

MacNeil, Jami

From: Becca Shaw Glaser <beccaglaser@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2021 3:27 PM
To: Foust, Karen L
Cc: MacNeil, Jami
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.

Thank you very much for the update. I will make it an official comment in future but now that I have learned that they plan to put the dinghy dock the closest that they possibly can to Sandy Beach, I have yet more concerns about oil and fuel coming into where the people swim, as well as the boats coming in an out of our one spot of leisure like that in Rockland. Will explain more in the next public comment period.

Thank you,
Becca

On Monday, November 22, 2021, Foust, Karen L <Karen.L.Foust@maine.gov> wrote:

Hi Becca,

The Bureau will be issuing its Preliminary Findings and Decision in the next few days and as an Interested Party you will receive a copy of them. Once the Preliminary Findings are issued you will have 30 days to comment. I am not certain of the ACOE's comment period but you could contact Heather Stukas at heather.s.stukas@usace.army.mil for more information on that.

Regards,

Karen Foust

Submerged Lands Coordinator

From: Becca Shaw Glaser <beccaglaser@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 20, 2021 1:20 AM
To: Foust, Karen L <Karen.L.Foust@maine.gov>
Cc: 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.

Hi,

I am glad you liked Wasses! They are some of my favorite hot dogs ever. Also, I have been looking through old files online for other permitting processes you have overseen and been absolutely amazed at the amount of emails you field.

I am also glad that you have pinned down how long the boats on the Eastern side may be. Every time I go to the beach now, particularly now that there are the red marker buoys, I can see how invasive it is going to be to Sandy Beach Park and Sandy Beach, our only swimming beach, to have large boats encroaching on what is now public waters and public viewsheds. From all angles at the park that expansion would be visible and have adverse effects. Does the state really want to take all that away from the public and gift it to a \$2.2billion marina expansion company? --- That question is meant more rhetorically than to be answered directly, but I would like to know:

Did you go to Sandy Beach on the site visit to get a sense of what will change there with the docks and boats so close?

Has Safe Harbors told you how many boats they could have in the expanded marina, at capacity, with various length configurations?

Have they clarified exactly how many fuel trucks might be coming in and out, and how often, to service these boats? How large will the trucks be? They will be extremely close to Sandy Beach. Might the fumes from the large sums of boat fuel and the trucks themselves be breathed in by those enjoying the park, particularly the many small children there?

Safe Harbor has some radical on-land plan changes in mind, and recently gave two members of the city council and the city manager and harbormaster a look at preliminary land plans, but they have so far kept them very close to their chest. Wouldn't those on-land plans be relevant to understanding the potential health effects of the fuel trucks that will be coming in and out so very close to one of the community's favorite places to relax and play?

Is there any permitting agency still taking comments on this proposal, such as the Army Corps of Engineers? And if so, do you know who to write to and the deadline?

I have asked Ms. MacNeil previously if there was a statistic for the number of these permits that are ultimately approved in Maine, perhaps a year-by-year breakdown, and I think she was going to look into it. I would still love to know.

And another comment: I understand that Safe Harbor took over the Yachting Solutions submerged land lease. I wouldn't necessarily have a problem with them if they were merely coloring in the lines with what they already had. What I find most upsetting is that that they want so much more--they want to take an area that they do not have a submerged land lease for so they can put 200' boats on 150' docks jutting out towards Sandy Beach, which they will most certainly be docking megayachts at, a flaunting of extreme wealth in a location frequented by many working-class families (if they can even manage to stay in rapidly-gentrifying Rockland), all to create infrastructure to accommodate the type of boat that flies in the face of everything we know about what we need to do to avoid the worst of the climate catastrophe. By expanding their footprint, Safe Harbor would essentially be stealing more public waterways from the community for their own profit. That's what it's about.

Also something I have observed that I hope you are watching out for is that Safe Harbor Marinas' Rockland representatives appear to employ the term "public" deceptively at times. When they say "the public" or claim that "this will have public benefit," they do not necessarily mean the local community--we who will bear the brunt of their expansion--they may just as easily mean the transient boaters, since this project isn't in any way for the local boaters, the local community, the fishermen, those who make their livings on boats--it is truly for transient boaters, the pleasure cruisers, and the megayachts--whom Safe Harbors' reps, in a likely intentional sleight of hand, often refer to also as "the public." While technically true--we, all humans, are "the public"--the way Safe Harbors' reps have used the term seems designed to obfuscate the fact that there are indeed two sets of the public: those who can afford the premium dockage price at the private, gated pier at the Safe Harbor Marina, and those of us from the local community.

I look forward to your answers.

Thank you very much,

Rebecca Glaser

On Mon, Nov 8, 2021 at 9:01 AM Foust, Karen L <Karen.L.Foust@maine.gov> wrote:

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 Eastern 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, littoral 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