

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

VOLUME I, PAGES 1-118

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
NEW ENGLAND DISTRICT

PUBLIC SCOPING SESSION held at the Old
Whaling Church, Main Street, Edgartown,
Massachusetts, on Thursday, April 18, 2002,
commencing at 7:30 p.m. concerning:

WIND FARM PROPOSAL
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PUBLIC SCOPING SESSION

BEFORE:

Larry Rosenberg, as Moderator
Karen Adams, Chief, Permits and Enforcement Branch
Susan Holtham, EIS Project Advisor

MARIANNE KUSA-RYLL, RMR
JUSTICE HILL REPORTING
252 JUSTICE HILL ROAD, P.O. BOX 610
STERLING, MASSACHUSETTS 01564-0610
TELEPHONE: (978) 422-8777 FAX (978) 422-7799

	I N D E X	
1		
2	Speakers:	Page
3	Jim Vercruysse, Chairman, Martha's Vineyard	
4	Commission	4
5	Karen Adams, Chief, Permits and Enforcement	
6	Branch, New England District, US Army Corps	
7	of Engineers	8
8	Susan Holtham, EIS Project Advisor, Engineering	
9	and Planning Division, New England District,	
10	US Army Corps of Engineers	14
11	Kate Warner, Martha's Vineyard Commission	22
12	Jim Gordon, President, Cape Wind Associates	23
13	Roger Wey, Martha's Vineyard Commission	32
14	John Best, Martha's Vineyard Commission	34
15	Jenny Greene, Martha's Vineyard Commission;	
16	Representative, Town of Chilmark	36
17	Linda Sibley, Martha's Vineyard Commission	36
18	Megan Ottens-Sargent, Martha's Vineyard	
19	Commission	41
20	Tristan Israel, Martha's Vineyard Commission	46
21	Richard Toole, Martha's Vineyard Commission	51
22	Andrew Woodruff, Martha's Vineyard	
23	Commission	52
24	(Continued)	

	I N D E X (cont'd.)	
2	Speakers:	Page
3	Robert Zeltzer, Martha's Vineyard Commission	53
4	Peter Kenney	55
5	Chris Murphy	58
6	Jonathan Mayhew	62
7	Henry Burt	67
8	Robert Douglas	72
9	Russell Walton	74
10	Anna Edey	78
11	John Abrams	84
12	Stig Persson	85
13	Thomas Zinno	91
14	Howell Kelly	92
15	Isaac Russell	94
16	Rez Williams	96
17	Chris Fried	98
18	Stanley Schonbrun	101
19	Murray Culbert	107
20	Steve Lohman	108
21		
22		
23		
24		

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2

3 CHAIRMAN JIM VERCRUYSSSE: Good evening,
4 everyone. This is a meeting of the Martha's
5 Vineyard Commission. We are going to do some
6 Commission business after the wind farm proposal;
7 so, Commissioners, don't go anywhere.

8 I'm pleased to announce tonight that we
9 are going to have a brief presentation from the wind
10 farm proposal in Nantucket Sound, and we're going to
11 ask for public comment and questions later.

12 First, there is going to be a proposal,
13 an outline of what is happening, and I'm going to
14 turn the meeting over to the people who are going to
15 do that.

16 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Good evening.
17 Good evening to all, and I would like to thank the
18 Commission for inviting the United States Army Corps
19 of Engineers here this evening, and let's get
20 started.

21 Good evening and welcome to this
22 National Environmental Policy Act public scoping
23 meeting for an Environmental Impact Statement that
24 will lead to a decision by the federal government on

1 a permit -- for a permit application, rather,
2 submitted by Cape Wind Associates for their proposal
3 to: (1) Build a wind farm power generation field in
4 Nantucket Sound in Massachusetts; and (2) For their
5 proposal for a scientific monitoring single tower
6 data facility also located in the Sound.

7 My name is Larry Rosenberg, and I'm the
8 Chief of Public Affairs for the United States Army
9 Corporation of Engineers in New England, and I will
10 be your moderator and facilitator for this portion
11 of this meeting.

12 Before we begin, I would like to thank
13 you for getting involved in this environmental
14 review process. You see, we're here this evening to
15 listen to your comments, to understand your
16 concerns, and to provide you an opportunity to
17 appear on the record should you care to do so. This
18 forum is yours.

19 In accordance with the National
20 Environmental Policy Act, our scoping officer
21 tonight is Mrs. Karen Adams, the Chief of the
22 Massachusetts Permits and Enforcement Branch for the
23 United States Army Corps of Engineers.

24 Should you need copies of the public

1 notice, the scoping procedure, or other pertinent
2 information, it is available under the windows in
3 the rear.

4 The agenda for the scoping session is,
5 following this introduction, Mrs. Adams will address
6 this meeting.

7 She will then be followed by the Corps'
8 EIS Project Advisor, who will discuss both the
9 Environmental Impact Statement and the National
10 Environmental Policy Act.

11 Following that short presentation, we
12 will begin to receive first your comments, and then
13 the public's comments. Please feel free to bring up
14 any topics you feel need to be discussed on the
15 record. And we are making a record of this, and I
16 assure you that all your comments will be addressed
17 during the environmental review process.

18 It's very important that everybody here
19 understands that no decision has been made by the
20 United States Army Corps of Engineers with regard to
21 this proposed wind farm.

22 Furthermore, the Corps of Engineers is
23 not here to defend any aspect of the proposed
24 activity. We are here to listen to what's on your

1 mind concerning the proposed activity.

2 You should also know that before any
3 decision is made, we must take into consideration
4 both the environmental concerns and all the issues
5 that are of concern to you.

6 You know, as a direct result of having
7 this type of open process, we have been able to
8 overcome many of the difficulties other agencies
9 face when having these types of public review
10 processes.

11 Now, although we are here to listen to
12 your thoughts regarding the proposed activity, we do
13 need your input throughout the entire process, which
14 is just starting now.

15 Your involvement is not only requested;
16 your involvement is necessary, especially those of
17 you who feel impacted by the project, to assist us
18 in the entire environmental review.

19 Before we begin, I would like to remind
20 everybody the importance of filling in those
21 registration forms that were available at the door.
22 The forms serve two purposes: First, they let us
23 know that you're interested in the EIS so we can
24 keep you informed individually.

1 Second, they provide the Corps a record
2 of concerned individuals, who went out of their way
3 to ensure that this process would be objective; that
4 this process would have integrity; and that this
5 process would reach conclusions based upon the
6 record.

7 If you did not fill in the registration
8 form, but wish to be kept informed throughout the
9 process, and receive future information on the EIS,
10 please take an opportunity to do so.

11 Ladies and gentlemen, Mrs. Karen Adams.

12 MRS. ADAMS: I would like to welcome you
13 tonight to this public meeting, which is an
14 important part of the federal environmental review
15 process, that will lead to decisions by the federal
16 government on permit applications submitted by Cape
17 Wind Associates; one for their proposal to build a
18 scientific monitoring tower in Nantucket Sound; and
19 one addressing the overall wind power project
20 proposed for Horseshoe Shoals in Nantucket Sound.

21 I would also like to thank you for
22 involving yourself in this environmental review
23 process.

24 I am Karen Adams. I'm Chief of the

1 Massachusetts Permits and Enforcement Branch of the
2 New England District of the US Army Corps of
3 Engineers. Our headquarters is located in Concord,
4 Massachusetts.

5 Other Corps of Engineers representatives
6 with me tonight include: Sue Holtham, who is
7 assisting in managing the NEPA EIS process, and who
8 you will hear from shortly; Brian Valiton, our
9 permit project manager, you might have met him at
10 the door; and Larry Rosenberg, our Chief of Public
11 Affairs, who will facilitate tonight's session.

12 Tonight's session is being conducted as
13 part of the federal National Environmental Policy
14 Act requirements, and the Corps of Engineers
15 Regulatory responsibilities to seek out public input
16 regarding the scope and content of the Environmental
17 Impact Statement, which is being prepared by the
18 Corps of Engineers for the overall wind power
19 project.

20 Our authorities are statutory and
21 include Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act and
22 the National Environmental Policy Act, often
23 referred to as NEPA.

24 I'll briefly review the Corps of

1 Engineers' responsibilities in this process:

2 First, the Corps' New England District
3 received a permit application from Cape Wind
4 Associates in late November for a permit for the
5 installation and operation of 170 offshore wind
6 turbine generators in federal and state waters off
7 the coast of Massachusetts in Horseshoe Shoals in
8 Nantucket Sound. We also received an application
9 for a single scientific monitoring tower within that
10 same area.

11 This application is more fully described
12 in our public notice, which is dated December 4,
13 2001, copies of which were available here this
14 evening. They are on a shelf there underneath the
15 windows. These copies include revised sheets 2 and
16 3 of the plans, which have been submitted recently
17 by the applicant. There have been some proposals,
18 some changes to the proposal with regards to the
19 dimensions of the structure.

20 In response to our Public Notice, we
21 received a request for meetings to be held on
22 Martha's Vineyard. So we extended our comment
23 period, and we are here tonight to listen to you.

24 The Corps of Engineers regulatory

1 authority for these permit applications derives from
2 Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, which
3 authorizes the Corps to regulate structures and work
4 in navigable waters of the United States.

5 Both the single monitoring tower and the
6 wind turbines are proposed to be located outside of
7 state waters on the outer continental shelf. The
8 outer continental -- the Outer Continental Shelf
9 Land Act mandates that all structures on the outer
10 continental shelf receive a Corps permit under
11 Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.

12 As part of our regulatory
13 responsibilities, a number of other federal laws
14 apply, including the National Environmental Policy
15 Act (NEPA). Under NEPA, federal agencies must
16 ensure that environmental information is available
17 to itself and to the public before decisions are
18 made.

19 For every permit application, the Corps
20 must decide if an environmental assessment, or full
21 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is necessary to
22 comply with NEPA. Colonel Osterndorf, our District
23 Engineer, has decided that an EIS is necessary for
24 the wind power project.

1 In addition to the federal EIS, the
2 Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental
3 Affairs will be preparing an Environmental Impact
4 Report (EIR) under the Massachusetts Environmental
5 Policy Act. As the EIS and EIR will study similar
6 issues and follow a similar process, we have decided
7 to prepare a joint EIS/EIR.

8 The Corps of Engineers and the state's
9 MEPA office are strongly committed to this joint
10 process as a way to avoid duplication and confusion
11 by conducting a coordinated comprehensive review of
12 this proposal.

13 NEPA requires that we have an early open
14 process for determining scope of issues to be
15 addressed in the EIS.

16 Our goals for the scoping process are
17 threefold:

18 First, to identify the affected public
19 and agency concerns;

20 Second, to define the issues and
21 alternatives that we will examine in the EIS; and

22 Third, to facilitate identification of
23 all the relative issues early to reduce the need to
24 backtrack later.

1 As Sue Holtham will explain further, it
2 is never too late to provide input on the EIS scope.
3 However, we plan to provide direction to the
4 consultant in the upcoming weeks as to what needs to
5 be addressed in the EIS. Comments received tonight,
6 or as soon as possible, would be most helpful.

7 Any additional comments regarding the
8 scientific monitoring tower need to be submitted to
9 us by May 13, 2002.

10 No decision has been made on the
11 contents of the EIS or the permit applications.
12 Input that you will offer will be used to help us
13 determine what to evaluate in the EIS and how to
14 address the public interest factors in the
15 evaluation of the single tower.

16 We need your help to do this.
17 Information on issues, resources, sites,
18 alternatives, available studies, data or maps would
19 be most useful to us.

20 Once the Draft EIS is prepared,
21 additional public hearings and meetings will be held
22 with more opportunity for public comment.

23 Thank you.

24 Ms. Holtham.

1 MRS. HOLTHAM: Thank you, Karen.

2 Again, good evening. Thank you all for
3 being here tonight.

4 Again, I'm Sue Holtham. I am with the
5 New England District Corps of Engineers. I am in
6 the Environmental Resources Branch there, and I'm
7 going to be working with the regulatory folks here
8 on the Environmental Impact Statement for this
9 proposed project.

10 First, I would like to take just a few
11 minutes to discuss the EIS process that will be
12 undertaken for this proposed wind energy project.
13 And there are a bunch of handouts in the back, and
14 some of them do follow what I'm going to say. So
15 feel free to grab one, if you haven't already.

16 First off, what really is this thing we
17 have been talking about, an Environmental Impact
18 Statement?

19 Well, as Karen noted, the National
20 Environmental Policy Act basically provides the
21 basis for federal agencies to prepare Environmental
22 Impact Statements, or EISs. The Act notes what
23 requirements the federal agencies have to do to
24 prepare the statements for major federal actions

1 that significantly affect the human environment as
2 the Act states; and that the statements shall
3 identify, analyze and document the effects and
4 issues associated with the proposed action, as well
5 as reasonable and practicable alternatives.

6 So, in essence, an EIS, it identifies
7 and evaluates potential environmental impacts, and
8 at the same time, ensures that the public and
9 agencies are involved in the process before any
10 decisions are made.

11 Again, I would like to note, as Karen
12 mentioned, that we are working closely with the
13 State of Massachusetts to have a joint process
14 during the development of this document.

15 The NEPA process and the EIS has several
16 specific elements, which are applicable to any EIS
17 that is prepared for any federal agency. Basically,
18 what an EIS is is a decision-making tool that helps
19 whoever the decision maker is in making their
20 decision on whatever is being discussed in the
21 document. It provides full public disclosure. It
22 involves the public throughout the process from
23 beginning to end, and it integrates all
24 environmental requirements, and I'll come back to

1 that in just a second. It documents all the
2 existing conditions, basically what is out there
3 right now as we either call it the existing
4 conditions, or baseline conditions. It evaluates
5 alternatives. It documents and analyzes the impacts
6 and then identifies a preferred course of action.

7 When I mentioned integrating all the
8 environmental requirements, that means that the
9 requirements of other environmental and applicable
10 laws and regulations are also included in the EIS;
11 for example, the requirements of the federal
12 Endangered Species Act and the National Historic
13 Preservation Act must be evaluated in the document.

14 So what does an EIS look like?

15 I'm probably sure that many or all of
16 you have probably seen them, but basically there is
17 a standard way of how an EIS is presented. There is
18 a description of a purpose of and need for the
19 action, which is a very, very important section of
20 the EIS. And then it goes into the alternatives
21 considered, and I'll be talking about that in a
22 moment as well. It talks about the affected
23 environment, again the baseline conditions, and then
24 it goes into the environmental and socioeconomic

1 consequences of the impacts of the action. Any
2 voluminous data and reporting of the data is usually
3 included in the appendices associated with the
4 document.

5 The alternatives section of the EIS
6 sometimes has been termed "the heart of an EIS."
7 This chapter basically evaluates all the reasonable
8 alternatives, as well as those alternatives
9 eliminated from detailed study, and as required by
10 NEPA, the no action alternative.

11 At this point, we foresee that the
12 following alternatives will be included in the EIS:

13 Again, the no action alternative;

14 Alternative wind park locations,

15 including onshore and offshore locations;

16 Alternative project capacities;

17 Alternative renewable forms of energy;

18 Submarine cable route alternatives;

19 Alternative landfill and overland cable
20 route locations;

21 And alternative connections to NSTAR
22 transmission lines.

23 Finally, there are basically five major
24 milestones in the development of an EIS:

1 The first one is scoping, which is what
2 we are doing here tonight. This kicks off the
3 process, and as Larry and Karen mentioned that this
4 helps us to determine the range of issues that need
5 to be evaluated in the document. And scoping
6 continues throughout the development of the
7 document; even though we would appreciate any
8 comments you may have in the very near future, we
9 will accept comments until the document is
10 completed.

11 Then the document goes out for public
12 review and comment, after all the technical analyses
13 and alternative evaluations are completed. The
14 availability of the document is published in the
15 federal register, as well as in public notices and
16 news releases.

17 And there is a 45-day review period.
18 And within that 45 days, a public meeting is held to
19 hear comments on the document. Then based on the
20 comments received, a final EIS is prepared, which
21 takes into consideration all of those comments.

22 That document goes out for a 30-day
23 comment period; and at the conclusion of that time
24 frame, a record of decision is prepared, which

1 outlays the findings and conclusions of the EIS, as
2 well as the Corps' decision on the permit.

3 And then finally, there was one handout
4 as well back there, regarding the overall time line
5 that has been developed for the preparation of
6 this -- this EIS. And at this point, the schedule
7 calls for a public Draft EIS to be out in January of
8 2003.

9 And that concludes my remarks for this
10 evening. And again, thank you very much.

11 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

12 Ladies and gentlemen, it is crucial to
13 this public process that your voice is heard, and
14 we're here to listen, listen to your concerns, to
15 understand your comments and provide you an
16 opportunity to put your thoughts on the record
17 should you care to do so.

18 You should be aware that subsequent to
19 any decisions made by the Corps, we conduct a
20 broad-based public interest review. As a direct
21 result of our decision to require an Environmental
22 Impact Statement, this scoping is part of that
23 review.

24 All factors affecting the public will be

1 included in the EIS and in our evaluation. Your
2 comments, as you have heard, will help define the
3 scope of the Environmental Impact Statement.

4 Furthermore, in order to make any
5 decisions regarding the permit application, we, the
6 United States Army Corps of Engineers, need to have
7 you involved just not tonight, but throughout the
8 entire environmental review process.

9 This -- the scoping will be conducted in
10 a manner that all who desire to express their views
11 will be given an opportunity to speak. To preserve
12 the right of all to express their views, I ask that
13 there be no interruptions.

14 When you came in, copies of the public
15 notice and the procedures were available and still
16 are. If you did not receive these, please make them
17 available to yourself.

18 I will not read either the public notice
19 or the scoping procedures, but they will be entered
20 into the record.

21 A transcript of this meeting is being
22 prepared, and the record will remain open throughout
23 the preparation of the Environmental Impact
24 Statement. However, comments on the scientific

1 monitoring station must be received not later than
2 May 13, 2002.

3 Anybody who cannot attend, but wishes to
4 send written comments should forward those comments
5 to the Corps' New England headquarters in Concord,
6 Massachusetts. I need to say that written and oral
7 comments receive equal weight.

8 Lastly, I would like to emphasize again
9 that the Corps has made no decision with regard to
10 this permit. It is our responsibility to evaluate
11 both the environmental and socioeconomic impact
12 prior to making any decision. And in order to
13 accomplish that, we need to hear from you.

14 As I said, the transcript of this
15 scoping session is being made to assure a detailed
16 review of all the comments. A copy of that
17 transcript will be available at our Concord,
18 Massachusetts headquarters for your review, which
19 doesn't do you a lot of good, but it will be also on
20 our website free, and you can download it from
21 there, or you can make arrangements with the
22 stenographer for a copy at your own expense.

23 When making a statement, we would like
24 you to come up to the microphone, state your name,

1 your address and spell your last name. And if you
2 represent any interest officially, please say so.

3 And I want to emphasize again that all
4 who wish to speak will have an opportunity to do so.

5 Prior to me turning it over to you, I
6 would like to ask the Commission, sir, do you have
7 any questions?

8 CHAIRMAN JIM VERCRUYSSSE: Yes. One or
9 two questions from the commissioners first before
10 they go to the public, if that's all right.

11 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: All right.

12 CHAIRMAN JIM VERCRUYSSSE: Any
13 commissioners?

14 Kate.

15 COMMISSIONER KATE WARNER: I would like
16 to request that the Cape Wind Associates give a
17 short presentation, because there are a lot people
18 in the audience who did not see our original
19 presentation, if that's all right.

20 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: That would be
21 fine.

22 Tonight, Mr. Jim Gordon of Cape Wind is
23 here.

24 Jim, could you come up and explain a

1 little bit about the permit application.

2 JIM GORDON: Sure.

3 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

4 JIM GORDON: Good evening, Commissioners
5 and audience. Thank you very much for coming this
6 evening to learn about our project, ask questions,
7 and talk about issues.

8 I would like to tell you a little bit
9 about who I am, and our company, and what we have
10 been doing for the last 27 years before I go into
11 the Cape Wind Project.

12 For the past 27 years, I have been
13 working on energy problems and solutions in New
14 England.

15 For the first ten years of our company's
16 existence, we focused on energy conservation and
17 pollution control projects. We went into a wide
18 range of industrial and institutional facilities.
19 We studied their energy consumption patterns and
20 practices, and we helped them devise ways in which
21 they could reduce fuel consumption, and we
22 implemented those processes and technologies very
23 successfully.

24 After concentrating on conservation and

1 pollution control projects for about ten years,
2 around 1985, our company transitioned into
3 developing independent power projects in New
4 England. If you recall back in the late '70s and
5 mid '80s, New England was heavily dependent on coal,
6 oil and nuclear power.

7 At that time, our company had looked
8 around the United States and in Europe, and we saw
9 that natural gas-fired combined cycle technologies
10 were being used very successfully. Our company
11 helped to pioneer the development of natural
12 gas-fired combined cycle plants in New England. And
13 what that did was significantly contributed to a
14 cleaner environment, cost competitiveness, greater
15 electric reliability, and a significant reduction in
16 pollutant emissions.

17 After operate -- owning and operating
18 natural gas-fired power plants for about ten years,
19 and we also did a renewable energy project, which
20 was a biomass project in Alexandria, New Hampshire;
21 after doing that for about 10 years, our company
22 decided to sell our natural gas-fired power plants
23 to focus on developing renewable energy projects in
24 New England.

1 Some of the reasons we decided to do
2 that is because just as we look back in the mid '80s
3 and saw our energy portfolio heavily dependent on
4 oil, we saw that New England was getting -- starting
5 to move and putting a lot of eggs in the natural gas
6 basket. And we wanted to look at ways to help
7 diversify our energy resources, as well as continue
8 to contribute to a cleaner environment, a healthier
9 environment in New England.

10 Our company decided to look at
11 developing a meaningful renewable energy project,
12 one that could significantly contribute to a cleaner
13 environment, lower and stable electric prices, as
14 well as address some of our reliance on imported
15 energy. We looked at various land sites throughout
16 New England, and we looked at various offshore
17 sites.

18 In our studies, we went to Europe, and
19 we saw that -- we looked at offshore wind farms that
20 had been operating. The oldest one has been
21 operating -- it just celebrated its 10th anniversary
22 off the coast of Denmark. What we saw is -- we saw
23 that land-based wind farms were springing up around
24 the United States and Europe, and we also saw that

1 Europe was beginning to make offshore wind
2 technology a key component of their energy and
3 environmental future, because of the success they
4 had in demonstration projects over the past 10 years
5 in projects in the waters of Denmark, the
6 Netherlands, Sweden.

7 Now, in Europe, there are over 18
8 offshore wind farms being developed in the United
9 Kingdom alone.

10 About a month ago, the Chancellor of
11 Germany and the Prime Minister of Canada announced a
12 700 megawatt offshore wind farm off the coast of
13 British Columbia.

14 In Arklow, Ireland, the Irish government
15 has just approved a 200 turbine, 520 megawatt
16 offshore wind farm four miles off the coast of
17 Arklow, an area that has maritime villages, beaches,
18 sailing, fishing, golfing.

19 We found after -- we studied, we looked
20 for a year, and employing environmental scientists,
21 marine biologist, geophysicists, meteorologists, we
22 looked and we found a site at Horseshoe Shoal; and
23 we selected Horseshoe Shoal, because quite simply,
24 it is where the wind is. It has some of the best

1 offshore wind resources in the United States.
2 Horseshoe Shoal is also a shallow and protected
3 environment. In some spots, the depths are two feet
4 to 50 feet; and at low tide sometimes part of the
5 Shoal is exposed.

6 Horseshoe Shoals also had proximity to a
7 growing demand center. The population on Cape Cod
8 is one of the fastest growing areas in New England.
9 Putting -- adding an addition of electricity in a
10 southerly direction into the existing Cape Cod grid
11 near Barnstable will help stabilize transmission
12 reliability. And we looked at -- our goal is to try
13 to develop a project that the Cape and Islands will
14 be proud of.

15 The project consists of 170 wind
16 turbines that will be placed approximately five and
17 a half miles off the coast of Hyannis, eight and a
18 half miles from Edgartown, and approximately
19 13 miles from Nantucket.

20 The wind turbines will be spaced a third
21 to a half a mile apart in this area of Horseshoe
22 Shoal. Nantucket Sound is 570 square miles.
23 Horseshoe Shoals is approximately 28 square miles.
24 Of the 28 square miles, we will be occupying less

1 than two acres of water sheet with the offshore wind
2 turbines.

3 The -- with the wind turbines spaced a
4 third to a half a mile apart, or six to nine
5 football fields apart, if that helps visualize it
6 better, we believe that the wind farm will
7 successfully coexist with fishing, recreational
8 boating. Horseshoe Shoal is out of the main
9 shipping channels. It is away from the air flight
10 paths. It is outside of the ferry routes. So it
11 truly is an ideal area to convert wind to
12 electricity. The electricity that is generated will
13 travel by undersea cable that will be jet plowed
14 approximately six feet under the ocean floor. It
15 will then reach a landfall in Yarmouth, and it will
16 be buried under existing public rights of ways and
17 streets to the existing NSTAR grid.

18 The Cape and Islands has a demand, an
19 electrical demand, peak demand of approximately
20 440 megawatts. The Cape Wind Project at peak output
21 will produce 420 megawatts of zero emission
22 electricity, zero water consumption, and zero waste
23 discharge into any water body or sewer.

24 On average, the Cape Wind Project will

1 produce approximately 180 megawatts of electricity.

2 We recognize that with any energy
3 project, even renewable projects, whether they be
4 wind or solar or fuel cells, there are environmental
5 impacts. There have been concerns about the visual
6 impact of the Cape Wind Project.

7 What is it going to look like?

8 And what I would encourage you is to go
9 onto our website at capewind.org. Go to the
10 benefiting Cape Cod section, and we do have visual
11 simulations that were done by Environmental Design
12 Research, a company out of Syracuse, New York, that
13 specializes in producing visual simulations of a
14 wide range of projects, including wind farms.

15 Our wind turbines are 250 feet high at
16 the hub; and at twelve o'clock, the blade will reach
17 425 feet. And I can tell you that the tallest wind
18 turbine, taken five and a half miles offshore, or
19 eight miles offshore, or 13 miles offshore looks
20 very small. In fact, if you look out on the
21 horizon, they will be about this big (indicating).
22 And, please, I encourage you to check our visual
23 simulations on our website.

24 The Cape Wind Project addresses a number

1 of issues. We all recognize that global warming, it
2 isn't theoretical. It's real. Our coastlines are
3 being altered. Our beaches are being threatened by
4 rising sea levels. Marine species are being
5 threatened by warming temperatures. Our bays and
6 estuaries are being -- nitrogen deposits are coming
7 from fossil fuel plants. Some of the filthy five
8 are located very near Cape Cod and the Islands.

9 This project every hour that it
10 operates, it will offset fossil fuel emissions; and
11 in fact, the project will offset approximately a
12 million tons of CO2 annually. It will offset sulfur
13 dioxide, which causes acid rain and hurts our lakes,
14 streams and forests. It will offset NOX. These are
15 pollutant emissions that are not only hurt our
16 fragile environment on Cape Cod, but it also
17 contributes to significant health issues.

18 There have been many -- the Physicians
19 of Social Responsibility have just put out a study
20 showing the health impacts of fossil fuel emissions.
21 The Harvard Health Report has studied premature
22 deaths from Brayton Point and Salem Harbor. These
23 are real issues that we face.

24 Will the Cape Wind Project solve these

1 to clean up their coal-fired plants, which drifts
2 over to our communities?

3 How do we have the moral and political
4 standing to ask the Midwest to clean these fossil
5 fuel plants up if we as a community do not take
6 advantage of our own indigenous resources to produce
7 clean energy for our use?

8 I would ask -- I would ask you to ponder
9 one question before I close. It has been estimated
10 by the Edison Electric Institute, by the New England
11 ISO and other people that follow the electric
12 industry that by the year 2020, our electric demand
13 is going to increase by 40 percent.

14 Are we to build more coal, oil and
15 nuclear power plants, or should we take a
16 sustainable energy path and look to develop our own
17 domestic resources for our benefit?

18 Thank you very much.

19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, Jim.

20 Any other questions from the Commission?

21 COMMISSIONER ROGER WEY: Ah, what study
22 will show what the effects of these towers will have
23 on our marine life in the area?

24 I mean, there has got to be some kind of

1 study if these towers are built. What affect on the
2 marine life will be in the area?

3 MRS. ADAMS: That is what we are trying
4 to determine is that what kind of issues need to be
5 addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.
6 The Environmental Impact Statement is the report
7 that will publish the results of all the studies
8 that are being done with respect to birds,
9 fisheries, all those kinds of things that are coming
10 up through these scoping meetings. And that is what
11 we are here to hear, to find out what kinds of
12 issues do the residents of Martha's Vineyard feel
13 need to be addressed in that document.

14 COMMISSIONER ROGER WEY: That is one of
15 the issues. The other issue I have is the visual
16 impact it's going to have, you know, with all these
17 towers out there. They say, you know, go to the
18 website. You can see the towers are small, but I
19 don't know how we can project what these towers are
20 going to be, so many of these towers are going to be
21 from the different towns on the island, obviously
22 Oak Bluffs. I am from Oak Bluffs, so I am concerned
23 about that, and I am also from Edgartown.

24 Then the other thing that I -- you know,

1 he mentions about saving, you know, this is going to
2 be a cost savings. It's going to save, you know,
3 these people in the area money. And then the
4 electricity, but it maybe not be cheaper, but it
5 will be there. And it seems like this is a
6 commodity, and they can sell this electricity to
7 other parts of the country, so I don't know how -- I
8 think there is a question how much of a benefit it's
9 going to be to the Cape area.

10 I mean, so those are a series of
11 concerns that I have.

12 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Those are points
13 well taken. Thank you.

14 Any other questions?

15 COMMISSIONER JOHN BEST: Yes. Just to
16 elaborate a little bit on what Roger said. My name
17 is John Best. I am a Commissioner from Vineyard
18 Haven.

19 The impact on the electric rates and the
20 sources of electricity. I assume it's going to be
21 just sold into the grid.

22 Navigation: Are they going to be lit?
23 The towers themselves must be hazardous to
24 navigation. So I wonder if they are going to be

1 lit. And if they are going to be lit, will that be
2 just visible from a good distance?

3 I mean, from a safety standpoint, they
4 have got to be visible to boats, but will they be
5 visible, say, from Oak Bluffs, Edgartown and
6 Cape Cod?

7 Roger touched on marine, the fisheries,
8 what impact it might have. I know in other areas,
9 particularly in California, I believe, that birds
10 have been negatively impacted by the windmills. In
11 those areas, I know they are on ridge tops, where
12 particularly raptors are soaring, and they have had
13 a large kill of raptors.

14 There is comments here that this is not
15 an area where there is migratory routes, and I
16 wonder about that, because I know that a great many
17 hawks and raptors come all down the coast, cross
18 over to the Vineyard during migration season. I
19 don't know how they get to the Vineyard without
20 crossing over the Sound. They may not -- it's not
21 like they are soaring on uplift as they are on ridge
22 tops, and these are down on the water. And maybe
23 when they come across the water they are at higher
24 altitudes and wouldn't be drawn to that particular

1 area or whatnot. But these are questions that I
2 would like to see addressed.

3 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

4 Ma'am.

5 COMMISSIONER JENNY GREENE: My name is
6 Jenny Greene. I represent the Town of Chilmark, and
7 I'd like to address the fact that that area is a
8 recreational summer area. The Islands and Cape Cod
9 both depend on the tourist industry in order for us
10 to survive. If we should have to give up a large
11 section of recreational area where there is a great
12 deal of boating during the summertime, where people
13 are coming and going from the Islands and the Cape,
14 there is going to be an economic impact that is
15 going to be significant. I think you need to
16 address this.

17 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Absolutely. Thank
18 you very much.

19 Any other questions from the Commission?

20 Yes, ma'am.

21 COMMISSIONER LINDA SIBLEY: Well, I'm
22 trying to figure out how we can better address the
23 visual impact. And I realize that these are very
24 tall, and that in order for them to stay upright out

1 there, there probably has to be something very heavy
2 underwater, but I am going to try something.

3 Is there any way that you can get models
4 of these things out there on barges?

5 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: It's a very good
6 question.

7 COMMISSIONER LINDA SIBLEY: I mean,
8 could you --

9 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Jim.

10 JIM GORDON: Yes. That's an excellent
11 question, and I think I can -- I want to touch on
12 one thing that I didn't, and then I'll answer your
13 question. I didn't talk about the scientific
14 monitoring station, which will give a frame of
15 reference.

16 We're -- as part -- as the Corps
17 announced, part of this hearing is also a scientific
18 monitoring station, which we are basically asking to
19 put out in pretty much the middle of Horseshoe
20 Shoals.

21 This scientific monitoring station is
22 being put out. We are approaching this in a very
23 scientific and rigorous manner. Today, we had boats
24 out there for the past two days studying birds

1 flying over the Sound. We have been doing flyovers
2 of Nantucket Sound in a seaplane with two of the
3 most reputed avian consultants in the United States,
4 Doctor Jeremy Hatch and Doctor Paul Curlinger, who
5 are looking very carefully at the avian issues. We
6 are also in May bringing a barge out. And we are
7 bringing special avian radar up from Florida. We
8 are going to have it mounted on the barge to really
9 study on a real-time basis exactly what birds are
10 flying over the shoal. We are doing this by
11 studying the -- what food is in the water, and those
12 will answer a lot of the questions, and we're doing
13 this with Mass. Audubon. We are working with Mass.
14 Audubon to set up the protocol, as well as the
15 regulatory agencies, but the scientific monitoring
16 station is going to validate -- we're measuring the
17 wind at three different heights: Wind shear,
18 turbulence, speed direction. We are also measuring
19 wave conditions, tidal currents, salinity,
20 barometric pressures. This will be important for
21 validating the design of the wind farm; but more
22 importantly, this data we are going to share with
23 the community.

24 We are working with Mass. Maritime

1 Academy, Malcolm MacGregor, the Chairman of the
2 Marine Safety and Environmental Protection. We are
3 going to share this with them, the University of
4 Massachusetts, Cape Cod Community College. This is
5 going to have significant value beyond the wind
6 farm. So the monitoring station will give you an
7 idea. It's not exactly the height of the turbines,
8 but it will give you an idea of the structure out
9 there.

10 COMMISSIONER LINDA SIBLEY: Before he
11 sits down, could I ask him --

12 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Yes. Let me say
13 one thing. Jim is the permit applicant. The scope
14 that we have yet to come up with will -- you will
15 help us come up with, with things such as the visual
16 impacts --

17 COMMISSIONER LINDA SIBLEY: Well, I was
18 just suggesting --

19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: -- a lot of
20 issues, the migration issues. It's very important
21 for us to remain very objective; and while the
22 applicant was more than happy to answer the
23 questions, we, the Corps of Engineers, has not
24 defined the scope of the project yet, as Sue and as

1 our scoping officer Karen have communicated. And
2 once that scope is identified, the lanes, as you
3 were, would be identified and the data that we would
4 need to make that objective determination would be
5 requested and analyzed; is that not correct?

6 MRS. ADAMS: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER LINDA SIBLEY: What I had
8 in mind, and maybe I'm impractical, but it would
9 have to be something that really looked like a
10 turbine, and I think it would have to be more than
11 one. You would have to have enough so that you
12 could see the size as well as the height.

13 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Very good point.
14 A point well taken. I thank you.

15 Yes, ma'am.

16 COMMISSIONER JENNY GREENE: I wanted to
17 know about when they were planning to do this
18 monitoring of the birds, because the migration is
19 well into the season already; and if they are going
20 to be doing it for this thing that we are responding
21 to on May 13th, there's no way.

22 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: That is one of the
23 things that we're looking at?

24 MRS. ADAMS: The bird monitoring is

1 going on for the date to be included in the
2 Environmental Impact Statement. We know it will not
3 be ready for the monitoring station. The monitoring
4 station is to help us collect data, which could be
5 used in the EIS. So that the monitoring station is
6 something they are looking to get a permit for
7 rather quickly so they can get it out for the summer
8 season.

9 It -- the -- the monitoring tower by
10 itself does not have the turbine blades on it that
11 would have the same types of impact. It is a
12 different type of a structure. So we are treating
13 that differently, but the data is starting to be
14 collected now. We don't have anything firmed up on
15 exactly what is going to be included, but because I
16 do know that the season is critical, they have
17 started getting people out there and started to do
18 some of the studies that they can anticipate
19 already.

20 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT:
21 Well, they should have been here two months ago.

22 MRS. ADAMS: They have actually been
23 trying to anticipate it. We don't know exactly what
24 will be included, but they have tried to anticipate,

1 and some work is being done already.

2 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Right. And once
3 again, the Corps is not here to defend any aspect of
4 the project.

5 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT: Oh,
6 I know.

7 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN JIM VERCRUYSSSE: In the Impact
9 Statement are there going to be studies comparing
10 the environmental impacts and economic impacts of
11 wind generated power versus oil, coal, nuclear, you
12 know, like the impacts that those would have on
13 wildlife; and so they are comparing things that are
14 generating electricity and their impacts, you know,
15 and compare them -- compare them. Is that going to
16 be...

17 MRS. ADAMS: One of the things that we
18 are trying to determine is what the scope of the
19 alternatives will be. We have pretty much looked at
20 the New England region it looks like, but exactly
21 what kinds of alternatives that we can determine is
22 get it evaluated in the Environmental Impact
23 Statement right now is one of the items that needs
24 to be addressed. And if there are specific types of

1 alternative power that you think need to be
2 addressed; or more importantly, sites that could be
3 used with, that's the sort of information we need to
4 hear about now.

5 CHAIRMAN JIM VERCRUYSSSE: Well, what I
6 would like to see is all forms of power generation
7 compared.

8 And in the EIS, do you come up with
9 conclusions, or do you just present facts?

10 MRS. ADAMS: Well, that is probably a
11 question that is better left to you.

12 MRS. HOLTHAM: When we do the
13 alternatives analysis, we are supposed to look at
14 impacts and make -- depending on the level of how
15 that alternative is analyzed, there are conclusions
16 reached as far as what those impacts may be.

17 Again, depending on the alternative you
18 look at, it -- the level of it could be -- could be
19 different from one alternative and another, just
20 because of the type of alternative you are looking
21 at, but you do look at the impacts. It's one thing
22 NEPA says you have to do in order to compare the
23 alternatives.

24 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: All right. One,

1 two. Go ahead.

2 COMMISSIONER KATE WARNER: Yeah. I
3 do -- would build on Jim's comment to say that I
4 hope when you are evaluating the impacts, you
5 evaluate the, you know, health impacts of standard
6 power generation and the impacts and planning of the
7 global warming from fossil fuel power generation.

8 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Absolutely. Thank
9 you.

10 Yes, ma'am.

11 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT: And
12 in terms of comparing information, I gather there
13 are quite a few of these in Europe. There is one
14 that has been around for 10 years.

15 Will you be collecting data based on the
16 impact on the fisheries, on the bird life, et
17 cetera, as well as cost?

18 MRS. ADAMS: We are actually hoping they
19 will send us to Denmark to check it out ourselves,
20 but --

21 (Laughter.)

22 MRS. ADAMS: We have been making some
23 contacts in Europe to see what kind of information
24 is available. How that information is going to be

1 used at this point, I'm not sure, but we certainly
2 will. If anybody has specific information that they
3 think is important for us to know about, don't
4 assume that we already know it's there.

5 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT:

6 Okay. I have a couple more questions. One is: To
7 get a context about two acres of water sheet. I
8 don't really know what that means when you have
9 100 and what 70 towers that are as much as a half
10 mile apart. And then in that context, when you are
11 talking about a shoal, which I imagine is perhaps a
12 spawning area more than another area might be, I
13 would like to get a sense of how unique this
14 particular resource area is in the context of the
15 whole Sound.

16 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Right. The
17 habitat issues are going to be addressed in detail,
18 as I understand it.

19 MRS. ADAMS: Well, also we want to know
20 exactly what kind of things we want to see
21 addressed, and we will be taking that into
22 consideration. In terms of the two-acre figure,
23 maybe Mr. Gordon could explain for us.

24 JIM GORDON: Yes. The wind towers are

1 22 feet in diameter, so if you add that all up --

2 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT: The
3 actual construction, the structures.

4 JIM GORDON: The structures are 22 feet
5 in diameter. And as you said, they are a third to a
6 half a mile apart. And it takes -- it occupies less
7 than two acres of water sheet.

8 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT: So
9 you are disturbing that much area? In a sentence
10 could you put it in those terms?

11 JIM GORDON: We are -- we are -- we are
12 putting these on monopile foundations. The
13 foundations will be driven into the seabed floor.

14 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT: How
15 deep?

16 JIM GORDON: Probably -- maybe 60 to 80
17 feet deep.

18 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT: We
19 are out of questions from the board. Thank you.

20 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

21 Do we have any other questions from the
22 Commission? And then we'll turn over to the public.

23 Yes, sir.

24 COMMISSIONER TRISTAN ISRAEL: I have a

1 comment also as well as a question.

2 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Absolutely.

3 COMMISSIONER TRISTAN ISRAEL: I just
4 have a couple of comments. I would like to see --

5 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Could you give
6 your name.

7 COMMISSIONER TRISTAN ISRAEL: My name is
8 Tristan Israel. I'm from the Town of Tisbury.

9 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

10 COMMISSIONER TRISTAN ISRAEL: As far
11 as -- my understanding is that the energy produced
12 by this goes into a grid, and the grid is sort of an
13 amorphous thing, which is very difficult to
14 understand.

15 (Laughter.)

16 COMMISSIONER TRISTAN ISRAEL: I would
17 like to see in any project coming out of here that
18 there be more direct benefit of this energy to the
19 Cape and the Islands.

20 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: A point well
21 taken.

22 COMMISSIONER TRISTAN ISRAEL: That's
23 No. 1.

24 No. 2, my understanding from Cape Poge

1 it is going to be as close almost as it would be
2 from Barnstable. It's going to be about
3 five-point-something miles to the tip of Cape Poge,
4 which is not shown on the handout.

5 There are competing websites and
6 competing pictures. I hope that the Corps will
7 take, you know, look at them and try to evaluate,
8 you know, what is real and what is not real, because
9 it's really hard. You have one of them is showing,
10 you know, that there is no impact. The other one
11 showing oil derricks so...

12 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: That is another
13 well taken point. I had a conversation with the
14 Cape Cod Times. They have a very good website
15 trying to capture everything. And I asked them -- I
16 notice they have a proponent website link and an
17 opponent website link. I asked if they would add
18 the objective link for the Corps of Engineers --

19 (Laughter.)

20 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: -- and I
21 understand that is being done as we speak.

22 COMMISSIONER TRISTAN ISRAEL: I also
23 would hope that the Corps would also look at the
24 feasibility of alternative locations for this same

1 kind of project that may not be as fragile -- may or
2 may not be as fragile, depending on what you come
3 out. I think that the applicant has addressed that,
4 but I do not know to my satisfaction beyond it's a
5 little more expensive perhaps to do things in
6 different places. I would like that looked into, if
7 possible, looked into more, because alternative
8 locations may reduce some of the controversy.

9 Also, concerns about fishing methodology
10 and how the actual towers would affect commercial
11 fishing, existing commercial fishing methodology, in
12 the way, you know, the towers, how people fish,
13 where the towers are and how that really would not
14 impact that industry.

15 And -- and also, again, migration, not
16 only of birds, but of mammals, and of butterflies,
17 and also the impact -- there is 170 of these things,
18 how that air -- what they do to the air and how does
19 that affect all that, I think, is important.

20 Lastly, if this is approved, I would
21 like to see, you know, to make sure that the -- that
22 there is -- that the Cape and the Islands receive
23 some kind of remuneration, you know, from
24 either -- from this, you know. So I guess those are

1 my comments.

2 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

3 Sir.

4 COMMISSIONER JOHN BEST: In regards to

5 comparing costs of alternative sources

6 of conservation --

7 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: This is Mr. Best,

8 again.

9 COMMISSIONER JOHN BEST: Oh, yes. John

10 Best from Tisbury.

11 I would also be interested in seeing the

12 issue of conservation being addressed --

13 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: All right.

14 COMMISSIONER JOHN BEST: -- and how that

15 can drop the demand down. In an ideal scenario

16 perhaps if the wind turbine can provide all the

17 electricity for the Cape, if we can do enough

18 conservation. But I think that would fit in with

19 the comparing costs for all the alternatives, also

20 preparing the costs of trying to generate more

21 conservation.

22 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: That's terrific.

23 Thank you.

24 The public. One more question, and then

1 we will --

2 COMMISSIONER RICHARD TOOLE: I don't
3 have a question.

4 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Yes, sir.

5 COMMISSIONER RICHARD TOOLE: I don't
6 have a question, but I'd just like to comment.

7 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Uh-huh.

8 COMMISSIONER RICHARD TOOLE: My name is
9 Richard Toole from Oak Bluffs.

10 I guess I would -- my first blush in
11 this project is that it has got a lot of potential.
12 I do see a lot of concerns, and I'm sure that they
13 are going to be addressed through this process, but
14 I would highly encourage you to permit the
15 scientific monitoring station, which I think will
16 probably help along in determining, you know,
17 impacts of this project.

18 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Absolutely. Thank
19 you, sir. Thank you for that comment.

20 At this point, we --

21 MRS. ADAMS: There are a couple of
22 questions over here.

23 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Oh, I'm sorry.
24 One then two.

1 Sir.

2 COMMISSIONER ANDREW WOODRUFF: Yes.

3 Just real quickly. I'm wondering is the Corps --

4 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Would you give --

5 COMMISSIONER ANDREW WOODRUFF: I'm

6 sorry. Andrew Woodruff, West Tisbury.

7 I am wondering if the Corps is under any
8 obligation in terms of the permitting process within
9 the timetable; and if so, I would certainly hope
10 that a rush to collect data is not, you know, that
11 we give enough time, because it's seasonal data.

12 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Well, the federal
13 government has never been accused of running too
14 quickly.

15 (Laughter.)

16 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: We intend
17 to -- oh, Sue, please.

18 MRS. HOLTHAM: Well, I can answer it
19 from the NEPA point of view. Normally, an EIS takes
20 from 18 to 36 months to complete from beginning to
21 end, depending on the complexity of the issues, and
22 the proposed action, comments received, and all
23 that. So in working with the regulatory folks and
24 some of the other information that we need to be

1 gathered at the schedule that is a handout is a
2 first cut. Now, what we're working at at this
3 point.

4 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Yes. I should
5 point out that our federal resource agencies are the
6 Environmental Protection Agency, US Fish and
7 Wildlife, Department of Energy, FAA --

8 MRS. ADAMS: National Marine Fisheries
9 Service.

10 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: National Marine
11 Fisheries. A lot of agencies, a lot of people
12 getting involved with this renewable nonpolluting
13 resource.

14 Sir.

15 COMMISSIONER BOB ZELTZER: Bob Zeltzer,
16 Chilmark.

17 A question and a comment. The question
18 would be, we hear the generation numbers coming up,
19 and I don't know how they are arrived at. I don't
20 know whether there has been a study indicating a
21 downtime in other sites. What -- you know, they are
22 not all going to be running 100 percent all the
23 time, and maybe that wind area, but I am sure that
24 it's not going to produce a hundred percent of the

1 power all the time. I am curious if some study has
2 been done to determine what the actual output is apt
3 to be, rather than what it is proposed to be?

4 The second is, I guess I'm going to
5 piggyback a little bit on what Tristan and John
6 said. In the information that has been put out by
7 Cape Wind, they talk about 800 million over 20 years
8 in New England, which is 40 million a year
9 throughout New England, which in terms of savings is
10 pretty insignificant for the economy of all of New
11 England. On the other hand, if this were focused on
12 the Cape and Islands and reduced the electrical
13 costs of the Cape and Islands, then the impact would
14 be much larger. It disappears going into New
15 England. It would not disappear limited to the Cape
16 and the Islands, and the savings would accrue to
17 those areas of the most impact by this.

18 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Sir, that is a
19 point well taken. If there is no other, you know,
20 questions or concerns, I would like to turn this
21 over to you.

22 Now, I'm going to call you up just off
23 these, and no time limits. Let's just remember we
24 have a lot of people here that are going to speak

1 tonight.

2 Peter Kenney. Please state your name
3 and --

4 PETER KENNEY: My name is Peter Kenney.
5 I live on Route 6A in Cummaquid in Barnstable, but I
6 sort of followed these hearings around; and since I
7 am working on Martha's Vineyard and staying over
8 here during the week, I thought what the heck.

9 My maternal great-grandfather, Manuel
10 Enos (phonetic spelling) came here in 1850. And his
11 son Joe Enos is probably, if you listen very
12 carefully, you can hear him laughing. He went to
13 sea when he was about 12. And I wonder how far away
14 a 410-foot mass would have to be for him to see it.

15 How far away does a 200-foot mass have
16 to be for you to see it, or a 150-foot mass?

17 And they are common. And if you went
18 from that wall to that wall, you've only gone a
19 little bit further than the size of the platform
20 supporting each one of these 170 structures, which
21 must by Coast Guard regulations have obstruction
22 lights on them, two per tower times 170, three per
23 tower, four per tower; bells; whistles; fog horns;
24 vroom, vroom, vroom, which is a problem cited with

1 other wind farms all over the world. But
2 miraculously that's not going to apply here in the
3 largest wind farm in the world involving the largest
4 turbines in the wind farm. We won't have vroom,
5 vroom.

6 It pays to know who is on the other side
7 of the poker table. Cape Wind, when this proposal
8 was first floated, if you pardon the expression, had
9 no provision for the decommissioning and removal of
10 anything. So let's say that these structures have a
11 20 year useful life, 30, 40, 50, what does it
12 matter.

13 Do they intend to leave them there?

14 Because there was no provision, or a
15 bond of indemnification to remove them in a safe or
16 a hazardous way.

17 I maintain that the Corps should
18 consider what the possible environmental harm can be
19 from the pouring of 170 20-foot diameter or 2-foot
20 diameter by 80-foot deep concrete structures.

21 How much fill comes out?

22 Where does it go?

23 How is it excavated?

24 But even worse, how do you get rid of

1 it?

2 We're not talking about pulling out an
3 old 12-inch piling on your dock. We're talking
4 about tens of thousands of pounds buried up to
5 80 feet in the seabed; and these environmentalists,
6 because Robin Hood and the gang are only doing this
7 because they have warm fuzzy feelings about the
8 world. They're not doing it for money. But they
9 once mentioned, and they still have not mentioned
10 how they are going to get these things out. That
11 must be addressed.

12 Has anyone here applied for a dock
13 permit?

14 (Laughter.)

15 PETER KENNEY: Huh? Well, try going to
16 your local Conservation Commission and saying, All I
17 want is one pylon, 80 feet deep and 22 feet wide,
18 and it's going to be made of concrete.

19 And, finally, many times on the Cape we
20 have -- by the way, this is fascinating. And the
21 story does change depending on the venue, trust me.
22 It changes a lot.

23 Many times in the Cape people have said,
24 well, look, if you guys get let's say a \$150 million

1 energy credit, and that's really what this is all
2 about, money. Will that be used, let's say, to make
3 a good-faith payment to the public who own the
4 seabed where you're going to take up 28 square
5 miles? No.

6 Will that be used maybe to lower the
7 selling price of the electricity, which by the way
8 goes into the New England grid. When you turn on a
9 light, you don't know if that electricity comes from
10 Ohio, Canada or Horseshoe Shoals, and you never
11 will.

12 And the answer we get is, well, it's
13 going to be used to kind of defray costs. It's not
14 going in our pocket. Well, it's really very simple.
15 It's either coming off your electric bill, or it's
16 going in his pocket. It really pays to know who is
17 on the other side of the table when the cards are
18 being dealt.

19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

20 The next speaker, Chris Murphy.

21 CHRIS MURPHY: Wow, that's a hard one to
22 follow.

23 (Laughter.)

24 CHRIS MURPHY: Boy. Phew. All right.

1 I'll try to just go the other way for a minute. If
2 I could direct your process, it would be:

3 (A) Approve the testing tower, which I
4 think is a very good idea;

5 (B) When the testing is done require, if
6 you are going to permit this at all, the
7 construction of one prototype wind machine,
8 completely as specified for the 170 so that it can
9 be monitored for at least 18 months, preferably two
10 years, by impartial outside monitoring that the
11 Corps can agree to for all the things that have been
12 mentioned here from butterflies to birds to fish.
13 And only then bring back to the table the question
14 of the 170 wind machines. I'm not opposed to them.
15 I think the idea is a good idea, and I think in this
16 case, the slower we proceed with it the better; that
17 we really should learn all there is that we can
18 learn before we go ahead. The idea of simply
19 saying, yes, go ahead, put up 170 machines, it's a
20 great idea, just seems to me to be very
21 shortsighted.

22 If we proceed in that direction, it's
23 just hard to picture what could happen. If these
24 things are an attractant to birds, you could wipe

1 out all of the migrating seabirds on the Northeast
2 coast in a matter of a couple of years. That is not
3 unreasonable to assume. Simple towers sticking up
4 in the sky that the -- I'm not sure who put them up,
5 but the older sea towers, some of them were
6 responsible for thousands of bird deaths a year; and
7 they were very small in comparison to these, and
8 they didn't have any moving parts. The birds simply
9 flew into them, because they were there.

10 I think that is a really key part of
11 this, that you need to put one up, run it. I know
12 there is no economy in it. You know, you can't make
13 money with one sitting out there and having to put
14 the cable in, but there is no other way to know
15 what's going to happen when you turn it on. It has
16 to be up there. The blade has to be turning in all
17 weather, foggy days, winter days, whatever. So I
18 urge you to consider to put up one tower, and then
19 sit back and watch it every way you know how and
20 wait awhile before you consider giving a permit for
21 a second tower.

22 To go back a little bit to some of these
23 other points that have been brought up. The two
24 acres of water. That's a good -- of water

1 sheet -- excuse me. That is a good point to
2 consider when you consider how much -- what is
3 it -- what do you call it when you have a dumping
4 permit for ocean dumping of sand and stuff? This is
5 something you guys deal with all the time. If you
6 take one of those towers, and it's 22 feet, and it
7 goes down 80 feet, and multiply it by 170, you come
8 up with something like five and a half million cubic
9 feet of sand. That's a lot of sand. I mean, I know
10 from trying to get dumping permits for little
11 projects around the harbor, you have to jump through
12 a lot of hoops. This is a hoop you need to address.
13 If you simply drive that container, however you
14 drive that, that pylon down into the bottom,
15 misplace all this dirt. If you overlay that dirt on
16 an area that is full of fish eggs, you kill the fish
17 eggs. Maybe permanently. So the dumping of what
18 comes out of the bottom is an important point. It
19 can't just be allowed to come out and dissipate into
20 the water column.

21 The gentleman before me talked about
22 bonding. Anything that gets put up out there should
23 be bonded for the cost of removal, which is
24 incredibly high. I tried to get a figure on it, and

1 it's not easy to come up with. Pulling the simplest
2 thing out of the middle of the Sound, just pulling
3 an anchor is expensive. Pulling a pylon that is
4 down 80 feet, which has equipment that is not easily
5 available, and it's very expensive. I think you
6 should bond anything that is out there for the life
7 that its out there and then guarantee that it is
8 going to be removed.

9 I think that was everything I had to
10 say.

11 Thank you.

12 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

13 The next speaker, Jonathan Mayhew.

14 JONATHAN MAYHEW: Hello. I'm Jonathan
15 Mayhew from Chilmark.

16 Both Chris and the gentlemen before have
17 raised some questions that I also have, and I have a
18 little bit of a different perspective.

19 I'm a -- I have been a pilot for 28
20 years, and I am a commercial fisherman for all my
21 adult life. I have to give this gentleman credit
22 for putting a nice spin on the turbines looking
23 at --

24 (Laughter.)

1 JONATHAN MAYHEW: But there really is
2 some -- some things that raise questions when I look
3 at this. Thumb high, 170 of them, that's pretty
4 darn high for me. And they are going to be lit.
5 And it's not just for the Coast Guard. They will be
6 lit for FAA as well I'm sure.

7 Another thing I see here that I take
8 exception to, the wind park is located outside a
9 flight path and migratory birds. Well, we have all
10 been on the ferry. And everybody all winter has
11 been looking at hundreds if not thousands of
12 seabirds in the sounds here. And seabirds aren't
13 the smartest bird in the world. And they may tend
14 to go around the rotors, but they may tend not to,
15 too, because I have had them fly into my boat,
16 they're so smart.

17 (Laughter.)

18 JONATHAN MAYHEW: And it's quite an
19 impact on my boat when a flock of them decides to
20 try to go through you.

21 The impact on the marine environment
22 will also be minimal. That's a pretty good
23 statement to make at this stage of the game, I
24 think. It seems like it needs a lot more study

1 before they can say that.

2 Consistent winds, distance from
3 commercial shipping lanes and flight paths. Well,
4 28 years of flying Hyannis to the Vineyard,
5 Nantucket, Cape and Islands is one of the most
6 traffic noncontrolled areas on the East Coast. And
7 that's an FAA statement. I'm sure you are going to
8 hear it. I have over 12,000 hours of spotting fish
9 from an airplane. Twice a day I flew through this
10 area just -- that is probably 80 percent of the
11 time, and it's a very traffic area. You have Cape
12 Express, Cape Air. They are flying between
13 Nantucket and Hyannis a lot, and they fly at 1,000
14 feet one way and 1,500 feet the other way. A lot of
15 the private pilots don't like 1,000 feet and don't
16 like 1,500 feet for that reason, because they are
17 pretty fast small planes. So they are very apt to
18 fly lower. And now you have got these things that
19 up 430 feet. I hope -- I mean, pilots learn to fly
20 higher than towers. That's one of the things we are
21 taught.

22 (Laughter.)

23 JONATHAN MAYHEW: But nevertheless, to
24 say that this is not in a flight path is very, to

1 me, disingenuous.

2 As far as the wind speed and direction
3 and the location, I really wonder how much they have
4 really looked at the locations around here. I went
5 to Mass. Maritime Academy. They mentioned it. I
6 was on the sailing team there. There isn't a
7 windier spot on the East Coast than Buzzards Bay,
8 and that would be a very good alternative perhaps
9 for some of the issues. And one of them for me is
10 that this area that they have chosen, if I as a
11 mobile gear fisherman, and I tow nets, I fish this
12 area highly, and there is probably about -- I'm not
13 sure of the exact number of licensed fishermen, but
14 two or 300 boats out -- licenses that are allowed to
15 do this type of fishing for squid specifically and
16 also flounder and some scup as well, but this area
17 here, to say that I'm only losing two acres of
18 fishing is ridiculous, because every one of those,
19 although they are submerged, I can't tow a net over
20 a submerged electrical cable. I'm very careful not
21 to tow between West Chop and Woods Hole and other
22 places where there is submerged cables, even though
23 they are buried in the ground, because the seas stir
24 things up, they may come to the surface. My doors

1 may hit this wire, and then everybody has got
2 troubles on Martha's Vineyard. And this you take
3 two acres. It's not two acres. I mean, for him to
4 say that it's only going to take two acres of my
5 fishing area, it is going to take all those acres,
6 as well as the acres of -- that the wires, to
7 protect the wires between each one and going to
8 shore. And so it has a big impact on commercial
9 mobile gear fishermen. And we are not -- it's not
10 like we can just go in and go tap fishing, because
11 we can't get the permits to do that ourselves. It's
12 limited entry. So we are out of business in that
13 area if this occurs.

14 Chris talked about the one -- putting up
15 one tower. I suggest if you are going to put up a
16 tower, it should look exactly like, it should have a
17 turbine on the top of it, and it should be the same
18 height; and if doesn't generate, really generate
19 electricity let it spill. Let it see what it has on
20 impact of the birds and everything else before you
21 go there, before you do anything else.

22 I don't want to look at 196-foot tower
23 out there that is not even close to something that
24 is going to be 430 feet to the top of the blades,

1 that do the very same thing I do. All summer long
2 starting at about this time of year and going until
3 the end of October, I'm out on the water two out of
4 every three days fishing, and I love it. One of my
5 favorite places to go is Horseshoe Shoals, which I
6 won't be able to fish any more if those things are
7 plopped all over Horseshoe Shoals.

8 Has anybody taken the trouble to look at
9 this map that they have?

10 And look at the size of that area they
11 have delineated. It's about a third of the size of
12 Martha's Vineyard. Not two acres. It's spread out.
13 There is 170 of them things all over the place.

14 I presume there is a design in the
15 thing, which I have no idea what it is, but it
16 covers a tremendous area of water. And it's like
17 Jonathan said, you have got all these cables. There
18 are going to have to be cables. How else do you
19 carry anything, you know, that comes out of those
20 turbines? They are going to be all over the bottom.
21 Nobody can drag. I have been out there many times
22 and seen anywhere from 20 to 25 draggers dragging
23 for squid. I think they are dragging mostly for
24 squid. Some of them might be going for fluke, maybe

1 even scup. They are out there all the time. These
2 people are making a living. There is two or three
3 men in them, in each one of those boats that earn a
4 living. This living is going to be taken away from
5 them as far as that area goes. They won't be able
6 to fish there any more, and I won't be able to fish
7 there any more with my rod and reel, because I would
8 be hanging up on their legs all the time when these
9 things that are hanging that are down there.

10 So that's going to kill it for the
11 residential -- residential. I don't know. In other
12 words, the pleasure fishermen, you might say. And
13 what is our economy based on on Martha's Vineyard,
14 Nantucket and the Cape? It's largely the tourist
15 industry. People that come here to enjoy
16 themselves, have vacations. We make our living from
17 these people. I'm not ashamed to say it. I had a
18 shot at that when I had businesses. I made a living
19 from people like this. And we want to encourage
20 them to come. Sure, we complain about the traffic,
21 but they are gone after awhile.

22 (Laughter.)

23 HENRY BURT: And, you know, we get to
24 keep some of their money, you know. I mean, that's

1 important. It's part of our living.

2 And if they don't find what they are
3 looking for when they come here, they will go
4 somewhere else. It's very simple. If I want to go
5 on a vacation, I go where I can go fishing. If they
6 don't have any fish in there, I go somewhere else.
7 What they do? This is important to us.

8 And when they speak of costs of setting
9 up these windmill farms, what costs are they
10 thinking about?

11 Their costs of driving these three foot
12 in diameter pipes down 70 feet and displacing a lot
13 of material, which is another point I want to
14 mention, but anyway. Were they talking just about
15 that, or the cost it's going to be to the local
16 economies?

17 They are not going to be able to take
18 any income when you can't interest the people to
19 come in there. I don't want to go and see a Coney
20 Island going around. They are going to have to have
21 lights all over these things to satisfy FAA and a
22 few other things. And it's going to look like a
23 summer playground out there at night. It's got to;
24 otherwise, airplanes are going to be in danger, even

1 though some of them are taught to fly high enough,
2 you know.

3 (Laughter.)

4 HENRY BURT: I seriously question, too,
5 whether the stuff that they bring up, the sediment
6 from down that deep in that area, there is going to
7 be an awful lot of it brought up. Again, when you
8 put something in, something is going to come out.
9 And when you -- when it comes out, is it just going
10 all over the bottom? Is this what they are planning
11 to do, or are they going to array it? If this is
12 going all over the bottom, I want to know what is in
13 that stuff, because that is definitely very easily
14 could affect the fishing in the area and the health
15 of the fishery in the area. Not that you can fish
16 there any more, but it's just the idea these fish
17 got tails, and they can move around, you know. I
18 might want to catch one of them over in the
19 Vineyard, you know.

20 I think these are the things -- a lot of
21 things have been mentioned I was going mention.
22 They've already mentioned. I won't tell them. But
23 I think it's important to keep all these things in
24 mind, because this is our future. That is our whole

1 future of the environment that you're talking about
2 displacing some of. And I think it's darn important
3 to us, and I think we should consider it that way.

4 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Yes, sir. Thank
5 you very much.

6 The next speaker, Robert Douglas.

7 ROBERT DOUGLAS: My name is Robert
8 Douglas. I live in West Tisbury. I have been on
9 the Vineyard since 1958, and I had too much
10 interest, I think, in this piece of real estate we
11 want to call home as anybody here. I would like to
12 suggest that for a visual solution you couldn't do
13 any better for this area. I can imagine -- I heard
14 this -- I read this in the newspaper a week or two
15 ago, and I thought my eyes were playing tricks on
16 me. The whole notion to me is appalling and for
17 many reasons.

18 We touched on a few things that haven't
19 been mentioned before, of course, that you can't
20 build these structures out there in the middle of
21 the Sound and not mark them.

22 Well, for the victims, Nantucket Sound
23 will look like Coney Island. You will have lights
24 all over them. And the thing that galls me the most

1 is that I must have read a few years ago in
2 the -- in some environmental magazine this fact that
3 there are enough abandoned water sites in New
4 England that if utilized could generate as much
5 electricity as all the nukes do in New England. I
6 think you are just going off on another tangent with
7 a hundred -- with 172 towers in Nantucket Sound is
8 appalling. That's the only word I can come up with.
9 There are other ways to generate our electricity.
10 We drown ourselves in electricity. We are
11 profligate in our use of electricity as we start
12 talking about conservation and stuff. But there are
13 other sources of electric power than filling
14 Vineyard and Nantucket Sound full of towers with
15 blades. I can't believe it. I've written it down
16 and still can't believe it. What is it 200 -- 460
17 feet high. I can't believe it. You would be able
18 to see them from anywhere around here. You could
19 see the towers on the bridge, the railroad bridge as
20 far west as Cuttyhunk.

21 I operate a little vessel which utilizes
22 wind power, and I am appreciative of wind power.

23 I am also aware that you have all kinds
24 of generating plants. You have got one on Nantucket

1 still. If these were blades, the top of the upper
2 blade might have been what, a hundred feet from the
3 ground maybe at the most? Maybe 150, if I can think
4 that high. And they might have turned about 15 or
5 20 RPMs. You weren't killing any birds. The
6 hazards that you pick up in disturbing that fishing
7 ground, a very valuable fishing ground, and what you
8 do for flyaways and birds with these, if that's the
9 case with these turbines. The propeller blades
10 turn. People talk about the very attractive birds,
11 the birds that are chopped up by the hundreds.

12 I think if this is -- this is an
13 appalling proposition. I hope reason prevails.

14 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

15 Mr. Russell Walton, you indicated you
16 may or may not speak.

17 RUSSELL WALTON: My name is Russell
18 Walton, W-A-L-T-O-N. I'm conservation officer for
19 the Town of Chilmark, but I'm not actually here in
20 any official capacity. I am just as an ecologist,
21 marine biologist.

22 I would note in passing, that I have had
23 in the past a four kilowatt Berkhold (phonetic
24 spelling) turbine, which worked actually quite well.

1 It was really fun to sit there and watch the slow
2 rotor of the electric meter stop and turn backwards.

3 (Laughter.)

4 RUSSELL WALTON: That is supposedly what
5 this is all about. It's generating our own electric
6 form, their own electricity to go into the Cape and
7 possibly use the needs elsewhere.

8 There are a number of concerns. The
9 birds have been mentioned. The idea that Horseshoe
10 Shoal is outside the flight path of migratory birds
11 is in one of the handouts, and that is simply untrue
12 for the many seabirds and shorebirds. They would be
13 killed by the thousands.

14 I would be somewhat worried the games we
15 have had in Piping Plover for the past few years.
16 Yes, the Piping Plover. It would be quite possible
17 for a gain of Piping Plover population to be
18 essentially wiped out in a couple of years or over a
19 few years.

20 It would be rather sad for the people
21 who have been running around putting up exclosures
22 on the beaches to try to keep the trucks out of
23 there.

24 There are also a number of other birds

1 wandering around, not necessarily seabirds. Chris
2 Murphy told me that a few years ago possibly because
3 they were taking a respite, a whole flock of several
4 hundred small song birds settled down on his fishing
5 boat while he was out there on the shoal. Then they
6 quietly flew off a little bit later.

7 I'm also concerned as a conservation
8 officer, I'm concerned with sedimentation,
9 turbulence and so forth. There will be obviously
10 some considerable activity during the process of
11 construction, as it has been mentioned. I don't
12 know exactly how this construction is to be done,
13 but if the material is pulled up to the surface and
14 pushed out of the way then that is going to have to
15 go somewhere, and that is going to be a change in
16 the topography and the sediment type, which will
17 affect what can go there, what has been hatching and
18 growing out in that area, the larvae.

19 Yet, at what depth plowing these cables
20 six feet into the bottom is also going to cause a
21 certain amount of disruption. I don't know whether
22 that can be fixed at all.

23 There is another problem, which has not
24 to my knowledge been brought up very seriously, and

1 that is that any pole or monopole or whatever
2 sticking up 100 feet or more into the air,
3 especially if it has a vibrating activity at the top
4 of it, is going to propagate vibration down into the
5 water and into the sediment. These poles are
6 indicated at extending something like 113 feet down
7 so there is going to be obviously some serious
8 stirring. What happens when that vibration is
9 propagated out into the water? I don't know. We
10 know that at least on land, mammals and
11 invertebrates can be chased away by these little
12 hypersonic beepers. I hate them myself, but they
13 are just barely at the edge of your hearing, and you
14 can hear de-de-de-de. Apparently, that drives mice
15 and cockroaches and other critters straight out of a
16 house. Whether it's something like that will happen
17 to fish, which have rather sensitive lateral line
18 pressure devices, I don't know. I think that
19 someone needs to do a dig into the literature and
20 find out what their reaction is to high frequency
21 vibration.

22 Lower frequency vibrations may also be a
23 problem since the small whales use echo location for
24 navigation and for -- for that matter, catching

1 their food.

2 The larger whales use for long-range
3 communication some very low frequency vibration, so
4 I -- as far as I can see, any vibration that happens
5 out there is going to affect something, whether it's
6 just sea bottom or whether you seriously chase away
7 the larvae, the fish, and the shellfish larvae and
8 all the rest of it. I simply do not know. I don't
9 know what vibrations are going to be generated. I
10 think we do need to know.

11 I don't think anyone has mentioned the
12 idea of electromagnetic effects. If you are running
13 a strong current from one of these devices down into
14 the -- a cable under the surface, you're going to
15 have some sort of magnetic field formed. I don't
16 know how serious. I don't know how thoroughly it
17 can be shielded, or whether it can be -- I don't
18 know -- I think there are problems. Several of them
19 have been mentioned by other people.

20 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

21 The next speaker, Anna Edey.

22 ANNA EDEY: Hi. My name is Anna Edey,
23 and I live in West Tisbury.

24 When I first heard about this project,

1 it was on the radio. My first reaction was, yeah,
2 fabulous. I love it. Even though I have never
3 liked the windmills that are out in Altamont Valley
4 in California, but I thought, oh, you know, they are
5 going to be way out there, eight miles out. How
6 high could they -- how visible could they really be
7 if they are only 400 feet high? I imagined there
8 will be little, tiny little mosquito sitting out
9 there. And I continued being enthusiastic when I
10 came to the meeting here that was a couple months
11 ago, I guess it was, and thought most of all about
12 the environmental benefits of not burning all that
13 oil and coal and nuclear and gas and not putting up
14 all that CO2, and not cost, you know, reducing the
15 need for drilling in the -- the so-called need for
16 drilling in the arctic and so on. But after -- and
17 I stated my approval. I signed my name to my
18 approval, and then I went -- right after the meeting
19 I went to the high point off of Oak Bluffs, and I
20 looked out over the Sound I and said, whoa. That is
21 not going to be invisible. It's going to be highly,
22 highly visible out there. I thought, well, you
23 know, then it is a minor -- I mean, I could live
24 with that. It would be like a bunch of kids'

1 pinwheels sitting out there. I could live with the
2 effects of it.

3 Then a few weeks after that, I ran into
4 a fisherman, who spends a great deal of time on
5 Horseshoe Shoals. And he told me, I want to talk
6 with you, he said. I want to talk with you about
7 the environmental impact of this. Have you thought
8 about that? And I said, well, I haven't thought
9 about anything but the beneficial environmental
10 impact, and he described for me what the impact
11 would be of drilling all these holes a hundred feet
12 deep. And I'm still not clear whether there are
13 three of them for each tower, each of them three
14 feet, which would be -- if they are three feet by a
15 hundred feet, that is about 300 cubic yards. And
16 times, what was it, 200 windmills or something like
17 that? We are talking about just a -- like perhaps
18 tens of thousands. I didn't quite have time to
19 finish my math there. Tens of thousands of cubic
20 yards. Where is that going to end up?

21 The way he was describing it to me, it
22 would be dumped in some kind of an air pressure or
23 water pressure. They would literally blow the sand
24 out of the hole and replace it with a tube that

1 would then be filled with concrete, and all this
2 sand from a hundred foot deep would be dispersed
3 over this area. And I said, Well, I mean, isn't
4 that area just like a sand dune in the Sahara
5 Desert? There is, you know, the dunes constantly
6 shifting underneath the waves. And he said, Oh, no,
7 no, no. This is -- this is richly vegetated with
8 all kinds of marine plants, and it is the nursery
9 for the fish that -- and the shellfish who live in
10 the entire area around the Sound. We are not just
11 talking about the fish that are in that area,
12 because they can swim away, as somebody alluded to.
13 We're talking about the eggs. We are talking about
14 the little baby fish. We're talking about all the
15 various stages of the fish and the shellfish who
16 live in the spawning area. This is a highly
17 desirable area, because it is close to the surface
18 of a -- the plants are thriving, because they are
19 able to get much more sunlight than they do deeper
20 down in deeper water in the Sound. So this is a
21 nursery for our fisheries, not just that it's an
22 ecological ecosystem that has a right to exist in
23 and of itself, but it is of tremendous economic
24 importance, because this is where the baby fish are

1 spawned, there in shallow areas in various places
2 around the Island, between the Islands and the Cape,
3 as well as in the estuaries. That is where the baby
4 fish and baby shellfish are born and are nursed and
5 begin their lives. Then they go off to deeper
6 water.

7 So all in all, the ecological disaster
8 seems very obvious to me that it's going to be
9 disastrous. And then I thought, okay. I went back
10 home after talking with this fisherman, and I
11 started doing my homework as to what can we do
12 instead. Because I am as much of a believer as
13 anybody in this room that we must reduce our use of
14 nuclear and coal and oil and gas with its -- its
15 constant -- horrible consequences, including rising
16 sea levels, of course.

17 And so I -- I went down. I went, sat
18 down to do some homework as to what it would take to
19 produce the equivalent amount of electricity by
20 other means, and it can be done with portable tanks,
21 and methane, methane from the sewage treatment
22 plants, sludge, garbage, saw dust, whatever, you
23 know, newspapers, all kinds of things that can be
24 made into methane gas; and photovoltaics, it would

1 take approximately a 6th or an 8th of an average
2 home -- house roof to make the electricity
3 that -- all the electricity that would be needed by
4 any -- any house. It doesn't have to be placed on a
5 roof. It could be placed on the ground. And so
6 photovoltaics is entirely economically comparable
7 when you take all the various accountings of
8 economics into account. And not to mention, of
9 course, conservation, which we all need to do
10 anyway.

11 So I am now absolutely against. I want
12 you to make sure to remove my name from the people
13 who are in favor of the project. I'm absolutely
14 opposed to it for so many, many different reasons;
15 and if you insist on doing windmills, I have a
16 counterproposal for a site, which is Otis Air Force
17 Base.

18 Thank you.

19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you. I
20 should point out the Corps of Engineers doesn't
21 maintain any lists. Everybody is for the process.
22 We are trying to make a decision based on your
23 input. So I thank you for that.

24 Now, our next speaker is John Abrams.

1 JOHN ABRAMS: Thanks to all of you for
2 the opportunity tonight. It's rare that
3 environmentalists get to support anything and be in
4 favor of something. This is one of those occasions
5 for me.

6 Like any other development project built
7 by humans, this one is sure to have negative
8 impacts; but the competing harms, in my view, the
9 damage to our natural systems, it's done by the
10 fossil fuels that this replaces and displaces are
11 dramatic. I think the proponents of this project
12 are early harbingers of a future that we will
13 probably -- that we are likely to embrace. And I
14 think our job is to make sure that they make as few
15 mistakes as possible in our backyard, and I hope
16 that you will permit the research station so that we
17 can get more information. I hope this process will
18 continue. I hope it will come to a successful
19 result. And I hope that we will take advantage of
20 the information and the knowledge that's being
21 gained in many other countries where similar
22 projects are happening. And I hope all of our
23 information will be good information. And I have
24 heard over and over tonight about the vast

1 quantities of concrete that are going to be used in
2 this project. My understanding is there will be
3 none. That may be wrong. That may be right. But
4 it just illustrates that we need really good
5 information to go forward.

6 Thank you so much.

7 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

8 The next speaker, Stig Persson. Did I
9 pronounce that okay?

10 STIG PERSSON: Yes. I'm Stig Persson
11 from Oak Bluffs.

12 And I am an engineer, and I have done
13 various development projects of shorter or longer
14 type of impact in my life. And one of the things I
15 have learned is that or a couple of things that draw
16 my attention to the presentation tonight is that I
17 did not hear what problem we are actually trying to
18 solve. And when you start on changing the course of
19 something, you -- particular things that have to do
20 with changing the course of fundamental
21 infrastructure, it's very important to understand
22 what problem you are trying to solve.

23 The second thing that drew my attention
24 was that I did not -- this is the study or the

1 environmental impact of a proposed project without
2 letting us know what the alternatives are to a
3 supposed problem that we don't know.

4 And there was a couple of things that
5 drew my attention or raised a red flag for us
6 embarking on new large-scale, long-term projects.

7 One was that we are absolutely
8 approaching this in a scientific manner. And the
9 other one was that we will show the rest of the
10 country that we can do something that hasn't been
11 done here before.

12 Now, there has been concerns raised here
13 that it goes into the grid. And what does it
14 actually do for us in the area that needs to live
15 with these towers?

16 Assuming that there is -- that the
17 impact is little, so even assuming -- assuming that
18 everything works out from that point of view, what
19 do we get out of it? And then I play that against
20 my -- my own background and my own experience of an
21 electrical engineer. I have not -- I was actually
22 trained both in power electric engineering and
23 computer science and how to build small -- small
24 electric circuits.

1 And I spend most of my time in
2 telecommunications, but I have kept up with my basic
3 initial education, which was in power, power
4 generation and power distribution. I have been over
5 the readings, and we -- what I understand the
6 current trends in power generation and power
7 distribution is the biggest problem is of the state
8 of the technologies. That is probably on a small
9 scale for houses that probably will work. Overall,
10 it cannot be that is pretty old, but it can
11 certainly work. What we hear here is a -- is a
12 proposal that basically solves half of the Cape,
13 quote/unquote, half of the Cape's energy needs from
14 a few square miles distributed over one or two
15 cables for sure. It's going against the trend.
16 It's going -- it's about as much centralized as I
17 could imagine. It is essentially one power station
18 taking care of half the Cape's electricity.

19 When there is -- there is certainly the
20 most -- the most promising as far as site can see of
21 the research in any energy generation now is
22 the -- is the fuel cells. When you look at them,
23 what do I do to fundamentally change the
24 infrastructure over the next 25 to 50 years? Those

1 kind of projects need to be -- fundamentally, you
2 need to look at what is the basic economy. We have
3 not heard about anything about the economy of this
4 project tonight.

5 And the statement about, we will show
6 the rest of the country that we can do, that in R&D
7 files is a private project. Private projects are
8 always expensive. They are -- and who is going to
9 pay for this large scale power project? Is it going
10 to be the New England Power Company? And half of
11 the Cape's energy is going to produce at
12 significantly higher costs than what we experience
13 today. That's the -- that is not the benefits to us
14 on the Vineyard.

15 So it's a private project. It's going
16 to be expensive. And even if you look at the save
17 on mass production of income today, from what I
18 understand, it really does not break even with our
19 current methods.

20 I was told that during the summer
21 backward scheme of power economics in California,
22 last summer, the Green Power there almost broke even
23 with what -- what was available and what was
24 available to the next one.

1 So we're talking about trying to solve
2 this, and are we trying to solve it with the
3 technology that can ever be competitive?

4 Well, the fuel cell technology has
5 the -- has probably a chance to meet what you call
6 normal large state R&D criteria. When you come
7 in -- when you go into a large state private
8 project, then you evaluate the promise of that based
9 on what is called disrupted technology to either
10 replace the way society does something or the -- all
11 citizens conduct their business, you need to have a
12 technology that is fundamentally disrupted -- that
13 is so attractive that you can't afford not to use
14 it. And I have not seen any data on the power
15 electrics that we have been having that come close
16 to some -- cutting the cost in half, or cutting the
17 cost to a tenth, when disruptive technologies
18 attempting to cut the cost by three times and making
19 it more convenient to use or better than that. I
20 don't see those numbers. Those need to be
21 understood.

22 And relating back to a few things from
23 the Vineyard. If we look at the hopes we are going
24 through and the pain that many of us -- for many of

1 us that live along the sandbanks and do the fishing
2 here, it will save a few Plovers. If we look at the
3 regrets, we have no plus for approving a net to
4 protect the neighboring houses from golf balls on a
5 driving range. That net is probably like a four
6 stories high building, and the net is -- is like the
7 badminton net or something like that.

8 And conventional thinking, I didn't
9 think you would disapprove, but when you come on the
10 ferry into Oak Bluffs, you can clearly see that net,
11 and you can see the half a foot piles going 60 -- 60
12 feet up in the air. That is -- that is a small
13 example of something that at first sight doesn't
14 seem to be that visible, but that is very visible.
15 It's a real eyesore.

16 And going back to an earlier comment
17 that was made here. When you understand -- have
18 studied what the what the outer continental shelf
19 is, the outer continental shelf is fundamentally
20 like, we'll say, the nursery of the marine life. It
21 is not only -- it's inconvenient for fishermen. We
22 have learned that. It's inconvenient for sport
23 fishing, but it's also fundamentally damaging to how
24 our marine life is generated and is going.

1 That area is -- somebody mentioned at
2 four or five feet some cases, sometimes 50 feet, but
3 it is certainly in the area where the sunlight comes
4 down to the bottom, and that is where the fish and
5 marine life is being generated. So looking at it
6 from a -- from a technology point of view, looking
7 at it from an economic point of view and looking at
8 it from an environmental point of view, I don't see
9 a justification.

10 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

11 The next speaker, Thomas Zinno.

12 THOMAS ZINNO: Hi. My name is Thomas
13 Zinno, and I'm an Oak Bluffs resident, and I spend
14 much of my time along the Eastern shore of the
15 Vineyard. And it's a -- the Vineyard shoreline is
16 not where the Vineyard stops. It expands out into
17 the Sound, especially into Nantucket Sound, along
18 the Oak Bluffs coastline from East Chop all the way
19 to Edgartown to Cape Poge and beyond. And right now
20 is the -- the fishing season is just starting, and I
21 am a recreational boater and fisherman, and the area
22 that we will be fishing in will be from the Vineyard
23 right out through Horseshoe Shoals; and that's where
24 most people do fish, and it's an excellent area for

1 that. And to industrialize that area with the size
2 of these turbines is un -- unthinkable to me,
3 because it's such a pristine area. If you are ever
4 out there in a boat, from the shoreline it's
5 beautiful. It's a fantastic place to just be on the
6 beach and look out towards the eastern coastline.

7 And it's -- I must say that just what
8 most people have said about this is also very true.
9 It's a -- it's an excellent idea, but it's not
10 really a great location to put it. And I hope you
11 look thoroughly at all the other areas where it can
12 be, because the affect on the Vineyard, the Cape and
13 Nantucket will be monumental, and we'll be looking
14 at this for our future, looking at this as a project
15 that we will not like.

16 Thank you.

17 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

18 The next speaker is Howell and Nancy
19 Kelly.

20 HOWELL KELLY: I am Howell Kelly, a
21 resident of Edgartown.

22 We kind of look at things with five
23 things: How much can I make; how much can I lose;
24 how do I get out; who else is in the deal; or who

1 says it is any good?

2 (Laughter.)

3 HOWELL KELLY: If it can't benefit the
4 Vineyard and the Cape then the environmental impact
5 has to be zero. You can't make anything out of it.

6 How much can you lose? Well, everybody
7 has talked about a lot of the things that you can
8 lose.

9 How do you get out? I think the
10 remediation at the end of the program is -- has
11 probably the greatest environmental impact, because
12 the last thing you want to look is like Altamont,
13 California, a lot of abandoned windmills out there.

14 Who else is in the deal? I hope you
15 will check with all the other areas around the world
16 and see what the impact has been.

17 And who says it's any good? I think we
18 want to look at the same thing. We want to look at
19 other people, who have had experience in this and
20 find out what their experience has been, as opposed
21 to trying to invent it all ourselves.

22 Thank you.

23 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

24 The next speaker, John Best.

1 JOHN BEST: I have already spoken.

2 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Isaac Russell.

3 ISAAC RUSSELL: I'm Isaac Russell from
4 West Tisbury.

5 Did Ms. -- did Susan Holtham say
6 that -- you listed some alternatives that you had
7 identified as possible things to be said.

8 Could you repeat them just quickly --

9 MRS. HOLTHAM: Sure.

10 ISAAC RUSSELL: -- because I didn't
11 concentrate in on them.

12 MRS. HOLTHAM: Sure. I do believe -- is
13 the mic here?

14 I do believe they are also in some of
15 the handouts up front. What I had mentioned was,
16 first off, we are required by the National
17 Environmental Policy Act to look at the no-action
18 alternative.

19 ISAAC RUSSELL: Yeah.

20 MRS. HOLTHAM: The other ones are
21 alternative wind park locations, including onshore
22 and offshore locations; alternative project
23 capacities; alternative renewable forms of energy;
24 submarine cable route alternatives; alternative

1 landfill and overland cable route locations, and
2 alternative connections to an NSTAR transmission
3 line.

4 ISAAC RUSSELL: Thanks. The second one
5 was the one I'm interested in, the possible land
6 site location. Someone suggested Otis Air Base.

7 Has anyone looked into Nomans land?
8 None of the Chilmark people here will like that.

9 (Laughter.)

10 ISAAC RUSSELL: But you'll get rid of
11 all the problems with the water, the nurseries for
12 fish, and you will probably have the same flight
13 path problems. I have never known whether Nomans
14 land is federal land, tribal land or kind of
15 Chilmark land.

16 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Federal.

17 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's all of the
18 above.

19 (Laughter.)

20 ISAAC RUSSELL: If it's federal land,
21 you only have to ask one person, the federal
22 government. That is my suggestion for an
23 alternative.

24 MRS. HOLTHAM: Thank you.

1 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

2 I should point out that the alternatives
3 list is infinite and not part of this process.
4 Unless, of course, they monitor when we looked at
5 the original list before a harbor, we had after four
6 months, 568 disposal alternatives that could have
7 worked for somebody. We ended up with 12, and then
8 we finally ended with up what was called a confined
9 aquatic disposal where we actually took the silted
10 materials, the dirty materials, and left them in the
11 environment that we took them from by digging deeper
12 into the harbor. So this process does indeed work.

13 The last person to sign up to speak, Rez
14 Williams.

15 REZ WILLIAMS: My name is Rez Williams.
16 I live in West Tisbury.

17 And, first of all, I'm absolutely in
18 favor of clean energy, and I think that we have no
19 problem looking at clean energy as far as aesthetics
20 goes. I'd much rather look at windmills than a
21 nuclear power plant.

22 As far as the effects on fisheries, I
23 don't know, but I would be willing to venture that a
24 long-term wind farm like this could be a bioreserve

1 for fisheries, probably a detriment.

2 I'm in favor of the monitoring station
3 and the research in order to get the scientific
4 information that would be critical.

5 Under alternative energy generating
6 sources, I would suggest tidal in relationship to
7 this project.

8 And finally, I have heard that the
9 jurisdiction for this project has been funded to the
10 Interior Department after the Army Corps of
11 Engineers issues with this preliminary stage.

12 Is this true; and if so, what are the
13 ramifications of that?

14 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: There is a bill
15 floating through the Senate right now in the Senate
16 Energy Committee that would require the Department
17 of Interior to take over leasing of these types of
18 activities tied onto their mineral leasing and oil
19 leasing. That does not negate the congressional
20 mandates given to the Corps of Engineers under
21 Section 10 of the River and Harbors Act, or
22 Section 44 of the Clean Water Act. The law is
23 presently on the books and will get us through this
24 process. As for any future laws, I leave that to

1 greater minds to work it out.

2 The Corps does not comment on pending
3 legislation.

4 Is there anybody here that would like to
5 speak, but did not sign up?

6 Yes, sir. Please come to the mic, give
7 your name, spell your last name if you would, and --

8 CHRIS FRIED: My name is Chris Fried,
9 and I am a resident of Tisbury.

10 This is a subject that I have a fairly
11 high level of experience with. I have been a
12 mechanical engineer for many years. I have lived
13 in -- I am in my fourth solar house, the first in
14 '75. I operate owned and operated wind machines,
15 and I have worked for the state -- the Pennsylvania
16 Energy Office for a few years. So this is something
17 that is really something that I am very up-to-date
18 on in a relative level.

19 And so that's -- as an opening line, I
20 would like to jump over to my experience of going to
21 the voting polls. Every four years, we vote for a
22 president; and in almost all cases, I find myself
23 voting for the lesser of the two evils, and so I go
24 to the polls, because we need a president. We need

1 a new president, but we are in a situation here
2 where, unfortunately, we continue to need more
3 electricity. And none of the electric generating
4 options available to us are totally clean and
5 benign. We talk about the construction problems,
6 the sand, the debris of installing these towers.
7 And, yes, they will disrupt the bottom of the water
8 there, and, you know, a few miles, square miles, but
9 every other power plant option also disrupts the
10 land or water where they are constructed, or where
11 they are getting their fuel supplies.

12 For example, there is tremendous
13 upheaval of the soil when you build a nuclear power
14 plant or an oil-fired power plant, or a gas-fired
15 power plant. And then there is all the disruption
16 to the ocean bottom and the land where the fuel is
17 being extracted, the oil, the natural gas, whatever.
18 So that is one -- one consideration.

19 There is also the visual impact. Yes,
20 there is going to be in some people's mind a
21 negative visual impact, but it has already been
22 mentioned. So do many people consider nuclear power
23 plants, coal-fired power plants, oil-fired power
24 plants to be visually unpleasant, as well as there

1 are the strip mines that feed the coal-fired power
2 plants, the mined tailings from the uranium for
3 getting the fuel for the nuclear power plants. So
4 there's so many considerations here that are
5 dissimilar, but much worse with our other options.

6 We have the -- the operating danger to
7 fish and birds. The same thing happens with fish
8 and birds all over the world due to the sulfur
9 dioxide and the other pollutants that spew out of
10 the power plants that we are already operating. I
11 don't want to lose any fishing grounds, but the
12 fishing grounds being lost in a few square miles at
13 the Shoals is nothing compared to the fishing
14 grounds all over the world that are being impacted
15 right now by all the conventional power plants that
16 we are operating and those that we are considering
17 building new, because we need more power plants.
18 There is no pollution, possibly vibrations, yes,
19 that's true. This -- the wind systems do have their
20 negative impact, but so do all the other options.

21 There is just, you know, I -- I wish we
22 didn't need more power, but because our population
23 is still growing, because we still love to buy new
24 electric-consuming devices, we have to bite the

1 bullet and look for the least damaging solution.

2 Unfortunately, the fuel cell systems are
3 not really well enough developed at this time to
4 generate the amount of power that we need. These
5 wind power systems are possible -- that are capable
6 of producing. These wind power systems are
7 relatively well-tested. They are not experimental.
8 So as much as I hate to say it, because I'm
9 essentially a conservationist, if we are not going
10 to tighten our belts any better than we are
11 presently doing, which we are not doing very well, I
12 think that rather than rushing ahead -- well, rather
13 than continuing to operate our much more polluting
14 conventional power plants, we should expedite
15 the -- the measuring, the testing, and the
16 construction of these systems. As damaging as they
17 are, they are not nearly as damaging as the other
18 options.

19 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

20 Is there anybody else?

21 Yes, sir. Please come up to the
22 microphone, state your name; and if need be, spell
23 it.

24 STANLEY SCHONBRUN: My name is Stanley

1 Schonbrun, and it's spelled S-C-H-O-N-B-R-U-N.

2 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

3 STANLEY SCHONBRUN: I am from West
4 Tisbury.

5 I brought this up at the last meeting,
6 which I think was in November, when I was addressing
7 it to Cape Wind, the company that is planning to put
8 up this project, which is the issue of what happens
9 to these 170 windmills if and when say in a year or
10 two years the economics of this thing fails, and the
11 people who put up the money for it decide to pull
12 out, and what happens to the windmills themselves.

13 Other people have touched on this, but
14 I -- I'm curious about how you people are going to
15 be involved. There was some talk about a bond being
16 put up for taking these down.

17 Who is going to police that? Will you
18 police it?

19 I haven't heard of the -- your agency
20 being the police agency before. So I sort of doubt
21 it.

22 So how are we going to be -- I mean,
23 this won't be the first time, by the way, that there
24 have been windmills put up in this area, and they

1 stayed that way long after they were defunct. So I
2 think this is a genuine issue and needs to be
3 addressed.

4 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: That is a fair
5 question. And, Karen, would like to talk about that
6 condition.

7 MRS. ADAMS: We do have the ability to
8 issue permits to put conditions on those permits.
9 At this time, it's too early for us to know what
10 kinds of conditions will be required, but certainly
11 the bonding issue is something that we do need to
12 take into consideration.

13 STANLEY SCHONBRUN: If can address that
14 point. If a company goes bankrupt, how are you
15 going to force them to pay to take these things
16 down? Isn't the -- isn't the money then gone?

17 MRS. ADAMS: Well, my understanding of
18 how it works is they post a bond, and somebody is
19 guaranteeing that that money will be available even
20 if the company disappears.

21 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: And thank you
22 giving us the opportunity to respond to that. We
23 have been hearing that a lot.

24 Any other questions?

1 Yes, sir. Please come to the
2 microphone, state your name; and if need be, spell
3 it for the stenographer.

4 THOMAS ZINNO: Tom Zinno of Oak Bluffs,
5 Z-I-N-N-O.

6 There were a couple questions I did
7 have. After the hearing that was done, I think it
8 was November, the first hearing, I have a few
9 questions that just came off the top of my head
10 hearing about the project.

11 And I -- I think it was Tristan brought
12 up one question that in January showed up in the
13 newspaper, which was what would happen in -- in the
14 type of wind conditions that we get through
15 nor'easters and potential hurricanes to a project
16 such as this?

17 And I think in January there were very
18 severe windstorms in Europe. And on the front page
19 of the Globe, or the second page of the Globe, when
20 I opened it up, I think in January, there was wind
21 turbines that were destroyed through the excessive
22 winds, and that is something that I would think
23 should be considered, especially in the test tower.
24 That is why I think a good idea that Chris Murphy

1 had was to have a full functioning, full height test
2 tower, not something under 200 feet, if there is a
3 test tower allowed, that would take the impact and
4 would be up long enough to see what the impact of
5 the winds are in the severe conditions that we
6 inevitably get through nor'easters and potential
7 hurricanes.

8 Thank you.

9 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.
10 That's a fair question. But first I need to clarify
11 the record. The Corps of Engineers did not have any
12 hearings in November.

13 THOMAS ZINNO: In Rhode Island, you
14 know --

15 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Okay. Well, I
16 just needed to clarify that for the record. And I
17 think with regards to your questions on the blades
18 and the wind, I would like to refer that to the
19 permit applicant on how the blades turn with the
20 wind.

21 JIM GORDON: I'll try to answer that.
22 Our engineers could answer it much better than I,
23 but the -- there are European design standards that
24 have been promulgated in Europe for the design of

1 offshore wind turbines, and we are looking at them
2 very closely. We know that we will be designing
3 these wind turbines to withstand 150-miles-per-hour
4 winds. So we feel that that is going to be -- that
5 is a very robust design standard; and the other
6 reason that we want this scientific monitoring
7 station approved is just so that we can measure wave
8 conditions and currents so that we can make sure
9 that the design we put together will withstand -- it
10 will be a good civilly structural design.

11 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you.

12 THOMAS ZINNO: Is it feasible for the
13 design to be the size of the towers that you are
14 proposing?

15 JIM GORDON: No. No, not on the
16 scientific monitoring station.

17 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

18 And any more quick questions
19 prior -- before you.

20 Anybody who has not spoken yet that
21 really needs the opportunity?

22 Yes, sir. Please come to the
23 microphone, state your name, and spell it if need
24 be.

1 MURRAY CULBERT: I am Murray Culbert,
2 C-U-L-B, as in boy, E-R-T. I am a resident of
3 Vineyard Haven.

4 And I would like to thank you for coming
5 to the Vineyard. I read about the hearings on the
6 Cape and Nantucket, and I was hoping there would be
7 one here.

8 I would basically -- I'll be brief. I
9 would like to say that from my concerns for the
10 wildlife, the most important time for your studies
11 of wildlife will be starting next October and
12 running through next April of 2003. That is when
13 there are thousands -- hundreds of thousands of
14 seabirds out in that area. And obviously, if the
15 DEIS is published next January, that's not a very
16 realistic time frame. I would encourage you to
17 delay the publication of the Draft EIS until after
18 the wildlife season has passed, the winter wildlife
19 season has passed.

20 I would also -- I manage the state beach
21 for the county here, and the land mass is very
22 dynamic as it relates to wind and waves. They say
23 that the offshore bathymetry out there is from two
24 feet deep to 50 feet deep.

1 Is that stable out there? Is it the
2 same spot always two feet deep, or is it one year a
3 spot that is two feet deep, the next year is it
4 50 feet deep?

5 Well, I think that is probably much more
6 likely. I think that will make the engineering a
7 lot more difficult. I do encourage you to approve
8 this test, the test platform. That will give us a
9 lot of these data.

10 Thank you.

11 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

12 Is there anybody else?

13 Yes, sir. Please come to the
14 microphone. Your name, and if need be, please,
15 spell it.

16 STEVE LOHMAN: Steve Lohman,
17 L-O-H-M-A-N. I am from West Tisbury.

18 I just have a very brief comment.
19 Purely on a visual thing, I know a lot of people are
20 very concerned. The visual impact from hearing from
21 the TV is that they are large; they are five miles
22 wide, and it strikes me as odd that they are going
23 to be painted white. I'm a sculptor, and when I do
24 an outdoor piece, I really want to be sure that

1 everyone can see it, and I paint it white. And it
2 seems to me that if you -- when you do something
3 that is more like a neutral gray, they are going to
4 blend in much more. Obviously, people want to be
5 sure you are not going run a plane into it or a boat
6 into it, but that's true for when you are in a high
7 fog of the continent, too. So being painted white,
8 you know, I mean, you are still going to have to put
9 lights on it at night, I understand, or create some
10 way that people aren't going to run into it, but I
11 don't think you have to worry about it on a bright
12 clear day when white is going to be -- make it most
13 visible from the furthest distance.

14 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Thank you, sir.

15 I think that is something for the permit
16 applicant.

17 JIM GORDON: Steve, thanks for that
18 question. I know you are looking at the brochure.
19 And in that, we have a picture of an offshore wind
20 turbine in the Baltic Sea, which is white. We are
21 going to paint the wind towers -- our plans are to
22 paint the wind turbines gray, try to make it blend
23 into the marine environment as much as possible.

24 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: So those who would

1 like to vote for red --

2 (Laughter.)

3 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Sorry.

4 Any other comments from people who have
5 not spoken yet that wish to speak?

6 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Again, I have one
7 more --

8 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANTS: Not spoken.

9 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Sir, if you would,
10 please come and make it quick.

11 STIG PERSSON: Okay. Only one comment
12 that I left out when I talked about the importance
13 of looking at the alternatives and what we could --

14 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Could you please
15 repeat your name again.

16 STIG PERSSON: My name is Stig Persson
17 from Oak Bluffs.

18 And one thing that I left out in my
19 background, I left out when we compare to
20 alternatives, and what permits are we trying to
21 solve. The experience of these kind of projects is
22 most in Europe. And when we think about the
23 economic trade-offs in Europe are fundamentally
24 hidden in lots of government subsidies. And in our

1 country, we have a free economy, but less subsidies.
2 So if we just say, well, it's economical in Europe,
3 it really doesn't mean very much in our economy. So
4 we need to look at it in our environment.

5 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: That's
6 appreciated. Thank you.

7 Now, back to the Commission.

8 COMMISSIONER TRISTAN ISRAEL: Just one
9 other -- just things to look into the -- Tristan
10 Israel from the Town of Tisbury.

11 Does it necessarily have to be all 172
12 windmills at the spacing that they are talking
13 about?

14 Would, you know, in other words, I
15 assume the applicant is doing this for some kind of
16 economic feasibility, but I don't know why. But you
17 know, would 75 windmills suffice in a smaller
18 project in a smaller area?

19 These are things that I think should be
20 looked at as well when considering alternatives, not
21 only locations, but --

22 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Absolutely. That
23 will be looked as an alternative.

24 COMMISSIONER LINDA SIBLEY: Linda Sibley

1 from West Tisbury.

2 I have a thought. A number of people
3 expressed concerns about where the material was
4 going to go that was being removed, the
5 fittings -- the footings in. And others have
6 discussed the importance of there being a bond to
7 remove this whole thing. And then suddenly I have
8 this vision of someone pulling out a footing, and
9 where are they going to get the fill to put into the
10 hole?

11 And so if it is within the scope of your
12 EIS to be looking at the removal, I think that they
13 should address whether the footing should be left in
14 place once they are there; and if not, where are
15 they going to get the fill to fill it in?

16 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: I thank you for
17 withholding your comment. It now may be part of
18 that scope.

19 Is there any other comments?

20 Yes, sir.

21 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Yeah, I was just
22 a little concerned about kind of a vague comment
23 about the bonding. Generally, a company would not
24 take the huge amount of money that it would require

1 to remove such a project and put that money in
2 escrow and leave it there for years in case
3 something happened. What they generally do is they
4 get -- they pay an insurance premium, and a number
5 of insurance companies gather together. And if the
6 company gets in financial difficulty and fails to
7 make the premium payments, they no longer have a
8 bond. And if you have got a contract with the
9 company and the company is defunct, who do you go
10 after?

11 So it's much more complex to say, well,
12 I understand there will be a bond. You know, they
13 are not going to take however many hundreds or
14 millions of dollars it would take to disassemble all
15 of this and put it to an account.

16 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Absolutely. This
17 is not an easy thing. It's certainly not going to
18 be easy.

19 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: But it has to be
20 protected against.

21 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Absolutely.

22 Yes, ma'am.

23 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT: I
24 didn't say my name before. I am Megan

1 Ottens-Sargent from Aquinnah.

2 I guess some questions were asked about
3 the regulatory process, and I gather that the Cape
4 Cod Commission had some purview from a regulatory
5 standpoint. Our Commission does not, and I'm
6 curious about the relationship between the Army
7 Corps and MEPA. And I know that the Department of
8 the Interior is involved to some extent, based on
9 what we have heard tonight, but I would like to get
10 a little bit of a sense of what the time line
11 process is, and also how often the Army Corps works
12 with MEPA in this context with MEPA?

13 MRS. ADAMS: You know, first of all, the
14 easiest part is that the Department of Interior
15 currently has no jurisdiction. That is something
16 that there is some pending legislation. It may
17 change, but at the moment they don't have any
18 regulatory jurisdiction.

19 The state MEPA office is requiring an
20 Environmental Impact Report, which is very similar
21 to our Environmental Impact Statements, and so we
22 are trying to develop a joint document as many of
23 the issues will be -- that need to be addressed will
24 be the same.

1 The Cape Cod Commission's regulatory
2 jurisdiction comes in through their association,
3 through the MEPA office. So that is all being done
4 under state regulations. There is no formal
5 connection between the state regulations, or the
6 federal regulations. It's two agencies with very
7 similar roles. One at the state level, one at the
8 federal level, so we are trying to work together.

9 COMMISSIONER MEGAN OTTENS-SARGENT: But
10 there is also a local regulatory level, too, the
11 Commission on the Cape has. In part perhaps because
12 there is actually a development in Yarmouth in the
13 proposed plans where the cable goes.

14 MRS. ADAMS: I'm not that familiar with
15 their jurisdiction, so I can't comment on that.

16 MODERATOR ROSENBERG: Ladies and
17 gentlemen, Mrs. Adams.

18 MRS. ADAMS: Well, thank you, everybody.

19 We have heard many thoughtful comments
20 today, and careful analysis will be required before
21 a decision can be made.

22 The record will remain open throughout
23 the development of the EIS; however, to ensure that
24 the initial outline for the scope is as complete as

1 possible, please send your written comments to us as
2 soon as possible, if you have anything that you want
3 to add to what has been said tonight.

4 Additionally, any comments regarding the
5 scientific monitoring tower need to be submitted to
6 us by May 13, 2002.

7 All written comments will receive equal
8 consideration with those presented tonight.

9 Once again, I would like to thank you
10 all for taking the time to provide us with your
11 thoughts, your comments and your concerns.

12 Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER JENNY GREENE: Can you give
14 a mailing address to the public where they can send
15 their comments.

16 MRS. ADAMS: Sure. Sure. It is on one
17 of our handouts in the back of the room. It
18 is -- the comments should be addressed to me, Karen
19 Adams, the Corps of Engineers, and that mailing
20 address is 696 Virginia Road, Concord, Massachusetts
21 01742.

22 Thank you, everybody.

23 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANTS: Can we e-mail
24 you also?

1 MRS. ADAMS: You can, but in terms of
2 making sure that things get into record, we find
3 that written comments are actually much preferable.
4 We feel our process is still kind of a fuzzy area.

5 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay.

6

7 (Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the hearing
8 was adjourned.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

I, Marianne Kusa-Ryll, Registered Merit Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript, Volume I, is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes taken on April 18, 2002, in Edgartown, Massachusetts.

.....
Marianne Kusa-Ryll, RMR