

Meeting Minutes
March 17, 2021
Present
Seth Lattrell, Port Authority
Deputy/Planner
Matthew Littell, Utile
Will Cohen, Utile
Elizabeth van der Els, Utile
Tom Skinner, Durand & Anastas
Mayor Kimberley Driscoll, Mayor
Capt. Bill McHugh, Salem Marine
Society/Harbormaster
Paul DePrey, National Parks Service

Mira Riggan, Derby Street Neighborhood Association
Beth Debski, Salem Partnership
Bob McCarthy, Ward 1 Councilor
Barbara Warren, Salem Sound Coastwatch
Rinus Oosthoek, Salem Chamber of Commerce
Pat Gozemba, Salem Alliance for the Environment
Ben Szalewicz, Salem State
Kate Fox, Destination Salem
Fred Ryan, Public Safety
John Russel, Ward 1 Resident
Kathryn Glenn, CZM

Salem Municipal Harbor Plan (MHP)

Harbor Plan Committee Meeting #5

Meeting Agenda

- Introduction
- DPA Program Overview by CZM
- Engagement
 - Summary of HPC One-on-Ones
 - Survey
- Overview of Comparable Ports
- Footprint Site: Presentation from Development Team
- Next Steps
- Public Comment

Meeting Date, Time, and Location

- March 17, 2021
- Convened: 4:00 pm
- Adjourned: 6:44 pm
- Zoom web conference

Actions

- No voting occurred at this meeting
- No Public Comment

DPA Program Overview by CZM

Kathryn presented the DPA program overview including: the roles of CZM and DEP, waterway regulations, Chapter 91 Jurisdiction, DPA policy and potential use, water dependent industrial uses, supporting uses and temporary uses. In a Municipal Harbor Plan the role of Coastal Zone Management (CZM) is to provide guidance specific to MHP regulations, to review MHP submittals on behalf of the Secretary of EEA, and the Regional Coordinator is a primary liaison. The focus of the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) is to protect and promote public use of tidelands and provide regulatory guidance during the MHP process. DEP is the license/permitting authority for Chapter 91. Kathryn explained that waterway regulations are the primary tool to implement protection of the public use of tidelands, coastal and inland waterways.

Any activity that takes place within jurisdiction requires authorization. Chapter 91 jurisdiction was explained as flowed tidelands which includes any project in, on, over, or under tidal waters seaward of mean high water (MHW) and extends 3 miles seaward (state jurisdiction) and filled tidelands which includes land that was formerly flowed tidelands.

There are 10 Designated Port Areas (DPA) in Massachusetts and are based on physical and operational features needed to support the water dependent industry (WDI). The three main attributes of a DPA include: waterway and associated waterfront developed to accommodate commercial navigation or other utilization of the water, landside space with physical and use character that supports siting of industrial facilities/operations, and appropriate land-based transportation routes and utilities for industrial use. DPA policy protects limited developed shoreline resources for water-dependent industrial uses that cannot be sited elsewhere.

A Municipal Harbor Plan (MHP) is voluntary and allows the community to modify some Ch. 91 requirements to fit goals for the harbor. Any changes must be consistent with state tidelands policy and will be reviewed and approved by the Secretary of EEA. As part of the MHP, the community specifies allowable supporting DPA uses that preserve and enhance capacity of the DPA to accommodate WDI uses. Allowed uses in the DPA include water dependent industrial(WDI), accessory to WDI, supporting DPA uses, and temporary uses. Some examples of WDI include: marine terminals/facilities for waterborne commerce, passenger vessel facilities, manufacturing facilities relying on goods arriving via water, and commercial fishing/processing facilities. Supporting DPA uses can take up no more than 25% of the jurisdictional area and temporary uses are allowed for a maximum of 10 years.

Engagement

In addition to HPC and Public Meetings the following engagement has occurred throughout the plan: Social Pinpoint, Online Survey, Eight 1-on-1 Zoom Meetings, Federal Street Neighborhood Meeting, Derby Street Neighborhood Meeting/Site Tour, Chamber of Commerce Meeting. In the smaller meetings there was a shared interest in public access, ferry/cruise facilities should be preserved and expanded, parking needs should be considered, there is a strong interest in offshore wind and resilience but there were mixed feelings on residential options.

The “Priorities for the Footprint Property Survey” is live on the website and 418 people have responded with 83% of respondents who live in Salem and 55% of respondents who work in Salem. The focus of this survey is to identify priorities for the reuse of over 40 acres of privately owned land around the new power plant.

Overview of Comparable Ports

A [presentation](#) was put together on eight other harbors and supporting DPA uses and emerging water dependent industrial uses. The presentation is available on the website in the documents section. Some of the examples included the South Boston DPA which focuses on mixed uses, the New Bedford DPA which includes the redevelopment for MassCEC offshore wind facility, the Mystic River DPA in Charlestown that includes traditional and emerging WDI uses, Brayton Point which is a DPA largely outside Chapter 91 jurisdiction, and the East Boston DPA which is focused on mixed uses.

Footprint Site: Presentation from Development Team

The Footprint Development Team presented their ideas around the Footprint site. The team included: Scott, Matthew, Emily, and Peter. The presentation included a site overview which outlined the proximity to downtown and the water, transportation restrictions, and historical references since 1873. The existing conditions overview included the DPA line, property line, FEMA Zone AE and considered the need to mitigate future risk. FXM Associates completed the market analysis which included exploration of offshore wind

and long term jobs that would support the whole industry. The team went over the goals for the site which include: providing resilient development, preserving the working waterfront, an area for marine industrial uses, removing fencing, public access, incorporating art, and allocating land to street parking, affordable housing, and open space. The team broke the site up into use zones which include: parking for supporting DPA use, proposed marine industrial, public access to the jetty, and a mixed use area. Within the uses the team outlined proposed water dependent uses, public access, and mixed use potentials. The presentation included a comparison of land areas from the downtown, a neighborhood and the footprint site. At the end of the presentation the team explained how to meet their goals and included a conceptual plan for the site.

Next Steps

The next scheduled Committee meeting will take place on April 28th and the next public meeting will be March 24th.

Committee Questions

Bill McHugh

Would like to address a few discrepancies pertaining to the offshore wind industry. New Bedford is at capacity if not almost at capacity with what is going through permitting right now. With the new administration there is more gusto for renewable energy and in the next six months I suspect there will be a bonanza on the sites that were designated for offshore wind. The need for other ports in the northeast is very real, I know this from talking to industry experts. The other ports identified in the presentation have navigational challenges including New Bedford and those include navigational challenges. New Bedford was developed for offshore wind but with the storm gate and jetty system that she has she doesn't meet all the requirements that vessels need. The issue is the height and scale, these offshore wind turbines aren't erected on site and don't go out vertically and you won't see a 400ft system, it will be more of a 60 to 80ft piece that will go on to a large ship. It is important to be accurate when we talk about scale and scope.

Scott Silverstein

Thanks, Bill for the accurate information, because the team doesn't have an U.S precedent they used the Danish example. Need to figure out what the demand is for wind. We are using information from the MassCEC presentation

that suggests the need for up to 10 Marshaling Ports in a year and in the presentation, Emily provided there are a dozen that are already in progress. The challenge is figuring out if there is additional demand.

Peter Furniss

It is not as if we haven't been in contact with offshore wind development entities, even in communication with Danish entities but we haven't heard back from companies. My last email with offshore companies was eight years ago, we hear you that there is a demand but we aren't seeing it.

Mira Rigglin

Question about all of the proposed residential, what is the proposed number of units? Trying to get an idea on the scale of the density.

Scott Silverstein

We are working on this. the scale is in terms of the size, we think this should be neighborhood scale. Three to four stories, three when you are up against Derby St. and it needs to fit in with the neighborhood. If we do this right you shouldn't feel like you are going into another place. In terms of unit numbers we hoped to get feedback from the committee and continue to work on it for the meeting next week.

Mira Rigglin

You would obviously want a lot of units because you need to make money, for a return on your investment.

Scott Silverstein

What drives unit numbers is the amount of significant infrastructure needed like, lighting, streetscapes, roads and all of that needs to be built in for the new neighborhood and to pay for that you need to divide it up by the number of units. Want to get feedback before we go into too much detail.

Mayor Driscoll

Scott and Peter, you've done the rounds of discussions with the Harbor Plan Committee and other members of our community, and there's a strong desire to understand what kind of role this site can play and when - can you go a bit deeper on your thoughts on that. Both of you put probably the last coal-fired power plant in Massachusetts, so you do have a window into the world of energy. I'd love to engage in a conversation on that - what kind of opportunities do you see for that, if this site could play a pivotal role in support for that? It's important to the community. We are trying to understand what capabilities exist, what that timeline looks like. I know no one has a crystal ball, even in Salem, but we're kind of at a crossroads where we are trying to

understand what the obvious benefits to this site would be based on what's happening in the world of energy and what the impacts might be associated with that. So, anything more you can say about it would be useful.

Peter Furniss

These conversations have been going on for the last decade. Just to step back - because you gave me the opening Mayor Driscoll, the power plant itself was designed and built with the idea that it would support additional renewable development of all kinds - solar, wind - but particularly wind power. The idea behind the plant was that it would initially displace coal (and obviously, it displaced itself as a coal plant, but then also displacing Brayton Point and other coal facilities as they came offline), and then it would transition into a role of being supportive to wind and other renewable which are intermittent supplies, and so what you need in order to support them is a dispatchable resource (like the gas turbine) that you can bring on very quickly to fill in the generating gaps if the wind fails or the sun goes down. So, that's always been our concept for the plan - that it would serve that role, and that the wind was coming right behind us. We actually thought the first wind facility was going to be Cape Wind and, but for the fact that they put it in the wrong place and in the viewshed of the wrong people's houses, it probably would have been Cape Wind! But, we do see a significant amount coming soon, and Bill you are absolutely right we are on the cusp of a significant amount of wind development happening. It is going to start in the area of the Cape. The wind resource is not significantly different from the wind resource off of Cape Ann, but you are dealing with some shallower depths, and so easier placement of your wind turbines down there. Some of the early parties that we talked to about wind and about using our site as a marshaling facility were Equinor, which used to be Statoil, and they were thinking actually about building floating wind platforms that would be good resources off of Cape Ann, which is deeper than Cape Cod. So, we see a significant amount of wind facilities coming online. We think it is going to be over a number of years - even in Europe it has taken them over two decades, they're maybe into their third or fourth decade, I'm not sure what their timeframe has been off of Denmark, Norway and Great Britain - but certainly this is going to take place over a long period of time, and as I mentioned, the easier places will go first. Vineyard Wind is the most likely to go first, and I can say that the Vineyard Wind folks also knocked on our door. So this is going to happen. We've done the legwork in terms of figuring out if anyone wanted or needed our site, as I said we haven't gotten any takers yet, but we do think there are other development sites that are further along and will be sufficient to support the development, but we do think there is going to be significant long-term needs for the support

function. And, there's one additional function beyond the operation and maintenance, which I've heard described as "a building and a boat" in terms of supporting the O&M requirements, but the other supporting use is actually providing a landing for transmission, and that hasn't gone away for Salem. Again, we haven't been approached by someone who has expressed an interest in this, but we do have a significant substation on the property and we do have significant land that would be available particularly behind the substation on the Derby Street side which would be appropriate for a converter station if it was ever needed, and it would just displace parking at that point. So, we see wind, we see a lot of wind, we see Salem playing a significant role in that wind development. We've had those conversations with people, and I guess the only question is whether the marshalling and construction happens off the site or whether the site is used for all these other ancillary uses, which includes our power plant, the one that we no longer have a significant ownership stake in, but which will continue to play a role in the foreseeable future in supporting that wind development.

Scott Silverstein

It is important to recognize the many ways this site can support offshore wind, and in a lot of ways they are a lot more feasible. In terms of the marshalling yard, which has gotten a lot of airtime in these meetings, in the port authority meetings, in other discussions, there is no question that marshalling is the single biggest use that needs the most space, but you have several things that need to happen. The desire of people for it to be a marshalling yard is necessary but insufficient. You also need a dance partner - you need a wind developer that wants to use it as a marshalling yard, and I would caution folks to be careful when they hear people talking outside of a public meeting or outside of conversations with us say "hey we think this would be great and we know people" - send them our way! As Peter mentioned, we talked to people eight and a half years ago, we talked to people eight and a half weeks ago - they tend to be very preliminary discussions that don't advance, and we get the feeling that we get lots of people who are just kicking the tires. You've seen the names of wind developers who have signed agreements with other ports - all of those folks, those are the ones out there building things and they've already signed agreements with other ports. So, I don't know why they kicked the tires and didn't come back, but they haven't to date. Could they? Ya, it's possible, but again, we're not the experts on offshore wind but CEC had their expert and they presented and their projection was a need over the next 10 years for, on average, 8 ports. And, Bill was right that New Bedford could be at capacity, but wind facilities will get built over a period of time and my expectation that the site would be reused for

the next wind farm, so it's not that once it is used for one project it can't be used for the next one. So, those are the considerations. We'll talk to anybody, but all those things have to come together and the other thing, which I mentioned before, is the funding. For New Bedford, the Commonwealth put in \$130 million dollars. It costs a lot of money to bring a site up to snuff in terms of being able to carry those loads, and for folks that remember the construction of the power plant, the site needed to be reinforced in order to support the loads of the equipment for the power plant, and the contractor drove 18 linear miles of concrete pilings in order to support those loads. Now, those loads are on a relatively small area compared to the roughly 30 acres that are on the south side of this plant, so I'm not an engineer, I have no idea how many miles of concrete piles would be required, but I got to think it is more than 18 and if anyone remembers the noise associated with those piles. Basically, there's a lot of work that would need to go into it, it would need a commitment from the Commonwealth and/or the federal government and in a lot of ways, that's a decision the Commonwealth is going to have to make at some point - what do they want to prioritize and what are they able to give in this economy.

Peter Furniss

One thing I would add, that has been concerning us, is the amount of uncertainty associated with the marshalling yard direction and the fact that it will require so much investment, and we haven't seen the demand materialize at this point. And so, one of the real advantages of the approach that we've suggested today is that it is something that, once we get the regulatory sign-off, we could put together very quickly, we could get people out to the water, we could get the marine industrial uses in place in the northern part of the site - these are things that could happen in human scale rather than over decades. We think that that level of certainty is something that would be beneficial to Salem, particularly given the uncertainty Salem has had for the last decade around the site.

Councilman Bob McCarthy

Yes, I do remember the pile driving, the construction vehicles, the tractor trailer trucks stuck on English Street. That being said, I'm not going to try to debate the uses right now - I think that is a decision we are all going to have to come to - but as a follow up to Mira's question, going from your depiction, my concern is, once you determine the number of units, your depiction shows egress in and out of the site as India Street - is that correct?

Scott Silverstein

It shows India Street as the access because that's what is there now. First of all, India Street goes the wrong way, so I

don't think that's what we would propose. It's shown on the schematic because India Street juts into the site, so it is just there because of existing conditions.

Councilman Bob McCarthy

Ok, because obviously if the determination through the whole process with neighborhood input on whatever conceptual plans you may come up with is that we want to switch this part of the DPA towards housing rather than water-dependent industrial uses - and I'm not sure that's the case, but just for the sake of argument - your depiction shows everyone coming into the site on India Street and obviously that's not going to work, so I think having that depiction on any kind of presentation is just going to be problematic. Maybe it's more of an in/out closer to Blaney Street somehow - slip people in and slip people out heading towards Webb Street - as opposed to everyone coming in and out on India Street. Conceptually, showing just that one access point is going to give concern to people living right there that you are going to create a bottleneck. And, it's kind of become a defacto parking area for the neighbors since the gate was closed.

Scott Silverstein

We will take a look at that, you're absolutely right, so if that's the way it's coming across, we'll take another look at that. Again, we were trying to be sensitive and depict what actually exists right now, but our intent is not to bring everyone in and out on India Street.

Councilman Bob McCarthy

This is going to be a long process, with a lot of feedback, so I would encourage everyone on this Zoom call to share the link to the survey and get more input so that we can make these decisions based on input from everybody - I think that is important.

Peter Furniss

Absolutely, we agree.

Rinus Oosthoek

The choice you've made as a possibility for this certain portion of the site is something that is definitely achievable, but it is also the most difficult based on the regulatory concept, and we've learned over the last six months that it requires the most work and is the most difficult thing to do. So, I'm curious how you want to address that. The second thing is everyone is looking at the amount of uncertainty - is that not the reason why CZM is saying we have to wait and see before we decide anything about the DPA?

Scott Silverstein

Rinus you're absolutely right in terms of the degree of difficulty from a regulatory perspective. The way we look at the world has always been is to try to sit down with people who are committed, who have the best intentions and want to get to the best spot, and put our heads together to figure out the right place to land - the place we all want to wind up - maybe not where everyone individually would wind up if they could drive, but where we are all comfortable together. If we can do that, and do it in a collaborative way, we can all work together to get there from a regulatory perspective. Easier said than done because there are very specific requirements in terms of how the boundary reviews are done, and Kathryn is obviously the expert on that so I don't want to step on her toes, but as a practical matter it seems to us that it is pretty clear that the line around this DPA was drawn when DPAs first came in, and it was drawn around the border of the plant for a very simple reason - you didn't have to think about getting any more granular than that because it was all one 65 acre site. It was actually a bit bigger then because Blaney Street was actually a part of the plant before Dominion sold it to the City, so that's why it sort of juts out onto the Blaney Street wharf area. So, there was never a need to figure out exactly what should and shouldn't be in the DPA. This seems like the first time that we as a community can look at it and say, well where should this line be drawn. Again, I realize, easier said than done, because there is a whole regulatory process to go through to get that done, but if you look at the kinds of things that were in the presentation earlier and you know, the one that jumped out to me was the need for landside transportation. And, again, not telling anyone on this Zoom something you don't already know, but while the site has terrific waterside transportation, the landside transportation to Rt 128 and I-95, is challenging - which might be the understatement of the year. And, no matter how much we all want to say, well, don't worry about that everything will come and go by water, which is the way we designed the construction of the plant, that's a great theory but in practice, we learned that it doesn't always work that way. If you've got a supplier that is inland and that can't get to the water to bring it back to the plant, things wind up having to come by road. So, you've got to have the ability to do that, particularly with a heavy infrastructure use, you need the ability for large trucks to be able to make their way there. We just don't see that, but this is a conversation that we need to have. We've been working with the City and with the CZM and DEP and they've been very constructive conversations and they're hard conversations, because like everything else on this site, this site doesn't neatly fit within any framework - we've all seen that over the years. Once we figure out what the consensus is, we're committed to sit down with the agencies of the Commonwealth and the City and figure out the right way to get to the right spot. But,

you're right - is it easy? no, but if it was easy it wouldn't be fun and you guys wouldn't all be here, right?

Peter Furniss

We'd love an easy one, though, Rinus, though - if you have any easy ones for us.

Rinus Oosthoek

No, unfortunately not. but, if any of the wind energy people are listening, they need to knock now. That's my understanding. and if they don't, that might be a problem.

Pat Gozemba

When will the final draft of the MassCEC report on the ports north of Boston be available?

Seth Latrell

I don't have a specific date for the final. My understanding was that they would be publishing a draft report sometime this month. That was an update that I received a little over a month ago, so that may have changed, but the final draft was to be determined. But, I'll make sure that we have links to that MassCEC report on our Port Authority website once they're released, just because the Port Authority has been leading those discussions. And I will notify the committee as well.

Pat Gozemba

And I have a follow-up, this is for Scott and Peter: according to what Kathryn Glenn presented to us, only 25% of what is happening on the site can be non-water dependent uses. How much area is the residential proposal that you have shown us today going to take up? And, will that precipitate a change or modification of our DPA?

Scott Silverstein

To take them in reverse order, and Kathryn is the expert in DPA so I hope I'm not getting this wrong but I think I'm in enough meetings that I'm getting this right: what we presented here is what could happen, and what we think addresses the needs and wants we have heard, not only from the members of this committee but also the broader community as we've talked to folks, and we'll continue to have those discussions. It's not what can happen right now, because even the 25% supporting uses, housing wouldn't be one of those so I don't think the mixed-use portion of what we've presented can work unless there are changes in the DPA boundaries and/or regulations. The conversation that we think we need to have, all of us, is where should the line be drawn. We think this site should be in the DPA, but not all of it needs to be in the DPA since the only reason the boundary was drawn where it was is because that's where

the site boundary was at the time. In order for the plan we've presented to provide the benefits we've talked about, the line would need to be redrawn one way or another - presumably through the regulatory process. Once that happens the area outside the DPA would go into the normal Salem planning structures and would no longer be subject to the 25% supporting use clause. That doesn't mean that if the DPA boundary is changed, we press go and we start construction right away, that just allows the City to take over and go through the normal Salem planning process - the Planning Board, Con Com, DPA, City Council, and I'm sure I'm missing a board that has jurisdiction - it just kicks off that normal process that we're all used to, and there will be significant public input, and hopefully, again, we all put our heads together and get to the right spot. That can't happen currently because under the DPA regulations, the only choice is water dependent industrial use, with those carve-outs that Kathryn discussed for supporting uses and temporary uses. What we're seeing though, based on the economic data that Emily shared, is that there isn't a need in the market for water-dependent industrial uses - again, leaving aside warehousing and storage, which is one of the few things I think we can get consensus on in Salem - that people probably don't want a giant warehouse with trucks going in and out all day long on that site. So, when you take out the warehousing and storage option, regionally over 12 years there are 1.9 acres needed. Statewide over those same 12 years, the number is 23.7 or 23.9. That wasn't every year, that was over the full 12 years. So, there's just not a need and the types of marine industrial uses that we're seeing out there - and we have talked to many folks - they tend to be the smaller one acre, two acre sites, if you've got three acres that's a big one. So, putting those together, we think that we can put a good mix of uses up on that north side, which is roughly 13 acres when you include the parking that will be marine industrial and could include a load-in facility for offshore wind. We don't see a way to build out the south side with compliant uses because we just don't see a market there. Would a wind marshalling yard change the equation? Yes, simply because they would need all of the site in order for it to be feasible - so that would change things completely. But, again, as Peter said, not for lack of effort and not because we're not answering the phone - we've talked to folks and nobody has been interested yet. If that were to change, that would change things, but I do think that it would require a significant commitment on the Commonwealth side in terms of the infrastructure investment required.

Pat Gozemba

I just wanted to add one thing that as you showed the other ports on the Eastern Seaboard, that in fact a lot of the

support for shoring up the port infrastructure, for making it acceptable to offshore wind has been done by the developers themselves and the wind developers I'm talking about. So, you know, that is still an option for us. I think about the fact that you build or anybody builds housing on that site. It's going to be there for a minimum of 50 years. There's no question that an industry like offshore wind will not be there for 50 years. Probably operations and management or maintenance might be there. But let's say marshalling, the building out at sea, that will disappear for sure, probably within 20 years. But I don't know. So we're talking a lot about the future. You're telling us that nobody's coming to you who's serious about wanting to do offshore wind? I guess that means that those of us who are supporting offshore wind have to go out there and beat the bushes and get those folks to come to your doorstep. It sort of reminds me, that was the game plan when we were trying to get rid of the coal power plant, bringing potential developers there. So we've got a game plan. If the time is right, the moment is, as others have said, seems to be right for offshore wind right now. But again, none of us is clairvoyant and we're watching what develops very, very carefully. Thank you.

Seth Latrell

I do just want to address one question that came through the chat that was related to your response. It asked about what the other regulatory processes were that were referred to modify the DPA. And that's something that we have talked about with the committee in the past and that there are two avenues for that. One is through a CZM DPA boundary review, which is an administrative review, and then the other is through a legislative change.

Bill McHugh

One thing I mean, my last comments and I appreciate Scott and Peter trying to clarify. My last comments were relative to keeping everything in perspective and the way technology is changing, just like when you were building the power station. I think the first design, by the time you guys got through the first design, the BMS technology changed drastically and you ended up employing even a cleaner technology for the burner management system. So with regard to operation and maintenance, I think we all got to keep focus, these turbine blades are six hundred feet in length. Each one of them are to be three hundred feet in length, each one of them in most cases. And part of the operation and maintenance isn't just an acre or two anymore. That's one thing we've got to be thinking about is because with these projects, as they get older and they start storing scantlings for repair, one of the real issues is,

is ports with the right navigation characteristics, which Schnabel does have. And a lot of the other ones do not, including riverways with swift currents, tight bulkheads at breakwaters. One of the nearest ports that fits the criteria, Salem, is, believe it or not, closer to the mid Atlantic. So I just want to say that I appreciate the comments, but I think we've got to keep up with the current technology where it is with renewable energy. And I think there is an opportunity, but I think it is more than just an acre to throw it out just as a point of reference. Thanks.

Paul DePrey

Just curious, Scott, you were talking about the north... And in the other types of non wind related.... I think Emily had was about vessels and research and that sort of thing, and so what kind of other options might be possible for that space? This is the north section that you're in.

Scott Silverstein

And you did come in and out a little bit, but I think I got most of the question. So jump in if I don't pick up everything, let me know. The types of uses that we're hearing from folks that we've been talking to on the north side tend to be smaller scale, but more traditional marine uses such as small boat building, boat repair, boat storage, those kinds of things, and potential seafood. Although, as Emily pointed out, that hasn't been a growth area in the market. There are certainly some companies that might be interested, but they tend to be smaller, smaller uses that all complement each other. But that takes, you know, three, four or five different uses to piece together in order to fill out even that north side, which is obviously significantly smaller than the south side. We don't have a specific tenant, but those are the kinds of folks that have expressed interest in that area, I think most likely those types of leases are most likely over there. There is certainly R&D out there. There are educational institutions out there that might be interested in piecing together with some of these other uses. But it's going to take some time to put all of those various components together, to fill out even just the north side, I think.

Peter Furniss

And this also responds to the John Hayes question that came up on the Q&A there. We have been in contact with President Keenan at Salem State and are eager to have Salem state involved in this development, if that's at all possible. So that is certainly something that we think would be a great addition to the northern part of the site.

Seth Latrell

And Peter, just for the folks that can't see the Q&A questions come through, I just want to read that. There was a comment from John Hayes earlier in a question that Selma State is making a budgetary decision to close Cat Cove lab as of August 31st of this year. Is there any chance that renovating Cat Cove could be part of this harbor planning? And Cat Cove does provide important research for aquaculture, both for coastal waters and deeper waters. So just building upon Peter's response, that can certainly be part of some of the ongoing discussions of this Harbor Planning effort.

Peter Furniss

Yeah, and I don't think anyone disagrees that the aquaculture work that Salem State is doing is critically important. And I'm actually assured by President Keenan that it will continue even with the closure of Cat Cove, but it would be better, we think, if it was done on our site.

Mayor Driscoll

I think it's more of a comment. I think the reason we were excited about the opportunity to have a Municipal Harbor Planning process was not so that we would have to look at this exactly through the lens of what was currently on the ground and really wanted to give our community an opportunity to fully engage with what we wanted to see on the site, what those opportunities might be, what those challenges might be. The site we know has been fenced off and unused by really anybody from the public since it was constructed in nineteen fifty. And rather than just saying this is a DPA, we can only do what's allowed in a DPA. This is a lens we need to look at this from. We really wanted to approach this as what do we want to see on this. That doesn't mean we're throwing the DPA out and it doesn't mean that anything that's in the DPA is bad. It just means that the full flavor and opportunity of this site shouldn't have to fit through whatever alphabet soup currently exists. We wanted to give us as a community an opportunity to think what's the next generation of Salemites? How are they going to benefit from this site? What are the opportunities that we really want to make sure we carve out here? We've talked about a lot of them and there's certainly, I would say, alignment around public access and walkways and wanting to make sure we access that pier and have it, whether it's for coal ships or wind. It is an asset that we want to see used. How the rest of the pieces all get used, I think, is like the devil's in the details, so to speak, and where the rubber hits the road. That's, I think, what we need to really marinate on and understand that we don't own it. We do

certainly have a lot of opportunities to shape this property. We want to get it right. We don't want to be looking ten years from now and see something that, ugh, looked at it and think we missed it. Nor do we want to be looking at this site ten years from now and have it look exactly the way it does now. That's not a goal either. So I hope people understand the spirit of what we're coming to this site as an opportunity for our community to think about this site and both for today and for tomorrow. And I appreciate the work that Scott and Peter and their team have done, sort of trying to approach this and the values that we have as a community trying to come through there. And I think more conversations, opportunities for us to fine tune our thinking as a Municipal Harbor Plan group will be important. And I think opportunities for the developer and the owner of the site, the real estate owner, the real estate owners, to say, OK, what are we hearing from the community and how do we match that up? Achieving the ultimate win, win win, even when things are not easy, I think is the goal overall. And I believe we can achieve that. We always do good things in Salem. We shoot big and we normally achieve it. And that's my hope for this approach as well. So I just wanted to share some of the thinking from a broader perspective that the details we need to get to. But the ideas are still ones that I think there's a lot of alignment on for sure.

Pat Gozemba

OK, my comment is this one, as we think about the future and particularly the future of this site, I think we should also factor into our thinking, the reality that the power plant that is currently on the site is slated to be decommissioned in 2050. That was signed into the year, into the agreement that that power plant is there. So we should think about the site. Let's not all get blindsided to the reality that that site in the future of young people living in Salem will be drastically changed by the decommissioning of that power plant. The other point that I wanted to make is that we've heard from Scott and Peter and from Emily comments about the potential for offshore wind, offshore wind industry using that particular site. I would love to have Mass CEC listen to this report that we heard today, particularly expressions of Peter and Scott about nobody really being seriously interested in this site, and I'd like to hear what Mass CEC thinks about that as well, because we're hearing from Footprint is one thing, there's really no big need for more land for this kind of water dependent industrial use. And we're hearing from MassCEC that there is a real need for more offshore wind ports. So two points. One, let's think big. Let's think about when the power plant is not there in 2050. And let's think about the future in terms of offshore wind, hear what Mass

CEC says, because as we know, they're doing another draft of the report. Thanks.

Peter Furniss

I would just say that we'd obviously welcome that, having that conversation with CEC and, yeah, I mean, we've also been struck, as you clearly have, by the disconnect between the market as we're seeing it and the market as CEC seems to have described it.

This memorandum represents our understanding of the events which transpired and the actions which were taken. If they do not conform to a recipient's understanding, prompt written notice must be communicated to the writer. If no corrections or objections are made, this memorandum will be relied upon as a factual interpretation of this meeting.