VOLUME A, PAGES 1-69

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

EFSB 22-04/DPU 22-67/22-68

PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING, held via Zoom video conference, by the Department of Public Utilities, One South Station, Boston, Massachusetts, on Tuesday, October 11, 2022, commencing at 6:30 p.m., concerning

MAYFLOWER WIND ENERGY, LLC

SITTING:

Robert Shea, Presiding Officer

EFSB:

Andrew Greene, Director

Joan Foster Evans, General Counsel

Wayne Wang, Assistant Director

--------Reporter: David A. Arsenault, RPR--------

Farmer Arsenault Brock LLC

Boston, Massachusetts

617.728.4404

APPEARANCES:
Day Pitney, LLP
Eric K. Runge, Esq.
One Federal Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110
617.345.4600
ekrunge@daypitney.com
for Mayflower Wind Energy, LLC

PROCEEDINGS -- 6:30 p.m.

MR. SHEA: Let's go on the record, please.

Good evening. I would like to welcome everyone to this remote public comment hearing in the Energy Facilities Siting Board docket EFSB 22-04/DPU 22-67/22-68. This case involves the petition of Mayflower Wind Energy, LLC, referred to as Mayflower Wind or the company, to construct a project that would connect a proposed offshore wind generation resource to the regional electricity transmission grid at Brayton Point in Somerset, Massachusetts. The company refers to this as the Mayflower Wind South Coast project. I will describe the project in detail in a minute.

My name is Robert Shea. I am the presiding officer in this proceeding and I am conducting the remote public comment hearing tonight.

As you can see on your Zoom video stream, there are other people on the Siting Board who will be involved in the review of this project. I ask them to raise their hands as I mention their name. First there's Andrew Greene, who is the

director of the Siting Division. Next, Joan Foster Evans, the general counsel of the Siting Division. And Wayne Wang, the assistant director of the Siting Division.

Counsel and company representatives from Mayflower Wind are also participating remotely on this Zoom public comment hearing. Using Zoom the public will have a full opportunity to see and hear everything said during this hearing and to offer comments and to ask questions.

For those of you accessing the meeting by phone dial-in, you too can hear everything and have an opportunity to comment or ask questions. The instructions on how to participate were provided in the public comment hearing notice that was published in the newspapers and in the notices sent to addresses near the project. The public comment hearing notice was also posted to the Mayflower Wind website. In addition, all the information contained in the notice, including instructions for participation, is available on the website for the Siting Board under EFSB siting calendar and today's date. Furthermore, the entire petition is available on the Siting Board's website under the same

Mayflower Wind South Coast. Please note that this public comment hearing is being recorded and will be published to YouTube.

I will now briefly relate the nature of the filings made by Mayflower Wind related to its proposed project and the legal standards that govern the Siting Board's project review. Next I will allow the company to make the presentation regarding the project. After that presentation, I will open the floor to comments and questions from members of the public who wish to offer oral comments tonight. Please note that we also will review any written comments submitted by the public by email through Tuesday, October 25, 2022.

Let me describe the project. The company would construct approximately 2.1 miles of high-voltage direct current electric transmission lines that would be laid in Massachusetts waters. For the company's preferred route, the transmission lines would make landfall on the western side of the Brayton Point peninsula from the Lee River. From the landfall the lines would proceed approximately .6 miles to a new, high-voltage direct current converter station next to an existing National Grid

Page 6

substation also on the Brayton Point peninsula. At the converter station the high-voltage direct current would be converted to high-voltage alternating current. From the converter station a high-voltage alternating current underground transmission line would proceed approximately .2 miles to the point of interconnection with the electric transmission grid at National Grid substation also located at the Brayton Point.

The company's project includes an alternative offshore route. The alternative offshore route like the preferred route would proceed through Mount Hope Bay but the alternative offshore route would make landfall on the eastern side of the Brayton Point peninsula from the Taunton River.

The company proposes a design variation which could be applied to both the preferred and the alternative offshore routes. The noticed variation would involve expanding trenching and underground infrastructure for high-voltage direct current cables. As a result of the expansion, the noticed variation would add infrastructure that would house additional conduits at the landfall and onshore.

Page 7

The additional conduits could accommodate the delivery of another 1,200 megawatts in addition to what the project would accommodate. The noticed variation would provide an advantage for the future connection of offshore wind energy. Please see the notice for a full description of the proposed project.

The offshore wind farm would be located in federal waters. Therefore, the Siting Board does not have jurisdiction over the wind farm or over that part of the electric transmission lines that would lie in federal waters.

Mayflower Wind has filed three petitions, one with the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Board and two with the Department of Public Utilities. The three petitions have been consolidated for review by the Siting Board. The Siting Board petition was filed under Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 164, Section 69J. Under this statute the Siting Board will review the company's filing to determine whether the proposed project would provide a reliable energy supply for the Commonwealth with a minimum impact on the environment at the lowest possible cost.

Page 8

Mayflower Wind also filed a petition under Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 164, Section 72. Under Section 72 the Siting Board will determine whether the project is necessary, serves the public convenience, and is consistent with the public interest.

Finally, Mayflower Wind seeks approval under General Laws Chapter 40A, Section 3, for certain individual zoning exemptions and a comprehensive exemption for the project from the Somerset zoning bylaw. Under chapter 40A, Section 3, the Siting Board will determine whether the requested zoning exemptions are required for the project and whether the present or proposed use of the land or structures is reasonably necessary for the public convenience and welfare.

There are multiple ways that the public can participate in the Siting Board's review of the project. The first is to provide oral comments at the remote public comment hearing tonight. As I stated before, you may also file written comments. In addition, you may choose to seek participation as an intervenor or limited participant.

The deadline for requesting

Page 9

participation as an intervenor or as a limited participant is Tuesday, October 25, 2022. This date is also the deadline to provide written comments as outlined in the notice of the public comment hearing. We would encourage anyone who does seek to participate to review the material published on the Siting Board website which outline the different ways in which you can participate in our proceedings. For example, you may participate as a full intervenor. A full intervenor has the right to ask discovery questions of the company, to present witnesses, to ask questions of witnesses testifying at the hearings, to file briefs and motions, and to appeal the decision of the Siting Board.

In the alternative, you may participate as an limited participant. A limited participant may receive filings made in this proceeding and may file briefs with the Siting Board. The information on participation is also in the public hearing notice for this proceeding.

If you would like a copy of the notice and intervention rules, please send your contact information to me at my email, Robert dot J, as in James, dot Shea, S h e a, @mass.gov, and I can send

Page 10

the information to you by email.
May I have appearances of counsel, please.
MR. RUNGE: Yes. My name is Eric Runge. I am with the law firm of Day Pitney LLP, and I'm counsel for Mayflower Wind.
MR. SHEA: Thank you, Mr. Runge.
Is there any other counsel for Mayflower Wind who wants to enter an appearance now? Hearing none. Thank you.
I will note that the company has provided a certification that the notice for this public comment hearing has been provided consistent with the terms required by the Siting Board.
Would the company like to begin its presentation regarding the proposed project? After that presentation we will open the floor for comments and questions from the public.
MS. FREEMAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Shea.
MR. SHEA: Please go ahead and make the presentation.
MS. FREEMAN: Hello, everyone. My name is Kathleen Freeman. I am the state permitting manager for Mayflower Wind. I am joined in the room

Page 11

with several Mayflower Wind team members to hear your comments and to assist with answering questions. Our siting permitting counsel, Eric Runge, who just introduced himself, will speak about how this project meets the Siting Board's needs standard, and our community liaison officer Kelsey Perry will tell you about our proactive community outreach and stakeholder engagement.
First, I would like to start by thanking the Siting Board for giving us this virtual opportunity to tell the Board and a broader public audience about our project and thank all of the attendees for your time and participation today.
Next, go to the next one.
Mayflower Wind is a 50/50 joint venture between Shell New Energies and Ocean Winds; Ocean Winds itself a joint venture between EDP Renewables and ENGIE. As such, Mayflower is backed by the combined capability and decades of broad, deep experience leading offshore and onshore energy projects across the globe with a strong focus on North America. Mayflower Wind is a stand-alone company with its own board of directors. Mayflower is based in Massachusetts with an office in downtown

Page 12

Boston and one on the South Coast in Fall River.
Next slide. I will turn this slide over to our counsel to tell you how this project meets the project need standard.
MR. RUNGE: Thank you, Kathleen, and thank you all who are attending tonight. We appreciate it.
On project need, just a few things I wanted to say. First of all, the need for the project itself is driven by strong public policy requirements in Massachusetts and other states in New England. By that I mean by legislation, by regulations and executive orders that require reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and require an increase in renewable clean energy supply and particularly from offshore wind, and that require the development of the offshore wind industry itself. So we have had statute after statute that has been passed doing this over the past almost 15 years now.
And so the most recent one was this summer. It was passed in August of 2022 and signed into law. It is the act driving clean energy and offshore wind. And part of that is to establish the

Page 13

procurement of 5600 megawatts of offshore wind for Massachusetts by 2027. Mayflower's project represents just a portion of that, of course. 2400 megawatts is the estimated amount of the offshore wind generation facility. And so you can see that these policies drive this need for offshore wind, for reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and development of the offshore wind industry for the benefit of the Commonwealth and the region.
The project is also needed to simply connect the offshore wind generation itself. It is out in federal waters. There's no transmission system out there. So the project before you is a connector transmission project to actually deliver the energy from that offshore wind generation to consumers ultimately, to the regional system on land at Brayton Point in this case. So that is part of the standard: Is the project necessary to connect the generator? Yes, it is.
The other part of the standard that the Siting Board uses is, is the generation likely to be available to contribute to the regional energy supply? And the answer to that is yes, it is. There are many indicators of commitment of the

Page 14

company to develop that generation, including power purchase agreements, contracts, for 1200 megawatts already in place.

And so the third reason for the need is the need to have this project to deliver the benefits of this project, environmental benefits, economic benefits and energy system reliability and energy security benefits, and it brings all of that.

I'll turn it back to you, Kathleen.

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you, Eric.

Next slide.

The project is among the largest contributors towards meeting Commonwealth's net zero goals. The project will eliminate over 2 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions annually, equivalent to reducing the greenhouse gas emissions of more than five million miles driven per year. The project will bring new job opportunities and help ratepayers save over $2 billion over the life of the project, cost savings that help reduce the energy burden of low-income ratepayers.

Next slide.

Our investment of over 115 million in initiatives is based on commitments made under

Page 15

Massachusetts offshore wind procurement awards as mentioned by Eric. 40 million toward offshore wind education and training and workforce development; 8.5 million towards low-income ratepayer support; 8.9 million toward's diversity equity and inclusion initiatives; and 10 million toward's supply chain opportunities. Mayflower Wind will contribute to supply chain growth throughout all project phases and has committed at least 75 percent of all operations and maintenance jobs to be local.

Less than two weeks ago Mayflower Wind signed a MOU, a memorandum of understanding, with North America Building Trade Unions and United Brotherhood of Carpenters regarding the offshore and onshore construction work for the South Coast project. This partnership will help the next generation of highly skilled, unionized, offshore wind workers.

All of these commitments help Massachusetts meet its environmental and economic development goals and ensure that the opportunities that come from the project flow to the benefit of the local communities.

Next slide, thanks.

Page 16

Mayflower Wind is in the process of permitting the development of a large scale offshore wind energy generation resource, as you heard the hearing officer say. It's capable of generating an estimated 2400 megawatts of renewable energy from federal waters on the outer continental shelf in a single lease area under the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Ocean Energy Management or BOEM. This slide provides a general overview of the lease area.

Interconnection points must be robust for these large injections of renewable energy. There are two separate Mayflower Wind projects for state siting and environmental review purposes and they are the two separate connector facilities, not the single wind-generation project undergoing federal review by BOEM. Why you may ask? Mayflower Wind intends to maximize output from the offshore lease area which will result in more than one project delivering power to shore. Each project must be reviewed through the electric grid operator ISO New England's interconnection process. ISO New England has a planning and reliability requirement that in effect limits capacity of a single project

Page 17

at a single point of interconnection to no more than 1200 megawatts. As a result, developing the full potential of the lease area will require multiple sets of transmission interconnection facilities.

Mayflower has invested considerable effort and funds in maturing studies, regulatory process and development for points of interconnection in Falmouth and Brayton Point. Both continue to move forward.

Next slide.

Brayton Point offers significant, multiple positive attributes for interconnection. For starters, existing 345 kV transmission infrastructure will allow for robust interconnection to the regional transmission system; the beneficial clean energy reuse of a former coal-fired station site that historically had negative impacts on nearby environmental-justice populations. Then there's the lack of direct abutters to this privately owned, previously disturbed industrial property. And then Mayflower Wind's mature position in the queue for interconnection enabling the project to move forward in a quicker and more cost-efficient manner.

Page 18

Next slide.
This diagram shows Mayflower Wind's project components and what elements will be sited in each jurisdiction, federal and state. The South Coast project includes everything from the wind turbines in federal waters all the way to the point of interconnection with the regional transmission system at Brayton Point.
Within Mayflower's federal lease area the turbines will be connected to an offshore converter station that collects the power and converts it from alternating current to high-voltage direct current for long distance transmission to shore.
The HVDC cables are called export cables, and we plan to connect the power to the transmission grid via a route up the Sakonnet River underneath approximately two miles of Portsmouth on land and offshore into Mount Hope Bay. The cables will landfall at Brayton Point where Mayflower's onshore electrical converter station will convert the power from high-voltage direct current to high-voltage alternating current for interconnection at the National Grid substation at Brayton Point.

Page 19

The federal agency BOEM reviews the entire project in detail. Mayflower Wind's HVDC export cable system routes through Rhode Island and Massachusetts are reviewed by the Siting Boards of Massachusetts and Rhode Island.
Next slide.
The offshore export cables are about 90 miles in federal waters, 20 miles in Rhode Island State waters, and only two miles in Massachusetts State waters. In Massachusetts there are no cable crossings anticipated. Within the offshore corridor the cables themselves will be quite small with a bundled width of just over 1 foot. Industry best practices that fluidize a narrow strip of seabed within that cable corridor of about 2,000 foot width, lay the cable and allow sediment to fall back in place to bury the cable.
The route was chosen after a careful study of many alternatives.
Next slide.
This slide shows the existing National Grid substation previously used by New England's largest coal-fired station, a portion of which will be repurposed by Mayflower Wind's point of interconnection.
Next slide.
Underground export cables routing will be within existing, previously disturbed, privately owned industrial land within existing access roadways. There will be no infrastructure installed in town roadways; all in private access roads on privately owned land.
And Mayflower Wind is proposing to lease and use about ten acres of this larger 300-acre site. The converter station footprint will be approximately 7 to 8 acres. We have been working with the landowner as a tenant to maximize the future redevelopment potential of this private site.
Next.
This slide shows in more detail the onshore transmission route which will connect the preferred Lee River landfall site to Mayflower Wind's converter station and will be installed within existing access roadways, as mentioned again, all on privately owned land. The photo on this slide shows the foreground of where we propose to construct our converter station.
Next slide.

Page 20

Page 21

As Mr. Shea, the hearing officer, mentioned, Mayflower is also proposing a design variation to the project intended to minimize impacts to the community and the environment while providing flexibility for future expansion of the electric system to accommodate additional renewable energy generation. The noticed variation depicted here includes the preferred alternative plus the incremental facilities at landfall and onshore to accommodate additional renewable energy generation. Developing in this way is more efficient, avoiding a second construction disruption to the community when a second connector project might be needed in the future.
To the extent that Mayflower Wind seeks to use this additional infrastructure for additional HVDC export cables, Mayflower Wind would, of course, return to the Siting Board for approval to do so. You can see in this schematic that there are hollow conduits that could be filled in the future with high-voltage direct current circuits or cables.
Next slide.
This project shows our schedule. Based on this overall schedule you can see that we are in

Page 22

the middle of the permitting process with offshore construction expected to begin in 2024 once major permits are in hand. The schedule reflects all the construction combined, not just the portion in Massachusetts. For example, the horizontal directional drilling activities are expected to take one to two months. Once construction is done, all cables will be below seabed or underground.

Next slide.

Mayflower is in the process of permitting the development of a large-scale offshore wind generation resource, as you heard, capable of generating an estimated 2400 megawatts of renewable energy from federal waters on the outer continental shelf in a single lease area under the jurisdiction of BOEM. Mayflower submitted its construction and operation plan to BOEM. The COP covers the full lease area as well the two offshore export cable corridors and the two corresponding onshore project areas, the connector projects. This shows that we will be stepping through a robust environmental and public engagement review process.

Across our lease area development we will be looking at about 60 permits with 30

Page 23

agencies, federal, state and local. BOEM will look at everything from the wind turbine generators to the points of interconnection, and we are expecting BOEM to issue our draft environmental impact statement in the first quarter of 2023.

Next slide.

This slide with the state and local permitting underscores what I just said about the agency engagement. A lot of what's happening in Massachusetts is happening in parallel in Rhode Island. We filed our Massachusetts EFSB petitions in May as well as filing our Rhode Island EFSB application that same month. We filed our MEPA environmental notification form in August. For Massachusetts we have engaged these agencies informally for the past year or so, and we are planning on filing our joint application for a Chapter 91 license and water quality certification in the second quarter of 2023.

All environmental and fisheries issues are being reviewed by state regulators who are closer to the local concerns. And in parallel, these reviews are been undertaken in parallel with the federal review process.

Page 24

Next slide.

Mayflower is building the project on a private site and does not foresee significant impacts to the community, such as congestion on local roadways. Despite the low impacts, Mayflower Wind will undertake several impact minimization and mitigation measures. We will work closely and coordinate with the Town of Somerset to establish construction schedule hours and logistics. We will maintain a construction schedule website to alert abutters, residents and other stakeholders of construction locations, dates, activities, traffic-control measures. We will coordinate with the town on traffic management plans as well as the landowner and the tenants on this 300-acre site.

I can't stress enough that we are leasing a small portion, ten acres of a larger 300-acre site. We will use best-management practices and ongoing environmental monitoring throughout construction to minimize noise, vehicle emissions and other impacts at the site.

Next slide.

All offshore export cables will come ashore via horizontal directional drilling or HDD.

Page 25

Use of high-voltage direct current cables reduces the number and size of HDDs. Essentially it reduces the footprint of the project. As mentioned previously, we are proposing two HVDC power cables and associated communication cabling or fiber optics. The offshore export cables will transition to onshore export cables in transition vaults or joint bays at the landfall site, and then continue underground through buried duct bank or vaults onshore. HDD will maintain the integrity of the existing coastal infrastructure and protect the armoring that exists today with bulkhead and riprap. And the cables will be located deep under the shoreline and protected from exposure by erosion.

This slide shows the Lee River HDD entry point at the preferred landfall. As you can see on the photos on the right, there is man-made canal and armored shoreline with riprap and bulkhead on the western landfall side providing protection from erosion due to wave action and storm surges.

Next slide.

The project is sited, manned and designed to avoid and minimize potential impacts based on robust environmental analysis, including

Page 26

extensive investigations and surveys, best-management practices implemented throughout the project phases to minimize potential impacts, and any adverse impacts that cannot be avoided will be minimized or mitigated.

Next slide.

This slide just illustrates the numerous field studies and desktop assessment that have been conducted since 2019 to characterize the onshore and offshore project areas. This includes six seasons of benthic sampling throughout the offshore project area, geophysical, geotechnical surveys from 2019 to 2021.

Next slide.

The onshore project area will not be visible for most of the surrounding landscape. Nighttime lighting of the converter station will be limited to only that required for safety and security, such as at vehicle entry points. Low-intensity safety lighting may be affixed to these vehicle entry points and building entry points, and will be motion activated and shielded downward.

During operations the converter station will generally be unmanned with personnel onsite

Page 27

periodically for inspections, maintenance and repairs. No adverse traffic or air emission impacts are anticipated as a result.

The converter station will meet MassDEP requirements to be no more than ten decibels greater than quiet ambient noise levels at any inhabited buildings near Brayton Point.

As far as electric and magnetic fields, Mayflower's study predicted EMF from the project, levels are well below health-based guidelines from the International Commission on nonionizing radiation for allowable public exposure to magnetic fields. This commission is a nonprofit commission formally recognized by the WHO, the World Health Organization. Mayflower continues to engage stakeholders on this topic through direct outreach and a dedicated web page for the community and we invite you to visit it.

Next slide.

This slide illustrates the EMF informational materials we have on our website, EMF reports, fact sheets, videos. The website also provides questions and comments and please visit it. As you can see here, our website also has a tool for

Page 28

translating information material into several languages for nearby environmental-justice populations. Here you can see Portuguese is shown on the right.

Next slide.

The onshore project area would not be visible from most of the surrounding landscapes. The project's isolated location on Brayton Point peninsula physically separates the onshore project area from other land uses and viewpoints. As you can see from this photo simulation, based on topography, vegetation, distance and development, the onshore project area features would be practically indiscernible to even highly engaged views. This is a photo simulation from Brayton Point Beach in Somerset.

Next slide.

This is a photo simulation from South Swansea Sycamore Street. Again, it just underscores that the onshore project area features would be practical indiscernible to even highly engaged viewers.

Next I will turn this over to our community liaison officer Kelsey Perry to talk about

Page 29

our proactive community outreach and stakeholder engagement.

MS. PERRY: Thanks, everyone, for being here and part of this process with us.

So Mayflower has engaged in outreach to the host community with the goal of informing stakeholders about the project and enabling meaningful engagement throughout this process. We have had consistent and transparent communication with town officials in Somerset, Fall River and New Bedford. And have communicated early about all of our geotechnical and geophysical work going on with harbor masters in the area.

We have had a series of virtual open-house events. One of them for the South Coast community on January 27th, which was an overview of our economic development investments. We had another open house specifically for the Somerset and Swansea communities on May 4th which we used our 3D virtual tool for that. It is a simulation of the project from the wind turbine all the way to the infrastructure at Brayton Point. The recordings of these open houses are available on our web page.

Ahead of that open house we did complete

Page 30

door-to-door outreach in Somerset in the neighborhood directly adjacent from Brayton Point. Just last month in September we sent out a mailer to the Swansea residents who live across the Lee River adjacent from Brayton Point.

As you can see on the left-hand corner of this slide, that's a scene shot of the Mayflower's virtual exhibition room which is available on our website. If you go to that link, it links to a poster hall with digestible information about our project. We do have all of our permitting documents on our web page, on our documents web page. We try to use more tools like the virtual exhibition rooms, fact sheets and FAQs which are all available online to help stakeholders digest these lengthy and very intense permitting documents.

Next slide, please.

We have also been engaging with the fishing industry. We have and will continue to conduct extensive engagement with both commercial and recreational fisheries. We do have a full-time fisheries liaison officer working on the project who attend regular port hours in both New Bedford,

Page 31

Massachusetts and Port Judith, Rhode Island. We have contracts with fishing captains who conduct scouting trips before our offshore surveys take place to make sure to point out any fishing gear that should be avoided. And we also work very closely with our fisheries representatives. We have three of them, including the New Bedford Port Authority and the Massachusetts Lobstermen's Association. Again, we have a lot of resources on our website. We regularly update our mariner's page on our website, and we encourage fishermen and other marine users to check that out and to sign up for updates to stay in the loop on what's going on offshore.

Next slide, please.

This is our last slide. We also have been actively engaging with the tribes since 2019. We have had early and direct engagement with the tribes as we have considered our best options and long-term opportunities for the tribes.

I do want to point out one of our workforce development opportunities. We have a partnership with RPS where we put together a PSO, protected species observer career training program.

Page 32

This is a cost-free training program for any tribal member who would like to become a PSO. After you receive the cost-free training, RPS will work to get you working offshore working on an offshore wind project. As you can see on the pictures in the bottom of the screen, that's a photo of the training that happened in the Mayflower Wind office in Fall River. That is Josh from the Pocasset tribe out at sea working on the Mayflower's geophysical survey work in the lease area. It is a great opportunity to get involved with offshore wind and it has direct employment benefits.

That's it for me. I hand it back to you.

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you, Kelsey. That concludes our presentation. We are ready to hear comments.

MR. SHEA: Thank you very much.

Before we begin, I'm going to outline some guidelines to use in speaking at this hearing. There is a stenographer who is also participating remotely and who will transcribe everything said during this hearing. This public comments hearing is also streaming to the Department of Public

Page 33

Utilities' YouTube channel. It is only the transcript produced by the stenographer, however, that is the official record of the hearing. As we are all relying on the internet or telephones to participate, we could experience technical difficulties such as sound from speakers, potential background noise, video and audio issues and potential delays. Therefore, it is imperative to speak slowly and clearly to allow a speaker to finish speaking before you begin speaking and to pay attention to the video of the person speaking and to my video. I will raise my hand as a signal on my video if I need to interrupt the person currently speaking to ask them to stop. We appreciate everyone's cooperation in participating in this hearing.

I apologize in advance for any technical difficulties we may encounter through the course of this remote public comments hearing. If you have problems, please raise your hand using the Zoom toolbar or dial Star 9 on your phone if participating by phone. You may call or text 857-200-0065 for assistance.

In the notice we requested that anyone

Page 34

with an interest in speaking notify the Siting Board in advance if possible. This is a great help due to the mechanics of the remote platform. We will begin with any federal, state or local officials who wish to be heard. Then we will proceed with members of the public who have signed up to speak. And finally we will allow anyone who wishes to speak but has not had a chance to let us know in advance. Please give us your name and address and spell your name for the stenographer and speak slowly and clearly. Again, please stop speaking if you see me raise my hand in the video. If the company response to a comment or a question asked is appropriate, I will ask the company's representatives if they would like to respond.

First of all, are there any public officials who wish to be heard? Please raise your hand using the Zoom feature and one of our staff will take the necessary steps to allow your comments to be heard by everyone and included in the transcript of the hearing.

Are there any public officials who wish to be heard? I'm going to ask the people who control this hearing, is there anyone in the waiting

Page 35

room?

MR. GREENE: There is no one who has raised their hand.

MR. SHEA: Not seeing anyone raise their hand as a public official, why don't we start with people who signed up with the Siting Board to speak or even anyone who wants to speak but didn't get a chance to sign up. I think that no one signed up with the Siting Board. If there's any member of the public who would like to speak, please raise your hand using the raise-hand button on the Zoom or dial Star 9 on your phone if you are dialing in.

MR. GREENE: I see few hands raised. I'm going to move the first person who raised their hand. That's Paul Shew.

Could you turn on your microphone and camera. You have joined the panel.

MR. SHEW: How do you do?

MR. SHEA: I ask you to spell your last name for the stenographer.

MR. SHEW: Sure. S h e w.

MR. SHEA: Thank you. Please go ahead with your comment.

MR. SHEW: Thank you first for the

Page 36

comprehensive presentation. It helps give an overview, a relatively understandable one to a very, very complex, arduous process. I'm wondering if there is a distilled copy or perhaps this copy that might be available. I work with PEER Consultants, which is an environmental engineering firm, in full disclosure. I have an interest in understanding it from that standpoint.

MR. SHEA: What is it that you want a copy of, Mr. Shew?

MR. SHEW: The presentation that you made was very good. If you have a copy of that or a reduced synopsis perhaps of the same, it would be appreciated.

MR. SHEA: Does someone from the company want to respond to Mr. Shew's question?

MR. RUNGE: We filed a copy of the presentation in the docket today. Bob I think read out the docket number earlier today. If you have that docket number, then you can just go into the virtual file room and access the document there.

MR. SHEW: Okay.

MR. SHEA: First of all, I should have asked you for your address.

Page 37

MR. SHEW: Sure. I live in Franklin, Massachusetts. I will give you my home address, which is 107 Hillside Road in Franklin, Massachusetts 02038.

MR. SHEA: Thank you.

MR. SHEW: Our firm is in Burlington, Massachusetts.

MR. SHEA: Thank you.

MR. SHEW: For the next step, is there anything that you anticipate is going to be of particular note that might affect the people of Somerset in that area or is this something that's going to continue on a relatively invisible path for a while and most of it is a paper path or permitting? 60 permits I think I heard you say along the way; fairly impressive. So is there anything of note that the population might see or witness?

MR. SHEA: Who would like to respond?

MS. FREEMAN: Kelsey, do you want to take that one?

MS. PERRY: Your question is what will Somerset residents see once the project gets started?

Page 38

MR. SHEW: An average resident with an interest but not an expertise in this field, is there anything of note?

MS. PERRY: I will just highlight the project's timeline again. We are in the permitting development stage, as you mentioned, right now. It is really all paper. We still have a couple of years to go to get all of those permits in hand. We are hoping to start onshore construction in 2024. During the onshore construction period Somerset residents would see some construction activity on Brayton Point. That should only last for a short period of time. We would start offshore construction in the lease area and for the subsea cables in 2025, which would be further away from Somerset residents and not impact them; and hope to complete construction in two to three years. Then be sending clean and green electrons into the grid around 2028 or by the end of the decade.

MS. FREEMAN: To that I would add, Kelsey is very modest but we are very transparent. She has posted on our website copies of all the permit applications that we have filed for easy access.

Page 39

MR. SHEW: Excellent. As I take it, even with the buildout, this is relatively something that is not particularly notable based on the simulated views that you have; is that correct?

MS. PERRY: Once the HVDC converter station is in operation, you won't be able to hear it. The only thing you will be able to see, at least from Brayton Point Beach, is the very slender lightning rod which is hard for the eye to see. So once the construction is over, there will not be much to see or hear.

MR. SHEW: Okay. Thank you. Thanks for an excellent presentation.

MS. PERRY: Thank you for joining.

MR. SHEA: Do you have my email address so you can contact me if you have any trouble accessing any of the documents you talked about?

MR. SHEW: I'm sure I can retrieve it. I don't have it with me at the moment, but I'm sure we can find it. Thank you, Mr. Shea.

MR. SHEA: Thank you, Mr. Shew.

Mr. Greene, is anyone else in the waiting room?

MR. GREENE: Yes. We have Patrick McDonald who will be joining us.

Page 40

MR. McDONALD: Sorry I'm in my sweatshirt tonight because I'm home. I met Kelsey at the town meetings. I thank her for coming to the town. I think I have seen Kathleen's presentation.

I'm a resident of Brayton Point. I live at 30 Admirals Way in Somerset, Massachusetts which is a beautiful piece of property. We lived here when the coal power plant was here and we lived here through all the improvements, my parents did too, of the cooling towers, of all the environmental restrictions that were put on by Save the Bay Narragansett. I'm a member of Save Our Bay Brayton Point. That was a zero net emissions facility. We loved the power plant when it was here because it was regulated to the point where it was not polluting our neighborhood.

I think there are other people on this line, including myself, that have survived cancer. Bladder cancer was one of the popular cancers here on Brayton Point. I'm surviving atrial fibrillation which has just been recently diagnosed.

So these are my questions about this project. Number one, we have heard in prior

Page 41

meetings that the electromagnetic fields that will be created from the Mayflower 1 project, the 1200 --

Is it a kilowatt or megawatt facility?

MR. RUNGE: Megawatts.

MR. McDONALD: -- will be no greater than what was here with the power plant. My problem as being a resident who is one half-mile away from Brayton Point is that we are in 2022. We were not in 1959. Why do I hear an answer that the electromagnetic fields will be no greater than what were here? Right now it is zero. Why should the residents of Brayton Point or Lee River, and our good friends on the neck that joined us in the fight that was here before you guys came in, which I am sure you are all aware of, about the scrap metal operation and trying to make this a commercial/ industrial port, why should we be subjected to electromagnetic fields that may harm us?

MS. FREEMAN: That sounds like a question for our engineering manager Kelly. Kelly, do you want to take that one?

MS. SMITH: This is Kelly Smith speaking.

MR. McDONALD: I have seen you before,

Page 42

Kelly. How are you?
MS. SMITH: Good. How are you?
I hear what you are saying, Patrick, and we do understand that electric and magnetic fields can be a concern to members of the community. I do want to note that they are produced anywhere where there's a flow of electricity. So when you speak about in the past versus now and a change in expected EMF levels, it is important to understand that it is a natural and man-made process that is tied to the flow of electricity.
So for Mayflower's cables we have done extensive modeling of our proposed system. As Kathleen spoke about earlier, the results of that show that there's no, the predicted levels are well below health-based guidelines set by the International Commission on Nonionizing Radiation Protection for allowable public exposure to magnetic fields. With respect to electric fields, because our cables are underground, those electric fields will be completely shielded by the cable materials.
Another thing to note is that magnetic fields dissipate very rapidly with distance from cables. So over in the community you will be well

Page 43

insulated from those fields which are located and tucked away on private industrial property.
MR. McDONALD: Also, when I take a right-hand turn from Oneil Road on to Brayton Point Road, that's where your converter station that you propose will be. Am I going to be subject to electromagnetic fields? How far up Brayton Point Road am I going to be subjected to electromagnetic fields as I take the turn from Oneil Road? I do walk down to the old power plant gate. How much electromagnetic fields am I going to be subject to? To the point where it's a cancer risk or no?
MS. SMITH: The detailed analysis of the line that we have done, I would point you to the website for our full study which was completed by experts for the modeling exercise. But again, it dissipates very rapidly with distance from the cables.
MR. McDONALD: And how rapidly? Am I still going to be within that zone? I mean, I'm a person who walks that every day. I walked it every day when the scrap metal trucks were coming. I have walked it every day before you guys are coming. I walk it every day. It is just like you drink one

Page 44

liter of something bad every day, it will cause a higher risk of cancer. If I walk by your facility every day, am I subject to more cancer risk than somebody who doesn't?
MR. REHIER: I can even elaborate a bit on that. We have done, for example, we have also done the modeling on Portsmouth, Rhode Island, which is very similar cables to what we are looking at on Brayton Point. In that case the same studies showed we were well below the health-based guidelines for somebody who -- and this is a typical situation across many communities in the US where these cables are installed in the roadway. Somebody standing directly over the cables in the roadway, so you would be six feet over the cables in that case.
On Brayton Point we are looking at distances that are, even the closest approach from the public road is much further than that. So it significantly decreases, as Kelly mentioned, away from it. But even if you were standing right over the cable in a roadway, we will be well below the health-based guidelines as Kelly mentioned. That's what that analysis that is referenced on the website looks at.

Page 45

I think that specific location we may not have looked at directly in the analysis, but showed what we would consider to be a more conservative and a more stringent case. And have shown how it decreases as you go further away to very, very extremely low levels that far away.
I think the direct comment I can say is we are well below from the guidelines that the international commission has set for health-based long-term exposure to EMF, and even decreased further and further away from the cables.
MS. SMITH: It is important to remember that there's already is existing transmission infrastructure at Brayton Point.
MR. SHEA: Kelly, excuse me. Could you speak slowly. I'm having a hard time understanding you.
MS. SMITH: I apologize. Thank you for catching me. This is Kelly Smith speaking.
I did just want to add one more point to what Tim said. There already is existing transmission infrastructure at Brayton Point. What our project is in kind with what's already there. So that flow of electricity from that existing

Page 46

transmission infrastructure is already producing negligible amounts of electromagnetic fields.

MR. McDONALD: I appreciate your comments on that. But that connection has long been tapped off now since 2018. I don't think there's anything coming through there like it was before when it was being generated from the plant. And that's what we don't want to hear, that we are going back to the power plant days. Because there were many cancers down here, my parents included that live down here. People died of bladder cancer down here. I think there's a caller here whose father died from bladder cancer down here. I have bladder cancer down here. We just don't want any more cancers down here. I know that we want green energy. I know I'm in favor of green energy versus greenhouse emission.

You have to remember that when Mayflower came in with Vineyard Wind, you guys had Brayton Point on the table and you totally took Brayton Point off the table and went to Falmouth and didn't even address Brayton Point. I feel like we are a secondary site. First you didn't even want to be here but now you do want to be here.

Page 47

I've got some more questions. I'm going to move off of the electromagnetic fields.

MR. SHEA: Mr. McDonald, thank you for your questions. What I would say though is this is not a forum for extensive cross-examination. If you would like to intervene, you can go into as much detail as you would like. It is really a forum for comments.

MR. McDONALD: I know what you're saying, Mr. Shea, and we'll probably responding to that on October 25th. But we are a group of just like -- you guys are coming in with Mayflower Wind and you are the energy Siting Board. We are citizens trying to come up to speed. We have been working as hard as we can to come up to speed. If you could give me a little deference, I will not be hugely long. But this is important to our neighborhood. It is important to the people who have been fighting down here for three and a half years for clean air and clean water. We have put up with 50 years of a power plant polluting. We want to be in history recorded as trying to make sure that the efforts that were not followed back in 1959 -- you have to understand that this was farm

Page 48

for hundreds of years before it was a power plant. And now it has been taken down. Now it is looking to be repurposed. We just have a few more questions.

MR. SHEA: Go ahead, sir.

MR. McDONALD: As far as your noise level, we never agreed with the ten decibels above ambient, because that is just impossible to capture by the DEP. So our town came up with a noise bylaw. That was generated by, basically by the residents of Somerset when we had the problems before you guys came in here with the owners of the property.

The residential decibels for residential area as defined on a property line -- and we have property lines that are direct abutters with Brayton Point -- was from 7:00 to 10:00 p.m. the maximum decibel level that's allowed in a residential area is 65 decibels. Then the maximum allowed decibels from a property line in a residential area from 10:00 to 7:00 a.m. are 55 decibels.

Is this Board looking to try to say that they are exempt from those decibel levels, because those decibel levels were very noisy in our neighborhood?

Page 49

MR. SHEA: Does anybody from the company want to respond?

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Shea, and thank you, Mr. McDonald. Again, I'm going to ask Kelly Smith our engineering manager to respond, because I know she's been involved with the noise studies we have been doing. Kelly?

MS. SMITH: Thank you. I appreciate your comment. We are aware of the local restrictions. Excuse me.

MR. MOTT: I'm going to let Kelly off for a moment and clear her throat. Good evening, Mr. McDonald. My name is Lawrence Mott. I'm going to speak for a moment. I work as a transmission development manager for Mayflower. I want to just quickly go back if I may, Mr. Shea, on your previous line and then we can come back to the sound point.

I would note per your question on the lines, the electric lines going in and out of the NGRID and Brayton Point substation, those remain what we call online or energized, is the technical term. So that energy as we sit here tonight is flowing there and the wires flow right from the substation actually into the transformers right

Page 50

adjacent to the old power building. So that is still active right now. And we assume NGRID, because that's a significant interconnection point as part of the our electric grid, will remain in that fashion separate from the Mayflower project.

To the sound question, I'll just begin and my colleagues can jump in. Kathleen, you might help me because you can quote specifically the regulation. I don't think as stated by Mr. McDonald that that is the correct term on what we have to meet for Somerset.

MS. FREEMAN: It is 6, I think the delta is 6 decibels as opposed to the Massachusetts DEP 10 decibels above quiet ambient levels.

MR. McDONALD: No. We passed a zoning bylaw. We were having problems with the current owners of the property. So we deviated from the original noise bylaw and went to a straight, so that we can measure it, decibel level. We have ten monitors -- those were dust. We have like six monitors for noise so that we could go out and measure. If you are over 65 decibels between this time you are in violation. If you are over 55 decibels in this time you are over. We bypassed and

Page 51

went to a more stringent standard.

Believe me, I've attended every town meeting, every zoning board meeting, every conservation meeting, everything involving Brayton Point because I live here. I have the bylaw up on my screen right now. This is a bylaw that was put into effect on May 17, 2021.

MS. FREEMAN: We are going to have to get back to you on that. Thank you, Mr. McDonald. We will definitely look into that. Did you say May 2021?

MR. McDONALD: May 17, 2021. You can get there from the town website.

My last comment -- not last but close. I don't want to take up everybody's time.

Vibrations. Will there be any vibrations from this transformer station?

MS. FREEMAN: Lawrence, do you want to take this one?

MR. MOTT: Lawrence Mott speaking again. The question is about vibration. During operations, no. You will have vibration of trucks as you come in during the short construction period. But during operations it will be the same as what it really is

Page 52

there in the NGRID facility, meaning the NGRID substation, and our facility will be similar electric components that don't vibrate at any frequency that would be felt outside of the fence line of the property because these are high-frequency items so there's no vibration.

MR. McDONALD: I have two more comments. Everybody understands that not only Mayflower Wind is at Brayton Point. I know the exact area where you guys want to go. There's also going to be Prysmian Cable that wants to develop 47 or 50 acres of Brayton Point. They want 670 -- 627 vehicle trips per day. And Carver Industries, who has I think still has some type of agreement with Brayton Point, is still advertising this as a commercial/ industrial port with 147 acres of industrial laydown areas.

The environmental impacts of all of those combined I think are an overload on the Brayton Point property. There was one business down here; that was a power plant. It took up the entire area. It produced I think 1600 megawatts of power or 14 -- somebody can answer before me -- of power. It had about tops 35 to 50 people. Now we are

Page 53

talking about Mayflower Wind, its operation, Prysmian Wire Group, its operation.

And I think that security -- I don't think there -- I think that Mayflower should have some type of security plan given what's going on down there. We see how important energy is worldwide and what's happening with countries conflicting over energy. What type of security plan and how far do you want businesses away from your converter station? I would say there should be a large buffer zone with security. We are concerned with what's going to happen down here if this becomes a target.

MR. SHEA: Would someone in the company like to respond?

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you for that, Mr. McDonald. As I mentioned earlier, we are going to have safety perimeter fencing around the converter station and restricted access. Obviously to protect our assets and protect the converter station we will have protective measures in place.

And as I mentioned earlier, we plan to coordinate with the landowner and the other tenants to ensure minimizing of any cumulative impacts. Our

Page 54

operation is going to be an unmanned substation. So once we build the converter station there will be minimal or negligible impacts at all continuing going forward. But thank you for that comment.

MR. McDONALD: I think that's a concern of the residents. My last one is what is Mayflower Wind going to contribute to the infrastructure of Somerset?

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you. I'm going to ask Kelsey to respond to that.

MS. PERRY: Sure. Just to answer on infrastructure specifically, all we will have in Somerset is the HVDC converter station. It is just one building. But I think the question of benefit is an important one.

Of course, as we mentioned with offshore wind projects like this, there is lots of opportunities, employment opportunities, climate and environmental opportunities. But for the Town of Somerset specifically, we are a long-term business partner and we will be engaging in our responsibilities regarding tax liabilities for having the infrastructure on Brayton Point. We are committed to working with the town to construct some

Page 55

type of fair compensation agreement once we get there.

MR. McDONALD: Why do I read in other articles that Barnstable is going to get $16 million in industrial taxes, and then I hear that the Town of Portsmouth who is not hosting the end connection is going to get $28 million? Why hasn't Somerset been offered something like that? I know it is landing on a private piece of property. But to get there you are coming through waters that are owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and are within the jurisdiction of the Town of Somerset. Why isn't the Town of Somerset being allowed some type of monetary stipend to host Mayflower Wind here?

MS. PERRY: I just want to clarify that Mayflower has not come to an agreement with Falmouth or Portsmouth regarding an agreement or monetary value quite yet. Other developers have but not Mayflower. But we have been engaging in those types of conversations.

Just to reiterate, we are committed to speaking to town officials on this topic and to come to an agreement for a fair compensation agreement. So I don't have the exact value or what that will

Page 56

look like today, but I can assure you that that conversation will progress as the project does.

MR. McDONALD: So should the town of Somerset intervene to have those negotiations go forward? I see that Portsmouth, Middletown and Little Compton just entered into a cooperation agreement. They are looking at it and they are wanting to make sure they are compensated.

I know, Ms. Freeman, that is a town decision. I'm very involved in this town. I'm speaking as a resident, but I'm making sure that our town gets the same benefits that every other town gets. The end-run is right here. You also -- this is my last comment.

I've heard that the second set of lines that you want to have empty are going to land at Brayton Point. But then the plan proposal is to drill those underneath the Town of Somerset and go to Montauk because ISO New England wants two separate 1200-megawatt facilities. So the Town of Somerset, you are asking us to say approve 1200 megawatts. We will be blank on 1200, and then you will come back and pose more impacts on the Town of Somerset, environmentally to the Town

Page 57

of Somerset. I think that our town -- and I'll speak to our leaders -- are made sure that this town has the same compensation and the same considerations that everybody else is asking for a project this size.

MR. SHEA: Thank you, Mr. McDonald.

MR. McDONALD: Thank you very much, Mr. Shea, for letting me speak so long.

MR. SHEA: Okay. Our pleasure. Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Greene, is there anyone else who wants to make comments?

MR. GREENE: Duncan Pedersen.

MR. SHEA: Mr. Pedersen, spell your last name and give us your address.

MR. PEDERSEN: Sure. The last name is P e d e r s e n from 21 Bradford Street in Boston, Massachusetts.

MR. SHEA: Thank you. Please feel free to give your comment now.

MR. PEDERSEN: First of all, thanks for having me. First time. If I say anything silly, please feel free to kick me off or just direct me to the resources to answer my question.

Page 58

I'm a new Boston resident. I've become for the last couple of years an alternative energy advocate. I definitely support the energy transition. I think it is obviously a massively technologically complex issue, politically complex issue, multifaceted. I'm happy that companies like you and individuals like you are participating.

My two questions, though, are around financials and reliability. Maybe you can just point me to a link to answer these questions. But in terms of reliability, you mentioned the fact that these green electrons are coming on to the grid. Obviously there's intermittency issues. And we need dispatchable power, as I understand it, to sort of be on standby, whether that's a combined-cycle gas plant that's got the turbines going half speed and is ready to turn on when the wind stops blowing. I'll add the two questions together. They should be quick.

My first question would be, what dirty electrons are we displacing with these new offshore wind electrons? And when the wind stops blowing, what does our replacement power plant look like? I know it is ISO New England that needs to handle that

Page 59

reliability to an extent, but I just want to get your thoughts.

The second question would be, who is paying for this? I understand there's state financing and federal financing and whatnot. Obviously it changes every five or six months. Of course there's got to be -- I understand that maybe the wind turbines are not necessarily the subject of this project, but there's overbuilding requirements, there's additional transmission requirements as we need to pull in that power, that replacement power from another power plant. Maybe that gas plant that's replacing the wind electrons is located a state away and we need to build out some transmission lines to get that backup power to us.

So there's obviously additional system costs. I know that one of the mandates and points that we discussed at the beginning of this meeting is that this is going to be good for the ratepayer.

I will ask you, who has done the study that will tell me how much this is going to cost? I don't mean any of those questions to sound flippant or anything like that. I'm curious about reliability and financials and I would like to get a

Page 60

response. Thanks.

MR. SHEA: Ms. Freedom, please answer.

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pedersen. I'm going to punt this one to our counsel who has carefully helped us with our petition and reviewed the PPAs and the retirement of fossil fuel burning facilities and why this benefits ratepayers in the wintertime for reliability. You want to take a crack at it?

MR. RUNGE: Happy to. You have a lot going on there, Duncan. The first question is what is it replacing? Obviously you have a fleet of generation throughout New England, some of which is older, some of which is coal-fired, oil-fired. Coal-fired is already retired. Oil-fired is there somewhat item but also will retire. We also have nukes that have retired recently. All of those need to get replaced. So large facilities like this offshore wind generation will replace those.

You are correct that you will need dispatchable generation of some sort certainly farther into the future, and that will potentially be new gas-fired generation or something else that we don't even know about in terms of the technology

Page 61

of that generation. And that will still be around. What you do need is something that will have a high capacity factor, especially in the winter months that can provide energy security.

Offshore wind is known for that. Offshore wind has a very high capacity factor relative to other intermittent resources. It's available when perhaps some others are not especially when it might be needed as we become a winter peaking system especially later into the future. So that's the answer to the first part of your question.

The second part had to do with financing. Right now these projects are largely financed through long-term power purchase agreements. These are entered into with the electric distribution companies. I mentioned earlier in our presentation the need for the project. I particularly pointed to legislation that is out there, and part of that legislation is legislation that requires procurements of large amounts of offshore wind energy. So those contracts are being formed pursuant to that legislation.

Those contracts themselves then get

Page 62

reviewed by the Department of Public Utilities for various factors and standards that they have to meet, including benefits to ratepayers. So there is a cost analysis that is done and the approval comes only after that analysis is done.

MS. FREEMAN: Can I just add? The $2 billion in savings came from the Department of Energy Resources. They had run the model. I believe that Lawrence from our team would like to add to this.

MR. MOTT: These are excellent questions. These are not silly. Take your pencil there. Brattle Group, B r a t t l e, Brattle Group, they did several studies that looked at savings to the ratepayers and how in the long-term, two of the points you brought up, the renewable generation and transmission upgrades, are beneficial to the ratepayers. Do take a look at those.

The next one to further what Mr. Runge focused on, which is a few numbers for you to think about to maybe help round this out. Typical solar panels in a residential application may be 15 to 20 percent capacity factor. And capacity factor when we use that term is a hundred percent capacity

Page 63

factor would be running 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. As I referenced, solar may be 15 or 20. A large solar array may be 20 to 22 in a Massachusetts type setting. When you go on to onshore wind let's say 35. When you go to offshore wind you get 55. You get natural gas at 65 to 75 depending on the type of plant. Nuclear is somewhere similar, in that 75, 80 region with the refueling process. Those are some of the real comparison numbers.

The next one is the efforts on a grid operation allow for the ability to bring the lowest cost resource in. And so you are not requiring a plant, as you mentioned, to be sitting at idle. That's quite rare now with the mix of generation that we have. So that you are not burning fuel needlessly in case a wind plant comes off. I would also mention that wind, especially as compared to solar, has a very predictable on and off ramp so the operators can predict when it is coming. So this really is a future of what I call a very practical generation.

I also note you used the word alternative. I would like to say this is mainstream and it is renewable energy. Thank you.

Page 64

MR. PEDERSEN: Thank you all. Very helpful.

MR. SHEA: Thank you, Mr. Pedersen.

MR. GREENE: If there are any others who would like to comment, please raise your hand.

Holly McNamara.

MR. SHEA: Ms. McNamara, spell your last name and give us your address.

MS. McNAMARA: M c N a m a r a.

MR. SHEA: Your address?

MS. McNAMARA: I live in Somerset. I prefer not to give my address due to an assault case that was just tied up in court.

MR. SHEA: Oh, okay.

MS. McNAMARA: I was a selectman in Somerset. I resigned a little over a year ago. I want to be sure that especially Mayflower -- I have met Kelsey. I had great conversations with her. I just want you to know that the silent majority in town supports Mayflower and really is grateful that you have chosen us and you are investing here and the fact that we can be at the forefront of something that's so progressive for the entire country, it is just unbelievable. So thank you and

Page 65

thank you for everyone's hard work.

If anyone has -- I'm still available even though I'm not a selectman anymore. But I'm happy to help if anyone needs help in navigating the waters here. It can be pretty difficult. I just wanted to let everybody know that I'm sure you have the same handful of people, a lot of NIMBYs that come to your meetings. The silent majority does not attend. I apologize I have not been able to go to any of these meetings or hearings and forums. I did want to come on today and at least reassure you that the majority in the town really supports and trusts you.

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you, Ms. McNamara, for your comments.

MR. SHEA: Thank you.

MS. McNAMARA: Nice to see you. Kelsey has my info if anyone needs it.

MR. SHEA: Thank you very much.

MS. FREEMAN: Thank you.

MR. GREENE: Again, if there's anyone who would like to comment, please raise your hand.

Mr. Shea, I think we have heard all of those who wish to speak.

MR. SHEA: Thank you, Mr. Greene.

Before we conclude the public comment hearing this evening, I would like to remind everyone of the opportunity to participate in the Siting Board's review of the project if you so desire. We would encourage anyone who does seek to participate to review the information on different types of participation that is listed in the public comment hearing notice for this proceeding and on the Siting Board website. If you would like a copy of the notice intervention rules, please send your contact information to my email at Robert dot J dot Shea S h e a @mass.gov. I can send the information to you by email.

Any written comments that you may wish to file or any petitions to participate further in the evidentiary hearings should also be sent to me to my email address at Robert dot J dot Shea S h e a @mass.gov. Comments are due by 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 25, 2022, and petitions to participate as an intervenor or a limited participant are also due by 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 25th, 2022.

In addition, any petitions or comments

must also be sent by email or email attachment to the counsel for Mayflower Wind Eric K. Runge, Esquire of the firm Day Pitney, LLP. Mr. Runge's email address is E K Runge R u n g e @daypitney D a y P i t n e y dot com. That's E k R u n g e @ D a y P i t n e y dot com. If you want a clarification of anything that I have said during this hearing, please email me at Robert.J.Shea S h e a @mass.gov. If you want to write please write before Tuesday, October 25th, 2022 which is the deadline for receipt of public comment in this docket.

Thank you all for your participation in this hearing tonight. Now I would like to go off the record.

(8:00 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, David A. Arsenault, Registered Professional Reporter, and Certified Reporter in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, #100693, do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes taken on October 11, 2022 in the above-captioned matter.

_____

David A. Arsenault, RPR

COMMENTS

D

S