

New York State Maritime Technical Working Group (M-TWG)
Meeting Summary
October 25, 2022

Next Steps

- **M-TWG members**
 - a. Be on the lookout for a save the date for an early 2023 M-TWG in-person cabling workshop
 - b. Provide feedback on the Master Plan 2.0 discussion questions via [Jamboard](#) by **11/04/2022:**
 - i. Any thoughts or recommendations on the proposed study area boundary?
 - ii. Are there new or different maritime issues to consider when siting or designing deep-water offshore wind projects?
 - iii. Are there specific studies you recommend in Master Plan 2.0 (either new studies or studies from the first master plan that warrant revisiting) and why?
 - iv. How would you like to be involved in the master planning process (e.g. reviewing certain portions or assessments or studies)?
 - c. Provide feedback on the Loss of Propulsion Study once received
- **Planning Team**
 - a. Plan M-TWG cabling workshop (date TBD in early 2023)
- **DOS / NYSERDA**
 - a. Work on venue and save the date for the cabling workshop in early 2023

Meeting Purpose

To discuss NYS's Master Plan 2.0, to share findings of the Anchorage Area Assessment Study and an update on the Loss of Propulsion Study, to share more about the upcoming offshore wind cabling workshop.

Summary

M-TWG Business

Laura McLean (NY DOS) kicked off the meeting and welcomed the new M-TWG members, many of which are offshore wind developers that secured lease areas in the recent BOEM Auction for the NY Bight. An M-TWG discussion of the Ports Study originally scheduled for Summer 2022 will be rescheduled in 2023. The M-TWG will be hosting an in-person full day workshop in early 2023 to explore maritime perspectives on offshore wind cabling in state waters., Be on the lookout for a save the date related to this event. COWI's technical support contract is expiring next year, and a new RFP for technical support will be released. Lastly, work is underway on an M-TWG website.

New York State Offshore Wind Master Plan 2.0

Sherryll Huber, NYSERDA, and Cindy Shurling, VHB, presented the process of developing the State's Master Plan 2.0 for offshore wind considerations in deeper waters. Sherryll and Cindy summarized current State goals, considerations for expanding the offshore wind targets, work conducted for Master Plan 1.0, and potential studies to be conducted for Master Plan 2.0.

This presentation was recorded for members of the M-TWG and other technical working group members' access.

- [Zoom Recording Link](#)
- Password: nbuvzr\$2

A few key points from the presentation:

- Governor Hochul announced the Master Plan 2.0 initiative in January 2022. Technology has advanced, enabling some deeper water applications of fixed foundation. New York may increase its offshore wind capacity goals beyond its current 9 GW goal.
- The Master Plan 2.0 Blueprint will be published in the coming months. The Blueprint will describe the state's approach to continued offshore wind development. Studies for deeper water have already begun, and many more will begin in 2023 and be coordinated with the TWGs. The State plans to petition BOEM for deep water lease areas.
- Master Plan 2.0 study area is broken into 3 geographic zones, delineated by distance to shore with Zone 1 being the closest. Zone 3 spans from the end of the continental shelf break to the end of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone.
- Master Plan 2.0 will build on existing studies and fill existing research gaps. Master Plan 2.0 will include a focus on environmental justice, workforce development, technology, ports and supply chain, environmental concerns, fishing, and maritime activities.

M-TWG members shared their perspectives on Master Plan 2.0 in response to the following prompts:

1. Do you have thoughts or recommendations on **the proposed study area boundary**?
 2. Are there new or **different maritime issues** to consider when siting or designing deep-water OSW projects?
 3. Are there **specific studies** you recommend in Master Plan 2.0 (either new studies or studies from the first master plan that warrant revisiting) and why?
 4. **How would you like to be involved** in the master plan process? e.g., reviewing certain portions, assessments, or studies
- An interactive Jamboard was utilized in the meeting to gather real-time feedback from attendees during the call via: [M-TWG Oct 2022 Meeting - Google Jamboard](#)
 - The Jamboard results from the Meeting are attached as an Appendix to this Meeting Summary. The Jamboard link will remain open for M-TWG member feedback through 11/04/2022.
 - M-TWG members expressed concern about cable routes and the number of cables, especially given the number of proposals for new uses in and beyond the harbor.

- Another member noted that National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) and the Department of Energy are conducting a 2-year Atlantic offshore wind transmission study that will evaluate different transmission typologies like a backbone or offshore grid. The study is expected to wrap up with recommendations and findings next year. After it is complete, it will be up to the federal government and state agencies with jurisdiction to advance those findings.

New York State Waters Anchorage Area Assessment

Nancy Zhou, COWI, provided an overview of findings from the Anchorage Area Assessment that COWI recently completed. The goal of the assessment was to identify areas in New York State waters commonly used by vessels as anchorages. Identified areas of interest included Bear Mountain / Jones Point, Upper New York Bay, Great Neck / Western Long Island Sound, Upper New York Bay, Staten Island / Raritan Bay, and Sag Harbor Bay. The highest occupancy Common Practice Anchorage Areas and Designated Anchorage Areas were in Sag Harbor Bay and Upper New York Bay, respectively.

M-TWG members asked a few questions and provided some comments:

- *Were non-designated anchorage areas captured? One of the largest current anchorage areas has not yet been designated by the Coast Guard and lies just outside the 3-mile state water limit. It runs from Long Beach to east Fire Island, a 50-mile stretch.* Sabine responded that the AIS dataset was for NYS waters and did not extend that far offshore. DOS added that the anchorage area is part of a separate study and designation process being undertaken by the Coast Guard.
- *How was restrictive visibility factored in? For example, when there's a northeaster and 60 vessels would be sheltering in an anchorage area?* Sabine responded that restrictive visibility situations were not factored into the analysis of 2017 data because no major storms were recorded in New York that year. There were 5 non-major and 3 minor storms to impact NY. The report was updated to acknowledge that these factors influence anchorage area use.

COWI Loss of Propulsion and Steering Study

Georges Valcour, COWI, provided an update on the Loss of Propulsion and Steering Study that his team has been conducting. A draft report will be shared with the M-TWG in the next few weeks. M-TWG members will be invited to share comments during a 2-week comment period, then the COWI team will incorporate comments into the final study. The purpose of the study is to identify and assess the occurrence and frequency of loss of propulsion and loss of steerage events, and emergency maneuvers, within the approaches of the New York and New Jersey Harbor. The area of study encompassed multiple shipping lanes approaching New York and New Jersey Harbor and the closest planned offshore wind project in Lease Area OCS-A 0512 of Empire Offshore Wind.

Based on the datasets reviewed, loss of propulsion and loss of steerage incidents occur infrequently and there was no correlation to a specific location or common causation. Groundings were clustered near anchorage areas at West Long Beach and near the Narrows and Sandy Hook. No U-turns were identified in the analysis of 2017 Automatic Identification Systems (AIS) data.

M-TWG members shared their perspectives on the study:

- *One member noted that the study area was not practical and should be extended further offshore. This study included only a portion of a single offshore wind lease area. Sabine responded that the study area was limited by the data they had access to. Laura confirmed the M-TWG is using an AIS model developed as part of NYSERDA's ports navigation study, which provided efficiencies for this study.*
- *Was an error rate factored in for vessel incident reporting?* Sabine answered that it was not, but it could be helpful information to incorporate, and she welcomes feedback on that.

Member Updates

M-TWG members shared the following updates:

- John Stone provided an update on the Fairways Rulemaking and that it is underway. The Coast Guard recently published Port Access Route Studies (PARS). Once the notice of proposed rulemaking for the Fairways Rulemaking is released, they will welcome comments in a comment period.
- Rick Robins (RWE and Community Offshore Wind) introduced himself and noted that Community Offshore Wind's fisheries communication plan has been posted on their website communityoffshorewind.com/fisheries.
- Brian LeFebvre (Attentive Energy) introduced himself and noted that Attentive Energy's lease area is the northernmost in Hudson South. He appreciates the dialogue at this meeting and opportunity to engage with stakeholders on the front-end.
- EJ Marohn (Equinor) introduced himself. He is Julia Lewis' alternate.
- Laura McLean said that the NY Harbor and NJ tributary study may be of interest to M-TWG members. There is currently a public meeting process and comment period it: [NY & NJ Harbor & Tributaries Focus Area Feasibility Study \(HATS\) \(army.mil\)](https://www.army.mil/ny-nj-harbor-tributaries-focus-area-feasibility-study)
 - Andrew McGovern echoed Laura's mention of the study and shared that the Army Corps of Engineers came to a Harbor Ops meeting a couple of years ago related to the study. The study is massive with lots of infrastructure potential. Andrew highlighted the significant potential available funding should another superstorm make landfall. One portion of the study includes the investigation of a seawall from NJ to NY. Another includes a seawall across the Narrows.
- Lauren Sidor (NYSDEC) noted that the DEC is currently involved in Article VII reviews for multiple offshore wind projects.

Meeting Participants

Adam	Tate	Invenergy
Andrew	McGovern	Harbor Operations Committee Port of NY
Anne-Marie	Mcshea	Ocean Winds
Brent D.	Cooper	COWI
Brian	LeFebvre	Attentive Energy
Chris	Sparkman	USCG
Chuck	Darrell	NY Shipping Association
Cindy	Shurling	VHB
Collyn	Chan	NYCEDC
Edward	Galvin	Cadmus
EJ	Marohn	Equinor
Eric	Johansson	Maritime College/Harbor Operations Committee Port of NY
Esther	Siskind	Bluepoint Wind
Fred	Zalcman	NYOWA
Georges	Valcour	COWI
Greg	Hitchen	USCG
Ian	Corcoran	Hudson River Pilots
John	Singletery	USCG
John	Stone	USCG
Julia	Lewis	Equinor
Laura	McLean	NYSDOS
Lauren	Sidor	NYSDEC
Maria	Grønnegaard	COWI
Max	Taffet	NYCEDC
Michele	Desautels	USCG
Nancy	Zhou	COWI
Ona	Ferguson	CBI
Rick	Robins	Bight Wind Holdings
Sabine	Wilkie	COWI
Sherryll	Huber	NYSERDA
Thomas	Morkan	MARAD

1: Any thoughts or recommendations on the proposed study area boundary?

For Master Plan 1.0, NYSERDA did a tremendous amount of analysis in defining proposed Area of Interest on the theory that this would enable time savings and obviate the need for

(cont'd) BOEM to do similar analysis. BOEM wound up virtually replicating the work, resulting in duplication of effort and time delays. What lessons can be learned from this?

I'm more comfortable with a study area containing the entire Atlantic Coast. Unfortunately, issues don't stop at user imposed boundaries.

If a holistic spatial planning process is undertaken early in the siting process, suggest looking more broadly than 60+ meter contours

2: Are there new or different maritime issues to consider when siting or designing deep-water offshore wind projects?

Floating wind projects require significantly different port and vessel requirements than fixed bottom projects.

There will be different commercial fishing interests in this area than the ones we are currently working with now.

Mooring lines required for floating structures may impact stakeholders differently than fixed bottom foundations do.

The concern of situational awareness among ships' crews further offshore.

we need to keep potential interaction between commercial shipping and wind turbines a minimum, my goal would be zero

with the shift of containerized goods to East Coast, we now have 10+ container ships off the coast of NY waiting a few days to get into port. A few years ago that # was zero.

Distances to offshore lease areas will lead to SOVs being employed as wind farm service vessels (larger ships, ~300' long) as opposed to smaller CTVs.

Need to pay attention to any current or proposed marine sanctuaries (the canyons and seamounts)

Pending feasibility of fixed bottom foundations at projected depths, it's important to assess port and harbor impacts as all components are likely to be larger.

development of safety fairways BEFORE any development

Feasibility of the downstream environmental impact processes, especially in the zones with special ecosystems, etc.

Want single cables or routes to minimize maritime disruption

3. Are there specific studies you recommend in Master Plan 2.0 (either new studies or studies from the first master plan that warrant revisiting) and why?

Local port and marine navigation requirements to install deep water (floating) OSW projects.

Same for port and marine navigation.

NOAA's National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS) conducted an integrative analysis to support siting in Gulf of Mexico. MP 2.0 process could benefit from front-loading such an analysis in the process.

Study the feasibility of offshore cable corridors/routes.

Syncing with the transmission feasibility assessments needed

2nd the note on transmission and interconnection. More lease areas equals more cables along more routes. Can be managed but should be done in full context.

4. How would you like to be involved in the master plan process? (e.g. reviewing certain portions, assessments or studies)

**Reviewing
port
assessments.**

Interested in thinking about ways NYC from a port and academic/R+D perspective can be involved in innovation and industry needs related to floating OSW.

Critical to keep industry at the table, thank you for seeking our input. The more communication up front the better off all stakeholders will be as 2.0 progresses from concept to reality.

And to be clear, industry touches on all aspects of these projects (stating the obvious) and is interested in mitigating impacts (environment, navigation safety, etc).