

WTG], the turbines appear as vertical lines on the horizon. The rotor blades are difficult to clearly perceive because of their minimal color contrast against the light blue and somewhat hazy sky, although, the nacelles of visible WTGs are discernable. Some members of the rating panel noted that under the conditions illustrated in the selected photo the Project will not be conspicuous to casual observers from this KOP, and the unique rock features in the foreground will remain the focal point in this view.

The rating panel members generally agreed that the turbines would be highly visible and noticeable from this KOP. One reviewer noted that “the visual density of the turbines and OSS platform on the horizon dominate the view from the Cliff Walk, even under favorable sky conditions”. Another noted that the wind turbines “will be noticed” by observers along the Cliff Walk. Another commented that “under these lighting conditions are likely to be visible and because of their number many my find them visually intrusive”. However, one reviewer suggested that the “proposed turbines can barely be seen on a clear day causing minimal impact on view” .

Rating panel members had varying reactions to the RWF’s impact, with VIA scores ranging from 9.8 to 17.0 (average score = 13.6). These scores indicate an average reduction of 1.2 point in comparison to the existing view, with individual rating panel members indicating reductions that ranged from 0.0 to 2.0. With the RWF in place, the KOP score remains in the Retention class (see Table 3.2-6), suggesting that Project has not exceeded the threshold of acceptable visual change from this KOP.

Considering the compatibility, scale contrast, and spatial dominance factors that influenced the visual impact rating at this KOP, averaged panel ratings suggest that the WTGs were generally compatible with landform, vegetation, and land use, and somewhat compatible with water resources and user activity (see Table 3.2-7). Scale contrast is minimal for landform, vegetation, and land use, but moderate for water resources and user activity. Considering spatial dominance, panel members suggest that the WTGs are subordinate to landform, vegetation, land use, and co-dominant with user activity and water resources.

Based on the compatibility, scale contrast and spatial dominance factors Project visibility from this KOP is consistent with VTL 3, because it “can be easily detected after a brief look and would be visible to most casual observers, but without sufficient size or contrast to compete with major landscape/seascape elements.” (Sullivan et. al. 2013)

Table 3.2-6 – Average Visual Impact Ratings – AI03

	KAC	RCS	JMG	WLK	Average
Existing	11.8	15.0	17.0	15.2	14.8
Proposed	9.8	13.0	17.0	14.5	13.6
Change	2.0	2.0	0.0	0.7	1.2

Table 3.2-7 – Average Visual Impact Ratings by Resource – AI03

Resource	Newport Cliff Walk		
	Compatibility	Scale	Spatial Dominance
Water Resources	1.8	1.6	1.5
Landform	1.3	1.3	1.0
Vegetation	1.0	1.0	1.0
Land Use	1.3	1.3	1.3
User Activity	2.1	2.0	1.6