



**COVERSHEET
STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE**

Operation Title: **Guidance for Assessing Impacts to Existing Scenic and Aesthetic Uses under the Natural Resources Protection Act**
Identification No.: **DEPLW0541-A2003**
Revision No.: **00**
Originator Name: **Judy Gates**
Reviser: **N/A**
Effective Date: **July 20, 2003**

APPROVALS:

Bureau of Land and Water Quality Director:

Brooke Barnes _____ Date: _____
Print Name Signature

QMSC Chair:

Malcolm C. Burson _____ Date: _____
Print Name Signature

DISTRIBUTION:

- () Bureau of Air Quality By: _____ Date: _____
- () Bureau of Land and Water Quality By: _____ Date: _____
- () Bureau of Remediation and Waste Management By: _____ Date: _____
- () Office of the Commissioner By: _____ Date: _____
- () Quality Management Steering Committee By: _____ Date: _____
- () Bureau QACs and Lead auditors..... By: _____ Date: _____



**Bureau of Land and Water Quality
Division of Land Resource Regulation
Licensing Unit**

Standard Operating Procedure

Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Existing Scenic and Aesthetic Uses
under the Natural Resources Protection Act

1. APPLICABILITY. This standard operating procedure (SOP) applies to all licensing staff in the Bureau of Land and Water Quality's Division of Land Resource Regulation (Division) after December 1, 2002. It applies to the processing of applications filed with the Department under the Natural Resources Protection Act (NRPA).

2. PURPOSE. This SOP is intended to establish consistent procedures for staff assessments of potential impacts to existing scenic and aesthetic uses during the processing of NRPA applications by the Division of Land Resource Regulation.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES.

3.1 **COMPLIANCE.** All licensing staff in the Division of Land Resource Regulation are responsible for becoming familiar, and complying with, the contents of this procedure prior to processing an application. The attached appendices are to serve as reference materials throughout the processing of applications. Supervisors are responsible for ensuring that licensing staff is familiar with and adhere to the procedures outlined in this SOP. Enforcement & Field Services staff Drafting Department Orders will also adhere to these procedures.

3.2 **OTHER.** The Licensing Coordinator is responsible for initial development, approval, distribution, and maintenance of the proposed SOP. Policy and Procedures staff in the Bureau of Land & Water Quality will track this SOP. The name of responsible individuals, document title, dates of last revision, and document numbers will be recorded.

4. GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES.

4.1 **ORIGINATION AND CONTENTS.** Division Licensing staff will be trained in the use of the Basic Visual Assessment (VIA) form (Appendix A) and Visual Impact Assessment Matrix (Matrix) (Appendix B) associated with this SOP. The appendices will be used by Division Licensing staff when potential impacts on existing scenic and aesthetic uses are identified during the processing of an NRPA application. The VIA and matrix will be used as guidance for determining whether a proposed activity will have an unreasonable adverse impact on an aesthetically significant place, as defined in Chapter 315, Section 9. The completed VIA and matrix will be included in the project file. Associated definitions included in this SOP apply to the VIA and matrix.



- 4.2 SOP DEVELOPMENT AND APPROVAL PROCESS. Approval of this SOP follows the preliminary draft cycle and final approval cycle for Bureau-specific SOPs described in SOP No. OC-PE-0001, Standard Operating Procedure Development, Format, Approval, and Distribution, dated June 15, 2001. The Director of the Bureau of Land and Water Quality and the Maine DEP's QAM approve the final SOP.

5. REFERENCES.

- 5.1 MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN (JUNE 2001).
- 5.2 MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE ON STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES (OC-PE-0001).
- 5.3 MAINE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, BUREAU OF LAND AND WATER QUALITY, STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE SUPPLEMENT TO OC-PE-0001 (DEPLW2001-22).
- 5.4 LANDSCAPE AESTHETICS: A HANDBOOK FOR SCENERY MANAGEMENT. REVISED OCTOBER 2000. U.S. FOREST SERVICE.
- 5.5 SMARDON, R.C. AND HUNTER, M. 1983. THE FUTURE OF WETLANDS: ASSESSING VISUAL – CULTURAL VALUES. TOTOWA, NJ.



APPENDIX A: Basic Visual Impact Assessment Form

VISUAL ELEMENTS	VISUAL SUB ELEMENTS	INDICATORS/CLUES	ELEMENT RATINGS	ELEMENT SCORES	
LANDSCAPE COMPATIBILITY ↓	COLOR	Significantly different color, hue, value chroma	Severe	3	
			Moderate	2	
			Minimal	1	
			None	0	
	FORM	Incompatible 2/3 dimensional shape with landscape surroundings	Severe	3	
			Moderate	2	
			Minimal	1	
			None	0	
	LINE	Incompatible edges, bands, or silhouette lines introduced	Severe	3	
			Moderate	2	
			Minimal	1	
			None	0	
	TEXTURE	Incompatible textural grain, density, regularity or pattern	Severe	3	
			Moderate	2	
			Minimal	1	
			None	0	
SUBTOTAL →					

SCALE CONTRAST			
↓	Major scale introduction/intrusion	Severe	12
	One of several major scales or major objects in confined setting	Moderate	8
	Significant object or scale	Minimal	4
	Small object or scale	None	0
SCORE			

SPATIAL DOMINANCE			
↓	LANDSCAPE SITUATION BACKDROP Object/activity dominates or is prominent in whole landscape composition; or is prominently situated within the landscape; or dominates landform, water, or sky backdrop	Dominate	12
		Co-Dominate	8
		Sub-ordinate	4
		Insignificant	0
SCORE			

TOTAL VISUAL IMPACT SEVERITY		
→		
Severe	27-36	
Strong	26-18	
Moderate	17-9	
Weak or Negligible	8-0	

DEPLW0541-A2002
 Used with permission
 of R.C. Smardon



Definitions associated with Appendix A.

- A. Backdrop.** The distant part of a landscape located from 4 miles to infinity from the viewer.
- B. Color.** The property of reflecting light of a particular wavelength that enables the eye to differentiate otherwise indistinguishable objects. A hue (red, green, blue, yellow, etc.) as contrasted with a value (black, white, or gray).
- C. Contrast.** Diversity or distinction of adjacent parts. Effect of striking differences in color, form, line, or texture of a landscape.
- D. Dominance.** The extent to which an object is noticeable when compared to the surrounding context.
- E. Form.** The structure, mass or shape of a landscape or an object. Landscape form is often defined by the edges or outlines of landforms, rockforms, vegetation patterns, or waterforms, or the enclosed spaces created by these attributes.
- F. Landform.** One of the attributes or features that make up the Earth's surface, such as a plain, mountain, or valley.
- G. Landscape.** An area composed of interacting ecosystems that are repeated because of geology, landform, soils, climate, biota, and human influences throughout that area.
- H. Landscape Character or Landscape Composition.** Particular attributes, qualities, and traits of a landscape that give it an image and make it identifiable or unique.
- I. Landscape Compatibility.** The elements of color, form, line, and texture that typically determine landscape character.
- J. Line.** Anything that is arranged in a row or sequence. In landscapes – ridges, skylines, structures, changes in vegetation, or individual trees and branches – may be perceived as line.
- K. Scale Contrast.** The degree to which an activity or object dominates or intrudes into a landscape or confined setting.
- L. Situation.** The position of the activity or object within the landscape.
- M. Spatial Dominance.** The degree to which an activity or object dominates the landscape; is prominently situated within the landscape; or dominates landform, waterform, or sky backdrop.
- N. Texture.** The grain of a landscape or repetitive pattern of tiny forms. Visual texture can range from smooth to coarse.
- O. Visual Elements.** The landscape's components that make up the overall visual character of a landscape.
- P. Waterform.** One of the attributes or features that make up the Earth's surface, such as a pond, lake, stream, river, waterfall, estuary, or ocean.



APPENDIX B: Visual Impact Assessment Matrix

Impact severity Rating Scenic significance	Severe	Strong	Moderate	Weak/None
	36-27	26-18	17-9	8-0
High				
Medium				
Low				
Unrated				

SCENIC SIGNIFICANCE OF VIEW

LEGEND

- UNACCEPTABLE.** High level of visual contrast in line, form, color, or texture between existing high quality landscape and development proposal; view of water or other significant visual resource obstructed. May be grounds for project denial.
- ACCEPTABLE WITH MAJOR MITIGATION.** High degree of contrast on landscape of medium significance; moderate degree of contrast on highly significant landscape. Project re-design necessary.
- ACCEPTABLE WITH MITIGATION.** Some modification to project siting or design necessary to achieve better landscape 'fit.'
- ACCEPTABLE WITH MINOR MITIGATION.** Relatively minor adjustments to plan or siting necessary to achieve a higher level of project compatibility.
- LOW/NO IMPACT.** No perceptible change to the visual landscape. No mitigation required.

Chart is recommended method for reviewing visual impacts and determining level of effort required for mitigation and/or reconsideration of project siting and design. Application of the recommended actions should consider length of view and viewer expectation.

Appendix B
 Basic Visual Assessment Form
 DEPLW0451-A2002
 (Used with permission of Terrence DeWan & Associates)



Standard Operating Procedure
Bureau of Land and Water Quality
Date: July 20, 2003
Doc num: DEPLW0541-A2003



August 12, 2018

To: James Palmer/Peer Reviewer
From: Amy Segal/TJD&A

**Re: NECEC - Response to Request for Basic Visual Impact Forms (Appendix A)
Supplemental Data**

Dear Jim,

As requested, we have attached a summary (Summary) of the visual impact ratings from the Appendix A: Basic Visual Impact Assessment Forms (DEPLW0541-A2002) for Central Maine Power Company's (CMP) NECEC Project. For ease of your review, the information from the forms has been consolidated into a spreadsheet format.

As you may know, the Appendix A Form was developed by the Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP) as a guidance tool for staff to review Visual Impact Assessments (see the attached 2003 memo from Judy Gates¹). These forms are not technically required to be completed or submitted by the applicant per the Natural Resources Protection Act Chapter 315 rules and are not available for download from the MDEP website, but we have completed and provided these forms in addition to the previously requested data sets at your request to assist in your reasonableness and technical correctness review of the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA). The VIA included the same assessment criteria that are outlined on the Appendix A forms: Visual Elements of Landscape Compatibility (and sub-elements of Color, Form, Line, and Texture), Scale Contract, and Spatial Dominance.

We have completed the forms/ratings for all of the photosimulations prepared for the September 2017 submittal and for the post-submittal photosimulations of the Upper Kennebec River (Photosimulations 30, 31, 32, and 33). Note that Photosimulation 32 is from the same general location as Photosimulation 10 which was included in the original submission. Two reviewers (Terrence DeWan and me) completed the forms and are reflected in the Summary as 'Reviewers A and B'. We have included additional information regarding the Upper Kennebec River Crossing below, to assist you in your review.

Also, as noted on the Summary, there are three locations that resulted in a potentially 'Strong' Visual Impact: (1) Moxie Stream crossing in Moxie Gore, (2) the Appalachian Trail crossing at Troutdale Road in Bald Mountain TWP, and (3) Fickett Road Substation in Pownal. We have

¹ Department of Environmental Protection, Standard Operating Procedure Memo for Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Existing Scenic and Aesthetic Uses under the Natural Resources Protection Act, by Judy Gates, dated July 20, 2003.

provided descriptions of our findings for those three locations below, to assist you in your review.

Upper Kennebec River Crossing

For the Upper Kennebec River crossing, the overall average Visual Impact Severity rating (from the five viewpoints) was “Moderate.” In referencing Appendix B: Visual Impact Assessment Matrix, a “Moderate” rating of a “Medium” Scenic Significance of View is an “Acceptable with Minor Mitigation” visual impact.

The section of the Upper Kennebec River where the Project will cross is not the area of highest scenic significance, but rather of “Medium” significance due to the absence of Class III-V rapids. According to American Whitewater, the Kennebec Gorge extends for 3.5 miles from Harris Station Dam to Carry Brook.² Downstream of the Class III and IV rapids that run through the Gorge, after Carry Brook, “the river becomes more sluggish the further downstream you go.”³ The proposed crossing of the Kennebec River is about three miles downstream of the last major Class III and IV rapids (Black Brook Rapids). The three miles between Black Brook Rapids and the Project’s proposed overhead crossing location include occasional Class I or II rapids. At the proposed crossing location, the river is generally flat water, and is not particularly valued by recreational users compared to the whitewater sections of the river. CMP has sited the Project at this flat water location to minimize its impact on existing scenic and recreational uses.

Length of View and Viewer Expectation

There is a note on the bottom of the Appendix B matrix that states as follows: “Chart is recommended method for reviewing visual impacts and determining level of effort required for mitigation and/or reconsideration of project siting and design. Application of the recommended actions should consider length of view and viewer expectation.”

The transmission line at the proposed crossing location will be visible for only about 0.25 mile from the upstream side and 0.5 mile from the downstream side (assuming rafters turn around and look up after passing under the crossing, which would not be expected). With a typical current and raft/boat speed of about 6 miles per hour, the proposed transmission line crossing of the river would be visible for only about 2.5 minutes from the upstream side and 5 minutes from the downstream side, again assuming rafters would turn around for this view. Careful siting of this crossing has thus limited the duration of this view to a very short period of time relative to the typical rafters’ time on the water of approximately 4 hours.

One rafting company currently uses a picnic area 750 feet (0.14 miles) north of the proposed crossing. Recreational users of this picnic area would potentially have an extended duration of

² See <https://www.americanwhitewater.org/content/River/detail/id/438>.

³ *Id.*

Project visibility (see Photosimulation 10 and 32), but CMP could reassign that company to use one of 11 other permitted picnic sites, none of which would have Project views.

Viewer expectations for Kennebec River recreational users are affected and moderated by the experience of traveling adjacent to a transmission line on Indian Pond Road for five miles to the river put-in site below Harris Dam, preparing for the rafting experience adjacent to Harris Dam and nearby existing transmission lines, and users' general awareness of the dependency on controlled dam releases to create the water flows necessary for this commercial recreational experience.

Additional Mitigation

CMP has proposed several additional mitigation measures to minimize the visual impact to the Upper Kennebec River including (1) the use of HVDC structures made of self-weathering steel, which will result in minimal color contrast with the surrounding wooded landscape, (2) the use of non-specular conductors, which will reduce reflective qualities of the conductors when viewed from the river, and (3) the preservation of existing mature tree growth within the corridor on each side of the crossing.

The initial river crossing design (as submitted in September 2017) included five structures that would have been partially visible from within the corridor and highly visible from south of the crossing (looking back upriver). Post-submittal redesign of this crossing, with three structures, resulted in the preservation of additional existing mature tree growth on each side of the corridor (for a total forested buffer width of 300' on the southeast side and 550' on the northwest side).

The preserved forested buffers will completely screen the transmission structures and corridor clearing from view when approaching the crossing on the river and at the crossing location and significantly reduce visibility of the structures when viewing from south of the crossing (looking upstream from the river). The conductors will be the only visible element of the Project from the crossing.

Moxie Stream

The Visual Impact Severity rating for Moxie Stream is "Strong." While the entire 12 miles of the Stream from Moxie Pond to the Kennebec River is designated as 'Scenic' in the Maine River Study, the highest scenic significance portion of the stream is the Moxie Falls Scenic Area located approximately 0.5 miles upstream from the Kennebec River. The Scenic Area includes a parking lot and trails to several viewing platforms on the south side of the 90-foot drop waterfall. The viewing platforms within the Moxie Falls Scenic Area are 0.5 miles to the south of the closest point of the Project and 1.6 miles downstream of the proposed crossing of Moxie Stream. The Project will not be visible from any portion of the Moxie Falls Scenic Area.

The area with the lowest scenic significance on Moxie Stream is where the existing transmission line is adjacent to Indian Pond Road leading to Harris Dam and crosses north of Moxie Pond, approximately 2.7 miles north (upstream) of the Project crossing. The Project crossing of the Stream is approximately 650 feet south of the location where Fish Pond Road once crossed the stream. Where the Project will cross is not the highest scenic significance section of Moxie Stream, but rather is of “Medium” significance due to its distance from the Scenic Area and proximity to the former road crossing. In referencing Appendix B: Visual Impact Assessment Matrix, a “Strong” rating of a “Medium” Scenic Significance of View is an “Acceptable with Mitigation” visual impact.

Length of View and Viewer Expectation

The transmission line at the proposed Moxie Stream crossing location will be visible for only about 800 feet on the upstream side approaching the crossing (for kayakers) and approximately 1,000 feet on the downstream side (if an angler walks upstream). The Stream is kayaked only at high water times due to the rocky nature of the streambed. A kayaker’s duration of exposure would be limited to one or two minutes traveling at about 6 miles per hour. Careful siting of this crossing in a narrow curve in the stream has limited the duration of this view to a very short period of time. Viewer expectations for recreational boaters of the stream are generally high, but moderated by the presence of the existing transmission line near Moxie Pond.

Additional Mitigation

CMP has proposed several additional mitigation measures to minimize the visual impact to Moxie Stream, including (1) the use of HVDC structures made of self-weathering steel, which will result in minimal color contrast with the surrounding wooded landscape, (2) siting the structures 410 feet from the stream on the north side and 560 feet on the south side of the stream, to minimize visibility, (3) the preservation and maintenance of existing non-capable riparian woody and herbaceous vegetation within the crossing area, and (4) a buffer planting plan for shoreline areas that will be prepared and submitted to MDEP, in order to further mitigate the visual impacts of the additional transmission line. Once the preserved vegetation and supplemental buffer plantings become established, views from the stream of the corridor clearing and the transmission structures will be significantly minimized.

Appalachian Trail Crossing

We also completed the Basic VIA Forms for three viewpoints on the Appalachian Trail (Trail), which include Pleasant Pond Mountain (Photosimulation A), Troutdale Road (Photosimulation B – Joe’s Hole), and Bald Mountain (Photosimulation C), from Appendix E of the VIA.

The Visual Impact Severity ratings from each of the elevated mountain viewpoints were “Minimal” (‘Weak or Negligible’ is the term used on Basic VIA form) due to the minimal corridor visibility from 2.8 to 3.0 miles away. See the VIA Report for descriptions from Pleasant Pond Mountain and Bald Mountain.

The Trail crosses the existing transmission line three times in close proximity to Troutdale Road/Joe's Hole on the south end of Moxie Pond. The middle location was selected for the photosimulation and the resulting Visual Impact Severity rating is "Strong."

The National Park Service (NPS) has only an easement over the existing 300' wide CMP-owned corridor, granted by CMP in 1987. When CMP granted this easement to the NPS, the Trail crossed the existing transmission line corridor in three locations (slightly different locations but similar to existing conditions). Hikers currently expect to cross the existing transmission line in this location, as it is noted in various guide books. The easement also allows CMP to place an additional transmission line in this location. Thus, NPS knew about the existing transmission line when it obtained this easement, as well as the possibility of a future transmission line in this location. Further, this section of the Trail is located on a public road for approximately 900 feet, and is in close proximity to several houses. For these reasons, this portion of the Trail has a "Low" Scenic Significance. In referencing Appendix B: Visual Impact Assessment Matrix, a "Strong" rating of a "Low" Scenic Significance of View is an "Acceptable with Minor Mitigation" visual impact.

Length of View and Viewer Expectation

As noted above, hikers currently expect to cross the existing transmission line multiple times in this location, as it is noted in various guide books. Further, this section of the Trail is located on a public road for approximately 900 feet, and is in close proximity to several houses.

Additional Mitigation

The new corridor will be maintained in accordance with current vegetation management protocols, resulting in preservation of non-capable woody and herbaceous riparian vegetation along the pond's shoreline ("non-capable" refers to woody plant species and specimens that are unlikely to grow tall enough to encroach into the conductor safety zone). Photosimulation B, from Troutdale Road, reflects a more immediate condition of vegetation after installation of the Project, rather than projecting vegetation growth 5 to 10 years post-construction. The non-capable vegetation allowed to grow within the corridor will reduce the amount of the clearing visible to hikers on the Trail and to motorists on Troutdale Road. Further, a buffer planting plan for the area southeast of Troutdale Road (between Joe's Hole and Troutdale Road), as well as the area northwest of Troutdale Road, will be prepared and submitted to MDEP, and native non-capable shrubs will be allowed to grow in this area, in order to further mitigate the visual impacts of the additional transmission line.

Fickett Road Substation

The Visual Impact Severity rating for the Fickett Road Substation as viewed from Fickett Road was "Strong." Fickett Road is not designated as a Scenic Byway or Scenic Road by the State Department of Transportation or the Town of Pownal and is therefore categorized as an 'Unrated' Scenic Significance of View. Motorists, pedestrians, and abutting residences will see

the Substation in context with the two existing 115kV transmission lines crossing Fickett Road, the existing 115kV and 345kV transmission lines crossing the fields, and Allen Road connecting into the Surowiec Substation.

In referencing Appendix B: Visual Impact Assessment Matrix, a “Strong” rating of an “Unrated” Scenic Significance of View is a “Low/No Impact” visual impact. However, due to the residential abutters on the north side of the road directly across from the substation, CMP is proposing buffer mitigation similar to what was approved for other substations as part of the Maine Power Reliability Program.

Length of View and Viewer Expectation

Motorists traveling on Fickett Road would see the proposed substation directly adjacent to Fickett Road for approximately 350 feet, or approximately 5 seconds while traveling 50 mph. Portions of the proposed substation will also be visible from the existing 350 foot wide transmission corridor located west of the substation. Most motorists and pedestrians who travel on this road regularly expect to see the existing transmission lines and the Surowiec Substation.

Additional Mitigation

CMP has proposed mitigation measures to minimize the visual impact to motorists, pedestrians, and abutting residential homes on Fickett Road, which include (1) siting the substation within an area that requires minimal additional clearing, (2) the preservation and maintenance of existing non-capable and capable woody vegetation along the south side of Fickett Road adjacent to the substation site, and (3) a buffer planting plan to be prepared and submitted to MDEP. The buffer planting plan has been developed using a mixture of native hardy deciduous and coniferous plant species that are tolerant of wet soils. The plant species specified will mature to be similar in height to the tallest substation components of approximately 60 feet. The proposed buffer plantings will also reduce the visibility of the existing Surowiec Substation and transmission lines that are currently visible from Fickett Road.

Enclosures

cc: James Beyer, MDEP;
Jay Clement, USACE;
Samantha Horn, LUPC;
Bill Hinkel, LUPC;
Naomi Kirk-Lawlor, LUPC;
Christopher Lawrence, USDOE;
Melissa Pauley, USDOE;
Bernardo Escudero, CMP;
Gerry J. Mirabile, CMP
Mark Goodwin, Burns & McDonnell;
Matt Manahan, Pierce Atwood;
Jared des Rosiers, Pierce Atwood

SUMMARY of Visual Impact Ratings

Based on Maine DEP Appendix A: Basic Visual Impact Assessment Form (DEPLW0541-A2002)

Photosimulation No. Resource/Location	Reviewer	Landscape Compatibility				Scale Contrast	Spatial Dominance	Total Visual Impact Severity Rating	Average	Visual Impact
		Color	Form	Line	Texture					
1. Beattie Pond Lowelltown Twp	A	1	1	1	0	2	2	7	8.5	Minimal/Moderate
	B	1	2	2	0	3	2	10		
2. Wing Pond Lowelltown Twp	A	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	3.5	Minimal
	B	0	1	1	0	2	0	4		
3. Rock Pond T5 R6 BKP WKR	A	2	2	2	1	4	4	15	16.5	Moderate
	B	2	1	2	1	8	4	18		
4. NO.5 Mountain T5 R7 BKP WKR	A	0	1	2	0	1	2	6	8.5	Minimal/Moderate
	B	1	2	2	0	3	3	11		
5. Fish Pond Hobbsstown Twp	A	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	Negligible
	B	0	0	1	0	1	1	3		
6. Attean View Rest Area Jackman	A	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	Negligible
	B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
7. Parlin Pond Parlin Pond TWP	A	1	1	1	1	2	4	10	9	Moderate
	B	1	1	1	0	2	3	8		
8. Coburn Mountain Upper Enchanted Twp.	A	1	2	2	0	2	4	11	12.5	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	4	14		
9. Route 201 Johnson Mountain Twp	A	1	1	1	1	4	4	12	12.5	Moderate
	B	2	1	1	1	4	4	13		
10. Upper Kennebec River 5 Structure Option, Sept 2017 (see Psim 30 for 3 structure option) Moxie Gore	A	1	2	2	1	4	4	14	14.5	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	5	15		
11. Upper Kennebec River 5 Structure Option, Sept 2017 Moxie Gore	A	1	2	2	0	5	6	16	15	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	4	14		
11. Upper Kennebec River 3 Structure Option, Dec 2017 Moxie Gore	A	1	1	2	0	6	4	14	15.5	Moderate
	B	1	1	2	1	6	6	17		
12. Moxie Stream Moxie Gore	A	1	2	3	2	8	6	22	21	Strong*
	B	2	2	2	2	6	6	20		
13. Moxie Pond North East Moxie Twp	A	1	1	1	0	2	2	7	4	Minimal
	B	0	0	0	0	1	0	1		
14. Moxie Pond North East Moxie Twp	A	1	1	1	0	2	2	7	5.5	Minimal
	B	0	1	1	0	1	1	4		

SUMMARY of Visual Impact Ratings

Based on Maine DEP Appendix A: Basic Visual Impact Assessment Form (DEPLW0541-A2002)

Photosimulation No. Resource/Location	Reviewer	Landscape Compatibility				Scale Contrast	Spatial Dominance	Total Visual Impact Severity Rating	Average	Visual Impact
		Color	Form	Line	Texture					
15. Moxie Pond South (Dec 2017) Bald Mountain TWP T2 R3	A	1	1	1	1	2	2	8	9.5	Moderate
	B	1	1	1	0	4	4	11		
16. Mosquito Mountain The Forks PLT	A	1	1	1	1	4	2	10	11	Moderate
	B	1	1	1	1	6	2	12		
17. Mosquito Mountain The Forks PLT	A	1	1	1	1	4	2	10	12	Moderate
	B	1	1	1	1	6	4	14		
18. Troutdale Road The Forks PLT	A	1	2	1	1	4	6	15	14.5	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	4	14		
19. Route 201 Moscow	A	2	2	1	1	4	4	14	14	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	4	14		
20. Wyman Lake Recreation Area Pleasant Ridge Plt	A	1	1	1	0	1	1	5	7	Minimal
	B	1	1	1	0	2	4	9		
21. Route 8 Anson	A	1	2	1	1	4	6	15	14.5	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	4	14		
22. Route 2 Farmington	A	1	1	2	1	4	6	15	14	Moderate
	B	1	1	2	1	4	4	13		
23. Androscoggin Riverlands State Park Leeds	A	1	1	1	1	2	2	8	10	Moderate
	B	1	1	1	1	4	4	12		
24. Merrill Road Lewiston	A	1	1	1	1	4	4	12	10.5	Moderate
	B	0	0	1	0	4	4	9		
25. Riverside Drive Auburn	A	2	1	1	1	2	2	9	12	Moderate
	B	2	2	2	1	4	4	15		
26. Fickett Road Substation Pownal	A	1	2	2	1	8	6	20	16.5	Moderate*
	B	1	1	1	0	6	4	13		
27. Route 1 Wiscasset	A	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.5	Negligible
	B	0	0	1	0	1	0	2		
28. Route 27 Wiscasset	A	0	0	1	0	4	2	7	11.5	Moderate
	B	0	0	2	0	6	8	16		
29. Route 194 Whitefield	A	0	0	1	0	4	2	7	11.5	Moderate
	B	0	0	2	0	6	8	16		
30. Upper Kennebec River NW within corridor- 3 Structure option Moxie Gore	A	1	1	2	1	6	4	15	14.5	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	4	14		

SUMMARY of Visual Impact Ratings

Based on Maine DEP Appendix A: Basic Visual Impact Assessment Form (DEPLW0541-A2002)

Photosimulation No. Resource/Location	Reviewer	Landscape Compatibility				Scale Contrast	Spatial Dominance	Total Visual Impact Severity Rating	Average	Visual Impact
		Color	Form	Line	Texture					
31. Upper Kennebec River SE within corridor - 3 structure option Moxie Gore	A	1	1	2	1	4	4	13	13.5	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	4	14		
32. Upper Kennebec River Picnic Area - SW - 3 structure option Moxie Gore	A	2	2	2	1	6	4	17	16.5	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	6	16		
33. Upper Kennebec River - North of the Picnic Area - 3 structure option Moxie Gore	A	1	2	2	1	6	4	16	15.5	Moderate
	B	1	2	2	1	4	5	15		
A. Appalachian Trail _ Pleasant Pond Mountain The Forks PLT	A	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.5	Minimal
	B	1	1	0	0	1	2	5		
B. Appalachian Trail -Troutdale Road, Joes Hole Bald Mountain TWP	A	2	2	2	1	6	8	21	22	Strong*
	B	2	2	2	1	8	8	23		
C. Appalachian Trail - Bald Mountain Bald Mountain TWP	A	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	4	Minimal
	B	1	0	1	0	2	2	6		

* Locations have been described further in the attached memo from TJD&A, dated August 10, 2018. Conceptual Buffer Planting Plans will be provided for these (*) locations by Central Maine Power Company as additional mitigation.

Hinkel, Bill

From: Amy Segal <segal@tjda.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2018 11:24 PM
To: James F. Palmer
Cc: DEP, NECEC; Beyer, Jim R; Kirk-Lawlor, Naomi E; christopher.lawrence@hq.doe.gov; Horn, Samantha; Hinkel, Bill; Melissa.Pauley@hq.doe.gov; Escudero Morandaira, Bernardo; Goodwin, Mark; Mirabile, Gerry J.; Matt Manahan; Jared des Rosiers (jdesrosiers@pierceatwood.com)
Subject: Supplemental Info - Summary of Basic VIA Form (Appendix A)
Attachments: 2018-08-12 Letter to Palmer_VIA Forms_NECEC.pdf; TJDA VIA Basic VIA Rating Form Summary.pdf; CH 315 OP PROCEEDURES 0603.pdf

Jim,

Attached are three files:

- (1) Summary of the visual impact ratings from the Appendix A: Basic Visual Impact Assessment Forms (DEPLW0541-A2002) for Central Maine Power Company's (CMP) NECEC Project.
- 2) Narrative memo to accompany the Summary
- 3) Copy of the Department of Environmental Protection, Standard Operating Procedure Memo for Guidelines for Assessing Impacts to Existing Scenic and Aesthetic Uses under the Natural Resources Protection Act, by Judy Gates, dated July 20, 2003.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Amy

--

Amy Bell Segal, Senior Associate, ASLA
Maine and NH Licensed Landscape Architect



This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.