

STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Docket No. 7250

Petition of Deerfield Wind, LLC for a Certificate of Public Good)
authorizing it to construct up to a 45 MW wind generation facility,)
and associated transmission and interconnection facilities,)
comprised of between 15 and 24 wind turbines on approximately 80)
acres in the Green Mountain National Forest, located in Searsburg)
and Readsboro, with turbines to be placed both on the east side of)
Route 8 on the same ridgeline as the existing GMP Searsburg wind)
facility Eastern Project Area), and along the ridgeline to the west of)
Route 8 in a northwesterly orientation (Western Project Area))

PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
JEFFREY PARSONS

ON BEHALF OF DEERFIELD WIND, LLC

July 30, 2007

Summary:

Mr. Parsons testifies regarding 10 V.S.A. § 248(b)(5). He discusses his review of the revised project layout and its effect, if any, on his original assessment of potential impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat.

1 **Q. Please state your name.**

2 Response: Jeff Parsons.

3

4 **Q. Have you previously submitted direct testimony in this matter?**

5 Response: Yes.

6

7 **Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony?**

8 The purpose of my testimony is to review the revised project layout in terms of its
9 potential impacts on wildlife and wildlife habitat.

10

11 **Q. Have you reviewed the revised project layout, consisting of 17 turbines (10 on
12 the western string and 7 on the eastern string)?**

13 Response: Yes.

14

15 **Q. Is the revised project layout within the Project area that you originally
16 investigated?**

17 Response: Yes it is.

18

19 **Q. How, if at all, is the revised layout different from the layout that you assessed
20 in your original testimony and report, in terms of potential impacts to wildlife
21 and wildlife habitat?**

22 Response: I do not believe that impacts to wildlife have appreciably changed.

23

1 **Q. Do the revisions to the layout alter your original testimony that the Project**
2 **will not have significant or undue adverse impacts on deer, moose, small**
3 **mammals, or rare, threatened or endangered animal species (other than birds**
4 **and bats)? Please explain.**

5 Response: No, my original conclusions stand. If anything, impacts to wildlife
6 habitat should be less as compared with the original 24 turbine scenario, given the
7 decrease in the number of turbine sites (and thus clearing).

8

9 **Q. Do the revisions to the layout alter your original testimony concerning the**
10 **Project's potential indirect impacts on black bear? Please explain.**

11 Response: Yes it does. I would expect that any indirect negative impact from
12 turbines upon black bears would be somewhat lessened, given the reduction in
13 turbine sites.

14

15 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony at this time?**

16 Yes, it does.