

MacNeil, Jami

From: MacNeil, Jami
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 8:12 AM
To: Kerry Hadley
Subject: RE: My concerns and objections to Safe Harbors plan

Thank you for your comments regarding the expansion of an existing marina in Rockland Harbor as proposed by SHM Rockland, LLC. The Department is currently reviewing the application (#L-20386-4P-P-N) under Maine's Natural Resources Protection Act (NRPA). The Department accepted the application as complete for processing on July 26, 2021. The deadline for public comments on the application closed on November 4, 2021. The Department anticipates issuing a decision on the project within the next few weeks.

To answer your question in comment #4, the Department is aware of the environmental covenants related to the voluntary response action plan (VRAP) at the project site, which was implemented to deal with lime kiln residue. If/when the applicant proposes to disturb soil within those areas, they will need to submit a plan for handling any lime kiln residues encountered during construction to the Department for review and approval. At this time, the applicant does not propose disturbance within those areas.

Your comments will be added to the file and will be considered during the review of the project.

Sincerely,

-Jami MacNeil (she/her)

Environmental Specialist III
Bureau of Land Resources
Maine Department of Environmental Protection
(207) 446-4894 | jami.macneil@maine.gov

From: Kerry Hadley <kerry.hadley6@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 01, 2021 7:12 PM
To: MacNeil, Jami <Jami.MacNeil@maine.gov>
Subject: My concerns and objections to Safe Harbors plan

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Jami -

I am a 30 year resident of Owls Head and a former Chamber of Commerce Executive Director (Portsmouth, NH) so I understand the needs for business to grow and for development. That said, with climate change, I no longer support growth as I did, and as we even did in Portsmouth, the growth that does occur needs to be carefully regulated.

I love our small towns, and yet vibrant and dynamic communities that have thankfully not gotten as gobbled up, commercialized and just plain gross as Bar and Boothbay Harbor have.

I see this development as adversely affecting environmental safety nets, views, clean water, quality of life, etc. if this plan is passed. I love boats, and yachting, and sailing, and safe harbors.

I don't love gasoline in the water, view obstruction, development that overwhelms it's environment. Here are just some of my concerns:

1. *The application is incomplete.* Without accurate, independent 2D/3D renditions of how the views from all sides of the harbor, Sandy Beach, the boardwalk, Harbor Park, and even the State Park at Owls Head and the Breakwater--will be affected by the maximum amount of 200+ and several stories high megayachts on their marina, we can't accurately tell how the viewsheds and our enjoyment of the harbor will be affected.

2. *As far as megayachts, Yachting Solutions' application for the 2017 federal Boating Infrastructure Grant, the grant which Safe Harbor has now taken over, references megayachts at least 25 times* and states that the "Yachting Solutions Boat Basin is positioned to become the most attractive destination for megayachts between Portland and Bangor." Though SHM seems to have taken pains to avoid using the term "megayacht" in their application to the state, and in their recent public statements, their current proposal includes several 150' docks, able to hold 200' boats, and perhaps even longer, and the Yachting Solutions associates who oversaw YS's BIG grant are still in charge of Safe Harbor-Rockland; those 25 megayacht references are still very much relevant and should be seen as reflective of Safe Harbor's plans.

3. *One of the things the people of Rockland and the surrounding communities enjoy most about Rockland is the harbor boardwalk(which was billed as a boardwalk providing "public access" in MBNA's original application to the DEP; 000150; bk2550; page 245), approved in 2000, walking along the the scenic harbor.* The marina is very likely to interfere with these open views, particularly with docking a number of these boats that can be several stories high. And furthermore, continued public access is also not guaranteed in the recent deed transfer between Rockland Harbor Park LLC and Safe Harbor, meaning that our community could easily lose this space we have all enjoyed for decades.

4. *There are environmental covenants enacted on the property which Safe Harbor bought.* Is the DEP looking to check on whether any of those are relevant to the plan Safe Harbor has put forward (doc 3450; book 3774; page 101; also in the deed between Bracebridge and Rockland Harbor Park LLC doc 3451; book 3774; page 125)?

5. *An unknown number of moorings would have to be moved* (Safe Harbor have not said how many would have to be moved to accommodate their plan). This often causes a lot of stress, financial cost and burden to the people whose moorings are being moved. It can lead to navigational challenges as well as loss to established uses such as fishing, if any of them are related to fishing uses.

5. *Fuel bunkering is in their plans.* Although Safe Harbor hasn't included this in their application, at the October 13, 2021 Rockland City Council meeting to discuss their plans, Bill Morong of Safe Harbor said that Safe Harbor is planning to be the only marina "north of Portland" very specifically doing fuel bunkering. This will involve, in Morong's words: "10,000 gallons or something like that, so it's not just pulling up to a pump and putting in and holding the nozzle. It's a larger exercise than that...So to answer your question, not another fuel pump in town. But we would allow for a truck to come in and have some plumbing to do that for for a larger service." He said they are planning to plumb the marina for these large quantities of boat fuel. 10,000+ gallons of bunker fuel right in Rockland's inner harbor seems like a pretty big deal, with potential for leakage and spills, unless managed exceedingly carefully.

6. *SOME OF THEIR PROPOSED DREDGING RUNS RIGHT THROUGH THE CITY CHANNEL.* Page 45 of their application includes a dredging proposal--it includes 300' long and for the entire width of the city channel. How long will the dredging go on for? How disruptive will it be?

7. *Their marina is likely to obstruct the city channel, particularly when boats are on their longest dock, which could likely accommodate a 240' (or even longer) megayacht.* At the October 13 Rockland City Council meeting, Safe Harbor was asked if boats at SHM would ever obstruct the city channel. Mike Sabatini, the engineer consulting with SHM-Rockland, whose firm drew up the plans for the expansion, said, "A boat could be sitting there, if it became a problem, it could be moved, but there's no reason why a boat couldn't be there for a week or a couple days. And it wouldn't obscure the whole channel." Morong seemed to try to tamp down Sabatini's comment by saying, "The intention is not to obscure the channel." That may be a stated intention, but the likelihood that the boats would end up obscuring part of the city channel for days on end, is of concern.

8. The proposed look-out near Sandy Beach, another of Rockland's prized public parks doesn't have any 2D/3D modeling, so how are we to know the extent to which this will affect our views and the wide-open space we enjoy at Sandy Beach?

Thank you in advance for considering my and many others strong concerns about this project.

Sincerely

Kerry Hadley

102 N. Shore Drive

Owls Head, Maine 04854

(207) 596-3884

kerry.hadley6@gmail.com