



## MEETING 2: OSW PORT PLANNING

Thursday, July 7, 2022 – 12pm-5pm  
University of Maine  
Orono, Maine

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

**Objective:** To describe the technical requirements for an OSW port; OSW Port purpose and need; the requirements for alternatives and analysis; and the opportunities and constraints to future development on Sears Island.

---

### MEETING TAKEAWAYS

#### The Pre-Meeting Tour

1. The Advanced Structures and Composites Center demonstrated how the Center develops, tests, and helps bring to market:
  - new materials for construction and other industries – materials are lighter, less costly to install with fewer environmental impacts, more durable/longer lasting
  - OSW floating wind turbine generators (WTGs)

#### Port Requirements

2. Port requirements, port facilities, and vessels for fixed bottom and floating WTGs are similar but not identical.
3. There are multiple examples of existing and proposed ports to support fixed bottom OSW WTGs. These ports, though not designed to serve floating OSW, provide meaningful comparison for scale, functional elements/areas, and operational needs.
4. There are no examples of ports built or under construction to support floating OSW WTGs.
5. Maine's timeline for a purpose-built port to serve floating OSW WTGs spans 2023-2040.

#### Sears Island Planning Initiative

6. The Sears Island Planning Initiative was a two-phase effort resulting in three documents, which are available on the OSWPAG website under Additional Project Information (left panel):
  - Steering Committee Consensus Agreement, April 2007
  - Final Report and Recommendations for Implementation of the Sears Island Planning Initiative Joint Use Planning Committee
  - Buffer Conservation Easement of 601 acres on Sears Island, granted by MaineDOT to Maine Coast Heritage Trust in January 2009

See pages 9-10 of this meeting summary for highlights of each document.

7. There are varied perspectives on the planning process (and participant) intent as well as the interpretation of the documents' language.



## ATTENDANCE

### ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS

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

### SPEAKERS

Bruce Van Note, MaineDOT  
Matt Burns, Maine Port Authority

### MAINE DOT PERSONNEL & CONSULTANTS

Nate Benoit, MaineDOT (virtual)  
Nate Moulton, MaineDOT (virtual)  
Michael Cole, MaineDOT  
Kristen Chamberlain, MaineDOT (virtual)  
Kim King, MaineDOT  
Kay Rand, Consultant  
Bill Plumpton, Gannett Fleming, Inc.  
Adam Archual, Gannett Fleming, Inc.  
Michelle Brummer, Gannett Fleming, Inc.

### PUBLIC, IN-PERSON

Caleb Jackson, Maine Heritage Coast Trust  
Genevieve McDonald, New England Aqua Ventus  
(NEAV)  
Jeff Romano, Maine Heritage Coast Trust  
Jake Ward, Vice President for Innovation and  
Economic Development, University of Maine  
Cory Limberger, Audubon Society

### PUBLIC, VIRTUAL

Christopher Allen  
Becky Bartovics  
Greg Biddinger  
Christina Breen  
Celina Cunningham  
Jennifer Delony  
Sabrina DeTurk  
Serge Drage  
Joseph Kennedy  
Bonnie Martinolich  
David Repass  
Gwyneth Roberts  
Joan Saxe, Sierra Club Maine  
Sharon Sneed  
Amber Thompson



## MEETING NOTES

### Welcome and Opening

Bill Plumpton thanked Dr. Dagher for opening the Advanced Structures and Composites Center to the OSWPAG members and for his remarks about the Center's work to advance floating OSW WTGs. He thanked the University of Maine for use of the Buchanan Alumni House.

The following introductions were made by Port Advisory Group members who were not present at, or attended virtually, the first OAWPAG meeting:

- Jim Guerrette, Searsport resident: Searsport resident for 16 yrs. Wife is a schoolteacher.
- Matt Marks, Associated General Contractors of Maine: Participated in Meeting 1 via Zoom.

The following members of the Consultant team were present at the first Advisory Group meeting, but were not introduced formally:

- Kay Rand, consultant to DOT providing management, policy, and logistical support
- Michelle Brummer, certified planner working in both community planning and transportation fields, specifically to engage stakeholders
- Adam Archual, Environmental planner and NEPA practitioner

Bill Plumpton reviewed the role of the OSWPAG and its member responsibilities:

Role: To provide advice to the state throughout planning and project development process.

Responsibilities:

- Stay informed. DOT is posting materials to the OSWPAG website (link in page footer). Visit and refer others to this public information. Summary of Meeting 1 is on the website.
- Ask questions and share thoughts as the State works to collect all viewpoints.
- When you give advice, whether positive or negative, explain why or how a future action could be improved.
- Relay information back to associations, friends, neighbors in Maine to strengthen public understanding and awareness of progress.
- Expect some disagreements. There are no votes and no need for consensus. Everyone will have an opportunity to speak and be heard equally.
- Participating in our meetings remotely is just fine. Use the 'raise hand' function to request to be heard.
- If you miss a meeting and would like a briefing, please contact Kay and she will schedule it.
- Co-chairs, Beth and James, are charged to keep the process moving at a good pace.
  - Let them know if you need us to slow down or speed up the conversation.
  - They may add subjects to the agenda.

Bill stated that all OSWPAG questions are being tracked. All questions are important, and we will have answers by the end of this process; some answers may come sooner, and others will be answered throughout the process of developing the port.



He noted that the OSWPAG will be notified about the state's next steps before they happen.

All the OSWPAG's meeting materials, including but not limited to meeting agenda, summaries, and presentations, will be packaged as a single record of the port advisory group's effort.

The Advisory Group had no questions at this time.

Bill Plumpton overviewed the Meeting 2 agenda.

## 1. **Maine OSW Port Characteristics & Operations Overview**

Presented by Matt Burns, Executive Director, Maine Port Authority

Presentation: OSWPAG Pres 2 7.7.22.pptx (44 slides)

### **Key Points from PowerPoint Presentation and Advisory Group Discussion**

- This presentation is intended to explain what an OSW port might look like by referencing existing ports in the US and Europe.
  - There are no purpose-built floating offshore wind (OSW) ports in the world. We are evaluating new criteria that are not common to all port design.
  - There are commonalities between ports that service fixed-bottom and floating wind turbine generators (WTG), particularly on the upland side (e.g., acreage, punch load, etc.).
  - All current OSW port projects are pilot projects.
  - Maine needs a port that will support a commercial OSW project.
  - Multiple ports may be developed to support this purpose.
- A floating OSW port must have (criteria):
  - Deep water access – 35 ft is good; 40 feet is best
  - No overhead restriction (i.e., no air draft)
  - Contiguous, level ground for cargo staging with heavy loading capacity (3000-6000psf)
  - Dedicated wharf frontage: one for delivery and one for installation
- Additional “nice to have” criteria:
  - Proximity to OSW project/installation site (efficiency and downward cost driver)
  - Access to labor force, preferably construction
  - Intermodal connectivity (i.e., road, rail, shipping)
  - Strategic geographic location to efficiently access the above criteria
- Wind turbine size and power generation
  - Terrestrial wind turbines typically range from 10kW (household) to 3MW (terrestrial wind project).
  - 12-15MW is the current commercial scale envisioned for OSW projects.
  - 50MW is the theoretical future (nearly as tall as the World Trade Center) for OSW projects.  
See slides 5 and 6 for graphics.
- Hypothetical OSW Solicitation Timeline (8 steps from 2023 to 2040)



## OFFSHORE WIND PORT ADVISORY GROUP

- 2023-25 – Maine Research Array (MeRA) will require a primary port to launch 12-turbine MeRA. This is about 40 acres.
- 2028-30 – primary port is expanded to accommodate commercial-scale OSW development. This is about 60 acres. Anticipate roughly 120 OSW WTGs (Solicitations 1 and 2). An operations and maintenance (O&M) port facility would be required in this timeframe and could be accommodated at the primary port or at a different port.
- 2031 – BOEM Solicitation 1 anticipated (800MW or about 60 OSW WTG)
- 2023 – BOEM Solicitation 2 anticipated (800MW or about 60 OSW WTG)
- 2032-34 – A Service Operation Vessel (SOV) port, a second **marshalling port** and foundation manufacturing facility will be required in this timeframe. These may be accommodated at the primary port or at a different port(s).
  - “Marshalling port” is synonymous with a multi-purpose port with capacity for staging materials and construction operations.
- 2035 – BOEM Solicitation 3 anticipated (1100MW)
- 2037 – BOEM Solicitation 4 anticipated (1100MW)
- 2040 – BOEM Solicitation 5 anticipated (1100MW)
- Types of vessels and equipment
  - WTIV – Wind Turbine Installation Vessel are typically for fixed bottom OSW WTG.
    - S. Miller asked for clarity on whether the WTIV is needed for floating OSW projects.
      - M. Burns replied that floating OSW WTG are assembled entirely at port and towed to the installation/project site.
      - Dr. Dagher stated these vessels are specific to fixed bottom WTG and are not needed for floating OSW WTG.
  - SOV - Service Operation Vessel are equipped to provide routine repair and maintenance to OSW WTG
    - OSV – offshore vessel; broad term for vessels supporting exploration and production of offshore mineral and energy resources (as stated, but not listed in the presentation)
  - CTV – Crew Transfer Vessel
  - Barge – semi-submersible barge; like a heavy lift vessel to haul ship or an OSW WTG in this case.
  - Delivery Vessel – General cargo or heavy lift vessel that is used to transport WTG components to the marshaling facility. 8-10m draft.
  - AHTS – Anchor handling tug supply. Specially designed to handle the large anchors that tether the floaters to the seafloor.
  - Cable Layers – to install subsea cables between turbines and to the shoreline.
  - Helicopters – Extremely fast way to shuttle personnel to and from support vessels as well as hotshotting parts and equipment.
  - Cranes – Massive cranes on shore and mounted on vessels are required to move heavy components.
  - SPMT – self-propelled modular transport (for equipment).
  - See slide 10 for a graphic from Crowley (Florida-based tug and barge company) depicting many of the vessels described above



- B. Ahearn asked M. Burns to confirm these are existing vessels.
  - M. Burns replied that, yes, all vessels depicted are either existing or concept.
  - Dr. Dagher stated that these vessels are specific to fixed-bottom OSW; not needed for floating OSW WTGs.
- M. Burns emphasized the modern safety systems integral to OSW vessels noting that those vessels that approach and/or work on the OSW WTG themselves are equipped with computerized, dynamically positioned systems that control the vessel's steering and thrust systems.
- ATB – articulated tug barge, which has a “hinged” connection allowing movement in the fore and aft (pitch)
- OSW Port Facilities
  - Marshalling (or staging) Port facility
    - Generally, 30+ acres in size (majority is for laydown) and to accommodate 100-300 personnel.
    - Examples:
      - Port of Esbjerg (Denmark) is a good example of a marshalling port at 150 acres.
      - Nigg OSW Terminal in Scotland, 182 acres
      - NJ Wind Port, proposed as 200 acres (rendering) for marshalling and manufacturing
  - Factory Facility
    - Take in raw materials and produces OSW WTG components. Blades, nacelles, tower sections and transition pieces are delivered from the factory to the marshalling facility.
    - Requires 60+ acres
    - Heavy lift cranes
    - Examples:
      - Albany Tower Manufacturing Facility (proposed), 82 acres
      - Siemens Gamesa Blade Manufacturing (Hull, UK), about 80 acres
  - O&M Port facility
    - Daily CTV voyages to/from an OSW farm
    - 3+ acres
    - Labor force arrives by car or bike/ped if local
    - Example:
      - Rampion O&M Base at Newhaven, England.
  - SOV Home Port
    - Supplies support vessels with O&M
    - 1-3 acres for storage yard, warehouse, parking
    - 24 ft min water depth
    - 1-3 port calls per month; 1 day at home port
- The concept of a “port network” is a viable option, e.g., Beatrice OSW Farm in Scotland. See slide 40.
- Some of the considerations surrounding port activity include, but are not limited to noise, cargo vessel activity, traffic (e.g., road, rail), workforce size, hours of operation, and lighting.



- Noise – There are no conclusive studies specific to an OSW terminal. See slide 42 for sources of noise at an OSW terminal.
- Vessel and Vehicle Traffic – characterized on slide 43

## Discussion

- M. Cannon noted that an OSW port's needs (in area, equipment, operations) will be related to market demand.
- D. Damon asked whether an obsolete OSW farm can be refurbished after the expected 25-year lifespan.
  - M. Burns replied that this should be possible, but that additional research needs to be undertaken. It is expected that some components will need to be replaced over the productive life of an OSW farm.
- D. Damon asked whether a collection of ports to support the various ancillary services associated with floating OSW development, operations, and maintenance is something Maine should explore.
  - M. Burns replied that, yes, these ancillary services could be split up but noted that (1) the longest recorded distance to tow a floating OSW WTG is about 800 nautical miles (nm) and (2) the industry will not grow without increased efficiency.
- J. Guerrette asked about cleaning the floating OSW WTG foundations: how is that done, and what is the US Coast Guard (USCG) class?
  - M. Burns was uncertain which USCG class would be applicable to foundation cleaning.
- R. Olson asked why the state is not considering tidal energy.
  - M. Burns was uncertain about the status of tidal energy research and development.
  - Jake Ward of University of Maine stated that ORPC in Portland, ME and volunteered to put R. Olson in touch with ORPC.

## 2. **Draft Purpose and Need for the OSW Port and Requirements for Alternatives and their Analysis**

Presented by Bill Plumpton, Gannett Fleming

Presentation: Purpose\_Need\_Alternatives\_Requirements 2022-07-07.pptx

Draft Purpose Statement: The purpose of the proposed action is to construct a marshalling port facility in Maine to support the commercialization of the offshore wind industry.

Draft Need Statement: The State of Maine does not have a marshalling port facility with sufficient space to support the construction, operation, and maintenance of offshore wind turbines.

Due to the time, this presentation was abbreviated and will be revisited at the next meeting planned for September 2022.

### **Key Points from PowerPoint Presentation and Advisory Group Discussion**



- Complying with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is a project planning and decision-making process. The intent is to gather and analyze all relevant information so that decision makers may evaluate viable project alternatives that meet the project purpose and need and select the most beneficial alternative with the least adverse impacts.
- One day, the State will prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD) to document compliance with NEPA. An EA is less detailed and an EIS is more detailed. Regardless both follow the same, sequential planning and decision-making processes.
- The purpose and need section of an EA or EIS lays out why the proposed action is being pursued, along with its inherent costs and environmental impacts. “Environment” includes natural, social – including all aspects related to people – and economic considerations and resources.
- A project’s purpose and need creates a basis for evaluating alternatives. It drives the identification of alternatives, their analysis, and the ultimate selection of the alternative that best meets the purpose and need of the project, with the least overall adverse impact.
- The purpose statement is like an overarching mission statement: what is desired future state or end-product.
- The draft purpose statement for this OSW port (stated above) was developed in coordination with Maine DOT. This will be discussed in greater detail at the September OSWPAG meeting.
- The NEPA process must consider a reasonable range of alternatives. The number of alternatives and level of analysis varies with the significance of a project. We expect a handful of alternatives will be rigorously evaluated. Conceptual plans for these alternatives will be presented at the September OSWPAG meeting.
- The requirements for alternatives and their analysis will be discussed in greater detail at the September meeting.

## Discussion

- None.

### 3. Planning Context in Searsport: Sears Island

Moderated by Beth Ahearn

#### a. Overview of Past Sears Island Planning Initiatives

Presentation by Bruce Van Note, Commissioner, MaineDOT

The Sears Island Planning Initiative was a two-phase effort resulting in three documents, which are available on the OSWPAG website under Additional Project Information (left panel), and which were agreements and legal documents relative to Sears Island were reviewed.

##### 1. Steering Committee Consensus Agreement, April 2007, which outlines:

- Appropriate uses for Sears Island as: compatibly managed marine transportation, recreation, education, and conservation and inappropriate uses/activities prohibited (Section 1)





- Preference to Mack Point as an alternative to port development on Sears Island; MaineDOT will investigate capacity and feasibility of an expanded marine cargo port and will collaborate to evaluate, and pursue proposals and partnerships, for a cargo/container port at Mack Point and/or Sears Island (Section 2)
- Need to define and protect an area for light recreation, education, and conservation through a buffer easement and management agreement (Section 3)
- No proposal for a marine transportation facility is endorsed by parties of the agreement; parties will not oppose such a facility for non-substantive reasons; parties will not oppose a cargo/container port if the proposal meets environmental/regulatory requirements and an alternatives analysis shows other locations do not meet the need; parties reserve the right to object to certain kinds of facilities (e.g., LNG or oil terminal) (Section 4)
- Jurisdiction of Sears Island remains with the MaineDOT (Section 5)

## **2. Final Report and Recommendations for Implementation of the Sears Island Planning Initiative, Joint Use Planning Committee, 2008**

- Identified and established locations for:
  - Protected Property for
    - Potential Education & Maintenance Center Area
    - Cell Tower Lease Acquisition
    - Enhancement/Restoration Areas

With consideration for natural and cultural assets, accessibility, and visitor suitability
  - Transportation Parcel, based on:
    - Orientation to existing federal navigation channel
    - Site topography to accommodate rail service
    - With consideration for secondary environmental factors
- See map of locations on Slide 11 in the SIPS-JUPC Summary\_6-30-22.pptx.

## **3. Buffer Conservation Easement of 601 acres on Sears Island, granted by MaineDOT to Maine Coast Heritage Trust in January 2009**

### **Key Points from PowerPoint Presentation**

- Preference should be given to Mack Point if its development can be accommodated.
- In the state's preliminary opinion, an OSW Port is an "acceptable use" as defined in the agreement documents noting that the type(s) of activities undertaken at a marshalling port are consistent with a cargo port.

- b. **Perspectives from OSPWAG Members Involved in Past Planning Initiatives:** James Gillway, Dennis Damon, Steve Miller, David Gelinias, and Jim Therriault (Note: Therriault was unable to participate in this meeting.)



## 1. James Gillway

- Has been in Searsport since before the Sears Island Planning Initiative (SIPI) having started in the police department. J. Gillway left for military service in 2004-05, concurrent with the LNG proposal on Sears Island. Upon his return from service, J. Gillway assumed the town manager position.
- Planning for Sears Island began locally, within the Searsport community. Future land use for Sears Island was discussed and addressed through the Town of Searsport Comprehensive Plan (developed about 2000), continued with a local group for acceptable use (i.e., SIAUC) in the 2004-2005 timeframe.
- J. Gillway became involved in the state's SIPI in 2005 and participated in the JUPC beginning in 2009.
- While the group reached consensus, in J. Gillway's opinion there were still some disagreements.
- J. Gillway's understanding was, and remains, that 300 acres of Sears Island was preserved for future marine transportation development.

## 2. Steve Miller

- S. Miller stated that Islesboro Islands Trust (IIT) became interested in Sears Island when there was considerable local concern about a proposed nuclear plant on Sears Island.
- IIT was notified of the SIPI and became involved as one of the 45+ members of the steering committee. It was their initial understanding at the time that the committee would undertake planning for the whole island. However, IIT learned that the SIPI would focus only on the conservation property (approximately 600 acres). While this was a disappointment to IIT, they decided to remain involved.
- S. Miller noted that there may be some differences in understanding, or definition, of terms in the agreements between those with conservation interests and those with marine transportation interests. Specifically:
  - Section 2 "Build out of Mack Point": IIT believes that "preference" means "priority" in plain language (i.e., marine transportation development in the Searsport area would prioritize Mack Point over Sears Island). When IIT received the March 2020 GOE and MaineDOT press release regarding an OSW Port, it was their understanding that Mack Point was the preference. IIT was surprised to learn in the Fall of 2021 that Sears Island was on the table and, in fact, appeared to be the preferred site (reference Moffatt and Nichol Feasibility Study).
  - Section 1. "Appropriate Uses": IIT considers appropriate uses to mean compatible uses. What does compatible mean? S. Miller stated he once heard a planner define compatible by whether one can hear, see, or smell adjacent land uses/development. The dictionary defines compatible as co-existing without conflict.



- “No soil harvesting”: Moffat & Nichol mentioned soil harvesting of 1 million cubic yards from Sears Island. This is not compatible with the agreement in IIT’s opinion.
- “Permitting for cargo port”: IIT was not agreeing to any future marine transportation uses at the time of the agreement and believed they were reserving the right to review and comment on future proposed uses. There was interest in a container port at Sears Island, per (former MaineDOT Transportation Commissioner) David Cole, but it didn’t develop.
- In closing, S. Miller stated that the public must be able to trust our institutions of government. While IIT constituents are eager to see OSW at the right time and place, there remains deep concern about negative impacts to Sears Island and the upper Penobscot Bay.

### 3. David Gelinias

- D. Gelinias was asked to participate in the steering committee as a ship pilot. Overall, he relayed a negative impression of the SIPI, noting that it seemed like the administration was giving the impression of doing something, but not the right thing. The right thing for Maine taxpayers would have been to use the SIPI as a blueprint to accommodate conservation wishes with transportation needs at the time when development was sought and permits required.
- The full 940 acres of Sears Island was owned by the MaineDOT before the agreement. At the end of the process, the state retained 330 acres for development and had no agreement to support development on the transportation parcel.
- D. Gelinias indicated that parties to the SIPI (“conservation affinity group”) did not act in good faith during the planning process, citing specifically a letter to conservation group membership that the agreement did not approve or endorse any port development, nor does it create a condition to allow development.
- The consensus agreement did not solve anything but gave the conservation affinity groups control over much of the island and kicked the can down the road.
- At the time, the transportation affinity group encouraged making any concessions contingent on securing necessary permits for port development as the conservation affinity group illustrated their strategy (in 2006 Scott Dickerson email provided by press) that placing 2/3 of Sears Island into conservation easement would give political leverage to ultimately advocate for conservation of the entire island.
- D. Gelinias went on to state that he supports compatible uses of recreation and conservation on Sears Island, pointing specifically to [Point Pleasant Park](#) in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, a 185-acre park adjacent to the Port of Halifax, the busiest port in the northeast. Gelinias also noted Fort Knox State Park in Maine where MaineDOT successfully meshed transportation and recreational uses.



## 4. Dennis Damon

- D. Damon was elected Hancock County Commissioner in 1992 where a personal and political interest in economic development and education coalesced. Around this time, he came to realize the link between economic development and transportation.
- Later, D. Damon was elected to the State Senate where he served on the Transportation Committee and Marine Resources Committee. Experience on the Transportation Committee strengthened his understanding of the link between economic development and transportation.
- At this time, D. Damon also became aware of Maine's 3-port strategy for commercial and marine trade.
- In D. Damon's opinion, the port at Searsport includes Mack Point and Sears Island. Sears Island was purchased in its entirety by the state for marine transportation purposes prior to the SIPI. Damon supported, and still does, Searsport's inclusion in the 3-port strategy as an important opportunity for economic development down east.
- It was through the SIPI that Damon was introduced to the concept of conservation/preservation on Sears Island. He had previously not considered this but listened and concluded that co-existence could work.
- Ultimately, D. Damon believed the SIPI arrived at a reasonable compromise (Consensus Agreement) though he wished, at the time, that the agreement was slanted more towards marine transportation.
- D. Damon was disappointed that the conservation groups appeared to be remolding the agreement in the environmental groups' favor through comments made in the public after the fact.
- D. Damon replied to S. Miller's remarks on compatibility noting that the sequence of development must also be considered (i.e., Sears Island was in marine transportation use before conservation use).
- D. Damon remarked that he had advocated to protect the cargo/container use for the transportation parcel. At that time, he had not envisioned OSW. If he had known, then about OSW he would have advocated for its permitted use.
- D. Damon remarked that development of the OSW Port represents economic development down east and may, at the same time, help to "save the planet".

### Discussion

- None.

## 4. Public Comment

Becky Bartovics

- B. Bartovics stated she participated in the SIPI.



- She said there is a clear difference between manufacturing at Mack Point and Sears Island. Sears Island offers natural resources that are not present on Mack Point (e.g., sea grasses, blue carbon). The Governor’s Climate Council stated that eelgrass is a high priority. Citing Page 7 of Climate Action Plan, Strategy E, Protect Maine’s Environment and Working Lands and Waters, to preserve and restore coastal habitats and encourage blue carbon habitat.
- She asked, “How will MaineDOT address blue carbon and the changing coastal climate at Searsport, including Mack Point and/or Sears Island?”
- She requested more advance public notice of future meetings.

## 5. Closing and Adjournment

Bill Plumpton noted that the presentations, interview summary, and meeting summary will be posted to the OSWPAG website.

Bruce A. Van Note, Commissioner of MaineDOT, concluded by stating that the market outlook for OSW is relevant to the Offshore Wind Roadmap but beyond the scope of this OSWPAG. Maine’s Three Port Strategy provides guidance but is not limiting to OSW port planning. The Sears Island Planning Initiative and associated documents are important for the Advisory Group to understand and discuss.