Case 19-T-0684

Application of New York Transco LLC for a Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need Pursuant to Article VII of the New York Public Service Law to Construct, Operate, and Maintain a New, Double-Circuit 54.5-Mile 345/115 Kilovolt Electric Transmission Line and Related Facilities Located in the Town of Schodack, Rensselaer County; the Towns of Stuyvesant, Stockport, Ghent, Claverack, Livingston, Gallatin, and Clermont in Columbia County; and the Towns of Milan, Clinton, and Pleasant Valley in Dutchess County

NEW YORK TRANSCO LLC OBJECTIONS & RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORY/DOCUMENT REQUEST

Request No.:	JI-6
Requested By:	Joint Intervenors
Directed To:	New York Transco LLC
Date of Request:	May 8, 2020
Date of Response:	May 18, 2020
Subject:	Application Appendix H: Visual Impact Assessment Report, as Amended

---

TRANSCO GENERAL DEFINITIONS

1. "CEII" shall mean "critical infrastructure" and "critical energy infrastructure" information as defined in Public Officers Law § 86 (5) and 18 CFR § 388.133 (c) (2), respectively.

2. "DPS" shall mean the New York State Department of Public Service.

3. "Joint Intervenors" shall mean the Towns of Livingston, Milan, and Pleasant Valley, together with Famers and Families of Livingston, Farmers and Families for Claverack, and Walnut Grove Farm.

4. "TJD&A" shall mean TJD&A, the authors of the VIA.

5. "Transco" shall mean New York Transco LLC.

6. "Project" shall mean the New York Energy Solution project.

7. "Protective Order" shall mean Administrative Law Judge Anthony Belsito's Ruling Adopting Amended Protective Order issued May 7, 2020.

8. "PSC" shall mean the New York Public Service Commission.

9. "PSL" shall mean New York State Public Service Law.

10. "Staff" shall mean DPS Staff.

11. "VIA" shall mean the revised Visual Impact Assessment filed with the PSC on April 24, 2020.

TRANSCO GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Transco makes the following general objections (collectively, "General Objections"), which shall be incorporated by reference into the below specific responses, as if expressly restated therein, without limiting or waiving any other objections to the instant information requests (individually, the "Request" and collectively, the "Requests") proffered by the Joint Intervenors:

1. Transco objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or production of documents that is or are subject to the attorney-client privilege, constitute attorney work product, are protected under state or federal law or are proprietary or confidential, or constitute draft and/or non-final documents and/or communications containing or concerning same. The inadvertent disclosure of any information or production of any document that is confidential, privileged, was prepared in anticipation of litigation, or is otherwise irrelevant and/or immune from discovery, shall not constitute a waiver of any such privilege or of any ground for objection with respect to such information or document, the subject matter of the information or document, or of Transco's rights to the use of any such information or document in any regulatory proceeding or lawsuit. Transco reserves its right to request the return of any such documents or information in the event of any inadvertent disclosure.

2. Transco objects to the Requests to the extent they are not tailored to this particular proceeding, are not commensurate with the importance of the issues to which each Request relates, and/or seek information or documents that is or are not relevant to any matter within the PSC's jurisdiction.

3. Transco objects to the Requests to the extent they seek documents or information regarding matters, or from entities, over which the PSC (including Staff) has no authority or jurisdiction under the PSL.

4. Transco objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information concerning matters that, due to federal preemption or preclusion, are not subject to regulation by the State of New York.

5. Transco objects to Requests that are overbroad or unduly burdensome to the extent that they (a) are cumulative; (b) call for the production of documents not in Transco's possession, custody, or control; (c) call for the review, compilation or production of publicly-available documents that could be obtained by the requesting party in a less-burdensome manner, including on a public website; (d) call for the review, compilation, and/or production of a

voluminous number of documents at great expense to Transco; or (e) are duplicative of discovery requests already issued in this proceeding and responded to by Transco.

6. Transco objects to the Requests to the extent they seek documents and information already known to or possessed by the requesting party or which are available to those entities from documents in their own files or from public sources including, but not limited to, the DPS website or other online sources.

7. Transco objects to the Requests to the extent they seek sensitive, proprietary and/or competitive information, trade secret information, confidential commercial information, work product, and/or material that is the subject of confidentiality agreements with third parties. To the extent Transco has elected to produce any confidential commercial information and/or trade secret information, such information is being produced solely for use in the above-captioned proceeding pursuant to the Protective Order.

8. Transco objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information and documents that are not known or reasonably available to Transco. Transco further objects to all Requests to the extent they seek to compel Transco to generate or to create information and/or documents that do not already exist.

9. Transco objects to the Requests to the extent they seek CEII.

10. Transco's agreement to provide information or documents in response to the Requests is not: (a) an acceptance of, or agreement with, any of the characterizations or purported descriptions of the transactions or events contained in these Requests; (b) a concession or admission that the requested material is relevant to any matter within the jurisdiction of the State of New York or any of its agencies; (c) a waiver of the objections herein; (d) an admission that any such information or documents exist; or (e) an agreement to provide information or documents pursuant to any other Request.

11. Each response reflects the information or documents located by Transco given the scope and nature of the Request at issue and as evidenced by the sponsor(s) of such response, after a reasonable, diligent search in the response period in which the Joint Intervenors have requested a response to be provided, particularly in light of the scope and breadth of the Requests. Transco reserves its right to amend or supplement the responses, including the assertion of additional objections, and any production of information and documents as additional discovery and investigations continue, in the event that additional information is identified, or in the event of error, inadvertent mistake, or omission.

***

JI-6.1

This is follow-up to JI-1.2 and JI-1.5: The Hudson River National Heritage Area is more than three National or State Registered Historic places as described in the Transco Visual Impact Assessment. Was any effort made to capture the visual landscape character and diversity of the Hudson River National Heritage Area within or abutting the power line corridor?

Transco's Response to JI-6.1. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The VIA does capture the visual landscape character and diversity of the Hudson River National Heritage Area, which covers the entire Project area. More specifically, the 230 photographs presented in the VIA, plus the context photographs presented as part of the photosimulations, illustrate the topographic features, water features, vegetation, and cultural features that comprise the National Heritage Area. *See also* VIA at 3-12 and Transco's Responses to JI-1.2 and JI-1.5.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.2

This is follow-up to JI-1.3 & JI-1.4: What specific on-line resources and publications were utilized for the landscape setting description in the Transco VIA?

Fieldwork for the VIA on page 4-19 states that "field work focused on the defined visual resources, the field evaluation team also visited publicly accessible sites of local sensitivity'. Did this fieldwork include all public roads with power line crossings?

Transco's Response to JI-6.2. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

Specific on-line resources and publications that were utilized for the landscape setting description in the VIA include:

> Columbia Land Conservancy. Greenport Conservation Area. https://clctrust.org/public-conservation-areas/greenport/
>
> Maurice D. Hinchey Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area, in partnership with the National Park Service, https://www.hudsonrivervalley.com/
>
> Mohawk Valley Heritage Areas. https://parks.ny.gov/historic-preservation/heritage-areas.aspx
>
> NYSDEC (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation). 2019. Official website. http://www.dec.ny.gov/NYSDEC.2011.
>
> Strategic Plan and Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement for State Forest Management. On line at: http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/lands_forests_pdf/spsfmfinal1.pdf.
>
> NYSDOS (New York State Department of State). July 1993, Reprinted 2004. Scenic Areas of Statewide Significance. http://www.dos.ny.gov/opd/programs/HudsonSASS/Hudson%20River%20Valley%20SASS.pdf
>
> NYS Parks www.nysparks.com/parks.
>
> www.ScenicHudson.org.

Fieldwork included visiting and photographing most of the public roads with Project power line crossings within the study area. Photography at road crossings included views up and down the transmission corridor, views from points along the road to illustrate the crossing itself, and photographs of buildings and other development patterns near the crossing. *See* VIA, Figure 4.4-4: Study Area Photos.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.3

What are the so-called "professional standards" that are referred to in Transco's response to JI-1.3?

Transco's Response to JI-6.3. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

Transco's response to JI-1.3 notes: "In keeping with accepted professional standards, VIA 3.1 describes the Project area in terms of its landforms (topography), vegetation, land use (cultural modifications), and water features."

Most visual impact assessment methodologies make reference to the way the landscape is described in terms of the characteristic water features, landforms, vegetation, and land use. Typical of this approach are the directives found in the National Park Service publication *Guide to Evaluating Visual Impact Assessments for Renewable Energy Projects*, by Robert Sullivan (Argonne National Laboratory) and Mark Meyer (National Park Service):

> "The first major step in the VIA process is to gather information about the characteristic regional landscape setting and the landscape setting in the vicinity of the project. The information includes a description of the physical environment, such as major landforms, vegetation, water bodies, and climate; discussion of the landscape character, that is, the scenic characteristics and quality of both the regional landscape and the immediate surroundings of the proposed project; and the nature and extent of human presence and modifications in the regional and project settings. Any relevant existing land use, visual resource management, or scenic conservation plans or programs are also described. This important information establishes baseline conditions for assessing visual contrasts and associated visual impacts."[1]

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

[1] http://blmwyomingvisual.anl.gov/docs/NRR_VIAGuide-RenewableEnergy_2014-08-08_large.pdf. P. 19.

JI-6.4

This is a follow-up to JI-1.11: Regarding Casey Recreation Park- what was the specific fieldwork that determined that Casey Recreational Park in Pleasant Valley met the criteria of low scenic quality?

Transco's Response to JI-6.4. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

There is no Casey Recreation Park in Pleasant Valley.

The fieldwork for Cady (Pleasant Valley) Recreation Park (the "Park") occurred on April 24, 2019. Access to the northern part of the Park was through commercial development on Route 44. Access to the southern part of the Park was on a gravel drive off South Road that follows a transmission line leading to a sports field at the western end of the drive. The existing transmission lines were prominently visible throughout the Park. A description of existing conditions of the Park is presented in the VIA at 3-14. Panoramic photographs of both sides of the Park are presented in Figure 4.4-4 of the VIA, photographs 218 and 219.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.5

This is a follow-up to JI-1.15: Would fieldwork verification for visibility be different in leaf off conditions? If so, where?

Transco's Response to JI-6.5. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

No, fieldwork verification for visibility would not be appreciably different in leaf-off conditions to those described in the response to JI-1.15. *See* Transco's response to JI-6.6 below for a description of the types of fieldwork evaluation completed.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.6

How was the "screening potential" of vegetation calculated or assessed?

Transco's Response to JI-6.6. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The screening potential of different types of vegetation was assessed based upon field observation (examining differences between evergreen and deciduous vegetation; evaluating age, stand density, and forest composition), aerial photo interpretation, cross sectional analyses, and computer modeling.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.7

What were the "varying degrees" of visibility considered between leaf off and leaf on conditions?

Transco's Response to JI-6.7. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

See Transco's Response to JI-6.6.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.8

This is a follow-up to JI-1.6: Since no landscape character classification was done for the whole corridor – how do we know that the six viewpoints selected for visual simulations accurately represent the various landscape character types within the study corridor?

Transco's Response to JI-6.8. Transco hereby incorporates the General Objections set forth above and further objects to the characterization of the VIA. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections and/or the specific objections set forth herein, Transco provides the following response:

There is no requirement to do a landscape character classification in the 2000 DEC Visual Policy (the "DEC Visual Policy") (*see* Transco's response to JI-1.1). As described in the VIA at 4.2.1, the six viewpoints selected are representative of the landscape character within and adjacent to the transmission corridor. They were selected to provide evenly spaced illustrations of the anticipated changes to the landscape where the Project would be visible.

Nevertheless, the photographic record in Figure 4.4-4 provides a visual description of the landscape character found throughout the Project corridor.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.9

This is a follow-up to JI-1.17: Why was leaf off conditions not considered for the photo-based simulations?

Transco's Response to JI-6.9. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

Leaf-off conditions were not considered for the six photosimulations since they would not have shown any appreciable difference in project visibility. *See* response to JI-6.5.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.10

This is a follow-up to JI-1.18: So specifically –what were the modifications to the BLM (1986) visual contract rating system as used for the Transco VIA analysis?

Transco's Response to JI-6.10. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The BLM system is very generalized, since it is meant to be applied to a wide range of physical conditions. As a result, the primary modifications to the BLM Visual Contrast Rating System were the development of more defined, Project-specific criteria to describe Degree of Contrast, and to provide a qualitative tool to describe the potential changes to the visual landscape. The additional criteria were based upon TJD&A's experience in working with and observing the visual effects of transmission lines and other energy-related projects in the Northeast. The VIA, at 4-23/24, provides a series of situations that could lead to strong, moderate, low, or no visual contrast.

An example of the modification to the BLM Visual Contrast Rating System follows. The BLM Visual Contrast Rating System Criteria for Moderate Degree of Contrast notes: "The element contrast begins to attract attention and begins to dominate the characteristic landscape." By comparison, the VIA states several situations that could result in moderate visual contrasts, including: "Upgrading existing access roads or construction of new access roads in rolling terrain with occasional short, steep slopes," and "[p]roposed project elements are somewhat larger in scale compared to existing, nearby, or parallel utility facilities."

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.11

This is a follow-up to JI-1.19: Research has shown that multiple raters are needed when utilizing BLM's contrast rating system to ensure both validity and reliability of the assessment of degree of visual impact(see Feimer et al 1979, Palmer & Hoffman 2001,Churchward et al 2012). What was done to meet standards for validity and reliability?

Transco's Response to JI-6.11. Transco hereby incorporates the General Objections set forth above and further objects to the characterization of the Request to the extent it argues a position about the need for multiple raters. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections and/or the specific objections set forth herein, Transco provides the following response:

There is no requirement in the DEC Visual Policy to use multiple raters. As noted in JI-6.10, the BLM Visual Contrast Rating System was modified to be Project-specific and provide a qualitative tool to describe the potential changes to the visual landscape.

While multiple raters may be used in some situations, they are not always needed or expected. In fact, when evaluating the BLM's Visual Resource Management system, Churchward et al noted that "the reliability and validity of the various VIA procedures are asserted but not well documented."[2]

To meet the standards for validity and reliability, TJD&A followed procedures used successfully in the VIA developed for the Maine Power Reliability Program, the New England Clean Energy Connect, and dozens of other transmission projects that have been approved by regulators. Projects completed in Maine were evaluated under Maine's Chapter 315 regulations, which are closely patterned after the DEC Visual Policy.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

[2] Churchward C., Palmer J. F. Nassauer J. I. and Swanwick C. A. 2012. *Evaluation of Methodologies for Visual Impact Assessments.* Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences. P. 26.

JI-6.12

This is a follow-up to JI-1.20: Most of the examples (except for Maine) of similar visual impact assessment methods applied to power line projects are not representative of the Northeastern US landscape. Are there examples of projects in landscapes similar to the Hudson River Valley landscape used by the Transco VIA consultants?

Transco's Response to JI-6.12. Transco hereby incorporates the General Objections set forth above and further objects to the characterization of the Request to the extent it argues a position about the representative nature about visual impact assessment methods described in response to JI-1.20. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections and/or the specific objections set forth herein, Transco provides the following response:

Examples of visual impact assessments in the Northeastern United States that are in landscapes within, similar to, or somewhat similar to the Hudson River Valley include:

- A&C Lines Project in Dutchess County, NY. PSC Case 13-T-0469.
- Empire State Line in Niagara County, NY. PSC Case 18-T-0499.
- Maine Power Reliability Program in southern and central Maine. Approved by Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MeDEP), constructed 2015.
- New England Clean Energy Connect in northern and central Maine. Approved by MeDEP 2020.
- Northern Pass in northern and central New Hampshire. Reviewed by the NH Site Evaluation Committee.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.13

This is a follow-up to JI-1.21: (a) How do you determine "public use and enjoyment" as stipulated in the NYS DEC Visual Policy (2019) if there is no usage or frequency data or surveys of resident or visitor data? (b) What was used to determine user concern for the visual resources assessed in the VIA?

Transco's Response to JI-6.13. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

As explained in the response to JI-1.1, the VIA was prepared using the then-applicable DEC visual policy (*i.e.*, the DEC Visual Policy), which makes no specific reference to usage, frequency data, or surveys of residents/visitors. Instead, the applicable DEC Visual Policy requires that an applicant determine if the project will result in an aesthetic impact, *i.e.*, one that "by virtue of its visibility, must clearly interfere with or reduce the public's enjoyment or appreciation of the appearance of a significant place or structure" (DEC Visual Policy, Glossary).

User concern for the visual resources assessed in the VIA is based upon the understanding that there is variability in the relative importance of aesthetics to the public for different activities.[3] With certain activities (*e.g.*, nature photography, driving scenic byways, viewing scenery, hiking), there is a high concern for visual quality of the surrounding landscape since it is an intrinsic part of and may significantly affect the experience. With other activities, there is a moderate expectation of visual quality, but it may be secondary to the primary experience (*e.g.*, fishing, swimming, boating, camping). In the same way, some activities have a low expectation of visual quality (*e.g.*, ATV-riding, hunting, field sports, court sports) or no expectation of visual quality (*e.g.*, visiting museums, indoor recreation). Determination of public expectation, appreciation, enjoyment, or concern for the visual resources assessed in the VIA is based upon TJD&A's observations of the particular aesthetic resource, TJD&A's understanding of the significance of visual quality in user expectations, and TJD&A's three decades of performing visual impact assessments for utility and other infrastructure projects in the Northeast.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

[3] USDA Forest Service. Landscape Aesthetics: A Handbook for Scenery Management. Agricultural Handbook Number 701. December 1995. http://www.esf.edu/via. P.7. Constituent Analysis.

JI-6.14

This is a follow-up to JI-1.24: For many of the local visual resources –field checks determined that they had no visibility to the proposed Transco project during summer months. Were there field checks from these local visual resources during leaf off conditions in the fall, winter or spring?

Transco's Response to JI-6.14. Transco hereby incorporates the General Objections set forth above and further objects to the characterization of the VIA. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections and/or the specific objections set forth herein, Transco provides the following response:

TJD&A initial field visits for the Project occurred in April 2019 as leaves were just starting to emerge. There were no additional field visits during leaf-off conditions.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.15

This is a follow-up to JI-1.28: For Photo simulation #4 on Highway 82 was the scenic quality before or after the power line crossing considered?

Transco's Response to JI-6.15. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

For the scenic quality of Highway 82, at the point where the transmission corridor crosses the highway, both existing conditions (before) and following Project installation (after) were considered. *See* VIA at 5-34.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.16

This is a follow-up to JI-1.29: Was there any effort to ascertain bicycle usage on Route 9 where the Blue Store Tap line will be visible?

Transco's Response to JI-6.16. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The VIA did not ascertain bicycle usage on Route 9 where the Blue Store Tap line will be visible. State bicycle routes such as Route 9 are primarily for transportation purposes and are not considered an aesthetic resource in the DEC Visual Policy. Further, the viewshed maps in the VIA indicate that the proposed H-frame structures to be installed on the Blue Store Tap line will be minimally visible from Route 9. *See* VIA, Figure 4.4-5, Map 3.

See also Transco's response to JI-1.31.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.17

This is a follow-up to JI-40: In the response to any location in the Hudson Valley where the transmission structures at the proposed height of 90 to 100 feet would be visible from public spaces- the Transco response was no. What about public roads?

Transco's Response to JI-6.17. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The type of transmission structures Transco intends to install, with a height of 90 to 100 feet, are not already installed at any location in the Hudson Valley in an area that can be viewed from public roads.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Joe Pattison, Project Manager, Burns & McDonnell Consultants, Inc. d/b/a Burns & McDonnell Consultants, P.C.
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.18

Under 2.0 Project Description: What was the rationale for the Blue Stores Tap line in Livingston – to have only one versus two existing 115 KV lines supported by 115 kV transmission H-frame structures to be replaced with new 115 KV line H-frame rather than the single monopole structures?

Transco's Response to JI-6.18. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

H-frame structures were selected as the proposed structure configuration on the Blue Stores Tap line in Livingston for consistency with the existing structures, which are currently H-frames.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Joe Pattison, Project Manager, Burns & McDonnell Consultants, Inc. d/b/a Burns & McDonnell Consultants, P.C.
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.19

What prompted the development of the April 24, 2020 VIA report modifications?

Transco's Response to JI-6.19. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

See Author's Note in the VIA.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.20

What was the basis for the scenic quality rating changes in Table 5-4?

Transco's Response to JI-6.20. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The basis for the changes to the scenic quality ratings in Table 5-4 was that the initial ratings were entered incorrectly and, as a result, did not conform with the descriptions of scenic quality for the individual aesthetic resources found in Section 3.2 of the VIA. These changes did not affect the determination of overall visual impact.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.21

What was the basis for the scenic quality, context, scenic quality impact, user concern impact and overall impact in Table 5-5 in the April 24 2020 Transco VIA?

Transco's Response to JI-6.21. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The basis for the determination of scenic quality, contrast, scenic quality impact, user concern impact, and overall impact in Table 5-5 of the VIA did not change and includes the field visits made during the course of the project, review of written and on-line material about the selected aesthetic resources, descriptions of the scenic resources in VIA 3.3.2 State Water Resources and 3.4 Visual Resources of Local Importance, the viewshed analysis, and the evaluation tables in the VIA 4.2.3.2 Impacts to Scenic Quality.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.22

Specifically what was the basis for the scenic quality, context, scenic quality impact, user concern impact and overall impact in Table 5-5 for Taghkanic Creek in Livingston?

Transco's Response to JI-6.22. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The basis for the determination of scenic quality (moderate), contrast (low), scenic quality impact (low to moderate), user concern impact (moderate), and overall impact (low) was TJD&A's field visit to the roads in the vicinity of Taghkanic Creek in Livingston (the "Creek") on April 25, 2019. Taghkanic Creek was rated as medium for scenic quality since portions of the Creek are eligible for inclusion in the State's Wild, Scenic, and Recreational Rivers list as a recreational resource (*i.e.*, not a scenic resource). The point at which the existing transmission corridor crosses the Creek appears to be on private land and not visible from public roads. The banks of the Creek are tree-lined, so views of the Project are limited to a 125± foot section within the transmission corridor, which resulted in a contrast rating of low. Scenic quality impact was judged to be low to moderate, due to the presence of existing transmission structures within the foreground (within ¼ mile). User concern impact was rated as moderate due to the proximity to potential users. The overall impact was rated low since the Project appeared to be on private property with no public viewpoints in an area that has an existing transmission line.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.23

Specifically what was the basis for the scenic quality, context, scenic quality impact, user concern impact and overall impact in Table 5-5 for Cady Recreational Park in Pleasant Valley?

Transco's Response to JI-6.23. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The determination of scenic quality (low), contrast (low), scenic quality impact (low to moderate), user concern impact (low), and overall impact (low) was based on TJD&A's field visit to Cady (Pleasant Valley) Recreational Park on April 24, 2019 and the viewshed analysis in the VIA. The site visit indicated that views would be screened by intervening vegetation. The viewshed analysis indicates that there would be limited or reduced views of several of the structures within the Park, resulting in a contrast rating of low, especially during leaf-on conditions. Scenic quality impact was judged to be low to moderate, given the proximity to the existing Pleasant Valley Substations. User concern impact and overall impact were judged to be low, given the context of the site (relative to the surrounding transmission lines and substations) and the limited Project visibility anticipated.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.24

Specifically what was the basis for the scenic quality, context, scenic quality impact, user concern impact and overall impact in Table 5-5 for Bower Park in Pleasant Valley?

Transco's Response to JI-6.24. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

The basis for the determination of scenic quality (moderate), contrast (none), scenic quality impact (none), user concern impact (low), and overall impact (none) was TJD&A's field visit to Bower Park in Pleasant Valley on May 30, 2019. The site visit indicated that views would be screened by intervening vegetation. The viewshed analysis in the VIA supports these observations and indicates that there will be no views of any of the structures within the Park.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Terrence DeWan FASLA, Principal TJD&A
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.25

Were alternative power line support structures considered as an alternative to the selected monopole structures? Were alternative heights considered?

Transco's Response to JI-6.25. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

Yes, alternative power line support structures were considered as alternatives to the selected monopole structures. Alternative structures would have resulted in increased heights or increased right-of-way ("ROW") widths, which would have violated underlying PSC criteria of minimizing structure heights and staying within existing ROWs.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Joe Pattison, Project Manager, Burns & McDonnell Consultants, Inc. d/b/a Burns & McDonnell Consultants, P.C.
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

JI-6.26

Were secular reflectance and color alternatives considered to minimize reflectance, glare, and visual contrast from the monopole structures?

Transco's Response to JI-6.26. Subject to and without waiving any of the General Objections set forth above, Transco provides the following response:

Color alternatives, such as the dark brown color resulting from weathering steel, were considered for the monopole structures. As discussed in the VIA, where the transmission line structures are close to the viewer and not screened by vegetation, they are often silhouetted against the sky. A structure finish that is darker in color increases the contrast of the structure when silhouetted against the light of the sky. For this reason, the lighter gray color of galvanized steel offers less visual contrast than the darker brown color of weathering steel. As for reflectance and glare, see response to DPS-7.

Name and Title of Person(s) Responsible for Response: Joe Pattison, Project Manager, Burns & McDonnell Consultants, Inc. d/b/a Burns & McDonnell Consultants, P.C.
Date: May 18, 2020
Entity on Behalf of Which the Response is Provided: Transco

References from Request

Churchward C., Palmer J. F. Nassauer J. I. and Swanwick C. A. 2012. *Evaluation of Methodologies for Visual Impact Assessments*. Transportation Research Board, National Academy of Sciences [on line]
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257936867_Evaluation_of_Methodologies_for_Visual_Impact_Assessments

Feimer N. R.; Craik K. H. Smardon; R. C. Sheppard; S. R.J. 1979. Appraising the reliability of visual impact assessment methods. In: Elsner, Gary H., and Richard C. Smardon, technical coordinators. 1979. *Proceedings of our national landscape: a conference on applied techniques for analysis and management of the visual resource* [Incline Village, Nev., April 23-25, 1979]. Gen. Tech. Rep. PSW-GTR-35. Berkeley, CA. Pacific Southwest Forest and Range Exp. Stn., Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture: p. 286-295 [online]
https://www.fs.usda.gov/treesearch/pubs/27591

Palmer J. F., Hoffman R. E. 2001. Rating reliability and representation validity in scenic landscape assessments. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 54 (200 1) 149-1 6 1 [on line]
https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/jrnl/2001/nc_2001_palmer_002.pdf

NYS DEC. 2018. DEP / Assessing and Mitigating Visual Impacts. DEP-00-2. DRAFT 10/30/2018. Albany, NY: New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. [on line]
https://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/permits_ej_operations_pdf/vispolfinaldraftoct18.pdf

New York Transco. 2020. New Energy Solution Appendix H. Visual Impact Assessment. Prepared for Transco by Terry DeWan & Associates. Modified April 24, 2020.

USDI, BLM (Bureau of Land Management). 1986. Visual Resource Inventory. BLM Manual Handbook 8410-1, Release 8-28, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

***