Massachusetts – Nova Scotia Offshore Wind
Request for Information (RFI)

Offshore Wind Generation off Nova Scotia and Delivery to New England Grid

Issued jointly by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Province of Nova Scotia

RFI Issue Date: November 12, 2026

Responses Requested by: December 31, 2026, 5:00 PM EST / 6:00 PM AST

Dear Offshore Wind and Transmission Market Stakeholder,

The Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs ("EEA"),the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources ("DOER"), and the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center ("MassCEC") (the "Massachusetts Parties"), together with the Nova Scotia Department of Energy ("NSDOE") are jointly issuing this Request for Information ("RFI") to **gather stakeholder input on the potential development of offshore wind generation resources in the Canada-Nova Scotia offshore area and the delivery of that generation to the New England grid.** The states of Connecticut, Maine, Rhode Island, and Vermont (the "Participating States") are also coordinating with the Massachusetts Parties and NSDOE on the issuance of this RFI.

This RFI is issued pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding on Offshore Wind Collaboration between Massachusetts and Nova Scotia (the "MOU"), which establishes a three-year framework for the two jurisdictions to collaborate on offshore wind development, workforce and supply chain coordination, and regulatory information-sharing. This RFI represents an early, concrete step under that MOU and is intended to inform both (i) NSDOE's efforts to establish a competitive offshore wind sector, and (ii) Massachusetts' ongoing and future electric sector planning and procurement processes. Importantly, this RFI also complements a broader effort to strengthen regional collaboration on energy among New England states and Eastern Canadian provinces, including through the Northeast International Committee on Energy.

All interested parties — including offshore wind developers, transmission developers, supply chain and port entities, utilities and system operators, labor organizations, academic and research institutions, environmental and fisheries stakeholders, First Nations and Indigenous communities, and other interested parties — are invited to respond to this RFI. Respondents are not required to answer every question and are encouraged to focus on the questions most relevant to their expertise and perspective.

Written comments should be submitted to austin.w.dawson@mass.gov and OffshoreWindSubmission@novascotia.ca by December 31, 2026, at 5:00 PM EST / 6:00 PM AST. Please see Section III below for complete submission instructions.

Thank you for your participation in this important initiative. We look forward to your input.

Sincerely,

Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources
Massachusetts Clean Energy Center
Nova Scotia Department of Energy

I. Introduction and Purpose

Massachusetts and Nova Scotia share a mutual interest in advancing offshore wind as a source of large-scale, reliable, low-carbon electricity generation. Load growth and decarbonization mandates are driving the need for additional generation capacity in New England, with particular need during winter peak periods. Offshore wind, which generates electricity at no marginal cost and has high wintertime production, is ideally suited to help meet this need, and is seen as critical for ensuring long-term reliable and affordable power supply in the region. To this end, Massachusetts established procurements for offshore wind under Section 83C of Chapter 169 of the Acts of 2008, as amended ("Section 83C"), and continues to evaluate both existing domestic offshore wind options as well as new sources including generation located outside of U.S. federal waters off the North American Atlantic coast. Nova Scotia possesses substantial offshore wind resource potential, and the Canada-Nova Scotia Offshore Energy Regulator ("CNSOER") is preparing to conduct a Call for Bids process for submerged land licenses in Nova Scotia waters.

The purpose of this RFI is to collect information that will help the Massachusetts Parties and the NSDOE (together, the "Parties") better understand:

1. The market's interest in, and capacity to develop, offshore wind generation off the coast of Nova Scotia;
2. The range of technically and commercially viable options for delivering that generation to Massachusetts and other New England load centers, including but not limited to: (a) a new subsea high-voltage direct current ("HVDC") cable delivering directly to a point of interconnection in New England and (b) power wheeled through Québec and/or New Brunswick delivering to a point of interconnection in New England via existing, upgraded, or new transmission infrastructure;
3. The regulatory, permitting, and interstate/interprovincial/international coordination issues that each delivery option would raise, and how those issues might best be addressed; and
4. The supply chain, workforce, and research and development opportunities — including opportunities for businesses, universities, and training institutions in multiple jurisdictions — that could arise from this potential development.

This RFI is deliberately organized to focus separately on questions related to offshore wind generation development ("Generation"), and delivery to the New England grid ("Delivery/Transmission"). The Parties recognize that generation and delivery may ultimately be procured, developed, financed, and regulated either jointly or independently; as such, the Parties are interested in receiving distinct feedback on each component at this stage. Respondents with a perspective on only one component are encouraged to respond only to the relevant sections.

Importantly, this RFI is intended for information gathering purposes only, with a goal of gathering additional information about the potential development of offshore wind off the coast of Nova Scotia, and the delivery of some of this energy to New England markets. Both regions view this as a potential opportunity to leverage and expand upon the learning and development of the offshore wind industry and supply chain already established in New England and Atlantic Canada.

II. Background

Substantial technical and economic modeling relevant to this potential development has already been conducted or is underway, including modeling related to New England's transmission needs, interregional transmission planning, and offshore wind integration more broadly. This RFI is intended to complement, and not duplicate, that work, and respondents are encouraged to reference relevant public studies (including ISO New England studies, Net Zero Atlantic studies related to offshore wind and transmission, and other

regional planning studies) where helpful. Section VII. Relevant Studies, Reports, and Research includes a non-exhaustive list of such work. Respondents are encouraged to identify additional studies, analyses, data sources, or other evidence that they believe would inform consideration of these issues.

This RFI does not commit either Party, or any agency, office, or instrumentality thereof, to any particular course of action, to the issuance of any future procurement or Call for Bids, or to any specific delivery or development model. Nothing in this RFI should be construed as a request for proposals, an offer, or a commitment to procure any goods or services, or to reimburse any respondent for costs incurred in responding.

III. Responding to this RFI

Responses should be submitted electronically, in Word or PDF format, to austin.w.dawson@mass.gov and OffshoreWindSubmission@novascotia.ca with the subject line “MA-NS Offshore Wind RFI Response” no later than December 31, 2026, at 5:00 PM EST / 6:00 PM AST. Responses will be shared directly with the Participating States.

Responses should be concise, should address only the question(s) relevant to the respondent's interest or expertise, and should not exceed 15 pages in length (exclusive of attachments and supporting studies). Each response should include:

- The respondent's name, organization, title, and primary contact information;
- A brief description of the respondent's organization and relevant experience;
- The RFI question number(s) to which the response corresponds; and
- An indication of whether the respondent is responding to the Generation questions (Section V), the Delivery/Transmission questions (Section VI), or both.

Response Content: The Parties strongly encourage honest responses and feedback to all questions to inform understanding of this development opportunity. As an example, if based on a respondent's experience, respondent feels a given delivery pathway is unfeasible or unlikely to be cost competitive, please share that feedback along with any justification the respondent can share. The goal of this RFI is to gather useful information that can inform future actions and ongoing collaboration between the parties; to that end, honest and transparent responses will best advance that discussion.

Confidentiality: Respondents should note that in Nova Scotia, information collected by the Provincial government and its agencies is subject to the Government Records Act (SNS 1995-96 c. 7) and the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (SNS 1993 c. 5). In Massachusetts, information collected by the Massachusetts Parties is subject to Public Records Law (M.G.L. c. 66, § 10 and c. 4, § 7(26)), and energy information collected by DOER (M.G.L. c. 25A, § 7). Respondents acknowledge that the Massachusetts Parties are public entities subject to the Massachusetts’ Public Records Law codified at M.G.L. c. 66, and that any such documentary material, data, or other information submitted to the Massachusetts’ Parties is a public record and may be subject to disclosure. Respondents may identify proprietary, commercially sensitive, or otherwise confidential information in their submissions. Any information for which confidential treatment is requested should be clearly marked "CONFIDENTIAL" and accompanied by a brief explanation of the basis for that request, including any applicable exemption under the Massachusetts Public Records Law or Nova Scotia's Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. The Parties will consider all requests for confidential treatment in accordance with applicable law. However, respondents should be aware that neither Party can guarantee that information submitted in response to this RFI will be exempt from disclosure. In the event confidential information is submitted to the Parties and confidential treatment

is not afforded for any reason, by a governmental agency or otherwise, the Parties shall not be held responsible. Information submitted in response to this RFI, including information identified as confidential, may be shared on a confidential basis with the other Party, Participating States, relevant government agencies, regulators, system operators, and technical or professional advisors for the purposes of evaluating responses and informing future policy, planning, regulatory, or procurement activities. Where practical, respondents are encouraged to provide both a complete confidential version and a redacted version suitable for public release. The Parties may follow up with respondents to seek clarification or to pursue further dialogue on the issues raised in responses. The Parties note that the collection and use of information are subject to the General Conditions and Disclaimer.

IV. General Conditions and Disclaimer

The information gathered through this RFI is advisory only and is not binding on either Party or any of their respective agencies, offices, or authorities. This RFI is independent of any future procurement, Call for Bids, or other competitive processes. Issuing this RFI or receiving, reviewing, or considering a submission does not oblige either Party to undertake or continue any procurement, Call for Bids, negotiation, or other course of action. Submitting or not submitting a response will not affect any person's eligibility, pre-qualification, qualification, ranking, or participation in any future process. The Parties may, in their sole discretion, reject any or all submissions, seek additional information, amend this RFI, suspend, postpone, terminate, or discontinue the RFI process, and retain and use submissions in accordance with this RFI and applicable law.

The Parties disclaim liability to respondents and potential respondents for any cost, damage, or other liability, under any legal or equitable theory, arising from preparing, submitting, or failing to submit a response or otherwise participating in the RFI process. Each respondent and potential respondent is solely responsible for all costs, expenses, losses, and liabilities arising from preparing, submitting, failing to submit, revising, or supplementing a response or otherwise participating in the RFI process. To the fullest extent permitted by applicable law, the Parties disclaim and shall not be liable for any such cost, expense, damage, or other liability, regardless of legal theory, whether statutory, common law or equitable. This includes any liability arising from any change the Parties make to the RFI process.

V. Generation Questions (Offshore Wind Development off Nova Scotia)

The following questions are directed primarily at offshore wind developers, potential project sponsors, supply chain entities, and others with a perspective on the development of offshore wind generation resources in Nova Scotia waters. These questions are intended to help the Parties and Participating States understand market interest, independent of how power could ultimately be delivered to the New England grid.

A. Market Interest and Project Characteristics

1. Describe your organization's current or potential interest in developing offshore wind generation in Nova Scotia waters, including any experience developing offshore wind or related infrastructure in Atlantic Canada, the United States, or elsewhere.
2. What project scale(s) (in MW) is appropriate and/or realistic for initial and subsequent phases of Nova Scotia offshore wind development, and why?
3. What technology types (e.g., fixed-bottom, floating) are expected to be deployed, and how might site characteristics (water depth, distance to shore, seabed conditions, metocean conditions) in Nova Scotia waters affect technology choice?

4. What is a realistic timeline from award of acreage (via a Call for Bids) to commercial operation, and what are the key drivers of that timeline?
5. What site characterization, survey, or seafloor mapping information currently exists for Nova Scotia offshore wind areas, and what additional information would developers find valuable before submitting a bid in a Call for Bids?

B. Call for Bids and Regulatory Process (Generation)

1. What is your understanding of, and experience with, the respective roles of the Canadian federal and provincial governments (including CNSOER) in leasing, environmental assessment, and permitting of offshore wind projects in Nova Scotia waters? What additional clarity, if any, is needed regarding these roles and the coordination between them?
2. What lessons from U.S. federal offshore wind leasing and permitting (e.g., BOEM processes) or from other international offshore wind leasing regimes should inform the design of Nova Scotia's Call for Bids and subsequent permitting process?
3. What environmental, fisheries, or other stakeholder engagement, as well as First Nations considerations specific to Nova Scotia waters, should be addressed early in the process, and what engagement, monitoring, and mitigation approaches have proven effective in other jurisdictions?

C. Supply Chain, Ports, and Workforce (Generation)

1. Please describe the current state of port capacity and availability in Nova Scotia and the broader Atlantic region that could support construction, staging, marshalling, and operations and maintenance of offshore wind projects in Nova Scotia waters? Please identify, if applicable, any differences associated with fixed and floating offshore wind projects.
2. Please describe the current state of port capacity and availability in Massachusetts and the broader New England region that could also support construction, staging, and operations and maintenance of offshore wind projects in Nova Scotia waters? Please identify, if applicable, any differences associated with fixed and floating offshore wind projects.
3. What additional port, vessel, manufacturing, or other supply chain infrastructure investments would be needed to support Nova Scotia offshore wind development, and on what timeline? Please identify, if applicable, any differences associated with fixed and floating offshore wind projects.
4. What opportunities exist to utilize existing supply chain infrastructure, certifications, and expertise already developed in the U.S. Northeast and Atlantic Canada offshore wind and oil and gas industries?
5. What challenges and opportunities do the Jones Act and Coasting Trade Act present for the development and utilization of ports and/or vessels?
6. What workforce needs (trades, engineering, marine operations, environmental monitoring, etc.) are anticipated, and what role could universities, community colleges, and trade schools in Massachusetts, New England, and Nova Scotia play in meeting those needs? Are there specific opportunities for joint workforce development or training programs between the two jurisdictions?
7. What labor and economic development opportunities (e.g., local hire commitments, apprenticeship programs, manufacturing investment) should the Parties consider encouraging through any potential procurement process?

VI. Delivery / Transmission Questions

The following questions are directed at transmission developers, offshore wind developers, utilities, system operators, and others with a perspective on how offshore wind generation from Nova Scotia could be delivered to Massachusetts or other points of interconnection within the New England market. Consistent with Section I above, these questions are intended to be considered separately from the Generation questions in Section V, recognizing that generation and delivery may be developed either jointly or independently by different parties or through different mechanisms.

Respondents should address, as applicable, each of the two delivery concepts to a point of interconnection in New England under consideration: (A) a direct subsea HVDC cable to a New England point of interconnection and (B) power wheeled through Québec and/or New Brunswick for delivery via existing, upgraded, or new transmission. Respondents are also welcome to propose or comment on other delivery concepts not described here.

A. Delivery Option A — Direct Subsea HVDC Cable to New England

1. What is the technical feasibility of a direct subsea HVDC cable (or cables) from Nova Scotia offshore wind areas to a point of interconnection in New England, including cable route length, water depth, and seabed conditions along plausible corridors?
2. What technical constraints (e.g., existing subsea infrastructure, marine protected areas, shipping lanes, fishing grounds, or other siting constraints) are relevant in considering potential cable corridors and landing points?
    a. Provide any relevant details regarding right-of-way guidelines for subsea cable installation (e.g. water depth, protections or shielding, installation width, installation depth upon seafloor, route flexibility to avoid other infrastructure or sensitive habitat constraints, etc.)
    b. What additional seafloor mapping or survey work would help clarify any constraints?
3. What voltage, capacity, and converter technology would be appropriate for a direct HVDC link of this distance and capacity, and what is the current commercial availability and lead time for the relevant equipment (e.g., HVDC converter stations, subsea cable manufacturing capacity)? Are there constraints in the supply chain for HVDC equipment that could present a timeline challenge?
4. What are the implications of delivering a large single block of power (e.g., 1,200 MW or more) via a single HVDC link, including with respect to system reliability considerations such as loss-of-largest-source limits or the magnitude of corollary upgrades required? How might these implications affect cable sizing, phasing, or the need for multiple, smaller links?
5. What is the process and timeline for obtaining a Presidential Permit or other U.S. and Canadian federal authorization required for a new cross-border transmission facility of this kind, and what steps could be taken now to prepare for that process?
6. What technical or commercial information would be needed regarding the onshore point of interconnection (e.g., available capacity, required upgrades) to support a bid or investment decision for this delivery option?
7. In considering a direct subsea transmission link to New England, are there coordination or proactive planning considerations relevant for possible future floating offshore development in the Gulf of Maine, including but not limited to consideration of offshore grid interoperability standards?

B. Delivery Option B —Delivery via New Brunswick and/or Québec

1. What is the feasibility of delivering Nova Scotia offshore wind power via new transmission to New Brunswick and/or Québec, with power subsequently wheeled through New Brunswick Power's, Hydro-Québec's, and/or other existing transmission systems into New England?
2. What existing transmission capacity, if any, is available along such a pathway, and what upgrades would be required to accommodate the capacities under consideration?
3. What wheeling arrangements, costs, and available capacity would need to be secured to support this delivery option, and what is the process for securing them?
4. What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of this option as compared to a direct subsea cable to the New England grid?
5. Given that this option would introduce additional counterparties and jurisdictions, what commercial or contractual structures would best manage the associated risks?
6. Where an overland pathway will require involving other jurisdictions along the transmission route, what coordination mechanisms would be needed?
7. In considering overland delivery pathways to New England, are there coordination or proactive planning considerations relevant for existing or possible future generation and/or transmission enhancement?

C. Points of Interconnection, Transmission Planning, and Grid Integration

1. Referring to publicly available ISO-NE transmission planning studies, what potential points of interconnection in the ISO-NE control area are most viable for receiving Nova Scotia offshore wind power, under each of the delivery options described above? What are the relative benefits and weaknesses of each?
2. Once developers have identified a specific point (or points) of interconnection, what additional information (e.g. onshore network constraints, upgrade needs, etc.) would developers need from the Parties or from ISO-NE in order to refine project design and cost estimates?
3. How should any future delivery project be designed to comply with, or take advantage of, FERC Order No. 1920 and its requirements for long-term regional and interregional transmission planning?
4. Should any new HVDC infrastructure associated with this delivery be designed to be "meshed-ready" or otherwise compatible with efforts to standardize HVDC converter design and enable future interconnection between separate offshore or cross-border HVDC links? What technical standards or specifications should be considered?
5. Should any new HVDC infrastructure associated with this delivery be designed such that it doesn't foreclose the development and delivery of other clean energy resources? Should such infrastructure include mono-directional or bi-directional cable design?
6. What role, if any, should regional or interregional transmission planning bodies play in evaluating or advancing this potential delivery project?
7. Which New England states would benefit from being directly involved in evaluating or approving any of the delivery options (for example, if the delivery pathway would cross or make use of transmission facilities located in another state)?

D. Cross-Border and Interjurisdictional Regulatory Coordination

1. What federal, state/provincial, and international (U.S.–Canada) regulatory approvals (e.g., permits, licenses, authorizations, etc.) would be required for each of the two delivery options, and what is the typical timeline for each?
2. What coordination model or governance structure (e.g., a joint technical working group, a formal interstate/interprovincial/international compact, or reliance on existing bodies such as ISO-NE, or the National Energy Board/Canadian Energy Regulator) would best support coordinated review and permitting of a project that crosses state, provincial, and international borders?
3. What are the respective roles of Massachusetts or other New England states (onshore/state waters), federal U.S. (offshore federal waters and cross-border authorization), and Canadian federal, provincial, or joint authorities in permitting each segment of a potential delivery project, and where are the greatest risks of regulatory misalignment or delay?
4. Are there specific past examples of U.S.–Canada cross-border transmission projects that offer useful lessons — positive or negative — for the coordination model or permitting pathway for this potential project? If so, what lessons were learned from those examples?

E. Other

1. Are there other delivery concepts, not described in this RFI, that the Parties should consider?
2. Are there any other comments, studies, or reports relevant to the topics addressed in this RFI?

VII. Cross-cutting Generation and Delivery Questions

The following questions relate jointly to the generation and delivery components of this work. They are directed at any respondents with perspective on these additional cross-cutting considerations.

A. Development Model Considerations

1. Should offshore wind generation and its delivery to New England be developed under a single, integrated “generation lead line” model (in which the generation developer is also responsible for transmission), a separately procured transmission model (in which transmission is developed and/or procured independently of any specific generation project), or some hybrid of the two? Please explain the advantages and disadvantages of each approach in the context of a cross-border delivery from Nova Scotia.
2. What ownership and cost-allocation models (e.g., merchant transmission, jointly owned transmission, public-private partnership, or an anchor-tenant model) would be best suited to a cross-border delivery project of this nature, and why?
3. What contract structures or procurement vehicles (e.g., transmission service agreements, voluntary state agreements, delivery commitment models, capacity contracts, or other state and federal mechanisms) would be best suited to a cross-border arrangement of this kind? Could Nova Scotia offshore wind be developed through contracts for environmental attributes only (e.g. Renewable Energy Certificates)? Should generation capacity be considered in addition to the provision of energy?
4. Are there preferred risk sharing approaches based on work in other jurisdictions (e.g. indexed pricing, financing arrangements, etc.)? What existing or new procurement and contracting models may be necessary for New England states to consider in enabling the development and financing of Nova Scotia offshore wind that could be delivered to New England?

5. What schedule considerations (including realistic commercial operation dates, permitting timelines, and construction lead times) should the Parties take into account in considering any future procurement tied to this development?
6. Should energy storage be considered as a complement to any of the delivery options described in this RFI (e.g., to manage variability or to enhance the value of a single, large-capacity delivery asset)? If so, how?

B. Environmental and Fisheries Considerations

1. What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of the two delivery options regarding environmental and fisheries impacts?
2. Given your knowledge of environmental impacts (e.g., benthic habitat disturbance, electromagnetic fields, thermal effects) often associated with the installation and operation of subsea and underwater transmission cables, what mitigation strategies have proven effective in impact mitigations on prior projects?
3. What fisheries, protected species, and benthic habitat considerations should inform cable routing and construction scheduling for any of the generation or delivery options described in this RFI, and what engagement practices with the fishing industry or other stakeholders have been most effective in other jurisdictions?

C. Research and Data

1. What research, modeling, or data-sharing opportunities exist for universities and research institutions in Massachusetts and Nova Scotia to collaborate on offshore wind-related research (e.g., wind resource assessment, marine spatial planning, environmental monitoring, HVDC technology)?
2. What research and/or data gaps exist that could help inform siting and permitting for each of the two delivery options?
3. Are there other topics related to offshore wind generation development in Nova Scotia not addressed above that the Parties should consider?

VIII. Relevant Studies, Reports, and Research

The following studies, reports, and research represent a range of analyses and perspectives relevant to the issues in this RFI. Their inclusion is not intended to indicate agreement or endorsement of any particular study, methodology, assumption, finding, or recommendation.

Atlantic Canada Offshore Wind Studies/Project Solicitations

Report/Study Name	Organization	Date	Link
Offshore Wind – Onshore Transmission Corridors and Technology Assessment – Request for Proposals (*this is a solicitation document, not a completed study)*	Net Zero Atlantic	October 2026	Link
Offshore Transmission Routing and Technology Assessment — Request for Proposals *(this is a solicitation document, not a completed study)*	Net Zero Atlantic	August 2026	Link
Electric Grid Impacts Report*	Net Zero Atlantic	July 2026	Link
Transmission Expansion Report*	Net Zero Atlantic	July 2026	Link
Roadmap and Action Plan*	Net Zero Atlantic	July 2026	Link
Technology Characterization Report*	Net Zero Atlantic	July 2026	Link
Power System Studies Report*	Net Zero Atlantic	July 2026	Link
Interregional Collaboration Report*	Net Zero Atlantic	July 2026	Link
Leading Jurisdictions Report*	Net Zero Atlantic	July 2026	Link
Phase 2 Report: Actual Deployment Potential of Atlantic Canada Offshore Wind*	Net Zero Atlantic	January 2026	Link
Policy Assessment Report: Atlantic Canada Offshore Wind*	Net Zero Atlantic	October 2025	Link
Assessment of Atlantic Canadian Ports to Support Offshore Wind Development	Net Zero Atlantic	August 2025	Link
Phase 1 Report: Market Opportunities for Atlantic Canada Offshore Wind*	Net Zero Atlantic	June 2025	Link
Atlantic Canada Wind Energy Supply Chain Assessment	Marine Renewables Canada	April 2025	Link
Nova Scotia Offshore Wind Energy: Sale and Export to the Northeastern United States	Net Zero Atlantic	November 2021	Link

**Each of these reports were produced as part of the Atlantic Canada Offshore Wind Grid Integration and Transmission Study, which ran from April 2024- July 2026*

Northeast States Collaborative on Interregional Transmission / Planning Offshore on Interregional Network Standardization (POINTS) Consortium

Report/Study Name	Organization	Date	Link
Offshore Transmission Standardization Report	POINTS Consortium (Johns Hopkins Energy Institute)	June 2026	Link
Procurement and Contracting Strategies	POINTS Consortium (Johns Hopkins Energy Institute)	June 2026	Link
Pathways Toward Standardized HVDC Transmission and Modernized Reliability Criteria for HVDC Systems	POINTS Consortium (Johns Hopkins Energy Institute)	June 2026	Link
Strategic Action Plan	Northeast States Collaborative on Interregional Transmission	April 2025	Link
Whitepaper on Transmission Standards	Northeast States Collaborative on Interregional Transmission	October 2024	Link

Regional/Federal Transmission Studies

Report/Study Name	Organization	Date	Link
Eastern Canada – Northeast U.S. Interregional Transmission Planning Roadmap	Northeast Grid Planning Forum	August 2025	Link
2050 Transmission Study: Offshore Wind Analysis	ISO New England	March 2025	Link
2050 Transmission Study	ISO New England	February 2024	Link
An Action Plan for Offshore Wind Transmission Development in the U.S. Atlantic Region	U.S. Department of Energy/Bureau of Ocean Energy Management	March 2024	Link
Atlantic Offshore Wind Transmission Study	U.S. Department of Energy	March 2024	Link
A New England – Maritimes Offshore Energy Corridor Builds Regional Resilience for a Clean Energy Future	New England-Maritimes Offshore Energy Corridor Coalition	May 2023	Link

Massachusetts-Specific Studies

Report/Study Name	Organization	Date	Link
Massachusetts Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2050	EEA	2022	Link
Massachusetts Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2025 and 2030	EEA	2022	Link
Massachusetts Offshore Wind Ports & Infrastructure Assessment — North Shore	MassCEC	2022	Link
2018 Massachusetts Offshore Wind Workforce Assessment	MassCEC	2018	Link
Offshore Wind Workforce Training & Development in Massachusetts	MassCEC	September 2021	Link
Massachusetts Offshore Wind Ports and Infrastructure Assessment Volume I and II	MassCEC	October 2017	Link (Volume I) Link (Volume II)

Studies from Other New England States

Report/Study Name	Organization	Date	Link
Report on Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Infrastructure and Supply Chain Opportunities as it Relates to the Deployment of Offshore Wind in the Gulf of Maine	New Hampshire Commission on Offshore Wind and Port Development (NH Dept. of Environmental Services)	2022	Link
Offshore Wind Transmission Technical Review — Initial Report	DNV, prepared for the Maine Governor's Energy Office	2022	Link
Maine Offshore Wind Roadmap	Maine Offshore Wind Advisory Council	2023	Link
Maine Energy Plan	Maine Governor's Energy Office	2025	Link
Maine Transmission Infrastructure Study	E3, prepared for the Maine Department of Energy Resources	2026	Link
Connecticut Offshore Wind Supply Chain Assessment: Opportunities and Collaborative Efforts in the Northeast	Xodus, prepared for the Connecticut Wind Collaborative	2025	Link
Connecticut's Offshore Wind Strategic Roadmap	Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development	2023	Link
Ocean State Accelerates: Five-Year Economic Development Strategy	Rhode Island Commerce	2023	Link

Relevant Environmental Research and Data

Research and Data Name	Organization	Link
Environmental Data Repositories	Regional Wildlife Science Collaborative	Link
Data Standardization Guidelines	Regional Wildlife Science Collaborative	Link
Northeast Ocean Data Portal	Northeast Regional Ocean Council	Link
Seascapes II: Regional Seafloor Geomorphology Maps	Northeast Regional Ocean Council	Link