-2$ due to navigational complexity from structure presence, which would increase the difficulty to conduct search-and-rescue operations.

The major impact goes down to moderate for search-and-rescue operations under alternative $D-2$; or $F$-- Alternative $F$ paired with $D-2$ due to the uniform grid in D-2, or the vessel transit lane with the uniform grid -- that's F, Alternative F, paired with D-2.

In addition, there are also minor
beneficial cumulative impact, primarily in recreational and tourism, land use and coastal infrastructure demographics and climate and economics.

This is the proposed schedule that is on the permitting dashboard. However, that schedule could change based on comments received. For example, if someone identifies a significant issue that we cannot consider in the draft or Supplemental EIS, it requires new analysis.

There are also ongoing
complications, including the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. All these consultations need could be completed prior to the signing of the record of decision.

BOEM is working with agencies to incorporate new project changes into existing consultations. Additional details about ongoing and completed consultations may be found in Appendix D.

BOEM's Vineyard Wind web page includes a variety of informative documents including Vineyard Wind's Construction and Operations Plan, copies of the draft and Supplemental EIS, including a large-print version of the Supplemental EIS, and a link to the virtual meeting room web page.

Within the virtual meeting room
web page, you will find the aforementioned posters and presentations, along with additional posters and presentations highlighting key topics and resource areas like our how to comment.

Thank you for your attendance and participation today. We look forward to your comments and questions.

And with that, $I$ will hand it back over to Christine.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. All
right. So here's -- we're going to talk
more information about how you can provide comments today. It is the last one for the public comment period. However, there are other ways that you can provide comments.

The comment period is open until July 27 th. You can provide comments on the SEIS site using regulations.gov, and also by mailing comments to the Office of Renewable Energy Program, or the Vineyard Wind virtual meeting page. If you haven't done so already, and would like to provide comments today, please press Star
now and speak to our operator.
After you press Star 1, please be patient, and we'll only have one operator today for the number of the people on the line. We really appreciate your patience with this.

If you prefer to submit your
comments electronically, go to
http://www.regulations.gov, and search for the packet BOEM, B-O-E-M, -2020-0005. Next click on "comment now."

Comments may also be submitted by mail with the envelope labeled "Vineyard Wind Supplement to the Draft EIS," and addressed to the Program Manager, the Office of Renewable Energy, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; the
address is 45600 Woodlands Road, VAM-OREP, V, as in Victor, A, as in apple, M, as in Mary, O-R-E, as in echo, P, as in Paul, in Sterling, Virginia 20166.

Envelopes must be postmarked no later than July 27th, 2020. And BOEM does not consider anonymous comments, so please include your name and address as part of your submittal. All comments will be part of the record and will be publicly posted without change.

You can also submit your comments online at regulations.gov.

So please take a few minutes also now -- I know that some people have already been using the $Q$ \& $A$ box on Zoom. You can do so at any time. You can also register to speak, you know, by pressing Star 1 and speaking to the operator at any time. As a reminder, we'll answer those questions at the end of the public comment period.

So now we'll talk a little bit more about how we're going to do the public comment period.

If you're providing comments, your remarks will be recorded, transcribed, and entered into the administrative record. It looks like there's about 30 people signed up already to speak. So we'll post and read about five names at a time into the chat box for those of you on $Z o o m$, and I'll read them aloud to those of you on the phone.

Also, given the number of people that we have in line to speak today, we'll plan to take a break after about 20 minutes.

So as a reminder, even though you might see your name in the chat box, we'll need everyone who speaks today to state your name slowly and spell your first and last name for us so that the court reporter and those that are on the phone only can hear who is speaking.

Also, if you would like, you can provide the name of the organization that you're affiliated with, if that's applicable.

All comments today will be take into consideration by BOEM to update the final EIS. The comments you make will be recorded
and may also be publicly posted.
Please be mindful of time so that everyone has an opportunity to speak. I may ask you to wrap things up at the five-minute mark. If you need more time, you can put your name at the end of the queue. This will allow everyone the opportunity to speak at least once, and if time allows, we'll give you another chance.

So please note your comments that -- it they are lengthy, you can also submit them in writing, as both written and oral comments are being considered equally.

We'll take repeat speakers, but only after everyone who is interested has provided comments at least once.

After identifying the first speaker, we'll note who is next to speak. And like $I$ said, we'll probably give about five or so names in the chat box for those of you on Zoom, and I'll call out the names for those of you on the phone.

And typically, I really like to
greet people when you arrive at meetings in
person so $I$ can hear how you pronounce your name, however, I don't have that luxury today. So I sincerely apologize in advance for any mispronunciations $I$ make this evening. I realize that we all like to hear our names properly pronounced, and so $I$ ask you for your patience and understanding.

We're committed to gathering all the questions and comments from today and the other meetings and responding to them as appropriate in the final EIS.

So, again, please press Star 1 and wait to speak to the live operator, if you're interested in getting the queue. And if you're wanting to put $Q \& A$, those of you on Zoom, use that $Q$ \& $A$ function.

With that, $I$ see that we've already posted a number of names that are ready to go. So Lars P., Gordon F., Peter H., Nick K., and Michelle F., you guys are going to be our first spotlight speakers today. And like I said, we will post about five or six, and $I$ will read them repeatedly.

So, with that, $I$ would like to
turn it over to Lars.
LARS PEDERSEN: Thank you. Can you hear me?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine. Thank you, Lars.

LARS PEDERSEN: Thank you. So my
name is Lars Pedersen, L-a-r-s
$P-e-d-e-r-s-e-n$, and $I$ 'm the CEO of Vineyard Wind.

So Vineyard Wind, we appreciate very much the opportunity to comment on the supplemental to the draft EIS for the Vineyard Wind 1 Project. And before I start my comments, I would like to express my gratitude to the entire BOEM team and the other federal and state agencies that have been involved in this process. It is and has been no small feat to deliver on the original time schedule for this process in a period where most normal ways of working has actually rapidly adapted with short notice. So we thank you very much for that.

I would also like to thank all the commenters that have participated in the
previous four hearings, as well as the participants in today's hearing, for the interest in the Vineyard Wind Project and the wider use of offshore wind industry.

We would like to express our deep gratitude for the wide ranging and deep support the project has seen over many years, and at least during these hearings, we are proud to have been supported by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, our long-term partners Vineyard Power, state and local legislatures, environmental organizations, unions, supply chain companies, business organizations, private citizens, and other developers who have supported this project.

We also want to acknowledge the organizations and the individuals that have raised concerns on potential impacts of this project and the industry as the process has gone its course. There's been some hard and challenging conversation with existing users of the ocean, such as the commercial fishing industry. And while we have not always been able to find a common understanding, Vineyard

Wind has been grateful for all the input it has received.

Vineyard Wind 1 takes its first mover status in the development of the offshore wind industry extremely seriously. We are committed to adhering to not only the highest industry standards, but also to help evolve those standards so that our industry gets better with each and every project. We are committed to learning from the first project, collecting and sharing data, and continuing to work with other users of the ocean to continuously improve.

Vineyard Wind has been through a long and, at times, very challenging permitting process that started as far back as December 2017, and since August 2019 , been unable to move forward with this landmark project awaiting the SDEIS we're discussing today in ordered to complete the federal permitting process.

Vineyard Wind was the first large-scale offshore wind project to be awarded a PPE in the United States, and it was
demonstrating that offshore wind can and will be a significant part of the energy mix along the Eastern Seaboard and has led to a significant number of projects being procured in many states since May 2018. However, without certainty that the offshore wind industry can and will be permitted -permitted in the U.S., it's unlikely that the industry will continue to invest in the market, and therefore, the timely completion of the federal review and approval process will provide the certainty needed for the continued investment in the U.S. market.

After the review of the Vineyard Wind 1 Project was put on hold in August last year, Vineyard Wind and other developers in the Massachusetts and Rhode Island lease areas came together to discuss and address the most commonly cited concerns reported during the initial review of the Vineyard Wind 1 Project.

Vineyard Wind, along with the other developers up in New England wind energy areas, in late 2019 proposed to advance all future projects in the combined lease areas
with a uniform one-by-one-nautical-mile layout with an east-west orientation. This is now represented as the $D-2$ alternative.

The agreement between the developers represents an unprecedented wide spacing of turbines on a global scale, and it reduces the available capacity within the lease areas for Vineyard Wind and other developers by more than percent. The unprecedented spacing is also captured in an unprecedented agreement where seven companies agreed to align their layouts across many projects over a couple of decades of build-out creating certainty and predictability for other ocean uses. The Massachusetts/Rhode Island developers wanted to ensure that safe navigation, safe search-and-rescue and safe fishing could continue within and around the joint lease areas with the proposed layout. Vineyard Wind was therefore pleased to note that the U.S. Coast Guard in its comprehensive MARIPARS study, released in

May, concluded that the suggested one-by-one-nautical-mile layout would ensure all three objectives and would be superior to the suggested alternatives analyzed by the Coast Guard.

We firmly believe that the D-2 alternative as presented in this SEIS, including the proposed conservative mitigation put in place for the Vineyard Wind 1 Project, represent the right compromise that will allow all existing and future uses to coexist now and in the future.

Other alternatives, in particular
the $F$ Alternative with additional transit lanes, should, in our opinion, not be considered as they would not provide additional navigation, search-and-rescue or fishing benefits. To the contrary, however, they would significantly impair the economic viability of existing and future offshore wind projects, including Vineyard Wind 1.

We have noted that this view is shared by many commenters through these public hearings.

So let me conclude by saying the time is now if U.S. offshore wind is to move forward. After years of study and public consultations to identify areas for offshore wind leasing in the United States, the SEIS presents a comprehensive and in depth analysis of the potential impacts of an industry that is poised to create more than 80,000 jobs, deliver 25 billion in economic input, and attract more than $\$ 100$ billion in investment, and make significant advances in combating climate change in line with state targets.

Vineyard Wind 1 alone would create over 3,600 jobs over the life of the project and making a significant contribution to tackling climate change by avoiding emissions of more than 1.7 million tons of carbon dioxide per year, the equivalent of 325,000 cars.

## Vineyard Wind 1 will also save

rate payers in Massachusetts more than $\$ 1.4$ billion per year in energy related -- I'm sorry, over the life of the project. These benefits will be multiplied by each project
that is built out over the next few years by either Vineyard Wind or the developers as those projects mature.

With those words, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment, and I'm looking forward to listening in to other comments today. Thank you.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we'll have Gordon, and then Peter and then Nick and Michelle.

I just want to remind folks that we are still using the $Q$ \& A function, so please use the $Q$ \& $A$ function for any questions that you have and that way I'll reserve that chat function so we can notify those of you Zoom where we are in the speaking queue. So, again, use the $Q$ \& $A$ function for any questions you have about the presentation you heard, the SEIS, and whatnot, and we'll get to those after the public comment period is concluded.

With that, I'm going to turn you over to Gordon.

Gordon, go ahead. Gordon, are you
with us? Perhaps mute?
Okay. We'll try and catch Gordon
in a bit. I'll move on to Peter, Peter H.
Are you ready to -- Peter?
PETER HIMCHAK: Yes. Good
evening. My name is Peter Himchak, and I offer the following comment on behalf of LaMonica Fine Foods, a vertically integrated seafood company that harvests and processes surf clams.

LaMonica Fine Foods has a fleet of five surf clam vessels and a processing plant in Millville, New Jersey, that has over 200 employees.

$$
\text { I speak from nearly } 45 \text { years of }
$$

experience in a marine fisheries research and management career.

As recognized in the draft supplementary EIS, there will be major negative impact on both commercial fisheries and fishery independent surveys, both of which cannot continue as presently conducted. My comments will focus on these two major impacts.

Over the past two years at least, I have participated at innumerable public outreach meetings held by BOEM, the wind energy companies, and the individual states involved in development of offshore wind.

I have on all occasions commented that surf clam vessels using hydraulic bottom tending gear would not be able to continue operations within a wind farm array where the individual turbines are not spaced at a minimum of two nautical miles apart. I have also commented on the need for wind farms to have an orientation in line with prevailing currents, place -- placement of all vertical structures in straight rows and columns, and the need to bury all transmission cables at least two meters deep.

Yet, upon reviewing all current and proposed design layouts of wind farm arrays, the comments from the surf clam industry have been ignored, essentially creating exclusion zones around wind farms in which surf clam vessels will not be able to operate.

The wind energy companies have not cooperated with the commercial fisheries in good faith, and their Construction and Operations Plans for leased areas are based purely on their own economic gain. Surf clam vessels will lose current productive clamming areas and incur many additional costs trying to cram in around wind farms, to find other likely suboptimal areas in which to operate. Equally important as lost access to current clamming areas would be the inability of research vessels to operate within wind farm arrays to conduct the fishery independent surveys vital to developing the stock assessments for all the species managed by the Mid Atlantic and the New England fishery management councils.

With lost data, scientific
uncertainty increases for any stock. And this affects how quotas would be established in future years. Scientific uncertainty leads to precautionary management, and current quotas for sustainable resources, such as surf clams, will likely decrease unnecessarily in the
future as a result.
The development of renewable offshore energy was supposed to have been smart from the start, as BOEM proclaimed many years ago. The entire process of leasing offshore areas and developing layout designs for wind farms has been anything but smartly done. They work -- they worked through the accommodations for all commercial fisheries that operated in the lease areas so that coexistence would occur in the future. The commercial fisheries have been engaged at every opportunity, but our concerns and needs have been summarily dismissed.

There should be an immediate five-year moratorium implemented on the development of offshore wind because the cumulative impact on commercial fisheries' resources and their habitats from wind farms in the foreseeable future are poorly understood or unknown.

Therefore, I support Alternative G, no action at this time. This process is not smart from the start.

LaMonica Fine Foods is not opposed to clean renewable energy offshore or anywhere else, however, it must be developed in general cooperation with the stakeholders currently operating in the EEZ so that major negative impacts are not experienced.

As Mr. Bennett mentioned in his
introductory marks, the goal of coexist -where's the goal of coexistence between wind energy developers and the impacted stakeholders? Well, given the way wind energy areas are being developed to this date, this goal will not be achieved. Thank you for your time and cooperation and consideration of these comments.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we have Nick and then Michelle.

Nick, go ahead.
NICK KRAKOFF: Yeah, hi. My name is Nick Krakoff. Can you hear me?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yes, I can. If you can state and spell your name, that would be great.

> And also, I did want to
acknowledge, for those of you on Zoom, you can see photos of Jim and Jenn, who spoke earlier, and then also Michelle. These folks are listening to your comments, and other experts that we have will be answering questions later. So I just wanted to acknowledge those folks listening in.

So go ahead, and state and spell
your name. Thank you.
NICK KRAKOFF: Yeah, thanks. My
name is Nick Krakoff; my first name is N-i-c-k, last name is Krakoff, $K-r-a-k-o-f-f$.

I'm a staff attorney on behalf of
the Conservation Law Foundation, otherwise known as CLF. CLF also plans to submit written comments to the SEIS.

CLF has long supported responsibly developed offshore wind energy. In our view, the transition of a clean energy economy is necessary to combat the effects of climate change, including ocean acidification.

Offshore wind presents a
tremendous opportunity to fight climate change, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and
grow a new industry that supports tens of thousands of well paying jobs.

CLF believes that Alternative D-2, when combined with Alternative B, to establish a one-by-one-nautical-mile wind turbine layout and make landfall on Covell Beach, is the most responsible option that has been proposed and that BOEM should reject the other alternatives analyzed in the SEIS.

Alternative D-2 would exceed expected power generation capacity with the leased areas while still allowing fishing and other activities to occur in the leased areas. This is supported by the Coast Guard's MARIPARS report which found that Alternative D-2 meets the Coast Guard's criteria for navigation, safety, and facilitate traditional fishing methods.

CLF also urges BOEM to reject
Alternative F. CLF is very concerned that Alternative $F$ and the incorporation of the RODA recommended transit lanes into the Vineyard Wind Project would reduce expected power generation capacity of offshore wind in

Southern New England as noted in the SEIS. Accordingly, Alternative $F$ is likely to produce -- or preclude Massachusetts and Rhode Island from meeting their renewable energy targets in mitigating the impacts of climate change. If that is the case, we cannot support Alternative F.

Further, as found in the MARIPARS report, the Coast Guard concluded that the Alternative D-2 layout would meet the Coast Guard's criteria for navigational safety. Given this conclusion, the addition of transit lanes for leased area under Alternative F appears unnecessary for the purpose of increasing navigational safety.

Finally, the SEIS only provides
cursory consideration of the impact that following vessel traffic in the transit lanes would have on marine mammals and North Atlantic Right Whales. Due to this deficiency in BOEM's analysis, we cannot support Alternative F.

CLF also wishes to comment on
BOEM's discussion in the SEIS of mitigation
and monitoring measures for the North Atlantic Right Whale.

As states on the Atlantic Coast mobilize to harness offshore is critical, but science-based measures are implemented in order to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the impacts on wildlife and habitat, especially our most vulnerable species, which is North Atlantic Right Whales.

Vineyard Wind's commitment to responsible, offshore wind development was demonstrated in agreement between Vineyard Wind, CLF, Natural Resources Defense Council, and National Wildife Federation to protect North Atlantic Right Whales during construction and operation of the project.

Under the agreement, Vineyard Wind agreed to certain monitoring and mitigation measures for North Atlantic Right Whales that go beyond the federal government's current requirement and can serve as important precedence for other offshore wind projects.

CLF appreciates that BOEM
incorporated this agreement into the SEIS;
however, the SEIS appears to assume that similar mitigation and monitoring will be put in place for future offshore wind projects.

The assumption in the SEIS that similar
monitoring and mitigation measures will be adopted appears to reduce the overall cumulative impact rating to our North Atlantic Right Whales. There's no guarantee that such mitigation and monitoring measures will be implemented for future offshore agreement, and the SEIS is flawed to the extent it speculates that similar measures will be adopted.

CLF believes that in order to reduce impact on the North Atlantic Right Whale, it is necessary that BOEM and NOAA incorporate similar monitoring and mitigation letters into all future permits associated with offshore wind.

In conclusion, Alternative D-2 is the best option for developing offshore wind responsibly. And other alternatives, including Alternative $F$, should be rejected. Alternative $F$ will prevent Massachusetts and Rhode Island from accomplishing their
renewable energy targets, does not reduce the overall impact level for the fishing industry, and its uncertain impact on the North Atlantic Right Whale.

CLF also believes that the types
of mitigation and monitoring measurements that Vineyard Wind has agreed to are needed on all future offshore wind projects. There's no guarantee such measures will be adopted on future projects, and the SEIS errs to the extent it assumes that similarly robust measures will be implemented.

BOEM and NOAA must ensure that similar measures are incorporated into all future projects.

Thank you for your time.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we have Michelle, and then I'll read a few more names. Katie A., Betsy S., Mary P., as in Paul, and then Robert H.

So with that, I'll turn it to
Michelle. Please state and spell your name, please.

MICHELLE SGARLAT: Hi, can you
hear me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine, thank you.

MICHELLE SGARLAT: Great. My name is Michelle, M-i-c-h-e-l-l-e, Sgarlat, S-g-a-r-l-a-t, and $I$ live in Centerville, Massachusetts. I strongly support Vineyard Wind's offshore wind project for several reasons.

First, there has been a remarkable number of public presentations, town meetings, and an ongoing open-house schedule at the Centerville Library where the Vineyard Wind staff has been available to educate folks and answer questions. Their professionalism and open communication has been much appreciated.

Second, I frequently go to Covell
Beach where the cable will come to shore and the road will be disturbed. While this will be an inconvenience for a time, I know that Cape Cod is particularly vulnerable to the effects of climate change with the eroding coast lines, warming ocean temperatures, and severe weather. And we need to invest in
renewable offshore energy now.
This project will produce $22,000-p l u s$ megawatts of power on the population-dense East Coast.

Third, I have two daughters, and I feel we have a responsibility to address the climate emergency for the wellbeing of future generations. The scientific community states that we have 10 to
years to address this emergency. One daughter recently became a boat captain, and she plans on exploring employment in the offshore wind industry.

Lastly, as someone who has lived on Cape Cod for almost 40 years and dearly loves the ocean, I feel we can coexist with the wind turbines. I support moving ahead with the nation's first large-scale offshore wind project.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we have Katie, then Betsy, then Mary and

Robert. So Katie, go ahead.
Katie? I think there was just a little delay
in
switching over from one person to
the next. Is Katie available?
KATIE ALMEIDA: Yes. Can you hear me?

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

KATIE ALMEIDA: Great. Okay. My
name is Katie Almeida; it's K-a-t-i-e
A-l-m-e-i-d-a. And $I$ want to state that $I^{\prime} m$ in support of legitimate baseline data prior to construction and development of any large-scale wind farm in the North Atlantic. I'm a member of the fishing industry. My company is out of Point Judith, Rhode Island, although I'm a Massachusetts residence, and we own six commercial fishing vessels that primarily fish for squid.

We were never consulted on the siting of those wind farms originally. And specifically, Vineyard Wind sits on productive -- sits on and near productive squid grounds, not only for fishing, but also for squid mops for nursery grounds.

There have been no peer-reviewed scientific studies in Europe on the impact of development operations on fisheries or fish stocks. There have also been no long term baseline studies here in the U.S. on wind energy areas that are much needed to track the changes that might happen over time. We've been asking for these baseline studies since we were first reached out to by Vineyard Wind in 2016 and 2017 .

The development will prevent them from conducting their fishery research studies in that area, and that will create management uncertainty for the fishing industry.

I also want to let it be known that we are for clean energy, and we do understand the need for it. But, you know, we -- we also understand that there's a need for research and monitoring. And that this needs to be done right, because it's -- once it's done, we're going to be the ones who will have to pay for this ecologically and biologically.

I like to think of it as you take the exact footprint of this wind farm --
actually, not just this wind farm, the whole entire area in Southern New England that's planning to be built out, and take that footprint, which is just smaller than Rhode Island, and place it in the middle of Yellow Stone National Park, wouldn't everyone who is so concerned about the environment, which includes the fishing industry, have questions about this? And want research prior to any sort of construction development in a national park?

You know, there's lots of things that are below the ocean that lots of people don't see and don't understand. And I think for some people, it can be out of sight and out of mind, and that's concerning to those of us who depend on the ocean for a living.

So, again, we have been striving for coexistence, but we've been making it -- a very strong case since the beginning, we just want this done right.

Regarding transit, I agree that the fishing industry are critical -- we're a critical partner, but regarding this transit
lane plan being put forth by Vineyard Wind and the other wind energy developers, we have sat down and worked with the individual -- with the wind energy development -- wind energy developers for years now. We've spent a lot of time and money on several meetings to sit down and discuss the issues regarding transits with them. None of that proved fruitful after all that time and effort.

And then after the latest
submission of transit lanes from the developer to the Coast Guard, it's clear that we've been ignored on this issue.

Submitting this plan without
industry consultation is not a compromise. And to hear that there's lots of support for that plan is concerning because I'm sure that a lot of that support is from people who don't operate on the water as part of the commercial fishing industry. And $I$ think it's really important to listen to the people who actually are out there making a living and to consider what they need for safety regarding weather, radar interference, and possibly collisions.

Real coexistence comes from working together on all issues, and it means being transparent. And that includes working together on mitigation compensation and transit. And those issues have left a lot of transparencies, especially given the latest mitigation compensation package coming out of Vineyard Wind for Massachusetts. That didn't involve any input from any fishing industry members, and neither did this one-by-one spread across the whole lease area.

So I will put my support behind Alternative $F$, RODA's transit lane layout, and D-2.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we've got Betsy, Mary P., Robert H. And then as $I$ look down, we've added a few more names, Keith L., Mike O., and Nina WL.

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

BETSY SOWERS: Hi, can you hear
me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: We can hear you
just fine, Betsy. Thank you.
BETSY SOWERS: Okay. Good
afternoon. I'm Reverend Betsy Sowers, it's $B-e-t-s-y$ S-o-w-e-r-s, from Weymouth, Massachusetts. I'm a member of Fore River Residents Against the Compressor Station, which is a little tangential, but not really so much.

I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak for this project that is essential to the clean and just energy future and critical to slowing the unfolding climate catastrophe.

I'm here as a safe leader whose ministry is focused on environmental justice.

The Vineyard Wind Project is not just about energy. Choosing to build it with the one-mile spacing of the turbines under Option D-2 or to further delay and possibly kill it through proposals such as Option $F$ is also a moral decision that may have possible life-and-death consequences.

You see, I've learned a lot about the impacts of energy choices as a resident of

Weymouth, Mass. With no EIS and a vacated air quality permit, Enbridge is venting massive amounts of methane at this very moment testing pipes for a fracked gas compressor station being built adjacent to an already overburdened environmental justice community. As a member of the citizens group fighting this project for five and a half years, I've seen firsthand how dirty and dangerous energy projects impact communities of color and low-income communities, how their lives and livelihoods are bearing the brunt of this solution. I've seen kids with rare cancers, high rates of coronary and respiratory diseases, greater illness and death from COVID-19 due to compromised respiratory systems. I've seen how the project's jobs that had been promised to local people are, in fact, being done by people from out of state.

I also know that projects like
this will make it impossible for Massachusetts to meet its mandated carbon reductions under the Global Warming Solutions Act, speeding up
the unfolding climate catastrophe, of which COVID-19 is only a foretaste. This is the alternative to Vineyard Wind.

Further permitting delays to
Vineyard Wind will increase the likelihood of killing it and leaving New England to the mercies of fossil fuel companies. Their environmental justice impact would far exceed the environmental justice impact on low-income fishing workers from that one-mile layout of wind turbines.

And the continuing of ocean
warming and acidification from burning fossil fuels would accelerate the crashing of fish stocks causing far worse impacts on the fishing industry.

The impacts of wind energy and the impact on the fishing industry have to be weighed in this context. And I want to say, I hear those concerns of the fishing industry, and I support ongoing conversations about mitigation.

But from what $I$ understand, Plan F, it would really make the project
financially not possible. So it has to be within a context that allows the project to continue.

Finally, I'm also here as one who has visited the only five wind turbines in the U.S. Off Block Island, which are gorgeous, and where I noticed that fishing boats abound because these turbines have become artificial reefs. And both commercial and recreational fishing boats are around them whenever you go out there.

I've seen the massive offshore wind farms off of Europe.

And it's simply strange to me that our country has only five of these turbines in the year 2020. It's past time for the U.S. to join other developed nations with projects like this starting with Vineyard Wind. It can provide clean energy, local jobs, and it would have far less impact on human and environmental health and fossil fuels.

Vineyard Wind has been studied for many years. There has been extensive engagement with stakeholders of all kinds. As
been mentioned before, the Coast Guard states that the one-mile spacing plan is safe for shipping and fishing and deems the additional transit lanes unnecessary. The additional transit lane, as I said, would -- would probably kill the project. So please give the project a green light with that $D-2$ one-mile spacing plan.

Finally, again, I do believe that it is essential that environmental groups like National Wildlife Federation, Mass Audubon, and others, continue to be part of the process and to hold the project to responsible environmental practices both during construction and operation.

And I ask that special attention be paid to training and hiring people from local communities of color and low-income communities to build and maintain Vineyard Wind as partial recompense for the disproportionate damage they've already suffered from polluting energy projects.

Please place climate justice, environmental and racial and economic justice
at the center of your decision-making and permit this project.

I thank you for your time.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you. Next we have Mary, then Robert, Keith, Mike,
and Nina. So go ahead, Mary.
MARY PENDERGAST: Hi, I'm Mary
Pendergast, $M-a-r-y P-e-n-d-e-r-g-a-s-t . A n d$ I'm coming from Climate Action Rhode Island and Mercy Ecology.

I speak in favor of the Vineyard Wind Project. Although antiracism and the global pandemic are huge issues that we're living through, climate change is the defining crisis of our time.

The ITCC report says 10 to 12 years. Well, they go by in a flash.

I speak for the need for renewable energy. I was a warrior fighting against the fracked and diesel-powered power plant in Burrillville, Rhode Island. And we won after four long years.

Although no one will be immune
from the devastating effects of climate disruption, we can be sure that the poorest will be hardest hit. And that mass migration, which have already begun, will become impossible for any country to handle.

Already climate disasters, food insecurity, and water insecurity are causing competitions for basic resources. Offshore wind is vital for meeting the clean energy goal of New England.

The promise of renewable energy ahead was what helped us win the Burrillville power plant issue.

The SEIS, I thought, was
critically responsive to the impacts on the needs of the beings who call the ocean home, and the environmental justice population. I would agree that similar care should be mandated for all future projects.

We have to do better. We have to
do it fast. Go Vineyard Wind.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you. Next, we have Robert and then Keith, Mike, and Nina.

So Robert? Robert H.?
ROBERT HANNEMANN: Yes, hello. My background is in academia, former engineering professor at Tufts, and now a resident of Chilmark, Massachusetts, and working as a Director of Vineyard Wind, a local electric energy cooperative.

I appreciate this opportunity, and I would like to commend the Bureau for the thoroughness of it's considerations as it has been expanded to the entire East Coast.

I'm sure that I could talk about -- in fact, you wouldn't want to hear all of the items -- most of which have been brought up by prior speakers, given that this is Hearing Number 5, so $I$ would intend to be brief.

As a resident of a coastal island, there are a number of concerns, of course. Here are three important ones:

Climate change is no longer speculative, it's here, and it's going to have a large impact on coastal communities in particular calling for expensive
infrastructure adaptation and need for greater resilience for our energy systems.

In fact, as $I$ speak, sea surface temperatures in the Georges Bank area are above 80 degrees Fahrenheit. This is unprecedented and feeds into an increased probability of hurricanes and dangerous storms.

Secondly, our fishing industry is threatened. It's threatened by climate change driving fish stocks northward by overfishing and by degradation of the marine environment.

A third key concern is the need for high-quality jobs and a future for the next generation. The development of a responsible and responsive offshore wind industry addresses these concerns. It's not the total answer, but it's a crucial element of a sustainable and prosperous future.

Now, as I said, the Vineyard Wind
Project is really going to impact highly Southeast Massachusetts. The Vineyard Wind 1 projects and the proposed follow-ons will provide thousands of good, well-paying jobs
and welcome diversification of the economy for our port community and the region as a whole.

Furthermore, the project is going to result in a significant lessening of the greenhouse gas emissions in the region, and it will provide renewable electricity at a significant cost savings for rate payers, particularly as compared to what is now an increasingly volatile fossil fuel industry. It's also important to note that the project financially supports community efforts to achieve our state and local renewable energy goals, and to increase the resilience of our energy systems to what is going to be an increasingly stormy future.

We are unique in our capability for impacting the marine environment at the planetary scale. Offshore oil and gas extraction and commercial fishing scouring the seabeds have clearly altered the marine environment on the Continental Shelf. Done thoughtlessly, large-scale offshore wind could also be a problem.

The Vineyard Wind Project has done
a remarkable job, in my opinion, over the last decade in making sure that the marine environment will be protected and has been responsive to the concerns of stakeholders in its exhaustive permitting process.

As an example, the project has
been altered to provide an improved and Coast Guard endorsed turbine layout for navigation at the cost of a reduced power output for the entire installation.

I would also point out that its experience with existing offshore wind projects, not in the U.S., but elsewhere, if those experiences hold true, fish stocks are likely to benefit. Very much a win-win situation.

One thing is very clear: Climate change is upon us now and is going to have a serious impact, and not for good, on the lives of future generations and the four grandchildren I'm looking at out my window here, and indeed, on people alive today.

Renewable energy generated by
offshore wind is a major part of the way
forward.
There is extensive offshore wind experience over the past two decades in Europe that shows that offshore wind and other marine activity, such as fishing, can coexist in a mutually beneficial fashion. Surely we can do this as well.

Further delay of the Vineyard Wind 1 Project is clearly an inappropriate solution at this point in time.

So thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: And Robert, I apologize, you may have spelled your name, but I just want to make sure we get the letter $M$ for your last name correct. Can you state and spell your name, please.

ROBERT HANNEMANN: Yes. I am sorry with that. Robert, I feel you know how to spell; my last name is Hannemann, $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{n}$.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. Thank you so much. With that, I will turn it over to Keith, and
then Mike, and then Nina. We have
a few more names added to the list now.
Jeannine, Jeffrey K., and Diane H.
So with that, I'll turn it over to
Keith.
KEITH LEWISON: K-e-i-t-h

L-e-w-i-s-o-n.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you.
KEITH LEWISON: I live in
Sandwich, Massachusetts, and $I$ work locally as a high school teacher and $I$ volunteer my time with the Sierra Club.

At age 40, I have lived my entire life with the climate crisis looming in the background. And while offshore wind energy is not a sufficient solution to this crisis, it is certainly a necessary step.

I support the construction of Vineyard Wind 1, which would finally bring large-scale offshore wind energy to the United States.

As a local teacher, $I$ see that my students are not as optimistic about their futures as $I$ once was at their age. Sadly,
the climate crisis is now at the forefront of their lives. To help them, I have worked with other teachers, scientists, and nonprofit environmental advocates to create regional youth climate action summits. The resounding takeaway is that young people realize that we need climate action now to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions.

Regrettably, the only large-scale power generation currently on Cape Cod is the Canal Plant in Sandwich, which $I$ can see from my house recently. Recently a fossil fuel burning facility was allowed to expand under the guise of, quote, cleaner energy. The reality is that a new unit is burning frack gas which is not safe or clean.

Our region needs to signal that it is ready to embrace offshore wind in order to provide reliable, renewable energy for our region, help Massachusetts reach its goal of net zero energy emissions by 2050 , and attempt to forestall the worst effects of the climate crisis while mitigation is still reasonably possible.

To put the matter visually, energy generation on the Cape and islands must -must switch from the smokestacks of the Canal Plant to the turbines of Vineyard Wind.

Vineyard Wind has built positive ties with the local community, including regional businesses and educational institutions, has pledged to act responsibly when treating and paying its workers fairly, and protecting wildife.

For example, Vineyard Wind signed a landmark agreement to mitigate the effects of their project on the critically endangered North Atlantic Right Whale. This agreement with the National Wildlife Federation, National Resources Defense Council, and Conservation Law Foundation should be the model for all future offshore wind developers.

The draft Supplemental
Environmental Impact Statement has been a productive process by, one, expanding the scope of study for offshore wind energies impacts; two, the proposal of a common one-by-one-nautical-mile grid layout known as

Alternative D-2, supported by the U.S. Coast Guard; and three (inaudible) Covell Beach, Alternative B.
(Inaudible) Vineyard Wind as its first offshore wind project. It has now been thoroughly reviewed by state and federal agencies, changes to the project have been made, and now Vineyard Wind
should be cleared for construction without further delay.

Thank you for consideration and comments.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. I just want to remind folks of a couple of
things. You can enter your questions into the $Q$ \& $A$ box, if you're in Zoom, at any time. And at any time, if you want to press Star 1 and speak to the operator to get added to the queue, we can add you to provide comments this evening, as it is the last evening for the spoken part of the comments. And as noted before, there are written comment opportunities as well.

So we are going to -- we're about

10 people in. We're going to pause after the next 10. Looking forward, I've got the next five people are Mike O., Nina WL, Jeannine GG, Jeffrey K., and Diane H.

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

MIKE OKONIEWSKI: Good afternoon. My name is Mike Okoniewski; and the last name, $\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{w}-\mathrm{s}-\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{i}$.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you.
MIKE OKONIEWSKI: And I've been involved in the fishing industry for 51 years on the West Coast and Alaska. Certainly not against green energy. And $I$ certainly want to see if we can do something about climate change.

But I kind of got involved in wind energy at the request of a few fisherman, I don't know, about seven or eight years ago. I went to two meetings, and $I$ kind of just got out of it. There didn't seem to be much to do.

And now that there's -- are some serious plans to develop wind energy offshore
on the West Coast, $I$ got reinvolved again.
And I thought that today would be
a good day to listen in and share comments from some of the fishing communities. This is -- really is going to be an opportunity to see probably what and how we're going to be handled here on the West Coast.

I've been -- talked to a number of fishermen up and down the Oregon coast, primarily also in Washington, though. And I have not heard one positive comment about the way they're being -- the outreach is going into these fishing communities on the behalf of BOEM and the wind energy industry. There's a lot of frustration, a lot of angst, and frankly some anger. So $I$ thought, well, a good thing to do would be to listen to people on the East Coast and see -- in the fishing community and hear what they have to say.

But we know that we got projects scheduled to go in, or to start anyway, and we're attempting to get ourselves more involvement. But it seems to be that it's very difficult to do that. It's not really a
-- this is the most public process I've seen so far where you're actually sitting here taking testimony and fishermen and fishing industry has been heard. And I commend that very much.

But it's -- it's a real concern to
those of us that spent or lives -- livelihoods and invested a lot of money and time in our industry out here as well as on the East Coast, I'm sure. I know a number of people back there.

And so that's really all $I$ have to say right now, is $I$ wanted to find out how this process unfolds and take what $I$ learned back to the people $I$ work with out here. So I'll leave it at that.

And I very much appreciate the opportunity to make a comment. So thank you.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we'll have Nina, and then Jeannine,

Jeffrey, and Diane. And there's a couple more names, Downing and Guy.

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

NINA WOLFF LANDAU: Hi, everyone.
My name is Nina Wolff Landau; $N$-i-n-a, $I$ have two last names, Wolff, W-o-l-f-f, Landau, $L-a-n-d-a-u$.

I just want to start by thanking everyone for their time today and for all the other people who are here to testify. I've learned a lot from hearing from all of you. And $I$ think it goes to show how passionate people are about being involved and making themselves available and making the time to contribute. So really happy to be here.

I'm 22 years old. I'm here to speak in support of this offshore wind project, specifically Alternative D-2.

I grew up in Massachusetts and am now a residence of Providence, Rhode Island. So I have a lot of stake in this personally, as does my family and my communities. I actually just graduated college with a degree in environmental studies, and I am a local climate change activist.

And rather than speak about some of the more technical details $I$ think a lot of
other people can speak really well to, I first wanted to commend the ongoing years of communication on stakeholder engagement on the part of renewed wind, $I$ think, including the fishing communities. And that has really resulted in a proposal with traditionally spaced out turbines, and then other offshore wind installation on what changes that are meant to accommodate the interest in stakeholders. So I want to commend that process.

And I also want to -- want to be supportive of all the people who have -- whose jobs concerns were also recognized in that climate change on the overwhelming issue that is going to continue to hurt fisheries, as it's already changing where species like lobsters can live, given warming waters, and know that this is an issue that impacts all parts of our lives.

So following the lead of the reverend who spoke earlier, $I$ want to continue to speak about the impacts in climate change right in Massachusetts and our island, because

I think that's the crux of this issue. I think the proposals are important, and I want to make sure that we don't lose sight that these are peoples' lives at stake. And this is not happening in the future, it's happening right now.

So Rhode Island has the highest prevalence of childhood asthma in the entire country, and we have very high rates for asthma. Emergency departments admits are highest in Providence, where $I$ live. And black and onyx children are much more likely to visit the emergency room or be hospitalized due to asthma. And it's our leading cause of absences from school.

Kids are not going to school because they can't breathe. And then it's strongly tied to our pollution we have from energy production and other problems we have in our ports.

And this is just one of the many health problems as with climate change, by the heat, by increased ozone, and one that we can really tackle through reducing our emissions
and reducing our reliance on fossil fuels.
When we talk about climate change, this is the rising seas that are impacting our coast in both Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and other states. Our hotter summers and more frequently intense storms, they are all impacting people on a daily basis. And there are people -- not just you and me, there's a lot of people out there, other people.

And I think as someone else stated, obviously Wind 1 Project is not going to change everything for climate change, but it's such an important project that we bring a long process to completion with some incredible wind turbines, and a lot of them, and really start charting the way for more offshore wind development in the United States, and the momentum of this project is incredibly important.

I have really grown up scared
about climate change and scared that over 50 years of government knowledge of a problem has not led to bold action. I wake up every morning, and $I$ work on this issue paid and
unpaid; I eat, breathe, sleep climate change. I think it is an incredible opportunity for Massachusetts to be a leader in a really big project, and for the United States to finally step into a better role in terms of offshore wind development. We are lagging behind, and we have a moral responsibility to the world to be meeting on emissions reductions including our energy sector.

So I just want to say that this is a good start to a lot -- a lot of longer battles around shifting our energy and shifting our entire economy to a renewable economy, and one that doesn't just change an energy source, but really changes peoples' lives, makes people have healthy, long fulfilled lives and livelihoods.

And that doesn't mean that fisher people should not be able to fish what they need to be fishing, and we think that industry as incredibly important. But we need to be able to move forward with these really important energy developments like this project, and we need to do that in a way that
keeps everyone's voices involved, which I think this project has done exceptionally well.

So in summarizing, we support this project, D-2.

And thank you for your time.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we'll have Jeannine, then Jeffrey,

Diane, Downing, then Guy. So I'll turn it over to Jeannine.

JEANNINE GIGUERE-GAGNON: Yes. My name is Jeannine -- you can hear me, right?

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

JEANNINE GIGUERE-GAGNON: Okay.
My name is Jeannine Giguere-Gagnon;
J-e-a-n-n-i-n-e, Giguere, G-i-g-u-e-r-e hyphen $\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{g}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{n}$.

I live in Woonsocket, Rhode
Island. I am a member of the Climate Action Rhode Island as a climate activist. And I want to give my support to Vineyard Wind.

I hope that it will be fitting a model to look at all the possibilities of what
might be able to be done all the way down the Eastern Seaboard. I like the fact that this cut fossil fuel emissions by taking the place of coal and natural gas plants to the extent of -- and also taking the extent of taking 325,000 cars off the road. I think that's quite a bit.

We are presently, in many parts of the world, in a climate emergency. We have to do everything we can and whatever we can do to lower fossil fuel emissions and switch our energy production to renewable energy forms. I hope that renewable energy production like Vineyard Wind can shut down some of the existing plants that impact black and brown neighborhoods in both Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

I appreciate the fact that the jobs that this will create will be good paying jobs and hope that you can hire black and brown workers, and also diversify and train a maintenance crew to keep up and do maintenance on the project.

I hope that everything that can be
done to work through all the difficulties presented today, such as with the fishing industry.

I appreciate all the work you have done to promote Vineyard Wind and how well you set this up and listened to all the complaints. Thank you very much.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you.
Next, we'll have Jeffrey, Diane, Downing, and then Guy. So Jeffrey K., are you available?

JEFFREY KOMINERS: Yes, can you
hear me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine. Thank you, Jeffrey. Go ahead and state and spell your name, please.

JEFFREY KOMINERS: Okay. Good.
Good afternoon, I'm Jeffrey Kominers; that's

$$
J-e-f-f-r-e-y, \text { last name }
$$

K-o-m-i-n-e-r-s. And I'm a -- I live in West Tisbury, Mass, on Martha's Vineyard. I'm also a board member of Island Wind, Inc., one of the companies involved in this project specifically to Martha's Vineyard itself in
particular. And I'm speaking in support of the Vineyard Wind offshore energy project.

This project will provide new economic opportunities in the offshore wind industry. The offshore wind facilities on Martha's Vineyard alone will provide as many as 40 technical jobs, really, highly skilled positions that we are conducting already now, training programs at Martha's Vineyard High School and local community college. And that's much needed for our island community. And it will be for the entire expected years of the offshore wind project. The Vineyard Wind Project has recommended the one-by-one-nautical-mile transit lanes for the project. I think that's the D-2.

After an exhaustive and detailed examination and analysis, U.S. Coast Guard has determined that one-by-one-nautical miles is the optimum spacing for the transit lanes for the Vineyard Wind Project. The Coast Guard is the preeminent institution for navigation in
U.S. waters. It has no big, financial, any other vested interest in the spacing of the transit lanes.

The Coast Guard is neutral and is the government body assigned the responsibility to ensure and facilitate the safety and smooth functioning of navigation in U.S. waters. Its analysis and conclusions on transit lanes should be afforded predominant consideration and adoption by BOEM.

Support of critical offshore wind farm and infrastructure projects will be one of the very largest single measures we can take that addresses our need to mitigate climate change by reducing global greenhouse gas emissions, and it will have a positive effect on sea-level rise and reduce potential negative impacts to our coastal shorelines and ocean acidification impacts. It will greatly boost our efforts to become a 100 percent fossil-fuel-free economy. Keeping our fingers crossed.

The State of Massachusetts and most of the world have determined that burning
fossil fuels releases such dangerous amounts of carbon into the atmosphere that it causes and will continue to have a harmful effect directly on the health of people and on climate change. Consequent effect will continue to warm the planet, cause sea rise, cause innumerable weather disasters, and reduce arable land.

This affects not only
Massachusetts, but, also importantly, the entire nation as well as the entire world. In particular, it greatly affects where I live here on Martha's Vineyard, which in the future will eventually largely be claimed by the rising sea if the world does not act to reduce and virtually eliminate the burning of fossil fuels. This must be done mostly by changing over to renewable sources of energy.

Offshore wind power is a key
element of that renewable energy. I see it as
a comparison of risk. The risk of the
offshore wind project's impact on the
environment and communities, including
fisheries, is very, very low. The risk that
the continued burning of fossil fuels at the current pace will cause the above-described effect, it is not only very high but virtually a certainty.

So low risk versus a virtual
certainty. That makes it a clear choice.
Thus -- thus, we must do all that
is possible to convert to renewable clean
energy. At a minimum, we are 30 to 40 years late in seriously committing to acting on developing clean energy. We cannot afford to delay it any further. BOEM has the opportunity to lead in that imperative.

Thank you for your time.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. And by chance, can you spell your name? I want to make sure we have the -- your name spelled correctly. So state and spell your name before you go, thank you.

JEFFREY KOMINERS: Okay. So first
name Jeffrey, that's a J-e-f-f-r-e-y; last
name Kominers, that starts with a $K$, so
K-o-m-i-n-e-r-s, like Sam, S.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you so
much.
JEFFREY KOMINERS: Thank you. CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. Good.

Thank you. All right. So next we've got Diane, and then
the order has changed a little bit, Guy, Len, Dave, Judeth, Jeremy, and Evan. And that will bring us to the 20 speakers, and at which point, we'll take a break.

So with that, $I$ will turn it over now to Diane.

DIANE HILL: Hello, can you hear me?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yeah, I can hear you just fine. Thank you, Diane.

DIANE HILL: Okay. Thank you. My name is Diane, D-i-a-n-e, Hill, H-i-l-l.

I live in North Kingstown, Rhode Island, and work as a clinical social worker with teenagers and children. I'm also a grandmother of a seven-year-old and a four-year-old.

I'm profoundly concerned for the future of my grandchildren and the young
people with whom $I$ work because of the climate crisis. Because of the time-sensitive nature of the climate crisis, I've been volunteering with Climate Action Rhode Island working to
move Rhode Island forward towards eliminating
fossil fuel emissions and implementing
sustainable and clean energy systems and
infrastructure immediately. I strongly
support building and operating the Vineyard Wind Project as part of New England's renewable clean energy plan. It has clearly been well researched over a number of years, and time is of the essence.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you.
Okay. Going ahead. And like I said, we will take a
break in a little bit. I want to thank those of you who have commented and those of you that have yet to come.

So next we'll go to Guy, and after
that, Len, Dave, Judeth, Jeremy, and Evan.
So Guy?
GUY SIMMONS: Hi. This is Guy

Simmons, $G-u-y$ S-i-m-m-o-n-s. I'm with Sea Watch International, harvesters and processers of the Atlantic surf clam and ocean quahogs. We have four processing facilities in Maryland, Delaware, Massachusetts and Maine, which we employ 700 people. We have an additional 200 employees on the water operating 20 vessels, and maintenance and dock crews. And we have been involved in this since the beginning.

> And I would like to say, as Mr.

Peter Himchak did, who has 45 years' experience in fisheries management, $I$ only have 38 , that he was right in his assessment of the process being flawed as far as coexistence and involvement and taking heed to the concerns of the commercial fisheries.

I'm going to list about four of these here. As a member of the National Science

## Foundation Science Center for

 Marine Fisheries, Sea Watch and other fellow members have hired about a dozen expert scientists on oceanography, ecology,environment, fisheries, and things like that to review the SEIS. So more specific comments with science-based will be given to you in writing.
One of the things that -- probably
the most preeminent concern is the safety of our crews operating within wind arrays with less than two-miles spacing. I've heard a few comments quoting the Coast Guard and the one-miles, and $I$ would say that I've never seen a Coast Guard vessel pull a fish net or a clam dredge behind them, so I do not think that they are preeminent experts on fishing practices.

The -- the other thing that scares us to death, as I mentioned in New York two years ago, is the degradation of the cold pool. And $I$ don't have time to explain it, so if you go to rucool.org, you will see what the cold pool is, and it is a unique oceanographic formation in the Hudson Valley, New York Bight region.
Buried cables -- we are a
hydraulic dredge mobile-tending bottom gear.

Buried cables are quite frightening to us. Use the only five wind turbines that are in the U.S. waters who have buried cables, and those cables have become unburied and will not be buried for another year. I think that's evidence enough that the wind energy developers do not have the proper ability to bury those cables where they won't interfere with commercial fisheries.

As Mr. Peter Himchak mentioned, the hindrance of federal surveys at sea will have terrible effects on our ability to accurately set quotas. And $I$ would like to give a nod to NMFS, the National Marine Fisheries Services, who conduct these surveys and has spent billions of dollars over the years making sustainable seafood in the United States a gold standard for the rest of the world.

So in -- in closing, I would like
to say that we do not support moving forward with Vineyard Wind at this time. We do think that there is a need for safe, clean energy. We think that more science needs to be done.

And you will see that in our comments on the -- on the SEIS at a later date. And we would like -- I would like to support, as Sea Watch would, a five-year moratorium to allow that science to be done.

And $I$ would like to thank all of you for your patience and time on this call.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we have Len, then Dave, then Judeth, Jeremy, and Evan.

So go ahead, Len.
LEN GREENE: Yes, thank you. My
name is Len Greene; it's spelled L-e-n,
the last name is G-r-e-e-n-e. And
I'm the Director of Government Affairs in
Communications for First Light Power.
Our company is one of New
England's largest suppliers of zero carbon emission electric generation and energy storage with assets in both Connecticut and Massachusetts.

On behalf of First Light, I would like to offer our company's support for the
project layout recommendations offered by the leaseholders. As stewards of thousands of acres of land in New England, we understand the difficult job required of BOEM to safeguard the environment while we're responsibly providing for commercial development. We believe that the leaseholder recommendations, particularly that for a uniform one-by-one-nautical mile layout represent a solid balance between these two important goals.

Additional four-mile -- four-mile
transit lanes, which are currently being considered by BOEM, would unfortunately reduce the area available to supply wind energy to the region thereby slowing New England's transition from a world dominated by fossil fuel to a cleaner and more sustainable future. Multiple studies published in the recent months examined the need to decarbonize New England's electric grid and site the maximization of offshore wind output to achieve these goals. We ourselves recently commissioned a study to examine the system
over the next decade as envisioned by the policymakers in New England. And the results showed the need for as much renewable development as can be built in addition to the more efficient usage of existing energy storage zero carbon resources.

As such, we urge BOEM to adopt the one-by-one nautical mile layout provision as recommended by the leaseholders.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. All right. Next we've got Dave, Judeth, Jeremy, and Evan.

Dave, go ahead.
DAVE WALLACE: Yes, can you hear me?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine. Thank you, Dave.

DAVE WALLACE: Okay. My name is
David, or Dave, D-a-v-e, Wallace,
W-a-l-l-a-c-e. I represent the surf clam and ocean quahog fishery. The ocean quahog and surf clam fishery have a number of very large fishing vessels as described by Guy Simmons
just a few minutes ago.
Our -- our critters do not move, so we have -- we have to be able to fish in an area where the -- the clams are. And the same goes for the scallop industry.

If the turbines are placed too close together, then the ability for us to fish in the -- within the array is very dangerous if not impossible; and therefore, all of that area will be lost to us. And that takes up about 1400 square miles of highly productive clam grounds.

The -- the measurement -- BOEM had said in their EIS that -- that the fishing industry is going to be very negatively impacted, and we want to point that out, that this is going to have a tremendous negative impact on us. And so we are going to possibly lose jobs. We surely are going to have to fish in other areas which are farther away, which means we have much more cost in catching the product that we are designed to -- to catch and to process.

So we're going to lose -- we have
a good chance of losing jobs to thousands of people who lived in and work in Europe who build the turbines. We have no capacity -capability of installing these turbines. The -- they will send, as there is a ship here now installing the two turbines off of Virginia Beach, Virginia, which is a European ship, European crew, European turbines. We don't have any capacity to build any of that stuff at this time. So we are -- thousands of jobs that they are talking about are all European jobs. And, yeah, they are very high-paid European jobs, but they are not high-paid American jobs.

So in return, we got power is extremely expensive compared to the standard power that we get today from the fixed nuclear power plants and gas powered power plants. And the turbines are only about 35 percent effective during the year. So the lights go out when the wind stops blowing, they have to have the ability to produce the maximum power necessary to sustain the -- the area that -that that grid is supplying.

So, therefore, you have -- you
have to have power plants, either nuclear power plants or conventional gas power plants, online all the time running at slow speeds. And when the wind stops, then you have a lag, usually the power goes out -- the lights go out, and then they come online and start back up. And so we sort of act like a third-world country.

So the fact is that we are in a situation where, number one, we do not understand all of the negative impacts that are going to be on the habitat, the fish populations, or the fishermen, and all of the people who support the fishing industry. And we are going to be in a situation where the -this process is -- is not in the best interest of the United States as far as trying to reduce carbon. We -- we could learn to build these turbines here and build the equipment to install them. We -- I support and the people I work with support Number G, to do nothing until a lot of studies have been done which was described by Simmons and its scientists.

And we need to also make sure that we have the capability of spreading these things out so -and burying the cables deeply so that we can operate safely within the arrays and transit safely through the arrays, and build these turbines here in the United States.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next
we'll have Judeth, then Jeremy and Evan. Judeth, go ahead. JUDETH VAN HAMM: Hi, Judeth Van

Hamm. Can you hear me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine. Thank you.
JUDETH VAN HAMM: Okay. It's
J-u-d-e-t-h, Van Hamm, it's capital V, as in
Victor, $a-m$ space capital $H-a-m-m . ~ I ' m ~ a$ resident of Hull. I'm also president of Sustainable South Shore, which is a group of mainly, but not -- mainly grass roots, but also officials from Quincy to Plymouth. So that's about nine coastal communities.

I really want to see this work
right. Hull is thinking of a couple of wind
turbines of the same size offshore, and some of the other South Shore communities have the capacities to have south -- offshore wind.

I'm extremely aware of the
deadline of 2030. Our town has adopted a goal of getting to 100 percent clean energy by then because of the study -- studies that have been done showing that if we don't get there, we'll get a 10-foot sea level rise by 2065 .

Having said all of that, I would
like you to listen to all of the people who have spoken and come up with a plan that -that incorporates the whole thing. So you've got deep cables, you've got batteries, you've got local jobs, you've got healthy clams, you've got a healthy clam industry. And you do it in a way that other people can copy you. And I'm not sure how you're going to do all of that, but really what $I$ would like to see. Thank you.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you.
Next, we have Jeremy, and then Evan. And just a reminder, we are going to take a
bit of a break before we get to
the -- the next group. At any time, you can put your questions into the $Q$ \& $A$ on Zoom, or press Star 1 on the phone to get into the queue to provide comments after we take the break.

So next, Jeremy, go ahead and state and spell your name, please.

JEREMY WELSH-LOVEMAN: Hi. My
name is Jeremy Welsh-Loveman; J-e-r-e-m-y space $W-e-l-s-h$ hyphen $L-o-v-e-m-a-n$.

Thank you for letting me comment.
I would like to comment in favor of the proposed action Option $A$ in construction of the Vineyard Wind farm as they have proposed.

Looking at the environmental impact report, it seems clear that overall, the Vineyard Wind farm would have a large net positive impact on the environment. The biggest threat to the environment currently is climate change, which will have massive negative impact on human beings and all living creatures.

Climate change will negatively
impact far larger industry than clam
harvesting, jeopardizing livelihoods throughout the United States.

Construction of this wind farm and many others will help to reduce carbon dioxide emission and thereby help the environment.

Furthermore, if this wind farm were not constructed in the ocean, other clean energy power solutions will need to be found. These other electrical generation options would have -- could have greater negative environmental impacts, such as cutting down trees or mining for coal.

Since the wind turbines and offshore wind farms have higher capacity utilization rates, building offshore wind farms take up a less overall space than other energy generation options.

Additionally, while the
Environmental Impact Statement or report listed potential and negative impacts to commercial fisheries or fishing, any reduction in commercial fishing could positively impact the natural environment. Negative environmental impacts of commercial fishing
include plastic waste from discarded fishing nets which then degrade and spread micro plastics in the water.

The ocean is a public resource.
The commercial fishing industry does not have a primary claim on it. The Atlantic Ocean is very large, and commercial fishing boats have access to the vast majority of it. This wind farm would impact them only slightly, and that impact is greatly outweighed by the positive impact on the environment through reduced fossil fuel power generation.

For these reasons, I vote that BOEM support the proposed action Option $A$ and allow this wind farm and many others be constructed as soon as possible. Further delay of this wind farm project will negatively impact the environment and raise electricity costs.

Thank you. That's it.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you.
Okay. Evan, we are to you. And in just a minute, we'll get a few names.

That will be the first ones that
are after the break. But $I$ did want to remind people that we are going to take a break, and we are putting up names in groups of five. We're not getting everybody's name into that queue yet, but we do have it recorded and -and we'll get to you.

If you are interested in providing comments, and would like to press Star 1 at any time to speak to the operator, we can get you into the queue.

And so now I see that we do have it posted, that after our break, it will be Peter, Jeff and Joseph and Witter. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to Evan to provide comments.

Evan? Evan, are you with us?
OERATOR: It looks like Evan has withdrawn his comment.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. Well, in order to be fair to Peter to provide enough time to get ready, I think we'll take the break right now. And let's be back at 7:20.

So just to, again, explain the process, we are going to take a break. If you
want to get into the queue, press Star 1 and speak to the operator. You can use the $Q$ \& $A$ function to ask questions, and our subject matter experts will be providing the answers to those questions upon conclusion of the public testimony.

So with that, $I$ want to really thank everybody that's provided comments so far, and also thank those that are yet to come for your patience.

We'll take a break, and we will be back at 7:20.
(Brief recess.)
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Hello, everyone. We'll get started in just a minute. I wanted to, again, thank those that have provided comments so far, and also thank those of you that have been patient through this break. I hope everybody had a chance to get up, stretch a bit, grab a phone charger, if you're on the phone, whatnot.

Just a few reminders, we have been doing a really great job sticking to about five minutes so that we can give everybody the
opportunity to speak. If you haven't done so already, and would like to get into the queue, press Star 1 and wait to speak to the operator. It might take a little bit, as they are also helping us manage getting people into the queue and speaking.

The $Q$ \& A function is at the bottom of the screen, for those of you on Zoom; you can use that to ask questions. Again, if you have a technical issue, you can use the chat box.

So with that, I am going to -- I think Evan was there, and we're going to see if we can get Evan back on to provide comments. And after that, it will be Peter, Jeff, Ann, Joseph and Witter.

So Evan, are you with us? Evan with us? Okay. We'll try and get him back in. Peter, do you want to go ahead and provide --
oh, just one moment. Sounds like we're getting Evan. I'll give it just a minute more.

Again, this is the last public
comment meeting. We will have public comment period open until July 27th. You can submit comments in writing or online. And also, I would encourage you to visit the Vineyard Wind virtual meeting room. There's all kinds of information there that you can check out and see.

So -- all right. One last try for
Evan right now. Is Evan available?
Okay. We'll put him at the end of the queue, and we'll go ahead with Peter.

Peter, go ahead. Peter? Okay.
We will -- everybody, again, if you
want to get into the queue, please
press Star 1 and wait to speak to the operator.

With that, I'm going to see if Evan or Peter, and then if neither one of those are available, we'll go to Jeff.

So Evan or Peter? Okay. Let's go
to Jeff K., and then Ann B.,
Joseph H., and Witter. So Jeff, are you available? There. One moment. It seems that we are
having some troubles getting folks into the -- into the queue. So give it one moment.

Isis, by chance, can you move the slide back to the screen that has the written comments, and we can read through that as we're waiting to get folks back into the queue? So just a reminder -- yeah, sorry, I'm making you flip around.

ISIS FARMER: So for
clarification, which slide would you like me to turn to?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: The one that has where you can submit comments via writing.

ISIS FARMER: There we go.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: There you go.
Yep. Thank you.
So then I'll read some of that to those who may be on the phone. Go to https://www.BOEM.gov/vineyardwind-SEIS-virtual -meeting. There's all kinds of information that's on that site.

And then if you want to submit comments via writing, go to the Program

Manager, Office of Renewable Energy, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management at 45600 Woodland Road in Sterling, Virginia 20166. And in all those comments that you're doing via writing, you can go to regulations.gov as well be sure to search for the Docket Number BOEM-2020-0005. That will bring you to the Vineyard Wind piece.

So with that, I think we're going to try to get back to the queue now. And if I'm not mistaken, we're going to start with Peter.

So Peter, are you available?
Looking for Peter F.?
OPERATOR: Peter, your line is open.

PETER FLOURNOY: Yes, can you hear me?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine. Thank you, Peter. And thank you for your patience everyone.

So Peter, go ahead and state and spell your name.

PETER FLOURNOY: Yes, my name is

Peter --
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Peter, I don't know if you accidently hit mute, but I'm not hearing you right now.

OPERATOR: Peter, your line is open. Our next question comes from Joseph Huckemeyer. Your line is open. JOSEPH HUCKEMEYER: Can you hear me?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine. Thank you, Joseph. You want to go ahead and provide comments?

JOSEPH HUCKEMEYER: Sure. My name is Joseph Huckemeyer, J-o-s-e-p-h
$\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{c}-\mathrm{k}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{m}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{y}-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{r}$. My company is Helen H Offshore Fishing Corp. I operate a number of for-hire partying charter boats, fishing boats, whale watching ferryboats out of Hyannis and Plymouth, Mass.

I have operated boats around the Cape islands and the wind lease area areas for 30 years.

For full disclosure, $I$ have
supplied vessels for avian or bird surveys for
our future wind -- Vineyard Wind Project, and worked as a guard vessel on the Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind Project this Spring. This is -- this shows that there is work for local companies in the wind industry.

I would like to comment on
Alternative $F$ regarding the fairways or channels through the lease areas. At one-mile spacing of the wind towers, these -- these channels are unnecessary. If anything, the consistent one-mile spacing throughout with east-west and north-south, letters and number markings would be best.

As a comparison, Ambrose Channel, that is the main entrance of New York harbor, is one-third of a mile wide, and has 800 -foot ships passing each other every day. One mile is more spacing than any good boat operator needs to transit.

As well, $I$ would be concerned
about fishing in any area designated as a, quote, unquote, channel or fairway for liability or insurance reasons.

Also, I believe that the towers and the anti-scouring stones around them at the bases will create fishing opportunities for private and smaller for-hire vessels.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you for your comments.
We're going to ask folks to press Star 1 and get back in the queue. We did have a little bit of -- some folks that were dropped, and so we want to make sure everybody is in the queue. So if you've already preregistered or pressed Star 1, please do so again now so that we can make sure that we've got you. We want to make sure that everyone who would like to speak tonight has the opportunity to do so. So apologies for the inconvenience.

And at this point, I'm going to -I believe we're turning it over to Witter; is that correct?

Operator, can you confirm?
WITTER SWANSON: Yeah, I'm here.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.

Great. Go ahead, Witter, if you can state and spell your name, that will be helpful. Thank you.

WITTER SWANSON: All right. Yeah, my name is Witter Swanson, that's spelled W-i-t-t-e-r $S-w-a-n-s-o-n$. I am a college student at Amherst College in Massachusetts. I'm currently the energy and environment policy coordinator for the Roosevelt Network, a national network of college students developing and implementing policy changes for their communities.

And I've worked extensive over the past five years with the Adirondack Youth Climate Program. That's an organization focused on using our climate summit model to educate high school students about climate change and giving them the tools to develop local climate action plans.

In both of those capacities, I've had the great fortunate of working with hundreds of young people across our country. I think anyone watching the news over the past couple of years has seen the incredible
mobilization of young people on the issues of environmental equity and climate change. And I can attest to that energy and passion firsthand, as have others on this hearing previously.

Members of the younger generations largely bear the brunt of the negative climate impacts stemming from the decisions we make today. We desperately want to see a government and government processes that reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and strengthens our economy. Therefore, I hope that BOEM considers the interests of the younger generations while making their permitting decision on Vineyard Wind.

We will approve Alternative D-2
and reject Alternative $F$, as this will maximize future investments in offshore wind and clean energy for the United States.

Additionally, I had the opportunity this past Spring to study abroad in Denmark, a country leading offshore wind industry worldwide, where $I$ learned from academic and professional experts in renewable
energy and sustainable development. To see the turbines as $I$ traveled the country or visited various islands, to speak to students and others with stable good paying jobs, and a country committed to a clean energy future, it felt disconcerting to be from a country that is still decades behind in deploying its scale of this clearly beneficial technology.

In Denmark, broad governmental
support for the industry helped attract and secure investment. We in the United States cannot afford further delays to the Vineyard Wind proposed construction plan because we need to guarantee the stability of this industry because that will allow supply chains and work force training to take full effect for job growth in the United States.

As someone who will very likely graduate during a pandemic and economic downturn, and having heard from classmates who have already had job offers rescinded as a result of the downturn, the offshore wind industry provides a glimmer of hope and expansion for the job market.

I think many students want to
enter the ground floor of a new and exciting career field. And the offshore wind industry can be that new, innovating and exciting job sector here in the United States.

I hope that those beneficial
impacts are not overlooked when drafting a final Environmental Impact Statement.

I've also heard some prior
comments regarding impacts to fisheries. And I want to add that the small reduced revenues for fisheries from Vineyard Wind will only be realized if fishing activity stops entirely in the lease area. But the one-by-one nautical mile layout will allow for fishing to continue once Vineyard Wind is operational.

So I think that needs to be taken into account when the final permitting decision is made, as well as other mitigation strategies already agreed upon by Vineyard Wind and consultation with the fishing industry.

All in all, approve this project
as quickly as possible. I voice my full
support.
Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you for
your comments.
Up next we'll have Jeff K., and
then Steven, with $a \operatorname{V}$, $W$., and then Laura G.
So Jeff, you're up next. Go
ahead.
JEFF KAELIN: Okay. Yeah, I started -- I guess we had a hiccup in the system earlier.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yeah, go ahead. Thank you.

JEFF KAELIN: Good evening, everyone. I'm Jeff Kaelin. I am the Director of sustainability and government relations for Lund's Fisheries in Cape May, New Jersey.

This is a family company; the third generation is operating it now. We employ a couple hundred people here in Cape May. We have a freezer plant. We've got 17 boats. And our operating area is from Cape Hatteras, really, to the Canadian border and all the way out to the Canadian line on

Georges Bank. So we operate throughout the region.

And you know, wind energy is
taking up a tremendous of our time these days threatening our ability to be able to fish where we do have and have historically fished. And apologies to the gentleman who just spoke, but there's no way we're going to go towing around inside a one-mile square. That's not going to happen.

So that's why transit becomes
extremely important to us as an industry as we attempt to coexist.

So I started -- when I got out of
the Coast Guard in 1972, I began to work on draggers in Point Judith, and we did go all the way to the -- to the northern edge in those days before the Canadians took the northern edge. So I've had a lot of sea time.

And we are part of an industry
that's, you know, been important to the economies of New England. I actually went to high school in Barrington, Rhode Island. I started out as a gas pump jockey and went
commercial fishing and ended up on the GI Bill at URI and got a master's in marine affairs in the days that we were asking the foreign fleets to leave our 200-mile zone.

And it's kind of ironic now that what we see with the wind energy is -- it's being led by foreign countries. I've been over to Denmark, too, and $I$ know a lot about the fisheries over there. The North Sea is more like a bowl than here, where we have a cliff and everybody is kind of jammed up in the same area.

But you know, we have Jones Act concerns with this industry, if you want to talk about jobs. You know, we'd like to see our industry commit to building some of their construction boats here.

You know, I want my comments to be received in the spirit of a comment that the lady from Hull, Mass, made earlier, that the Vineyard Wind 1 should be resolved so that others will copy you. I thought that was really very wise.

And because for people like us,
and many of the fishermen in between here and where -- you know, up off of Massachusetts there -- you know, we heard from Dave earlier. We work very closely together and have for decades. Guy Simmons, as he said, we'll be -start filing formal comments from a technical wind team that we funded to specifically address this SEIS.

Katie, talk about young people, I think I'm old enough to be her grandfather maybe. And we're happy to have young people in the fishing industry. It's a proud industry. We feed people. And it's something that we need to be able to preserve.

So we operate a plant in New
Bedford. We operate two plants in California. Both Peter, who wasn't able to connect, and -and Mike, are colleagues of ours, working with wind development on the -- on the -- on the West Coast, too.

So you heard a lot of our concerns generally. We do not believe that this SEIS should be used as a template for the other developments and the other developers between

Massachusetts and -- and Virginia.
And I think BOEM -- while I really
appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight -has done a terrible job frankly in -- in encouraging the developers to work together to resolve issues like our ability to transit areas where we're going to be displaced because there are other areas where we can still catch fish. But these transit areas are extremely important. Our boats are in New Bedford frequently in the scallop fishery, herring, mackerel.

So I would like to see this
outcome have Vineyard 1 be the leader in a rational transit system so that we can get around it and safely get through it. So, you know, maybe four miles is too long. But I wanted to point out that, you know,

Alternative $F$-- we've heard a lot about environmental justice tonight. You know, it's a minor impact whether it's $F$ or $D-2$, frankly. We don't think that a check --

CHRISTINE DAVIS: I'm sorry, it seems we lost Jeff again.

Steven, are you up next?

JEFF KAELIN: So that's it. Okay.

Well, we'll be filing written comments and we hope BOEM does a little better job of coordinating between these projects.

Thank you.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you, Jeff.
All right. Next we have Steven, with a V,

Steven W., and then Laura.

STEVE WENNER: Hello.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Hello.

STEVE WENNER: I'm Steve -- I'm

Steve Wenner, my last name is $W-e-n-n-e-r$. I'm a resident of Cohasset, Massachusetts. And I'm a volunteer with several climate activist organizations.

I want to urge BOEM to expedite approval of a robust option for the Vineyard Wind Project.

The scientific community agrees that we must greatly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change. And we have about 10 years to accomplish this. If we fail, the cumulative
impacts of climate change will likely overwhelm society's ability to adapt. The stresses induced by climate change will endanger our very civilization.

I recognize that this offshore wind project has some short-term environmental and societal problems, but these risks are surely much less than the irreversible and overwhelming damage certain to hit us if we fail to curtail our dependence on fossil fuels.

What do we want to tell our grandchildren? Will we be forced to admit that we put obstacles in the path of saving civilization? Or would we rather be able to say that we did everything in our power to save the environment for our grandchildren and for future generations?

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you. Next we've got Laura, Laura G.
LAURA GARDNER: Hello, can you
hear me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine. Thank you, Laura.
LAURA GARDNER: Great. Thank you.
Good evening, and thank you for the
opportunity to speak. My name is
Laura Gardner, L-a-u-r-a
$G-a-r-d-n-e-r$. And $I l^{\prime} m$ from
Climate Reality Massachusetts South Coast, a relatively new climate justice group on the South Coast of Massachusetts with a strong contingent of teenage participants.

Our mission is to catalyze a
global solution to the climate crisis by making urgent an action a necessity across every level of society.

I am also a school librarian in
our local area.
One of my former students who is
now also in our Climate Reality group wrote the following for our local newspaper, the Standard Times a year ago:

Scientists are predicting that we
have 12 years to solve the worldwide crisis known as climate change. This won't impact your future too much, but it will destroy
mine.
As a mother of two young children, and a teacher/librarian, my primary concern is building a safe and healthy future for our youth. In addition, we are excited about the new clean energy jobs for our New Bedford region that Vineyard Wind will provide, as well as the opportunity to lower electricity costs for our region.

Climate Reality Massachusetts South Coast recently began a new campaign called 100 Percent Committed. That means we are advocating for businesses and communities on the South Coast to commit to and make the necessary changes to go 100 percent renewable by 2030. We cannot get there without Vineyard Wind.

We see how the climate crisis is devastating our planet thanks to dirty fossil fuels. Vineyard Wind is a key part of solving that crisis creating a clean energy economy for New England where solar wind and other renewables create hundreds of thousands of jobs and power our lives without polluting our
atmosphere.
Our group gives our full support to this project, and we express our hope that permitting will go forward as soon as possible.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you. Next we've got Stephen, with a p-h, C., and
then Alexander. So Stephen, go
ahead. Stephen?
STEPHEN COAN: Hang on one second, I don't know if I'm on.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Steven, I think you -- I can hear you just fine. I don't know --

STEPHEN COAN: Okay. Thank you. Stephen Coan here from Mystic Aquarium; S-t-e-p-h-e-n C-o-a-n. Thank you for taking the time this evening.

As president of Mystic Aquarium, I'm here to speak in favor of Vineyard 1. The aquarium is partnering with Vineyard Wind on research related to marine mammals and
fisheries.
Vineyard Wind is a responsible and highly-community minded company. Since the inception of Vineyard 1, the company has done an exemplary job in engaging the public and working with experts and scientists in refining their proposal.

Massachusetts and New England needs ocean wind energy, and this Vineyard Wind Project, it's really essential that it gets started. We'll generate clean, sustainable injury for more than 400,000 homes and businesses. And the most important thing, as has been said this evening, is the need to reduce carbon emissions, which this project does by nearly 2 million tons annually.

The issue of adding transit lanes, in my opinion, does not need to be revisited. The Coast Guard has already endorsed the one-by-one NM layout, and the Coast Guard finds that the standardized spacing layout would be best for navigational safety. They also have reported that additional transit lanes are potentially less safe than the
one-by-one NM layout.
BOEM's scientists have studied the impact of offshore wind in Massachusetts and indeed up and down the Eastern Seaboard. And BOEM's own scientists have concluded that Vineyard 1, as proposed, does not have an adverse impact on birds or fisheries.

The economic impact of fishers not being able to fish in the wind energy area, where Vineyard Wind, is cited is less than. 5 percent. And that negligible impact assessment assumes that fishers cease to fish in the entirety of the lease area and/or fail to shift fishing to other areas nearby. Those are highly unlikely scenarios.

So in short, adverse impact on the environment, fish stocks, and on the economics of the fishing industry have not been shown.

Enough is known, however, about the adverse impact on the environment and the economy including the livelihood of fishers if nothing is done to develop renewable energy such as the Vineyard Wind Project. Warming waters due in part to carbon emissions are but
one example of a far greater threat to fishers and others than Vineyard 1 .

Vineyard 1 has shown that the economics of moving ahead with this beneficial project are greatly diminished with additional delays or unnecessary changes to the citing plan. So time is of the essence to begin construction of Vineyard 1 so that

Massachusetts and New England can begin to see the benefit of having renewable and less carbon impact on our environment.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you,
Stephen, just to confirm, your first name is with a p-h; is that correct? Go ahead and state and spell your name one more time, I want to make sure $I$ have it correct.

STEPHEN COAN: $S-t-e-p-h-e-n$ $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{n}$.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you so much.
Okay. Next we're going to move to Evan and then Alexander.

So Evan, are you available now?

EVAN SAUTER: Can you hear me now? CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yes, $I$ can hear you just fine. Thank you, Evan.

EVAN SAUTER: So my name is Evan, E-v-a-n, Sauter, $S-a-u-t-e-r$.

I was born and raised on the
island of Martha's Vineyard, and I'm a college student Polytechnic Institute.

As someone who has grown up on the island, $I$ have had a front-row seat to the impacts of climate change with warming weather, ocean rise, and more severe storms.

Because of this, we need to move away from relying on fossil fuels and instead use a hundred percent renewable energy.

This has been along the response of Vineyard's goal to be a hundred percent renewable in achieving electricity and transportation before 2040 .

The development of offshore wind projects meets the need for more clean energy. In order to capture the full potential of the U.S. offshore wind work force, developers and suppliers are willing to
train the local work force moving towards a hundred percent U.S. work force attaches the full economic benefits of this industry will require consistent, predictable projects entering construction to allow workers to gain experience and qualifications (inaudible) to advance within the work force and replace the Europeans over time.

I want to commend Vineyard Wind for committing to training the local work force on Martha's Vineyard, which is critical in the diversification of our local economy. It gives a generation of people, like myself, a hope to get new jobs, especially during very challenging times.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide input. I urge BOEM to submit this project to move forward without delay.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you. Alexander. You're next. Can you state and spell your name, please.

ALEXANDER THILLERUP: Hi, my name is Alexander Thillerup. I just want to make
sure you can hear me.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you fine. If you can spell your last name, that would be great. Thank you.

ALEXANDER THILLERUP: Excellent, my last name is Thillerup, $T-h-i-l-l-e-r-u-p$. I am the Vice-President of Renewables U.S. Xodus Group.

Firstly, $I$ want to thank BOEM for issuing a very comprehensive analysis and taking the time to engage with multiple various stakeholders, including industry experts and communities.

Xodus Group is an energy expert consultancy that enables technology and takes a leading role and interest in industry challenges.

In the U.S., we are involved in shaping the offshore wind supply chain of tomorrow. We do so in close collaboration with all levels of the supply chain, including local supplies, oversea supplies, top tier supplies with developers and local
municipalities. We have also done the
consensing for high-end wind, the first movers of puritan wind in Europe.

We are here to speak in strong
favor of approving Vineyard Wind to move forward with no further delay.

The nature of developing an offshore wind asset is complicated and challenging from all circumstances. The baseline risks are many, significant, and intimate from environment to finance to supply chain to project quality and project schedule.

While we cannot eliminate these risks, we can mitigate them to the extent that make these projects viable and real, as seen in other parts of the world.

What sets Vineyard Wind apart from
the rest is that they carry an additional component risk for being the first movers. In such -- in such new markets with no existing supply chain, these risks can be hard to quantify. In laymen's terms, we do not know what we do not know.

What we do know is that the entire industry is moving towards Vineyard Wind, and
the suppliers are actually deferring critical investments, a healthy business skepticism in response to -- to the perceived risk profile. We have reached the point where we cannot reduce the risk for the first project much further, and we need to let it be constructed.

In the construction of the first project, it increases our understanding and knowledge base significantly, and it will form all the projects to follow, hence reducing their risks and associated costs.

What would happen if Vineyard Wind is delayed or not approved? The next project will have to carry the additional risk of being the first movers, something that they probably have not factored into their current models.

A disillusioned supply chain would further compound that risk. Their risk profile has gone up significantly. Investors will be clear that they cannot be guaranteed a return on their investments.

In best case, offshore wind
development will be set back by years, and worst case scenario is that the projects -projects will become financially unviable.

In conclusion, in Section 3.7.2.1, and I'm quoting here, if the proposed project is not approved, it is assumed that the energy demand that the proposed project would have built would likely be met by other projects in the remaining areas off Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New York leases. In other words, future offshore wind facilities capable of generating 9.4 megawatt -- would be 9.4 gigawatts -- would be built in the Rhode Island and Massachusetts lease areas.

We believe that the premise of the assumption is incorrect, and we urge you to reassess this assumption. Further delaying the project, worst case we move not to approve Vineyard Wind, create a significant material ripple effect throughout the entire industry and the local supply chain.

Thank you for your time. We will be providing a written comment as well.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.

Thank you very much.
We are going to go to Ann next.
Ann, can you state and spell your name, please?

OPERATOR: Ann has withdrawn her question.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. Sorry.
We'll go to Meghan and then Wesley.
Meghan? Is Meghan available?
Hold it. One moment.
I ask, again, apologies, that if
you would like to speak tonight, please press Star 1 and speak to the operator. I know they are busy right now, but please be patient and -- and be sure to do that. We will hold until we make sure that we've given people an opportunity to speak tonight.

So I'll just remind everybody, the Q \& A box is there, and we'll go there. And $I$ just want to see if Ann is available. And then after that, it will be Meghan and Wesley and Gordon. Is Ann available?

OPERATOR: Ann will go next.

We're grabbing her again now.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. Thank you.

OPERATOR: Currently, Meghan's
line is open.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Oh, okay. So
Meghan, why don't you go ahead, and then -and apologies for that, but if you want to go ahead and provide your comments, that would be great. Thank you.

Meghan, state and spell your name.
MEGHAN LAPP: Thank you. Meghan
Lapp, $M-e-g-h-a-n$ L-a-p-p. I represent Seafreeze Limited in North Kingstown and Seafreeze Shoreside in Point Judith.

We are a commercial fishing company, and we have three vessels that operate in the area. And we service many more.

As I've been reviewing the SEIS, it references the COPs in determining various impact. However, if you go to the volumes and sections of the COP referenced, they are redacted. Not one or two sections, but
several sections; many sections, actually. This prevents meaningful comment and external review, and therefore, cannot be used in decision-making.

Regarding a proposed action, we learned of the one-by-one-nautical-mile layout created by developers first in the media. It was not developed with us or with input from others in the commercial fishing industry who would be majorly impacted by the proposed project and cumulative projects, should they move forward.

The U.S. Coast Guard MARIPARS report, which also accepted this layout, did not analyze radar interference impact, which were well documented and acknowledged by the U.S. Coast Guard study on the previously proposed Cape Wind Project as a result of wind turbines.

Furthermore, mathematical errors
and omissions in the MARIPARS report demonstrate that further work is necessary regarding layout and navigational safety.

The SEIS determines that there are
major impacts to navigation and, therefore, navigational safety as a result of the proposed layout. However, due to the lack of radar analysis, and the errors and omissions in the MARIPARS, and particularly, since the size of turbines in the project design envelope has now increased from a 10-megawatt-turbine to a 14-megawatt-turbine maximum, we believe more analysis, including and especially a radar modeling of the project and surrounding areas based on 14 megawatt turbines is necessary before moving forward.

Human lives and safety at sea are paramount. The Vineyard Wind Project and the Mass/Rhode Island lease area are larger than any currently operating wind farms in the world, and it is important to get this right.

Our vessels and our customers' vessels require safety at sea when transiting in the area, and they currently transit the area frequently. So we request this analysis to be done, this modeling to be done and analyzed prior to any approval.

Our vessels and many customer
vessels will be unable to fish in the project area during the life of the project or surrounding cumulative projects should they move forward due to being trawl vessels which are the primary fishing (inaudible) in the area.

Any product these vessels and our
facilities have relied on for decades will disappear. Due to cable batting on export cables, we will likely lose fishing area outside the project as well.

Our vessels, customer vessels and facilities know intimately about renewable resources. The resources we rely upon to feed the American public and provide steady American jobs are renewable and sustainable and more highly regulated than the offshore energy industry.

The SEIS determines major impact to commercial fisheries. Cumulatively, some seasonal fisheries and reliant vessels may not survive if all of build-out occurs.

In contrast, the SEIS determines
negligible to minor and minor beneficial
impacts to air quality, i.e., climate change and greenhouse gas reduction. Since greenhouse reduction and air quality is the primary driver of this project, minor negligible beneficial impacts would override negative impacts to another renewable resource industry should the project move forward as proposed.

Due to this fact and the lack of radar modeling for 14 megawatt turbines and the issues of the MARIPARS, we support more work on these prior to approval.

We also echo the need for a time series of baseline information prior to construction that was raised by previous commenters.

Fisheries' renewable resources both inside and adjacent to the project area need to be carefully monitored for impacts before, during, and after projects are built. A standard fisheries baseline survey is only acceptable for stock assessment once they have five to seven years of uninterrupted data collection. This is standard scientific
procedure in the fishing industry and U.S. East Coast Fisheries Management by the federal government.

These should take place prior to construction, as we and others have continuously requested over the past number of years. A one-year baseline survey prior to construction is too statistically insignificant and uncertain to produce reliable data.

Due to the very significant
potential and expected impacts to the long fin squid resource, which cannot be farmed, and therefore, is important to sustain a monitor in the wild, measuring these impacts is very important, particularly due to the fact that air quality will only be affected in a minor capacity, conducting due diligence to majorly impacted natural resources and resource users is appropriate.

Therefore, we support requiring this type of time series data collection as a prerequisite of permitting as well.

Thank you.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. All
right. Next we've got Ann, then Wesley,
Gordon, and Bonnie. So Ann -- and then just a reminder to folks,
we do have more names that we're putting on the screen. We're just trying to put a few names up at a time, and then we will, you know, add more as we go.

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

ANN BERWICK: Thank you. Can you
hear me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you just fine. And actually, one minute, Ann. I'm going to ask one other thing.

Please use the question box on Zoom for questions and comments. And then if you have any technical issues, use chat. But we're trying to use the chat box for our -putting our names in. So if you can help us out with that, that would be great. We'll continue to take those questions in that $Q$ \& $A$ box.

So with that, I'll turn it over to
you, Ann. Thank you.
ANN BERWICK: Okay. Thanks a lot. My name is Ann Berwick. I'm a member of the board of Vineyard Power. I was Undersecretary for Energy in Massachusetts from 2006 to 2010 ; Chair of the Mass Department of Public Utilities from 2010 to 2015; I'm also on the Mothers Outfront Legislative Team; and Chair of the Mothers Outfront Legislative Rapid Response Team.

So thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today. I very much appreciate it.

And I'm speaking in support of Alternative D-2 of Vineyard Wind 1.

And I want to step back from the details you've been hearing about, like thousands of local jobs created, millions of tons of CO2 avoided, and over a billion dollars in energy cost savings, although that's all correct.

It's easy to get mired in the details, but the big picture is simple, we need more renewable electricity; and then
counterintuitively, we need to use more electricity for things like heating and cooling buildings and for transportation. But where will that renewable electricity come from? There's no serious dispute about that, at least here in New England, that there's no resource that can begin to compete with offshore wind.

After a decade and a half of vigorous development of solar in Massachusetts, which is an important resource even here in snowy New England, we have 2500 megawatts of solar nameplate capacity. That's at a 14 percent capacity factor, meaning 350 megawatts of solar power.

Compare the capacity of offshore wind. At 800 megawatts nameplate capacity and a
capacity factor of 45 percent, Vineyard Wind 1 alone will contribute 360 megawatts in power to the New England grid. In other words, more energy from a single offshore wind project than from a decade and a half of solar development.

And you know, better than $I$ do, the reasonable capacity of offshore wind on the East Coast.

Don't misunderstand me, I'm all
for solar. I was a member of the Patrick Administration that was responsible for launching the state's robust solar program.

Does Vineyard Wind have any negative impacts? Yeah. But guess what? There's no free lunch. However, any minimal impacts from Vineyard Wind and other offshore wind projects in the queue are small compared to the massive impact of climate change, on birds, on fisheries, on humans, and especially on the most disadvantaged communities.

This project is a no-brainer.
Massachusetts has been working on offshore wind for two decades. This is a great project for jobs, for the economy, for the environment. And we all know that time is running out.

So I really appreciate your time and attention and all the work you're putting into all of these really incredibly important
projects. Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Up next, we've got Wesley, then Gordon, Bonnie, Seth and Ron.

Wesley, are you available?
WESLEY LOOK: I am. Can you hear
me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine. Thank you so much.
WESLEY LOOK: Great. My name is
Wesley Look, that's $W$-e-s-l-e-y L-o-o-k.
I am a resident of West Tisbury on Martha's Vineyard where $I$ was born and raised and where my family has lived for over 300 years, largely as farmers and fishermen.

I am joining the -- the voice of support for Alternative D-2 of Vineyard Wind 1, and, in general, support the environmentally conscious and ecologically responsive development of offshore on the North Atlantic sea board.

I want to start by saying that $I$ also very much respect the livelihood of fishing in this same area, and -- and
appreciate the hard work that the agency is navigating to balance these -- these continuing needs. And $I$ want to state my support also for the fishing community.

I think that one of the reasons
why I support Vineyard Wind is that I -- I believe the process thus far has done a very good job of balancing those needs. That's my subjective opinion, of course.

But one of the -- one of the other
key pieces that I'm concerned of is not just the fishing industry, but also our local marine ecosystem. And one of the ways in which I -- I think that the Vineyard Wind process has really done a good job of balancing that is in the Right Whale settlement agreement.

As had been stated earlier in this public comment period, or session, there's no guarantee that any future offshore wind project would achieve that same -- that same concensus and settlement around how to manage a crucial population in this ecosystem. So I think that that is -- that's one reason why I
support this project.
In response to the fishing
industry, Vineyard Wind and other developers in the New England wind energy area agreed to develop all future projects with a uniform one-by-one-nautical-mile layout throughout the lease areas, as has been talked about. This, I think, is another reason why this project should -- should go forward. This change reduces the potential output of the wind turbine projects by 30 percent, but does seem to address the main concerns that have been articulated from the commercial fishing industry raised during the comment period of the Vineyard Wind 1 Project.

The Coast Guard, as has also been said, has endorsed this
one-by-one-nautical-mile layout without seeing the need for additional wider transit lanes.

I also want to applaud Vineyard
Wind for taking feedback from our island community in incorporating aircraft detection lighting systems, or ADLS, into their project, which will make nighttime lighting impacts
reduced to negligible.
We encourage BOEM to require future developers to incorporate ADLS on their turbines to significantly reduce the amount of time that light will be visible from shore.

As has been talked about, offshore wind produces power at long-term fixed prices and provides a hedge against fossil fuel volatility, something that we're seeing these days. This is important for our region's energy generation and security. This is an energy security issue for -- for the New England region.

Development of offshore wind projects aligned with Martha's Vineyard's goal to be a hundred percent renewable for heating, electricity, and transportation by 2040 , and aligned with Massachusetts' target of being net zero by 2050 .

Furthermore, when paired with energy storage, this project aligns with the Massachusetts Clean Peak Standard, which is designed to incentivize the use of clean energy technologies during peak hours instead
of relying on fossil fuel burning plants.
Overall, as well, offshore wind projects are anticipated to have a continuous long term beneficial impact on local employment and economics. It provides new employment and economic opportunities, including for communities like the Martha's Vineyard's community to the development and expansion of port, shipping, and related industries.

Lastly, I want to join the -- the many who have spoken to the importance of climate change. This is an existential threat that we have very little time to address, and offshore wind projects like this one are crucial to meeting that lead.

Lastly, I just want to close by saying that $I$ worked for many years in the United States Senate for a senator from Oregon, and worked on various energy projects, energy siting projects, including many in the relatively desolate high desert of North Eastern Oregon, where particularly a transmission line was being cited.

And I just want to articulate that we often think that, you know, we can't build this project here because this is a precious ecosystem. There are precious ecosystems everywhere. Even in that very arid high desert environment, we were having trouble moving a transmission line through because of an endangered species of Washington Ground Squirrel.

So I just articulate the voice that there's nowhere where there will be no impact, and $I$ think this community is well positioned to minimize the impact and take a leadership position on this important clean energy technology.

Thank you so much.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we've got Gordon, and then Bonnie, Seth and Ron. Gordon, go ahead.

GORDON STARR: Hello. Can you
hear me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine. Thank you, Gordon.
GORDON STARR: Oh, thank you.

Thank you, Christine.
My name is Gordon Starr;
$G-o-r-d-o-n$, last name $S-t-a-r-r$. I'm a lifelong resident of Massachusetts. I'm also a Town Councilman in the Town of Barnstable, though my remarks tonight are really my own.

The earth's temperature and CO2 levels are rising steadily, and we need to act quickly to mitigate these threats.

I've been involved with the permitting process of Vineyard Wind since they first came to Cape Cod. The Vineyard Wind 1 (inaudible). It's a long process. But the Vineyard Wind team has worked closely with the town professional staff to develop a detailed host agreement.

Their team has been thorough, meticulous, and accommodating throughout the process. This will be a huge first step in preventing reliable renewable energy for South Eastern Massachusetts.

The design of the wind farm itself 14 miles of Martha's Vineyard has been
(inaudible) since the (inaudible) and
corroboration (inaudible).
To ask the developers now to add the three- or four-mile transit corridor (inaudible) unnecessary, especially (inaudible).

The fishing fleet is an essential part of our marine economy, and we should listen to their concerns.
(Inaudible) wind towers will have small footprints, and they will be a mile apart in a grid pattern along state transit routes in many directions.

Ask yourself, would you rather offshore wind mills or oil and gas building platforms with related land-based refinery infrastructure? So I ask everyone to support the timely development of this offshore wind project. We need the renewable energy, we need the jobs, and we need to move to non fossil fuel generated electricity.

So I think Vineyard Wind 1 and Vineyard Wind has done a great job (inaudible) to move this project forward.

Thank you.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next is Bonnie, then Seth and Ron. Bonnie, you can go ahead.

BONNIE BRADY: Hi, can you hear me okay?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine. Thank you.
BONNIE BRADY: Great. My name is
Bonnie Brady. I represent the Long Island Commercial Fishing Association, which represents gear types throughout Long Island of commercial fishermen.

First of all, $I$ would like to echo all the comments Meghan Lapp made in the virtual hearing. All of the items she mentioned need to be further evaluated.

The Massachusetts wind energy areas, including Vineyard Wind were chosen without any input from New York fisherman that fish in federal waters where the WEAs were selected. Massachusetts/Rhode Island state-formed task force at no point included New York representation nor did they notify federal fishery stakeholders from other states
to offer input to the process from the beginning.

All memorandum of understanding
was written between Rhode Island and Massachusetts and the fisheries' advisory boards selected from those two states. There was no meeting notification or attempt to reach out to New York State's federal fishery communities and stakeholders to gather input. Fisheries are of great economic importance to the state of New York, including the whiting, scup, butterfish and squid fisheries, each of which are worth millions of dollars each year in revenue via New York State's commercial fishermen.

The Rhode Island/Mass BOEM task force did not include any of New York's economic catch data and none of the historical traditional fishing grounds of importance to the trawl fleet of New York. We were removed from consideration.

New York fishermen have no compensation package and no safe, direct, and four-nautical-mile-wide transit lane to either
travel directly to our fishing grounds or to our home port.

Since 2000, New York fisherman have caught over 100 million pounds of squid. Some years, 40 to 60 percent of that catch has come from the fishing grounds south of Nantucket. Much of it was in the Vineyard Wind. Without wide and safe transit lanes, such as the example submitted by RODA, commercial fishermen from New York will not be allowed to directly home to their ports from fishing grounds within the Rhode Island/Massachusetts wind energy area.

In a Vineyard Wind vacuum, it may look like that is not needed. But the overall Rhode Island/Massachusetts wind energy area at 1400 square miles is two-thirds of the size of the Grand Canyon National Park. Or to think of it another way, equal to the total landmass of Long Island.

Now, imagine a turbine 900 feet tall a mile apart in every direction. Now add black fog, which laymen refer to as pea soup, and 20 - and 30 -foot seas, and winds up to 40
miles per hour or more. Those that have spoken before me, with the exception of those representing commercial fishermen, have no idea how dangerous the offshore environment is. And quite frankly, it's incredibly disrespectful to the brave men and women who go out every day providing food for the nation, and for those we have lost at sea through the generations.

Last week, a July 4th story in
Bloomberg Opinion called "Green-Energy
Companies Have Human-Rights Problem," by Adam Minter, discussed a new report that uncovered striking abuses in the renewables business. I'm quoting from this now, the report from the Business and Human Rights Resource Center, a London-based group that promotes human rights in the corporate world, spoke of at least 197 allegations of human rights abuses that have been leveled against renewable energy projects in recent years, including land grab, dangerous working conditions, and even killings.

> Meanwhile, many of the world's
largest publicly held solar and wind companies are failing to meet wildly accepted human rights benchmarks.

Iberdrola is a 50 percent partner in the Vineyard Wind Project through Avangrid renewables. Iberdrola is a Spanish multinational electric utility who scored a 53 percent overall in that report of 13 core indicators developed, tried and tested by the corporate human-rights benchmark to measure a company's alignment with the United Nations' guiding principle on business and human rights.

From that report, 19
sector-specific indicators were developed to assess salience -- and I'm quoting again from the report, salient human rights -- excuse me, human-right risks relevant to the renewable energy industry, including indigenous peoples' rights, labor rights, and land rights based on the international standards such as the ILO core conventions and OECD guidelines.

The results of the benchmark
suggest that none of the companies analyzed
are currently fully meeting the responsibility to respect human rights as defined by the UN guiding principles.

Now additionally, and this is my
own numbers here, $I$ would draw a score a whopping 29 percent on the renewable energy sector-specific indicators seen $D$ through $K$, which include indigenous peoples' and affected communities' rights. These indicators were used to assess, quote, companies' commitments to respect indigenous people and affected communities' rights in line with international standards and their approaches to benefits sharing. Land rights, in which allegations of abuse of land rights are among the most frequently reported abuses in the renewable energy sector, yet none of the 16 companies scored any point in those seen.

Security and high-risk context,
human rights and environmental defenders and labor health and safety in which those indicators, quote, assess companies' policies and practices to address fundamental labor rights including commitments to a living wage,
worker health and safety and closing the gender wage gap, the right to a healthy and clean environment transparency and anticorruption equality inclusion.

If we learned nothing else as a nation from the COVID-19 pandemic, it is that our domestic food supply matters. And the sustainable commercial fishing catch of the U.S. commercial fishing industry is vitally important to feed our nation. National food security matters.

It may interest those on this line to know the fish species caught within the Vineyard Wind wind energy area and the Rhode Island/Massachusetts wind energy area are not only some of the freshest and most sustainable, but are also some of the most economically attainable with a low price point by all U.S. consumers, including and especially those in the most disadvantaged communities.

The cost alone to electric consumers for this highly subsidized project has been shown to be a real concern for
environmental justice, for low-income families who cannot afford electricity at five times the average rate of power purchase agreements. While the wind subsidies are being handed out by the federal government to these foreign-owned energy and investment companies to bring double digit rates of return to their foreign country's pension funds, Americans will be forced to pay for this energy, especially, again, in the time of COVID when many Americans have lost their jobs.

It is a no-win/no-win for
Americans, especially those affected during this pandemic, and those in the most disadvantaged communities.

My comments today haven't even begun to take into account the biological consequences to fish, migratory birds and bats, and whales, of pile driving, jet piling, sedimentation, scour, the real possibility of sediment, and the actual littering of the motion floor with hundreds of wind turbines, thousands of miles of transmission cables, and then throwing electric current through the
cables and sets them spinning.
We do not support moving forward with this project at this time. We believe a five-year moratorium should be put in place to allow for thorough scientific studies by the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Northeast Fishery Science Center.

Climate change does not mean ready, shoot, aim. Climate change doesn't translate to mean destroying giant swaths of the ocean environment in order to save it. We, as a nation, should not rush through this process because of a desire, as one speaker previously said, to maintain the stability of a wind company, a foreign government-owned energy company, when this process could destroy our ability to feed our country and destroy the food production of the ocean itself for all of its citizens.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Can you please spell your name, please. I don't believe I caught that at the beginning.

BONNIE BRADY: Sure. Bonnie,
$B-o-n-n-i-e, ~ B r a d y, B-r-a-d-y, ~ l i k e ~ B u n c h$.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. Thank you so much. All right. Now we've got Seth, then Ron,

Tom, Marybeth and Luke. And I believe we've got about a dozen more speakers, so if you haven't had a chance to press Star 1, put yourself in the queue, please do so now. Continue to use the $Q \& A$ box for questions that we'll address after the public comments. And the chat box if you have any technical issues.

So with that, $I$ will turn it over to Seth.

SETH KAPLAN: Good evening. My name is Seth Kaplan, $S-e-t-h \quad K-a-p-l-a-n$.

In my day job, I am the Director of Permitting and Development for Mayflower Wind, although I'm speaking today in my personal capacity harkening back to my 16 years at Conservation Law Foundation, and 10 years of experience during the extensive review of the Cape Wind Project, and my service on the Federal Advisory Committee when
the Minerals Management Service was transitioning into what is now BOEM.

So during that time at
Conservation Law Foundation, I would have the opportunity to work on clean energy and climate change issues. And one of the reasons that -- that that work was so essential was the existential threat that global warming poses to fish and to the marine environment at large.

And without a healthy marine environment, there is no fishing industry. And I think that is something that needs to be laid out on the table and confronted as obvious an observation as it is.

I really wanted to just take a minute or two -- and $I$ understand how long this has all gone on, and short comments are always appreciated in these kinds of proceedings. I just wanted to take a minute or two to reflect on the history of what has occurred and what has led us here.

BOEM led an extensive process shaping the wind energy area. Consideration
was made during the design of the wind energy area of many different factors. And it was a deep and thoughtful process.

The design of the specific lease areas also reflected extensive public comment and built a firm foundation for the environmental review of the individual projects.

BOEM fostered dialogue, conversation, which led to the process that brought the developers together to agree to the one-by-one grid that underpins the design of Vineyard Wind that should move forward at this point.

Here's the bottom line: The NEPA process, however long and painful it has been, did what it was supposed to do. It has narrowed the issues.

The issue that has emerged through the process is the question of the impact on the human environment, specifically navigation, and even more specifically, the impact on navigation regarding fishing.

That issue has been addressed by
the most expert of those agencies, the United States Coast Guard. And BOEM is legally obligated and, I believe, you know, inclined because they listen to the best evidence, to follow the guidance of that expert state -that expert federal agency, the United States Coast Guard.

The issues have been raised, the issues have been discussed, the issues have been resolved. The process has been extensive. A hard look has been taken at the issues that have been raised, and it is time to bring the process to a conclusion to move forward with Vineyard Wind and to move forward with the development of this important new industry.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you.
Next, we have Ron, Tom, Marybeth, Luke, and
Camilla. So Ron, can you please
state and spell your
name?
RON DAGOSTINO: Hi, my name is Ron
Dagostino; first name $R-o-n$, last name

D-a-g-o-s-t-i-n-o. I live in West Tisbury in Martha's Vineyard's, and I'm a Director on the board of Vineyard Power.

This project is a culmination of several years of exhaustive study, analysis, and public consultation. And this single project alone is going to create thousands of jobs for local residents, avoid the emission of millions of tons of carbon dioxide, and save rate payers billions of dollars.

That's just one project. A recent study indicated in the next 10
years, the offshore wind industry will eventually create more than 80,000 jobs and generate annual economic output on the order of $\$ 25$ billion.

The projects in the aggregate will make urgently needed process in addressing an existential threat, climate change.

The Coast Guard has determined that the uniform one-by-one-nautical-mile turbine layout maximizes safe navigation. This separation would be greater than that of any existing offshore wind project in the
world. It eliminates almost a third of the potential wind energy production of the area, but it is the right thing to do.

Despite this, though, the fishing industry has proposed additional transit lanes of at least four nautical miles, Alternative F.

Adding six additional transit
lanes of four nautical miles would severely constrain even further the overall clean energy production in the wind energy area. At a minimum, it would result in yet more delays and substantial cost increases to consumers. At worst, it could possibly kill wind projects.

The North Eastern United States' prime source of renewable energy is offshore wind. Every area of the country has to do their part to mitigate the risk of climate change. It has been the Northeast's responsibility to deploy offshore wind.
Adding of transit lanes would
prevent states in the Northeast from achieving their renewable energy goals. This would be
unconscionable. It would not meaningfully improve navigation or safety as the Coast Guard has indicated. In fact, they would act as funnels for traffic and actually increase risk.

I urge you to reject Alternative $F$ and select the Coast Guard recommended one-by-one-nautical-mile layout in Alternative D-2. We all must address the climate emergency.

I emphatically encourage your
approval of Alternative D-2 for this project.
Thank you for your efforts
throughout this long process, and thank you for the opportunity to make these comments.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we've got Tom, Marybeth, Luke, Camilla, and then after that, Mark and Peter. So Tom, go ahead.

TOM DAMERON: Hi. This is Tom
Dameron,
Delta-Alpha-Mike-Echo-Romeo-Oscar-November.
In an effort to not take up too
much time for everybody, I would like to echo
the comments made by Peter Himchak and Meghan Lapp in their entirety.

I represent Surfside Foods and support Option G. And we'll submit written comments to further support that position in addition to what $I$-- what $I$-- the Environmental Impact Statement and the draft and the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement were supposed to analyze the environmental impacts from the cumulative wind energy areas that are -- that are now under -under lease.

As a commercial fisherman, $I$ can tell you that in the early days of commercial fishing becoming industrialized, the world believed that the oceans held a limitless quantity of fish, and it was there for our taking. Now, of course we now know better, and the amount of fish that is harvested from U.S. waters is -- is highly regulated and highly (inaudible).

We model how much fish we're taking from the ocean, and we must abide by those models.

The environmental -- the wind
energy we know is a bedrock environmental feature that all environmental conditions in the New York Bight rely on that wind energy. There's not been any modeling to see the effects of removing that wind energy from the environment and what that will do to the New York Bight.

I support a five-year moratorium on build-out of wind energy areas in the New York Bight, and would support an analysis and modeling to see how much wind energy we can safely remove from these areas, just as we must do those analyses before we remove any other resource from the Mid Atlantic Bight.

Thank you for considering my comments.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next
we've got Marybeth, Luke, Camilla, Mark, Peter.

Marybeth?
MARYBETH TOOLEY: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Can you hear me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine. Thank you, Marybeth.
MARYBETH TOOLEY: Thank you very much. My name is Marybeth Tooley, and the last name is spelled $\mathrm{T}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{o-l-e-y}$.

I am the Government Affairs
Manager for the O'Hara Corporation. And the O'Hara Corporation is a five-generation commercial fishing company that started in Boston in 1907 and continues strong today. We operate 13 vessels on the East Coast from Virginia to the Canadian border, primarily in the scallop fishery and the herring fishery.

We also have a 50 percent interest in a joint venture company in New Bedford. That facility processes scallops, manages vessels, and employs approximately 400 people from that facility.

New Bedford has been the highest value port for seafood in the United States for well over a decade, and 80 percent of those landings are from scallops, and we are part of that community.

We also, as a multigenerational company, understand the impact of climate
change on our operations and fishery resources, and we share a lot of those concerns. In fact, we often have discussions on what's our greatest risk going forward as a commercial fishing family, and climate change is at the top in most of those conversations. We have children, we have grandchildren, and we -- our goal is to provide stability for them. Going forward, the path of a company that's healthy for them, their children, and their children's children. So that's our goal. We do think long term. We do care about climate change, and we do support renewable energy. I think here $I$ would state that the biggest concern $I$ have has been the process. The process has not been adequate for the fishing industry. I am a past member of the New England Fisheries Management Council. During my time there, I heard many presentations by BOEM to the council on keeping us up to date on what was going on, and we appreciate that.

However, during that process, my
-- I expressed my concern many, many times of the process BOEM used in reaching out to the industry. We are federally permitted vessels working in federal waters. And the state-by-state process that BOEM has developed does not work for us. I've heard -- I've heard a number of people mention parts and pieces of why that doesn't work for us.

And you know, we need a regional approach, and -- and BOEM has never been able to put together a regional approach that actually works toward the fishing industry. And it concerns me greatly when $I$ think about some of the opening statements that were made here about how important this project is, and it's going to set a precedence. And to me, that's extremely problematic. This is not the process that we want to see going forward. It's just -- it -it's actually -- it disenfranchises many, many people in the process. And I -- I can't say that more strongly than that at the moment. And we will be submitting comments on our concerns relative to that.

I appreciate the people, you know, seem to express many -- you know, here, have said that they support commercial fishing, and we should learn to coexist. But you need to give us an opportunity to do that because we do not feel like we've been heard.

As far as siting, that's one of the major concerns $I$ hear from our fisherman and others, is that they didn't talk to us, we don't know anything about that. They just say, well, here we go, and this is open for, you know, applications and bids for leasing.

We do not feel like we are
incorporated into this. We feel like we're given lip service at best. And we really -you know, if we are going to, you know, utilize the oceans for energy and create benefits for society as a whole, there's a way to do it, and we're not doing it.

So I would encourage BOEM to really restructure their whole process.

People have mentioned mitigation, and clearly, you know, if we're down off of New Jersey, you're running the cable in
through the state of New Jersey, and you're going to do a one-off mitigation plan with them? What about us? This is federal waters. Just -- this whole thing just needs to be rethought and rethought again about how to engage with fishermen.

So I -- I do want to say that I
don't feel the need to get down into a lot of details that people have already mentioned. A lot of the, you know, commercial fishermen here on this, you know, this call $I$ personally know, have a great amount of respect for, and I respect their comments and endorse them.

And again, we'll be submitting written comments, and $I$ thank you for the opportunity.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next we've got Luke, then Camilla, Mark,

Peter, John, Nicole and Carli. So Luke, go ahead.

LUKE LEFEBER: Hi, can you hear
me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: We can hear you
just fine. Thank you, Luke.

LUKE LEFEBER: Hi. My name is
Luke Lefeber; first name $L-u-k-e$, last name Lima-Echo-Foxtrot-Echo-Beta-Echo-Romeo. And I am a third generation energy consumer on Martha's Vineyard.

My great aunt and uncle came to the island in 1959 when land in Aquinnah costs $\$ 500$ an acre to enjoy the beauty of Aquinnah life.

However, they were only willing to do so with access to the comforts of modern utilities, that is an oil-fired furnace, a gasoline powered automobile, and electricity generated from coal which only became available to Aquinnah residents in the early 1950 s.

Ironically, the lifestyle my great aunt and uncle chose, like most Americans, a lifestyle indoctrinating in our society is destructive to the beauty and ecological harmony of this island sanctuary.

Fossil fuel dependency has ravaged our natural world, and will continue to do so at a pace that is unsustainable for life as we
know it. Coastal communities like those on the Vineyard are already experiencing the effects of climate change. Fish populations have inhabited these waters for generations, and are migrating further north to seek colder waters.

Additionally, we are seeing warm water fish, like Great White Sharks, more frequently off of our coast. And as the seas continue to rise, the harbors of Menemsha, Vineyard Haven, Oak Bluffs, and Edgartown will be the first to go.

The time is now to change the way we live and embrace the transition to an electric lifestyle powered by offshore wind that afford the same comforts of modern living that we are accustomed to.

More importantly, it is imperative that we secure renewable energy resources capable of meeting our current and future electricity demands.

Vineyard Wind 1, an 800-megawatt project with the potential to power over 400,000 homes across the Cape, the island, and
the Commonwealth that will essentially eliminate 1.6 billion metric tons of CO 2 emissions each year, marks the beginning of a renewable future in Massachusetts and across the country. It must not -- it must not be delayed anymore.

I fully support the Vineyard Wind
1 Project under the attachment of the supplement to the draft Environmental Impact Statement, including the
one-by-one-nautical-mile turbine layout deemed acceptable by the U.S. Coast Guard.

Vineyard Wind 1 has conducted the requisite survey and research to make sure that the project minimizes environmental impact, especially those associated with the critically endangered North Atlantic Right Whale.

$$
\text { In addition, Vineyard Wind } 1
$$

presents an unparalleled economic opportunity. Project document and maintenance will bring billions of dollars to the region and provide well-paid jobs for thousands of workers across many disciplines. Through a partnership
between Vineyard Wind and ACE Energy, the project works to guarantee that long-term operations and management positions will be filled by island residents. The proposed project also projects over $\$ 1.4$ billion in rate payer savings over the next 20 years. During a time of significant economic uncertainty, with the effects of the coronavirus expected to last for years to come, Vineyard Wind
offers much needed economic security for islanders and Massachusetts residents alike.

In specific -- in specific regard to the SEIS, BOEM claims that Vineyard Wind 1 and offshore wind development as a hole will only have minor beneficial impact. Frankly, I believe BOEM is vastly underestimating the long-term benefits of offshore wind and should consider that environmental justice communities include diverse groups whose health and wellbeing will be positively impacted by clean offshore energy development.

Vineyard Wind represents the
crucial first step in the right direction for our energy future. I urge you to approve the project in accordance with Alternative D-2 without further delay.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next
Camilla. And Camilla, are you available
to join us?
CAMILLA PRATA: Hi, can you hear me?

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

CAMILLA PRATA: All right. Good evening, everyone. Name is Camilla Prata, spelled C-a-m-i-l-l-a $P-r-a-t-a$.

I am a born-and-raised Martha's Vineyard resident and a college student at UMass Amherst.

We need more renewable energy, and we need to reduce our carbon footprint. I believe that offshore wind farms are a step in the right direction.

Vineyard Wind will be able to
create 3600 jobs for local residents over the life of the project as an industry build-out over the next few years. This is particularly important in the aftermath of the coronavirus pandemic which has resulted in high levels of unemployment.

This organization will also offset about 1.7 million tons of $C O 2$ from the atmosphere yearly. This is also important due to the ever growing issue of climate change.

Additionally, the development of offshore wind project aligns with Martha's Vineyard's goal to be a hundred percent renewable for electricity, heating, and transportation by 2040 .

This goal also aligns with
Massachusetts' target of being net zero or carbon neutral by 2050 .

Furthermore, offshore wind produces power at long-term fixed prices and produces a hedge against loss of field volatility. This is important for our region's energy generation and security.

In conclusion, I support the
development of offshore wind turbines for the numerous benefits that they bring, and I urge BOEM to allow this project to move forward without delay and to choose Alternative D-2.

Thank you so much for your time.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you.
Looking ahead, we got Mark, Peter, John,
Nicole, Carli and Carry (sic).
That's who $I$ have on the list right now. So if $I$ haven't read your name, and you want to speak today, please press Star 1 and wait to speak to the live operator. Be patient, as we are moving people into the queue.

Also, I'll note that a number of you provided comments in the $Q$ \& A box, those of you on Zoom. We will address those. And for those of you on the phone, we will read the questions and answer them, you know, orally so you'll be able to share the questions and answers.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to Mark. Mark, are you available?

MARK PHILLIPS: Can you hear me? CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine, thank you.
MARK PHILLIPS: Okay. My name is
Mark Phillips, $M-a-r-k$ P-h-i-l-l-i-p-s. And I'm probably the only person on this that's actually fishing today out here where they want to put the wind farm.

And it will have a major negative impact on me. I fish up and down the whole coast. Primarily the summer, I fish from Nantucket to New York where many of these wind farms, including the Vineyard Wind Project, are.

I derive all of my summer income now from squid fishing. And what $I$ don't see is any -- any information on what it's going to do to the squid fishery, squid dye from the low frequency vibrations from wind mills. The fish beneath our fishery in the North Sea was destroyed by the wind farms, but that's never mentioned. Nephrops are a type of lobster/shrimp, kind of in between.

I won't transit through the wind farms, period. I won't fish through the wind farms, period. It's too dangerous for me.

This morning, we had pea soup fog. We had sailboats, we had little sport boats, and they are notoriously hard to see as it is. And in a wind farm, you're not going to see them with this -- with the radar clutter.

And I listened to somebody else say something about how easy it is for the tankers and everything to transit because with a mile separation. Well, the Nantucket to Ambrose traffic lane is not one mile wide. Each traffic lane, the east lane is two miles wide, the west lane is two miles wide with a six-mile separation zone; that's 10 miles. That's a lot more than one mile. And I've seen many close calls, many. I'm -- I've been fishing for -- I've been running my own boat for over 40 years, and I've been fishing for over 50. So I'm not completely inexperienced.

These wind farms will destroy my summer fish route. People can say, that, well, $I$ can go someplace else. I don't -you're going -- you're going to kill the squid to come in shore because the squid won't go through the wind farms.

The recreational fisherman are going to blame the commercial fisherman because the fluke, the sea bass, the striped bass and all their other fish, aren't getting one of their prey, so commercial will be blamed for decreasing those fishies not coming in.

Like Bonnie said, New York was excluded from any compensation pack. My home port is Greenport, New York. So even though I fish in these areas, no thought was given to us.

Today, the wind turbines would not have turned. Zero energy from these things, that if you listen to all the other commenters, are going to save the world.

So zero energy today. Zero energy
yesterday. One study off of Virginia said they are going
to go a week, 10 days with zero energy from the summer doldrums when we need the energy the most. So wind farms are not the panacea that all these people seem to be making it out to be.

And the commenters that know more about my business than $I$ do, $I$ wish they could get on here and make a living for my crew, my families, and all the people on shore that I support. Because they don't know much. It's nice to sit in a house and say this is great.

But I've lived here. This is my home. I've lived here for $50-s o m e ~ y e a r s ~ o n ~$ the ocean. This is my home. This is where I've grown up. And I guess I don't know much. And the people that sit home, the people that sit and listen to the NGOs, and how great they are, and how great wind farm is going to be, they are not the panacea that everybody thinks they are.

Europe, the fisherman in Europe are not happy with them. They don't like them. I've talked to the fishermen in Europe. Draggers, like I am, they don't fish in the wind farm. They can't. It's a hazard.

The wind farm service vessels, they turn their radars off when they work in the radar fields because of all the interference.

So people that say it's not a problem, it's a problem.

So I'm not -- I'm a hundred percent against these wind farms. I'm a hundred percent against foreign companies coming in here and telling the fishermen to go blank themselves.

So that's just my opinion, but
like $I$ say, I've been doing this a long time.
I started in 1964 , so $I$ think I've got a little bit of experience.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you for your comments.
Peter, you're next, then John, Nicole, Carli and Carry (sic). Peter, want to go ahead?

PETER FLOURNOY: Thank you. But I do have to ask if you can hear me.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yes, a little bit louder perhaps. I can hear you, but if you can move your volume just a stitch up, that would be great. So go ahead and state and spell your name.

PETER FLOURNOY: Okay. Peter H. Flournoy, the last name is $\mathrm{F}-1-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{u}-\mathrm{r}-\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{o}-\mathrm{y}$. Is that better?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: A little bit
better. Thank you. Yep.
PETER FLOURNOY: I wanted to thank you for this opportunity to speak because I don't actually have a dog in the East Coast fight, if you want to call that a fight. But I represent the American Fishermen's Research Foundation, which is made up of albacore fishermen here on the West Coast.

One of the things about going so
far towards the end, is on the good side, you get to hear what everybody else said, so you might be able to make a couple of points there.

On the bad side, you have to keep crossing out what you wrote down to say because other people have said it. So I'll try to keep it not repetitive.

Although I must say, Mark pointed out something that $I$ was going to say, and
that is, unfortunately, many of the people who talked about with commercial fishing and fishermen are not actually very well informed. In my youth, I spent a lot of time around Long Island, Martha's Vineyard, Block Island, et cetera, fishing for large tunas. But that was a long time ago. That was in the days when you could pull up a lobster trap, stick a six-pack of beer in it, and everything was okay. Can't do that anymore. I spent 10 years with the United States State Department working to protect our 200-nautical mile exclusive, in that time, Fishing Conservation Zone; now it's called EEZ, or Exclusive Economic Zone.

Since then, I've spent about 40
years representing fishermen in internationally managed fisheries for tunas, sword fish, and other species.

> My albacore clients are concerned about climate change as much as those people who have spoken before me, and care about it with the same passion that those people have spoken with because they do understand, as
someone mentioned, that if we don't get a handle on climate change, our fisheries are going to be ruined by changing weather patterns, maybe sea level rise -- excuse me -rise, et cetera.

Some people have talked about plastic pollution and waste and overfishing. But what they don't understand is that the U.S. Government doesn't let commercial fishermen do any of those things. And yet, even though our fisheries are sustainable and clean, the fish American consumers eat is 70 to 85 percent caught by foreign fishermen and companies.

We need U.S. fishing people. Just ask those people who are living through, as we all are, COVID-19, meat, chicken and other shortages in our supermarkets. And yet, out here in California, down in our commercial dockside, we supply the local people with high protein, sustainable, fresh, American-caught seafood.

You know, one of the things that $I$
must say is that at-sea renewable energy is
not the silver bullet to solve climate change, sea level rise, et cetera. In a way, I wish it were. It would make life a lot simpler.

But it seems to me, from what I've heard, that basically what the fishermen who have spoken before me are asking for, is for a seat at the table, and for some new or renewed cooperation so that they don't lose their livelihood.

I was going to talk about the U.S. Coast Guard, quote, unquote, study, but I don't have to do that because someone else took care of that.

And as you can tell, I'm going through my notes trying to figure out what $I$ haven't crossed out yet.

Ah. There were some people who talked about the vastness of the Atlantic Ocean; you know, fishermen can fish anywhere. Well, that's not actually true. There are many areas on the East Coast, you're intimately familiar with it, because it was just a big political hoo-ha that many areas are closed because different presidents had
designated them as national monuments. That's not the extent of it. There are sanctuaries, there are marine protected areas. There are all kinds of areas that for one reason or another fishermen cannot fish in. And they are very concerned when they see large areas being taken away from them at this point. And I think they -- they should be.

> I don't have, actually, a
calculation for what it is on the West Coast for closed areas, but $I$ do know that in the EEZ, around Hawaii, because of sanctuaries, closed areas, et cetera, the Hawaiians there can only fish about 15 percent of the Exclusive Economic Zone around Hawaii.

I also am concerned by outsourcing our country's energy needs, which is pretty much what $I$ see happening, given the rapidity with which many of these companies are pushing ahead.

Haven't we learned anything from the last six months about outsourcing personal protective equipment, medicines, respirators, masks?

I am not a talker. In fact, I
wish $I$ had been one of the never-talkers to start with, but $I$ believe in cooperation not confrontation, and $I$ believe that's what all the fishermen are asking for here. Somehow, they were either at the table and got shoved aside, or they weren't at the table at all.

Yes, BOEM has done lots and lots of studies, but they haven't done studies on vibration, magnetism, electric currents, and other impacts on fisheries -- fisheries migration, fisheries spawning, fisheries habitat.

Most remaining commercial
fishermen, with some exceptions of families that have been in the business for years and worked hard and been successful, but most of the fishermen, at least here on the West Coast are small business men, and they are part of generations of families that have fished.

Small business men are the backbone of our economy, as we have seen. CHRISTINE DAVIS: Peter? Peter?

PETER FLOURNOY: Yes?

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Can I ask you to wrap it up? If you want to, we can put you at the end of the queue, but we do have a few more, and I'm cognizant of the hour that we've already reached here. So if you wouldn't mind --

PETER FLOURNOY: No, I'll wrap it up. I didn't have my stopwatch going. So to some extent, we're facing old enemies in the sense that our salmon streams were ruined by banks investing in ranching and development, and energy companies that brought in those days that the way to get energy was by building multiple dams, which actually we're tearing down now.

Now we're facing another group of
huge energy companies, their bankers. And again, the solution for our energy needs seems to be just in one place, offshore wind farms. Thank you. CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right. Next, let's go ahead with John, and then we got Nicole, Carli, Carry (sic), and Annie. So Nicole? I mean, John. Go
ahead. Sorry. John, you're next. Do we still have John? Okay. I'm not hearing -let's wait a few minutes and see if you can get John on the line.

OPERATOR: John's line is open.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. John?
John, you might be on mute, by chance? John, we're not hearing you quite yet, so --

OPERATOR: If he shows back up in the queue, I'll go ahead and add him.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. Can you bring me to Nicole, please?

OPERATOR: I can.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you.
OPERATOR: Nicole, your line is open.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Hello, Nicole.
Go ahead.
NICOLE DIPAOLO: Can you hear me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yes, we can hear you just fine. Thank you, Nicole.

NICOLE DIPAOLO: Thank you. Thank you all. I really appreciate all that you are doing at BOEM to make
these hearings happen, and it has been the longest night of comments so far, so $I$ really appreciate what all of the -- all of the technical challenges and overcoming it altogether.

So I actually tonight am going to read testimony for Hillary Bright from the BlueGreen Alliance. She was unable to make the hearing tonight but wanted her testimony to be heard.

Do you need me to spell her name?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Yeah, if you
don't mind spelling both your name and her name, that would be just great. Thank you.

NICOLE DIPAOLO: Sure thing. So
my name is Nicole, $N$-i-c-o-l-e, Dipaolo,
D-i-p-a-o-l-o. And Hillary Bright is
H-i-l-l-a-r-y Bright, B-r-i-g-h-t. That's B, like boy, like a bright star.

And she is with the BlueGreen
Alliance. So here is her testimony:
Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. The Vineyard Wind 1 offshore wind project is a demonstrable example of the
founding principles of the BlueGreen Alliance. We should not have to choose between good jobs and a clean environment. We can and must have both.

The Vineyard Wind 1 Project will alone create 33,600 jobs for local residents and potentially create tens of thousands more as the supply chain and additional projects are built out over the next several years.

This project presents a tremendous opportunity for our highly-skilled unionized work force in the manufacturing and billing trade.

Vineyard Wind pledged to sign the nation's first non demonstration offshore wind project labor agreement for Vineyard Wind 1 to ensure both fair compensation and the highest construction standards for the project.

Following through on this
commitment will set a precedent for this injury.

Offshore wind projects will be constructed by building trades, union, ensuring fair wages and consistent work for
generations of local tradesmen and women. This project is an opportunity to not only the guide -- drive the nation's clean energy future, but to create quality,
family-sustaining jobs at the same time.
The SEIS claims that if Vineyard Wind is not approved, the economic potential of the offshore wind industry will be realized by future projects. However, this claim ignores the possibility that the failure of Vineyard Wind 1 will have a chilling effect on future investments and could send the signal that the United States is not serious about offshore wind.

```
If Vineyard Wind 1 is not
```

approved, the chances this industry moves forward in the United States will be severely compromised, potentially resulting in a reduction in projects built as well as uncertainty in manufacturing supply chain investments.

Additionally, the industry has
already conceded 13,000 megawatts of capacity in over 1,000 turbine locations by
accommodating fisherman with this proposed one-by-one-nautical-mile layout.

As referenced in Alternative -- in Alternative $F$ in the SEIS, additional transit lanes would reduce capacity by another roughly 4,000 megawatts in over 300 turbine locations. This translates to an estimated 1400 turbines that will not be built. Cancellation of this project would mean thousands of fewer jobs for the skilled men and women in the region, with no additional benefits to navigation safety. In conclusion, we urge approval of Vineyard Wind 1. This is the greater renewable energy transition our economy has seen. The working men and women of the United States deserve a vision of their future that integrates economic prosperity and environmental health.

Thank you so much for your time. CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. And next we have Carli, Carry (sic), and then Annie. And at this moment, that's all I see in the queue. So if you haven't done so already, please press Star 1 to speak to the
operator and get added, if you want to provide comments tonight. And then after this, we will be going to the $Q \& A$ session. So I appreciate everybody's patience tonight, and patience for each other, and patience as we go on this process.

So with that, I'll turn it over to
Carli. And then Carry (sic) and Annie.
So Carli, are you available?
CARLI BRENNER: Hi, can you hear
me?
CHRISTINE DAVIS: I can hear you
just fine. Thank you.
CARLI BRENNER: My name is Carli
Brenner, spelled C-a-r-l-i B-r-e-n-n-e-r.
Thank you to BOEM for the
opportunity to speak today. I would like to voice my enthusiastic support for the Vineyard Wind offshore wind project.

As a student at Boston College
studying political science and environmental studies, I'm gaining an understanding of the dramatic and negative impacts climate change will have on our world. This is especially
concerning for the younger generations, like my own, as well as my children.

The State of Massachusetts has set goals to limit greenhouse gas emissions, and the Vineyard Wind Project is not only vital to reaching these goals, but it will also launch the industrial offshore wind industry in the U.S. which will minimize this country's polluting contributions.

I would be remiss if $I$ spoke about climate change without mentioning the national conversation happening at the moment surrounding racial justice. Communities of color and low-income communities are disproportionately faced with the negative health impacts as a result of peaker plants or power plants located nearby them.

A future with someone's health and mortality are determined simply by their economic circumstances is not a just future.

I've seen environmental racism and classism in my own backyard as children in Roxbury, Massachusetts, are diagnosed with asthma six times more often than children in

Greater Boston. This is a result of heavy automobile traffic through the area, specifically the MBTA buses.

Electrifying public transportation and personal vehicles is another vital part of mitigating climate change which goes hand in hand with the benefits of the Vineyard Wind. However, environmental injustices happen on a larger scale, too, as the southern hemisphere already begins to feel the more drastic effects of climate change, despite the facts that the northern hemisphere contains the primary polluters.

I recently spent a few months working with Oxfam, an international humanitarian NGO which fights climate related events such as flood or drought as the largest contributors -- contributor to internal displacement. My work focused on providing aid to this displaced person who faced food insecurity, property loss, and in extreme cases, are forced to permanently move.

All this goes to show that now more than ever, we need projects like Vineyard

Wind to further adjust transition to renewable energy for all.

It's clear when reading the document that BOEM's SEIS underestimates the benefits of offshore wind projects and renewable energy to the wider environmental justice community as well as the major positive impacts these projects would present.

Vineyard Wind also offers
countless benefits for local stakeholders.
The project will provide 400,000 Massachusetts homes and businesses with clean and cost effective electricity. During the first 20 years of the project alone, rate payers will save $\$ 1.4$ billion in energy costs. And in addition, community members will see 3600 new jobs created over the life of the project.

I am especially appreciative of Vineyard Wind's prioritization of organized labor and fair compensation.

Overall, this project will be beneficial for our community, our planet, and the people who share it. I'm eager to see it be approved in the coming months after years
of studies and analyses as well as recent delays.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. Next
we have Carry (sic), and then Annie. Carry (sic), are you available?

BARRY COHEN: This is Barry
calling. I think it may have been misunderstood.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. Sure. So thank you for that. And please state and spell your name. Thank you.

BARRY COHEN: So my name is Barry Cohen, $B-a-r-r-y C-o-h-e-n$. And I'm speaking on behalf of the Atlantic Capes Fisheries. We're a family-owned business. We operate a fleet of scallop boats, clam boats, we're involved in agriculture. There must be at least 120 crew and captains -- or captains and crew who make a living at sea with our company, 450 men and women working in processing wild caught -- in wild-caught fisheries.

And between our company and some
of the other representatives I've heard this evening, thousands of jobs. And when one considers the multiplier effect, the commercial fishing industry is a major contributor economically from New England down to the Mid Atlantic. I'm calling from Cape May, which is second only to New Bedford in terms of dollar value of wild harvest caught. And $I$ believe the entire industry is both concerned with and sensitive to the issues of climate change. We fully understand the threat that climate change actually does pose to the fisheries.

I don't believe our industry is anti-wind. I do believe, looking down at the process generally, that the -- the failure, and I think it has been a significant failure, is one of process.

If we look at this holistically, it should have been known, it should have been obvious. It was obvious to the commercial fisheries from the outset that our industry would be the most vulnerable and negatively impacted of the ocean users with the onset of
offshore wind. And so one would have assumed, one would have thought, one would have hoped, number one, that intra-governmental agencies would have been consulted with each other.

For example, our fisheries are federally permitted fisheries. The National Marine Fisheries Service knows virtually where every one of these federally permitted boats are fishing at any given time. And those can be actually seen on -- on photographs that look like lines of spaghetti coming out of our ports, whether it's New Bedford, whether it's Port Judith, whether it's Cape May. And -and it shows where we are fishing.

And if those are readily
available, and photographically depicted, spaghetti lines of where federally permitted fishing boats are going are actually overlaid on top of lease areas, one would immediately see the incredible conflict between these two industries.

Now, that's not to say that the wind industry and the fishing industry can't coexist, but one would tend to think that, you
know, if -- if -- if these two industries are the most conflicted, that a process would have developed that would have attempted to accommodate both of these.

And I'll give you -- Bonnie, who I don't personally know, who $I$ thought gave a very great presentation, you know, spoke about many of these issues. But -- and specifically, about the fact that mitigation. Now, we are not interested in financial mitigation. We want to earn our money by fishing. But interestingly, because there is no regional approach that has been taken to that, you have two states that have come up with compensatory mitigation plans without fishermen really being involved. And we have boats that are coming out of Cape May that are fishing along New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, you know, Maine, and these boats don't know state borders, and yet the -- between the wind industry and the separate states, the fishing industry, which is a regional fishery is literally kind of cut out of these conversations because in a sense
we were chopped by artificial lines.
In fact, $I$ would tend to think it may be, you know, a constitutional violation, taking a state-by-state approach when you're dealing with this type of intrastate industry such as the commercial fisheries.

We have the largest offshore wind area in the world, these 1400 square miles of leases. Holistic planning should have occurred in advance to minimize these impacts. So I am in favor of RODA's navigation safety corridor. I would hope that if this project is approved, it is not used as a template, and that, in fact, a vigorous process take place that actually includes the commercial fisheries, which wants to cooperate. But every time this effort is made, there is a smile, yes, we understand, and then essentially, there is very little that is truly studied and negotiated.

And so I -- it's late. I will
leave it at that. But $I$ do believe that our industry should not be characterized as being, you know, anti-green. Our industry should be
characterized as a vibrant historically rich, traditional economic driver along the East Coast with many of the people who spoke today coming from these very same communities in which we should be attempting to live with amity and with accommodation between these two industries.

And with that, I thank you. CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. All right. Next we have Annie and then John. Annie, do you want to go ahead, please?

ANNIE HAWKINS: Perfect. Can you hear me okay?

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

ANNIE HAWKINS: Great. Thank you. So my name is Annie Hawkins, and I am the Executive Director of RODA. But I would like to offer a few brief comments on behalf of myself as a private citizen, not on behalf of RODA.

So I've heard several comments tonight about the environmental justice
analysis in the SEIS. And on the other hand, I've heard tonight and consistently, in the last eight years that I've been working in this arena of fisheries and offshore wind, that the fishing industry is united in its concern about the uncertainties associated with offshore wind development and with the significant impact that they are going to bear the brunt of which is highlighted in the SEIS. So aside from my work with RODA and the natural resource science and policy, I've spent my whole life living in and working with disadvantaged minority in underrepresented communities and individuals. I've spent thousands of hours using the benefits of my education in community organizing, providing legal assistance to incarcerated victims of racial disparities in the justice system, and even representing many who are detained without charge at Guantanamo Bay.

So I take exception to accusations of apathy to low-income minority communities, which $I$ heard a few of tonight. I especially
take exception when these accusations are leveled at the same time that people are summarily ignoring the unanimous concerns of fishermen.

I won't -- encourage you all not to lose sight of the fact that on the South Coast and islands, and also along the coast, the low-income and at-risk communities are overwhelmingly employed in the seafood industry. The seafood industry has provided continuity, stability, and culture in these places for hundreds of years. I can't speak directly on behalf of those communities since I'm not living their experience, but $I$ do know that to the extent that offshore wind jobs are temporary or transitory in nature, they can never replace what those communities have built and maintained for generations.

So we really need to figure this out. And again, to repeat what each fishing expert
who had spoken tonight has voiced, most of them are very concerned about climate change and the environment, but they have also
unanimously said they are concerned about the economics and environmental -- economic and environmental uncertainty. And the SEIS with it's facts-based analysis also reflects that. So over and over again, I've heard everyone who is not a fisherman saying that these concerns have been addressed. And I just want to put these wonderful intentions that I hear voiced towards -- towards justice and equity toward a genuine effort to hear what these communities are saying on their own behalf and to afford equity to those voices as well.

Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Thank you. John is going to be next, and he is what $I$ have as our last speaker. So I'm going to make this call and one more call for anyone that likes to provide comment tonight, please press Star 1, be patient to speak to the live operator. And we'll go from there.
So with that, I'll turn it over to

John.
JOHN HARAN: John Haran, J-o-h-n

H-a-r-a-n, Northeast Fisheries Sector 13.
I've been attending meetings on behalf of fishermen for six, seven years on this issue, the wind farm issue. And I've asked one question repeatedly, and I get no answer, and the question is decommissioning. There is no set plan for the decommissioning of these wind farms, and yet the social justice people, the environmentalist, the climate change people sit idle.

Should this type of development be on land, be a solar farm or a wind farm, there are decommissioning plans that are bonded in place before they start construction. Yet nothing like this is in place for this type of project. What they are basically going to do is they are going to liter the ocean with the worn-out turbines in
to 30 years. Thank you.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you. We'll give it one last call for speakers.

And while we wait just a minute in case anyone is trying to press Star 1 now, I
want to remind folks that we've been taking questions and using the $Q$ \& $A$ box, and we'll be getting to that in just a moment. And looking forward to listening to some of the subject matter experts address things that have been in that $Q$ \& $A$ box and also stated during the meeting.

You can also go to the BOEM
website and to the Vineyard Wind virtual meeting room to see a number of pieces of information that might answer questions as well.

So with that, I'm just going to do a quick check with the operator. Do we have anyone else queued up to speak?

OPERATOR: At this time, I am
showing no one is queued up.
CHRISTINE DAVIS: Okay. So with
that, $I$ will officially close the public testimony for the fifth and final session of the public comment period at, let's see, 9:21 p.m. Eastern Time.

All right. So let's move on to
the question-and-answer period, and if we can
move to the next slide please.
Two-way communication is very much a priority for BOEM, and so we're going to answer questions at this time. We're going to start answering the questions that everyone has already submitted. But if you would like to add some more in the next
to 20 minutes or so, please do so by -- if you're on Zoom, go into the $Q$ \& $A$ box.

Several people are on the phone, too, so we encourage you to stay with us, and we'll be reading the questions and orally providing those answers.

We've had several people been with us tonight that are dedicated to watching that Q \& A box and preparing answers to the questions. But additionally, I would also encourage you to visit the Frequently Asked Questions on the virtual meeting web page that I mentioned just a few minutes ago.

So with that, at this time, I'm going to turn it over to Isis Farmer with BOEM to answer questions and open the meeting up to
further questions.
As a reminder, please use that Zoom $Q$ \& A function to submit them.
With that, Isis, I turn it over to
you.
ISIS FARMER: Thank you for that introduction, Christine. And thank you to everyone for hanging in with us. I know it's been a long evening. And so we thank you for -- for still being here and listening to us as we enter into this $Q$ \& $A$ session.

My name is Isis Farmer, and I'm an environmental coordinator with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management's office of renewable energy programs, and I'm also one of the co-leads for the Vineyard Wind Supplemental EIS.

And so we have several questions that have been submitted throughout our meeting, and so I'm going to start off by -by reading off some of the general questions that we received and providing those answers verbally.

Don't worry if you don't see the
answers to the -- or the questions right away. You'll see the questions start to pop up as we answer them verbally.

So the first question that we got
was: Where can we access the court reporter's transcripts -- transcript that are part of the public record?

So once the transcripts become available, we will post the transcripts to regulations.gov. And in addition, the recording for BOEM's public -- virtual public meeting from June 26 th is now available on the virtual meeting room web page. And the other recordings for those other meetings will be posted as well as soon as they become available.

The next question asks: Can BOEM provide a count of the total number of participants who attended the five Vineyard Wind BOEM virtual public hearings, and if possible, the number of online commenters.

So the virtual public meetings have been very well attended thus far. The numbers have actually been higher than what we
typically get with our in-person meetings. The number of total attendees at each meeting have ranged from approximately 150 attendees to just under 300 participants.

About 15 to over 30 verbal
comments have been provided at each previous meeting. This evening, I think we had close to 50. So quite a bit of participation this evening.

And over 40 comments have been received. So -- at tonight's meeting, as I just said.

So BOEM will continue to accept comments throughout the public comment period which ends July $27 t h$. And we've received about 140 comments through regulations.gov to date.

And our next question is about why sections of the COP volumes, which are referenced in Supplemental EIS, are redacted.

So certain portions of the Construction and Operations Plan, such as the marine archeological resources assessment report, contains sensitive information
relating to the locations of archeological sites and indigenous tribal and traditional cultural properties. And so making that information public could increase the risk of looting or damage and destruction of those places that the Department of the Interior is charged with protecting under Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

So the information is, however, being made available to consulting parties participating in our Section 106 review. And we provide summaries of those information, you know, where applicable in the Supplemental EIS.

Other portions of the COPs that are not made publicly available include proprietary or confidential business information, which includes wind resource data, meta ocean data, and geophysical and geotechnical data.

And for our next set of questions, I'm going to ask for Jim Bennett, our program manager, to turn on his camera and unmute his line.

JIM BENNETT: Okay.
ISIS FARMER: Thanks, Jim. And I'm going to read off a couple of questions for you.

So the first question $I$ have for you is: During -- during meetings between the commercial fishing industry and wind energy developers, who breaks the tie? For example, industry wants two-nautical-mile spacing between turbines, and wind developers want one-nautical-mile, how is this decided?

JIM BENNETT: Thank you, Isis.
Again, I'm Jim Bennett. I'm the program manager for renewables. And thank you for the question.

It goes right to the heart of our decision-making process.

I want to assure you that all
input will be considered in our analysis. And this analysis that we're doing through the need for process and other processes will help the Department of the Interior and BOEM meet our goal of getting this right.

The decision-making authority for
approval or disapproval or approval with modifications of the Construction and Operation Plans submitted by Vineyard Wind ultimately rests with the Department of the Interior. However, that decision-making is not done in a vacuum.

Our task here at BOEM is to ensure that the decision is well informed, and that is indeed one of the reasons why we're gathered virtually here today. Our -- we do feel that we have the best available information, and that the decision-maker is available to take into account stakeholder input, analysis in the EIS, available data, consultation with other agencies, such as the U.S. Coast Guard, or NOAA, and of course the state. We remain committed to putting that information together to ensure an informed decision, and permitted to -- a permitting process that minimizes user conflicts and establishes a strong foundation for wind projects moving forward.

ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Jim. So
the next question $I$ have for you, is West

Coast projects appear to be rapidly developing with no real participation from fishermen. With the development schedule, there appears to be no time for research specific to the West Coast where floating wind turbines will be used.

JIM BENNETT: Well, thank you for the question. It's an excellent point. I'd like to first note, from a program standpoint, the renewable energy development on the pacific -- in the pacific is at a much earlier change in BOEM's process compared to the Atlantic.

The pacific is in the process of identifying areas appropriate for leasing, and there are currently no leases issued.

Planning for offshore wind has
been on -- has been ongoing in Hawaii and
California, and it's in preliminary discussions in Oregon.

So while some of the information from the East Coast and globally can be useful, indeed a lot of West Coast information is essential. And for this reason,
stakeholder meetings have been taking place for several years on the West Coast, including meetings focused on learning more about commercial and recreational fishing data needs.

BOEM is continuing to work with the State of California to collecting shared respective data, and these efforts will continue throughout the planning and leasing process.

But in addition to research, BOEM specifically, it has in the past and continues to fund a number of scientific studies aimed at better understanding fish and fishing. I would note that this is true of all activities on the Outer Continental Shelf that we work with during the environmental studies program.

These renewable energy studies, among many others, can be found on the BOEM website including potential impacts to commercial fish species, our subsea transmission tables, and electromagnetic field, habitat characterization studies, and potential economic impacts from offshore wind
development.
At start, much more work and
research is anticipated in the years ahead for activities on the West Coast.

ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Jim. And so next we had a couple of NEPA or
process questions, and so $I$ would like for Jenn Bucatari to turn on her camera and unmute her line.

JENNIFER BUCATARI: Hey.
ISIS FARMER: Hey, Jenn, thank you. So the questions $I$ have for you, the first
question is: When stake -- when will stakeholders know more about mitigation solutions given the identification of major impacts to fisheries, navigation, and research surveys? The question also mentions concerns about NOAA or NMFS surveys.

JENNIFER BUCATARI: Okay. Great,
thank you. So BOEM decides these case --
these issues on
a case-by-case basis balancing
multiple site-specific factors and
considerations and reserves the right to impose restrictions on development or require specific mitigation measures if necessary.

As Jim Bennett stated in his opening remark, BOEM's objective is to ensure that offshore wind, commercial fishing, and other uses of the ocean can all be pursued successfully together.

This does not mean that there won't be any impacts. There will be, but our goal is that all users can successfully coexist.

The National Marine Fisheries Service, or NMFS, would require additional resources to evaluate options and to design and implement survey adaptations to account for the offshore wind facilities in their survey study areas.

These impacts may begin to occur over the next 10 years and would increase as the projects were constructed assuming that all the projects are approved and built on schedule.

So BOEM has been working with NMFS
to ensure that the impacts to their research, the scientific surveys, were appropriately analyzed in the SEIS and is committed to working with NMFS -- we're committed to keep working with NMFS towards a long-term solution to account for changes in survey methodology as a result of the wind farm structure.

To that end, BOEM is funding a study -- will be funding a study with NMFS this year to investigate some of these issues.

If you would like to see some more
information, Appendix $D$ of the draft EIS outlines the mitigation and monitoring that could be required for the project, and the final EIS will include more detailed discussion of the mitigation and monitoring measures that are determined to be needed.

ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Jenn.
And the next question is a question asking
for clarity on Vineyard Wind's
landfall location, specifically where Vineyard Wind is pursuing Alternative D, the Covell Beach landfall, and not Alternative A, the proposed action which includes the New

Hampshire Avenue landfall.
JENNIFER BUCATARI: So Vineyard Wind has specified to BOEM that they are no longer pursuing the New Hampshire Avenue landfall location. So the Covell Beach landfall location, which is described in Alternative $B$-- B, as in boy -- in the draft EIS and the Supplemental EIS is Vineyard Wind's preferred option.

ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Jenn. So for our next questions, we have a couple
of questions about commercial fishing. And so can $I$ have Ursula Howson turn on her camera and unmute her phone?

URSULA HOWSON: Hi, Isis. Can you hear me okay?

ISIS FARMER: I can hear you great. So the first question that we have for you on
commercial fishing has -- it's multiple parts. So I'm going to try to break it out into sort of two pieces.

So the first part of the question is: How do fishermen and processors have
their voices heard? Who represents their concerns?

URSULA HOWSON: Okay. Thank you, Isis. First of all, my name is Ursula Howson, and I
am a fishery rep for BOEM.
Fishing is of important use to the Exclusive Economic Zone that BOEM must consider in its decision-making; therefore, BOEM regularly engages with commercial and recreational fishermen to understand their concerns from both a biological and a socioeconomic impact perspective. This has been accomplished through focused engagement with regional fishery management councils, participation at statewide fishery advisory group meetings, and the convening of the national academy fisheries steering committee. BOEM incorporates fishing industry recommendations into the leasing process by issuing guidelines to leaseholders, by including lease stipulations to develop and implement $a$ fisheries communication plan, by developing a fishery industry web page, and by
working closely with state partners to address regional fisheries monitored and associated with potential impact of offshore wind development.

In addition, during the SEIS comment period, BOEM continues to reach out to the fishing community to ensure the scope and the content of the SEIS is understood, the commenting procedures are clear, and to determine if additional engagement is needed.

Next week, BOEM will participate
in a virtual town hall hosted by the Responsible Offshore Development Alliance, or RODA. This town hall will bring together RODA members and other commercial fishermen for additional discussion of the SEIS.

ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Ursula. And for the second part of that question, how does BOEM apply our fisheries data on both fishing grounds and from fisheries who have decades of fishing data? Is BOEM considering the impacts of the cost and productivity on the fishing community and seafood and food security?

URSULA HOWSON: I'll answer that question. Regarding where -- fisheries data sources, we
use the best available data
throughout the fisheries both spatially and temporally for our analyses. We also rely on published information on current and former fishing grounds.

For example, for impact solely from the wind development area, we looked at local sources such as the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, as well as regional sources, such as the National Marine Fisheries Service.

In the SEIS, we supplemented the draft -- the draft EIS with regional cumulative analyses.

We value the total economic
benefits of the fishing and processing industry by analyzing the shoreside first point of sale value from impacted areas in order to understand the magnitude of the expense revenue in both dollars and percentages.

The percentages exposed don't appear to indicate measurable impact to seafood in reports. Sections 3.11.1.1 and 3.11.2.1 of the SEIS address the impacts of future offshore wind activities, and the cumulative impacts of a proposed action on commercial fisheries and for-hire recreational fisheries.

For the value of commercial fisheries, Appendix $B$ includes Table 3.11-2, and that shows the value and volume of commercial fishery findings by port for 2016 through 2018.

Table 3.11-3, which shows the average annual percentage of total Mid Atlantic and New England fishery revenue exposed to offshore wind energy development by a fishery management plan from 2010 to 2020 .

And then Table -- Table 3.11-4, which showed the average annual revenue from all lease areas for exposed port groups from 2013 through 2018 .

ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Ursula. So the next question is: Why was fishery
data previously unavailable, and where did the new data come from in the Supplemental EIS?

URSULA HOWSON: Thanks, Isis. Not all of the fisheries data presented in
the SEIS are entirely new.
There's a monitoring system, or $B$ and $F$ data, were included in the draft EIS. But the focus is they don't know location and the intensity of effort.

However, as a result of the public comments on the draft EIS regarding layout, new data fields were included in the SEIS to show vessel direction. These data allow for frequentation of polar histograms that helps explain the direction of travel in the wind development area and beyond.

These polar histograms show how the orientation of vessels transiting and fishing within the Southern New England lease area should vary by activity, by fishery, and by area. They could be found in Appendix B, Figures 3.11-1 through 3.11-6.

Previously, BOEM did not have
access to that data field and vessel -- at the vessel level information because it was protected under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

So we had to work closely with the National Marine Fisheries Service to access and analyze that information.

ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Ursula. And so the last question that $I$ have for you
is whether it's possible to pull a hydraulic sea clam dredge or a tow net through -- in between a wind turbine generator a mile -- that are spaced a mile apart. And I'm assuming they mean one nautical mile apart.

URSULA HOWSON: Thanks, Isis.
BOEM believes it is possible to tow a net or
a dredge through a wind energy area. However, our analysis relies on the testimony of fishermen that the risks posed by the offshore wind facilities may preclude some fishing methods, fishing under certain conditions.

Ultimately fishing in a wind
facility is going to be the decision of the
fishing vessel operator. Impact to structures or mobile tending gear such as dredges, and such as trawls are analyzed in the SEIS in Sections 3.11-- 3.11.1.1, and 3.11.2.1, and in Appendix $B$ in Table 3.11-1.

ISIS FARMER: And thank you,
Ursula. And so I think we're just -- maybe we just
need to pause for a moment to see if we get any additional questions.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: As we -- oh,
yeah, I was going to say, as we wait, just a reminder that you can submit comments and questions in writing to BOEM, and also online at regulations.gov. So $I$ just wanted to point that out as we wait for the final questions to come in.

I just want to thank everybody for joining us today and the previous days. It's been a pleasure and a privilege to be with everyone. I thank BOEM and my colleagues.

And more importantly thanks to those in the public that have participated in this process and have provided comments and asked
questions.
So Isis, I think you have one more question. And you know, we'll give it just a few more minutes. It is quite late, but if you want to put a question in the $Q$ \& $A$ box, we will be wrapping this up very shortly. ISIS FARMER: So we got two more questions. And so I'll take the first. And one --
the -- one of the questions we received is: Is the town hall open next -- is the town hall next week open to the public?
And so I -- I'm assuming -- I
guess I initially thought this question was referring to additional virtual public meetings, and, you know, today is our last one. But $I$ would mention that our virtual meeting room web page will be open throughout the $45-d a y$ public comment period, which again closes on July 27th. So I'll mention that. And that information, which includes prerecorded presentations and posters, will be available -- will be available on our website throughout the public comment period through

July 27th.
And so the town hall that $I$ think was mentioned might be referring to the RODA town hall meeting. And so for that question, as well as our last question, I'm going to turn things back over to Ursula Howson. And so I'm just going to give her a minute to get her -- her camera turned back on as well as her line unmuted.

URSULA HOWSON: Okay, Isis. So, yeah, I apologize, what was the -- we were addressing the one question that came in, is that the one?

ISIS FARMER: That's correct. And actually, it's -- if you don't mind, I'm going to -- you know, back to one previous question that we got specifically about fishing landings.

So one question that also came in was about how we measure commercial fishing landings.

So specifically, it asks when we account for the amount of a tow that takes place within a wind energy area, or $I$ guess in
this case, within the Vineyard Wind development area, but we do not include the overall value of the tow, if it was started outside of that area.

So Ursula, would you mind
providing us with some clarification on that?
URSULA HOWSON: Sure. Yes, that
is a good comment, and we will
consider that for the SEIS. There
is data available that is based on VMS
point data in dealer reports. If
any point from that trip fell into a wind development area, it was counted as a trip. The DEIS, specifically, Table
3.4.5-7A use weighting. So the more of the trip in the wind development area, the heavier the weight is; and the less in the wind development area, the less weight that trip has to the overall analysis.

ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Ursula.
And so with respect to the -- I guess the
last part of the question, where we were going to go back to the question about the town hall meeting that's being hosted by
the Responsible Offshore Development Alliance, do we know if that meeting is open to the public?

URSULA HOWSON: If you could just bear with us for one minute. We believe that the town hall is open to the public, but people do have to register -- yes, that has been confirmed. And if we could get the website, or the URL for it, that would be helpful, if you will. Just stand by.

The link is on RODA's website for registration. And I believe it's RODA.org -excuse me, RODAfisheries.org. So it is https://RODAfisheries.org/events/. And let me spell that out for you.

Again,
https://RODAfisheries.org/events/. And I believe someone will put it in the chat. And I just state that for everyone on the phone. Again, that was RODAfisheries.org/events/.

And the town hall is open to the public, and you may register through that website.

ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Ursula. And so we're getting a couple of messages
through the chat, so if we wouldn't mind just pausing here for a moment to make sure that we have all the questions answered.

URSULA HOWSON: I believe I may
need to repeat the answer for the last fisheries related question. Can someone confirm that?

ISIS FARMER: Yeah, I think I'm going to -- yes, I'm going to confirm that for you Ursula.

So that question was about when we are looking at tow information. Let me go back under our answered questions so that $I$ can make sure that I'm reading the question accurately for tow information.

Yeah, so the question was: When you measure commercial fishing landings, don't you take into account the amount of the tow that takes place in the wind energy area? And again, in this case, we're talking about the Vineyard Wind 1 development area. And do not include the overall value of the tow if it started outside of that area.

So would you mind giving us the
answer to that question again? The person who submitted that question lost audio and so wasn't able to hear the response.

URSULA HOWSON: Okay. Are we confirmed that she's back on? Hopefully?

ISIS FARMER: Yep, yep. She just put in the chat saying she's back on the line. Yep.

URSULA HOWSON: Great. So the comment was that we believe that it is
a good comment, and we will consider it for the SEIS.

There are data available that are based on VMS data -- VMS point data, and VMS, again, that's a motoring system, point data that link dealer reports. If any point from a trip for this data set fell into a wind development area, that it was counted as a trip. The DEIS, specifically Table 3.4.5-7A, uses weighting. So that more of the trip in the wind development area -- the more of the trip in the wind development area, the heavier the weight; and the less of the trip in the wind development area, the less weight that
trip has to the overall analysis.
But again, we will consider that in the SEIS. There's simply not enough time this evening to address that in a lot of detail, but -- but it will be in the SEIS. ISIS FARMER: Thank you, Ursula. And $I$ just wanted to, again, say, you know, thank you for everyone who's submitted questions and also provided us with comments this evening. You know, we appreciated that you waited until the end to have your questions answered. We just wanted to make sure that given that it was our last virtual meeting, that we gave everyone the amount of time necessary to be able to make sure that they were able to provide their comments on the record. So we thank you for your patience.

And with that, I'm going to turn it back over to Christine.

CHRISTINE DAVIS: All right.
Thank you, Isis.
And thank you, everyone, for being with us the last few days and tonight as we --
as we go late into the evening.
I wanted to mention a couple of things. You know, the public comment period is still open until July 27th, and there are opportunities to provide comments in writing and online.

Also, the meetings have been recorded, and as Isis mentioned earlier, the first meeting has already been posted. The other meetings will be posted as they are available. So if you want to go back and listen to parts of it, you can go back and do so.

I think that's what $I$ have for comments. I really do appreciate everybody who has
provided comments, the folks that have answered the questions, and everybody that has participated in this process. So I wanted to say thank you so much. It's been a real pleasure and honor to work with everyone.

And stay safe and be well. I'll turn it over to Jim now for final remarks from BOEM.

JIM BENNETT: All right. Thank you, Christine. To close, I just want to say thank you to the team, to Isis, here at BOEM, with ERM, who denote that they made a best of a -- of the situation.

We've had some effective
communication here in this virtual
environment, and again, thanks to all of you for your patience and participation in this process, and for Massachusetts officials who joined us as well.

I want to repeat, BOEM oversees the expeditious and orderly development of energy and available resources on the Outer Continental Shelf with environmental safeguards. That is our responsibility. And your input is critical. And we at BOEM remain committed to working with all of you to ensure the success of offshore activities, protecting our oceans and coasts and the communities that depend upon them while still allowing the United States to remain a global energy leader and innovator.

So one final thought, again, as a
reminder, the public comment period is open until July $27 t h$, and there are a number of ways that you can participate in that process as it is displayed on your screen.

So thank you again and $I$ hope
everyone stays well. Bye now.

OPERATOR: This concludes today's conference, you may disconnect at this time. (The meeting was adjourned at 9:44
p.m.)
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