

where it meets the ocean across the entire view. The water is a rough-textured dark blue, with small waves breaking at the shore.

Rating panel members indicated that the existing beach scene is pleasant, and the rocks add visual interest in the foreground. They commented that there are attractive changes in color and texture from the sand, rocks, and transition to deep water; and that the middle ground and background are open water with a strong, uninterrupted horizon line. Rating panel scores for the existing conditions photograph(s) ranged from 10.5 to 15.7 (average = 12.8), which is consistent with a Partial Retention classification.

**Proposed Project**

Regional visibility of the RWF in this area is largely restricted to the shoreline along the western edge of Martha’s Vineyard. However, due to the presence of the westward-facing sloping hills, viewshed analysis suggests that visibility of the RWF extends inland across areas where there are large clearings, including roadway corridors like Moshup Trail, Old South Road, and Windy Hill Drive before breaking up into discrete areas where views of less than half of the WTGs will be available due to screening provided by vegetation, structures, and topography (this includes an area directly adjacent to the shoreline south of the KOP where sand dunes and associated vegetation reduce visibility).

With the proposed RWF in place, the nacelles and rotors from numerous WTGs will be visible from this KOP in the background along the horizon. The nearest WTG would be 13.5 miles (21.7 km) west-southwest of this KOP. Rating panel members noted that the RWF turbines are very visible on the horizon line and will dominate the view from the KOP. One reviewer commented on the breadth of the installation and noted that the OSS look like freighters. Another commented that the number and color contrast of turbines on horizon may be distracting to some observers.

Rating panel members had varying reactions to the RWF’s impact, with VIA scores ranging from 9.8 to 12.0 (average score = 11.2). These scores indicate an average reduction of 1.6 point in comparison to the existing view, with individual rating panel members indicating reductions that ranged from 0.7 to 3.7. With the RWF in place, the KOP score remains in the Partial Retention class (see Table 3.2-36). Considering the compatibility, scale contrast, and spatial dominance factors that influenced the visual impact rating at this KOP, panel ratings suggest that the WTGs were generally compatible with vegetation, and somewhat compatible with water resources, landform, land use, and user activity (see Table 3.2-37). Scale contrast is minimal for landform, vegetation, and land use, but moderate contrast is noted for water resources and user activity. Considering spatial dominance, averaged panel ratings suggest that the WTGs are subordinate to landform and vegetation, and co-dominant with water resources, land use, and user activity.

Based on the anticipated compatibility, scale contrast and spatial dominance factors resulting from the RWF it is anticipated that the Project visibility from this KOP will be consistent with VTL 5 “is not large but contrasts with the surrounding landscape elements so strongly that it is a major focus of visual attention, drawing viewer attention immediately and tending to hold that attention. In addition to strong contrasts in form, line, color, and texture, bright light sources such as lighting and reflections! and moving objects associated with the study subject may contribute substantially to drawing viewer attention. The visual prominence of the study subject interferes noticeably with views of nearby landscape/seascape elements.” (Sullivan et al., 2013).

**Table 3.2-36 – Average Visual Impact Ratings – MV02**

	KAC	RCS	JMG	WLK	Average
<b>Existing</b>	10.5	12.7	15.7	12.2	12.8
<b>Proposed</b>	9.8	11.3	12.0	11.5	11.2