

June 28, 2017

By Hand Delivery and E-Mail

Ms. Judith Whitney, Clerk
Vermont Public Service Board
112 State Street, Drawer 20
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

Re: **CPG #16-0042-NMP -- Application of Orchard Road Solar I, LLC**

Dear Ms. Whitney:

Enclosed please find Applicant Orchard Road Solar I, LLC's *Prefiled Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits of Rod Viens and Mark Kane* for filing in the above-referenced matter.

Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions.

Sincerely,



Geoffrey H. Hand, Esq.
Victoria M. Westgate, Esq.

cc: Service List

**STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD**

Application of Orchard Road Solar I, LLC for a)
certificate of public good, pursuant to 30 V.S.A.)
§§ 219a and 248, to install and operate a 500 kW) CPG #16-0042-NMP
group net metered solar electric generation facility)
located on Orchard Road in Middletown Springs,)
Vermont, to be known as the "Orchard Road)
Solar Project")

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Gillian Bergeron, certify that on June 28, 2017, I forwarded copies of Orchard Road Solar I, LLC's *Filed Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits of Rod Viens and Mark Kane* to the service list below by the delivery method noted:

By Hand Delivery and E-Mail:

Ms. Judith Whitney, Clerk
Vermont Public Service Board
112 State Street, Drawer 20
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

By E-Mail and First Class Mail:

Randy J. Miller, II, Esq.
Vermont Agency of Natural Resources
1 National Life Drive, Davis 2
Montpelier, VT 05620-3901

Stephanie Hoffman, Esq.
Vermont Public Service Department
112 State Street, 3rd Floor
Montpelier, VT 05620-2601

John E. Arsenault, Chairman
Middletown Springs Planning Commission
P.O. Box 1232
Middletown Springs, VT 05757

David P. Wright, President
Middletown Springs Historical Society, Inc.
10 Park Avenue, P.O. Box 1121
Middletown Springs, VT 05757

Brooke Dingleline, Esq.
Valsangiacomo, Detora & McQuesten, P.C.
172 North Main Street
Barre, VT 05641
(for the Neighbors)

Ted & Dina Fitzpatrick
12525 Jot Em Down Lane
Odessa, FL 33556

Peter and Aileen Stevenson
97 Coy Hill Road
Middletown Springs, VT 05757

Karen L. Gutmann and Larry L. Springsteen
290 West Street
Middletown Springs, VT 05757

Douglas Freilich & Julie Sperling
PO Box 1041
Middletown Springs, VT 05757

Roy Cooper
327 West St.
Middletown Springs, VT 05757

Elizabeth W. Cooper
49 Rocks and Trees Lane
P.O. Box 1011
Middletown Springs, VT 05757

Dated at Burlington, Vermont this 28th day of June, 2017.

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gillian Bergeron". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "G" and a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gillian Bergeron
Paralegal

**STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD**

Application of Orchard Road Solar I, LLC for a)
certificate of public good, pursuant to 30 V.S.A.)
§§ 219a and 248, to install and operate a 500 kW) CPG #16-0042-NMP
group net metered solar electric generation facility)
located on Orchard Road in Middletown Springs,)
Vermont, to be known as the “Orchard Road)
Solar Project”)

REBUTTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ROD VIENS

June 28, 2017

Summary: Mr. Viens’ rebuttal testimony provides an update on Applicant’s review of the alternative sites for the Project that have been proposed by Neighbors.

Q1. Please state your name, occupation and business address.

1 A1. My name is Rod Viens. I am Executive Vice President with groSolar, which has offices at
2 205 Billings Farm Road, Building 4, White River Junction, VT 05001.

Q2. Have you previously submitted testimony in this proceeding?

5 A2. Yes, I previously submitted prefiled direct testimony with the Application submitted by
6 Orchard Road Solar I, LLC (“ORS” or “Applicant”) on July 15, 2016.

Q3. What is the purpose of your testimony today?

9 A3. The purpose of my testimony is to provide an update on ORS’s review of alternative sites in
10 the area for the Orchard Road Solar Project (“Project”) in response to the Neighbors’
11 proposal that the Project be moved to one of these locations.

**Q4. Please describe the alternative locations that Neighbors proposed for the Project,
14 and your review of these locations.**

15 A4. Neighbors proposed two alternative locations for the Project, in the vicinity of the currently
16 proposed site, and on land owned by the same landowner. The first alternative site is
17 located on the east side of Orchard Road across the street from the current location. The
18 second alternative site proposed was on the same side of Orchard Road as the current
19 location but shifted farther east directly adjacent to Orchard Road.

20 The first alternative site had been considered by ORS when it initially designed the
21 Project, and was reviewed by ORS’s environmental consultant and state wetlands ecologist
22 Zapata Courage from the Agency of Natural Resources during a site visit to the area.

1 However, as indicated on the attached correspondence, *Exhibit ORS-RV-8*, the alternative
2 site was deemed by Ms. Courage to contain an extensive Class 2 wetland area. As a result,
3 Ms. Courage informed ORS that “it would be highly unlikely that a project(sic) could avoid
4 or minimize impacts to the wetland in this field, thus a wetland permit would unlikely be
5 issued for construction.” Based on this feedback, ORS determined that the site was not a
6 feasible location for the Project, and proposed the Project at the current site.

7 For the second alternative site proposed by Neighbors, ORS conducted multiple site
8 visits to review this location and determine whether it would be feasible to construct the
9 Project in this area to reduce the viewshed of the Project. ORS construction team members
10 and civil engineers reviewed the location but ultimately determined the topography would
11 not support a project in this location. Grading was also considered but the extent of ledge in
12 the area made the amount of required grading unfeasible.

13
14 **Q5. Are there any other updates you wish to provide regarding the Project?**

15 A5. Yes. With the Application, I submitted a draft letter from the Vermont Division of Historic
16 Preservation (“DHP”) as *Exhibit ORS-RV-7*. On July 26, 2017, DHP issued the final
17 version of the letter, which is attached as *Exhibit ORS-RV-9*. This letter concludes that the
18 Project will not have an adverse effect on historic sites.

19
20 **Q6. Does that conclude your testimony today?**

21 Q6. Yes, it does.

From: Courage, Zapata <Zapata.Courage@vermont.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 29, 2015 2:59:43 PM
To: Peter Bay; dori@arrowwoodvt.com
Subject: Wetland Site Visit Summaries 2015-669 and 2015-670

Hello to you both,

I am finally catching up site visit summaries. Thanks for your patience. Let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Site Visit Summary: 2015-669, Mill Pond Rd-Benson Please reference this project number in future communications regarding this project.

ZC conducted a site visit with Dori (Arrowwood) and Peter Bay (GroSolar) on Nov. 6 to confirm the wetland delineation and classification. Given the time of year the delineation was undertaken, outside of the growing season, a conservative approach to identifying the boundaries was made to allow for a project design to occur that would avoid impact to the wetland and its 50-ft buffer. ZC concurs with the conservative delineation. The classification of the wetland system is Class 2. A Class 2 wetland requires a 50-ft buffer. Any activity that is not considered an Allowed Use under VWR, occurring within the wetland or its 50-ft buffer shall require a wetland permit.

The wetland, as it pertains to the project area is primarily a horseshoe shaped feature around an area of upland open field, where the solar project location is proposed. Other areas in the overall field system were assessed, but it appears the wetland likely extends into the lower portion of the field towards Mill Brook Road, and doesn't provide enough contiguous upland area in which to design a solar installation without impacts, other than in the back portion of the field, south of the hedgerow.

Access to the proposed site has been confirmed to be the existing gravel farm road which runs along the property boundary between neighbors, but on the neighbors land. An easement or permission is currently being acquired and likely granted at the time of this summary. If permission was not provided, a new access road will need to be constructed, which will impact both wetlands and wetland buffers. If a wetland permit is to be pursued during the winter for this activity, the conservative boundaries will be used in the calculation of impacts; however, it is anticipated this can be avoided.

If no new access road is needed, and all impacts to wetlands and the 50-ft buffer can be avoided, then no wetland permit is required for construction.

Site Visit Summary:2015-670, Middletown Springs Please reference this project number in future communications regarding this project.

ZC conducted a site visit with Dori (Arrowwood) and Peter Bay (GroSolar) on Nov. 6 to confirm the wetland delineation and classification. Two fields were assessed by Dori to determine which site offered the best alternative for a project location.

The first field was located to the east of Orchard Road and contained an extensive wetland area within the open field extending into the forest and likely was associated with the stream. This wetland is considered Class 2 and it would be highly unlikely that a projected could avoid or minimize impacts to the wetland in this field, thus a wetland permit would unlikely be issued for construction.

The second field was located to the west of Orchard Road and it was determined that no wetlands were present. Therefore, the solar project will likely be proposed within this field. No wetland permit will be required for construction within this field.

**Happy Happy New Year,
Zapata**

Zapata Courage

District Wetland Ecologist

Addison and Rutland Counties

Please note, districts have changed.

For more information, visit our [inquiry portal](#).

Asa Bloomer State Office Building

88 Merchants Row, Suite 430

Rutland, Vermont 05701

Phone: 802-490-6179

NEW email: zapata.courage@vermont.gov

<http://www.vtwaterquality.org/wetlands.htm>

See what we're up to on our [Blog Flow](#).

State of Vermont
Division for Historic Preservation
Deane C. Davis Building, 6th Floor
One National Life Drive, Montpelier, VT 05620-0501
www.accd.vermont.gov/strong_communities/preservation/

[phone] 802-828-3540

*Agency of Commerce and
Community Development*

July 26, 2016

Judith C. Whitney, Clerk
Vermont Public Service Board
112 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

Re: Application of Orchard Road Solar I, LLC pursuant to 30 V.S.A §§ 219a and 248 for a Certificate of Public Good authorizing the installation and operation of 500 kW group net-metered photovoltaic electric facility located near 30 Orchard Road in Middletown Springs, Vermont. Public Service Board Review.

Dear Ms. Whitney:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced project. The Division for Historic Preservation (VDHP) is reviewing this undertaking (VDHP #RU15-079) for purposes of 30 V.S.A., Section 248. Project review consists of identifying the project's potential impacts to historic buildings, structures, historic districts, historic landscapes and settings, and known or potential archeological resources. The purpose of the VDHP's comments is to provide the Public Service Board (PSB) with the necessary information for their Section 248 review.

The proposed project consists of the construction of a 500 kW solar generation facility on an approximately 5 acre section of a 126 acre parcel of land located off Orchard and Wescott Roads in Middletown Springs, Vermont. The facility will consist of approximately 2,250 photovoltaic modules attached to fixed ground mounted racking systems arranged in 11 east to west rows. Related infrastructure includes an access road, string inverters, an equipment pad, a gated perimeter fence, and underground electrical connections. The facility will interconnect to the existing Green Mountain Power Inc. distribution system utilizing an existing overhead electric line along Wescott Road that will be upgraded to 3-phase and the addition of three pole mounted transformers to an existing or new utility pole near the array. An underground electric line from the array's equipment pad will connect to the upgraded overhead line.

The project area is situated on sloping glacial hillside west of VT Route 140 and the Poultney River that was formerly used as an apple orchard. No archaeological sites or archaeologically sensitive areas were identified in the project area during a site visit to the property on February 15, 2016 which identified that the array will be primarily located on sloping surfaces. In addition to our archaeological review, the VDHP has considered the effects of the project on above ground historic



July 13, 2016

Orchard Road Solar 1, LLC, Middletown Springs, Vermont

Page 2 of 2

structures, districts, and landscapes. The VDHP has reviewed the Proposed Solar Array Site Plan dated 6/29/16. While there will be no direct effects to any above ground historic sites, there will be possible indirect visual effects for the properties closest to the project site. The proposed solar facility will be east of 67 Wescott Road and south of 30 Orchard Road. The structure at 67 Wescott Road is less than 50 years old and is not historic. The farm complex at 30 Orchard Road was listed on the State Register of Historic Places on May 7, 1980 as #1111-16 Spitalny House. However, due to the distance, terrain, and the existing intervening vegetation it is VDHP's opinion that there will be limited visual effects on the historic property at 30 Orchard Road and other standing historic sites with views of the sloping hillside location of the solar facility. Therefore, VDHP concludes that the facility will have no adverse effect on the historic character of any standing historic structures, districts, or landscapes.

Based on the above considerations, the VDHP concludes that the Orchard Road Solar Project will have **No Adverse Effect** on any historic sites listed in or eligible for inclusion in the State Register of Historic Places. Thank you for your cooperation in protecting Vermont's irreplaceable historic and archeological heritage. R. Scott Dillon and Elizabeth G. Peebles reviewed this project and prepared this letter. I concur with the findings and conclusions described above.

Sincerely:

VERMONT DIVISION FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION


e-Signed by Laura Trieschmann
on 2016-07-26 19:35:27 GMT

Laura V. Trieschmann
State Historic Preservation Officer

Cc: Service List



**STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD**

Application of Orchard Road Solar I, LLC for)
a Certificate of Public Good, pursuant to)
30 V.S.A. §§ 219a and 248 to install and operate)
a 500 kW group net metered solar electric)
generation facility to be located on Orchard)
Road in Middletown Springs, Vermont.)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I Jennifer Lavoie, hereby certify that I sent a copy of the foregoing Division for Historic Preservation Comment Letter by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, on this 26th day of July, 2016, to the individuals without email addresses and by electronic mail, to the following with email addresses:

Ms. Judith Whitney, Clerk
Vermont Public Service Board
112 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701
Psb.clerk@vermont.gov

Green Mountain Power
163 Acorn Lane
Colchester, VT 05446-6611
allen@greenmountainpower.com

Geoffrey H. Hand, Esq.
Victoria M. Westgate, Esq.
Dunkiel Saunders Elliott Raubvogel & Hand, PLLC
P.O. Box 545
Burlington, VT 05402-0545
ghand@dunkielsaunders.com
vwestgate@dunkielsaunders.com

Jen Duggan, Esq.
Beverly Smith
Vermont Agency of Natural Resources
1 National Life Drive
Montpelier, VT 05620
Jen.Duggan@vermont.gov
beverly.smith@vermont.gov

Jeanne Elias, Esq.
Angela Valentinetti
Vermont Department of Public Service
112 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620-2601
jeanne.elias@vermont.gov
Angela.valentinetti@vermont.gov

Middletown Springs Planning Commission
P.O. Box 1232
Middletown Springs, VT 05757

Commissioner Christopher Recchia
Department of Public Service
112 State Street – Third Floor
Montpelier, VT 05620-2601
Chris.recchia@vermont.gov

Middletown Springs Selectboard
P.O. Box 1232
Middletown Springs, VT 05757
redboneVT@gmail.com

Rutland Regional Planning Commission
P.O. Box 965
Rutland, VT 05702
ebove@rutlandprc.org

Dated at Montpelier, Vermont this 26th day of July, 2016

Jennifer Lavoie

Jennifer Lavoie
Administrative Assistant

Division of Historic Preservation

**STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD**

Application of Orchard Road Solar I, LLC for a)
certificate of public good, pursuant to 30 V.S.A.)
§§ 219a and 248, to install and operate a 500 kW) CPG #16-0042-NMP
group net metered solar electric generation facility)
located on Orchard Road in Middletown Springs,)
Vermont, to be known as the “Orchard Road)
Solar Project”)

REBUTTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MARK KANE

June 28, 2017

Summary: Mr. Kane’s rebuttal testimony addresses issues raised in other parties’ testimony regarding the Project’s compliance with the § 248 criteria pertaining to town and regional plans, and aesthetics and scenic beauty. Mr. Kane also provides an update on the mitigation planting plan for the Project.

Q1. Please state your name, occupation and business address.

1 A1. My name is Mark Kane. I am a land use planner and the Director of Community Planning
2 and Design at SE Group, which is a multi-disciplinary consulting firm specializing in the
3 planning, entitlement, and design of public facilities, mountain, and resort communities and
4 other complex projects. SE Group has four offices across the United States, and the
5 Vermont office is located at 131 Church Street, Burlington, Vermont 05401.

Q2. Please describe your background and qualifications.

8 A2. As described in my resume, previously submitted as *Exhibit ORS-MK-1*, I received my
9 Bachelor of Science in Environmental Studies from the University of Vermont's School of
10 Natural Resources in 1991. After graduating, I worked as an environmental scientist at
11 Wagner, Heindel, & Noyes, in Burlington, Vermont. Beginning in 1996, I worked as a land
12 planner and principal of Dunn Hamelin Kane, also located in Burlington. I have been
13 working at SE Group for 14 years and have been a director of that group since 2005. I have
14 worked and/or managed dozens of aesthetic and land use analyses for renewable energy
15 projects, including Kingdom Community Wind Farm in Lowell, Vermont, New Haven Solar
16 Farm in New Haven, Vermont, and the Addison Solar Farm, in Ferrisburgh, Vermont. I
17 have extensive experience with Aesthetic and Environmental Impact Analysis, Regional and
18 Land Use Planning, Permitting and Entitlement, and Geographic Information Systems
19 ("GIS"). I am an affiliate member of the American Society of Landscape Architects, a
20 member and executive council member of the Vermont Planners Association, and the
21 Vermont Director for the Northern New England Chapter of the American Planning
22 Association.

1 **Q3. Have you previously testified before the Public Service Board or in other judicial or**
2 **administrative proceedings?**

3 A3. Yes. I have testified before the Vermont Public Service Board on numerous occasions over
4 the past decade.

5

6 **Q4. Please describe your participation in this proceeding to date.**

7 A4. I previously submitted my report containing my review of the Project under the section 248
8 (b)(1) (orderly development) and (b)(5) (visual aesthetics and above-ground historic
9 resources) criteria with the application on July 15, 2016. *See Exhibit ORS-MK-2.* In my
10 report, I concluded that the Project did not create an undue adverse impact under any of
11 these criteria.

12

13 **Q5. What is the purpose of your testimony today?**

14 A5. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to issues raised in testimony submitted by the
15 Department of Public Service (“Department”) and the Neighbors who have intervened in
16 this proceeding. Specifically, I make few corrections to my report, provide a follow up
17 response regarding the Project’s compliance with the Town and Regional Plans, and provide
18 an update to my previous conclusions regarding the Project’s aesthetic impacts.

19 Additionally, I introduce a revised mitigation planting plan for the Project, which takes into
20 account the recommendations of the Department’s witness, Mr. Owens.

1 **Q6. What corrections would you like to make to your report?**

2
3 A6. On page 7 of my report, I stated that the Project would not be visible from the intersection
4 of Route 140 and Orchard Road. However, as shown in Photopoint D in the report, there is
5 a small, narrow view of the Project is possible, albeit somewhat filtered by existing
6 vegetation along the south side of Westcott Road. Photopoint D also incorrectly states that
7 there is an intervening hillside; however, there is no topographic obstruction and limited
8 views of the project are possible as indicated in the cross section provided with the report
9 (Figure 9).

10

11 **Q7. What additional information or analysis do you wish to provide regarding the**
12 **Middletown Springs Town Plan?**

13 A7. I would like to respond to the testimony of Neighbor's witness, Mr. Thomas, regarding the
14 Project's compliance with the Town Plan. Citing the Plan's "Highland Conservation Area"
15 district, Mr. Thomas argues that the Town Plan contains a clear written community standard
16 because one of the land use goals identified is to protect ridgelines from development. I
17 disagree with this conclusion. The proposed Project is not on a ridgeline, nor is it located
18 within the "Highland Conservation Area." The project is located in an old orchard that is
19 more than 180 feet below the ridgeline, which appears well behind (south and west) and
20 above the project, when viewed from a distance. This is supported by the topographic
21 contours shown on Figure 1 of my original report (*See Exhibit ORS-MK-1, Figure 1*). In
22 addition, as shown on the "Future Land Use" map included in the Town Plan, *see Exhibit*
23 *ORS-MK-2*, the proposed Project site is within the "Rural District."

1 I agree with the assessment of the Department's witness, Mr. Owns, that although
2 there are several generalized statements and goals in the Town and Regional Plan regarding
3 protecting scenic resources, there are no specific policies included in these plans regarding
4 these resources (Exhibit DPS-JO-2 at 9); nor is the Project site proposed in an area that is
5 identified as a scenic resource. I therefore reaffirm my conclusion that the Project does not
6 violate any clear written community standards in the Town or Regional Plans.

7
8 **Q8. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding the Project's compliance with**
9 **the Town or Regional Plans?**

10 A8. Yes. In addition to disagreeing with Mr. Thomas's assessment regarding the presence of any
11 clear written community standards, I disagree with Mr. Thomas's conclusion that the Project
12 unduly interferes with orderly development in the region. Mr. Thomas cites to a provision
13 of the Rutland Regional Plan labeled "Proposed Regional and Community Standards for
14 Energy Facility Siting & Development (for Regional and Municipal Plans and Act
15 250/Section 248 Proceedings)." Although it is not clear based on this title whether this
16 section has been adopted, or is a draft proposal for future standards, the Project is compliant
17 with the standards set out for solar electric facilities. Specifically, the Project has been sited
18 to avoid impacts to primary agricultural soils and silvicultural areas as much as possible, and
19 Project infrastructure is located away from existing residences, wetlands, special flood areas,
20 and slopes to the degree possible. The project is proposed on a defunct apple orchard, and
21 as stated in the Natural Resources Report submitted with the Project application, *Exhibit*
22 *ORS-DB-2*, only a very small portion of the Project (approximately 3500 square feet) is
23 located on soils that are designated as primary agricultural soils. These soils will be

1 minimally displaced for Project infrastructure, and will be maintained on site for the life of
2 the Project. *Exhibit ORS-DB-2*. Thus, the Project has been sited to largely avoid impacts
3 to primary agricultural soils, and has been designed to be set back from roads, wetlands, and
4 existing residences and to incorporate substantial mitigation plantings to further screen the
5 Project. As a result, I conclude that the Project is compliant with these proposed objectives.

6 In addition, I would reiterate my earlier conclusion that the Project site is not located
7 in an area that has been identified in either the Regional or Town Plan as part of a
8 formalized conservation strategy or process. For these reasons, I disagree with Mr.
9 Thomas's assessment, and conclude that the Project will not unduly interfere with orderly
10 development of the region.

11
12 **Q9. What update do you wish to provide regarding your evaluation of the aesthetic**
13 **impacts of the Project?**

14 Q9. My report included a visual assessment of the Project's viewshed from areas that were
15 accessible to the public. It did not include an assessment from nearby private roads and
16 residences, as we did not have permission to enter those areas. However, the site visit held
17 for this proceeding included several private residences off of private roads in the area. A
18 representative of SE Group, Thomas Hand, attended the site visit and took pictures, which I
19 have reviewed. Additionally, upon request of the Neighbors, we created three simulations of
20 views of the Project from at or nearby certain Neighbors' properties (Sun Dog Lane,
21 McKeen/Secord property, and the Galloway property). Those simulations are attached as
22 *Exhibit ORS-MK-3*.

1 Having reviewed the viewshed of the Project site from the private properties
2 attended on the site visit, I reaffirm my assessment of the Project's impact as adverse, but
3 not unduly adverse. The majority of these residences are located across the valley from the
4 Project, at a significant distance from the Project site, and the Applicant has taken generally
5 available mitigating steps to improve the harmony of the Project with the surroundings –
6 including revising the mitigation planting plan in response to feedback from the
7 Department's witness (discussed further below), and to review and consider alternative
8 locations requested by Neighbors (as discussed further in the rebuttal testimony of Rod
9 Viens). Thus, I conclude that the Project does not have an undue adverse impact on visual
10 aesthetics.

11
12 **Q10. You mentioned a revised mitigation planting plan. Please identify and explain what**
13 **changes have been made to the plan from what was originally submitted with the**
14 **application.**

15 A10. In my report, *Exhibit ORS-MK-2*, the originally proposed mitigation planting plan was
16 included as Figure 10. Following the recommendations made by the Department's witness
17 in his testimony and report, Applicant ORS has made a number of changes to the plan, as
18 described below. The revised plan is attached as *Exhibit ORS-MK-4 (Rev. Mit. Planting*
19 *Plan)*.

20 The specific changes to the plan include:

- 21 • I have moved a row of twenty (20) proposed white pine trees (*Pinus*
22 *strobus*) closer to the eastern property line, allowing them to gain some
23 additional elevation relative to observers further east. I have also

1 increased the density of these plantings by adding eight (8) additional
2 pines and specified 10-12 foot tall pines at installation rather than the
3 8-10 foot as originally proposed. Further, I have added nine (9)
4 additional sugar maples (*Acre saccharum*) east of those pines to help
5 soften and naturalize the plantings.

- 6 • I have added fifteen (15) new pines (*Pinus strobus*) along the northern
7 edge of the Project boundary and shifted previously proposed maples
8 to their foreground (closer to Wescott Road) to again soften and
9 naturalize the plantings.
- 10 • I have also replaced and shifted the previously proposed shadblow
11 serviceberry (*Amelanchier canadensis*) with gray dogwood (*Cornus*
12 *racemosa*) which will create a denser understory within the proposed
13 landscape area.

14 With these changes, ORS has taken additional steps to mitigate the impacts of the
15 proposed project relative to the adjacent public roadway and the more distant residential
16 properties. When combined with the proposed setback of the Project, its placement well
17 below the ridgelines to the south and west, and the orientation of the array away from public
18 and private views, the proposed mitigating steps are reasonable and improve the harmony of
19 the Project with respect to its surroundings.

20

21 **Q11. Does that conclude your testimony today?**

22 Q11. Yes, it does.



All Photographs taken by SE Group using a Canon Rebel camera with a 52mm focal length (35 mm equivalent) on 04/10/2017 from 3:30 PM-5:00 PM. 9"x13.5" image is best when viewed 24.33" from the eye.



All Photographs taken by SE Group using a Canon Rebel camera with a 52mm focal length (35 mm equivalent) on 04/10/2017 from 3:30 PM-5:00 PM. 9"x13.5" image is best when viewed 24.33" from the eye.

Prepared By:



groSolar | Orchard Road Solar - Middletown Springs , VT
SIMULATED VIEW FROM SUN DOG LANE | Figure 2

MAY 24, 2017



All Photographs taken by SE Group using a Canon Rebel camera with a 52mm focal length (35 mm equivalent) on 04/10/2017 from 3:30 PM-5:00 PM. 9"x13.5" image is best when viewed 24.33" from the eye.

Prepared By:



groSolar | Orchard Road Solar - Middletown Springs , VT

EXISTING VIEW FROM MCKEEN/SECORD PROPERTY | Figure 3

MAY 24, 2017



All Photographs taken by SE Group using a Canon Rebel camera with a 52mm focal length (35 mm equivalent) on 04/10/2017 from 3:30 PM-5:00 PM. 9"x13.5" image is best when viewed 24.33" from the eye.

Prepared By:



groSolar | Orchard Road Solar - Middletown Springs , VT

SIMULATED VIEW FROM MCKEEN/SECORD PROPERTY | Figure 4

MAY 24, 2017



All Photographs taken by SE Group using a Canon Rebel camera with a 52mm focal length (35 mm equivalent) on 04/10/2017 from 3:30 PM-5:00 PM. 9"x13.5" image is best when viewed 24.33" from the eye.

Prepared By:



groSolar | Orchard Road Solar - Middletown Springs , VT

EXISTING VIEW FROM GALLOWAY PROPERTY | Figure 5

MAY 24, 2017



All Photographs taken by SE Group using a Canon Rebel camera with a 52mm focal length (35 mm equivalent) on 04/10/2017 from 3:30 PM-5:00 PM. 9"x13.5" image is best when viewed 24.33" from the eye.

Prepared By:



groSolar | Orchard Road Solar - Middletown Springs , VT

SIMULATED VIEW FROM GALLOWAY PROPERTY | Figure 6

MAY 24, 2017

PLANT LIST:					
KEY	BOTANICAL NAME	COMMON NAME	QTY.	SIZE	REMARKS
TREES:					
AS	Acer saccharum 'Green Mountain'	Green Mountain Sugar Maple	16	2-2.5" Cal.	B&B, 6' min. branching
PS	Pinus strobus	Eastern White Pine	52	10-12' ht.	B&B, Full
SHRUBS:					
CR	Cornus racemosa	Gray Dogwood	11	3-4' Ht.	B&B or container



Legend

- Project Parcel
- Project Fence
- A** Photographic Point - See Figure 3-6

Notes: The site information depicted on this plan was provided by Novus Energy. The aerial photograph is from Google Earth. SE Group has used this information as part of its analysis of the project, but makes no warrants as to the accuracy of it. This material is provided for review purposes only.

