



MEETING 6: CONCEPTUAL PORT ALTERNATIVES AND FINAL COMMENTS

Monday, June 26, 2023 – 9am-3:30pm
DOT Headquarters, Main Conference Room
24 Child Street, Augusta

Advisory Group Members and the public were offered the option to participate remotely.

Objective: To provide updates on the preliminary port alternatives and their potential impacts; review the alternatives evaluation matrix; and receive Advisory Group comments.

MEETING MATERIALS

- OSW Port Alternatives Drawings_v1 dated June 12, 2023
- OSWPAC Presentation 6_6.23.23
- Final Alternatives Evaluation Matrix Key Points Memo dated June 15, 2023
- Alternatives Evaluation Matrix dated June 15, 2023

MEETING TAKEAWAYS

Report from Meetings with Federal and State Regulatory and Resource Agencies

1. Agencies suggested modifications to the alternatives in Searsport that would result in less in-water work: an alternative completely on Mack Point with less in-water work, and an alternative on Sears Island that reduces in-water fill by bridging the uplands to the heavy lift wharf and placing the quay closer to upland area, which would require more dredging.
2. A lot of discussion will be needed to identify the lead federal agency and it will take time.
3. Although the Maritime Administration thought it would be the lead federal agency if the State's Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP) Grant is approved (decision expected this fall), the Maritime Administration insisted on no communication until the grants awards are announced.
4. Agencies understand how the State came to focus its attention at Searsport and Eastport. Concerning the 22 other sites considered across the state, they suggested the State consider a few sites further to tighten up the documentation for the alternatives analysis.
5. The Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry's Submerged Lands Program and a couple of other agencies noted it will be difficult to permit the placement of large amounts of fill into the ocean. At both Mack Point and Sears Island, it was suggested the State consider reducing the size of the quay and increasing the amount of area used on land to reduce impacts to the ocean. It was recognized reducing the size of the quay increases the amount of dredging needed to achieve a 35-foot depth at the berth.

Updates to Conceptual Alternatives and Preliminary Impact Results

6. The availability of a wet storage area for completed foundations to await WTG integration may require only one integration berth, not two. A wet storage area could be up to mile offshore.
7. At all locations, side slopes were added to the quay (the infill area).
8. For the Mack Point alternative:



- a. The availability of a wet storage area for completed foundations to await WTG integration may require only one integration berth, not two. A wet storage area could be up to a mile offshore.
 - b. A 50-year land lease (from Sprague Energy to the State) was estimated and added as a cost to the Mack Point alternative. There was extensive discussion about whether this was a capital cost or an operation cost that would be passed to the OSW developer through a port tariff (fees).
 - c. Dredge quantity can be reduced by about half by relocating the liquid dock to the dry cargo pier, reconfiguring the wharf from a linear to an L-shaped configuration, and shifting the footprint of wind port activities eastward.
9. In the Mack Point-Sears Island Hybrid alternative, the footprint of wind port activities is also shifted eastward. The associated dredge required is less than the Mack Point alternative.

Advisory Group Comments

10. All Advisory Group members at the meeting offered final comments on behalf of themselves or their groups or associations. Many Advisory Group members offered a preferred location for the OSW port and the reasons it was preferred over other alternative locations.
11. Written comments were submitted by Steve Miller on behalf of the Islesboro Islands Trust; Rolf Olsen, the Friend of Sears Island; and Matt Cannon, Sierra Club Maine. Written comments were received from three individuals from the public at or following the meeting. Written comments received are attached to this meeting summary.

NEXT STEPS

12. Moving forward, the Advisory Group will see both a summary of today's meeting and a final report of the PAG process consisting of a compendium of meeting summaries, presentations, and related items.
13. Over the next few months, the State will continue to refine the OSW port alternatives and start to prepare an EIS and permit applications.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

14. Members of the public made statements or asked about the following topics:
 - a. Preferred alternative locations.
 - b. Capital and operations expenditures.
 - c. Federal funds for brownfield remediation at Mack Point.
 - d. A new Maine Department of Marine Resources coastal eelgrass survey is due in 2024.
 - e. Long-term effects of dredging.
 - f. The need to advance the project quickly.



COMMON TERMS & ACRONYMS

- **AHTS** – Anchor handling tug supply. Specially designed to handle the large anchors that tether the floaters to the seafloor.
- **Barge** – semi-submersible barge; like a heavy lift vessel to haul ship or an OSW WTG in this case.
- **CTV** – Crew Transfer Vessel
- **Delivery Vessel** – General cargo or heavy lift vessel used to transport WTG components to the marshaling facility.
- **EIS** – Environmental Impact Statement
- **HLSS** – Heavy lift semi-submersible barge
- **LEDPA** - least environmentally damaging practicable alternative
- **NEPA** – National Environmental Policy Act (1970)
- **OSW** – offshore wind
- **PSF** – Pounds per square foot
- **PTOW** – Pine Tree Offshore Wind consortium (which is behind the Maine Research Array [MeRA])
- **Quay** (kee) – a platform constructed using concrete, stone, or metal along a riverbank or coastline to allow ships to dock parallel to the shore. (<https://www.accudock.com/blog/pier-vs-dock-whats-the-difference/#:~:text=A%20quay%20is%20a%20platform,area%20for%20boats%20to%20dock>); part of the river bank or coastline which has been modified so ships can dock at it parallel to the shore; a quay has a solid infilled surface between the land and the quay (<http://www.theshippinglawblog.com/2011/10/what-is-difference-between-quay-pier.html>).
- **SOV** - Service Operation Vessel provide routine repair and maintenance to OSW WTG
 - OSV – offshore vessel; broad term for vessels supporting exploration and production of offshore mineral and energy resources (as stated, but not listed in the presentation)
- **SPMT** – self-propelled modular transport (for equipment).
- **WTG** – Wind turbine generator
- **WTIV** – Wind Turbine Installation Vessel are typically for fixed bottom OSW WTG.

See slide 10 of the July 7, 2022, Operations Overview presentation for a graphic from Crowley (Florida-based tug and barge company) depicting many of the vessels described above.



ATTENDANCE

ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS

Beth Ahearn, Maine Conservation Voters,
Co-Chair
James Gillway, Town of Searsport, Co-Chair
Matt Cannon, Sierra Club Maine
Joshua Conover, Islesboro Marine Enterprises
(absent)
Habib Dagher, Ph.D., P.E., University of Maine
College of Engineering
Dennis Damon, Maine Port Authority
Eliza Donoghue, Maine Audubon
Francis Eanes, Maine Labor Climate Council
David Gelinias, Capt., Penobscot Bay & River Pilots
Association
James Guerrette, Citizen, Town of Searsport
Jessie Gunther, Retired Judge, Public At-Large
Member
Ben Lucas, Maine Chamber of Commerce
(absent)
Sean Mahoney, Conservation Law Foundation
Matt Marks, Associated General Contractors of
Maine (absent)
Paul Mercer, Consultant to Governor's Office
(absent)
Steve Miller, Islesboro Islands Trust
Rolf Olsen, Friends of Sears Island
Mac Smith, Town of Stockton Springs (absent)
Jim Therriault, Sprague Energy

MAINEDOT PERSONNEL & CONSULTANTS

Bruce Van Note, MaineDOT
Matt Burns, Maine Port Authority
Nate Benoit, MaineDOT
Nate Moulton, MaineDOT

Kristen Chamberlain, MaineDOT
Paul Merrill, MaineDOT
Kay Rand, Consultant
Bill Plumpton, Gannett Fleming, Inc.
Adam Archual, Gannett Fleming, Inc.
Julia Roblyer, Gannett Fleming, Inc.

PUBLIC

Ella Allan-Rahill
Becky Bartovics
Greg Biddinger
Amy Browne
Murray Carpenter
Celeste Cary
John Cropley
Kerry Dougherty
Anita Herrick
David Italiaander
Andrew Johnson
Daniel Kennedy
Alessandra Martinelli
David Perkins
Emily Pontecorvo
Mary Richards
Spencer Roberts
Zach Schmesser
Laurie Schweikert
Sue Stafford
Jim Tankersley
Phelps Turner
Susan White
Janet Williams
Scott – last name unknown



AGENDA

1. WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Bill Plumpton, Gannett Fleming, Inc., welcomed Advisory Group members, MaineDOT representatives, and the public to the meeting.

- Bill noted today was the last meeting of the Advisory Group. He said a summary of the meeting would be prepared as well as a final report summarizing the six meetings of the group.
- Bill restated the Advisory Group's role: to help strengthen the public's understanding of the study, the planning process, and the regulatory framework for project development and which decisions need to be based; to provide advice and share information with the State regarding the OSW port alternative locations and alternatives under consideration; and to share the State's progress with member's organizations and constituents.
- He reminded the Advisory Group that developing alternatives is an iterative process and noted it will take time to develop the alternatives to the point where they can be evaluated in great detail. Even though the port alternatives have come a long way, much work remains to be done. And while today is the final meeting of the Advisory Group, there will be many more opportunities for public involvement and the sharing of ideas and comments and feedback in the years ahead.
- He asked co-chairs Beth Ahearn and James Gillway to reach out to the State if they think the State should be doing something more as it transitions to the process of complying with NEPA and the preparation of permit applications.
- He reminded the Advisory Group that their single of point of contact for information is Kay Rand.

2. REPORT FROM MEETINGS WITH FEDERAL AND STATE REGULATORY AND RESOURCE AGENCIES

Bill noted, since the last PAG meeting on March 29, the State met twice with federal and state agencies to introduce the OSW port project. While the State has had a couple of one-on-one conversations with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for guidance regarding a future permit application, these were the first two meetings held with agencies.

The agencies invited to attend the meetings were agencies that are known to have direct or indirect jurisdiction by law. While the lead and coordinating agencies have not been identified, these agencies will review or comment on the permit applications and review and comment on the EIS. These agencies were: U.S. EPA, Maritime Administration, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard, National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Highway Administration, Maine Historic Preservation Commission, Department of Marine Resources, Department of Environmental Protection, Department Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry's Maine Natural Areas Program and Submerged Lands Program.

The first meeting was held on April 26. The purposes of the meeting were to: introduce the OSW port project, explain why the OSW port is needed, introduce what an OSW port may look like and how it may operate, discuss the project timeline and next steps, seek feedback from agencies relative to potential significant impacts and lead federal agency determination, and initiate coordination and communication for the sharing of information.



The discussion consisted of information that has been shared at previous PAG meetings. It specifically consisted of an overview of the project, its purpose and why it is needed, design criteria and OSW port characteristics, the four alternatives under consideration in the towns of Searsport and Eastport, and next steps to define agency roles and responsibilities.

The takeaways from the meeting were:

- EPA representatives expressed a strong desire to be included in project planning moving forward as a Cooperating Agency under NEPA.
- No comments were received on the project's purpose or need.
- While there were few remarks were offered about the potential impacts to individual resources or features at this early stage, there was recognition that the potential for significant impacts exists, and extensive studies still need to be performed.
- Agencies asked for available information to help them become better informed. Specifically, agencies requested all information and analysis relative to the identification and winnowing of alternatives available to date, which was the subject of the second meeting.
- Agencies suggested some modifications to the alternatives in Searsport that would have less in-water work:
 - an alternative at Mack point incorporating less in-water work
 - an alternative on Sears Island that reduces in-water fill by bridging the uplands to the heavy lift wharf and using more dredge to bring the quay closer to upland area.
- A lot of discussion will be needed to identify the lead federal agency and it will take time.
- Although the Maritime Administration thought it would be the lead federal agency if the State's Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP) Grant is approved (decision expected this fall), the Maritime Administration insisted on no communication until the grants awards are announced.

The second meeting was held on June 14. The purposes of the meeting were to: talk about the OSW port and operations in greater detail, review the alternatives considered across the entire state and information leading the State to focus its attention on the Searsport area and Eastport, and understanding the existing operations and property ownership at Mack Point.

The discussion consisted of: the design criteria (100 acres of flat area, deep water access, unlimited air draft, 6,000 PSF pier loading area, and 1,500 feet water frontage for delivery vessels and two WTG), and port operations (staging and integration and commissioning of WTG components, foundation fabrication and delivery of materials, assembly of foundations, and loading foundations into the water, assembly/integration of WTG components, breakdown of the 100 acres by function served, and efficiency of operations, i.e., importance of minimizing movement of WTG components).

It was noted 22 other locations were considered across the entire state leading the State to focus its attention on the Searsport area and Eastport.

The meeting included a discussion of Mack Point, including the complex property ownership, property sizes, and current uses. It also included a discussion of adjusting the OWS port footprint, shifting the vessel berth to the east, what it would take to put more operations on land, and reducing the in-water work and the implications of increased dredging.

The takeaways from the meeting were:



- Agencies have a firm understanding of scale of project, design criteria, OSW port activities and operations, efficiencies needed.
- Agencies understand the OSW port is different from other ports on the East Coast and why the OSW port is larger.
- Agencies understand how the State came to focus its attention at Searsport and Eastport. Concerning the 22 other sites considered across the state, they suggested the State consider a few sites further to tighten up the documentation for the alternatives analysis.
- The Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry's Submerged Lands Program and a couple of other agencies noted it will be difficult to permit the placement of large amounts of fill into the ocean. At both Mack Point and Sears Island, it was suggested the State consider reducing the size of the quay and increasing the amount of area used on land to reduce impacts to the ocean. It was recognized reducing the size of the quay increases the amount of dredging needed.

Discussion

- Beth Ahearn asked, if the State submitted for another grant, could another federal agency become lead federal agency?
 - Bill replied that it is possible, but it would depend on timing and the extent of the granting agency's involvement. All agencies will need to use and base their own agency's actions and decision-making on a single EIS.
- Sean Mahoney asked whether any federal agencies had agreed to accept the lead federal agency role.
 - Bill replied that none had agreed to accept the lead federal agency role to date.
 - Bruce Van Note added that MaineDOT submitted an application for a discretionary grant, Port Infrastructure Development Program (PIDP), from the Maritime Administration for preliminary design and acknowledged that much more conversation is required.
- Jim Therriault asked whether the grant application used an agnostic port design and associated costs.
 - Matt Burns offered to share a link to the PIDP grant application to further the three deep water ports. The file is posted on MaineDOT's website at:
[https://www.maine.gov/mdot/grants/pidp/docs/2023/MaineDOT%20MPA%20PIDP%20FY23%20Grant%20Application%20-%20FINAL%20\(042723\).pdf](https://www.maine.gov/mdot/grants/pidp/docs/2023/MaineDOT%20MPA%20PIDP%20FY23%20Grant%20Application%20-%20FINAL%20(042723).pdf)
 - Grant monies would be used to continue the work at Searsport, including but not limited to design, environmental, and permitting.
- Frances Eanes asked how this grant intersects with the monies currently being sought in the state legislature for offshore wind.
 - Matt replied that the two are related. Monies authorized by the state legislature would provide state matching funds for the federal grant and keep the doors open so that work may continue.
- Sean asked whether there had been any specific agency conversations relative to Sears Island, the Sears Island Planning Initiative, historical concerns and whether they shared perspective about siting an alternative there.
 - Bill replied that, based on early coordination with the agencies, there is great institutional knowledge about prior studies and proposed actions on Sears Island. The agencies



- acknowledged the State is considering locating the OSW port on Sears Island. No agency questioned whether the State could use Sears Island.
- Sean asked what was meant by “in-water work.”
 - Bill and Matt replied that, yes, in-water work, consisting of dredge and fill, were presented to the agencies and part of the discussion. (The same slides shared with the Advisory Group today are those that served as the basis for discussion.)
 - Eliza Donahue asked if MaineDOT had already considered modifications to reduce in water work.
 - Matt replied the State has updated the conceptual alternatives to reduce the quantity of dredge, but more work needs to be done. The State has not chased out all the “what ifs” (e.g., using a bridge on Sears Island, between uplands and heavy lift wharf, to reduce ocean fill).
 - Rolf Olsen asked for clarity on why the State’s proposed OSW port would be the biggest on the East Coast.
 - Matt replied that the scale of the operations are unlike those that are currently undertaken at port facilities. Foundation assembly would require up to 60 acres. Another 40 acres is needed to move materials and facilitate integration of components. The spatial requirements for activities associated with floating OSW WTG manufacture, integration, and launching is significant.
 - Rolf noted that the New Jersey Wind Port, at 200+ acres, is bigger than the area currently under evaluation in Maine.
 - Matt acknowledged that NJWP was exceptionally large but is planned for fixed bottom wind. The other ports on slide 8 are also planned for fixed foundation WTGs and are smaller.
 - Habib Dagher added that floating OSW ports are very different and pointed to a couple examples on the west coast whose design is a little further along. Specifically, the proposed floating OSW ports at Humboldt Bay and Los Angeles/Long Beach are larger than the port being evaluated in Maine, or on the east coast.

3. UPDATES TO CONCEPTUAL ALTERNATIVES AND PRELIMINARY IMPACT RESULTS

Matt and Adam Archual, Gannett Fleming, Inc., reviewed the changes to the port alternatives and changes to the alternative’s evaluation matrix since the last PAG meeting on March 29.

Matt reviewed the design criteria and proposed terminal activities, including staging and integration and foundation fabrication (OSWPAC Presentation 6_6.23.23). The size and scale of the wind turbine generator (WTG) components drives the spatial requirements. Matt provided a breakdown of uses within the overall 100-acre project footprint, including but not limited to a port administrative building and parking (two acres), 35 acres of storage for WTG components, and 55 acres for foundation fabrication. The availability of a wet storage area for completed foundations to await WTG integration was added. Matt presented some figures associated with other east coast OSW ports under development, noting that all are designed for fixed foundation OSW WTGs, and most would not be suited for floating OSW WTGs.

Matt summarized that it is possible to achieve the design criteria at Mack Point and at Sears Island. Construction costs are almost the same for both alternatives. A major cost driver for Mack Point is the ground lease costs. The State is assuming a 50-year lease. Matt reminded the Advisory Group that all cost



estimates and quantities are preliminary and subject to change. A decision will not be made until the NEPA and permitting processes are complete.

The available upland area at Mack Point has changed since the March meeting and will continue to be adjusted. The current alternative consists of 65-acre upland area and 35-acre fill area. This alternative requires relocation of existing assets and reconfiguration of the terminal. Sprague Energy, the State of Maine, and the Canadian Pacific Railway own property at Mack Point. Dredging and fill will be required to achieve the 100-acre site requirement. Some design refinements at Mack Point evaluated reduction of dredge quantities, and the State could reduce dredge quantities by shifting the footprint to the east and relocating the existing liquid dock. It was noted the Mack Point alternative incorporates a wharf area that consists of a berth perpendicular to the shoreline, consistent with comments received from the Advisory Group previously. Similar design refinements were incorporated into the Hybrid alternative.

The Sears Island site has 300 contiguous acres. The port alternative at Sears Island consists of 75-acre upland area and 25-acre fill area to reach the previously dredged 40-foot vessel berth adjacent to the federal navigation channel. It may be possible to reduce the ocean fill quantity by dredging, rock blasting, and excavating upland areas. The transportation parcel is owned by the State, so lease costs do not apply. The State assumes use of the existing access road.

Adam reviewed updates and changes to the evaluation matrix, which were highlighted in the document provided to the Advisory Group prior to this meeting. In the interest of time, only those cells that changed since the March meeting were discussed. Adam stated that detailed information is not currently available for several of these resource categories and aspects will require detailed study by specialists. In areas where answers are not currently available, this matrix attempts to express the work that needs to be done to answer the question(s). It was noted that Matt covered the changes to design included on page 1 of the matrix. The items reviewed with the Advisory Group were:

- Consistent with comments received from the Advisory Group in March, the State added available historical resource information to columns 12 (wetlands) and 13 (streams).
- Column 17 (Endangered Atlantic salmon and Sturgeon) – a sturgeon species was added to the Sears Island cell.
- Column 21 (Animals & Birds) – marine mammals (historical) were added to Mack Point, Sears Island, and the Hybrid alternative. Further, a few inconsistencies were resolved in the birds listed for Mack Point and Sears Island.
- Column 24 (Archaeological) – updated to include expected field surveys based on recent conversation with Maine Historic Preservation Commission and with information from survey conducted on Sears Island last summer associated with geotechnical borings.
- Column 26 (Tribal Interests) – updated to reflect conversations between MaineDOT and tribes since March.
- Column 29 (Business, Commercial & Institutional) – updated to reflect current ownership information at Mack Point.
- Column 31 (Aquaculture) – updated to include aquaculture leases in the vicinity of Sears Island.
- Column 35 (Air Quality) – updated to note the region is in attainment or maintenance area for priority pollutants.



- Column 36 (Climate Change & Resiliency) – updated to note consistency with renewable energy goals and an expectation that there would be a net beneficial climate effect.
- Column 37 (Host Community Benefits & Impacts) – updated to reflect additional work is required and that local stakeholders will be involved in the evaluation of real benefits and impacts.
- Column 38 (Environmental Justice) – updated to state that though detailed study has not been performed yet, it is likely that potential impacts would be the same between alternatives.
- Column 39 (Proximity to Labor Markets & Affordable Housing) – updated to state that though detailed study has not been performed yet, it is likely that potential impacts would be the same between alternatives.
- Column 40 (Legal or Policy Issues) – updated to include the Sears Island Planning Initiative (SIPI) and Joint Use Planning Committee (JUPC) for Sears Island involvement.
- Column 41 (Economic Contribution of Existing Uses) – like other categories, additional work remains to be done, but this column was updated to acknowledge potential tax base effects as well as the need to understand the economic impact of Sears Island as a recreational destination.

Discussion

- Steve Miller asked for clarity on how much each foundation weighed.
 - Matt replied that a concrete foundation/hull weigh between about 9,000 and 15,000 tons; a steel foundation/hull, between about 4,000 and 6,000 tons. The State is evaluating the University of Maine concrete foundation/hull but planning to accommodate foundation/hull technology.
- Sean asked what “wet storage” means, as this is a new term to most on the Advisory Group.
 - Matt replied that this would be an area in the open water, but close to port, where a completed foundation/hull, for example, could be towed and stored temporarily, if needed.
- Jessie Gunther noted that direct access to the wharf is critical. To accomplish that at Eastport requires blasting and rock removal opposed to ocean filling. Has any thought been given to increasing ocean filling at Eastport?
 - Matt replied that the State has not evaluated such an alternative that would result in more filling at Eastport.
- Rolf asked if steel foundations had the same space requirements as concrete foundations/hulls.
 - Matt replied that they are about the same. The State is looking at both, to help determine the area necessary.
- A member of the public asked whether wet storage was included in the areas identified in the conceptual alternatives.
 - Matt replied that they are not. Wet storage would occur in deep water offshore, but no specific areas have been identified.
- Beth asked which of the other ports on the east coast were furthest along in development.
 - Matt and Jim Therriault replied that New Bedford (MA) and New London (CT) are the furthest along.
- Rolf asked about the timeline for development of competing ports on the east coast.
 - Matt stated that it is a competitive market, and he does not have completion dates for these ports. The State can document these dates and report back.



- James Gillway noted that the wind port in New Jersey is years behind schedule, based on media accounts.
- Steve asked about the timing of the ports on the west coast.
 - Matt is uncertain but can get additional information to share.
 - Jim Therriault shared that the Humboldt Bay port has about the same timeline as Maine. The port design is also being done by Moffat & Nichol.
- Becky Bartovics (public) asked if the State would lease Sears Island should the port be located there.
 - Matt replied that, yes, the State would lease the port to an OSW developer.
- Relative to the preliminary cost estimates, Jim Therriault shared Sprague's calculations included a \$90,000 per year per acre lease cost and \$20 million of investment from Sprague. Sprague would share in the revenue but not the cost of capital. There is risk associated with port downtime and inactivity. Sprague views the land lease as a cost-sharing item, not a capital cost.
 - Matt replied that, in the State's opinion, because the State does not own the land, it was considered a cost.
 - Jim Therriault does not agree with the State's position relative to land lease costs.
- Rolf asked about the schedule and timing of the proposed port and whether an OSW port on Mack Point could be online more quickly than Sears Island.
 - Matt replied that the projected end of construction is the same for both locations.
 - Nate Benoit, MaineDOT, added that the expected general timeline is that an EIS will take two years to prepare, the State will secure funding over the course of one year, and construction will last about three years. The fast-track schedule is six years at any site. In general, the State considers it easier to do business on land that they own.
- Steve stated that a lease should be considered an operating cost and that cost would be handed off to the developer. What about other operations cost? For example, there would be costs associated with train and barge operations at Sears Island that would not be incurred at Mack Point. The lease cost needs to be placed into context.
- Beth asked for clarity that the lease is an annual cost.
 - Matt replied that, yes, it is an annual cost, and it was included in cost estimates for the 65 acres owned by Sprague on Mack Point (50-year lease).
- Sean asked what the current arrangement is at the International Marine Terminal in Portland.
 - Matt replied that the State has established a schedule of rates that are included in a tariff.
 - Sean stated that, assuming that is the difference between Mack Point and Sears Island, Sears Island would work like Portland, as a multi developer site, over time. The State would incur a \$400 - \$500 million fee associated with any land lease at Mack Point. Mack Point and/or Sears Island would generate income.
- Sean noted that an EIS could be completed in one year and that he believes the total schedule could be four years.
 - Jessie Gunther noted that litigation delays could impact any decision.
- Steve understood that there would be no decisions today and he looks forward to additional information natural resources. How and where does the announcement of the State's Preferred Alternative fit into the general timeline?
 - Bill replied that after the draft EIS is prepared and the lead agency signs it, the document will be circulated as a draft for public and agency review and comment. As the project



sponsor, the State will collect comments and hold a formal public hearing. All comments will be evaluated. The State will make a site selection based on data and issue a final EIS to announce the Preferred Alternative, why the site was selected, and what mitigation measures will be applied. Along the way, the State would be well served to submit the necessary permit applications to ensure that the least damaging preferred alternative (LEDPA) is the same as the State's preferred alternative.

- Beth asked if the State must choose primary location when submitting its permit application or if multiple sites can remain in plan?
 - Bill replied that the draft EIS could have no preferred alternative. In the final EIS, the State would identify a single preferred alternative, which would be the preferred alternative listed in the permit application.
 - Sean added that the NEPA process is triggered due to federal agency permitting requirements and that this proposed OSW port qualifies as a major federal action.
- Jim Therriault stated that Sprague is confident that it can relocate the existing assets to the north. He can distribute a slide showing the relocation arrangement. Jim stated that Sprague could add a new gate dedicated to the 100-acre OSW port.
 - Matt Cannon asked about the long-term plans associated with the Irving Oil Corporation assets on Mack Point.
 - Matt replied that Irving is interested in continuing use at Mack Point; they have a 100-year lease.
 - Jim Therriault added that there is approximately 80 years remaining in their lease agreement.
- David Gelinis asked about the Mack Point design refinements and how they encroach upon the liquid dock, the busiest pier on Mack Point.
 - Jim Therriault reminded the Advisory Group that the liquid dock is the existing pier on the left (west) and the dry dock is on the right (east).
 - David added that there are only 250 feet between the two.
 - Jim Therriault stated that they may be able to extend the dry dock to accommodate the relocation of the liquid dock. Two vessels would not occupy the dock at the same time. Rearranging these would result in less dredge associated with the Mack Point alternative design.
 - David asked if the extension would reach the federal navigation channel.
 - Jim Therriault said Sprague thinks the extension can be built without infringing on the channel.
- Steve asked about the age of the dry dock at Mack Point and where it is currently in need of repairs.
 - Jim Therriault replied that the dry dock is 110 years old and in need of improvements.
- Jim Therriault emphasized that if the existing dock operations were combined and the wind port activities shifted east, the dredge area and quantity would be reduced from the original alternative.
 - Nate Benoit commented that this configuration creates a clear separation of wind port activities from other activities.
 - Jim Therriault emphasized a realistic alternative over a clean design.
- Jessie asked about the status of the federal navigation dredge project.



- Matt replied that the maintenance dredge project has not been permitted. The State continues to pursue this project.
- David asked how long the State has pursued the maintenance dredge project.
 - Matt replied that it has been at least a 10-year process.
 - Nate Moulton said the first meeting was in 2005 and monies were approved in 2011.
 - For context, David added that the federal channel maintenance dredge is about 25,000 cubic yards (CY).
- Matt Cannon asked if there had been any discussion with agencies regarding the potential reuse of dredge material for infill.
 - Matt replied that this had been discussed in concept, and the State would prefer to reuse as much as possible depending on the quality of the material. He expects some dredge material would need to be disposed by an undetermined method and cost.
- Sean noted the significance of impacts associated with dredging, particularly as it relates to commercial and recreational fishing seasons.
- Beth asked what the dredge amount was at Sears Island.
 - Matt replied that no dredge is required at Sears Island.
 - Steve Miller recalled dredging to 45 feet for the cargo port in the 1980s. He could not recall a disposal method.
 - James Gillway stated that the dredge at Sears Island was done in 1988-1989 for the proposed cargo port facility. The dredge material was disposed near Rockland, and some was placed on land. The federal navigation channel was constructed in 1964, and it has not been maintained by dredging since.
- Habib asked about how components would be moved from the delivery berth to the lay down shown on the far side of the manufacturing area in the Mack Point alternative.
 - Matt replied that this is a representative concept and that it has not yet been optimized. Input from developers will be critical in the optimization of conceptual designs.
 - Jim Therriault noted that the Pine Tree Offshore Wind consortium (which is behind the Maine Research Array [MeRA]) is a known project. Is there a way to get around non-disclosure agreements and learn from PTOW in the development of the OSW Port?
 - Matt said that he could inquire directly with PTOW.
- David noted the side slopes on the Sears Island alternative, specifically the north end of the wharf, is the optimal safe landing place for smaller crafts. He strongly suggests the State evaluate the use of this area to optimize operational efficiencies and safety.
- Relative to Sears Island, Eliza Donahue asked how the State could reduce in water work and still achieve the desired depth.
 - Matt replied that a good option has not presented itself, and that reducing ocean fill would result in more dredging.
 - Nate added that the alternative design represents the most efficient and least expensive option.
 - Jim Therriault asked if construction could be accomplished using the existing road.
 - Matt and Nate replied that the road would need improvements and a new road cut is not expected.



- Rolf noted that the existing road bisects a portion of the conservation area and asked whether the road is part of the conservation area or the transportation parcel, hoping an area of the conservation parcel would not be isolated from the rest.
 - Sean stated that the easement addresses the road location, and the road is part of the transportation parcel.
 - Matt added that a gate for the wind port facility would likely be located at the facility, not at the top of the island (i.e., edge of the transportation parcel).
- Becky (public) asked what the cost is to barge back and forth between Mack Point and Sears Island in the Hybrid alternative and whether doing so would interfere with existing navigation and/or port operations.
 - Matt replied that the cost associated with barging would depend on the commodity ferried. More traffic at the port is a navigation consideration, but not a deal breaker.
- Beth asked for clarify regarding the overall size of the Hybrid alternative.
 - Matt replied that it is about 120 acres.
- A member of the public noted that the Hybrid alternative appears to create a bottleneck scenario.
 - Matt replied that, operationally, all alternatives, including the Hybrid, include one integration berth. As such, he did not foresee added operational issues associated with the Hybrid alternative.
- Rolf commented on the six acres of open water at Mack Point in column 12 of the alternatives matrix.
 - Adam replied that this number comes from the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) which consists of planning-level data based on aerial photography, remote sensing, etc. Field verification will have to take place at all sites.
- David asked about the footnote included in the key points memorandum (i.e., ocean disposal of dredge material could result in additional fill, not included in these totals).
 - Matt replied that the note acknowledges the potential for disposal of dredge material at another location (e.g., CAD cell). Any disposal will be evaluated from a cost and feasibility perspective.
- Beth asked whether the bird species listed in column 20 have been identified.
 - Adam replied that the source for the bird species is the US Fish and Wildlife Services (FWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) which aggregates species data at a county level.
- Dennis Damon asked whether the archaeological site identified in column 24 is located on the transportation parcel and if there are other sites on the island that may impact the future use of the transportation parcel.
 - Adam replied that it would depend on the resource type and its significance.
 - Jessie asked what the site consisted of.
 - Adam replied that based on memory it is a multicomponent artifact scatter.
- Rolf stated that the Penobscot Nation would have interests in the Searsport area; the Pleasant Point and the Passamaquoddy Tribal Councils have interests in the Eastport area. Why have the Penobscot Nation not been contacted?
 - Adam replied that these represent initial contacts and not formal Section 106 consultation.



- Beth added the Commissioner contacted the Passamaquoddy and the Penobscot, but that she believes a meeting had occurred with the Passamaquoddy but not the Penobscot.
- James Gillway noted that the Passamaquoddy Nation spoke out against Eastport as a potential port location at the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) Gulf of Maine Intergovernmental Renewable Energy Task Force meeting in Bangor (May 10-11, 2023).
- Sean noted that he thought the Passamaquoddy took issue with not being involved appropriately in the process. This Advisory Group raised the issue at the first meeting 18 months ago and it has not been addressed. To delay consultation with the Wabanaki is a recipe for litigation. It is malpractice to not converse with the Sipayik Tribe at Eastport and the Penobscot at Searsport.
- Rolf remarked that an economic analysis is needed.
 - Adam replied that it will be done.
- Steve asked how the conclusion that a “net positive” was reached for climate change and resiliency (column 36). Any renewable energy benefits will be due to the wind farms and not the port.
 - Adam replied that additional work must be done on these topics. Preliminary discussions with federal agencies have highlighted the need to neatly draw a line between the port and the OSW energy production. This is a line that the State will define through further consultation with federal agencies.
- Sean took issue with the conclusion that potential impacts relative to Environmental Justice (column 38) would be the same between alternatives.
- Rolf made a general remark about page 6 of the matrix (columns 35-41) that these appear to be high-level placeholders.
 - Adam replied that that is true.
 - Rolf continued that the phrasing of several columns appears skewed, suggesting that impacts are ok.
 - Adam replied that for natural resources, like wetlands and streams, we have some historical information and quantifiable planning-level data (e.g., NWI). The State must conduct field survey for wetlands and streams to verify the data quantified in this matrix. The same may be said for other resources – much more detailed work remains to be done to answer these questions.
- Relative to column 39 (Proximity to Labor Markets & Affordable Housing), Frances stated there are significant differences between Eastport and Searsport.
- Jim Therriault stated that column 41 (Economic Contribution of Existing Uses to Local Economy) is misleading in that the removal of tanks will reduce the tax base, but other improvements and investments (i.e., OSW port) would replace them. Overall, a net positive should be expected.

4. ADVISORY GROUP COMMENTS

As the last meeting of the Advisory Group, the State thanked all Advisory Group members for their time and service to help inform the planning for the OSW port. Much of the remainder of the meeting was spent listening to the thoughts, comments, ideas, concerns, and questions from individual Advisory Group members. It was noted written comments, if submitted to the State, would be attached to the meeting summary and the State would reach out to Advisory Group members that were not in attendance for final remarks. Advisory Group members were asked to limit remarks to about five minutes.



Discussion

- Matt Cannon, Sierra Club Maine
 - Prepared comments were submitted in writing to the State before this meeting (and are attached to this summary).
 - Noting that difficult decisions still need to be made, some concerns include preservation of biological diversity, protection of Sears Island, compliance with the consensus agreement, and sufficiency of public involvement to date. More information is needed, and the lack of detail has made this process difficult at times.
 - There is a need for climate action, consistent with state and federal plans and goals and it should be done with urgency, equity, and with as few adverse impacts as possible. Preserving Sears Island is consistent with the State's plans and goals (e.g., Maine Climate Action Plan and 30-by-30).
 - Federal funding opportunities may be available for cleanup and conversion of the fossil fuel energy infrastructure at Mack Point to renewable energy infrastructure. This is the preferred approach; Mack Point should be given preference.
- Dennis Damon, former Maine Port Authority Director
 - Given historic involvement with the SIPI and JUPC, he came to this process with an open mind, but a predisposition that the transportation parcel at Sears Island was the appropriate location.
 - Based on this process, Eastport was evaluated but does not appear to be practical.
 - Sears Island appears to give the State the biggest bang for the buck, namely commercialization after the research array.
 - Hybrid alternative would be the second-best option because not convinced that Mack Point alone can support this project.
- Eliza Donoghue, Maine Audubon
 - Three guiding principles in mind throughout this process: (a) climate change is the greatest threat to wildlife; (b) infrastructure must not displace the most valuable environmental resources; and (c) appropriate mitigation will be required, following avoidance and minimization.
 - Strong support for floating OSW in the Gulf of Maine and agreed that a purpose driven port is required. No build is not an option.
 - Based on the information presented, Eastport does not appear to be a good option.
 - Lack of tribal coordination by the State is problematic.
 - While the principles outlined above tend to lean towards siting the project at Mack Point, the following factors contribute to the feeling that Mack Point is not the preferred location: (a) lots of dredging and probable release of contaminants that would affect salmon, sturgeon, lobster fishing, etc.; (b) this portion of Sears Island was set aside for transportation use through a public process (i.e., SIPI); (c) costs; and (d) the Hybrid does not offer sufficient cost or environmental benefits. Sears Island is the preferred option.
 - Wherever the port goes, mitigation of operational impacts will be required, and Maine Audubon will be interested in the impacts from lighting, sound/noise, and traffic. Impacts must be compensated and there are various options available.



- The State will need to get creative on funding, tapping into available federal funds, private financing, etc.
- There is a need to move quickly.
- Frances Eanes, Maine Labor Climate Council
 - No build is not an option. This project could be a game changer if we get it right, or a tragic misstep if we do not. Need to build a port as soon as possible.
 - Consultation with the tribes is a critical next step and represents a real risk to the project if not undertaken soon.
 - There is currently a funding window of opportunity. Federal monies are available until 2025. Equity, Justice40, Community Benefit Agreements (CBA), workforce development, and labor standards are all important considerations in the State's competitive pursuit of federal grant money.
 - Agnostic on the location of the port in Searsport but will remain committed to maximizing opportunities for labor agreements.
- James Guerrette, Citizen, Town of Searsport
 - Have heard concerns from Searsport citizens and others that are indifferent. Concerns are relative to the infrastructure, including but not limited to noise and lighting.
 - Mitigation should be a part of the plan and not an afterthought.
 - There is not a lot of information available publicly which leaves room for misinformation. There are some skeptics not convinced of the cost-benefit. An informational campaign is needed for the citizens of Searsport.
 - Job projections will be very important, and will new jobs benefit the community? How will this project affect the tax base? Is there a tax benefit?
- David Gelinas Captain, Penobscot Bay & River Pilots Association
 - Cost matters and is likely to continue to increase as time passes.
 - Mack Point presents risk for cost overruns simply because the State does not own it. Variables like rail relocation, relocation of existing tanks and associated permitting, potential for contamination, relocation of the liquid dock, dredging, and final lease costs contribute to a greater potential for cost overruns.
 - Dredging will be controversial and has a history of opposition in Searsport. Contaminants (e.g., mercury) associated with dredging will be important and will affect fisheries and lobsterman.
 - Sears Island is the only dredge free option; therefore, this is the preferred option.
- Jessie Gunther, Retired Judge, Public At-Large Member
 - Regrets that Eastport is not a practical option; economic activity and investment is needed in Washington County.
 - Studies need to advance before a decision may be made between Sears Island and Mack Point. Though, what is currently known regarding practicability and environmental impacts, Sears Island appears to be the better option today.
- Sean Mahoney, Conservation Law Foundation
 - Eastport and the Hybrid option should be taken off the table based on the information presented to date.
 - Dredging is a real source of controversy and should not be taken lightly. Do not make any unforced errors relative to the potential for dredge.



OFFSHORE WIND PORT ADVISORY GROUP

- The State's failure to consult fully with Penobscot is an error that needs to be resolved as soon as possible.
- There is a need to ensure the community benefits from the project.
- Further clarification around the State's revenue stream is necessary.
- Does not agree with the degradation of the process raised by Steve Miller and the Islesboro Island Trust (IIT) in writing prior to today's meeting.
- Except that the Penobscot have not been engaged, Sears Island appears to be the best option.
- The State may consider continuing this Advisory Group, in this form or another, with additional representative from the host community, Friends of Sears Island, the fishing industry, and Wabanaki (tribes) throughout project development.
- Steve Miller, Islesboro Islands Trust
 - Mack Point is the best option for business, the State, and the environment. Giving Mack Point preference is consistent with the consensus agreement. Build out at Mack Point consolidates infrastructure and replaces and remediates fossil fuel assets at Mack Point.
 - Sears Island's present benefits include, but are not limited to, ecological services, fisheries, public recreation, and carbon sequestration.
 - The State has communicated a preference for Sears Island and the IIT's FOIA request produced evidence of predetermination. This Advisory Group was convened to give the illusion of transparency and public involvement.
- Rolf Olsen, Friends of Sears Island
 - Cynical participant early on because there was the sense that a finger was on the scale in favor of Sears Island. By 2021, the State announced that Sears Island was the primary site under consideration. There are some concerns with the process.
 - Raised the potential conflict of interest for Dr. Dagher in the interest of transparency. This has since been resolved.
 - The State did not fulfill the Advisory Group's purpose and the commitment for a robust stakeholder process was not met. He has had to push for information and there is a lack of communication with Searsport residents and the public in general. Misinformation is circulating in the public. Could the State not conduct public surveys? One hundred seventy people attended the informational meeting FOSI hosted.
 - Some concerns that we are forwarding an experimental design. What if we build a port for technology that does not work?
 - There is enough land on Mack Point to accomplish the project, Sprague welcomes the prospect, and Mack Point is a brownfield site that could be repurposed. The 75 acres of forest on Sears Island could be preserved. Sears Island will bring controversy; Mack Point will be accepted.
 - Why does the State prohibit state waters (3 miles from shore) from OSW development? Recreation and lobsterman may be part of the reason.
- Jim Therriault, Sprague Energy
 - In favor of Mack Point. Sprague is committed to renewable energy.
 - No tank relocation or permitting will be required, only tank removal.
 - Shifting the design (wharf) to the east significantly reduces dredging.



- Contends that the construction cost at Mack Point is not higher than Sears Island. The cost of the ground lease is an operational cost, not a construction cost, which will be passed onto a private operator.
- Habib Dagher, University of Maine College of Engineering
 - The OSW technology is tested, and it works. It was first installed in Norway about a decade ago, with several research arrays throughout Europe and Japan.
 - The clock is ticking.
 - What is the fatal flaw? Cost, dredging, etc.?
- James Gillway, Town of Searsport, OSW PAG Co-Chair
 - Making OSW affordable is important.
 - Does not accept that the costs are the same for Mack Point and Sears Island.
 - Mack Point would be a great site but does not believe it is permissible. What will be permissible?
 - Sears Island may be the only permissible option in Searsport.
- Beth Ahearn, Maine Conservation Voters, OSW PAG Co-Chair
 - Has found the advisory group process to be transparent and is surprised to learn others feel differently.
 - Prioritizing tribal coordination is critically important.
 - The decision of a site location will need to meet the LEDPA thresholds and support the commercialization of floating OSW in Maine, and elsewhere.
 - The State is in a race, there is some real urgency. The people of Maine will benefit, the workforce will benefit.
 - Cost is a real concern for the state and rate payers.
 - Dredging is hugely impactful and additional analysis needs to be done to determine the harm it may incur.

6. WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS

Through the meetings with the Advisory Group, the State has developed a much deeper understanding of the features, issues, and concerns of members. This information will inform the next phase of project development and the preparation of the EIS and permit applications. Moving forward, the Advisory Group will see both a summary of today's meeting and a final report of the PAG process consisting of a compendium of meeting summaries, presentations, and related items.

Over the next few months, the State will continue to refine the OSW port alternatives and start to prepare an EIS and permit applications. Specifically, the State will be working to:

- Continue coordination with federal and state agencies with jurisdiction by law and define both the lead federal agency and potential cooperating agencies;
- Continue tribal outreach leading to engagement and consultation;
- Continue detailed studies of the natural and socio-economic features surrounding the alternatives under consideration in Searsport and Eastport;
- Continue to identify and evaluate potential historic and archaeological features in proximity to the alternatives in coordination with the Maine Historic Preservation Commission;



- Analyze the potential economic impacts, both positive and negative, to the Town of Searsport and the region from using a portion of Mack Point and / or Sears Island for the OSW port;
- Analyze the potential impacts to traffic from the OSW port;
- Conduct a wave study and navigation impact study;
- Perform a visual impact assessment of the OSW port; and
- Other items noted during discussions of the Advisory Group.

During the preparation of the EIS and permit applications, there will be many opportunities for public involvement and for individuals to continue to share their comments, ideas, and concerns related to the OSW port.

Comments/Questions

- Sean stated that a timeline for the OSW Port going forward would be helpful.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

- David Italiaander
 - The State has heavily favored Sears Island, and this has been a yearlong charade.
 - Opposition to Sears Island is strong. Mack Point is the path of least resistance.
 - Takes issue with conflating capital and operations expenditures.
- Celeste Cary
 - There may be opportunity to subsidize remediation of Mack Point (brownfield) with federal monies.
 - Sears Island is available, but not a good fit.
 - A new Department of Marine Resources (DMR) coastal eelgrass survey is due in 2024.
- Becky Bartovics
 - This will affect the entire Penobscot Bay.
 - What are the long-term effects of dredging?
- Amy Brown
 - Does the State foresee any potential issues with marketing the Sears Island site for green energy development, as development of a greenfield site seems counterintuitive.
 - Understanding the need to move quickly, the process will get bogged down at Sears Island.

ADJOURNMENT OCCURRED AT 3:30 PM.