

**STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Petition of Northland Solar LLC for a Certificate of Public Good, pursuant to 30 V.S.A. § 248, authorizing the installation and operation of a 4.999 MW solar electric generation facility off Route 100 in Lowell, Vermont to be known as the “Northland Solar Project”

Case No. 25-2346

TOWN OF LOWELL, LOWELL CEMETERY ASSOCIATION, LOWELL GRADED SCHOOL BOARD, DOUGLAS AND DEBORAH MANNING, MICHAEL AND PAMELA TETREULT, AND MADONNA SULLIVAN'S RESPONSE TO THE COMMISSION'S MAY 29, 2026 REQUEST REGARDING MOTION FOR SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE DETERMINATION

The Town of Lowell and the above-captioned Intervenors respectfully submit this response to the Commission's May 29, 2026 request regarding whether the revisions submitted by Petitioner, Northland Solar, LLC, constitute a substantial change requiring further review and procedural protections.

Motioning Parties have previously submitted filings describing why the revisions presented in Petitioner's rebuttal testimony should be considered substantial. We respectfully submit that the revisions extend beyond minor corrections, clarifications, or limited responses to testimony. Rather, the revisions alter important aspects of the project that require additional review by the parties, experts, adjoining landowners, and the Commission.

Motioning Parties acknowledge that certain revisions appear intended to address concerns raised during the proceeding. For example, Petitioner has modified portions of the project to address visual impacts, adjusted portions of the layout in response to concerns regarding water resources and property interests, and altered panel orientation in response to concerns regarding glare. These changes demonstrate that the originally proposed project required significant revision in order to address issues raised by parties and intervenors.

However, the fact that revisions may be responsive does not resolve the question presently before the Commission. The issue is not whether Petitioner intended to reduce impacts. The issue is whether the revised project differs materially from the project originally presented such that additional review and procedural protections are warranted.

The revised filings include four new rebuttal testimonies totaling approximately 73 pages, together with revised site plans, revised visual simulations, revised acreage calculations, revised equipment specifications, and changes affecting a significant portion of the project area. These revisions required the preparation of new analyses and visual materials because the project presented for review is substantially different from the project originally evaluated by parties, experts, and affected landowners.

Summary of Material Revisions Table

Project Component	Original Proposal	Revised Proposal	Material Significance
Perimeter Fence Configuration	Original perimeter fence alignment shown in Petition site plans.	Revised comparison plan depicts a different fence alignment and identifies the original fence location.	Demonstrates a physical modification to project layout that may affect visibility, screening effectiveness, neighboring properties, and overall project appearance.
Panel System and Orientation	Original array design and orientation presented in Petition.	Revised panel system and orientation submitted in rebuttal filings.	May alter visibility, glare, viewsheds, and impacts on neighboring properties and public viewpoints.
Landscape Mitigation	Original proposal relied primarily on existing conditions and screening.	Revised filing includes a Landscape Mitigation Plan and additional plantings.	Introduces new mitigation measures requiring evaluation of effectiveness and adequacy.
Visual Impact Analysis	Original visual analyses based on original configuration.	Multiple new visual simulations depicting existing, unmitigated,	Demonstrates that visual impacts and mitigation effectiveness required reevaluation.

installation, and seven-
 year conditions.

Public Viewpoints	Original visual record evaluated identified viewpoints.	New simulations from Mountain View Cemetery and EDR Viewpoint 18.	Introduces new evidence concerning visibility from public viewpoints and scenic resources.
Neighboring Properties	Original impacts evaluated under original design.	New residential-property simulations, including 411 Route 58.	Suggests impacts on adjoining landowners required reevaluation.
Equipment Specifications	Original equipment specifications accompanied the Petition.	Revised specifications for modules, racking systems, inverters, and transformers.	May affect appearance, operation, maintenance requirements, and project impacts.
Project Record and Impact Evaluation	Parties evaluated the project as originally filed.	Extensive revised testimony, plans, simulations, calculations, and technical materials.	Requires review of whether prior testimony, discovery responses, and expert analyses remain applicable.

Of particular concern is Petitioner's decision to change the panel system and panel orientation. Motioning Parties understand that the revised configuration alters the direction in which the panels face and changes the visual presentation of the project from surrounding properties and public roadways. As a result, the revised project may affect different viewsheds, different neighboring properties, and different public vantage points than those evaluated under the original proposal.

The revised panel orientation also raises new questions regarding potential glare, visual impacts, and the adequacy of previously proposed mitigation measures. While Motioning Parties are not asserting that such impacts have been conclusively established, the revised configuration presents issues that have not yet been fully evaluated in the record and that warrant meaningful review by the parties and relevant agencies.

Motioning Parties are particularly concerned that the revised project may affect adjoining landowners differently than the original proposal. Certain neighboring properties that may not have experienced significant impacts under the original design could now be affected by the revised orientation, visibility, or appearance of the project. The fact that Petitioner provided additional notice to adjoining landowners suggests recognition that the revised project may implicate interests not previously affected by the original filing.

In addition, Motioning Parties understand that ownership of certain adjoining properties has changed during the pendency of this proceeding. To the extent newly affected property owners may now be impacted by the revised proposal, those individuals should be afforded a meaningful opportunity to understand the revisions and determine whether participation in the proceeding is appropriate.

The revisions also create uncertainty regarding the applicability of testimony, discovery responses, visual assessments, and expert analyses prepared in response to the original project design. Motioning Parties and their experts devoted substantial effort reviewing and responding to the project as originally filed. The revised proposal now requires evaluation of new site plans, new simulations, revised equipment specifications, and revised impact assessments. Additional time is necessary to determine whether previously submitted analyses remain applicable and to assess the significance of the revised design.

Motioning Parties further note that they are municipal and citizen participants with limited resources. Unlike the Petitioner, they do not have dedicated teams of consultants assigned full-time to this proceeding. The Town has already incurred significant costs and must carefully manage limited funds for expert assistance. The Town and Intervenors must secure additional funding to address these substantial revisions. Meaningful review of the revised filings requires sufficient time to consult experts, evaluate the changes, and prepare informed responses.

Dated at Lowell, Vermont this 12th day of June, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Jennifer Blay

Jennifer Blay

/s/Byron Dolan

Byron Dolan

/s/Shalna Richardson

Shalna Richardson

/s/Douglas Manning

Douglas Manning

/s/Michael Tetreault

Michael Tetreault

/s/Madonna Sullivan

Madonna Sullivan