The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114-2524

MITT ROMNEY
GOVERNOR
KERRY HEALEY
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
STEPHEN R. PRITCHARD
SECRETARY

Tel. (617) 626-1000
Fax. (617) 626-1181
http://www.mass.gov/envir

# CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL NOTIFICATION FORM

| | |
|---|---|
| PROJECT NAME | : South Coast Offshore Wind Project |
| PROJECT MUNICIPALITY | : Fairhaven, Gosnold, Dartmouth |
| PROJECT WATERSHED | : Buzzards Bay |
| EOEA NUMBER | : 13812 |
| PROJECT PROPONENT | : Patriot Renewables LLC |
| DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR | : June 7, 2006 |

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G. L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and Section 11.06 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I hereby determine that this project **requires** the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The project as described in the Environmental Notification Form (ENF) consists of construction and operation of 90-120 wind turbine generators (WTGs) in the Buzzards Bay area. The proposed project will produce up to 300 megawatts of renewable energy, which will be transmitted to the mainland electrical transmission system via a submarine cable interconnection to a location in Fairhaven (off Egypt Lane). The proposed WTGs are located entirely within commonwealth waters and tidelands. The proponent presented a conceptual plan in the ENF that identifies three study areas as potential locations for the WTGs. Study area 1 is located south of Sconticut Neck and West Island and north of the Buzzards Bay navigational channel, running from the east edge of the channel to New Bedford Harbor to the east of West Island and terminating at Nasketucket Bay. Study area 2 is located between Buzzards Bay navigational channel and the Elizabeth Islands, running from Sow and Pigs Reef to Woods Hole. Study area 3 is located between the mainland of Dartmouth and Westport and the north edge of the Buzzard's Bay navigational channel, running from Hen and Chicken Reef to the west edge of the channel to New Bedford Harbor.

The project is undergoing MEPA review and requires a mandatory EIR pursuant to Section 11.03 (7)(a)(1) because it involves construction of a new electric generating facility with a capacity of 100 or more megawatts (MW) and Section 11.03(3)(a)(5) because it involves a new non water-dependent use occupying one or more acres of waterways or tidelands. The project is also under review pursuant to Section 11.03(2)(b)(2) because it may involve a taking of an

endangered or threatened species, or species of special concern, and Section 11.03(7)(b)(4) because it involves construction of an electric transmission line greater than one mile with a capacity of 69 or more kilovolts (kv)

The project requires a Chapter 91 License from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), and may require a 401 Water Quality Certification from DEP. The project is subject to review and approval by the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board (EFSB). The project requires a US Army Corps of Engineers Section 10 and 404 individual permit. The proposed project requires a MA Coastal Zone Management (CZM) federal consistency review and is subject to the requirements of the Ocean Sanctuaries Act. The project requires an Order of Conditions from the Fairhaven Conservation Commission (and, on appeal only, a Superseding Order from DEP). The project may require other local permits and approvals from the Towns of Fairhaven, Dartmouth, Gosnold and Westport, and the City of New Bedford.

US Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) will be the lead federal agency for review of the project under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The project will require an Environmental Assessment (EA) under NEPA. However, a determination has not yet been made as to whether the project will require an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to NEPA. I believe that coordinated review is a good government practice to enhance public and agency understanding of the project and facilitate an efficient regulatory process. Therefore, I strongly encourage the proponent to facilitate a coordinated state/federal review by incorporating federal agency requirements into the DEIR and inviting federal agencies to participate in any coordination meetings.

The proponent is not seeking financial assistance from the Commonwealth. Therefore, MEPA jurisdiction extends to those aspects of the project that are within the subject matter of required or potentially required state permits that are likely to cause damage to the environment (as defined in 301 CMR 11.02). However, due to the nature of the project and the broad scope of Chapter 91 and EFSB permits, MEPA jurisdiction is broad and extends to all aspects of the project likely to cause damage to the environment as defined in the MEPA regulations.

## MEPA REVIEW

It is the policy of this office to strongly support the development of renewable energy in the Commonwealth. Like my predecessors, I firmly believe that an ambitious program of renewable energy development, including wind power, is in the interest of the people of Massachusetts. However, as my predecessors have recognized in Certificates on previous proposals of similar scale, the most promising areas in Massachusetts for development of wind power lie off the coast, often in areas recognized for their scenic beauty and value for fisheries, wildlife habitat, and other resources. No matter how worthy a potential project may be, MEPA imposes a requirement on project proponents to understand and fully disclose the potential impacts of a project, both positive and negative, to study feasible alternatives to a project, and to avoid, reduce or mitigate environmental impacts.

The issues raised by this project are similar to previous major windfarm projects reviewed by this office, but here the proposed location illustrates the public interest challenges in sharp relief. As discussed in greater detail below, the project faces two threshold regulatory issues beyond the required comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to the natural resources and human uses of Buzzards Bay. First, the project as proposed is not permittable under the Ocean Sanctuaries Act. The proponent therefore proceeds at risk of denial of required permits on completion of MEPA review. Second, the proposed location is both within and proximate to the breeding, nesting and foraging habitat of the roseate tern, a state and federally protected endangered species. Comments by the state Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program and Mass Audubon question whether the project can be designed to avoid impacts to this species. The project proponent faces a high threshold in addressing these issues.

Lastly, I note that several public comments suggest that issues relating to the project's standing under the Ocean Sanctuaries Act should be resolved prior to MEPA review of the project; some commenters have requested that I not accept the project for review. I do not have the authority through MEPA to approve or deny a project. MEPA review will allow the public to participate in the review of alternatives that may be comparably suited to achieve the proponent's objectives and that meet regulatory requirements. In addition, MEPA review will provide an opportunity to inform the on-going discussion of the respective impacts and benefits of siting wind projects in coastal waters. If the proponent chooses to proceed with the proposed project, a Draft EIR must be filed in accordance with this Certificate.

## SCOPE

### General

I have received many comment letters in opposition to the project with requests that I deny the project because of its potential impacts on Buzzards Bay. I have also received many comment letters that support the project and renewable energy in general because of the clean air and energy independence benefits associated with such projects. As noted above, commenters also questioned the purpose and timing of the project's review under MEPA because of OSA exemptions and pending ocean management legislation. I expect the DEIR to discuss the project in the context of the OSA and proposed ocean management legislation. However, MEPA is not a zoning process, nor is it a permitting process. Rather, it is a process designed to ensure public participation in the state environmental permitting process, to ensure that state permitting agencies have adequate information on which to base their permit decisions and their Section 61 Findings, and to ensure that potential environmental impacts are described fully and avoided, minimized and mitigated to the maximum extent feasible. Many commenters have written with thoughtful and detailed recommendations regarding additional information and analysis needed, and I appreciate all the comments received, which were helpful in developing a detailed scope for the Draft EIR (DEIR).

Many commenters expressed frustration with the lack of information contained in the ENF, especially given the nature of the project and its potential impacts. In the ENF, the proponent has committed to conducting an interactive public involvement process that will

include all stakeholders in project design and review. Given the limited information provided in the ENF, this Scope for the DEIR is necessarily broad. The proponent should prepare a DEIR in accordance with the general guidance for outline and content found in Section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations as modified by this Scope. The DEIR should include a copy of this Certificate and a response to comments on the ENF. A Project Summary in clear non-technical language should be included in the DEIR. This section of the document should summarize the project, alternatives analyzed, the type and extent of potential impacts, and mitigation measures that the proponent is committed to. It should also include a list of permits and approvals required and a timetable and cost estimate for the project.

The DEIR should include sufficient baseline data to allow a full characterization of existing conditions and natural resources, and a meaningful analysis of feasible alternatives. Baseline data should include detailed seafloor mapping, including mapping of habitat types. The DEIR should include relevant physical parameters such as sediment and soil quality and other physical characteristics, oceanographic information such as sediment transport processes, bathymetry and wave, current and storm surge data, floodplain data, and wind speed. The DEIR should provide information on wind and meteorological data collection, including equipment and technology used to collect baseline data. Additional baseline data needs are discussed below in relevant sections of the Scope.

The DEIR should provide information on the sources of data used to assess short-term and long-term impacts associated with the project, which should include data from post-construction monitoring of other offshore wind energy installations. The DEIR should provide details on study methodologies, as well as guidelines and standards used.

Project Description

The DEIR should include a detailed description of all aspects of the project and a schedule for construction, maintenance, and other development activities. The DEIR should discuss the project timeline and any phasing proposed. The DEIR should include maps and plans at a reasonable scale that clearly locate and delineate all project elements. The DEIR should describe the proposed WTG design and include WTG specifications, cross-sectional views with dimensions of all structures proposed (including portions of structures that will be buried beneath sediment or land, submerged below marine or other waters, and projecting above land or water surface). The DEIR should describe all activities associated with the project's construction and operational phase. The DEIR should discuss the application and performance of proposed WTGs in similar conditions in other areas of the world. The project description in the DEIR should include:

- turbine spacing and arrangement, number and height;
- proposed lighting, and color of turbines and rotor blades;
- power curve and cut in/out speeds of turbines;
  description of service platforms (if proposed);
- cable laying specifications and methods;
- diagram of interconnecting cables between wind turbines;

description of the engineering analysis related to the design and sizing of the turbine foundation structures.

- detailed drawings and descriptions of scour aprons;
  description of construction materials, including any proposed bio-inhibitors or coatings and paints, oils, or lubricants (including volumes);
- spill avoidance and containment strategies, and contingency plans for potential spills or catastrophic events associated with construction and operational phases.

The DEIR should provide a rationale for sizing the proposed 300 MW facility and provide data regarding the average generating capacity expected, and the degree to which the facility will contribute to regional and local energy needs.

Alternatives Analysis

The DEIR should include a detailed and comprehensive alternatives analysis. Alternatives should be discussed and compared in the context of a clearly articulated project purpose. The methodology for evaluating and ranking alternatives should be described in the DEIR, including a description of criteria used to compare alternatives, and select or reject alternatives. CZM has recommended that the proponent model the alternatives analysis on a variation of the USACOE Highway Methodology. I ask the proponent to consult with CZM in this regard. The alternatives analysis should evaluate land-based and off-shore alternatives, and consider regional locations that may accomplish the project's purpose and goals (which may include locations outside of Massachusetts). Projects of varying sizes should be considered in the alternatives analysis, including a reduced-scale alternative, and alternatives that may phase the project, and/or split the project among different sites. The DEIR should also consider alternate configurations and spacing arrangements of turbines that could minimize the surface area impacts.

The ENF referenced a year-long study of four alternative sites. These should be further discussed and evaluated in the DEIR. The DEIR should evaluate at least one marine alternative that is not subject to Ocean Sanctuaries Act (OSA) prohibitions. The DEIR should include an evaluation of alternative feasible technologies for generating 300 MW of electricity. The alternatives analysis should include a comparison of project impacts with those of similar sized coal, oil and natural gas generating plants. I am not suggesting that the proponent should select an oil or gas-fired facility. However, I do believe it is appropriate to include a "generic" analysis of impacts associated with a traditional electricity generating facility in order to enable a comparative assessment of air quality, fisheries, avian, visual/aesthetic and other environmental impacts. The DEIR should include a "generic" analysis for a 300 MW coastal and inland gas-fired facility, and a brief comparison of impacts associated with similar sized oil and coal plants. The DEIR should also provide a comparison of alternate renewable energy technologies and discuss their relative impacts.

The DEIR should include an analysis of alternate routes and landfall sites for the proposed transmission cables. The alternate route analysis should demonstrate how the project will be designed to minimize impacts on benthic resources, water quality, submerged aquatic vegetation and the shoreline environment. The DEIR should include a thorough analysis of

alternatives that minimize impacts to water quality, and any other alternatives analysis required for the 401 Water Quality Certification, Chapter 91, NHESP, or other state permitting process. The DEIR should include alternatives to avoid impacts to salt marsh, eel grass or other submerged aquatic vegetation important to fisheries as recommended by DEP in its comment letter. The alternative analysis should clearly identify unavoidable impacts associated with each alternative and provide details on proposed mitigation.

The DEIR should provide sufficient information to establish a clear baseline for consideration of alternatives, and a concise quantitative summary of each of the alternatives studied to allow a simple comparison to be made. The DEIR should include a no-action alternative and discuss the status of other renewable energy projects and how they would impact the regional situation for Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards (RPS).

The CZM Office, in its comment letter, noted that existing data may be insufficient for a detailed site suitability analysis, and recommended that the proponent consider erecting data collection towers for the most promising sites. In comparing alternatives and discussing site suitability, the DEIR should present existing wind data and any additional data collected from monitoring stations as part of the DEIR preparation, and should include a discussion of data sources and adequacy. The DEIR should include an analysis that compares existing wind generating facilities, in particular those in marine environments, with the proposed project and its alternatives. The DEIR should discuss the successes and failures of previous projects, including reliability and maintenance issues and associated environmental impacts.

A number of commenters have raised the issue of rapid advancement in technology and the potential for new technology in the near future that may enhance the feasibility of wind energy installations in deeper water, and provide alternatives that would have reduced environmental impacts. I note that the Mineral Management Service is developing a deep-water alternative for the Cape Wind project in the federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The proponent may incorporate that information in this DEIR to satisfy this element of the Scope. The DEIR should discuss the status of wind power technological advancements in the context of the proposed project and its feasible alternatives.

The proponent indicated that tidal energy conversion may be considered as a component of the project. If the proponent intends to pursue a tidal energy component, the proponent should consult with the MEPA Office well in advance of filing a DEIR to determine how best to proceed in terms of the MEPA review as this would likely require a Notice of Project Change (NPC) for a revised Scope, or other MEPA filing.

Consistency with State and Local Policies and Plans

The DEIR should address consistency with state policies concerning energy, environment and sustainability, including Executive Order 385 (Planning for Growth) and the Massachusetts Climate Protection Plan. The DEIR should discuss the project's consistency with the Buzzards Bay Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan: 2006 prepared by the CZM Office, as well as the Ocean Sanctuaries Act (OSA) and Chapter 91 requirements as further detailed below.

The proponent should consult with the Towns of Dartmouth, Gosnold, and Fairhaven, regarding their comment letters, and provide response to comments in the DEIR. Issues raised by the towns, to be addressed in the DEIR, include: noise and visual impacts; ecological and socio-economic impacts; interactions with Atlas Tack Superfund Site; detailed plans for construction and connection with the NSTAR grid; safety issues during catastrophic storm events; decommissioning; and mitigation plans. The DEIR should identify local permits and approvals required for the project, and discuss the project's consistency with relevant local and regional plans and policies.

Ocean Sanctuaries Act

The project as proposed in the ENF is located within the Cape and Islands Ocean Sanctuary (CIOS) and thereby subject to the terms of the Massachusetts Ocean Sanctuaries Act (OSA) (sections 13-16 and 18 of Chapter 132A of the Massachusetts General Laws). Under the terms of the OSA, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) is responsible for the care and control of five state-designated ocean sanctuaries. As further detailed in the DCR comment letter, section 15 of the OSA prohibits within the CIOS the "building of any structure on the seabed or under the subsoil" as well as "the construction or operation of offshore or floating electric generating stations". Section 16 of the OSA modifies the above-mentioned prohibition to allow for certain limited activities. DCR views the exemption to allow (if the impacts are properly mitigated and permitted) activities such as those involving electric transmission cables and natural gas pipelines that support electric generating facilities located outside of an ocean sanctuary. DCR has indicated previously that this exemption would not allow the construction of an actual offshore electric generating facility within an ocean sanctuary. I concur with the DCR's reading of the prohibition and exemption. The exemption in section 16 should be read together with the section 15 prohibition of offshore generating facilities within the CIOS to allow other electrical power related activities but not the construction and operation of a generating facility itself. As I stated in the Cape Wind DEIR Certificate (EOEA# 12643, dated 3/3/05), the OSA prohibits the construction of any electric generating facilities, including WTGs, that would fall within the CIOS.

If the proponent considers that any of the exemptions in section 16 of the OSA are applicable to the proposed wind turbines, the proponent should provide a detailed discussion regarding its interpretation in the DEIR. The DEIR should also discuss other project components, such as the cables, in the context of the OSA exemptions. The DEIR should include a discussion of the proposed project and its alternatives in the context of ocean management legislation that is pending before the General Court.

Waterways Regulations/Chapter 91

The proposed project is also subject to the Chapter 91 licensing requirements of the Massachusetts Waterways Regulations (310 CMR 9.00). As noted in the DEP comment letter, DEP would be prohibited from issuing a Chapter 91 license if the project does not comply with the OSA. In addition, DEP has determined that the project is considered a non water-dependent use and would require a variance under 310 CMR 9.00.

The DEIR should include sufficient information for DEP to make a determination regarding the project and whether it meets the criteria for issuance of a variance. The DEIR should provide detailed information to demonstrate how the project meets variance standards (310 CMR 9.21) and other applicable regulatory standards including the Standards for Nonwater-Dependent Infrastructure Facilities (310 CMR 9.55), which provides for the protection of public interest in waterways. The DEIR should include a detailed analysis of the project's impacts to public interests in waterways and any necessary compensatory measures. Protected interests include maritime commerce, industry, recreation and associated public access; living marine resources and water quality; public views, visual quality of the shoreline environment, and historic and cultural resources near waterways. I refer the proponent to the DEP comment letter, and other sections of this Certificate, for additional details on information and analysis to be included in the DEIR regarding protection of the public interest in waterways.

The DEIR alternatives analysis, which is a critical component of the variance application as further detailed by DEP in its comment letter, should include descriptions, analysis and supporting documentation of:

a) the specific regulatory provision from which variances are being sought;
b) alternative designs, locations, or construction methods that would allow the project to proceed without a variance, and explain why these alternatives are unreasonable;
c) the detriments to public interests in waterways due to the project, and proposed means by which these impacts can be minimized;
d) proposed measures to compensate for any remaining detriments to public interests in waterways; and
e) the overriding public interest served by the project.

Avian and Bat Impacts

Buzzards Bay is a globally significant tern nesting and feeding area and provides critical habitat for the Massachusetts population of the federally and state-listed Roseate Tern (Endangered), the state-listed Common Tern (Special Concern) and the Least Tern (Special Concern). The project may also adversely impact Piping Plovers, which are a state and federally-listed threatened species of migratory shorebird. The proposed project has a high threshold to meet in order to be considered for permitting under the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA). Based on comments received from Mass Audubon and the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP), it is uncertain whether avian mortality and habitat impacts could be adequately mitigated.

The three major tern nesting areas in Buzzards Bay support approximately 45% of the entire North American population of the Roseate Tern. The NHESP has been operating an intensive tern restoration program in Buzzards Bay since 1998. The proposed project is a potentially significant threat to Buzzards Bay tern populations which, as further detailed in the NHESP comment letter, are highly vulnerable to disturbance at breeding areas and to factors that affect foraging efficiency and adult mortality. Studies referenced by Mass Audubon indicate that Study Area 1 is located in an important shallows feeding area for roseate terns and that Study Area 2 is located in close proximity to a prime roseate tern foraging area. According to

Mass Audubon, all proposed turbine locations would likely be in areas that roseate terns (and common and least terns) pass through on the way to foraging sites. Mass Audubon also notes that there are few sites in the northeastern U.S. that would be likely to support and sustain even a portion of the Buzzards Bay breeding population of roseate terns.

In order for the proposed project to be permittable pursuant to the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA), the proponent must demonstrate that the project will not result in a "take" of a state-listed species or that the project meets the standards for issuance of a Conservation and Management Permit (321 CMR 10.23). It appears that the project as proposed would constitute a "take". In order to meet the MESA permitting standards, the proponent will need to demonstrate that alternatives posing less risk to state-listed species are not available, that the turbines do not pose a significant risk of mortality to state-listed terns and plovers, and that the turbines will not significantly affect tern movements or foraging opportunities. The NHESP is of the opinion that there are few other areas in the U.S. where the risk of conflict between turbines and endangered wildlife would be as great as in Buzzards Bay. Therefore it is very important that an assessment of site alternatives be conducted and incorporated in the DEIR for the proposed project.

The DEIR should demonstrate that alternatives to avoid and minimize impact to state-listed species have been adequately assessed. The DEIR should include a detailed analysis of impacts to local state-listed tern and plover populations associated with the project and its alternatives. The DEIR should include the results of multi-year intensive tern and plover studies throughout Buzzards Bay and adjacent areas of Vineyard Sound. Mass Audubon and the Association to Preserve Cape Cod (APCC) recommended three-year studies for birds and bats. The proponent should consult with NHESP to determine the appropriate time period for the studies and other aspects of research design.

A risk assessment for terns and plovers should be conducted as recommended by NHESP, which should include an assessment of the relative frequency of use of different areas of the marine environment, activity patterns, flight heights and directions, and fine and gross-scale temporal variation in use of the areas. I strongly encourage the proponent to consult with Mass Audubon regarding the avian assessment, and to incorporate its recommendations on risk assessment, data analysis, literature review and survey methods subject to direction from NHESP. Assessments should be conducted in all weather conditions, at all times of day or night when foraging or migratory terns and plovers are active. The DEIR should describe survey techniques used, which will likely need to include aerial and boat surveys, radio-telemetry, and radar. The DEIR should describe the methodology used for risk assessments and other components of the avian assessments, including any assumptions, limitations or data gaps, and discuss the confidence levels associated with the results.

The DEIR should address potential impacts due to collision as well as avoidance and loss of feeding, breeding, migratory and staging habitat. The DEIR should assess specific aspects of the project that may impact avian populations, including lighting, temporary and permanent benthic changes, and potential avoidance of the areas, that may affect food availability for terns. The DEIR should also include the results of prey studies (juvenile fish and crustaceans) including their abundance and discuss the relative importance of the turbine areas for foraging.

In addition to studies of terns and plovers, the proponent should consult with NHESP regarding the design of studies to assess potential impacts to wintering waterfowl and other seabirds, and migratory songbirds. Studies should include multi-year radar, aerial and boat surveys to document the use of Buzzards Bay by these species. The DEIR should include the results of these surveys, which should be conducted at all times of night and day in varying weather conditions, and include data on flight heights and directions. The DEIR should address potential displacement of sea ducks and availability of suitable habitats in alternate sites. The avian assessment in the DEIR should include impacts to flyways, effectiveness of visual avoidance cues, and how these would be affected by low light, night and fog conditions.

The Massachusetts Audubon, in its comment letter, highlighted several Important Bird Areas (IBAs) located in or adjacent to Buzzards Bay, that provide essential habitat for regional populations. In addition to the studies on state and federally-listed species, the DEIR should discuss potential impacts to other avian species in the project area, including Bird Island and other IBAs. The DEIR should also evaluate impacts to bats, including potential collision risks to migrating and locally feeding bats. The proponent should work closely with the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, Massachusetts Audubon, and other appropriate agencies to develop a suitable methodology for a study to quantify potential impacts on avian and bat species and develop measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate unavoidable impacts to the maximum extent feasible.

Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Federal Consistency Review

The DEIR should provide sufficient information and analysis for a determination regarding the project's consistency with all of CZM's enforceable policies including but not limited to Energy Policy #1, Coastal Hazard Policy #1 and #2, Habitat Policy #1, and Public Access Policy #1. In addressing the CZM energy policy, the DEIR should thoroughly address the issue of coastal dependency and demonstrate that sites which could lead to substantial harm to the most valued areas of the coastal zone have been avoided.

For all coastal sites considered, the DEIR should include information as recommended by CZM in its comment letter, including a geological data collection plan, assumptions, methodologies and results; a description of seafloor types; characterization of physical processes that shape alternative sites; compatability of geological conditions with proposed methods of turbine construction and cable installations; an assessment of the magnitude and significance of the effects of wind turbines on waves, currents and sediment transport.

For the most promising alternative site(s), the DEIR should include a detailed description of the wind turbine and cable installation, and any data collection tower installations. The DEIR should include comprehensive mapping of the seafloor. The DEIR should include comprehensive data as required by this Scope, to document existing natural resource habitat and species, and a detailed analysis of potential impacts, and proposed measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts.

Fisheries and Marine Habitat Impacts

Buzzards Bay provides important habitat for a variety of finfish and invertebrates. The project area contains highly productive feeding, spawning, and/or nursery grounds for species such as tautog (*Tautoga onitis*), bluefish *(Potatomas salatatrix*), striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), lobster (*Homarus americanus*), squid (*Loligo pealei*) and other species. As further detailed in the Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) comment letter, construction of the proposed WTGs will cause direct impacts (temporary and permanent) to fisheries habitat and could result in reduced species success and decrease in abundance as far as the Mid-Atlantic states, and may significantly affect local commercial and recreational harvests of fish and invertebrates.

The DEIR should present a thorough evaluation of impacts to marine habitats, resources and commercial and recreational uses of the Bay. The DEIR should describe potential changes in habitat functions and values and discuss permanent and temporary alterations, and recovery periods. The proponent should consult with the DMF, DEP and CZM jointly to identify additional data needs, and to develop an appropriate research design to ensure a comprehensive assessment that accurately characterizes fisheries habitat and resources and potential impacts associated with the project and its alternatives. Data from additional studies should be integrated as appropriate with existing data sets, landings data, and physical/oceanographic characteristics to accurately characterize diversity and abundance of fishery resources. The DEIR should include a draft Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) assessment for state and federal agency review.

In addition to fish and invertebrates, the DEIR should include an evaluation of impacts to other protected species such as mammals and turtles. The DEIR should include sufficient information (including data from pre-construction surveys) to accurately characterize benthic habitat and organisms. Areas of submerged aquatic vegetation and shellfish habitat should be clearly mapped in the DEIR. The DEIR should present the results of physical surveys of sufficient spatial and temporal scale to characterize water flow and sediment transport within the preferred project area and alternative sites. The DEIR should describe cumulative changes in water flow and/or sediment transport due to interaction between the towers.

The DEIR should address habitat impacts associated with all phases of development, including construction, operational, decommissioning, and cumulative impacts. The analysis of impacts should include salt marsh, eel grass beds, and other habitat areas (including marine and wetland jurisdictional areas). The DEIR should quantify temporary and permanent impacts. Indirect impacts to aquatic life, including those resulting from changes to water currents, sediment transport and other factors should be addressed. Impacts associated with the conversion of seafloor habitat to hardened reef-like structures should be evaluated in the DEIR, which should include an analysis of anticipated changes to the fish community in the project area and throughout Buzzards Bay.

The DEIR should include a thorough review of existing literature of short and long-term impacts of cable-burying techniques on benthic environment, including turbidity impacts, impacts to submerged aquatic vegetation, and potential habitat displacement, with particular attention to lobster migration impacts and changes to fish and crab community. The DEIR should include an analysis of impacts to near-shore and inter-tidal areas at the landfall point

(including construction-vessel related impacts such as anchoring disturbances, chain scour and potential spills).

The proponent should work with the appropriate resource and permitting agencies to develop comprehensive plans, which should be presented in the DEIR, to avoid, minimize and mitigate project impacts, and to monitor resource recovery.

Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles

The DEIR should characterize species diversity and abundance of marine mammals in the project area, and provide an analysis of potential impacts from project construction and operation. The proponent should work with relevant state and federal agencies to develop an assessment plan and to develop appropriate strategies to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts. The DEIR should evaluate underwater noise impacts on cetaceans (whales, dolphins, porpoises) and seals. The noise impact analysis in the DEIR should evaluate the impacts to marine mammals and sea turtles of construction noise and potential collisions associated with construction and operational phases. Magnetic fields associated with submerged cables or other project components, and their potential impacts to marine mammals and sea turtles should also be evaluated in the DEIR.

Historical and Archaeological Resources

The Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources (BUAR) and the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) has determined that the project area may contain historically and archaeologically significant resources, including shipwrecks and submerged cultural resources such as ancient Native American sites. The proponent should secure the services of a qualified marine archaeologist to quantify the archaeological sensitivity of the proposed project areas and conduct a marine archaeological reconnaissance survey in consultation with the BUAR and the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC).

The proponent should consult with Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) and the USACOE to determine the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Archaeologically reconnaissance survey (950) CMR 70; 312 CMR 2.06(1)(a) should be conducted for the terrestrial and marine portions of the project's APE as further detailed by MHC in its comment letter and as recommended by BUAR. The proponent should consult with BUAR, MHC and a marine archaeologist/cultural resource consultant to develop an appropriate research design for the sensitivity study and surveys. The proponent should consult with MHC regarding proposed geotechnical studies for cultural resources and associated permit requirements. The DEIR should provide an update on consultations and the results of studies and surveys conducted. The DEIR should describe how the project is being designed to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate impacts to cultural resources.

Visual and Aesthetic Impacts

The DEIR should include a detailed visual impact assessment, which should include computer-simulated images from a range of vantage points. I encourage the proponent to

include photographs of similar existing wind energy facilities (taken from distances approximating the distances between Buzzards Bay vantage points and proposed project). The visual impact analysis should characterize visual impacts during day-time and night-time hours, and include consideration of turbine lighting requirements. The DEIR should include quantitative information to facilitate assessment of the significance of the simulated views. As further detailed in the CZM comment letter, quantitative information should include the amount of ocean-facing shoreline within various distances from the project perimeter, and the arc describing the horizontal extent to which the project structures will be noticeable against the horizon.

The visual impact assessment in the DEIR should include an evaluation of how the project affects the character and setting of historic resources in the APE. MHC has indicated that the APE is likely to include numerous National and State-listed properties that are included in MHC's Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth, and properties that have yet to be identified. The DEIR should include a map that clearly indicates the locations of historic resources relative to the APE, including the distances to these resources from the project area and photographic simulations to assess impacts on historic resources as further detailed in the MHC comment letter.

The DEIR should provide sufficient graphic and other descriptive information and analysis to enable assessment of impacts to public views of natural, historic and cultural features, as required by Chapter 91 performance standards. I encourage the proponent to avail of CZM's offer to assist in development of an appropriate methodology for the visual impact assessment. The proponent should also consult with MHC regarding the visual assessment.

Air Quality

The DEIR should include an evaluation of the project's air quality impacts, including anticipated benefits associated with reduced use of fossil fuels. The DEIR should include an assessment of local and regional impacts and a discussion of the project in the context of Massachusetts air quality policies and goals. The DEIR should include information on the data sources and models upon which the air quality assessment is based, including any assumptions, limitations, and data gaps.

Noise and Vibration Impacts

The DEIR should include an assessment of noise and vibration impacts associated with project and its alternatives, including construction and operational phases. The noise and vibration assessment should address impacts to marine mammals and sea turtles as outlined above, and other potential biological and ecological impacts that may result from a change in the noise environment. The DEIR should discuss studies regarding underwater noise that have been conducted at overseas installations, and address behavioral responses of different species to different types and intensities of underwater noise. The noise and vibration assessment should include consideration of spinning of blades, navigational aids/avoidance, fog horns, and flights associated with operation and maintenance activities. The DEIR should include a noise impact assessment for the proposed project modeled from sensitive receptors located along the

shoreline and other nearby areas. The DEIR should describe, for informational purposes, how the project will meet the performance standards of DEP's noise policy.

Wetlands and Water Quality

The DEIR should include a review of project's compliance with 314 CMR 4.00, the Massachusetts Surface Water Quality Standards, and 314 CMR 9.00, the Water Quality Certification (WQC) regulations for the discharge of dredged or fill material. The proponent should also consider proposed regulatory revisions as recommended by DEP in its comment letter. The DEIR should clarify applicable regulations and standards for proposed activities. I refer proponent to DEP comment letter and relevant regulations cited. As further detailed by DEP in its comment letter, a 401 WQC may be required by DEP under its discretionary authority based on cumulative or other impacts that may affect water quality.

The ENF indicates that there will be no dredging associated with the project. If dredging is proposed, the DEIR should include data on sediment quality and physical characteristics as necessary pursuant to 314 CMR 9.07. The DEIR should include a review of water quality designations for all water bodies in which the project would occur, evaluate impacts to designated uses, describe measures necessary to protect those uses, and review compliance with relevant standards and criteria at 314 CMR 4.05(5), including aesthetics, bottom pollutants and alterations, nutrients, and radioactivity.

The DEIR should delineate all wetlands resource areas pursuant to 310 CMR 10.00. The DEIR should include an analysis of project impacts to land under ocean and all other wetlands resources including coastal beach and vegetated wetlands. The alternative analysis in the DEIR should include project designs that avoid impacts to salt marsh, eelgrass or other submerged aquatic vegetation important to fisheries, and rare species habitat. The DEIR should demonstrate how the project would comply with the Wetlands Protection Act, including the provision at 310 CMR 10.37. As noted by DEP in its comment letter, no project may be permitted which will have any adverse effect on specified habitat sites of rare vertebrate or invertebrate species, as identified by procedures established under 310 CMR 10.37. The DEIR should identify any components of the project which may be filed as "limited projects" and demonstrate how the project would meet the "limited project" provisions pursuant to 310 CMR 10.24(7)(c).

User Conflicts

Buzzards Bay, which is designated by Congress as an Estuary of National Significance, is extensively used for public recreation and commercial activities such as fishing, boating and transportation of fuel oil. Many commenters have raised concerns about potential conflicts, including concerns that shipping activity will become more concentrated in already crowded navigation channels, and that the amount of open water available for recreational users will be limited. The DEIR should include a comprehensive assessment of potential conflicts between the proposed wind energy project and other commercial and recreational uses of the Bay. I recommend that the proponent use CZM's assessment of competing uses in Buzzards Bay, in consultation with agencies, as a basis for developing a use conflict assessment.

In order to adequately assess potential impacts, the DEIR should include a detailed analysis of current uses, and describe and quantify changes that may result from reduced access to the marine environment, collisions, fuel spills, and other potential impacts. The DEIR should identify ongoing or incremental impacts to resources and uses of the Bay associated with project operation, including identification of any areas where current uses would be excluded in the future by the proposed use.

The DEIR should include an assessment of the project's socio-economic impacts, including impacts relating to the fishing, boating, and tourism industry, and other public uses that may be affected in the future by the project. The DEIR should discuss potential disruption of recreational or commercial activities associated with access to docking areas, and any safety zones and no-anchoring areas that may be required for the project. The DEIR should discuss measures to avoid and minimize and/or mitigate adverse impacts associated with user conflicts. In the discussion of mitigation measures, the DEIR should provide details on the "host community packages" proposed in the ENF and data to support any proposed changes in electric rates or commitments to other stakeholder economic benefits.

*Vessel Collision and Oil Spills*

The DEIR should evaluate the potential for vessel collision and oil spills. Many commenters have raised concerns due to the high volume of oil transported by barge through Buzzards Bay each year (estimated at two billion gallons of fuel oil), and the natural resource damage that resulted from accidents and spills including the Bouchard oil spill in 2003. The DEIR should include information on the type and volume of oil and lubricants associated with the proposed turbines, and include a spill control and prevention plan and a contingency plan to be implemented in the event of an accident or spill.

*Aviation, Navigation and Communication*

The DEIR should describe potential project impacts on aviation in and around the Buzzards Bay area, including radar interference and issues relating to flight rules, wind turbine heights, and lighting. The DEIR should describe other potential impacts on navigation and general public purpose communications in the project area and discuss measures to avoid and minimize or mitigate communications problems.

The proponent should consult with DEP regarding the Vessel Traffic Service (VTS) system for Buzzards Bay, which DEP is coordinating with the United States Coast Guard, United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) and the Massachusetts pilot commissioner. Plans are underway to enhance and expand the VTS system, which is intended to provide vessel tracking and other information to prevent collisions and groundings. The DEIR should provide an update on consultation with DEP, and should evaluate potential project impacts to the existing and/or expanded VTS system.

*Fisheries-related conflicts*

The DEIR should describe the types and intensities of fishing activities that occur in the project area, and potential conflicts with the proposed project. The DEIR should include an evaluation of potential conflicts with traditional lobster trap and pot-fishing areas, and address habitat impacts and habitat recovery associated with concentrated fishing in restricted patterns within the project array. The DEIR should also include additional information and analysis relating to fisheries and marine habitat impacts as required in other sections of this Scope.

Construction Phase

The DEIR should describe how the turbines, transmission cables and other project components will be constructed, including construction methods, equipment to be used and details on project duration, sequencing and staging requirements for land and water-based components. The DEIR should include a detailed evaluation of impacts associate with cable-laying and other construction activities, including impacts to water quality, fisheries, and other wildlife.

The DEIR should evaluate potential impacts associated with pollutant discharge from contaminated sediment, including contaminants associated with previous spills and the Atlas Tack Superfund Site. The DEIR should address construction-related impacts to water quality and provide details on proposed turbidity monitoring and other measures to avoid and minimize water quality impacts. A detailed construction protocol should be included in the DEIR along with a spill containment and contingency plan. The DEIR should address construction related air pollutants and demonstrate compliance with US Clean Air Act and other applicable air quality regulations.

Cumulative Impacts

The DEIR should include an evaluation of the cumulative impacts of all project components and phases. The DEIR should assess cumulative impacts of the project, any other projects, and other work or activity in the immediate surroundings and region.

Monitoring

The DEIR should include a comprehensive monitoring program for pre-construction, construction and post-construction phases that will provide sufficient information to adequately assess actual impacts and inform development of adaptive management strategies. The monitoring program should include plans for monitoring: water quality; benthic habitat; living marine resources including fish, shellfish, sea turtles, marine mammals, birds and bats; navigation; fishing and shellfishing activities; and freshwater resources affected by terrestrial components of the project. The DEIR should discuss the use of monitoring data and adaptive management strategies proposed to minimize impacts that may arise after the project is operational.

Decommissioning

The DEIR should include a decommissioning plan for the turbines, cables and other project elements. The decommissioning plan should include details on process, timeline, methodology, and financial arrangements, as well as measures to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate potential impacts associated with the decommissioning process. The DEIR should discuss the feasibility and proponent commitments to structure and foundation removal in the event of catastrophic damage, system failure or other events.

Mitigation and Compensation

The MEPA process can serve an important role in coordinating the requirements for compensation and mitigation related to the proposed project. The MEPA process should be used as an opportunity for resource and management agencies to recommend mitigation requirements at an early stage so that a comprehensive program that addresses priority issues related to the project can be developed in a coordinated fashion. This is particularly important for large infrastructure projects such as this one that involve multiple agencies, and raise important policy issues regarding the use of public trust resources. The permanent occupation of the seafloor by the WTGs and associated cables may preclude or detrimentally affect other potential long-term future uses of the surrounding seabed and marine resources. Therefore, the DEIR should include proposals for compensatory mitigation, in consideration of the life expectancy of the turbines versus any proposed restrictions on activity in the project area and potential impacts to marine habitat and fisheries and their anticipated recovery periods. In addition to regulatory mitigation requirements, compensation may be required for this project under Chapter 91.

I ask that development of required mitigation be coordinated through my office. Mitigation should be based on consultations with local, state and federal agencies to develop a comprehensive package of mitigation measures designed to offset and rectify the direct and indirect impacts of the project including impacts to marine resources and habitats, and lost or impaired human uses.

The DEIR should include a summary of all mitigation measures to which the proponent has committed, based on the outcome of the ongoing consultation process. The DEIR should also include Draft Section 61 Findings for use by the state permitting agencies that are consistent with the outcome of the consultation process and that include clear commitments to implement mitigation measures, including costs, responsible parties, and the schedule for implementation. Comprehensive contingency planning and a valid monitoring program are two core components of an effective mitigation strategy.

Response to Comments

The DEIR should respond to the comments received on the ENF to the extent that they are within MEPA jurisdiction. The DEIR should include a copy of each comment letter received. The DEIR need not reproduce every form letter received but should include one "template" and any form letters that included additional individual comments. The proponent should use either an indexed response to comment format, or direct narrative response. The

DEIR should present any additional narrative or quantitative analysis necessary to respond to the comments received.

Circulation

The DEIR should be circulated in compliance with Section 11.16 of the MEPA regulations and copies (or a notice of availability) should be sent to those who submitted comments on the ENF as listed below. To save paper and other resources, I will allow the proponent to circulate the DEIR in CD-ROM format, and to send a notice of availability to those who submitted form letters (or those who commented via email and did not include mailing addresses). However, a hard copy of the DEIR should be sent to each state, federal and local agency from which the proponent will seek permits or approvals. The proponent should also make hard copies available to accommodate those without convenient access to a computer.

The notice of availability should include relevant comment deadlines, locations where hard copies may be reviewed and electronic copies obtained, and appropriate addresses. As required by the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.16(3)(c), the proponent should send a copy of the DEIR to any agency or person requesting it during the public comment period. A copy of the DEIR should be made available for public review at the Fairhaven, Dartmouth, New Bedford, Westport, and Gosnold Public Libraries.

August 9, 2006
Date

Stephen R. Pritchard, Secretary

SRP/AE/ae

*See Appendix 1 for a list of MEPA comments received on the ENF for the South Coast Offshore Wind Project*

**Appendix 1 - Comments Received**

| | |
|---|---|
| 6/28/06 | Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) |
| 6/29/06 | Massachusetts Marine Trades Association |
| 7/12/06 | Julie Wright |
| 7/12/06 | Evelyn Baum |
| 7/12/06 | Diane Starr Daniels |
| 7/15/06 | Town of Dartmouth Board of Health |
| 7/16/06 | Liz Wilcox |
| 7/17/06 | Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources (BUAR), Office of Coastal Zone Management |
| 7/20/06 | Anne Baker |
| 7/20/06 | Town of Dartmouth Planning Board |
| 7/21/06 | Victoria Cunningham |
| 7/21/06 | Allan Wolstenholme |
| 7/21/06 | Blair Walker |
| 7/21/06 | James Murphy |
| 7/21/06 | Steven Arnold |
| 7/22/06 | David Dionne |
| 7/22/06 | Paula Boutin |
| 7/23/06 | Austin Hoyt |
| 7/23/06 | John Smith |
| 7/24/06 | Arnold Scott |
| 7/24/06 | Gail Van Buren |
| 7/24/06 | Angelina Leite and Family |
| 7/24/06 | Maria Silva |
| 7/24/06 | Arlete Meneses |
| 7/24/06 | Robert Cunningham |
| 7/25/06 | Tom Porter |
| 7/26/06 | Richard Smith |
| 7/26/06 | Cathy DaSilva |
| 7/26/06 | Rachel Bonfiglio |
| 7/26/06 | Debra Thomas |
| 7/26/06 | Carol Allbright |
| 7/26/06 | Charlotte Murphy |
| 7/26/06 | Jean and Walter Koenig; Beverly and Herbert Pope; Rebecca and James Raymond; Cindy and Walter Koenig; Sandra and Stephen Koenig |
| 7/26/06 | Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) |
| 7/26/06 | Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, Office of Coastal Zone Management (CZM) |
| 7/26/06 | Wayne Hayward, Fairhaven Planning Board |
| 7/26/06 | Town of Fairhaven, Office of the Selectmen |
| 7/27/06 | Diana DiCarlo |
| 7/27/06 | Thomas Lynch |
| 7/27/06 | John Hunter |

| | |
|---|---|
| 7/27/06 | Keith Plapinger |
| 7/27/06 | George Lewis |
| 7/27/06 | Michael Walker |
| 7/27/06 | Stephen Derdiarian |
| 7/28/06 | Fairhaven Conservation Commission |
| 7/28/06 | James Gabana |
| 7/28/06 | Paul Elias, Trustee, Naushon Trust, Inc. |
| 7/28/06 | Michael Moomey |
| 7/28/06 | Sarah Ries |
| 7/28/06 | Walter Thomas |
| 7/28/06 | John McCoy |
| 7/28/06 | Association to Preserve Cape Cod (APCC) |
| 7/28/06 | Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) |
| 7/29/06 | Robert and Catherine Konicki |
| 7/29/06 | Vance and Edith Lauderdale |
| 7/29/06 | Sarah Johnston |
| 7/29/06 | Mark Perkins |
| 7/29/06 | Mary Heroux |
| 7/30/06 | Diane Keys |
| 7/30/06 | Robert and Nancy Stanhope |
| 7/30/06 | Betsy Powel |
| 7/30/06 | John and Ruth Elander, Jr. & John and Nancy Elander, III |
| 7/30/06 | Brenda Dias |
| 7/30/06 | Walter and Lisa Vehey |
| 7/30/06 | Thomas and Bernice Publicover |
| 7/31/06 | Mass Audubon |
| 7/31/06 | State Representative William Straus |
| 7/31/06 | Mabel C. Alkander |
| 7/31/06 | Richard Aubut |
| 7/31/06 | Donna Kirk |
| 7/31/06 | Stephen Bowling |
| 7/31/06 | Theresa Hedrick |
| 7/31/06 | Yvonne Sabourin |
| 7/31/06 | William Auerbach |
| 7/31/06 | Cheryl Brownell |
| 7/31/06 | Edith Forbes, Trustee, Nashawena Trust |
| 7/31/06 | Association to Preserve Cape Cod |
| 7/31/06 | Save Our Sound, Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound |
| 7/31/06 | Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) |
| 7/31/06 | Enrico Picozza |
| 7/31/06 | Gail Baillio |
| 7/31/06 | Louise Merrick |
| 7/31/06 | William Curtis |
| 7/31/06 | Karen Quigley and Russell Hensel |
| 7/31/06 | Linda, Everett and Samantha Benton |
| 7/31/06 | Ivan Quinchia |

| | |
|---|---|
| 7/31/06 | Douglas Dorr |
| 7/31/06 | Joanne Abut |
| 7/31/06 | Jameson Abut |
| 7/31/06 | Sierra Club (James McCaffrey) |
| 7/31/06 | Judith Pittman |
| 7/31/06 | Bob Feingold |
| 7/31/06 | Bill Pittman |
| 7/31/06 | Lucy |
| 7/31/06 | Joseph DeLellis |
| 7/31/06 | Cora Pierce |
| 7/31/06 | Bethany Laprade and Kaya Couture |
| 7/31/06 | Tim Shields |
| 7/31/06 | Coalition for Buzzards Bay |
| 7/31/06 | Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) |
| 7/31/06 | Kenneth Gregg |
| 7/31/06 | Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) |
| 7/31/06 | Cape Cod Commission (CCC) |
| 7/31/06 | Janet Gabana |
| 7/31/06 | Carolyn Bendiksen |

7/31/06 Form Letter (some with additional comments)

James Baker
Mary McQuaid
Sean Quintin
Alex Jones
Marilyn McMahon
Emily Capozzi
Marion Arrighi
Colleen Zentz
Robert Arrighi
Eileen Coyne
Gertrude Bellavance
D.B. (Dartmouth resident-signature unclear)
Don Frost (additional comment)
Alison Magee
Leslie Maguire
Richard Hogan
Marjorie Jones
Deborah Ronin
Catherine Timmons
John Timmons
Natalie Goregyson
AL. (Fairhaven-signature unclear)
Charlene Charette
Myra Mouneau

Terence Allen
Leon Femino (additional comment)
Marianne Allen
Lynda Johnson
Michael Smith
Bruce Norlund
Eli. J. (West Island-signature unclear)
Joan Perry and Jesse Perry (additional comment)
Normand Demers and Audrey Demers (additional comment)
Donna Olney
Fairhaven resident (signature unclear)
Patricia Burden
Donald Dion
Chris Burden
Jane Bailey
Fairhaven resident (signature unclear)
J. Johnson
Tommy Hickox (additional comments)
David Hickox
Fred and Jan Corcoran
Craig Arden
Linda and Bruce Haslehurst
Louise Merrick
Carol Roposa
Maryann Costa
J. Conto
Susan Rizzon (additional comment)
Jean Costa
P.Y, (Fairhaven resident-signature unclear)
William Yulon
MJ (Fairhaven resident-signature unclear)
David Herbert (additional comment)
James Ristuccia (additional comment)
Jesse Nateli
Albert Jones
Noreen Kavenagh
David Kavenagh
Anne Moomey
Michael Moomey
Robert McCarley
Ryan Malone
Alici Macarley (additional comment)
John R. (Fairhaven resident-signature unclear) (additional comment)
Beverly Ristuccia (additional comment)
John Ristuccia (additional comment)
Evelyn Maguire

J. Caldea
Margaret Caldea
Louise Caldea
NC (Fairhaven resident-signature unclear)
Sherry Kirk
Donna Kirk (additional comment)
Kathleen Hartman
Mr. and Mrs. Harley Ostis
Joseph Petner
Josephine Petner
Jon Siha
Geraldine Dehalles
Joseph Dehalles
Nicholas Lyndon
Christopher Morneau
Brian Swins
James Hickox
Jesse Perry
D. Brael
Acushnet resident (signature unclear)
Gwen Wilson
John E. (Fairhaven resident-signature unclear)
R.R. (Fairhaven resident-signature unclear)
Linda Jones
Ken Mullert
Joan Califf (additional comments)
E. Jacenda (additional comments)
Carl Gustafson (additional comments)
Candace Gustafson (additional comments)
Carol Tyson (additional comments)
Patty Lacerda (additional comments)
Elizabeth Stewart
Lee C. (Fairhaven resident-signature unclear)
Patricia A. H. (Fairhaven resident-signature unclear)
Brian McMahon
Judith Graham
J.D.H. (Fairhaven resident-signature unclear)
Elizabeth Raposa
Kathy Raposa
Jeremiah Raposa
Mark Raposa

8/01/06 Ruth and John Elander
Richard and K. Guarand (form letter)
Town of Gosnold
Knollmere Beach Association