

**Responses to Public Hearing Comments Regarding the
SouthCoast Wind LLC Dredging and Water Quality Permit**



Name	Comment*	Response
Chris Gadbois	In support: The practice of burying cables for transmission of energy is well-established and there are best practices established, and I think our only concern should be that those best practices are followed.	
David Booth	In support: Talking about building infrastructure that is going to operate cleanly and use zero resources. If our energy needs continue to grow, would we rather build something like this or continue the way we're using fossil fuels and pollution and continue to make the air and water worse? We're building an infrastructure and economy that's going to serve the next several generations to come as previous generations did for us. At the forefront of a major explosion in industry, and I think we would be smart to take advantage of that. The far greater harm is in doing nothing but business as usual. Replacing fossil fuels with clean energy is the solution.	
Jeff Migneault	In support: The only way that the climate crisis is avoided is by everyone, every entity, doing their part. I can't tell you there will be no negative effects of the dredging. Whenever there's a large infrastructure, there are impacts. The question is how serious are the impacts and compared to what. And clean energy from these wind farms will displace an immense amount of fossil fuels that cause an immense amount of pollution and threaten our very future. I know there's a lot of concern about fisheries, but the real threat to fisheries is the warming and acidification of the ocean that's part of climate change.	



Name	Comment*	Response
David Brunetti	<p>In support: Rhode Island's climate goals rely on offshore wind, and we currently have no plan to meet them without this project. We desperately need a massive transition to clean, renewable energy. This is part of the necessary permitting process to get us there. As long as this project is in compliance with Section 401 of the Federal Clean Water Act, the rules and regulations for dredging, and the management of dredge materials, and the State water quality regulations, then I see no reason why this proposal shouldn't be approved. Burying an underwater cable is a safe, well-established practice, similar to what has already been done in the area for many uses such as the electric power lines. Block Island and Martha's Vineyard get their electricity from similar buried underwater power lines.</p>	
Sue Kelley	<p>In support: While years from now we may learn that wind turbines cause damage that we currently don't imagine, but they will not equal the damage of nuclear energy, coal, or oil and gas. What is understood about wind turbine interface with ocean life, BOEM, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, makes an effort to address by working to mitigate dangers by, for instance, being careful not to place turbines in migratory flight paths. We can and should demand that whatever environmental harm may be involved, that it be mitigated and addressed by the wind energy companies. Wind energy provides a renewable source of energy for all of us, while doing limited harm to the environment. We must allow wind energy and development</p>	



Name	Comment*	Response
	and implementation to proceed at the fastest pace possible.	
Greg Vespe	<p>I would just ask DEM to remember that it's our last Class 2 waterway, marine waterway left in the state. I am very concerned that in the tie-in to get renewable energy, the Sakonnet River's being chosen as the path to run the cables for a couple of reasons. One, it's our last Class 2 waterway. We're not going to get it back once it's gone. Once you permit one set of cables to run down that river, it's not really feasible for likely we're going to tell the next person that requests permission to run cables down the river that they can't. There's two other ways to get down the bay. There's the East Passage and the West Passage. The West Passage has already had electrical cables run through it. That's been cleared and passed, and it's not a Class 2 waterway. My concern is that we're treating the Sakonnet like an industrial park, and it's not. It's our last waterway left that has very little industrialization. It's also the last conch fishery that we have that's healthy. The dredge is going to bisect the river completely in half, 22 miles. And as our own DEM fisheries biologists have spoken, it's reasonable to consider that that population will be split in half permanently into East and West Passage. There are other passageways. There are land passageways. While they might not be quite as convenient, they certainly wouldn't have the ecological damage that dredging the entire 20 miles of river would.</p>	<p>The dredging and jet plow activities will not change the Water Quality classification. Significant fisheries information has been submitted and reviewed. Condition 27 of the Permit requires a Fisheries Monitoring Plan.</p>
Dennis Lassige	In support: I represent 2,500 carpenters, piledrivers, and millwrights	



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>living in the state of Rhode Island. Mostly, we appreciate the job creation. The project we're talking about tonight isn't new. It's not novel. It's not unique. It's not complex. It's not detrimental. The State of Rhode Island already approved cable-lay operation. For Block Island Wind, they got the weigh-in and cable-lay operations for Vineyard Wind in MA. They've already approved, with reasonable conditions, cable-lay operation for Revolution Wind. I would ask that this Board approve the same. The same type of project in the same type of marine environment because it's already done so in the past.</p>	
Joel Gates	<p>In support: As I understand, this dredging project will have only a temporary negative impact and a limited physical scope. I am far more worried about the impact the climate crisis will have on our community if the deployment of offshore wind is slowed or stopped. If we don't do all we can to end our fossil fuel addiction, the view will be the least of our worries.</p>	
Bill Thompson	<p>While reviewing Revolution Wind, CRMC inferred that they were essentially powerless to stop the project. That even if they had voted against granting ocean SAMP consistency, BOEM could overrule their objection and permit the project. In fact, that is not true, but it does convey the prevailing attitude that, regardless of the numerous adverse impacts, no one has the power to stop the offshore wind development's plan for our coastal waters. I'm wondering if DEM feels the same way, that with a little bit of practicable mitigation, permit approval</p>	<p>The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>is a foregone conclusion. So, if DEM does determine that the proposed dredging would pose a substantial risk to public health and to the marine ecosystem, would DEM feel obligated to reject the permit request, and would they be willing to reject it?</p>	
<p>Katie Hamilton</p>	<p>1. I would ask DEM to discuss the disruption of fish migrations and physical disturbances of habitats, including smaller animals and fish and seedlings and such in the sedimentation as they plow through the entirety of the Sakonnet and divide it in half. This will affect fish spawning. Dredging also causes interment and carries things down the river. The Journal of Marine Science said, alterations to any portion of the ecosystem, such as changes in the bottom dwelling, have the potential to impact levels of the entire food web.</p> <p>2. I would like more information regarding the cables themselves. They currently have heat that would emit from them. This can alter the temperature and chemistry of the surrounding waters. There are pollutants and contaminants in the actual cables themselves, and I would like to know more about those while they exist underground, additionally, in a decommissioning situation.</p> <p>3. I'd love to know more about testing, specifically with EMF and their emission in the area on the marine life, and I'd like a baseline of what's in our bay now. It might be beneficial for more of us to know about the issues with respect to damage and problems with the actual cables should they be approved. The cables cost as much as 1 million per</p>	<p>1. The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.</p> <p>2. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p> <p>3. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report. Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>kilometer to be repaired. That's worth considering when decommissioning plans are put in place because when they start losing money, they're going to ask for passes on decommissioning potentially.</p>	
<p>Constance Gee</p>	<p>There are so many questions about this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have core samples from the proposed cable route been taken? If so, where are the published results? If not, why not? 2. If there haven't been core samples taken, why is approval for dredging even being discussed? 3. What are the contamination levels along the proposed dredging cable and cable-laying routes? 4. What dredging and cable-laying methods will be employed to minimize the resuspension of these contaminants? 5. What assurances can you give the public that the marine and human life will not be negatively impacted by resuspended contaminants during the dredging and cable installation processes? 6. What is your proposed timing of the cable-laying process from beginning to end? 7. Will you commit to not working during spawning season for various marine species? 8. What type of machinery does South Coast plan to use for preparation of the seabed and for the installment of cables? 9. How wide and deep will trenching need to be at various points along the cable corridor? 10. Do you anticipate going over areas in the river or bay that cannot be 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-3. Core samples have been taken for development of the sediment transport model. Sample results are available in Attachment I of the Application. Additional testing is required as noted in Condition 12 of the Permit. 4. Cable laying methods are noted in condition 10.C. of the Permit. This condition also requires a work window of October 15 to January 31. 5. The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts. 6-7. Condition 10 of the Permit requires a work window of October 15 to January 31 to avoid larval and spawning periods. 8. Cable laying methods are noted in condition 10.C. of the Permit. 9. The trenching depth is 4 to 6 feet. Conditions 14 to 18 note conditions for cable burial tools and depth. 10. Conditions 14 to 18 note conditions for cable burial tools and depth. Condition 20 notes



Name	Comment*	Response
	trenched out but where cabling will need to be laid on top of the seabed?	Secondary Cable Protection for areas at other cable crossings.
Kyle Kossak	<p>In support: From a technical standpoint, I see no issues with this proposal for cable dredging. There's nothing unusual about this and is no different from the cables that have already been installed all over the world. I also reviewed the environment report presented by South Coast to CRMC last year. They cited six peer-reviewed environmental sitings of past projects, three of which included our own Block Island wind farm. They have conducted benthic surveys in order to precisely route the cable through the lowest impact corridor. To my knowledge, the existing gas and water pipelines that already run under the Sakonnet River made no such considerations for environmental impact. They have a full-time archeologist on staff to preserve any potential cultural artifacts that they may encounter. I believe that South Coast Wind has done their due diligence towards minimizing environmental impact, going far above and beyond what is typical for comparable projects.</p>	
Karen Gleason	<p>Deep concern allowing 700,000-voltage cables in the outer continental ocean, Rhode Island Sound, Sakonnet River, and Island Park Beach. I'm very concerned with the sulfur hexafluoride. Just like the turbines, the cables need continual maintenance, checking for leaks, cracks, damage, resurfacing, etc. There's potential for cable cyberattacks from others that may want to shut down our grid.</p> <p>1. How are we in this town supposed to trust DEM with ensuring that protocols</p>	<p>Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan.</p> <p>1. The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.</p> <p>2-5. Condition 4 of the Permit requires a 3rd -party Environmental Compliance</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>and specifications will be followed with the dredging and cable laying?</p> <p>2. How are we to trust you with enforcement?</p> <p>3. What DEM presence will be here daily to oversee the project?</p> <p>4. What experience and background does your staff have to even oversee such a large project?</p> <p>5. Who is going to oversee the cable installation underneath a major gas and water line that exists?</p> <p>6. Has there been discussion with our local water department or gas company?</p> <p>7. Is there an emergency plan if the gas line is accidentally hit or damaged during the laying of the cable?</p> <p>8. Do you have staff that has background experience with the dangers of EMF in our seabeds and roadbeds?</p> <p>9. Have you seen the geophysical and geotechnical test reports from South Coast of the river and the bay? If so, where are they?</p> <p>10. Do you have concerns for the sediments being disturbed?</p> <p>11. What are the impacts of the sediments being disturbed in our waters on the sea life, on future use of the beach, and how about the fishing industry?</p> <p>12. The Sakonnet River is Class 1 and 2 waters. Will the rating change after installation?</p> <p>13. What will parents think when they see a large sign posted, "Beware of the large cables underneath the beach" or "do not go past this area due to high electrified cabling"? Will parents feel comfortable allowing their children to</p>	<p>Monitor that reports to the DEM, CRMC and the ACOE.</p> <p>6-7. Per SouthCoast's permit application section 2.3.3 Pipeline Crossings: "SouthCoast Wind will coordinate with the owners of the pipelines, and any other unanticipated cable or pipeline crossings not identified, to agree on detailed cable crossing design, installation, protection measures and maintenance requirements. Crossing designs will be determined by the crossing's water depth, seabed conditions and the third-party crossing agreement requirement."</p> <p>8. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF study and report.</p> <p>9. Sediment boring results are part of the permit application and are a public record available for review.</p> <p>10-11. The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.</p> <p>Condition 27 of the Permit requires a Fisheries Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>12. The water quality classification will not change.</p> <p>13. Condition requires burial depth of t least 9 feet below area where the cable makes landfall.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>swim in the water or just meet up with their friends on the sea wall?</p> <p>14. With 700,000 high-voltage cables in the area, are people still going to visit this area?</p> <p>15. Will there be dead fish and other sea life lying along the beaches and up and down the river or along Mount Hope Bay? Who's responsible to clean up the beaches all along the coastal properties?</p> <p>16. Will there be an uptick in leukemia in young children who play on the beach or swim in the water?</p> <p>17. Are you aware of any medical conditions due to environmental exposures to high-voltage cables?</p>	<p>14. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p> <p>15-17. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging water quality regulations.</p>
Donna Lafleur	<p>This wind turbine project is wrong on so many levels, from whales, birds, fish migrations, to the fishermen's livelihood being disrupted and impacted, to the point that it will be forced out of business. The rivers, the Sakonnet River, our beach, our town, our fishing, our shellfish beds. If you look at the water, it's clean. However, there is a very dirty past hidden just below the surface of the bay and the riverbed. Heavy metals do not disappear over time. They can be trapped in deeper levels of sediment until mining, geological, or biological processes release them. At which point they may affect plant and animal life. I would urge for sediment testing going down 6 feet, not three-quarters of an inch. It took decades to clean up the bay and bring it back to life. Does RIDEM want to give the green light to do something that is frightening to even think about? I cannot find a sediment test study that has been conducted in the Sakonnet River, only water tests.</p>	<p>The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>Now you would let South Coast come in and pollute our waters all over again? The residents of Island Park don't want it affecting their environment. The entire river has been designated as an inshore, juvenile cod habitat area of particular concern. Adverse impacts of the Sakonnet River must be avoided, and it may result in significant long-term cumulative impacts to the stock. It also says South Coast should provide an alternative to the proposed Sakonnet River cable route to minimize the impacts of the project on the complex habitat. NOAA also wrote a letter suggesting a land-based route as an environmentally preferred alternative. Why did CRMC agree to continue this, knowing South Coast has yet to obtain any funding for these projects? Why didn't they meet with the residents of Portsmouth as well so they could talk about the Atlantic cod?</p>	
Jeanne Smith	<p>South Coast has said going through the Sakonnet River is the cheapest route. There are other routes they can take to save the planet. Save our community because our community is part of the planet.</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>
Dwight McNeill	<p>In support: I think we have to make trade-offs about our desire to have a beautiful waterway with the need to make a very important transformation to renewable energy. Regulatory agencies from the feds down to the state have done a comprehensive job in eliciting inquiry from people, setting goals, and being demanding. The regulatory process slows things down as do special interest groups. We can't</p>	



Name	Comment*	Response
	slow this down more. We have to proceed to have clean energy.	
Nick Horton	<p>In support: Help us stop global warming, help us make Rhode Island energy independent, not dependent on foreign fuel. According to a Princeton study, to fully decarbonize our energy in the U.S., we would need wind and solar spanning up to 590,000 square kilometers, roughly equal to the landmass of Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Ohio, Rhode Island, and Tennessee put together. This gives us a sense of the scale of the challenge we are dealing with. We need projects like this one to survive. So I ask, if we don't allow this project to move forward, what are people's other ideas? People in Portsmouth, like the rest of Rhode Island, produce about 9.7 metric tons of carbon per year, in comparison to the average globally of only 4. If we don't build this project, how will Rhode Islanders reduce their carbon footprint? Those of you who are opposed to development of this type, will you stop driving your cars, flying in planes, running air-conditioning? The Sakonnet Harbor was created by dredging and was expanded in 1957 when the corps constructed a 400-foot-long extension to the breakwater and dredged the harbor to the depth of 8 feet. The total area dredged was 13 acres. In 1954, the Algonquin natural gas pipeline was buried across the Sakonnet. Just last month, Enbridge submitted an application to replace this pipe with a pipe twice as large. We must compare the disturbances from this project to the</p>	



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>damage from fossil fuels. The fossil fuels we all rely on are disruptive and pollute in other places. Petroleum refineries that kill people along Cancer Alley in Louisiana, fracking that poisons water in Pennsylvania, pipelines that destroy habitats like tundra in Alaska. If we don't make space for renewable energies in our backyards, we are forcing it into the backyards of others.</p>	
<p>Renée Critchley</p>	<p>The Sakonnet River is not the ideal place. I would love to see another proposed idea, not the Sakonnet River.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I just want to know why we're so ignored. Our Town Council tells us we can't talk about the impacts on our ocean life, on birds. I just don't understand. 2. I don't understand how a deal just goes through. 3. How was this passed. How we're not allowed to speak our mind. 	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>
<p>Carol Mello</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What machinery is being used by SouthCoast? 2. How deep and wide is the trench going to be? The river is not that wide and would be devastating whatever they do. <p>To stop global warming, we need the whole world to do that, not just Portsmouth, Rhode Island.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. How wide of a trench will it be? And what are you getting your recommendations from? Who are you getting information from to make an intelligent decision on whether or not you should move forward? <p>Alternative C was developed through scoping process for the draft EIS and response to comments received from National Marine Fisheries and other</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cable laying methods are noted in condition 10.C. of the Permit. 2. The trenching depth is 4 to 6 feet. Conditions 14 to 18 note conditions for cable burial tools and depth. 3. Cable laying methods are noted in condition 10.C. of the Permit. The trench width is estimated to be 7-8 feet with a sled width of 25 feet. <p>All other comments are outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>agencies expressing concern with the potential impact of the offshore export cable on fisheries, EFS, and habitat areas of particular concern, HAPC, in the Sakonnet River.</p> <p>The Sakonnet River supports EFH for 16 fish species. It's over a hundred species of fish and cod larvae. There's over a hundred species of fish in that river -- and has HAPCs for summer flounder and Atlantic cod.</p> <p>To address this concern, BOEM, which is the Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management, developed onshore cable route options that would avoid placing offshore export cables in the Sakonnet River.</p> <p>So, I would hope that you would really look toward the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and other organizations who are delving into the severity of the damage that could be done to our fisheries in the Sakonnet River.</p>	
Mike Jarbeau	<p>Representing Save The Bay. Save the Bay supports the responsible development of offshore wind and seeks to ensure that construction and operations prioritize protection of the bay and its natural systems at times. Climate change is not a future problem that some have mentioned. It's a current problem. It is here, and it is affecting Narragansett Bay.</p> <p>Offshore wind is an important part of transitioning away from fossil fuels.</p> <p>1. Is it appropriate for this permitting to be moving forward at this time, given the current lack of a power purchase agreement by the applicant, given project uncertainty, and given the permitting pause currently in place by</p>	<p>1 The EFSB decision is not required for the processing of the Dredge Permit/WQC applications. Condition 32 requires that approval be received from the EFSB prior to commencement of dredging and jet plow activities.</p> <p>A decision must be issued by March 15, 2024, to meet the Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 deadline.</p> <p>2. Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan.</p> <p>Conditions 14 to 26 of the Permit address cable burial depth, secondary cable</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>the Rhode Island Energy Facility Siting Board and CRMC. The piecemeal, state permitting process can hinder effective public participation, and that is concerning to us.</p> <p>2.Concerned by the lack of sediment testing databases given the legacy of contaminants in the area, particularly in Mount Hope Bay and in the vicinity of the proposed horizontal directional drilling pits. Much of this historical contamination, including toxins like mercury, has been noted for decades and summarized in reports like the Narragansett Bay Estuary Program's most recent state of Narragansett Bay in the Watershed Report. We encourage DEM to ensure that there is recent data accurately characterizing the sediment proposed for disturbance so that any impact can be appropriately mitigated. Save the Bay believes that, in order to be protective of the river, its inhabitants and its users, the applicant must make every effort to achieve a targeted 6-foot burial depth, limiting the need for secondary protection, and avoiding the most critical and important habitat in the Sakonnet River and Mount Hope Bay.</p> <p>Scientific evidence also demonstrates the effectiveness of cable burial in reducing EMF, which further demonstrates need to achieve this 6-foot cable burial throughout the process and as much as possible through the cable burial procedure.</p>	<p>protection, boulder relocation, and long-term monitoring and maintenance.</p> <p>Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report. Condition 10 of the Permit requires a work window of October 15 to January 31 to avoid larval and spawning periods.</p>
Edward Allan	Required to rework my septic system at a cost of between 20 and 30 thousand dollars, like many others in the community. It has worked and the water	1. The dredge window is from October 15 to January 31. The water quality classification will not change.



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>is cleaner. I don't know if, after a project like this, it would still be cleaner.</p> <p>1.What will the dredging do to the quality of the water?</p>	
Will Nakshian	<p>In support: The only way to solve the climate crisis is to end the use of fossil fuels as rapidly as possible, and creating a new renewable energy infrastructure is the only path forward. The impacts of this dredging will have far less impact on our environment than the long-term impact of the climate crisis upon Rhode Island and the rest of the world.</p> <p>Completion of this offshore wind project will benefit Rhode Island's economy by making us a leader in renewable energy, and it will help us make a leader in the green energy revolution.</p>	
Corey Wheeler-Forrest	<p>NOAA, in its comment to BOEM, expressed their land-based alternative to avoid the Sakonnet River, to reduce the impact on aquatic resources and designated habitat areas of particular concern. The CRMC also repeatedly urged them to look at an overland route for the cable to avoid the Sakonnet River because it is an essential fish habitat classified by the New England Fishery Management Council.</p> <p>Every document concerning offshore wind, BOEM uses phrases like, quote, probably will be, anticipated to be, expected to be, and likely will be. Every document contains conjecture like this; conclusions formed based on incomplete information. And the opposite of what's probable, anticipated, likely, and expected is not discussed. There are far too many uncertainties, controversies, and questions for this uncharted, large-</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>scale, long-term project to gain the momentum it already has. U.S. fishermen are required, by law, to adhere to the strictest rules and regulations in the world. Our seafood must be caught according to fishery management plans that consider social and economic outcomes for fishing communities, prevent overfishing, rebuild depleted stocks, minimize bycatch and interactions with protected species, and identify and conserve essential fish habitat.</p> <p>Just like the laws that govern, protect, and hold us accountable to keep our fishery sustainable, shouldn't offshore wind companies be required to adhere to these same standards?</p> <p>Rhode Island is the ocean state for a reason, and fishermen are a fundamental part of coastal communities and the backbone of our nation's food security and supply. Fishing in these waters is legacy and a practice that must be preserved for future generations, like we've always done.</p>	
Abigail Brown	<p>Representing Town or Portsmouth Harbor Commission. How long or how deep is the wind turbine cable going to interact with the pipeline that's going across the Sakonnet River starting next week?</p>	<p>Cable laying methods are noted in condition 10.C. of the Permit. The trenching depth is 4 to 6 feet. Conditions 14 to 18 note conditions for cable burial tools and depth. Condition 20 notes Secondary Cable Protection for areas at other cable crossings and utilities.</p>
David Gleason	<p>I see no information provided by DEM at the meeting. I hope that the outcome to this public hearing will be to get some information from DEM. I don't believe wind turbines belong on fishing</p>	<p>1 & 3. The dredge window is from October 15 to January 31. The water quality classification will not change.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>grounds. Putting any kind of cable in the Sakonnet River and going through the jet-plow process puts our environment in jeopardy.</p> <p>1. Will DEM protect citizens of Portsmouth and Rhode Island, Tiverton, all local people around the river, to ensure that it's going to be the same river after this process is done? Allowing for this permit is premature.</p> <p>2. Will DEM look at the pros and cons of putting a high-voltage cable down the river? Will we have that information? Do the pros outweigh the cons?</p> <p>3. Are there issues and dangers with dredging the pristine Sakonnet River?</p> <p>4. Has DEM looked at what's at the bottom of the river and Mount Hope Bay? Do you know what's there? Are you looking at reports from previous studies? Do you have new studies? Will there be studies if you don't have any? The bottom line is I don't believe this cable belongs in the Sakonnet River.</p>	<p>2. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p> <p>4. Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan.</p>
Sam LaRose	<p>In support: If we all work on it together, we'll be able to do this with minimal impact. Stopping development is not the answer. What we need to do is keep pushing forward and really push for the development that's going to make life sustainable.</p>	
Rich Tully	<p>In support: I get that this project will probably have some impact and certainly some inconvenience, but I also get that there's other things going on in the world that this project aims to mitigate. I get that this project could have impacts, but the consequence of not doing projects like this also has impacts, and they're real.</p>	



Name	Comment*	Response
James Murray	<p>My company that I worked for dredged Quonset Point back when we were doing that project, and we capped nuclear waste off of Block Island as one of the dredge spots. I don't know if anybody has even thought of something like that as a study, but I have seen it firsthand. While we may not be able to stop the wind farms from happening, while it's going to benefit MA, you, as RIDEM, can stop the cables from coming into Rhode Island waters.</p>	<p>Condition 12 of the Permit requires additional testing for potential contaminants. Testing will be performed by independent, licensed consultants hired by the applicant.</p>
Emil Cipolla	<p>DEM is responsible for Rhode Island waters and soil. That's their area of jurisdiction. All the wind towers are under the jurisdiction of the federal government. So, we have, in Rhode Island, no authority and responsibility to say whether or not the sites are proper. Is there a better route or a better alternative than using the Sakonnet or Narragansett Bay? I assert that it would be less damage and less impact by going the southern route up Narragansett Bay. The additional distance that the cable has to go for South Coast, from Quonset Point to Brayton Point, is a matter of miles, five or ten miles. There already is disruption of the lower half of the West Passage, and there will be an ongoing tunnel from Providence to the rest of Narragansett Bay. So that soil, those contaminants, are already impacted. My point is that any additional cost that South Coast would have to implement would be more than offset by not having to pay the post-community agreement of 10 or 20 million. So, therefore, I would recommend you use either one of two routes. Do the same thing that</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>Revolution is doing or go to New Bedford, that would be the exit point because the power is going primarily to MA.</p>	
<p>Sal Carceller</p>	<p>1. Would we be here if this electrical cable was being supplied electricity from a nuclear power plant? 2. Would we be here if this was a pipe to carry oil? 3. And I like to ask, does it matter? 4. What is your job at the DEM? 5. Is your job to concern yourself whether it's a clean energy project, which -- or a dirty energy project? The reality is, it's our river we're talking about. It's the impact to the river. It should not matter whether that electrical cable is going to carry the wind farm power or a nuclear power plant. It is very possible that 20 years from now we will have fission a reality and that cable could be used for something else, and it will be. As long as there is oil under our feet it will be extracted. So, while I agree that maybe oil is the problem, you know when the problem goes away? When all the oil goes away. I ask DEM to not pass judgement on whether or not you're going to put a cable in that river because it's a feel-good project because tomorrow that cable could be used for something else and will set the precedent that we could put a different type of cable in there, perhaps for oil or gas. 6. how many have been run down a narrow river like that of 300,000 plus in two lines? Based on Electrical background gas would be safer because it only poses a</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>threat if it leaks, however and electrical line leaks every time. Once you turn those electrons on, it is leaking and there is nothing that can stop the leak.</p>	
<p>Peter Roberts</p>	<p>I want to bring up Brayton Point. When I used to ride across the Braga Bridge, I would see over there all the growth was brown. No green. And then they re-did the stacks. As soon as they re-did the stacks, everything was green again. The problem is they haven't done any maintenance on anything.</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>
<p>Ken Mulder</p>	<p>I have heard a lot of people say tonight that the river is a pristine environment. I'm sorry, folks, it's not. It hasn't been since prior to the industrial revolution. The pollutants that were put into our waterways starting in the 1800s are still there. Running a cable up that river is going to disturb all of that sediment and release a lot of pollutants into our waterways again. Dredging this river is not going to help global warming. It is not going to help any of the situations. There was an overland route going through MA. This was cheaper and a lot of MA communities said no. So, this is the way they want to go. But they could afford to cancel their contract and pay a multimillion dollar fine? They could have used that money for a better route than destroying the waterways.</p>	<p>Condition 12 of the Permit requires additional testing for potential contaminants. Testing will be performed by independent, licensed consultants hired by the applicant.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
Martha Koziara	<p>1. Who is responsible for ensuring that they comply with all environmental mandates? Is there an entity? Does DEM do that? There's some federal entity that would be the overseer of this.</p> <p>2. What if South Coast Wind decides that they just don't feel like doing it a particular way?</p> <p>3. Did Portsmouth sign away their rights to complain or take umbrage with or contest any of the factors involved in that agreement?</p> <p>4. So, if they're not going to be held accountable, then why would they do what they're supposed to do?</p>	<p>1&2. Condition 4 of the Permit requires a 3rd -party Environmental Compliance Monitor that reports to the DEM, CRMC and the ACOE.</p> <p>3. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p> <p>4. The Permit conditions are required to ensure the project meets the applicable sections of the Clean Water Act, the Dredging Regulations, and the Water Quality Regulations.</p>
Elizabeth Pedro	<p>I do not agree that this cable should come down the Sakonnet Tiver for many of the reasons that have already been stated. I do particularly agree that the dredging is premature. We don't even know if this company is going out of business and then you've already done all this dredging.</p>	<p>A decision must be issued by March 15, 2024 to meet the Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 deadline.</p>
Cam Crockford	<p>I'm just touching base on what a lot of people have kind of voiced, especially in regards to septic systems and cost of maintenance of those and how our whole community puts forth the effort to maintain those, install them so we can live here. I've also had to deal with CRMC and DEM to construct seawalls to preserve our properties and with all the bad storms we've been having. The whole neighborhood gets flooded. And so, we understand that environmental global warming and the effects of that are very real. However, we live on the waterfront. And we just ask CRMC and</p>	<p>DEM has reviewed the application for compliance with the Dredging Regulations and the Water Quality Regulations. The Permit conditions are required to ensure the project meets the applicable sections of the Clean Water Act, the Dredging Regulations, and the Water Quality Regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>DEM to protect our water and give these wind farms as much of a hard time as they give use just to live here. And we just hope DEM can put as much work and effort in to protecting our water and giving them a hard time as much as they give our local residents a hard time.</p>	
<p>Emil Cipolla</p>	<p>The issue before us is not whether the wind farms will be installed. That's the feds' decision because it's on the continental shelf. So, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management has decided to grant permits to those eight developers. So, I think I'm correct in saying your only jurisdiction and authority is to say what's the impact if the cables go up on Rhode Island waters.</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>
<p>Paul Kesson</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is DEM going to do to notify the people that a hazard happened? 2. What notification will RIDEM use to inform the people of a failure of either a wind turbine or any hazard from this installation? 3. Do you have a calculation of how much tonnage of hazard is going to be put into the water column? 4. Do you have a method, has RIDEM done testing? 5. Has RIDEM done the testing in extensive where it's going to land base in Island Park? 6. Are you going to be measuring hazardous waste? 7. Is DEM installing monitoring stations? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-2. Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan. 3-4. Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan. 5. Landfall will occur using horizontal directional drilling. Condition 28 of the Permit requires a cable burial depth of 9 feet between mean high water and mean low water. 6. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations. 7-8. Condition 4 of the Permit requires a 3rd -party Environmental Compliance



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>8. Are they going to monitor the water in the dredge area to notify the residents?</p> <p>9. Has DEM done an aquatic survey to know what's out there in the first 12 inches of the top to know if it's going to change the aquatic life, the marine life that's in the bay, the marine life that's in the river?</p> <p>10. How are you going to protect the child that's not here tonight at the boundary where we transition from a wet cable to lang? What is the safety zone? How are you going to protect the residents?</p>	<p>Monitor that reports to the DEM, CRMC and the ACOE.</p> <p>9. Condition 27 of the Permit requires a Fisheries Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>10. Landfall will occur using horizontal directional drilling. Condition 28 of the Permit requires a cable burial depth of 9 feet between mean high water and mean low water.</p>

***Comments are not verbatim. Comments have been condensed and grouped to fit the table format for response purposes. Verbatim comments are contained in the scanned file "Public Transcript of Feb 22 Public Hearing" which can be found and downloaded from the same location as this file at: [Customer and Technical Assistance | Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management \(ri.gov\)](#) under "Public Notices and Topics of Interest."**