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MS. HILTON: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to -- I guess this is a reconvening of the hearing that we had last week up in Lincoln and it's on Development Permit DP 4889, Champlain Wind LLC's proposed Bowers Mountain wind power project.

My name is Gwen Hilton and I'm the commission chairperson and presiding officer for this hearing. And I'd like to introduce everyone -- staff and commissioners here at the table. And I'm going to ask -- Angella, why don't you introduce yourself as well.

MS. CLUKEY: Angella Clukey, court reporter.
MR. HAMMOND: Toby Hammond, Naples, Maine.
MR. LAVERTY: Ed Laverty, Medford, Maine.
MS. KURTZ: Rebecca Kurtz, Phillips, Maine.
MR. NADEAU: Jim Nadeau, Winterville Plantation.
MR. TODD: Fred Todd, LURC staff.
MS. HILTON: Gwen Hilton, Starks.
MS. MILLS: Amy Mills, AG's office.
MS. CARROLL: Good morning. My name is Catherine
Carroll and I am the Commission staff director.

MS. HORN OLSEN: Samantha Horn Olsen, LURC staff. MS. HILTON: And we also have Scott Perrow who is providing our recording services here, and Jim Palmer, our scenic expert, over in the -- near the windows there. I think we're going to -- since there's so many folks here, we're going to forego having introduction of individuals in the audience.

I do want to thank everyone for being here and, I guess, in particular our State agency representatives who have come here today to assist us in review of this application.

I have my formal opening statement here. Today's hearing is being held pursuant to the provisions of 12 M.R.S.A. Section 685-B. The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedures Act and Chapter 5 of the Commission's rules for the conduct of public hearing.

Today's hearing is a continuation of the hearing begun in Lincoln on June 27 th and 28th, 2011 to receive testimony on the matter of Development Permit DP 4889 submitted by Champlain Wind, LLC to construct a 69.1 megawatt wind energy development in Carroll Plantation, Penobscot County and Kossuth Township, Washington County.

The purpose of today's session is to provide an opportunity for the commission, staff and parties to ask
questions of review agencies and consultants to assist the commission in determining whether the development proposal meets the criteria for approval as specified in 12 M.R.S.A. Section 685-B(4) and (4-B) of the Commission statutes and the Commission's Land Use Districts and Standards.

Representatives of the applicant will first provide a summary of the proposal. Questioning of witnesses may be conducted first by the commission, then by the staff, next by the applicant and then by the intervenors. However, commission members, staff and counsel for the commission may ask questions at any time.

All witnesses must be sworn and will be required before they give testimony to state for the record their name, residence, business or professional affiliation, the nature of their interest in the hearing and whether or not they represent another individual, firm or other legal entity for the purpose of the hearing.

In addition to being transcribed, we will be recording the proceedings today, so I request that you speak clearly and not too quickly. All questions and testimony must be relevant to the Commission's criteria for approval for this proposal. Irrelevant or unduly repetitious materials or questions will be excluded.

The record of this hearing will remain open until Monday, July 18th to receive written statements from the
interested public and for an additional seven days until Monday, July 25 th for the purpose of receiving rebuttal comments. No additional evidence or testimony will be allowed into the record after the closing of the record.

Persons attending the hearing who wish to receive a copy of the final action taken by the Commission as a result of this hearing may leave the their names and address with the staff.

At this time $I$ would like to swear in any witnesses who plan to testify today. And I guess if you could please stand up and raise your right hand. Is that everyone? All right. Do you solemnly swear to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth?

PARTICIPANTS: I do.
MS. HILTON: All right. Thank you very much. Okay. So I guess the applicant -- we're looking for a presentation from you folks. Who's going to do that?

MS. PRESCOTT: I am.
MS. HILTON: You are. Okay.
MS. PRESCOTT: Good morning. I'm Joy Prescott with Stantec. I'm going to provide a brief overview of the project, which will be similar to that which you heard last week.

Bowers is being proposed by Champlain Wind, which is a subsidiary of First Wind, who has constructed and is
operating several grid scale projects throughout Maine. And it is located in Carroll Plantation in Kossuth Township, as you can see on this map here. Unfortunately, I don't have my pointer, but it's the same map we showed at the hearing last week.

But it will be up to 27 turbines located on three lower elevation ridge lines which range in elevation from 750 to 1,100 feet. And it will -- each of the turbines will be connected by access roads and there will be 9.8 miles of existing roads and 1.8 miles of improvements to -- sorry, 9.8 miles of new roads and 1.8 miles of improvements to existing roads.

And Champlain has conducted a full suite of environmental surveys including two seasons of radar bird surveys, two seasons of raptor surveys, three seasons of bat surveys. And these results showed consistent with surveys conducted at other locations both in Maine and New England. And we also conducted a full suite of both wetland delineation surveys and vernal pool surveys. And from those surveys there was -- the design was able to avoid most of the impacts to any wetland or vernal pool resources. There is 0.10 acres of wetland fill and 3.79 acres of clearing in wetlands, primarily under the electrical collector line.

And the electrical collector line collects power from
each of the turbines and then runs north across Route 6 for approximately 5.2 miles to a substation that's located adjacent to Line 56 , which was the -- which Line 56 was built for the existing Stetson project.

In addition to those surveys, a suite of both historic architecture and precontact archeological surveys were done and found that there would be no impacts to resources in those areas. And in addition, a visual impact assessment was conducted by LandWorks in which they evaluated the scenic resources in the area. And there are two types of scenic resources. One is great ponds of scenic significance, either outstanding or significant. And there is also one historic -- historic -- location on the historic register which does not have visibility.

There are a total of 14 lakes with scenic significance within 8 miles. And this is probably a good point to point out that at last week's hearing there was a question raised about Pug Lake. And the applicant has consulted with LURC since last week and established that although initially we did not think that -- we thought that Pug Lake was a separate lake and was not scenic significance, we've worked with LURC and Palmer to identify that it is. And yesterday we provided an initial analysis of the visual impact from that location.

And overall there are nine lakes that would have
visibility of turbines within 8 miles, there are four lakes within 3 miles that would have visibility, and there are four lakes within the 3 to 8 miles that would have visibility, and then there are six lakes that would have no visibility within the -- within 8 miles of turbines.

LandWorks conducted the analysis and looked at the scenic -- the scenic significance and character of each of those lakes, the existing use and the likely impact of the turbines on those uses. And in summary concluded that there would be no undue adverse effect on any of those uses from the presence of those turbines.

In addition to the environmental considerations for the project, Champlain must also demonstrate significant tangible benefit for the host communities and for the state. And in this case there are several specific benefits that are included as part of the package. There is a community benefits agreement with Carroll Plantation for $\$ 92,000$ for the life of the project and for Kossuth -and with Washington Township it's 10,000 for the life of the project. And there will also be an energy fund that is set up for the residents of Kossuth Township that would be funded at $\$ 20,000$ initially and then $\$ 15,000$ for the life of the project. And, finally, there will be a conservation fund that's set up in cooperation with the Forest Society of Maine that is funded at $\$ 120,000$ initially and then
$\$ 20,000$ for the life of the project.
And overall the total benefits for the -- this -- for the tangible benefits package over the life of the 20 years of the project would be $\$ 2,845,000$.

And so in summary, Champlain has developed a project that has limited environmental impact but will provide significant economic impact to both the local community -local and regional economy directly and immediately. And with that we look forward to additional discussion this morning.

MS. HILTON: Thank you for that presentation. So I'm going to work with Fred here. I guess what we want to do is ask our consultants to -- or our State agency reps to come up to the table and --. I'll let you take it away.

MR. TODD: Well, intervenors had an opportunity, as well as the applicant, to request agency representatives or our consultants to be present today for questioning and cross-examination. Intervenors requested the presence of I F \& W staff and Jim Palmer. At last week's session in Lincoln there was some question raised by Intervenor Corrigan about potential groundwater impacts from construction activities on Bowers Mountain to the watershed to the south of it. So I posed some questions to both DOC and DEP staff about that potential.

I'm going to pass out to the Commission an e-mail that
went to Bob Marvinney and John Hopeck -- Bob Marvinney is with the -- is a state geologist and John Hopeck is at DEP -- regarding the -- the potential for adverse groundwater quality impacts from construction activities on the mountain. I supplied a copy of that e-mail to the parties. I did not bring a lot of copies with me, I just had copies for the Commission.

But what I would suggest is the order to proceed here is that we have John Hopeck come up and, basically, articulate what he responded -- how he responded to my question about potential groundwater impacts, and then that we go to $I \mathrm{~F} \& \mathrm{~W}$ staff on wildlife issues and then to Jim Palmer on scenic issues. I think potentially the questions of Jim Palmer will probably take up most of the time today, so I would rather get what I think will be the lesser time-consuming questions out of the way before we go to the scenic issues.

I would point out that Dave Rocque is also in the audience from the Department of Agriculture, the State soil scientist. The -- none of the intervenors or the applicant asked for him to be here, but he is here in case Commission or intervenors have a question of him. I will not ask him to come up unless somebody says that they actually have a -- they have a question of him. You do, Ed? MR. LAVERTY: Just a quick question.

MR. TODD: So, actually, maybe we can start with -with Dave Rocque. Dave, if you would be willing to come up?

MR. ROCQUE: Good morning.
MS. HILTON: Good morning. Thank you for being here. MR. ROCQUE: It's hot outside. EXAMINATION OF DAVID ROCQUE

BY MR. LAVERTY:
Q Dave, I've just got a couple of really quick questions. One came up and as -- I believe it was testimony from the public that was -- concern was raised about blasting in the area associated with various projects that have been approved and the potential for creating or contributing to a major earthquake in Burlington in the recent past.

I know you're -- I mean, you're a soil scientist, but do you see any relationship between blasting on these project sites and earthquakes in the area?

A I'd have to say that that's not an area that I have any expertise in. So I probably would defer that to the state geologist and -- but not -- not be able to answer that.

Q Okay. Thank you very much for that. Could we get in the record something from the State geologist? I mean, this really ought to be put to rest, either that or explored. But it just seems that that ought to be --. I had a couple other things.

In your review comments you requested -- yeah, you requested that -- well, again, you requested that there should be additional blasting of rock for fill, that that would be taken care of that -- that's why I sort of thought you were the person to answer the blasting question, but I understand it. The other is that with regard to rock sandwiches, you -- I love this rock sandwiches and rock burrito thing. Whoever makes these terms up --

A The comments that I made regarding those two features I think were addressed. One of them was that they didn't really indicate where the rock sandwich was going to be used. And they revised their plans and that detail explaining where it should be used, which was something I was very concerned with. I mean, I could look on the maps, figure out where I thought might be a good location, but when you get out into the field, it may be different and there may be places that weren't identified. So they conditioned it to be used in certain locations,
which was as appropriate. So I -- I think that was addressed properly.

Q Okay. So you feel comfortable with the application as it stands today?

A For the most part. There were still a couple of minor details. I -- I did get in touch with the -- the project engineer about the lay-down areas because there was no provision for where or how those lay-down areas are going to be constructed. Erosion sediment control, storm water and that kind of stuff and there should have been something.

And the engineer indicated that that would be addressed before the project went out for construction.

Q And you feel comfortable with that?
A Yeah. I mean, it's not rocket science, but it just needs to make sure that there is a procedure and they're not just built inappropriately.

Okay. So you don't see any loose ends here that need to be addressed, everything seems to be --

A I feel pretty -- yeah. MR. LAVERTY: Okay. Thank you. MS. HILTON: I don't have any questions, but $I$ do want to say that we very much appreciate your attention to those details and thorough review that you give of it. MR. LAVERTY: Yeah, it would be hard for us to do this
without you.
MR. ROCQUE: Well, I am glad to be able to be of service.

MS. HILTON: I think -- do you have anything else? Anybody else? Okay. Thank you, Dave.

MR. LAVERTY: Just another -- no, this is not to Dave. Thank you. I just wanted to say to Fred, there was another issue raised by the public comment and -- that I really -I think we need to, again, lay it to rest or pursue. And that was the idea that -- that there's been a number of forest fires -- or fires associated with wind power projects where turbines somehow burst into flame and create fire. Either this is an issue or it isn't an issue. And for the public in the Lincoln area, I think we owe to them to allay their fears about earthquakes and fires, if those can be allayed. If not, we need to address them.

MR. TODD: Okay. I did pose that question to the Maine Forest Service. And they have a -- a letter on file that was submitted prior to the record saying that they feel they can deal with potential forest fire danger from any activities around this development site. I put the question to them again because it came up in Lincoln. I said, you know, given -- and there was some recent press coverage about turbines catching fire. And they, basically, said their comments stand, they're not in the
business of fighting -- if a turbine catches on fire, they're not going to rush to put it out. If it starts burning in the brush, that's what they'll pay attention to. But they feel that -- that they're able to deal with what they perceive as potential woods fire from -- from this construction.

MR. LAVERTY: So they -- they feel that they're in a position to sufficiently provide for public safety. MR. TODD: Right. MR. LAVERTY: Thank you. MR. TODD: I mean, I -- if you would like, I could get them to put that in writing, but they, basically, said, our opinion is as stated on the record, we don't see the need to add to it.

MR. LAVERTY: That's fine for me. I just -- you know, it was brought up by the people in Lincoln and I think, you know, we needed to make sure it's addressed. And it's been addressed and I think that's sufficient for our purposes. Don't you? Unless somebody else wants to do something.

MR. NADEAU: No, I had concerns, too, Ed. And I'm glad to hear that they're the ones that are going to be providing the fire protection because I don't believe that the communities in that area could do that because I don't think they would have the right equipment.

MS. HILTON: Is there anywhere in the application where
there is any statement on the part of the applicant as to what the protocols are if there is a fire associated with one of turbines? I don't know --.

MR. TODD: I couldn't say off the top of my head. You could pose that to the applicant.

MS. BROWNE: I don't think -- is this on -- I don't think there's anything specific in the application, but it's certainly something we could follow up on during the post-hearing comment section, because it's something we've actually addressed in some of the very early hearings before the Commission. But I think in particular the Kibby project there was substantial discussion about it. So we could certainly provide follow-up on that question. MS. HILTON: I think that would good. MR. LAVERTY: Yeah, that would be good. MS. HILTON: Yeah. Thank you. MS. MILLS: Amy Mills, AG's office. I just wanted to make sure that the State agency representatives don't leave until we're done with the hearing because the other parties, other than the commissioners and staff, might have questions for you. So if you could just stick around for the morning, that would be great. MS. HILTON: Is there anything else on either of those two topics that we just spoke about? Okay. Fred, what's next?

MR. TODD: I would suggest that we have John Hopeck come up. As I mentioned earlier, I've passed out the -the series of e-mails back and forth between myself and John and Bob Marvinney. The commissioners have that in front of them, the parties have seen it before.

And I do appreciate John coming as a last-minute arrangement. I didn't contact him until late last week after we got back to Lincoln. So thanks for coming, John. MR. HOPECK: Thanks, Fred.

MR. TODD: I guess what I would -- what I would suggest we do is if you could just articulate your response to my question.

MR. HOPECK: Sure. The sort of general issues related to water quality impacts of construction, particularly with regard to the blasting and other bedrock effects, what we've seen historically, not so much in Maine but in other states where there are larger construction projects, is that groundwater contamination due to blasting itself --

MS. HILTON: John, I'm sorry to stop you. Can you state your name and -- for the record and your agency?

MR. HOPECK: Sure. John Hopeck with the Department of Environmental Protection.

MS. HILTON: Okay. Go ahead. I'm sorry.
MR. HOPECK: Groundwater impacts from blasting usually have to do with nitrogen compounds in the -- in the
explosives. And typically where we see those, it's improper storage of the explosives, improper disposal of explosive cartons or of wastes, failure to clear up misfires, other things like that that have to do not with the explosives afterward, but more to do with -- with the waste and how that soluble and -- gets into the groundwater there.

There was recently a major problem in New Hampshire that was associated with a long duration construction of a road cut and they had some groundwater contamination from the blasting in those areas. But, again, that was an explosives storage issue and not an explosives use issue. Certainly there are issues with emissions plants in federal facilities that we know of this Cape Cod and Oregon and other places like that where there are nitrate issues and also where there's perchlorate issues.

We don't see those -- or have not seen those historically in Maine simply because the volume of explosives used and stored aren't anywhere near what they are and because we do monitor the sites -- we and the fire marshal's office monitor those sites pretty carefully.

ANFO is a very common explosive, it does use fuel oil. So, again, storage is potentially a problem. Usually that's mixed offsite, it's delivered to the site in a truck, loaded into the holes and fired that day, so there's
not a storage issue on site. Again, the actual sort of storage and transport of that is dealt with through the fire marshal's office, but it is routine in -- in Maine for that all to be done offsite. And there are, you know, except for the quarry operation, obviously, not a lot of explosives storage on the site itself.

So we don't really anticipate, if the blasting is conducted according to the principles that we go by and that we've recommended to the Commission, that the blasting itself is a major groundwater contamination issue. One thing we do have some concerns about in particular -- not so much down in the flat territories, but in these steeper environments where there's a potential for extended fill slopes, where there's the usage for the rock sandwiches, rock burritos, just general slopes of rock fill, is whether or not there's the potential for encountering reactive rock in some areas. And -- which is to say rock that could generate acidic drainage or that could leach metals.

We don't have anywhere -- you know, this is not -- it's not West Virginia, it's not Tennessee, it's not the portions of the Miramichi in New Brunswick where that's been an issue. Although, the reason we're concerned is that that belt in the Miramichi area, where in New Brunswick they have had problems, extends down into Maine and, in fact, into some of the area of this project. We
have seen gravel pits and quarries in some areas that have encountered some of this material where it's been a problem. Not a major problem -- again, I say it's not West Virginia, it's not Kentucky, anywhere like that where some of these rocks are major issues, and it's certainly not the mining operations that we see up in New Brunswick.

But it's something we want to be aware of, particularly if those rock types are put into areas where there's a lot of water moving through them, which you have in a fill slope, a rock burrito, a rock sandwich. And so we work with the applicant to do some preliminary surveys, we go out and look at the rock types. And it's not an unmanageable issue. Basically, you have to control the pH.

So where you've encountered them before, it's, basically, avoiding putting that into a fill slope, burying that rock type on site. They tend to be pretty discrete, small bodies that those rock types can be segregated pretty easily. They tend to be very easily recognized in the field so that the construction crews can recognize them once they're told what to look for. That's what we've seen on other sites where this has come up, they're very easy to recognize in the field.

And, again, there are -- there are simple solutions to manage them, whether it's burying them on site so that they're not exposed; if you do have an exposed area,
putting limestone rip rap in the drain instead of just other kinds of rip rap so that the limestone will raise the pH and prevent the -- the issues. And, again, it's not a major issue, but it is something that where these rock types might be put into a setting where there's the potential for leaching there is a relatively simple measure we can use to prevent that.

So far the -- you know, we haven't had a -- and it's an issue on these slopes, basically, because we're dealing with steep slopes. It's -- when you get down to other types of development in more level parts of the landscape, you don't have those extensive fill slopes, you don't have the same needs for things -- and certainly we're not encountering the rock type in many other areas of the state.

At this particular site, even though it is in that same belt, because of the proximity to the large granite body just off to the south of Bowers Mountain, the heating from that has altered many of these minerals to a -- to a more stable form so that we are less concerned about the potential for leaching that we might be at another setting. But, again, there are -- unusual things happen and so the applicant here is going to be using the same principle, same sort of method, same sort of field review of what they encounter during the project, that we have recommended and
it's, to our experience, worked successfully on other sites.

The general issue as far as temperature, certainly, you know, we know that headwater streams are particularly sensitive, that they may be spring fed. Certainly open areas do expose the ground to more sunlight and have the potential for, you know, creating warmer conditions, but in Maine in -- and, again, in most locations most of the groundwater is fed by snow melt. And so while the precipitation as rain on the ground, the temperature -that may be elevated somewhat. The temperature of the snow melt is going to be, basically, the temperature of melting water regardless of how open the site is.

So our experience is that unless it's influenced by a discharge from something, a leaking lagoon or something like that, say, the temperature of the groundwater is not going to vary that much and the exposed area, compared to the area of the entire watershed, which is going to be contributing a base flow to the streams, is so large that if you -- Dr. Marvinney addressed this point a little bit more specifically. If you look at the heat balance, the effect of opening up this area is going to be small to negligible on the temperature of groundwater in the streams.

The temperatures we worry more about are temperatures
of surface water where you have runoff coming off paved areas or developed areas. And that's why in this case -in this case and, again, in many other cases we encourage people to divert water to buffers -- to forested buffers so that water can filter through the soil and can, you know, be cooled, basically. So anybody who's dug a -- not even too deep a hole knows how cool it gets and you don't have to get down too far.

So we like to have that water sheeted off the site, allowed to filter down through the soil structure. And if it does have an elevated temperature because it is coming off an open area, it cools down by contact with that.

And if any member of the Commission or, Fred, you have other specific issues related to that, I would be happy to try and address them.

MS. HILTON: Commissioner questions? Fred?
MR. TODD: So the short answer is if -- if the usual construction precautions are taken in terms of controlling runoff, et cetera, that you don't see either groundwater quality or groundwater temperature being an issue with this particular project.

MR. HOPECK: No. I think that based on -- you know, if they follow the recommended procedures and operate in compliance with all the other statutes we have, you know -I know our standard is unreasonable adverse impact. So I
would never say no impact, but certainly there would be nothing for us that would qualify as an unreasonable impact, nothing that would adversely impact surface water quality. Certainly there are -- there are a small number of wells in the vicinity of the substation, but none in the area of the turbines or the -- except at the very end of the access road where it joins the Brown Road.

So I think that we would -- we would, in our case, make a finding of no unreasonable adverse impact, to use the -the DEP technical language.

MR. TODD: Thank you.
MR. LAVERTY: I guess I do have --. Just to be clear, I mean, from a layman's perspective, okay, it seems to me that one of the concerns here is not only wells, but we're looking at, you know, feeder streams for some damn high quality fisheries. And what we're concerned about ultimately is the impact on the fisheries. And so what we're saying is if the applicant follows the protocols recommended by DEP, that we have reason to believe that there will be no adverse impacts -- no unreasonable adverse impacts on fisheries?

MR. HOPECK: Yes, that's a reasonable conclusion. MR. LAVERTY: That's where we are? MR. HOPECK: Hm-hmm. MR. LAVERTY: Thank you.

MS. HILTON: I guess that's all the questions we have. That was very helpful.

MR. HOPECK: Thank you.
MS. HILTON: Thank you very much. Okay. I guess the next folks we'd like to hear from are Fish \& Wildife. MR. TODD: Mark and Steve, thanks for making the trip to Bangor today. There are three -- three issues that I wanted to pose questions on. The first one is the issue of lynx habitat, which there have been some correspondence amongst ourselves and the U.S. Fish \& Wildlife Service. And most recently there was a report that was put into the record, I think it was dated mid June -- June 15 or 16, from Stantec to U.S. Fish \& Wildlife Service in regards to a question they had posed earlier regarding potentially impact to lynx habitat.

My understanding is that U.S. Fish \& Wildlife has not had a chance to review that report and comment on it, but I wonder if you folks have had any further conversations with U.S. Fish \& Wildlife, or if you, yourself, would care to comment on that report.

MR. CARON: Mark Caron, Maine Fish \& Wildlife out of the Enfield office. Fred, you're referring to the habitat assessment?

MR. TODD: Yes.
MR. CARON: Okay. I'll just state for the record that

I $F$ \& $W$ didn't request this study, so we're -- you know, The Service is really the ones that ought to be responding to this and we understand that they haven't as yet.

Another point I just wanted to make is this is a standard request, I believe, that comes from The Service for these types of projects. And Stantec can correct me if I'm wrong on that. But the methodology used, I guess my question was, has that been worked out between The Service and the applicant and Stantec so that it's kind of routine and they know what they're asking for or is this something new? I don't know if it was or not.

And then I believe last Tuesday Ms. Prescott had asked in a phone conversation with Mark McCollough if he had had a chance to look at it, the data, I don't remember. He hadn't. I also requested back on Monday, June 27 th in a phone call with Mark if he had looked at it then and he hadn't gotten to it yet, so here we are.

But with that said, I did review it. The habitat types that were focused on are in line with what lynx habitat and snowshoe hare habitat would be. I did not have any concerns with that. I think the wording -- the Stantec information is -- came right out of other documents that The Service has -- had presented when they described lynx habitat. And I have no reason to -- to disagree with it. And I -- I think what Stantec presented here for the type
of habitats that they were reviewing were fine, they -they're acceptable to I F \& W.

The methodology that they did use is acceptable to I F \& W, photo interpretation to delineate stand-type information. It's similar to what we've used with many projects in the past including lynx survey work in the eastern lowlands region. When we did some work there in the past, we -- we did -- we used photo interp, habitat modeling, that sort of a thing. So that's in line with that.

The results focused on current conditions within the project area and suggest -- and I was not surprised by the results, small patches of conforming habitat-type scattered throughout. It's -- it's really a hardwood dominated area to a large extent. So I wouldn't expect to see a lot of lynx, snowshoe-hare-type habitat in large contiguous blocks in there. And the discussion about loss of habitat, there may be some minor loss of habitat related to the construction work. Probably gain -- arguably gain a little bit of habitat, too, over time as things are reforested or come on line.

I guess the only other question $I$ had is -- and I'm not familiar with the -- the arrangement that the applicant has made with landowners there, if there's going to be additional harvesting operations in that greater area or
not. And those are all unknowns that could influence habitat over time. But, again, that's -- I mean, based on what was asked for -- and I'm assuming that Stantec provided what Mark McCollough asked for -- I F \& W has no major concerns with this report.

MR. TODD: Okay. Thanks. I'm told by our timekeeper that our time is running out for the Commission and staff. But just quickly, what's your understanding between you and the applicant on the status of curtailment of operations for -- to avoid bat -- to minimize bat mortality and the post-construction avian fatality studies?

MR. TIMPANO: I'm Steve Timpano, environmental coordinator with Maine Inland Fisheries \& Wildlife Department. And we -- as I think was pretty well concluded at the Bull Hill project hearing, we have made the recommendation for curtailment or not operating the turbines until wind speeds are above 5 meters per second, which is the point at which bat activity diminishes in the vicinity of the project turbines -- or bat activity overall regardless of where it would be, but to minimize the risk of impact to bats that were resident in the area. And so we had made that recommendation.

And Stantec and the applicant worked to develop a curtailment study proposal. And it's -- it's modeled after one that is going to be undertaken at a project in Vermont,
the Sheffield project, Sheffield study, is the way we refer to it. At this point in time we're still awaiting -- and on good terms planning to work with the applicant and develop a final study plan to be implemented when the project is ready to go operational.

And the way it's set up right now with the Bull Hill project, half the turbines would be operated at all wind speeds, that is, as soon as there was wind enough to turn them, and that half of them would be held stationary until the wind got above 5 meters per second. And then there would be post-construction mortality studies done in connection with that to determine if, in fact, the -- there was a difference -- an observable difference in mortalities with those two replicates.

And adding the -- the Bowers project to that study would be very beneficial in increasing the sample size, the number of turbines that could be studied. So we agreed to the -- as I say, at this point, until the final plan is developed, I consider it at least a conceptual plan. We agreed that the conceptual outline for the Bull Hill project, we're entirely willing to move forward with that same conceptual planning effort for the Bowers project. And I assume that it would be conditioned in any permit that is subject to final approval by you the Commission or staff, however. So that's where we stand with it.

MR. LAVERTY: So there's no -- you and the applicant are working cooperatively on this now, there's no difference of opinion, the conceptual -- there may be some devil in its details, but the conceptual plan is agreed upon by you and the applicant; that's your understanding? MR. TIMPANO: That's the way we are planning to move forward. It will be a collaborative, cooperative effort. MR. LAVERTY: Thank you. MS. HILTON: Any other questions, commissioners? MR. HAMMOND: Just one. Let's say they do these studies and they find out that there is more fatalities for the -- for the turbines that are turning; is there anything that's going to happen once we know that? MR. TIMPANO: You mean in terms of -MR. HAMMOND: Making all the turbines -MR. TIMPANO: -- project operations? MR. HAMMOND: Yes. MR. TIMPANO: Okay. And that -- I guess that is the crux of it. I mean, once you do the study and reach the determinations from it, then what do you do with it? And our intent would be that it would be -- the project would be operated such that turbines were not rotating or causing risk up to whatever -- you know, if it's 5 meters per second wind speed or whatever wind speed we study. And that that would be -- become the mode of operation for the
project curtailment up to asap.
MR. HAMMOND: And this is in agreement with the applicant and your --?

MR. TIMPANO: Yes, I -- I'm assuming so or they
wouldn't be undertaking the studies.
MR. HAMMOND: The point is there's no sense having the study if we don't do something with it, right?

MR. TIMPANO: Correct.
MR. HAMMOND: And so I guess my question would be -and perhaps you can help us with it, Fred, but --. If that's the case, I have no problem.

MR. TODD: That's my understanding. I see the applicant shaking -- nodding their head that they're comfortable with that.

MR. HAMMOND: Okay. Thank you.
MS. HILTON: I think that is key. And in the Bull Hill project wasn't there such a -- a written agreement? Yeah. Okay.

MS. BROWNE: I mean, just to clarify, in Bull Hill following the hearing the applicant submitted a proposed language for a condition that essentially after the study was completed, the results of the study and any proposed change in operations would be submitted to the Commission for the Commission's review and approval. So there's a mechanism for the Commission to come back and decide
ultimately whether adjustments in operation are appropriate based on the results of the study.

MR. LAVERTY: My assumption is that that similar condition would be attached to this approval; is that correct?

MR. TODD: Yes.
MR. LAVERTY: Thanks.
MS. HILTON: Okay. Any other questions, concerns? Okay. I guess, very good. Thank you very much. So I guess we're going to tackle the scenic issues. And, Jim, if you'd like to come up.

So do commissioners want to ask questions first here or shall we have Fred take the lead? I guess we're looking to you to --.

MR. LAVERTY: I just wanted to ask -- I had the opportunity to engage, $I$ thought, in pretty interesting dialogue with both Jim and the applicant's visual expert, so I -- at the hearing, previous hearing, I think it was what Tuesday morning, so --. I want to thank you guys for entertaining that kind of -- kind of twisting and curving and up and down, but it was a very interesting discussion I thought, so --. I'm interested in what Fred has to ask. MR. TODD: Okay. I -- I have several questions and I could probably chew up a lot of time. I'm just trying to focus on what seems to be the most important, at least to
me.
EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER
BY MR. TODD:
Q Jim, in your report dated June 3rd, the review of the Bowers wind project VIA, there's a table -- Table 4 on Page 32 which has a number of columns which are -- there's two columns which are titled VIA. I assume that's LandWorks' VIA; is that correct?

A Yes, that's correct.
Q And the reason I ask that is because the -- your analysis of the number of turbines visible from the -- the different lakes there would indicate that there's a potential for visibility from three of the lakes, which they indicate there is no visibility, specifically Horseshoe, Norway and West Musquash.

Can you explain why your table has different results?
A Yeah. This table is based solely on a visibility analysis. So in this case, for the VIA column I'm trying to replicate their assumptions. I'm assuming when LandWorks made their final determination it was based on the visibility analysis and fieldwork. And in this table -- I don't have the benefit of fieldwork. I wouldn't have reported the fieldwork, anyway, it's really related to just the -- the visibility analysis.

But, say, take the -- the bottom row, the West Musquash

Lake where I'm saying there's one turbine visible, somewhere on the lake within the 8-mile distance there's at least one cell where there can be one turbine visible. And it's -- it's actually not likely that that's true because the height that I'm using for vegetation is 45 feet and the vegetation along the shoreline is higher than that. So it makes sense to me that LandWorks didn't find any visibility at all.

I would be more concerned if I would have found one of these lakes with a dozen -- or a large part of the lake looked like it was going to be visible. Then what would have happened is I would have gone back and asked. And that -- that actually has happened in previous projects where we found errors.

Okay. Thank you. On Page 30 of your report, the second paragraph ends with a statement: The guidance to evaluate state or national significant scenic resources with potential views of the turbine tip, as indicated by the topographic visibility analysis, is reasonable and should be adopted by others.

Are you suggesting that the Commission should take the worst case scenario in terms of potential visibility and assume there's no vegetation, that we just simply look at topography.

A
a procedure the that Maine Historic Preservation Commission is using, which I think originally was posed in Kibby, but I've since checked on and they are doing it. There could be, for instance, a dozen historic sites that are north of this project and we just know they're not going to see anything because of their location.

It seems an unnecessary expense to make them go do site evaluations for all of these sites when we -- when we're very confident that because of topography those sites will never have visibility. And that's what I'm saying here, that if a state or nationally significant scenic resource will not be able to see the tip of an upraised blade because of topography -- not vegetation, just topography is going to block it, then we really don't need to do other assessments, that that's a pretty simple geometric evaluation and the data -- there's always the potential for data error, but the data are pretty reliable for that kind of analysis.

Okay. Thank you. One last question. You present an intriguing idea on Page 27 in terms of post-construction monitoring. Have you given any thought to how we would do that for scenic impact? Or maybe another way to put it is, do you know of that being done in other -- in other areas?

A The only study that $I$ know of that made a real attempt to use a probability sample for that was done for Searsburg.

So there was a survey done before the -- the Searsburg project in Vermont to determine the public's reaction and then a survey done after -- shortly after the project went into operation to see whether or not the original survey was accurate, but also to get an assessment from local public how the construction went and were there impacts, for instance, that weren't really being accounted for like trying to get these blades through a village, which in this case -- in the Searsburg case was difficult.

In that project people thought that the first survey and the simulations and everything were really quite accurate and had been fairly done and that the project was pretty much what they expected it would be. And it would seem to me useful to at least do that a few more times to see whether these methods are working. It's not unlike doing these bird and bat mortality studies, we have no idea whether the calibration is really working or not.

Q And really, finally, the big question is, do you feel you could -- you could make a recommendation on whether or not the scenic impact here is unreasonable?

A Well, the -- part of the issue -- I don't feel that the scenic impact to any individual lake is unreasonable. I feel pretty comfortable saying that, understanding that the definition of -- there is no definition of unreasonable that I've been able to find anywhere in court cases or
anything. So I guess that really means the Commission gets to decide that -- that definition. The only difficulty that I have is, there's a bunch of lakes here. And I think I criticized the LandWorks' synthesis procedure, which was a simple averaging, just because it -- if you have a couple lakes where there's no impact but you've got a dozen lakes where it's really pretty bad, then when you average them, it's not going to reach the level of the -- averaging always will bring the value down.

But my, God, oh, ten lakes, a dozen lakes, that's a lot of lakes. And we're starting towards that number in this case. We've got a bunch of lakes that are going to get impacted. That's a different kind of cumulative impact -or it is a cumulative impact. I don't know how to -- how to weigh that. The way that the Wind Act is set up, every significant scenic resource is evaluated separately and there's no guidance on how you do that synthesis.

And, I mean, as you know, you're going to talk about cumulative impacts later probably in a different way, but that's not something for which there's a lot of procedures in this country anywhere, let alone for wind turbine projects. So that's a tough one. I don't have a simple answer or a good answer to that. But if we did do follow-up studies, that would be one of things to find out about.

And part of the way to look at it might be the extent of exposure, duration. So in these particular lakes, as I understand the opposition's argument, is that they're special because they're linked and that you could get on a three-day trip and, you know, be going through Junior and Scraggly Lake and Pug Lake -- the new Pug Lake and, you know, be exposed to it for several days, like, all day long. That's not as bad -- or that's much worse than the Appalachian Trail argument.

The Appalachian Trail is just saying that, you know, we're going to get three or four minutes' exposure every hour. And they're, you know, kind of throwing up their hands and did throw up their hands in Redington and that project was turned down. Well, now we've got one where there's the -- some potential where there's much longer exposure. And I just don't have -- I don't have enough knowledge about use and exposure to be able to evaluate that, we don't have that information. That's the issue, though.

MR. LAVERTY: Fred, if I might. EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER

BY MR. LAVERTY:
Q Jim, this is a question that obviously we need to -- that Amy needs to address and we need to mull over. But you -you have spent some time with the statute in attempts to
interpret, you know, the terms of art in a -- in a way that allows you to do your job.

I just ask you for your opinion, a lay opinion. Do you think that we have the statutory authority under the Wind Power Act to look at cumulative impact -- cumulative visual impact?

A Well, I certainly think that you have the statutory authority within an 8-mile study area to consider cumulative impact the way that $I$ was just talking about it for these linked lakes or, for that matter, in Highland along the Appalachian Trail there's several places, not just Bigelow where it's going to be visible. So within a project you absolutely do. And there may be ways, you know, to, well, stretch it to make it among projects.

Q I don't want to get into this now because we need to talk -- we don't have time. One side of this whole discussion about cumulative impacts is that the Legislature has already weighed in and said that there are expedited areas for wind energy and there are nonexpedited areas. These expedited areas have addressed this issue because they provide a different standard for evaluation. The Redington project, this was before the Act, and it now is in a nonexpedited area should a project come forward again, so there's a different standard being applied.

Some people have argued -- or a very legitimate
position is that the Legislature, when they said, these are expedited areas, they said, this is where wind power will take place and has said that we're going to look at issues of cumulative impact in nonexpedited areas and that we're going to accept sort of clustering in expedited areas. And so that's the way we're going to address this, we're going to have areas where there aren't going to be assessments of this type and there are going to be areas where there are going to be assessments of this type. Do you have any comments on that?

A I mean, that wasn't my understanding. My understanding was that expedited areas were identified because they're not close to a couple extremely sensitive receptors like national parks or, I don't know, some city centers. I don't know what the thing said they were. But I don't remember them talking at all about things like clustering or -- I think that that's stuff that we brought into the discussion later on the notion that that -- and that's what we're going to talk about later.

Q We'll talk about later. I apologize --
A That's okay.
-- for leading into that.
I think that this cumulative impact, that is, many lakes all within the study area which one could assume users may travel from one to the other to the other, I think that
that's within your purview. I just don't have a way -given the data, I don't have a way to assess that and I don't have the data to assess that. It's two parts. That's really different than project to project to project as you're walking the Appalachian Trail.

That's a different kind of cumulative impact, which is also serious, or the notion that the Appalachian Mountain Club study, I guess that's who it was, did the study of what the impact of fulfilling the State's wind energy goal would be, you know, as sort of painting a patina of wind turbines across the whole state, what's that impact going to be like.

MR. LAVERTY: Thank you.
MS. HILTON: We're out of time if we're following our schedule here. Fred just -- but I do want to mention something that we haven't talked about that has come up and that has been the issue of night lighting. We can either take that up now realizing that we're running over on time or we can allow -- listen to what the applicant and some of the intervenors are going to be asking questions of the various State agencies and it may come up as a part of that discussion. There's no reason why the Commission at any point in time can't ask questions.

So would you -- do you want to move along or would you like to address the lighting issues right now?

MR. LAVERTY: The thing about the lighting issue is that I thought we already pretty much addressed them? I mean, I think -- you know, Toby's questioning, the dialogue we had the applicant at the -- Tuesday morning's portion of the hearing. You know, I think that we collectively could see coming perhaps a condition to the permit talking about, you know, as technology improves that the project be reconsidered in that light given technical fees -- I mean, all the important boilerplate language. But $I$ think that -- I mean, if we need to go into that any further --. MS. HILTON: Okay. Good point. I don't know, Fred, any of the commissioners want to -- Rebecca?

## EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER

BY MS. KURTZ:
Q I guess I wanted to just add, I guess it was Ed's question that said -- that asked unreasonable impact and you said not for any individual lake there may not be an unreasonable impact, but for the collective there might be, or you expressed some reservation. Did you take into account night lighting on that when you -- the assessment that you just gave us?

A No. No, I didn't -- I didn't. Part of the problem there is that I don't have any knowledge of night use of these lakes. A resident that -- or the gazebo where we were looking at -- I mean, you weren't, but at Lincoln, isn't
from a significant scenic resource. So the way that the Act is written, you know, residents aren't protected under the Wind Energy Act, it would be somebody on the lake using the lake. And I don't have any knowledge of that being a significant thing. But I did not -- I mean, the direct answer is, no.

Q Unfortunately, I wasn't at the hearing on Tuesday so I -but I'm looking forward to the -- or the -- the auditory record has been made available to me and I'm waiting for the transcription, but --. And I don't know that you're comfortable answering this, but based on what you saw on, I guess it was Monday night, do you believe that your assessment that you have just given would change if you knew more about night use?

A Yeah, if, for instance, there was a State campground with the view that we had from Lincoln, that would be probably an unreasonable impact, I think. And that would be for two reasons. One is because it's a pretty strong impact, but also because there's a number of -- you know, more than just a very occasional person being exposed to it.

Part of the difficulty in this case -- it's not that there aren't campsites, there are campsites scattered throughout this area, but it appears to be a very small number irregularly used and there's no firm data that would suggest that it's anything other than that so far. If I
had such data, then my opinion might change and I might push harder for mitigation.

I mean, it's my understanding that there -- that these are pretty standard lights and there are other lights that have cutoffs and things like that that may or may not work in the wind turbine situation, but conceptually would help mitigate this situation.

## EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER

BY MS. HILTON:
Q I have one last question and I think it's pretty quick. Is there -- you mentioned the -- that one of the unique things about these lakes is that they -- they are connected and -which is -- sort of introduces a little bit of complexity to how we look at scenic resources. And I may have missed something here, but is there anywhere that you have seen where there is actually a map -- you know, the AT is a very well established trail.

A That's right.
Q And we've heard in testimony that these lakes are used for canoe trips -- multi-day canoe trips. Have you ever seen anything, you know, advertising or showing a map of this canoe trail, if you will?

A It's not set up like a trail. And I think that, actually, we had some testimony from that from the guides that they sort of -- because of the nature of what guides are, they
tailor it to the individual client or two that they take out and what they're looking for. So it's -- they kind of customize their trip. I was interested in this, too, because that's sort of the way that Lawrence presented in his visual impact assessment. I couldn't find such a map, but there were blog sites that talked about the general phenomena.

All the lakes aren't connected, but clearly several of them are and they're all controlled with the same dam and, I mean, we experienced that, we went through several lakes. Q Right. Okay.

A So it's not advertised that way, it's not something that an individual, like I with my kids, would know and just go. I think it's really accessed primarily by guides so far as I understand the description.

MS. HILTON: Okay. Thank you.
MR. LAVERTY: Gwen, if I'm not mistaken -- and this could be something for the staff to pursue is that NRCM's testimony during the public session mentioned some -- at some point these -- these lakes and these trips had been addressed or noted by some publication and I think there might have -- I'm not sure what the testimony was, but there may, in fact, be something like that.

MS. HILTON: Yeah. Good point.
MR. TODD: There is information in the record submitted
by NRCM on, as I recall, two particular canoe trips from different -- starting from different points amongst these lakes.

MR. PALMER: I think that's the -- maybe the Maine Flat Water Canoe Guide or something like that. But I don't see anything that's sort of separate like the -- the watershed. I mean, this has been presented as though this is a unit and -- and that's how the Lawrence VIA presented it. And I'm not able to find anything that would suggest that that's -- that that kind of advertising and marketing is actually occurring. That doesn't mean it doesn't -- that the opportunity doesn't exist, I'm just not seeing it.

MS. HILTON: Okay. I think that's clear. Any more questions for Jim? Okay. So how do we --? Okay. I guess would the applicant like to do their cross-examination now and who would you like to cross-examine?

MS. BROWNE: I think what $I$ would like to do is start with Dr. Palmer. We have 45 minutes for cross and what I would like to do is take 25 minutes now, if $I$ could, and then reserve 20 minutes for recross at the end after the other parties have gone.

And I think I will, in the interest of time, probably just question Dr. Palmer and potentially I F \& W depending on what issues come up when they're questioned by the other parties.

MS. HILTON: Okay. That sounds fine.
EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER
BY MS. BROWNE:
Q So good morning, Dr. Palmer.
A Good morning.
Q I appreciate the thoughtfulness of your review and your comments in both the hearing last week and prior hearings. It's been a little bit of an evolving process through these projects.

I want to touch on just a few basic points because they may come up in your cross from the intervenors. And some of these are just technical issues. I think in your report -- and I assume you would agree -- that the visual simulations that were done by LandWorks are generally accurate, well constructed visual simulations that provide a good sense of what the project will look like when built?

A Yes, I would agree with that.
Q And you think they followed best professional practices in preparing those simulations?

A Yes, I do.
Q And I think you also stated in your report that although there are some differences of opinion on specific matters, that LandWorks' evaluation has led to an evolution in your thinking about how to apply the criterion under the Wind Energy Act?

A Yes, that's accurate. I'm comfortable with that statement. Q And I assume that you would agree that the report as prepared overall, not just the visual simulations, but in accordance with professional standards and provides a comprehensive body of information for the Commission and others to rely on for decision-making?

A Yeah, that -- my only hesitancy has to do with the survey and the opportunity of using the survey is to gather data about use and things like that, but LandWorks wasn't really involved centrally in that. But, yes, I think that it was a professionally done -- well done report.

Q Okay. And then I want to talk a little bit about visibility. Go ahead.

A No, good.
Q Because this came up in -- in the table of visibility that you had that compared your assessment and LandWorks' assessment and this also came up on the West Musquash Lake. But as I understand it, you think it would be erroneous to include visibility of turbines that are greater than 8 miles away from the scenic resource, right?

A As I understand the Wind Energy Act law, the Commission must consider turbines that are further than 8 miles away as insignificant. And if there isn't a way for them to separate out those turbines from turbines that are within 8 miles, then it's very difficult for the Commission to do
what it's legally been asked to do. So the way I would suggest doing that is, in the visibility analysis you just separate, you don't include. Yes, that would be the simplest way. I could think of other ways, but --. So it's -- it's possible that your viewshed map might show a potential visibility, but then your analysis of visibility would show no visibility because those turbines are more than 8 miles away?

A That would be one reason or because you went into the field and you found out that the trees are higher than you modeled them and so they're screening, right. height and this came up in the prior Bull Hill proceeding. And I think you -- you use a default of 40 foot for vegetation height in this area, right?

A Yep.
Q And LandWorks used a different height, right?
A Yeah, 5 feet higher.
Q But --
A But different, yeah.
Q But based on fieldwork, which should inform the -- the vegetation height you use in the VIA, right?

A Correct. Well, I don't know that fieldwork should inform that, but it should at least validate that you're modeling vegetation height is not higher than the actual height.

But, yes, fieldwork would suggest that both 45 and 40 are below the typical tree height.

Q So the VIA would be conservative in terms of its assumptions about visibility?

A For the -- yes, it would. The only exception to that would be that the VIA gave a 45 -foot height to a scrub shrub land class, which won't -- won't be that high. But the practical impact to that is very, very low because there isn't very much of that area.

Q And I think if you compare your table of visibility to theirs, the differences are insignificant, right?

A Well, they're very small. And, actually, they're insignificant because they don't really affect the significant scenic resources.

Q Right. And then I think you've also said in prior proceedings, but also in your June 3rd report, that if you have visibility of just turbine blades as opposed to the hub, that they oftentimes are not noticeable and they will never be visually dominant; is that correct?

A Well, there's certainly never -- a blade will never be visually dominant if it's seen, you know, from several miles. The -- you may be able to optically resolve a small portion of a blade tip, but whether you could recognize it as part of a turbine from the distance of several miles -I mean, you may not be able to tell that. Yeah, you have
to see a larger portion to be able to know that -- what it is you're looking at. Yep. So a hub -- from an impact point of view, a hub -- the center of the hub is a better -- more important.

It has a greater potential impact on visibility?
A Yeah, because if you can see the hub, people will really recognize the turbine as a turbine.

Q One of the early potential concerns you identified was the potential for the turbines to loom over the viewer. And then you went on your -- and that concern was articulated before your site visit, right?

A Maybe. I'm not absolutely sure of that. But it's certainly -- in other contexts it's something that -- that I've thought about and written about in reviews, so possibly, yes.

Q And then when you went on your field visit, you specifically looked at the potential for turbines to have this since of looming over the observer, right?

A Right. And we talked about that as a boat, as a group of four, trying to understand when that feeling would occur for those of us that were in the boat, correct.

Q And as I understand it -- and elaborate if I'm off on this, but as I understand it, where you have, you know, large bodies of water as you do here, the potential for looming is reduced?

A Well, I think that that would be only because you're further away from the turbines. It's that distance, I think, that's -- that's really the factor. In some ways it's increased just because it's an open area and, therefore, the visibility of turbines is going to be greater, but the sense of looming starts to occur as you move toward turbines or any big object.

For some time they're sensed as something over there. And at some point you sort of get a feeling that you're getting under them, that they're over you. That's the threshold of where they start to feel looming over you. They're no longer out there, they're above you, they have a different kind of presence.

So conceptually it would be possible, it's just that I don't think that we're close enough on any of these lakes to be past that threshold.

Q Okay. So it wasn't an issue for this particular project with visibility on these lakes, right?

A Yeah, that's correct.
Q And then, as I understand it, from your evaluation matrix there are, basically, three lakes that have the potential greatest scenic impact if you look at them individually; and that's Pleasant Lake, Scraggly Lake and Shaw Lake, right?

A Yep.

Q And I think with each of those lakes and, in fact, for each of the scenic resources of state or national significance within the study area, you concluded that the impact of visibility on use and enjoyment would be low, right?

A Yeah. Yes. And in part that's because it's my understanding that use is very low on these lakes -- on these particular lakes.

Q Okay. So your -- your understanding is that overall use of the lakes is low, right?

A On these -- on the lakes that -- those particular lakes. Bottle Lake, for instance, it's high, but the lakes that we're talking about.

Q Well, relatively speaking.
A Yes. Right. Yes. Well, I -- yeah.
Q But as I understand it, the Wind Energy Act directs us that visibility alone is not a basis for concluding that there's an undue adverse impact, right?

A Correct.
Q And that the standard is what is the impact of visibility on scenic character and existing uses related to scenic character, right?

A Correct.
Q And my understanding from your report is that impact on use and enjoyment is -- I think you refer to it as a bottom line criterion for evaluating scenic impact, right?

A Certainly one of them, yes.
Q Well, because, for example, $I$ think what you said was if -even if there were significant visibility, if the visibility wasn't adversely impacting use and enjoyment, we certainly wouldn't want to conclude that the scenic impact was unreasonable?

A Correct. Yeah.
Q So that what we're really trying to get at is what is the impact of visibility on use and enjoyment of these resources?

A $\quad \mathrm{Hm}-\mathrm{hmm}$.
Q And that for each of the lakes, including the three with the greatest visibility, your conclusion was that the impact on use and enjoyment was low?

A Yes, but part of that is because there's very little use. But, yes, that is my conclusion. Right.

Well -- and part of it is also because of the nature of the use. For example --

A Yes.
Q -- fishing is -- is probably the most significant use?
A Yeah, that's my understanding.
Q And I think that you've testified previously and perhaps written that in general there may be a lesser expectation of scenic quality for fishing as opposed to, for example, paddling or canoeing or a greater acceptability of turbines
or other --
A It's not the reason -- it's not a primary reason why people go fishing. People go fishing for other reasons and their focus is closer in, it's not on distant mountains, yeah. That's been my experience, right.

Q And then I think you were -- obviously, heard the testimony and I think have read the testimony of both the owner of Maine Wilderness Camps on Pleasant Lake, Cathy Whitney?

A Yes.
Q And you understand that her view was that for users of Pleasant Lake the visibility of turbines would not adversely impact their use and enjoyment?

A I -- yeah, I heard her testify to that. I don't know whether that's accurate or not, but that's what she believes.

Q And she certainly has experience on that lake and has some basis for drawing conclusions, wouldn't you think?

A Well, she has experience on the lake and basis, but I heard from guides who said that it's going to completely destroy their livelihood, too, and they -- they have a similar experience and basis to her. I'd really rather do a probability sample and find out what people's experience is like.

Q Well, that's a good question. And, I mean, it leads me to another line of questioning. And I appreciate your desire
for empirical data. And I guess what I want to sort of focus on -- and you've advocated for intercept surveys with the use of photo simulations and -- to determine actual users' expectations, right?

A Yep.
Q But you agree that's not a requirement of the Wind Energy Act? There are other ways to get to the question of impact on use and enjoyment other than through the use of intercept surveys?

A I won't deny that there's that possibility. Intercept surveys are one way to do that, but there may be other ways, correct.

Q And did you have a chance to look at all the material that LandWorks relied on when they came to their conclusions about impact on use and enjoyment?

A Well, I certainly read through that part of VIA and I'm familiar with some of the material and I've written some of that material, so, yeah.

Q And if includes, for example, the phone survey done by Portland Research Group, the snowmobile survey done by Portland Research Group, a review of State publications, formal, informal interviews with people in the area?

So you'd agree that although there weren't intercept surveys with photo simulations on the lake, as you would have in an ideal world prefer, that there was a substantial
body of information on which they did rely?

A
But I -- I'm not very confident in the applicability of a lot of that information. For instance, it's pretty clear that there's a lot of support for renewable energy generation in northeastern states, $I$ don't disagree with that. It's pretty clear there's also a huge NIMBY phenomenon -- what's called the NIMBY phenomenon that as soon as it affects me, I'm against it, even though the week before I knew that it was going to be in my back yard I was for it.

So I don't know what the value of a general survey like that is worth or the telephone survey. I mean, yeah, all of these people -- or most of the people that answered the telephone survey claimed that they had seen wind turbines somewhere, but it's not clear that they're anything like the wind turbines that are going to be here or that they're -- that they're the same distance or that they were seen from a lake, which may be important or I --. I mean, there's just so many problematic variables.

So I think that the easiest most direct way -- I'd rather have, you know, 12, 20 responses of people that are really on one of these lakes for specific turbines than a large survey of New England users saying that they support wind energy, which isn't very relevant.

Q Well, you read the Baskahegan study, right?

A I did. That -- and I like that and it's a strong study. It falls to the same critique that I had of the snowmobile study, that is, if people are going to react as we've heard from a couple of guides that, you know, they've taken clients out and they're never going to return again because they're so upset, those people will not be on the lake, right, because there's wind turbines there now. So you miss those people.

Nonetheless, you know, 48 respondents, none of whom when asked, you know, what management problems are there say anything about wind turbines. Instead they talk about things like liter. You know, I'd say that that was a pretty powerful finding, yeah.

Q I want to talk for a minute about --
A I might also add that from that study we can estimate something about what the usage on those lakes are, which is very helpful.

Q It's probably the closest thing we have to a -- certainly in Maine a post-construction study of visibility of turbines?

A Yeah. I mean, it would have been nice if we could have asked about -- specific about turbine questions and I understand it wasn't part of the design. But I do agree with the authors of that study that not having anyone mention those turbines is significant.

The particular boat launch that's on Baskahegan Lake was beyond 8 miles, so in part that sort of suggests that the 8 -mile zone might be a really well chosen zone. There's two other boat launches where they questioned people and they actually weren't on Baskahegan Lake, they were part of that lake system. And I don't know the relative numbers, you know, how people were divided among those three boat launches. But that shouldn't -- the way the study gets titled and referred to gets that all confounded, but it was a good study.

Q Right. And there -- okay. So in the interest of time I'll move on. There was a discussion about sort of clustering and -- and wind turbine sprawl. And this gets to your question about even though your conclusion that there's no undue adverse impacts on any individual lake, you don't know how to address the cumulative experience of moving through the lakes. You agree that sort of reducing -- that there is a scenic benefit to locating turbine wind power projects in proximity to other wind power projects and reducing what we sometimes refer to as wind turbine sprawl, right?

A Yes. It's both for the turbines and the infrastructure. So there's a benefit to locating this project in this area, which is approximate to the Stetson 1 and Stetson 2 projects?

A Right.
Q And that that has a -- a net positive scenic benefit as opposed to locating it in a more remote area of jurisdiction that may also be home to many scenic lakes?

A Yes.
I've been told I don't have much time left. Just bear with me for one minute.

On this question of going through the lakes, do you recall the testimony last week that the AMC Quiet Waters guide identifies 25 canoe trips in this greater region?

A Yes.
Q And that only two of those trips go through any portion of the study area?

A Yes, I do remember that.
Q So that would be an indication that, in fact, the publicized multi-lake trips are not predominantly within the study area, right?

A The publicized ones, yes, that's correct.
And I didn't bring it with me today, but I had last week --
and I wonder if you're familiar with, the Downeast Lakes Land Trust Water Trail Guide; is that something you've seen?

A I have not seen that.
Q Okay. That also identifies water trail trips, none of which go within the study area, but we can follow-up with
that.
I guess I will save any follow-up for later. And thanks again for your thoughtful comments.

A You're welcome.
MS. HILTON: Okay. I guess we're looking at cross-examination by CLF. Did you want --? Okay. EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER

BY MR. MAHONEY:
Q Good morning. Shawn Mahoney with the Conservation Law Foundation. And I have a question and I'm not sure if you'll be able to help me on it, Dr. Palmer.

But in your discussion about empirical data it brought to mind some empirical data that has been gathered in this watershed area. So let me premise by asking if you're familiar with another issue that has arisen in this area with respect to impacts on guiding and lodges with respect to alewives returning to the St. Croix area. Are you familiar with that?

A No, I know what alewives are, but I'm not familiar with any study about them.

Q Okay. I guess -- I'm interested just because there was empirical data that was gathered to show -- that showed after a study by State agencies that alewives in the watershed would not compete with other freshwater species. And that empirical data was gathered over a long period of
time.
In the face of that empirical data, though, there was still opposition to introducing alewives to the area. And so I guess my question really goes to your emphasis on gathering empirical data -- something like the Baskahegan study is, I think, a very useful and helpful one, not just for individual projects, but for the process. Have you had any experience, though, similar to this one where empirical data says there's no conflict and yet people are still -are discounting the empirical data and still saying there's a conflict and an impact?

Yeah, we're trying to close down a nuclear plant in Vermont that's like Maine had and -- and got closed down. And we keep getting told that there's no empirical data to say that it's safe and a lot of people are upset about it. Well, I guess my question really goes to, I mean, even with empirical data, aren't you still going to have these same types of more emotional visceral responses regardless of empirical data, so there's a limit on -- on the empirical data's usefulness?

A Well, it's -- at some point a policy decision needs to be made. And in some ways the population of Maine has to make a determination through their representatives or at the polls or -- or through the Commission or somehow. And a policy decision includes more than just empirical data.

But I -- I think that we could do -- we can do a lot with empirical data. And scenery assessment is an area where you can go to town meetings all through New England and developers will get up and say, well, I think it's beautiful and beauty is in the eye of the beholder and it's different than everybody. And, in fact, that isn't true. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder and, what you do know, most people agree incredibly in -- in that impact in this particular area, social science is more reliable than the science of forestry. And we make all kinds of decisions in forestry about whether to cut down trees or not. But why shouldn't we rely on the social science to make those decisions, too? Anyway, yeah, I'm going on. Sorry.

MR. MAHONEY: Okay. No. Thank you. I appreciate it. That's all. Thank you.

MS. HILTON: Thank you very much. All right. I think we're ready for Corrigan.

MR. MAHONEY: I'm sorry, Chairman Hilton, I may have a -- one or two other questions for the agencies, I just wanted to reserve that in case I do. Thanks. MS. HILTON: All right. Sure. MR. CORRIGAN: Dave Corrigan, Fletcher Mountain Outfitter and RealWindInfoForMe.com. I've got a lot of questions for $I F \& W$, but since $M r$. Palmer is here, $I$
think we'll just start with him.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:
Q At the June 28th hearing you recall you and I had a rather lively debate concerning the remarks in my testimony where I said that for anyone to suggest that scenic impacts to some of these places cannot be considered unreasonably adverse simply because they see fewer users is to overlook the entire reason that people come to Maine in the first place. Do you remember that conversation?

A I do.
Q Okay. At that time it appeared to me your contention was that the Expedited Wind Law required that the Commission -required the Commission to consider the number of users affected, though you seemed to be at something of a loss as to exactly what number of users that had to be before the impact was considered unreasonable. Does that sound correct?

A The Wind Energy Act does not say how many users, it just says that the number of users needs to be considered, that's correct.

Q Okay. I've read Title 35-A, Chapter 34-A, the Wind Energy Act. And I find criteria such as, the primary siting authority shall consider the existing uses of the
surrounding area and the expectations of the typical viewer. I find nothing that says that we have to have some exceptionally high number of users before we consider the impact unreasonably adverse. It seems we have ample testimony in the record speaking to the existing uses of the surrounding area and the expectations of the typical user. So can you explain your position that the decision somehow hinges on a certain undefined large number of users?

A The extent, duration and -- the extent, nature and duration of potentially affected public uses, in that phrase, which is evaluation Criteria E, I'm assuming extent has to do with number.

Q Okay. So that's an assumption. Could that not be assumed just as much it could be the extent of one individual user?

A I'm not sure what extent of an individual user means. That sounds like duration to me.

Q Okay. So what we're saying is there's an interpretation of law here that you and I are not clear on that, perhaps, is for the Commission to -- to deliberate more on?

A Well, certainly the Commission is the ultimate arbitrator --

Q All right.
A -- with this access --
Q Thank you. You testified just a little while ago that you
believe fishermen have lower visual expectations than other users; is that correct?

A And -- I mean, more to the point is that people engaged in fishing activity tend to have a lower sensitivity to scenery issues compared to, say, people that are hiking.

Q That's your opinion, okay.
A No, it's not an opinion, it's a research --
Q Okay. Are you a professional fishing guide, Mr. Palmer?
A No, I'm not a professional fishing guide.
Q Have you dealt with thousands of fishermen on these or other similar lakes?

A No, I can't say that I've dealt with them, but I've certainly surveyed hundreds.

Q Okay. Perhaps -- would you agree that perhaps the full-time professional guides who have already testified might have a better understanding of the visual expectations of the typical fishermen on these lakes than you do?

A No, I wouldn't agree with that.
Q You would not agree with that?
A I would not agree with that.
Okay. And just one final question. It is it true that you're not a legal expert and you're not retained to interpret the law or to provide legal advice to the commissioners; is that correct?

A I'm certainly not a legal expert, that's correct. I am hired by the Commission to, I think, interpret the Wind Energy Act as it applies to the scenery issues.

Q To actually interpret the law or to provide technical assistance for their interpretation?

A It seems to me that I have been asked to interpret what that means within the context of the scenery.

Q So you believe that in this case you are being asked to interpret the law?

A I think that that's how it began, that's correct. MR. CORRIGAN: Okay. I thank you for your time and I'd like to move on to $I F \& W$, if we could.

MS. HILTON: Okay. Hold on just a moment. Okay. That sounds fine. I guess, Jim, you can -- are there any more questions for Jim? And I'm just asking possibly I guess as follow-up on the part of the applicant, right?

MS. BROWNE: If possible -- I would like to see how much time $I$ need for $I F \& W$. So is it possible to have the intervenor complete their --?

MS. HILTON: Okay. Sounds like a good idea. Why don't -- Jim, you can just stay there and we'll bring I F \& W up. Do you want both of the folks -MR. CORRIGAN: Yes, please. MS. HILTON: -- from I F \& W? Okay. MR. CORRIGAN: As we don't have U.S. Fish \& Wildife

Service, I think it would be good to have both folks from -- from I $F$ \& $W$.

BY MR. CORRIGAN:
Q Hi, guys. Thanks for being here today. I know you've done a lot of research on these issues. A few questions and you two can decide who's the best to answer them as we go. Just to lay some basic background, are you aware that lynx are known to use the area around the proposed Bowers project site? Is The Department aware of that?

A What are you calling the -- I'm Mark Caron of Inland Fisheries \& Wildlife. What are you calling around the project site?

Q Say, south on Route 6 in the general Bowers area.
A We have no confirmed sightings in the project area. We have two confirmed sightings in our lynx database from 2006 in Kossuth and 2009 down by Fifth Machias.

Q So it would be fair to say there's evidence in the record of lynx using the general area?

A Yes, historically they've come and gone from this area. It's certainly understood that it's not a stronghold by any stretch, but they're capable of traveling great distances, they will disperse, they will make sallies out of core
areas up north, come down to places and -- and possibly return, possibly not.

All right. That's very helpful. Thank you. So it is true that there's designated critical lynx habitat north of this project area?

A According to the Fish \& Wildlife Service.
Q Okay. And are you aware that the tribal lands immediately south of the proposed Bowers site are also managed as lynx habitat by the Passamaquoddies?

A I'm not aware of that. Okay. Do you have contact with their -- with their tribal biologists and game wardens, who is where I received this information from?

A Technically, yes, but we don't often discuss issues. I don't -- I've never talked to them about lynx.

Okay. So really you haven't done any real studies on that.
All right. If we assume that there's critical lynx habitat north of the site and that the tribal lands immediately south of the site are being managed as lynx habitat by the Passamaquoddies, would it be safe to say that building an industrial energy facility on and around Bowers, which divides these critical habitats, could possibly lead to a disruption or even disuse of a critical travel corridor for these lynx?

A No, that's not I F \& W's opinion.

Q Well, if we have critical habitat on one side of the project and critical habitat on the other, what would be your opinion of traveling back and forth? You just said that the lynx travel great distances in and out of different habitats. Would it be unreasonable to expect them to use both habitats with a travel corridor in between?

A I don't -- I don't see where this project would be a barrier to movements of a terrestrial animal that's capable of dispersal or routine movements of hundreds of miles.

Q Okay.
A And there are very few confirmed sightings of lynx, documentation of the lynx in the area.

Q Well, there are very few in the record. Has The Department ever done any actual studies to find out if they're in the area?

A We surveyed the eastern lowlands biophysical region in -well, between 2005 and 2007. And we focused our efforts at the northern edge of the biophysical region. We used --

Q Could you tell me where that northern edge would be in relation to the project?

A I'm getting to that. We worked -- well, I could tell you the towns -- well, I'll just focus through this. What the strategy was, we took a habitat -- regional habitat model put together by someone named Chris Hoving from the
university that suggested lynx were unlikely to occur in the eastern lowlands eco region. And historic observations of lynx in the eco region were also rare. We selected survey areas by working southward from known observations of lynx in the adjacent eco regions, so those regions to the north. As a result, we aggregated survey areas in the eco region rather than distributing them -- distributing them throughout the eco region.

So what we did was we focused our efforts where we thought lynx were more likely to occur using a 2002 land cover map to identify townships with a higher proportion of conifer forest and regeneration. So -- let's see if I have a list. The towns surveyed in the region were La Grange, Hershey Town, T8 R2 WELS, Forks Town area, Woodville, Lakeview, Sebois, Plantation area, Glenwood, T2 R4 WELS, Upper Molunkus and Yarmouth, Academy, Grant and T2 R9 NWP.

Q Okay. But not Bowers or Kossuth? They were specifically not --

A No. And for the reasons I've already stated, we didn't feel that there was much there for lynx habitat and we were more interested in -- in looking adjacent to areas that we knew there was more habitat and potentially more lynx to see if they were indeed moving down through.

Q All right. I appreciate that. I would move on to a few bat questions if we could. Is it true that The Department
is aware that the northern long-eared bat, the small-footed bat and the little brown bat are currently being considered for fast tracking on the federal endangered species list?

A That's our understanding.
Okay. And is it your understanding that these three species are likely to be listed within the next one to three years depending on paperwork and when official projects go through?

A I wouldn't say that it's a done deal. It's been identified and it has to go through a process. And so until it does, it's just something that's out there for consideration.

Q Okay. Are you aware that there are serious concerns within the scientific community that some of these species could be extinct within the next 15 years?

A That opinion has been made.
Okay. Knowing that and knowing that I F \& W is still considering allowing the applicant, if approved, to use mitigation protocols that could still result in bat mortality, can you tell me just how many bat deaths The Department would consider acceptable at this -- this project site?

A No, we couldn't.
Q You couldn't. Maine I F \& W and U.S. Fish \& Wildiife Service seem to be so concerned about mortality in these species that they're issuing statements to the public to
prevent individual bats from being killed in homes, but you're still saying that some level of mortality seems acceptable at wind facilities.

Is there some explanation as to why it would be okay for wind developments to kill endangered bats, but not for homeowners to kill them?

A We understand there will be mortality of both birds and bats associated with wind power projects. What we're trying to do -- and we do it through our pre-construction survey efforts and our post-construction efforts -- is get an understanding about activity, abundance, potential for fatalities at the project sites.

Q So we're talking all after the fact?
A Well, before we get some idea of -- and we can only really get it down to the guild aspect of -- of bat species. But at present -- I mean, we have limited bat survey work, which is why we do these pre-construction and post-construction mortality studies. And the next step we're doing is this -- this -- what do they call that, the curtailment effort.

Q Okay. I've just got one more question for I F \& W. We've heard a lot from the applicant and the DEP about how this project will not affect water quality in any significant way. Since you guys are basically in charge of fisheries, I'd like to ask you specifically, can you tell me
unequivocally that Maine Department of Inland Fisheries \& Wildlife has absolutely no concerns about adverse changes to either surface or groundwater relating to quality, quantity or temperature as a result of the Bowers wind project?

MR. TIMPANO: For the record, Steve Timpano. And I guess our regional fisheries biologist that evaluated the project application concluded that the findings -- the proposed construction methodologies, et cetera, and the findings of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection -- and you had John Hopeck here this morning -seemed to cover our concerns for any adverse impacts on water quality and/or fisheries resources related within the -- the project area.

MR. CORRIGAN: Okay. Thank you very much. And I have no further questions.

MS. HILTON: Okay. Thank you. Just sort of going backwards a little bit. Shawn CLF, did you want to ask these folks any questions?

MR. MAHONEY: I don't think we have anything at this point.

MS. HILTON: Okay. All right. MR. TODD: Mark, if we could have a copy of the -- the studies that you referenced on lynx habitat evaluation for the record?

MR. CARON: The eco regional?
MR. TODD: Yeah.
MR. CARON: Do you want the entire report or just -the eco regional studies are for all our rare, endangered and threatened. So we go systematically across the state to these various eco regions and we do all the work that we can, we put together a report. So within that report there's the lynx -- lynx and wolf, actually, were done together.

MR. TODD: I guess the portions dealing lynx in this approximate area. It doesn't sound like we need the entire -- it sounds like it's fairly voluminous.

MR. CARON: Right. And for the reason I suggested, the decision was made to just focus on the periphery of known lynx populations and much better, more consistent uninterrupted habitat, versus spending time going down through these other areas where they --. The decision was made, based on resources available, that we're going to get the most for our money and -- and focus where we did.

MR. TODD: Okay. If I could see the whole thing, then I can tell you what part of it $I$ would like for the record.

MR. CARON: Well, my copy is marked up. If you want a clean copy, $I$ can --.

MR. TODD: It doesn't have to happen today, just before the -- the end of the record.

MS. MILLS: Amy Mills from the AG's office. Just in particular, the portion that you were reading from today, that would be helpful. And Fred can follow up with you on -- to get those portions.

MS. HILTON: Okay. I guess, unless we have questions ourselves, I think the applicant wanted an opportunity to ask further questions.

MS. BROWNE: I would of Dr. Palmer. I don't have any questions of $I F \& W$.

MR. HAMMOND: Gwen, we need to be recognized over here, I think for --

MS. HILTON: A break? All right.
(A discussion was held off the record.)
MS. HILTON: Okay. We're going to take a ten-minute and then we'll come back with Jim and the applicant.
(Whereupon a recess was held at 11:35 a.m., and the hearing was resumed at 11:49 a.m. this date.)

MS. HILTON: I'd like to pick up where we left off and -- with the applicant. I guess they're re-crossing on Jim Palmer, our scenic expert.

## EXAMINATION OF JIM PALMER

## BY MS. BROWNE:

Q Thank you. I'm not sure this came up in the testimony last week, but it's reflected in your report and $I$ just wanted to confirm. Your understanding is that these lakes are
managed -- the water levels are managed, right, there's drawdown of the water levels?

A I don't know about drawdown, but the water level is -- is managed in that several of them are -- the connected ones have one dam that manages that level, correct.

Q So the management of water levels is a piece of evidence that these resources are used for human needs as opposed to being in a remote, pristine environment, right?

A
I would say that it's neither remote, nor pristine, correct.

Q And then getting back to this discussion about connectivity, the Pleasant Lake and Scraggly Lake and Shaw Lake and -- I know you know where they are, but for the benefit of the Commission, Pleasant Lake is there, which we went to on the site visit from the boat launch, Shaw Lake is here, Scraggly Lake is here and we went to Scraggly Lake on the site visit. Those three lakes are not interconnected, correct?

A You can't take a boat from one to the other, correct.
Q Right. And then to get from about Bottle Lake to Junior Lake, as you may recall, on our site visit we took a relatively circuitous path to get from Bottle to Junior to avoid hitting rocks, right?

A Yes.
Q In fact, I don't know about your boat, but our boat hit a
rock on the way back.
A Yeah.
Q And that was in June. And your understanding is that later in the summer the water levels are even lower in that passageway, right?

A I didn't understand that, but it's not going to be higher.
Q Right. So there is some difficulty getting from Bottle to Junior, particularly when those water levels are lower, right?

A You have to do it carefully and it takes time I think, yeah.

Q And when you talk about the experience, maybe over several days, of being in these lakes, when you're in -- you're not always going to be seeing turbines when you're on the lakes, right?

A Well, it depends on what lakes you're on, but certainly if you -- you come to shore on a northern edge of one of these lakes, you're going to be under the trees' shadow, so, yes, that would be true.

Q So canoeists and paddlers are going to tend to hug the shore more than be out in the middle of these lakes, which often are pretty windy, right?

A I would expect that that's the case. Did you -- I assume you heard the testimony about the Borden report last week. Is that anything that you've
looked at?
A
No, I have not seen the Borden report.
Are you aware that there was a study that was done looking at the sort of economics of the guiding industry in the Grand Lake Stream area around the time that they were looking at some of these conservation options?

A I've seen reference to it, but $I$ have not been able to find the report online, so I'm not -- but, yes, I understand that such a thing was supposedly done.

Q And would it surprise you if the results of that report indicated that the sort of gentlemen fishing experience was a declining use in this area?

A No, that -- that wouldn't surprise me.
Q And when we -- we heard a lot of testimony from the guides and some of the lodge owners, but you would agree that that is just -- that they represent the perspective of one potential user group of these resources, right?

A They -- yes, that would be correct.
Q And there are snowmobile users that use the resources in the area, right?

A Yes, but I don't know that they're on a state or nationally scenic resource because those are all on water. But, yeah, there are snowmobilers that use the area. I'm not concerned about them, though, unless they go on the lake.

Q And oftentimes in the winter they do go on the lakes,
right?
A So in that case then, yes.
Q And, in fact, the snowmobile survey identified a number of people that were familiar with and actually use these lake resources in the winter, right?

A I don't -- I can't say whether they said that they used the lake resources. They used the area is what I remember, but, yes.

Q And they were, by and large, not concerned with visibility of turbines in the viewshed, right?

A That's correct. But as -- I mean, as you know, my critique of that study is this is all interviewing people that are, basically, recreating under turbines and so that's the answer I would expect.

Q But even in the snowmobile survey if there were aspects that the users objected to, they would have voiced that. So, for example, I may go and recreate in an area because I like to, you know, swim or fish, even though there may be jet skis using the lake. And if I were interviewed, I might say, I object to jet skis, but I'm still recreating in the area. So the simple fact that these snowmobilers are recreating in the presence of turbines doesn't necessarily mean that they have no objection to turbines, that was something that was elicited through an interview, right?

A I mean, in principle $I$ agree with you, but as -- my understanding is that sort of snowmobile rally, I don't know -- event was literally was under, onsite with these turbines. So that's a little different than saying that somewhere on Pleasant Lake there's a jet ski and I'm fishing. I wouldn't go fishing on a small lake that had lots of jet skiers and water skiers on it because it disturbs the fish and so you -- you know, you don't go fishing there.

Q Well, I think what it says is we have to be careful about drawing generalized conclusions from any of the sources of data that are out there, whether it's the snowmobiler survey or the testimony of the guides, right?

A Yes. And, I mean, to support your line a bit more, designing any survey in the real world there's always shortcomings. And so we -- yeah, that's an issue.

Q And at some level we need to use our experience and deductive reasoning to draw conclusions from what is necessarily imperfect information, right?

A Well, probably not you and I, but the commissioners are certainly going to have to do that. That's what they get paid the big bucks for.

Q But that's certainly the nature of the beast, right?
A That's correct.
Q And in addition to snowmobilers which we've talked about,
there are also other user groups that would include ATV users, right, that come and recreate in the area?

A Again, $I$ don't know if they're on -- ice fishing would be, for instance, another one, yeah. Yeah, perhaps ATV users.

Q Day users who come and fish for a day and might not use guides, might not stay at the lodges?

A Correct.
Q Other weekend users who, again, might not stay at the lodges or use guides, right?

A Correct.
Q And I think the -- the testimony as I heard it from the guides, was their fear that their customers wouldn't return; is that a fair characterization of some of that testimony?

A That's my understanding of what they were saying, that's correct.

Q And you would agree there are many other options for good fishing in the area other than the lakes within the study area?

A I suspect that's true, but I don't have enough experience to be able to say all that for certain. Yeah, throughout Maine there's good fishing.

Q Do you think it's fair to say that there's a growing body of evidence -- and I think this came up in your questioning maybe in the Bull Hill proceeding, but there's a growing
body of evidence that visibility of turbines in the viewshed is not adversely impacting continued recreational use of these resources in the way that people may have feared initially?

A
I think the growing body of evidence is that people interviewed onsite don't expect -- that if the turbines are going to look the way the simulations indicate they're going to look, they don't expect that it will keep them from returning and it will have only a very modest depression on the quality of their experience, but they recognize a more significant -- a bigger decrease in scenic quality.

So it will affect scenic quality significantly, but it's not going to affect their experience very much and it's not going to affect the likelihood that they'll return at all.

Q So that would be good news with respect to the guides, right?

A Except that the guides may be dependent on a type of customer that is more sensitive. And I -- I mean, in that respect I've got to agree with Mr. Corrigan, they have more experience about who their customers are than I do. And I don't -- I don't have any sense about the relative numbers of those people compared to all the other types of users that -- that we've talked about. And I don't have any real
knowledge of how much that particular gentleman user, which is maybe an overcharacterization, but that group whether it's shrinking rapidly or stagnant or -- or whatever. I mean, that's all information that it would be nice to know more about, but we don't.

Q Well, there are studies that have been conducted where projects have been built and that have looked at the impact of the project on continued recreational use of the area, right? For example, the -- some of the studies relied on by LandWorks, the Prince Edward Island study, there was a Scotland study, the Searsburg study that you're familiar with.

A I mean, those are sort of attitude survey studies, to the best of my knowledge. Certainly that's what the Searsburg study was. And, yeah, so there's a little before and after kind of thing. And to the best of my knowledge, they have not indicated a collapse of use, for instance. And the Baskahegan study didn't have a pre-study, but had an after study and the people that they interviewed were not, obviously, concerned.

Q Well, actually, in the Baskahegan study, the in-depth interviews that they conducted indicated that there had not been a drop in use of the resource since the project was built, right?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q And, in fact, they commented on continued use by, in fact, guides among other user groups, right?

A Correct.
So there was not only no indication of a collapse of recreational use, but there was every indication that the visibility of the turbines was simply irrelevant to the continued recreational use of that resource, right?

A It was -- irrelevant is exactly -- probably a good descriptor. It's not -- the turbines are not present in the study, nobody mentions them at all. So, I mean, you might ask people and they would say, oh, I'm shocked, but nobody volunteered any information.

Q And do you remember hearing Roger Milliken's testimony last week?

A You'll have to refresh me who he was.
He testified about standing at the boat launch seeing the turbines, first thing he would do is count the turbines and then he would go on fishing or boating or whatever and not give them a second thought, right? Do you recall that?

A Yeah, I do recall that.
Q And do you recall he also testified that he -- when he was -- first learned about the potential project from First Wind had some of the same fears that have been voiced by the guides about the impact the project would have on a resource that was very dear to him. Do you recall that
testimony?
A Yes, I do recall that.
Q And do you recall that his conclusion once the project was built was that, in fact, his fears were not realized, there was visibility of the turbines, but it didn't change the fishing in Baskahegan Lake, right?

A Right.
Q And it didn't change the other recreational aspects that were so dear to him, right?

A Correct.
Q And wasn't that a similar outcome in the Searsburg study, which was a study that you were the principal author of, right?

A I did the whole study.
Q Okay. So if I mischaracterize something, please -- I will count on you to correct me. But as I understand that, there have been some local concerns voiced about the project before it was built, right?

A They were very modest, but that's correct.
Q And the post-construction surveys indicated that those -you know, that those concerns hadn't been realized?

A That's correct. I would also add that the simulations, which were not as high quality as were given in this study, were judged to be very adequate to have made that assessment, people thought the simulations were accurate
and helpful, all black and white, by the way.
Q So do you think it's fair to say there is a growing body of evidence that visibility of turbines oftentimes has less of an impact on recreational users of these resources than we might fear, looking specifically at the Baskahegan and Searsburg studies?

A Well, the Searsburg study really wasn't oriented towards recreation use. But from everything that we've seen so far -- and mostly it's the intercept -- the best evidence that we have is the intercept studies that have been done -- the five intercept studies that have been done this past year -- that's a fair statement -- that's an accurate statement, it's more than fair. Yeah, I would -- the anticipation of people onsite is it's not going to significantly affect their use.

MR. HAMMOND: Could I interrupt just for a second? Do any of these studies that we're referring to involve the impact of night lights?

MR. PALMER: No.
MR. HAMMOND: And on your studies that you're referring to?

MS. BROWNE: Not -- I don't believe so. MR. HAMMOND: So this whole conversation is regarding daytime observation and usage, which is half the time? MR. PALMER: Well, it's when the most use -- recreation
use occurs.
MR. HAMMOND: Unless you happen to be a stargazer, right?

MR. PALMER: Well -- or don't sleep during the night. But, yeah, I get your point. And, no, I'm not aware of any study that has investigated the night lighting issue at all.

MR. HAMMOND: I just wanted to highlight there is another area.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. I'm also not aware of any night lighting studies on com towers, you know, and how that might affect use.

BY MS. BROWNE:
Q Just a follow-up on that, the Baskahegan -- actually, there's a fair amount of camping on Baskahegan Lake, right?

A That's my understanding.
Okay. And then also on the question about stargazing, isn't it your understanding that the nature of the turbine lighting doesn't affect the night viewing of the stars? In other words, it doesn't affect the night sky in terms of ability to -- you know, in the same way that building lights and other sources?

A Right, it doesn't give that -- that kind of glow that you get from a city area that -- yes, that's -- the problem is that it sort of attracts one's eye the same way that a
mosquito bite -- you know, that you pick at it. It's this thing that you can't not look at, I think, is -- is the -the issue.

MS. BROWNE: I'm going to take just one minute, if I will, and I think I'm probably all done.

A Okay.
MS. BROWNE: I don't have anything further. Thank you.
MS. HILTON: Okay. Thank you, both. Do commissioners have anything else? I maybe should ask you that before --. Okay. Fred has a couple things he wants to enter into the record.

MR. TODD: The material I asked of Mark Caron regarding lynx habitat evaluation I'm entering as Exhibit 7-E3, and the e-mail -- the chain of e-mails that I circulated a copy of to the Commission between myself, Bob Marvinney and John Hopeck I'm entering as Exhibit 7-F4.

MS. HILTON: Also, I just want to say that there are several issues that have arisen during these hearings that may require some follow-up by the Commission. And I will work with the staff to address those issues, in other words, to get things into the record that need to get into the record through procedural orders.

And then $I$ don't think $I$ have anything else other than the closing statement. I wish to remind everyone that the record of this hearing will remain open until Monday, July

18 to receive written statements from the interested public and for an additional seven days until Monday, July 25 th for the purpose of receiving rebuttal comments.

No additional evidence or testimony will be allowed into the record after the closing of the record. I wish to remind the parties that the third procedural order establishes the process for parties to request permission to submit additional comments into the record following the close of today's technical session. I declare this hearing closed. (Concluded this hearing at 12:10 p.m. this date.)
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