

MacNeil, Jami

From: Foust, Karen L
Sent: Monday, November 08, 2021 9:02 AM
To: Becca Shaw Glaser; MacNeil, Jami
Subject: RE: Additional Public Comment on SHM Rockland, LLC's Natural Resources Protection Act permit application (#L-20386-4P-P-N)

Good morning Rebecca,

Thank you for your email clarifying the statement that was made at the October 13th City Council Meeting. I had attended that meeting on-line and although I hadn't noted what he was referring to in the response, you and Mr. Wexler have both made it clear that the berthing area of the boats on the 150 ft. docks pointing east could be up to 50 ft. longer than the floats themselves. I have noted that in my take away from the meeting on Friday. We also discussed the extended berthing with Mr. Morong and Mr. Sabatini after walking around on the floats.

I always find it helpful to see what a project will look like at the actual site and we enjoyed being in Rockland and seeing what the City has to offer. The Boardwalk is indeed a highlight of the City and a beautiful way to experience Rockland. (The Wass' hotdogs were pretty good too!)

The next steps are that the Bureau will issue Preliminary Findings. You and other interested parties will be given 30 days to comment on those Findings.

Regards,
Karen Foust
Submerged Lands Coordinator

From: Becca Shaw Glaser <beccaglaser@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 5, 2021 10:52 PM
To: Foust, Karen L <Karen.L.Foust@maine.gov>; MacNeil, Jami <Jami.MacNeil@maine.gov>
Subject: Re: Additional Public Comment on SHM Rockland, LLC's Natural Resources Protection Act permit application (#L-20386-4P-P-N)

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.

Dear Karen and Jami,

Thank you so much for coming to Rockland today. I hope you enjoyed yourselves. I know that this may not be able to be entered into the public record, but I said I would follow up with some important clarifying information after a brief conversation with Karen Foust at the site visit today. There seemed to be a discrepancy between what Ms. Foust understood Safe Harbor Marinas' plans are for the four 150' docks on the Easten side, versus what Safe Harbor's representatives have been stating publicly.

Ms. Foust said that the application called for no longer than 150' boats to be berthed in the 150' docks. I explained that Bill Morong, the consultant and main spokesperson for Safe Harbors' plans in Rockland, said, at the October 13, 2021 Rockland City Council meeting, that Safe Harbor could dock up to 200' boats on those docks. From the City's recording of the meeting:

<https://livestream.com/rocklandmaine/events/9889860/videos/226572158>, at 1:00:01, **Rockland Mayor Ed Glaser asks Bill Morong:**

"On the outer-face docks, what do you see as the maximum size vessel that you'll put out there?" Glaser clarifies, "I meant on the Eastern side where you have all those fingers."

Safe Harbor representative Bill Morong responds:

"Oh, in the slips; so, they're 150 foot fingers. So typically, you could put, you could probably, at 150 feet, you could have probably a 50 foot overhang max, I would think, and be safe with a breastline tie-up."

This is a Safe Harbor Marinas' representative stating unequivocally at a formal, public, Rockland City Council meeting, that they would plan to put 200' vessels on those four 150' docks. If they have not made those intentions clear in the application, that needs to be sorted out, because that appears to be their plan.

It may be relevant to refer to the comment I send to Jami MacNeil earlier today, showing that in the previous application for the marina expansion, Yachting Solutions included a mock-up showing how the boats would poke out significantly of those four docks, but in the SHM application, they have no longer included the boat mock-ups.

I also want to note that while SHM has now said 16 moorings would need to be moved for their expansion, my dad, Ed Glaser, who was the Rockland Harbormaster for over twelve years, and is now Mayor of Rockland, told me tonight that it will certainly be more than 16 moorings the project would displace.

And a final note, after the meeting, I went to our beloved Sandy Beach to tend to the flower gardens I take care of. It was particularly evident from there with the red mooring ball marking the end of those 150' docks, that the new docks and their attendant large yachts to be berthed there, will be a dominant view for people from Sandy Beach Park and from the beach itself. If the docks are built, and the new submerged land lease given from what is now public to a private corporation, it will undoubtedly affect the lovely, open feeling people now enjoy at our only sandy harbor swimming beach as they swim, walk their dogs, unwind, picnic, visit, and play.

Thank you very much,
Rebecca Glaser

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Becca Shaw Glaser** <beccaglaser@gmail.com>

Date: Fri, Nov 5, 2021 at 9:13 AM

Subject: Re: Additional Public Comment on SHM Rockland, LLC's Natural Resources Protection Act permit application (#L-20386-4P-P-N)

To: MacNeil, Jami <Jami.MacNeil@maine.gov>

Thank you, Jami. I've decided to bend my work schedule so that I can be there. I'm curious how site visits work, having not seen them before, and will come in my capacity as a columnist for a local paper. I love the idea that you get to visit various sites to look at them.

Is there a place I can go to find out general statistics for what percentage of NRPA applications are approved throughout the state, year to year?

One other thing I wanted to note about SHM's application is something that may seem small but also could have been intentional. I compared the second Yachting Solutions application, which is put together by the same engineering firm, and under the guidance of the same person, Bill Morong, the head of Yachting Solutions, who is now a primary consultant for Safe Harbor Marinas on the ground in Rockland, with the current SHM application. The previous application included depictions of boats tied up at the docks on the Eastern side—although these depictions were flat, and didn't give a sense of the height of these boats, they helped with visualizing how long those boats would stick out.

That feature isn't in the new application, and one wonders if it was done in order to make it appear as if SHM didn't know the exact length and width of the boats they plan to dock there and charge for, and/or perhaps to obscure how those 200'-240' boats could actually be affecting the viewshed, line of sight, litoral zones, and the municipal channel. I believe a more accurate rendering including the maximum boat lengths and widths would better reflect their plans.

Attached are screenshots from the SHM application, which includes them trying to show that their previous application called for more dredging; it also shows that in their prior application they included boat renderings, whereas the current one does not seem to anywhere.

Thank you,
Rebecca Glaser