

LandWorks Analysis of Resources NOT Evaluated*

*Based on the Saratoga Associates visual resource report and supplemental testimony

Saratoga Associates did not identify or assess 172 resources of the 290 resources that LandWorks did, which are listed below. They did not identify the scenic byways, scenic roads or scenic viewsheds. They also did not list many of the lakes, ponds and rivers with public access. Nor did they identify any of the recreational and hiking trails in the area, as well as many locally documented recreation areas.

- 1. Edward MacDowell Lake Recreation Area-Dublin, Peterborough
- 2. Edward MacDowell Lake Project Lands-Hancock, Harrisville, Peterborough
- 3. Contoocook River Shorebank Angling Area-Antrim
- 4. Pitcher Mountain State Forest-Stoddard
- 5. Currier & Ives Scenic Byway-Henniker
- Contoocook River-Antrim, Bennington, Deering, Greenfield, Hancock, Henniker, Hillsborough, Peterborough
- 7. Ashuelot River-Gilsum, Marlow, Washington
- 8. Piscataquaog River-Deering
- 9. Otter Lake-Greenfield
- 10. Childs Bog-Harrisville
- 11. Seavers Reservoir-Harrisville
- 12. Silver Lake-Harrisville, Nelson
- 13. Center Pond-Nelson
- 14. Cold Spring Pond-Stoddard
- 15. Halfmoon Pond- Washington
- 16. Sunapee Loop-Antrim, bennington, Hillsborough, Washington, Windsor
- 17. Monadnock Region Loop-Antrim, Gilsum, Hancock, Marlow, Peterborough, Stoddard
- 18. Clement Hill Road-Deering
- 19. Fisher Road-Deering
- 20. Glen Road-Deering
- 21. Mountain View Lane-Deering
- 22. Old Clement Road-Deering
- 23. Old Francestown Road-Deering
- 24. Pleasant Pond Road-Deering
- 25. Wolf Hill Road-Deering
- 26. Oak Hill Road-Francestown
- 27. Old County Road North-Francestown
- 28. Pleasant Pond Road-Francestown
- 29. Schoolhouse Road-Francestown
- 30. Cavendar Road-Greenfield
- 31. Colonial Drive-Greenfield
- 32. County Road-Greenfield
- 33. Muzzy Hill Road-Greenfield
- 34. Old Bennington Road-Greenfield
- 35. Riverbend Drive- Greenfield
- 36. Sunset Lake Road-Greenfield
- 37. Swamp Road-Greenfield
- 38. Baker Road-Henniker
- 39. Bear Hill Road-Henniker
- 40. Western Avenue-Henniker
- 41. Barden Hill Road-Hillsborough

- 42. Beard Road-Hillsborough
- 43. Danforth Corners Road-Hillsborough
- 44. Jones Road-Hillsborough
- 45. Second NH Turnpike-Hillsborough
- 46. Shedd Road-Hillsborough
- 47. Crosby Road-Peterborough
- 48. Windy Row Road-Peterborough
- 49. Black Fox Pond Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 50. Clark Summit Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 51. Clement Hill Road Scenic Viewshed(1) Deering
- 52. Clement Hill Road Scenic (2)-Deering
- 53. Codman Hill Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 54. Cove Hill Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 55. Deering Reservoir Scenic Viewshed(1)-Deering
- 56. Deering Reservoir Scenic Viewshed(2)-Deering
- 57. Deering Reservoir Scenic Viewshed(3)-Deering
- 58. Gregg Hill Road Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 59. Hedgehog Mountain Summit Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 60. Hodgen Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 61. Old County Road Scenic Viewshed(1)-Deering
- 62. Pattern Brook Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 63. Peter Wood Hill Road Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 64. Pleasant Pond Road Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 65. Range Road Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 66. Rangeway Road Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 67. Scenic Viewshed (north of Clark Summit)-Deering
- 68. Tubs Hill Road Scenic Viewshed(1)-Deering
- 69. Tubs Hill Road Scenic Viewshed (2)
- 70. West Deering Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 71. Wilson Hill Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 72. Wilson Hill Scenic Viewshed-Deering
- 73. Baker Road Scenic Vista-Henniker
- 74. Bear Hill Road(1) Scenic Vista-Henniker
- 75. Bear Hill Road (2) Scenic Vista-Henniker
- 76. Kimball Hill Road Scenic Views-Hillsborough
- 77. Hurlin Trail-Antrim
- 78. Lily Pond Trail-Antrim
- 79. Lovern's Trail at Lovern's Mill Cedar Swamp-Antrim
- 80. Thumb Mountain Summit Trail at Harris Center (Briggs Reserve)-Hancock
- 81. Trail around Half Moon Pond at Sargent Center-Hancock
- 82. Contoocook Riverwalk-Hillsborough
- 83. Thompson Mountain Trail at Wenny-Baker Forest-Hillsborough
- 84. Trails at Fox Forest-Hillsborough



- 85. Kulish Ledges Trail-Nelson
- Trails at Otter Brook Preserve-Nelson, Stoddard, Sullivan
- 87. The common Pathway-Peterborough
- 88. Trails at Andorra Forest-Stoddard, Washington
- 89. Trout-n-Bacon Trail at Pierce Reservation-Stoddard
- 90. Trails at Camp Morgan Town Forest- Washington
- 91. Oak Hill Summit Trail at Clark Robinson Memorial Forest-Washington
- 92. Shea Field-Antrim
- 93. Deering Town Beach-Deering
- 94. Moose Brook Park-Hancock
- 95. Town Beach at Norway Pond-Hancock
- 96. Seaver Pond Picnic Area-Harrisville
- 97. Sunset Beach-Harrisville
- 98. Town Beach at Gould Pond-Hillsborough
- 99. Route 10 Picnic Area-Marlow
- 100. Town Common-Nelson
- 101. Mill Pond-Antrim
- 102. Rye Pond-Antrim, Nelson, Stoddard
- 103. Cold Spring Pond-Bennington
- 104. Whittemore Lake-Bennington
- 105. Dudley Pond-Deering
- 106. Deering Reservoir-Deering
- 107. Howe Reservoir-Dublin, Harrisville
- 108. Mud Pond-Dublin
- 109. Wood Pond-Dublin
- 110. Pleasant Pond-Francestown
- 111. Halfmoon Pond-Hancock
- 112. Hunts Pond-Hancock
- 113. Juggernaut Pond-Hancock
- 114. Harrisville Pond-Harrisville
- 115. Russell Reservoir-Harrisville
- 116. Skatutakee Lake-Harrisville
- 117. Gould Pond- Hillsborough
- 118. Sand Brook Marsh-Hillsborough
- 119. Village Pond-Marlow
- 120. Village Tin Shop Pond-Marlow
- 121. Granite Lake-Nelson, Stoddard
- 122. Spoonwood Pond-Nelson
- 123. Center Pond-Stoddard
- 124. Trout Pond-Stoddard
- 125. Bolster Pond-Sullivan
- 126. Chapman Pond-Sullivan
- 127. Ashuelot Pond-Washington
- 128. Barrett Pond-Washington

- 129. Mill Pond- Washington
- 130. Millen Pond-Washington
- 131. Smith Pond- Washington
- 132. Virginia Baker Natural Area-Antrim
- 133. Bennington Town Land (Cold Spring Pond)-Bennington
- 134. Bruce Edes Forest-Bennington
- 135. Bradford Bog-Bradford
- 136. Bradford Springs and Hotel Site-Bradford
- 137. Deering Wildlife Sanctuary-Deering
- 138. Black Woods Easement-Dublin
- 139. Dublin Lake Scenic Area-Dublin
- 140. Dublin Town Parcel-Dublin
- 141. Dublin Town Land (at Howe Reservoir)-Dublin
- 142. Dublin Town Land (at Mud Pond)-Dublin
- 143. Crotched Mountain Town Forest-Francestown
- 144. Emerson Brook Forest-Filsum Marlow
- 145. Briggs Preserve-Hancock
- 146. John Kulish Forest-Hancock
- 147. Walcott Forest-Hancock
- 148. Contoocook River Access-Henniket
- 149. Coffin Wildlife Sanctuary-Hillsborough
- 150. Wenny-Baker Forest-Hillsborough
- 151. Stickey Wicket Wildlife Sanctuary-Marlow
- 152. Claus Wildlife Sanctuary-Nelson
- 153. The Great Meadow-Nelson
- 154. Otter Brook Farm-Peterborough
- 155. Parker Hill Forest-Roxbury
- 156. Charles L. Pierce Wildlife and Forest Reservation-
 - Stoddard, Windsor
- 157. Stoddard Rocks-Pioneer Lake Reservation-Stoddard
- 158. Thurston V. Williams Forest-Stoddard
- 159. Barrett Pond Town Forest-Washington
- 160. Camp Morgan Town Forest-Washington
- 161. Eccardt Farm Conservation Easement-Washington
- 162. Farnsworth Hill Town Forest-Washington
- 163. Huntley Mountain Town Forest-Washington
- 164. Journey's End, Bell-Cofield Forest-Washington
- 165. Nuthatch Way Town Forest-Washington
- 166. Old Meadow Town Forest-Washington
- 167. Webb Forest Preserve LLC-Washington
- 168. Eliza Adams Gorge-Harrisville
- 169. Gleason Falls-Hillsborough
- 170. Bailey Brook Falls-Nelson
- 171. Robinson Brook Cascades-Stoddard
- 172. Stoddard Rocks-Stoddard

| | | 159 |
|----|----|---|
| | | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
| 1 | | in my previous report. |
| 2 | Q. | Right. |
| 3 | Α. | I didn't, in terms of this one, I made the assumption |
| 4 | | that all those things were still true, and I was only |
| 5 | | looking at the difference in terms of the two. Because |
| 6 | | the context the context is the context is what I |
| 7 | | had identified before in my previous report. But the |
| 8 | | difference was in the Project, not in the context. |
| 9 | Q. | Does context of view at a particular scenic resource |
| 10 | | change based on the visibility of the object you're |
| 11 | | analyzing? |
| 12 | А. | No. That has to do with project. The context is still |
| 13 | | the resource. It does change, to the extent that you |
| 14 | | have the resource, you have the kind of characteristic |
| 15 | ŝ | of the resource, and then you look at the project and |
| 16 | | determine "well, how does this" "to what degree does |
| 17 | | this contrast with the existing context or have some |
| 18 | | kind of either negative or potentially positive |
| 19 | | impact?" But, certainly, in terms of the impacts, the |
| 20 | | visibility does make a difference. |
| 21 | Q. | On Line 23 of that same page, I say "Visibility of |
| 22 | | clearing around Turbine 9 will also result in |
| 23 | | significant visual impacts." Can you describe all of |
| 24 | | the places, in your opinion, that will experience those |
| | | {SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15} |

° . Y '

EXHIBIT

| | | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|----|---|
| 1 | | significant visual impacts? |
| 2 | A. | That would be from Goodhue Hill. |
| 3 | Q. | Anyplace else? |
| 4 | | |
| | Α. | Well, I haven't seen those clearing studies anywhere |
| 5 | | else, for any because that was the only one that I |
| 6 | | did, because it hadn't been done by the previous in |
| 7 | | the previous application. And, so, we don't know what |
| 8 | | the from where these, the road grading/clearing, |
| 9 | | that's a piece of information that I don't have access |
| 10 | | to. |
| 11 | Q. | So, you can't identify specific locations on Goodhue |
| 12 | | Hill where you believe these significant impacts would |
| 13 | | be experienced? |
| 14 | А. | Well, it was from the clearing at the top. |
| 15 | Q. | Is that the only location? |
| 16 | А. | Yes. |
| 17 | Q. | And, is that based on the prior work you did or is that |
| 18 | | based on new work you've done? |
| 19 | А. | That's based on the prior work that I did. |
| 20 | Q. | So, you actually haven't done new work regarding the |
| 21 | | proposed Project to reach that conclusion? |
| 22 | Α. | Well, my understanding is there was no difference in |
| 23 | | Turbine Number 9, in terms of its location or the road |
| 24 | | clearing. So, it seems logical to me that those |
| | | {SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15} |

| | | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|----|---|
| 1 | | that that visibility would continue to be there. |
| 2 | Q. | Let's turn to Page 8 please. And, I'm looking at Line |
| 3 | | 22. And, it says, and it carries over to the next |
| 4 | | page, "View of roads and clearings would be visible |
| 5 | | along the project ridge and visible from off-site |
| 6 | | viewpoints including those within the Sanctuary." So, |
| 7 | | it seems to me that this point relates to the one we |
| 8 | | were just talking about, though I'm not sure. Can you |
| 9 | | explain that to me? What "off-site viewpoints" do you |
| 10 | | mean? |
| 11 | Α. | Well, I had been thinking about Goodhue Hill in that |
| 12 | | particular case. But I had raised, in my last |
| 13 | | assessment, questions, because of looking in detail at |
| 14 | | the grading plans, whether there would be the potential |
| 15 | | for off-site visibility from other locations as well. |
| 16 | | But I don't I didn't I don't know of any. |
| 17 | Q. | Okay. Looking at Page 10 now. And, I'm looking at the |
| 18 | | table that you've got on Page 10. And, the first |
| 19 | | complete entry on that page says, and I guess the |
| 20 | | heading is "Project Characteristic", and then the |
| 21 | 2 | characteristic you list is "Visibility of Road and |
| 22 | | Clearing at Turbine 9 and between Turbines 5 and 6". |
| 23 | 0* | You see where I am? |
| 24 | Α. | Yes. |
| | | |

.

{SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15}

| | | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|----|---|
| 1 | Q. | Again, does that relate to anything beyond the clearing |
| 2 | | of Goodhue Hill? |
| 3 | Α. | Not from not from my own assessment. I would add |
| 4 | | that another possible viewpoint would be Pitcher |
| 5 | | Mountain, would be another possible place where there |
| 6 | | could be some visibility. But that was only |
| 7 | | speculation. So, yes, this does relate to that. |
| 8 | Q. | So, only to Goodhue Hill? |
| 9 | Α. | Yes. |
| 10 | Q. | Page 10, Lines 2 through 4, you say "Removal of one |
| 11 | | turbine and a slight lowering of a second turbine would |
| 12 | | not materially change the proposed project's impact, |
| 13 | | especially given the substantial aesthetic impacts |
| 14 | | noted by the SEC in the previous decision." What is |
| 15 | | your view regarding the impact at the boat launch at |
| 16 | | Willard Pond with respect to the new Project? |
| 17 | А. | I think it's the same as the former Project, which is |
| 18 | | that there isn't there isn't the visibility is |
| 19 | | somewhat limited from that point of view. |
| 20 | Q. | So, it's your view that there's no material change |
| 21 | | between the old Project and the new Project from the |
| 22 | | boat launch? |
| 23 | Α. | So, from the boat launch may I ask a sort of |
| 24 | | clarifying question? |
| | | {SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15} |

.

. . '

| | | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|----|---|
| 1 | Q. | That was my question. Thank you. On Page bottom of |
| 2 | | Page 12, over to Page 13, you talk about "scale of |
| 3 | | structures" and the importance of that. Do you see |
| 4 | | where I am? |
| 5 | А. | Yes. |
| 6 | Q. | Is there some accepted standard for evaluating that? |
| 7 | Α. | For the scale of structures? |
| 8 | Q. | Yes. |
| 9 | Α. | There is I think the the evaluating scale has to |
| 10 | | do with a combination, is there I guess your |
| 11 | | question is really, is there a I think that, again, |
| 12 | | you're looking at those, the characteristics, |
| 13 | | proximity, the actual size of the structure. The |
| 14 | | scale, of course, has to do with two things. It has to |
| 15 | | do with the horizontal scale and the vertical scale, |
| 16 | | and both of those come into play. So, those are the |
| 17 | | those are the data points that we can work with to look |
| 18 | | at. |
| 19 | Q. | I understand. I just am trying to get more specific |
| 20 | | here. You've provided a list of things that you |
| 21 | | consider to be important variables. "Scale of |
| 22 | | structure" is one. And, I just want to understand, is |
| 23 | | there a particular accepted standard in the visual |
| 24 | | impact assessment community for evaluating that? |
| | | {SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15} |

| | | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|----|---|
| 1 | Α. | With wind turbines? The idea of scale I think has |
| 2 | | with something that was with the kinds of developments |
| 3 | | that we would see in the landscape, shopping centers, |
| 4 | | housing projects, you have a sense of what the scale of |
| 5 | | those are going to be in relation to what is around. |
| 6 | | With wind turbines, the scale issue has |
| 7 | | become has become more difficult, because of the |
| 8 | | extreme heights. So, what we have to work with is a |
| 9 | | the known variable is existing projects, and looking at |
| 10 | | those, and the effects of those projects, but also |
| 11 | | within the particular context. Because scale has to |
| 12 | | do, in part, with what's with what's around it. |
| 13 | | And, again, with wind projects, you have a there's a |
| 14 | | difficulty, because you have you have a scale of |
| 15 | | landscape that sometimes there are grand landscapes, |
| 16 | | bigger mountains, sometimes there are much smaller |
| 17 | | landscapes. So, scale is always a relative thing. |
| 18 | | It's always relative to the surroundings. Scale is, by |
| 19 | | itself, cannot be really determined. It has no |
| 20 | | meaning. It's only scale is only in relation to |
| 21 | | what is its context. |
| 22 | Q. | So, I think we're probably in the same place, let me |
| 23 | | just be sure. If you were to look at the Forest |
| 24 | | Service visual assessment methodology, there would be |
| | | {SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15} |

| | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|--|
| 1 | nothing in there that says "when evaluating scale of |
| 2 | structures, do the following:"? |
| 3 | A. That's correct. |
| 4 | Q. And, if you were to look at the BLM methodology, the |
| 5 | same answer? |
| 6 | A. Yes. I think that that's correct. |
| 7 | Q. And, for any other methodologies you can think of, same |
| 8 | answer? |
| 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | MR. NEEDLEMAN: I have nothing further. |
| 11 | Thank you. |
| 12 | MR. IACOPINO: Justin. |
| 13 | MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you. Good |
| 14 | afternoon. |
| 15 | MS. VISSERING: Good afternoon. |
| 16 | MR. RICHARDSON: I'm Justin Richardson, |
| 17 | we met earlier today, for the Town of Antrim. |
| 18 | BY MR. RICHARDSON: |
| 19 | Q. I want to go back to a point that Attorney Needleman |
| 20 | raised early on. And, I just wasn't sure that I |
| 21 | understood your answer correctly. And, to characterize |
| 22 | it, I think what he was asking was, "is there a |
| 23 | difference between deciding what the whether the |
| 24 | visual impact is different and whether the Project is |
| | {SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15} |

| | <u> </u> | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|----------|---|
| 1 | | different?" Do you remember that? |
| 2 | A. | Yes. |
| 3 | Q. | Okay. So, my question is, setting aside the setting |
| 4 | | aside whether or not the visual impact is different, |
| 5 | | how did you set about to evaluate whether the Project |
| 6 | | was different? What did you consider important to look |
| 7 | | at? |
| 8 | A. | So, I think that the differences, in terms of the |
| 9 | | Project, were I think the thing that I looked at was |
| 10 | | "how much of a difference visually, in terms of |
| 11 | | <pre>impact?" I mean, "visibility" does not necessarily</pre> |
| 12 | | mean "impact". |
| 13 | Q. | Uh-huh. |
| 14 | А. | But those factors that we've been talking about, the |
| 15 | | proximity, the number of turbines visible, |
| 16 | Q. | Sure. |
| 17 | А. | those kinds of things were the ones that |
| 18 | Q. | So, am I correct then in saying that the purpose of |
| 19 | | your report was really to get I'm sorry, I keep |
| 20 | | losing you, I'm going to move over here to get to |
| 21 | | the second question, which is "how is the visual impact |
| 22 | | the same or different?" And, the answer to that |
| 23 | | question really controls whether or not the Project is |
| 24 | | different. |

1.

{SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15}

| | | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|----|---|
| 1 | | recommendations I saw, you listed this one first? |
| 2 | А. | Because those are the two turbines that were closest to |
| 3 | | the well, clearly, Number 10 was the most egregious. |
| 4 | | Turbine Number 9 was not particularly not |
| 5 | | particularly, it was lower in view, |
| 6 | Q. | Uh-huh. |
| 7 | A. | as we know, and probably not as tall as some other |
| 8 | | turbines that were viewed. But this seemed to me, and |
| 9 | | the main reason I put in "Turbines 9 and 10" in my |
| 10 | | recommendations is because, if it seemed like it |
| 11 | | would be a lot easier to eliminate Turbines 9 and 10, |
| 12 | | in terms of changing the Project, than it would be in |
| 13 | | terms of eliminating 10 and 7. |
| 14 | Q. | Uh-huh. And, I guess the question, I mean, there's |
| 15 | | always a danger in trying to read too much into it. |
| 16 | | What I was really trying to find out, without asking |
| 17 | | you a leading question, was did you put this |
| 18 | | recommendation first because it was the most important |
| 19 | | of the recommendations? Or, are they all equally |
| 20 | | important? Or, how what was your thought in putting |
| 21 | | this recommendation first, both in your testimony here |
| 22 | | and in your report in the last case? |
| 23 | Α. | So, if you read my report, the Visual Impact Assessment |
| 24 | | Report, you will see that I very clearly state that |
| | | {SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15} |

| | | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|------|---|
| 1 | | these are all significant. |
| 2 | Q. | Uh-huh. |
| 3 | Α. | And, so, there was no reason for putting this one |
| 4 | | first. It's probably the most the most obvious one. |
| 5 | | But I think that it's but I was very clear in |
| 6 | | stating that I thought these all needed to go in |
| 7 | | (Court reporter interruption.) |
| 8 | CONT | INUED BY THE WITNESS: |
| 9 | Α. | Needed to go, I said, "be done in combination". |
| 10 | BY M | R. RICHARDSON: |
| 11 | Q. | Understood. So, in your with that caveat that you |
| 12 | | just explained, would this recommendation that you |
| 13 | | listed first provide the greatest benefit to the |
| 14 | | visual or, to reducing visual impacts, of all seven |
| 15 | | recommendations that you made? |
| 16 | Α. | I would say that there the first three probably have |
| 17 | | been the ones that provided the most meaningful |
| 18 | | benefit. |
| 19 | Q. | Okay. So, then, after the first three, the benefits, |
| 20 | 8 | in terms of reducing visual impacts, drop off, although |
| 21 | | it would not quantifying it, but, in general, you think |
| 22 | | that the first three big ones are the most critical? |
| 23 | Α. | I would say, yes, those are the most critical. |
| 24 | Q. | And, I almost, to go back where we started, and as I |
| | | {SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15} |

| | | [WITNESS: Vissering] |
|----|-----|---|
| 1 | | went away from this a little bit, because I wanted to |
| 2 | | touch base on this point before we went back to it, but |
| 3 | | it almost seems to me that part of your testimony is |
| 4 | а. | saying that, because this changed Project didn't adopt |
| 5 | | all of your recommendations, it therefore continues to |
| 6 | | have a visual impact, and, therefore, it's not |
| 7 | | substantially different. I mean, is that another way? |
| 8 | | So, you could look at the fact or you looked at the |
| 9 | | fact that not all of these changes had been implemented |
| 10 | 283 | as a basis for concluding that it's really the same |
| 11 | | project? |
| 12 | Α. | I think that the Project is the changes have been |
| 13 | | small, they have ignored some of the major impacts of |
| 14 | | the Project. So, I think that would that would be |
| 15 | | my answer. |
| 16 | Q. | Uh-huh. So, when the changes are small, though, I mean |
| 17 | | we just kind of went over I believe you ultimately |
| 18 | | reached the conclusion that we can't use just height. |
| 19 | | So, we have to look at the "total visual impact" you |
| 20 | | said? |
| 21 | Α. | So, eliminating Turbines 9 and 10 had to do with |
| 22 | | proximity to the refuge, had to do with the |
| 23 | | visibility the particular visibility around Turbine |
| 24 | | 9, of some of the clearings that were associated with |
| | _ | {SEC NO. 2014-05} [Technical session] {04-23-15} |

,

1.11 1. 91

.