



**Responses to Written Comments Regarding the SouthCoast
Wind LLC Dredging and Water Quality Permit**

Name	Comment*	Response
Joe Forgione	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will you be issuing the permit for dredging even though the PUC/EFSB has not approved the route and the route may never be approved? 2. Do you have a timeline for a decision after the hearing? 3. How long will the permit be valid before another application and review is required? 4. Will the permit be transferable to another entity or does the new entity have to reapply? 5. What is DEM's plan to assure that there is no impact of dredging on recreational and fishing activity due to sediment disturbance? 6. Do you have technical parameters for approval, and will you be publishing the detailed assessment showing how these parameters were used to justify your decision? 7. Will there be testing and who will do the testing of contaminant levels in near real time during dredging? 8. What provisions will be made to assure the chain of custody of samples that are collected and tested? 9. Who will perform the dredging and what experience do they have in shallow tidal basins and bays? 10. Will DEM and other agencies be on board every minute during dredging? Why not? 11. Will provisions be made for community members to observe the entire process on board? Why not? 12. What are the contaminant thresholds upon which DEM will issue a cease dredging order? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PUC/EFSB decision is not required for the processing of the Dredge Permit/WQC applications. Condition 32 requires that approval be received from the EFSB prior to commencement of dredging and jet plow operations. 2. A decision must be issued by March 15, 2024, to meet the Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 deadline. 3. The Permit will be valid for ten years with option for future modification if warranted. 4. Permits are transferable. 5. See Condition 10 of the Permit that requires dredging and jet plowing be conducted from October 15 to January 31. 6. The Permit includes 38 conditions to address a number of technical issues. 7. Condition 12 of the Permit requires additional testing for potential contaminants. Testing will be performed by independent, licensed consultants hired by the applicant. 8. Chain of custody documentation must be submitted with the sampling results. 9. An experienced dredging contractor will perform the dredging and jet plowing. 10. Condition 4 of the Permit requires a 3rd -party Environmental Compliance



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>13. Will data collected during dredging be made available to the public or will this be another case of redacted proprietary information?</p> <p>14. Will DEM assure the public that there will be no partial or full shut down of areas during dredging?</p> <p>15. Has DEM ever approved a high voltage cable route of this magnitude through a Type I area? Please provide examples.</p>	<p>Monitor that reports to the DEM, CRMC and the ACOE.</p> <p>11. Community members would require authorization from the Permit holder to board any vessels.</p> <p>12. Dredging and jet plow activities are subject to compliance with Rule 1.10 of the Water Quality Regulations.</p> <p>13. All data collected to date and data that will be collected prior to, during, and after dredging and jet plow activities are public records and available for review. No public record data has been redacted.</p> <p>14. Dredging and jet plow activities shall be conducted during the work windows noted in Condition 10 of the Permit.</p> <p>15. Cables associated with the Block Island Wind Project and the Revolution Wind Project have been approved by DEM.</p>
<p>Jodi Briand Douglas Marzonie Maria Spinelli Gianna Sgroi Samuel Dawson George Close Claire Hall Roger Greene Sean Mullaney Aimee Burke Louise Cardoni Jane Broderson Brendan Dyer Simon Davidson Henry White Richard Bohan</p>	<p>1. There is currently no power purchase agreement in place.</p> <p>2. Chemical testing has not been completed to identify toxins in the sediment</p> <p>3. Unknown effects from the EMF emanating from 345,000 high voltage subsea electrical cables on marine life.</p> <p>4. Subsea cables must be regularly monitored and maintained, so the disruption to the seabed is not a one and done proposition</p> <p>5. RIDEM must be held accountable to its own statements and protocols (citing the mission statement)</p>	<p>1. The PUC/EFSB decision is not required for the processing of the Dredge Permit/WQC applications. Condition 32 requires that approval be received from the EFSB prior to commencement of dredging and jet plow operations.</p> <p>2. Condition 12 of the Permit requires additional testing for potential contaminants. Testing will be performed by independent, licensed consultants hired by the applicant.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
<p>Jeanene Gwin Frederick Prince Kathleen Kits van Heyningen Donna DeFusco Allen Tetreault Diana Oehrli Diane Harrison Edie Burke Marc Lewinstein Mark Lacz Carol Anderheggen Brook Hawkins Pandy McDonough Lynne White Duncan K Law Jr. Maureen Goldfarb Braden Massey Robert & Anne Schulte William Keogh Joanne O'Connor Andrea Keogh Roberta Elizabeth Mauch Susan Sipple George Scheppler Craig Tamash Tom & Joan Carson Albert Sherman John Carter Susan DeLeo Marisa Nardo Carl van Warmerdam Anne Salas Andrea & Bill Breyer Linda Adams Frank Crowley Sofia Sinclair Robert Bauer Brooke Humm</p>	<p>6. Experts from RIDEM and UMass Dartmouth said they were unsure of the potential negative effects of EMF on the various species in the Sakonnet.</p> <p>7. Failing to provide crucial information from independent fisheries experts falls short of “adequate resource planning.” The testing/studies were incomplete in 2022 and still have not been completed.</p> <p>8. This permit violates the Public Trust Doctrine in Rhode Island’s Constitution.</p>	<p>3. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF study and report.</p> <p>4. Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan.</p> <p>5. DEM has reviewed the application for compliance with the Dredging Regulations and the Water Quality Regulations.</p> <p>6. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF study and report.</p> <p>7. Significant fisheries information has been submitted and reviewed. Condition 27 of the Permit requires a Fisheries Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>8. The issuance of this Permit does not violate the Public Trust Doctrine.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
Christine Cavanaugh Shannon Korzeniowski Jeanne Grimes David Gray Leeza Amarant Wendy Logan Jocelyn Sherman Robin Chisholm Carol Mello Charles Stankewich Jason Humm Raymond Gallison Jr. Leila Ray Michele Simos Karen Gleason Thomas Doran Susan Ondrick Doreen Ciancaglini Debbie Amarant Thomas McCarthy Bryan Haggerty Douglas Beimler Marie Sheffield Kristie Labonte Devin Waldron Donna Hauck Maria Shevlin Ward Detwiler Elizabeth & Michael McBreen		
Dick and Jean Bordeau	1. Not enough testing has been done on the potential collateral damage of such a project. 2. Violates the Public Trust Doctrine in Rhode Island's Constitution	1. Condition 12 of the Permit requires additional testing for potential contaminants. Testing will be performed by independent, licensed consultants hired by the applicant. 2. The issuance of this Permit does not violate the Public Trust Doctrine.



Name	Comment*	Response
James Baldwin Edie Burke Ellen Nichols Alexandre Lepore Will Carlin Joseph Doyle Leon Amarant Peggy Price Andrea Culipher Lynn Goodwin Leonor Silva Maeve Heaney Lola Roy	Concern about marine mammals, wildlife, and the ecosystem.	Condition 10 of the Permit requires work windows that are protective of marine mammals, wildlife and the ecosystem.
Kathleen Papp Brandon Newell Matt Bauer Kate Leonard Amy Dahlin Barbara Milotte Gus Adams Jessica Kielbasa Deborah Vine-Smith Valerie Dugan Donald Dugan Jr.	Concern about impacts to fishing, habitat, and aquaculture industries.	Condition 10 of the Permit requires work windows that restricts work to times of least spawning activity.
Melyssa Beimler Joan Shamshoian Tom Ricci Marc Adams Robb Roach	The risks and costs outweigh the benefits.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Elizabeth Lamar Susan Farrell Patty and Jay Horan Alexandre Lepore Branda Sabbag Jill Kramer Alexandra Quick Will Kammerer Michael Marston John Chappell MaryBeth Murphy Caroline Richards	Concern about the environment, wildlife, recreation, tourism economy, property values, human health, and the natural beauty.	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts, consistent with the Dredging and Water Quality regulations.



Name	Comment*	Response
Richard Legan Christina Legan Albert Fanning John Shea Kristen Martin Kate Raposa Laurel Howe Julie Savage Judy Hayes Kim Thoman Jillian Stang Laura Coggeshall Holly Mclear Jay Buettner Matthew Fenster Laina Pedro Beverly Muessel		
Kathleen Kits van Heyningen	All comments sent in, both in support and in opposition, will be made publicly available online after the deadline. Wants transparency from government representatives, who are elected or hired to work for our needs and rights.	The Permit, all comments and application documents are posted on the DEM website and are available to the public.
Donna DeFusco	Concerned about the amount of electricity produced and what states will benefit.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Barbara Ghazarian	Very concerned over how dredging the Sakonnet River will affect the quahog population in the Cove and elsewhere in the river. There are other routes the cable can take that will not disturb the Sakonnet.	Condition 11 of the Permit requires that a shellfish survey be performed prior to the dredging of the HDD pits. Based on the results of the survey, relocation of shellfish may be required.
Sandra Craig	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have you determined what will be the impact on the health of local animals? 2. Will these proposed actions be in violation of the Clean Water Act and Seafood Safety Regulations? 3. Will the cable be buried to at least a depth of 10 or more feet below the seabed? How deep? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Condition 10 of the Permit requires a work window that will limit impacts to fisheries. 2. The Permit conditions are required to ensure the project meets the applicable sections of the Clean Water Act, the



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>4. Have tests been done to determine if covering the cable with fill will withstand wave action?</p> <p>5. What is the plan to secure cables so there will be no movement and consequent further disturbance of the seabed?</p> <p>6. Are there plans to determine the effects of EMF?</p> <p>7. Do you know if animals will be impeded by electrical charge and heat from cables?</p> <p>8. Will there be continued monitoring of EMF during the life of the cable's operation? Area of ongoing research and study with unknown impacts.</p> <p>9. Need for cable repairs. Will there be chemicals in cables considered toxic which would require a special process for clean up if/when they leak?</p> <p>10. How do you clean up a toxic leak in the sea?</p> <p>11. Will costs of repairs be passed on to ratepayers?</p> <p>12. How many more beach closures will dredging necessitate?</p> <p>13. Will people become ill from chemicals disbursed from dredging?</p> <p>14. Are there plans to mitigate pollution, for example creating oyster reefs?</p> <p>15. What if the wind farm project never comes to fruition?</p> <p>16. Will the ships that dredge and lay the cables be powered by diesel fuel?</p> <p>17. Will South Coast be required to use electric powered vessels or retrofit any vessels powered by diesel fuel?</p>	<p>Dredging Regulations and the Water Quality Regulations.</p> <p>3. Condition 16 of the Permit requires a cable burial depth of at least four feet.</p> <p>4. and 5. Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan.</p> <p>6, 7, 8 Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report.</p> <p>9. Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan. There are no toxic chemicals noted in the cable bundle.</p> <p>10 – 17. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>
Liz Tardif	<p>Please consider alternative solutions to minimize the ecological impact. Dredging can have significant adverse effects on river ecosystems. It disrupts</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>natural sediment patterns, alters water flow dynamics, and disturbs habitats for various aquatic species. Disposal can introduce pollutants. Installing high-voltage power export cables threatens marine life. Disrupt migratory patterns, interfere with navigation, and introduce EMF in the water, adversely affecting marine life. Are there environmentally friendly alternatives?</p>	
<p>D.C. Curtis Jr. Carter Mario Celeste Kane Alex DeMolles Betsy Green Alexander Veras Pamela Reynolds Camille Guerin Ed Richards Jonathan Goodnow Patrick Gaudreau Dotsie Bohan Kathleen Barek Clayton Dickison Pam Aguiar Nancy & Phil Morton Rosemarie Silva Tenenbaum Dean Sinclair Matthew Huff Thea Credle Eileen Melley Addison Caproni Victoria Vermette Jack Condon Jessica Hagen Marylou Sully Elizabeth Lamar Rick & Cate Meffert Kristen Fagan Katharine Barnum</p>	<p>General opposition and concern.</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
Susan Behan Beth Ethier Brian Odell Kevin Hyman		
Christine Carceller	<p>Unknown chemicals will be unearthed and “thrown” back into the clean waters of the Sakonnet River. DEM hasn’t received results of the chemicals from South Coast.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can you make an educated decision if all information is not given to you? 2. How long will beaches be closed when we dredge up materials that have been lying still for decades? 3. How many animals will be affected by this? 4. Other concern is EMF. Do we just want to guess what can happen over time and hope for the best? 5. How will you say no to future companies that want to do the same if you say yes to this company? 6. How are incidental takes for marine mammals from wind farms federally legal? “Not in my backyard” even applies to those laying the cables. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The application package contains adequate information to make a decision in compliance with the requirements of the Dredging Regulations and Water Quality Regulations. 2. Condition 10 or the Permit requires dredging and jet plow activities to be conducted from October 15 to January 31. Beach closures are determined by the Department of Health. 3. Condition 27 requires a Fisheries Monitoring Plan. 4. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report. 5. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations. 6. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
LisaMarie Leavitt Rosemarie Drop Brenda Lees	<p>From all that we know about these failed wind projects, why do we continue to keep pushing them, never mind funding them? Interference in US defense acknowledged by the Pentagon & locator radar for boat passenger safety/search & rescue. Gallons of diesel leaking, effecting ocean life/water quality dangers. Death of plankton, and sustainable foodstuff for ocean life, whale survival. Dangers of cables to fishermen/possibility of electrocution. Maintenance & repair extremely costly</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	to the taxpayer. Scrambles whale, shark, seal etc. sonar and is causing untold numbers of beaching. The complete destruction of our fishing industry in RI, which sustains many families, corporations, and economy. Industrial blight to scenic coastline. Cost analysis show more expenses, cost to repair, maintain, & replace than benefits.	
Hillary Davidson	Many other projects proposed to DEM, including private home dock extensions, yacht club deck expansions, private residence encroaching on wetlands, were rejected as they posed a potential “risk” for various reasons, which were minor compared to what is being proposed in the Sakonnet River.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Tom Grieb	<p>Alternative suggestion: joint contract between CT, MA, & RI would serve better laying cable through Quonset, RI like Revolution wind.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cheaper route for SouthCoast, don't have to dredge through the Sakonnet 2. would provide tax revenue to RI through Quonset station 3. Cables would be in the same area as Revolution Wind cables reducing the potential spread of environmental damage to just the Quonset area. 4. Quonset is already an industrialized area so it's fine to run the cables through there instead of ecologically sensitive area of the Sakonnet. 5. Other than re-planning by Southcoast, no downsides. 	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Daniel Warburg Sharon & Edward Allan Herb Wagner Richard Fairgrieve Everett Mills	Disturbing legacy sediment poses grave environmental risks that threaten the natural habitat of many species and could erode the natural beauty.	Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan. Sampling results must be in compliance with Rule 1.10 of the Water Quality Regulations.



Name	Comment*	Response
Rich Tully	In support. Lives on Sakonnet and despite the impacts and inconvenience, believes projects are necessary to counter global warming, which potential adverse impacts outweigh proposed dredging project. Suggests the dredging occur in the fall timeframe so disturbed sediment has time to settle before recreational water activities occur starting in May/June.	Condition 10 of the Permit requires work windows that restricts work to times of least activity, October 15 to January 31.
Marco Dirks	In support. Urgent need to switch current reliance on fossil fuels to clean renewable energy sources. Critique offered by opposing groups seems to go against expert scientific findings. No evidence to support claim that offshore wind installations kill whales. Submarine electric cable technology has more than 200 years of experience behind it. Impact of disturbing sediment during cable burying process needs to be in context of ongoing sea-bottom disruption during fish trawler and scallop dragger activity, in which large swaths of sediment are perturbed on a daily basis.	Condition 12 of the Permit requires additional testing for potential contaminants. Testing will be performed by independent, licensed consultants hired by the applicant.
Katrina Hamilton Gewirz	Unknown future impacts, citing states reneging on Purchase Power Agreements, changing balance sheets of developers, admission by developers that projects are suffering from 'inflationary cost hikes and supply chain slowdowns,' potential violations to several federal acts. Is there strong scientific evidence to exemplify that dredging and laying of these cables would improve the environment in the Sakonnet and Mount Hope Bay? Runs risk that South Coast starts dredging in hopes of getting	The Permit application was reviewed for compliance with the Dredging Regulations and the Water Quality Regulations. The DEM Permit is a conditional approval of the Project. Dredging and jet plow activities cannot commence until all other state and federal permits, including the EFSB, are granted.



Name	Comment*	Response
	contracts or approvals that may never come.	
Susan & David Jamison	Wind project is terrible investment for RI, only 42% return on investment, still need 58% of some other form of energy to fill the void. Environment is destroyed in order to save it. Benefits only companies building and installing windmills, cables, etc. Electric bills will go up, not down, from this. Cost of electricity will be three times number governor is citing after you factor in distribution to customer. There have been no studies showing impact from windmill and cable installations.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Archbold D. van Beuren Ben Riggs Lorrie Burns Howard & Elizabeth Lamar	Concerned about dredging and laying high voltage cables without proper environmental testing or public review. More research needs to be done.	The Permit application was reviewed for compliance with the Dredging Regulations and the Water Quality Regulations. The DEM Permit is a conditional approval of the Project. Dredging and jet plow activities cannot commence until all other state and federal permits, including approval of the EFSB, are granted.
Dan Moriarty	Proposes to earmark funds coming from the wind farm for a capital improvement project for 2 saltwater ponds that bisect Boyd's Lane to fix flooding caused by storm surges.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Emil Cipolla	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the impacts upon the land and waters under RIDEM jurisdiction? 2. Are there feasible, better alternatives for the cable? 3. Proposes Quonset Point route already undertaken by Revolution Wind cables. 4. Second alternative suggested is to bypass the Sakonnet, go north, and have landfall near New Bedford. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.



Name	Comment*	Response
		2-4. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Audrey Pfeiffer	<p>1. The shedding of the blades' coating is toxic material and will make its way into the food chain.</p> <p>2. Economic effects of shutting down the Sakonnet River while construction is in process</p> <p>3. Unknown effects of dredging on shellfish beds – will they recover?</p> <p>4. Only 10% of energy produced will be for RI.</p> <p>5. Questionable guarantees that the installing wind turbine companies will still be in business to repair turbines in the future.</p> <p>6. Cites wind project in Prince Edward Island, Canada where Spanish Company installed wind turbines, turbines went into state of disrepair, but company went out of business, and the company that bought them out said it wasn't their problem.</p> <p>7. The public has not received estimates on how this project will affect energy costs.</p>	<p>1-2. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p> <p>3. Condition 11 requires a shellfish survey prior to dredging.</p> <p>4-7. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>
Christopher Santilli	South Coast has applied to RIDOT for grant of subsurface cable easement beneath former Newport Secondary Railroad Right-of-Way. Easement remains under review with all reviewers, thus far, expressing no objection.	
Arthur Palmer	Proposes as part of the negotiations with South Coast request restoration of the Sakonnet River connection to the marsh along Boyds Lane via Park Ave. Believes the area, with built-up	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.



Name	Comment*	Response
	sedimentation, is now a breeding ground for mosquitoes. Reopening the connection would keep the water moving and alleviate the mosquito problem.	
Abigail Demopulos	In support. Developing offshore wind industry in Southern New England will help diversify economy and potentially attract new industries. If New England can't take a long-term view and overcome procedural hurdles to develop this industry, we will continue to depend on imported energy and miss opportunities to be part of a new industry. Calls on RIDEM to ensure the installation is done in a manner that protects the Sakonnet River ecosystem.	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.
Nancy Howard	The state Energy Facility Siting Board unanimously voted to pause consideration of the application for the transmission line until questions about the financial viability of the 2,400-MW project are cleared up. Until EFSB has confidence the project is financially viable, DEM should not review the documentation.	Review of the Dredge Permit application and Water Quality Certificate are independent from the EFSB. EFSB decision is not needed for DEM applications. DEM is obligated to complete the review and issue a decision once the application is received unless the applicant voluntarily withdraws. Condition 32 requires the approval of the EFSB prior to the commencement of dredging and jet plow activities.
Zachary St. Lisa & John Dickmann	Send to MA where the power will benefit and does nothing to help RI but raise rates and inconvenience residents. Send the cables over land.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.



Name	Comment*	Response
Margo Sullivan Glenn Melanson	Questions whether citizens are being indemnified sufficiently in the event of problems.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Thomas Kits Van Heyningen	Concerned about environmental impacts and rushed nature of approvals/permit for project. Feels it will be a political liability to have been involved with what will surely be a very locally unpopular decision.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Peter Reynolds	<p>Operation should be great concern for marine habitat of Sakonnet and Narragansett Bay. Mount Hope Bay's industrial history would introduce heavy metal and chemicals into waters. Only benefit is allowing MA a small amount of electricity and RI will have a huge impact.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is DEM doing impact studies on sediment and water quality from Mount Hope Bay? 2. Where is NOAA research on impacts to porgies and striped bass fisheries? 3. Underestimated dredge quantities planned to back fill with existing material that may be already polluted. 4. Project should be treated as hazardous waste dredging project. 5. This is a MA power project that should stay in MA 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan. 2. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations. 3. Condition 12 requires a sampling and analysis plan prior to dredging activities. 4, 5. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Judith	Detrimental to sea mammal communication and fish. Soon to be wind turbine farms will be destroying the coastlines by heating them up and destroying currents with EMF radiation, microwaves, and sonar blasting for pipeline construction. Wind technology is outdated.	<p>Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report.</p> <p>Other comments are outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
Tiffany Smith	Project would be a disaster for wildlife and residents in the effected area. The dredging process would be extremely disruptive to the nature of the river. The enormous voltage that would eventually be transmitted through these cables would greatly damage and affect the water quality and the area's quality of life.	Condition 10 of the Permit requires a dredge work window of October 15 to January 31. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report. Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan.
Sarah Atchley	In support. Is protective of the river but knows of the need to find alternatives to fossil fuels. The Sakonnet has been much more polluted by overfertilized runoff and illegal construction debris than careful dredging will do.	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.
Nick Del Greco	In support. Electricity alternatives are required with continuous population growth and energy demand, offshore wind makes more sense than the other alternatives. Running cables up the river is a one-time operation just as the gas line and water lines that cross the river were. Trawlers are allowed to continue to scrape the riverbed and lobster traps are pulled along the bottom everyday to stir up the sediment. The river is not pristine, pollutants enter the water with each heavy rain, trash continues to enter the water, and massive amounts of fertilized soil erodes into the river regularly.	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.
Joseph Lombardi III	Offshore development at Coxes Ledge where marine life congregates is concerning. There was no long-term environmental study regarding industrial scale construction and sonar sounding of the area. Whale casualties in the area and bribes from wind companies to Mystic Aquarium. Did anyone consider that now the massive	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.



Name	Comment*	Response
	development is clearly visible from the shore? 60% of the Block Island turbines malfunction regularly, putting oil on the turbines to combat corrosion that leaks into the ocean. Dredging the Sakonnet and putting high voltage cables is a major threat to the Rhode Island way of life.	
Shawna Swift William James Doyle Margaret Warburg Lucy Warburg Barbara & William MacGowan Judy Hayes	Concerned about threat to the environment and ecosystem, dredging resuspending pollutants, impacts from EMF, and cable maintenance.	Condition 10 of the Permit requires a dredge work window of October 15 to January 31. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report. Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan.
Paul Treciokas	In support. Finds concerns with the power cable through the Sakonnet to be without merit. Regularly fishes and swims in the river and finds no issues with the dredging plans.	
Christine Sullivan	In support. Permit to dredge Sakonnet as a local resident.	
MaryBeth Feeney	Concern over marine mammal deaths, fishing industry, tourism, property values, price of electricity, repair from storm events, and how well the turbines work.	Condition 27 of the Permit requires a fisheries monitoring plan. Other comments are outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Brian Cam	Concerned about maintenance to cables, pollutants in the river, electrical grid reliability, that Rhode Island electric ratepayers will be on the hook for repairs, and the cost of electricity after the fact.	Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan.



Name	Comment*	Response
Brittany & Benjamin White	Environmental factors such as toxins and EMF can affect human cellular activity and cause cancer.	Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report.
Barbara Chapman	Environmental impact statement revealed too many unknowns and adverse impacts to marine life. The developer filed the permit before receiving permission from the RI Public Utility Board.	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.
Steve Cardone	In support. Benefits of sustainable energy projects like this one outweigh drawbacks. Project is an important step in the right direction.	
Bob Wilson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the project funded and moving forward with the current owners? 2. Is the owner willing to post bonds to ensure completion once construction starts? 3. Are the owners pushing the permit to enhance the value of the project prior to sale? 4. Why is RI being asked to bear the initial risks and burdens of this project and why were none of the other paths evaluated except Falmouth, MA disclosed? What criteria was used to make the decision? 5. Why is RI the cable corridor chosen over Falmouth, MA when the project benefits MA power consumers and the Falmouth path is shorter? 6. How many more wind projects will be developed in the coming years and ask for RI as a cable corridor? 7. Isn't there a need for a more regional analysis and solution to minimize environmental impacts? 	<p>1-9 Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p> <p>10. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF study and report.</p> <p>11. Core samples have been taken to identify grain size in the sediment to develop the sediment dispersion model. Additional testing is required as noted in Condition 12 of the Permit.</p> <p>12. Condition 10 of the Permit requires that dredging activities be restricted to a work window from October 15 to January 31. Fishing and recreational activities can continue to occur.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>8. How would the new natural gas pipeline replacement in late 2024 impact the wind cable? Will DEM review pipeline replacement and its impact on dredging?</p> <p>9. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement should be completed before being used to make decisions.</p> <p>10. There is no study of EMF for the cables running through the Sakonnet.</p> <p>11. Have core samples been taken from the Sakonnet seabed?</p> <p>12. Will it be safe to swim, fish, and boat post dredging?</p> <p>13. How will dredging methods impact the depth of the existing channel?</p> <p>14. Is burying cables at a depth of six feet adequate? Will cables lie above major rock formations or will rocks be removed?</p>	<p>13. The depth of the channel will not change.</p> <p>14. Conditions 14 to 21 require monitoring and reporting related to the cable installation and include a boulder relocation plan (Condition 21).</p>
Paul Kesson	<p>1. What are the RIDEM MS4 requirements imposed on South Coast Wind LLC?</p> <p>2. How are they going to contain all the material at the beach as well as the cables in the water?</p> <p>3. What demands has RIDEM made on South Coast Wind to ensure health and safety of residents in Island Park and along the onshore proposed cable path?</p> <p>4. While burying the cables, how is the material going to be contained?</p> <p>5. What system of monitoring is RIDEM going to require to ensure health and safety of the public?</p> <p>6. What experience does RIDEM have internally to understand the potential hazard of a point source failure to keep residents safe?</p>	<p>1. MS4 requirements are not applicable to this project.</p> <p>2. Condition 10. B. requires that dredge material be stored on a support barge and be placed back into the excavated HDD pits. Jet plowing allows sediments to return to the trench as the cable is being laid. Some sediment dispersion is allowed and is described in the sediment transport model.</p> <p>3. The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.</p> <p>4. Jet plowing allows sediments to return to the trench as the</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>7. What safety zone is RIDEM going to impose on South Coast Wind to keep residents safe?</p> <p>8. How much public beach is the safety area going to consume, taking quality of life away from residents?</p> <p>9. What is RIDEM going to do to keep residents safe because all the hazardous material will be disturbed when these cables are buried?</p> <p>10. Is RIDEM going to require the company burying the cables to collect the disturbed material (based on MS4 requirements) to minimize the impacts to water quality of the Sakonnet River?</p> <p>11. If the disturbed material isn't collected and allowed to settle back to the bottom, will RIDEM require clean fill to be deposited over the cable burying area?</p> <p>12. Is RIDEM going to test boring on a grid to determine any and all material as it transitions from the point of landfall to the access pit on Boyd Lane?</p>	<p>cable is being laid. Some sediment dispersion is allowed and is described in the sediment transport model.</p> <p>5. Condition 10 of the Permit requires a dredge work window of October 15 to January 31. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report.</p> <p>Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan.</p> <p>6. The DEM Water Quality and RIPDES Programs have significant experience reviewing and permitting point source discharges.</p> <p>7. The Coast Guard regulates safety zones.</p> <p>8. No public beach is being used by the project. Landfall will occur using horizontal directional drilling. Condition 28 of the Permit requires a cable burial depth of 9 feet between mean high water and mean low water.</p> <p>9. Condition 10 of the Permit requires a dredge work window of October 15 to January 31. Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan.</p> <p>10. Disturbed sediments are allowed to naturally return to the bottom. MS4 requirements are not applicable to this project.</p> <p>11. Placement of fill is not allowed.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
		12. Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan. Upland work is in the jurisdiction of the CRMC.
Katie Hamilton Gewirz	Concern about air quality associated with any construction vessel for offshore wind. 1. What fuel will be used? How much fuel? For how long? At what hours? 2. What if the air quality in the vicinity is negatively impacted? 3. Will there be noise from the vessels?	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Lawrence Silvia	A cable with that much voltage will have a major effect on a small waterway. The Sakonnet is a pristine breeding ground and will be majorly disrupted by the cable as a narrow waterway.	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.
Rhonda Gilbert Jeff Rose	Concerned about the lack of data, the damage to the ecosystem, dredging up buried toxins, and EMFs from cables. Concerned that this is being pushed forward for monetary reasons and the fact that it was rejected in other towns.	Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report.
Leila Ray	1. Will PTC fluid or any other type of liquids be contained in the cables? If so, what happens if they leak or malfunction? How are you able to identify any leakage and how quickly? How would you contain it, and what other mitigation measure would you employ? 2. Where are these cables manufactured? 3. How often do cables need to be maintained? What is South Coast's plan and procedures for addressing cable	1. There are no fluids in the cable bundle. 2. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations. 3. Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan. There are no toxic chemicals noted in the cable bundle. 4-5. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>failure in the Sakonnet River? Who pays for cable repairs? Will the associated expenses be passed on the ratepayers?</p> <p>4. Why is DEM considering this dredging proposal/request while the RI public energy siting board has refused to consider it since South Coast doesn't have a power purchase agreement in place?</p> <p>5. Who is making the decision if this happens or doesn't happen?</p> <p>6. What is the decision-making process and timeline after March 7th?</p> <p>7. Has the application for the dredging permit from South Coast been made public? If not, why not?</p> <p>8. If only available to read at the office, and copies not released for comment, why not? Have citizens actually made appointments to review? If so, how many?</p> <p>9. The cabling to Quonset for Revolution Wind was approved by DEM, is this going to be the same? Is this a foregone conclusion because you already think it's fine to run the cable to Quonset for Revolution?</p> <p>10. Will comments and questions received by March 7th be made public?</p> <p>11. What is the current state of the consortium and PPA or estimated pricing? Has the RFP been released? Have agreements been made or discussion between the participating states?</p> <p>12. Montaup is not allowing cable through the golf course, what are the onshore route options now?</p> <p>13. Onshore route variant 4 goes through a residential area, and onshore route variant 3 goes through Land Trust</p>	<p>6. A decision must be issued by March 15, 2024, to meet the Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 deadline.</p> <p>7. Yes, the application is a public document that has been provided to all that requested a copy, as noted in the public notice issued on February 6, 2024.</p> <p>8. The full application is available electronically and has been provided to 6 parties that made a request for the document.</p> <p>9. The SouthCoast project is using similar methods for cable installation as what was approved for Revolution Wind. The decision for both projects was issued after full review of the applications.</p> <p>10. All comments received are available to the public.</p> <p>11-14. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations. Upland work is in the jurisdiction of the CRMC.</p> <p>15-16. Core samples have been taken for development of the sediment transport model. Sample results are available in Attachment I of the Application. Additional testing is required as noted in Condition 12 of the Permit.</p> <p>17. Cable laying methods are noted in condition 10.C. of the Permit. This condition also</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>area. Will be compensated if there are resulting health impacts?</p> <p>14. How deep will they be onshore and how close to cables get to residential properties?</p> <p>15. Have core samples from the proposed cable route been taken? If so, have they been published? If samples have not been taken, why is approval for dredging even being discussed at this juncture?</p> <p>16. What are the contamination levels along the proposed dredging/cable laying route?</p> <p>17. What dredging, and cable laying methods will be employed to minimize the resuspension of these contaminants? What assurances can you give us that marine life and human life will not be negatively impacted by resuspended contaminants during the dredging and cable installation processes?</p> <p>18. What is your proposed timing of the cable laying process from beginning to end? Will you commit to not working during spawning season for various marine species who spawn and hatch in Mount Hope Bay and the Sakonnet?</p> <p>19. What types of machinery does South Coast plan to use for preparation of the seabed and for the installment of the cables? How wide and deep will trenching need to be at various points along the cable corridor? Do you anticipate going over areas in the river or bay that cannot be trenched out, but where cabling will need to be laid on top of the seabed?</p> <p>20. Could you please explain the phenomenon of directional installation</p>	<p>requires a work window of October 15 to January 31.</p> <p>18. Condition 10 of the Permit requires a work window of October 15 to January 31 to avoid larval and spawning periods.</p> <p>19. Cable laying methods are noted in condition 10.C. of the Permit. The trenching depth is 4 to 6 feet. Conditions 14 to 18 note conditions for cable burial tools and depth. Condition 20 notes Secondary Cable Protection for areas at other cable crossings and utilities.</p> <p>20. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report.</p> <p>21. The dredging and jet plow activities will not change the Water Quality classification.</p> <p>22. The Work window for the HDD work is restricted to October 15 to January 31 per Condition 10 of the Permit. The cable will be installed below the beach. Condition 28 of the Permit requires a 9-foot cable burial depth between mean high water and mean low water.</p> <p>23. Condition 27 requires a Fisheries Monitoring Plan. Condition 24 requires an EMF survey and report.</p> <p>24. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>toward Magnetic North to minimize the intensity of EMFs, and explain what relevance this might have on how South Coast cable route will be configured?</p> <p>21. Will the dredging and laying of the cables have a positive or negative effect on Class SA 1 of the pristine waters of the Sakonnet River?</p> <p>22. How long will Island Park beach be unavailable for use and will DEM be overseeing the construction site as well as the area where the cable is to be installed in the Bay?</p> <p>23. What effects will two 345,000 voltage DC cables trenched into the Sakonnet River and Mount Hope Bay have on various marine species?</p> <p>24. What are the positive and negative effects on the population of folks who frequently use Island Park beach?</p>	
Gail DeSisto	Too many factors are unknown to protect the fragile environment.	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.
Michael Smutok	Put solar panels on all RI government buildings first.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Susan McColough	Considerable uncertainty. Longer term environmental implications are almost certain to be substantial to local marine habitats and aquaculture and should weigh more heavily than shorter term theoretical benefits. Could approval of the project be delayed until a more fully informed decision be made, ideally to	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.



Name	Comment*	Response
	include impacts from multiple other proposed contiguous wind projects in total rather than individually by project?	A decision must be issued by March 15, 2024, to meet the Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 deadline.
Diana Ouellette	Concerned this is only about money. Compensation proposed will not be enough to offset the damage to the town, river, or community. Who will take care of the lines when they fail, the company fails and the wind farm fails? There are other ways to be green without the disruption of the fragile waterway.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Jeff Frederick	Concerned about the disruption and destruction to sea life, impact on recreational use of the waterways, EMFs, the heat from EMFs, and the environmental impacts of EMFs.	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report.
Mike Jarbeau, Save the Bay	Save the Bay supports the responsible development of offshore wind. Believe the permitting, construction, and operation of all renewable energy projects should carefully consider all pertinent environmental factors and mitigate impacts to the maximum extent practicable, regardless of cost to the developer. Urge all permitting authorities to carefully consider the best available science and require best management practices when issuing important permits. Specific comments: 1. Purpose and need: South Coast terminated purchase power agreement related to this project in 2023. Rhode Island Energy Siting Board & Coastal	1 The EFSB decision is not required for the processing of the Dredge Permit/WQC applications. Condition 32 requires that approval be received from the EFSB prior to commencement of dredging and jet plow activities. A decision must be issued by March 15, 2024, to meet the Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 deadline. 2. Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan. 3. Conditions 14 to 26 of the Permit address cable burial



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>Resources Management Council have paused state permitting for South Coast. Is it prudent for DEM to move forward with the Dredge Permit and Water Quality Certification at this time? When state permitting occurs in a piecemeal fashion without the whole project scope available for review, effective public participation and input is hindered.</p> <p>2. Sediment testing: Concerned by the lack of sediment testing data, particularly in Mount Hope Bay and the vicinity of the proposed horizontal directional drilling (HDD) pits. Recent reports have identified elevated levels of heavy metals and other contaminants. Targeted sediment testing should be required prior to dredging. If there is not recent data available in and around HDD pits and export cable route.</p> <p>3. Cable burial: Cable burial is critical to successful operation of the project. Urges DEM to carefully review all areas where the applicant claims the target burial depth may not be met. Proper seabed preparation and cable burial reduces future risks to marine species and other users of Narragansett Bay. The applicant should prioritize use of a boulder grab over a boulder plow for seabed preparation to limit impacts to benthic and other habitats. Increased costs should not be considered a reason to use more invasive methods. Given the confidential nature of South Coast's Cable Burial Risk Assessment, the public must rely on DEM's expert analysis for this area.</p> <p>4. Electromagnetic Fields (EMF): applicant states that "currently available scientific evidence does not provide</p>	<p>depth, secondary cable protection, boulder relocation, and long-term monitoring and maintenance.</p> <p>4. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report. Condition 10 of the Permit requires a work window of October 15 to January 31 to avoid larval and spawning periods.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>support for concluding there would be population-level harm to marine species from EMFs associated with HVDC submarine transmission.” Save the Bay shares this view based on reviews of scientific literature, however, studies also show that EMF levels and associated effects on marine species may be reduced, if not eliminated completely, by achieving target burial depth. Careful cable routing and burial depth much be prioritized over other factors such as cost to mitigate impacts, including avoidance of essential fish habitats and other sensitive habitats where possible.</p> <p>Urges DEM to exercise authority under the federal Clean Water Act and other applicable statutes to protect the Sakonnet River and Mount Hope Bay by requiring the applicant to avoid and minimize potential impacts from dredging and placing cables, and where necessary, mitigate impacts.</p>	
Susan Buettner	<p>Concerned that Rhode Island is giving permission to dredge waterways for the benefit of wind turbines in Massachusetts. Concerned with the environment, wildlife, recreational and tourist industry, the release of toxins, changing the pH of the water, and the hazard to locals without any benefit.</p>	<p>The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.</p>
David Brunetti	<p>In support: Desperately need massive transition to clean and renewable energy. The approval of the dredging permit is part of the necessary permitting process to get us there. So long as the project is in compliance with Section 401 of the Federal Clean Water Act, the rules and regulations for the Dredging and the Management of</p>	



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>Dredge Materials, and State Water Quality Regulations. Global impacts of climate change outweigh the potential impacts to local fish and shellfish.</p>	
<p>Nancy Howard</p>	<p>During the public meeting, it was stated that RIDEM has not yet received the information about chemicals found in any core samples. Although RIDEM may not be receiving this particular information, the decision will still be made.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why would South Coast bring forward any information that would potentially cause RIDEM to refuse the proposal? 2. Why would South Coast bother to reveal potentially dangerous chemicals that would harm the Sakonnet River and surrounding communities? 3. How can residents living here trust this decision if RIDEM does not have all the critical information to make the decision? <p>It seems like RI and Aquidneck Island are taking all the risk since this particular project only benefits MA and South Coast.</p>	<p>1-3. Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan. DEM approval is required prior to the commencement of dredging and jet plow activities.</p> <p>Condition 32 of the Permit requires approval from all other applicable state and federal agencies including the EFSB prior to the commencement of dredging and jet plow activities.</p>
<p>Michael Fumento</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned about health issues caused by EMF. Studies show EMF poses cancer hazards to children and adults living close to EMF. Has the EMF risk to health been considered? Could the Block Island cable generating EMF cause marine life issues? 2. Has spoken to construction repair crews for the main natural gas line and water pipe from Tiverton running under the Sakonnet who have reported that the pipe is deteriorating, and they have to fix and band aid repairs. 	<p>Condition 24 of the Permit requires a cable route inspection and post-construction monitoring plan. This condition also requires an EMF survey and report.</p> <p>Condition 20 of the Permit requires secondary cable protection at crossings with other submerged cables or utilities.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>3. They say a new 12” pipe is going to be laid down in the near future, how is the dredging risk for these pipes being addressed?</p>	
<p>Cathleen Hickey</p>	<p>Concerned with the small size of the Sakonnet, believes there are alternative routes for laying the cable. Also concerned about disturbing the sediment, microbial burden, toxicity, introducing fill to protect cables, and the effects of EMF from cables on the ecosystem and human health. The recent whales beached in the Narragansett area, was the causative agent affected by their nearby wind farm? Could the wind farm have influenced proliferation of a particular organism, reduced the whales’ resistance to infection, or affected their navigation ability?</p>	<p>Condition 24 of the Permit requires a cable route inspection and post-construction monitoring plan. This condition also requires an EMF survey and report.</p> <p>Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan. DEM approval is required prior to the commencement of dredging and jet plow activities.</p> <p>Other comments are outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>
<p>Katie Eagan</p>	<p>Asks state to consider not permitting the project until baseline data has been collected and potential impacts have been identified for fishery species. Concerned that South Coast will plow a trench across the Bay over two years during channeled whelk spawning season. Concerned that laying the cable will upend fishery cooperation. Jet plowing a trench through spawning areas and potentially disrupting migratory patterns will not help climate change.</p>	<p>Condition 27 requires a fisheries monitoring plan that includes a welk pot survey.</p> <p>Condition 10 of the Permit requires a work window of October 15 to January 31 to avoid larval and spawning periods.</p>
<p>Richard Loeb Jr.</p>	<p>Concerned about irreversible harm to the environment and associated benthic species and is in direct contravention of DEM’s responsibility to protect the environment under the Public Trust Doctrine.</p>	<p>The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
<p>Robert Mushen and the Little Compton Town Council</p>	<p>The Town of Little Compton is bordered on its long western shore entirely by the Sakonnet River. The Sakonnet is home to a wide variety of fin fish, shellfish, with virtually no industrial development on the shoreline. The entirety of the river of high-power electrical transmission cables from offshore wind turbines would subject its ecosystems to unpredictable risks and damage. The intended destination of the cables and beneficiary of the revenues their electricity produces is a power plant in MA. An alternative overland path with few attendant drawbacks has not been sufficiently explored. Therefore, the Little Compton Town Council supports the exploration of a cable path alongside State Route 88 in Westport, MA which would carry none of the attendant risks of the current plant and traverses an area relatively free of private residences or businesses.</p>	<p>The DEM jurisdiction for this project is limited to the state waters. The upland portion of the cable route is in the jurisdiction of the Coastal Resources Management Council (CRMC).</p>
<p>Gary Mataronas</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How will fishing boats that sail out of the Sakonnet be impacted while laying the cable? 2. Will the cables give off electrical currents that will disperse sea life? 3. How will the dredging for the cable affect quahog beds? How will fishery dredging interact with the wind cables? 4. Very concerned about fishing gear in the Sakonnet between March and November and whether gear will be damaged during laying of cables. 5. How will dragger fishermen tows react with the laying of the cables and after the cables are placed? 6. Concerned about massive die-off of crustaceans and fish from dredged mud plumes. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Condition 10 of the Permit restricts the jet plow activities to a work window of October 15 to January 31. 2. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report to assess potential effects of EMF on the composition, life cycle functions, uses, process and activities of fish and wildlife. 3. Condition 11 of the Permit requires a shellfish survey of the HDD pit areas and relocating shellfish will be required if deemed necessary by DEM. 4. Condition 14 of the Permit requires a cable burial work plan prior to the start of



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>7. How will you mitigate the negative impacts on recreational fishers and boaters in Sakonnet Harbor?</p> <p>8. How will boats stopping over at Sakonnet Harbor during travel routes to Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket be affected?</p> <p>9. How does South Coast plan on securing and getting past the two pipelines already running across the Sakonnet River?</p>	<p>construction activities. Condition 21 of the Permit requires a Boulder Relocation Plan.</p> <p>5-6. Condition 27 of the Permit requires a Fisheries Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>7-8. Condition 10 of the Permit requires a work window of October 15 to January 31.</p> <p>9. Condition 14 of the Permit requires a Cable Burial Work Plan. Condition 15 of the Permit requires a Cable Burial Plan.</p>
Joe & Mary Studlick	<p>In support: Concerned citizens who value environmental sustainability and the development of renewable energy sources, believe that the project aligns with RI goals of promoting clean energy and reducing carbon footprint. Any activity in the area of the Sakonnet River must be carefully planned and executed to minimize the potential impacts on the environment. Believe that South Coast's approach to cable installation through dredging demonstrates commitment to environmental responsibility. Confident that South Coast has taken the necessary precautions to mitigate these impacts through comprehensive environmental assessments and adherence to regulatory guidelines.</p>	
Donna Welk Cameron Gricus	<p>Concerned about the death of whales and other sea life. Concerned about the New England Regional Power Grid being too high. How does constantly moving equipment help the environment? Is the South Coast Wind Energy Permit all about helping investors, rather than protecting the environment?</p>	<p>Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>



Name	Comment*	Response
Susan & Kevin Keogh	Appears there are more questions than answers at this juncture. Have concerns about the proposed Enbridge project to replace the cross Sakonnet gas pipeline and the coordination efforts with the South Coast Energy project. No question the future will embrace wind power, but it must be approached carefully and environmentally friendly, with coordination throughout the northeast area.	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts. Condition 20 requires secondary cable protection at crossings of other cables and utilities.
Patricia Lidstone	Concerned that MA already denied the project while they will be reaping 98% of the benefits, whereas it will be going through RI, which will only receive 2%. How about doing the job in the Quonset area where other work has taken place? The \$23 million over that long period does not make it more attractive.	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Jody Stone	Concerned with the impact of acoustic measurements as well as electric and magnetic ambient fields on animals such as turtles, marine mammals, birds and fish. Compared to the smaller Block Island wind farm which had a potential impact radius of 30 feet, fear that the potential radius for larger cables is 100 feet and will cause dead zones up and down the coast line.	Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report to assess potential effects of EMF on the composition, life cycle functions, uses, process and activities of fish and wildlife. There will be no wind turbine installations within the project area, therefore no acoustic impacts are expected.
Charlotte DuHamel	Proper baseline studies in real life scenarios in different locations, different depths, different times of year were not undertaken. The sediment of the Sakonnet River is composed of year of settling from drainage from the fall river area. All of the ecosystems are connected, you can't affect one without the other. The people immediately affected by this will not support this. It is unethical to rubberstamp projects	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts.



Name	Comment*	Response
	because there is a financial gain for the state.	
Alexandra Sassi	Who will be accountable when the inevitable harmful effects take place on the ocean, its inhabitants, and the people that live on the river? The toxic waste? The EMFs that will be sure to cause terminal illness to those young and old?	The Permit includes 38 conditions that restrict the work to times of least fishing and recreational activity and requires monitoring and reporting to ensure minimal environmental impacts. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an Emf survey and report.
Andrew Roussinos	Will residents have an impact and make their case against this project and the government machine mandating it? Would like to see the funds for this project properly allocated to improve access to solar panels on public buildings, build solar farms over existing parking lots, incentivize property owners to install them on their dwellings, and consider possible nuclear power options instead. Why is Rhode Island being impacted by this project?	Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.
Barbara Durkin	Concerned about the stakeholders involved in South Coast wind and expensive cable failure and maintenance.	Condition 25 of the Permit requires a cable inspection and long-term monitoring plan.
Lisa Quattrocki Knight	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The benefits of offshore wind have never been proven. 2. South Coast misleads the public about potential benefits. Wind is an intermittent power source. 3. The risk of resuspending toxins laden in the seabed from generations of industry waste and having this accumulate in the food web could 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1-2. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations. 3-4. Condition 12 of the Permit requires a sediment sampling and analysis plan. DEM approval is required prior to the commencement of dredging and jet plow activities.



Name	Comment*	Response
	<p>potentially contaminate our food supplies and harm the fishing, oyster, and shellfish industries</p> <p>4. the company has not tested the sediment adequately. They have never even tested for the “forever” chemicals, or PFOAs.</p> <p>5. EMFs do cause harm to both developing marine life and to humans.</p> <p>6. Humans can also suffer from high levels of EMFs and implantable medical devices can malfunction when exposed.</p>	<p>5. Condition 24 of the Permit requires an EMF survey and report to assess potential effects of EMF on the composition, life cycle functions, uses, process and activities of fish and wildlife.</p> <p>6. Outside the review authority of the DEM dredging and water quality regulations.</p>

***Comments are not verbatim. Comments have been condensed and grouped to fit the table format for response purposes. Verbatim comments are contained in the scanned file “SouthCoast Wind 1 Project: Written Comments” which can be found and downloaded from the same location as this file at: [Customer and Technical Assistance | Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management \(ri.gov\)](#) under “Public Notices and Topics of Interest.”**