

SUPPLEMENTAL FILING FOR BINGHAM WIND PROJECT USER SURVEYS

Prepared for:

**First Wind
Portland, Maine**

Prepared by:

Kleinschmidt

Pittsfield, Maine
www.KleinschmidtUSA.com

August 2013

SUPPLEMENTAL FILING FOR
BINGHAM WIND PROJECT
USER SURVEYS

Prepared for:

First Wind
Portland, Maine

Prepared by:

Kleinschmidt

Pittsfield, Maine
www.KleinschmidtUSA.com

August 2013

**SUPPLEMENTAL FILING FOR
BINGHAM WIND PROJECT
USER SURVEYS**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Additional surveys were conducted at Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond during June and July 2013 to supplement the survey results obtained during September 2012 in support of the proposed Bingham wind project. The three primary objectives of the 2013 surveys were the same as in 2012. Specifically, the objectives were to examine:

1. Type of Use: Determine who uses these resources, the type of activities users participate in, and how often the resource is being used or visited.
2. User Expectations and Impact to Enjoyment: Understand the user expectations of the resource and the impact the project may have on enjoyment.
3. Likelihood to Return: Determine the user's likelihood to return to the resource if the project were developed.

2.0 METHODS

Surveys were conducted at the same locations in 2013 as in 2012. The Wyman Lake surveys were completed at the Pleasant Ridge DOC Boat Launch and Recreation Area. This site includes a public boat ramp, a picnic area, and a swimming area. At Bald Mountain Pond, the interviews were conducted at the only boat access point to the Pond. A small camping area is adjacent to the Bald Mountain Pond boat launch. The Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond interview locations were chosen because they provide public access, are better known destinations in the area, and have potential visibility of the wind turbines. It was assumed there would be a high likelihood of intercepting recreationists at these locations because they provide easily accessible (i.e., via passenger vehicle) boat launches.

With the exception of two additional questions added to the Wyman Lake surveys conducted in July, 2013 and one additional question added to the Bald Mountain Pond surveys conducted in July, 2013, the same survey instrument and interview manual was used in 2013 as in 2012. The survey instrument used for the June 2013 surveys and the survey instrument with the additional question(s) used for the July 2013 surveys are attached as Appendix 1. Interviewers followed the same procedures regarding interview techniques and respondent selection as in 2012. In contrast to 2012, all of the 2013 surveys at both Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond were conducted on the weekend (Table 1).

One additional difference between the 2012 and 2013 surveys is that the simulations showing the visibility of turbines from the survey location changed slightly (Appendix 1). The simulations used in 2012 were modified by LandWorks during the finalization of the VIA to more accurately reflect potential Project visibility. The changes to the Bald Mountain Pond simulation were very

subtle and were mostly related to changes in formatting and viewing distance. The changes to the Wyman Lake simulation resulted in 7 hubs and 1 blade being visible in 2013, in comparison to the previous simulation which depicted 5 hubs and 1 blade.¹

3.0 RESULTS

Twenty-three surveys (sixteen at Wyman Lake and seven at Bald Mountain Pond) were completed between September 1 and 25, 2012. An additional 34 surveys were completed at Wyman Lake between June 30 and July 13, 2013, approximately tripling the total to 50 completed surveys (Tables 1 and 2). Twelve eligible parties refused to participate in the survey because of being too busy or a lack of interest. At Bald Mountain Pond, 7 surveys were done on July 7 and 20, 2013, doubling the total to 14 completed surveys. All of the eligible parties at Bald Mountain Pond on July 7 and 20, 2013, were interviewed; thus, as in 2012, the low number of completed surveys (7) reflects the overall level of use of the resource during the time period the interviewer was at the site. Due to the low number of completed surveys at Bald Mountain Pond, the results should be considered qualitative and caution should be exercised when interpreting the results. Overall, 76% of the eligible parties approached at Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond completed the survey in 2013 (Table 2).

TABLE 1. SAMPLE FRAME FOR INTERCEPT SURVEYS AT WYMAN LAKE AND BALD MOUNTAIN POND, JUNE 30-JULY 20, 2013

	Total Available				Sample			
	Weekdays	Weekend	Holiday	Total	Weekdays	Weekend	Holiday	Total
Wyman Lake	13	4	4	21	0	2 ^a	1 ^b	3
Bald Mountain Pond	13	4	4	21	0	1 ^c	1 ^d	2

^aSunday, June 30, Saturday, July 13

^bSaturday, July 6

^cSaturday, July 20

^dSunday, July 7

TABLE 2. RESPONSE RATE FOR THE WYMAN LAKE AND BALD MOUNTAIN POND SURVEYS CONDUCTED BETWEEN JUNE 30-JULY 20, 2013

	Wyman Lake		Bald Mountain Pond		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Surveys Completed	34	72%	7	100%	41	76%
People Approached	47		7		54	
Refusals	12		0		12	
Repeat	1		0		1	

The average number of people observed on shore at Wyman Lake during the time periods the interviewer was at the site was 66, and the average number observed at Bald Mountain Pond was 21 (Table 3). On average, the interviewer was at each site for 5 hours. The total number of

¹ Of the 7 hubs depicted in the more recent simulation, 1 hub will not be built as it is the alternate turbine 7a.

people observed at each site during the 2013 survey periods was higher than in 2012 likely because interviews occurred only on weekends and during the middle of the summer.

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents were permanent residents of Maine (Table 3). Similar to the 2012 results, the majority of respondents (91%) in 2013 had visited Wyman Lake before whereas it was the first visit for approximately half of the respondents at Bald Mountain Pond (Table 3).

During 2013, the dominant primary activities at Wyman Lake were fishing (21%), swimming (26%), and motorboating (24%) (Table 4). Other activities participated in include relaxing, enjoying the scenery, picnicking, kayaking, sunbathing, and using the beach (Table 5). At Bald Mountain Pond, respondents participated in a variety of activities, including fishing, camping, kayaking, using the beach, enjoying the scenery, observing nature, canoeing, motorboating, relaxing, sunbathing, and swimming (Tables 6 and 7).

An additional question was added to the survey in July 2013 at the request of DEP visual expert Jim Palmer and was included in the interviews which occurred on July 6 and 13 at Wyman Lake and July 7 and 20 at Bald Mountain Pond. Thus, only 21 of the 34 surveys completed at Wyman Lake included this question. The question asked respondents to rate what they look forward to when visiting the site. All respondents stated that getting outdoors and scenery are important factors they look forward to (Table 8). The majority of respondents indicated that companionship and rejuvenation are important as well. Most respondents rated experiencing a challenge or novelty as being “Very Unimportant” to “Neither Important nor Unimportant”.

Per a request from Jim Palmer, an additional question was added to the survey in July 2013 and was included in the interviews for Wyman Lake. A portion of the Arnold Trail to Quebec, which is also considered a significant resource, is located near Wyman Lake and is within 8 miles of the proposed turbine locations but does not have potential visibility of the turbines. Respondents at Wyman Lake on July 6 and 13 were asked whether they were aware of the Arnold Trail. Thirteen of the 21 respondents (62%) were aware of the Arnold Trail. Nearly all of the of the 13 respondents who were aware of the trail said it had no effect on their visit to Wyman Lake or that it did not make an important contribution to their visit (Table 9).

TABLE 3. NUMBER OF PEOPLE OBSERVED AT WYMAN LAKE AND BALD MOUNTAIN POND DURING SURVEY PERIODS AND RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Respondent Characteristics	Wyman Lake		Bald Mountain Pond		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
People						
Average Per Day ^a	66		21		48	
Median Per Day ^a	61		21		35	
Average Group Size ^b	4		7		4	
Total	199		42		241	
Age						
18-24	5	15%	2	29%	7	17%
25-34	6	18%	0	0%	6	15%
35-44	11	32%	0	0%	11	27%
45-54	4	12%	4	57%	8	20%
55-64	2	6%	0	0%	2	5%
65 or older	6	18%	1	14%	7	17%
Total	34	~100%	7	100%	41	~100%
Residency						
Year-Round Maine Resident	29	85%	7	100%	36	88%
Part-Time Maine Resident	2	6%	0	0%	2	5%
Nonresident	3	9%	0	0%	3	7%
Total	34	100%	7	100%	41	100%
Gender						
Male	20	59%	4	80%	24	62%
Female	14	41%	1	20%	15	38%
Total	34	100%	5	100%	39	100%
First Visit to Site						
No	31	91%	3	43%	34	83%
Yes	3	9%	4	57%	7	17%
Total	34	100%	7	100%	41	100%

^a This is the average and median total number of people observed at the site by the interviewer for the three days surveyed at Wyman Lake and the two days surveyed at Bald Mountain Pond.

^b This is the average group size of the parties being interviewed.

TABLE 4. RESPONDENT PRIMARY ACTIVITY AT WYMAN LAKE

Primary Activity	Wyman Lake 2012		Wyman Lake 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Fishing	4	25%	7	21%	11	22%
Kayaking	4	25%	1	3%	5	10%
Enjoying Scenery	3	19%	1	3%	4	8%
Observing/Studying Nature	3	19%	1	3%	4	8%
Swimming	2	13%	9	26%	11	22%
Beach Going	0	0%	1	3%	1	2%
Camping	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Motorboating	0	0%	8	24%	8	16%
Picnicking	0	0%	1	3%	1	2%
Relaxing	0	0%	4	12%	4	8%
Hiking	0	0%	1	3%	1	2%
Total	16	~100%	34	100%	50	100%

TABLE 5. OTHER ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN AT WYMAN LAKE

Activity	Wyman Lake 2012		Wyman Lake 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Beach Going	1	3%	2	3%	3	3%
Camping	1	3%	1	2%	2	2%
Canoeing	1	3%	1	2%	2	2%
Driving ATV	0	0%	1	2%	1	1%
Enjoying Scenery	3	10%	3	5%	6	6%
Fishing	3	10%	8	13%	11	12%
Kayaking	0	0%	3	5%	3	3%
Motorboating	1	3%	8	13%	9	10%
Observing/Studying Nature	4	14%	7	11%	11	12%
Watercraft	1	3%	1	2%	2	2%
Picnicking	5	17%	9	14%	14	15%
Relaxing	4	14%	5	8%	9	10%
Staying at Camp	1	3%	0	0%	1	1%
Sunbathing	2	7%	4	6%	6	6%
Swimming	2	7%	11	17%	13	14%
Total	29	100%	64	100%	93	100%

TABLE 6. RESPONDENT PRIMARY ACTIVITY AT BALD MOUNTAIN POND

Primary Activity	Bald Mountain Pond 2012		Bald Mountain Pond 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Fishing	5	71%	2	29%	7	50%
Kayaking	1	14%	1	14%	2	14%
Camping	1	14%	2	29%	3	21%
Beach Going	0	0%	1	14%	1	7%
Enjoying Scenery	0	0%	1	14%	1	7%
Total	7	100%	7	100%	14	100%

TABLE 7. OTHER ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN AT BALD MOUNTAIN POND

Activity	Bald Mountain Pond 2012		Bald Mountain Pond 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Camping	3	25%	2	7%	5	12%
Canoeing	1	8%	3	10%	4	10%
Driving ATV	0	0%	1	3%	1	2%
Enjoying Scenery	2	17%	1	3%	3	7%
Fishing	0	0%	2	7%	2	5%
Kayaking	1	8%	2	7%	3	7%
Motorboating	0	0%	4	14%	4	10%
Observing/Studying Nature	2	17%	2	7%	4	10%
Relaxing	2	17%	3	10%	5	12%
Stargazing	0	0%	2	7%	2	5%
Staying at Camp	0	0%	2	7%	2	5%
Sunbathing	0	0%	2	7%	2	5%
Swimming	1	8%	3	10%	4	10%
Total	12	100%	29	100%	41	100%

TABLE 8. RATING OF FACTORS DESCRIBING WHAT RESPONDENTS LOOK FORWARD TO WHEN VISITING WYMAN LAKE OR BALD MOUNTAIN POND

	Very Unimportant		Neither Important nor Unimportant			Very Important	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Wyman Lake							
Getting Outdoors	0	0	0	0	0	1	20
Scenery (i.e., Enjoying the surroundings)	0	0	0	0	0	1	20
Companionship/Spending Time with Friends/Family	2	0	0	0	2	1	16
Challenge (i.e., catching a big fish, hiking a new area, canoeing to a new location)	7	0	0	6	3	1	4
Rejuvenation	0	1	1	1	0	1	16
Novelty (i.e., trying a new activity)	5	0	0	7	4	4	1
Bald Mountain Pond							
Getting Outdoors	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
Scenery (i.e., Enjoying the surroundings)	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
Companionship/Spending Time with Friends/Family	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Challenge (i.e., catching a big fish, hiking a new area, canoeing to a new location)	1	0	1	3	2	0	0
Rejuvenation	0	0	0	1	0	0	6
Novelty (i.e., trying a new activity)	0	0	1	2	2	0	1

TABLE 9. RESPONDENT AWARENESS OF THE ARNOLD TRAIL TO QUEBEC AND RATING OF CONTRIBUTION OF THE ARNOLD TRAIL TO THEIR VISIT

	Number	Percent
Yes	13	62%
No	8	38%
Total	21	

	Number	Percent
1 Very Unimportant	6	46%
2	0	0%
3	0	0%
4 No Effect	6	46%
5	1	8%
6	0	0%
7 Very Important	0	0%
Total	13	100%

3.1 SCENIC VALUE

In 2013, the most frequent responses given for places in Maine with a high scenic value were Wyman Lake, the Moosehead Lake area, Mt. Katahdin, Moxie Falls, Acadia Park, Moxie Bald Mountain, Bald Mountain and Punchbowl Pond, Rangeley, Bar Harbor, and Spencer Pond (Tables 10 and 11). The reasons given for why these places are considered highly scenic include mountains, waterfalls, views, forests and that the sites are unique and clean. Locations which respondents stated have a low scenic value include Lewiston/Auburn, Portland, Skowhegan, Augusta, Old Orchard Beach, and transfer stations because these places have too many people, are dirty, have poor views, buildings, poor water quality, too many houses or camps and because they are cities (Tables 12 and 13).

TABLE 10. PLACES IN MAINE RATED AS HAVING A HIGH SCENIC VALUE AND EXPLANATION FOR THE RATING FOR RESPONDENTS AT WYMAN LAKE, JUNE 30-JULY 20, 2013

Highly Scenic Places in Maine	Characteristics That Make Places Have High Scenic Value														Total	Percent of Total
	Mountains	Unique	Waterfalls	Memories from kid	Clean	Views	View with no houses/camps on shore	Forest and Mountains	Wildlife	Everything	Ledges on shoreline	Open	We live here	Pebble beach on the backside of Kineo		
Mt. Katahdin	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9%
Flagstaff Lake	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Moxie Falls	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6%
Wyman Lake	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	21%
Houston Brook Falls	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Moosehead Lake Area (including Kineo and Kokadjo)	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	21%
Acadia Park and Surrounding Area	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6%
Moxie Bald Mountain	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6%
Bald Mountain Pond, Punch Bowl	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Rangeley	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	6%
Grand Falls	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Kennebunkport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Bar Harbor	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	6%
Rangeley overlooking Mooselookmeguntic	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Sebec Lake and Peaks Kenny State Park	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Total	7	2	3	2	3	7	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	34	100%
Percent of Total	21%	6%	9%	6%	9%	21%	6%	6%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	100%	

TABLE 11. PLACES IN MAINE RATED AS HAVING A HIGH SCENIC VALUE AND EXPLANATION FOR THE RATING FOR RESPONDENTS AT BALD MOUNTAIN POND, JUNE 30-JULY 20, 2013

Highly Scenic Places in Maine	Characteristics That Make Places Have High Scenic Value						Total	Percent of Total
	View with no houses/camps on shore	Forest and mountains	No phone reception	Get away from people	Wilderness	The water and the views		
Mt. Katahdin	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	29%
Moosehead Lake Area (including Kineo and Kokadjo)	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	29%
Lower Enchanted Road, Forks area	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	14%
Spencer Pond	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	29%
Total	1	1	1	2	1	1	7	100%
Percent of Total	14%	14%	14%	29%	14%	14%	100%	

TABLE 12. PLACES IN MAINE RATED AS HAVING A LOW SCENIC VALUE AND EXPLANATION FOR THE RATING FOR RESPONDENTS AT WYMAN LAKE, JUNE 30-JULY 20, 2013

Low Scenic Places in Maine	Characteristics That Make Places Have Low Scenic Value															Total	Percent of Total
	Too Many People	Developed Poorly	Flat	Dirty	Poor Views	Standard	Scraps	Poor Buildings	Personal	Houses	Trash	Looks like a Stream	Poor Water Quality	City	None, Cannot think of any		
Lewiston, Auburn	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6%
City, town	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6%
Portland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	9%
Sebego	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Augusta	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	6%
Skowhegan	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9%
Local dump/transfer Station	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	9%
Lakewood	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Williams boat launch	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Sibley Pond	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
My compost pile with fresh refuse thrown on top	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Jay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Square Pond	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Biddeford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Austins Gorge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Herman Pond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3%
Range Pond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3%
Old Orchard Beach	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
None, Cannot think of any	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	21%
Total	3	1	1	3	4	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	4	7	34	100%
Percent of Total	9%	3%	3%	9%	12%	3%	3%	6%	6%	3%	3%	3%	6%	12%	21%	100%	

TABLE 13. PLACES IN MAINE RATED AS HAVING A LOW SCENIC VALUE AND EXPLANATION FOR THE RATING FOR RESPONDENTS AT BALD MOUNTAIN POND, JUNE 30-JULY 20, 2013

Low Scenic Places in Maine	Characteristics That Make Places Have Low Scenic Value					Total	Percent of Total
	Poor Views	Too Many Camps	Touristy	It is so spread out and has dumpy areas	None, Cannot think of any		
Old Orchard Beach	1	0	1	0	0	2	29%
Belgrade Lake	0	1	0	0	0	1	14%
Lake Auburn	0	1	0	0	0	1	14%
Waterville	0	0	0	1	0	1	14%
None, Cannot think of any	0	0	0	0	2	2	29%
Total	1	2	1	1	2	7	100%
Percent of Total	14%	29%	14%	14%	29%	100%	

Under current conditions, all respondents at Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond rated the site as having a “Typical” to “High Scenic Value” in both 2012 and 2013 (Tables 14 and 15). In 2013, approximately 70% of interviewees rated the simulated conditions at both Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond as having a “Typical” to “High Scenic Value” (Tables 16 and 17). Overall, the results from 2012 and 2013 indicate that the majority of respondents (~70%) think the simulated conditions at Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond have a “Typical” to “High Scenic Value”.

TABLE 14. SCENIC VALUE RATINGS UNDER CURRENT CONDITIONS AT WYMAN LAKE

Rating	Wyman Lake 2012		Wyman Lake 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Lowest Scenic Value	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4 Typical Scenic Value	4	27%	1	3%	5	10%
5	3	20%	13	38%	16	33%
6	4	27%	9	26%	13	27%
7 Highest Scenic Value	4	27%	11	32%	15	31%
Total	15	100%	34	100%	49	100%

TABLE 15. SCENIC VALUE RATINGS UNDER CURRENT CONDITIONS AT BALD MOUNTAIN POND

Rating	Bald Mountain Pond 2012		Bald Mountain Pond 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Lowest Scenic Value	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4 Typical Scenic Value	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
5	2	29%	1	14%	3	21%
6	2	29%	5	71%	7	50%
7 Highest Scenic Value	3	43%	1	14%	4	29%
Total	7	100%	7	100%	14	100%

TABLE 16. SCENIC VALUE RATINGS UNDER SIMULATED CONDITIONS AT WYMAN LAKE

Rating	Wyman Lake 2012		Wyman Lake 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Lowest Scenic Value	1	7%	4	12%	5	10%
2	1	7%	3	9%	4	8%
3	1	7%	4	12%	5	10%
4 Typical Scenic Value	3	21%	8	24%	11	23%
5	1	7%	6	18%	7	15%
6	3	21%	4	12%	7	15%
7 Highest Scenic Value	4	29%	5	15%	9	19%
Total	14	100%	34	100%	48	100%

TABLE 17. SCENIC VALUE RATINGS UNDER SIMULATED CONDITIONS AT BALD MOUNTAIN POND

Rating	Bald Mountain Pond 2012		Bald Mountain Pond 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Lowest Scenic Value	1	14%	1	14%	2	14%
2	0	0%	1	14%	1	7%
3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4 Typical Scenic Value	1	14%	0	0%	1	7%
5	2	29%	1	14%	3	21%
6	1	14%	4	57%	5	36%
7 Highest Scenic Value	2	29%	0	0%	2	14%
Total	7	100%	7	100%	14	100%

3.2 ENJOYMENT OF VISIT AND REPEAT VISITATION

At Wyman Lake in 2013, ~40% of respondents stated the presence of the wind farm would have “No Effect” on the enjoyment of their visit, and 21% said the wind farm would have a “Positive Effect” (Table 18). These are similar to the results obtained from the 2012 surveys. In 2013, 71% of respondents at Bald Mountain Pond stated that the wind farm would have “No Effect” on the enjoyment of their visit (Table 19). Overall, approximately two-thirds of respondents at Bald Mountain Pond in 2012 and 2013 indicated that the wind farm would have “No Effect” on their enjoyment of visiting the site. Common responses for why the wind farm would have “No Effect” or a “Positive Effect” on the enjoyment of their visit at Wyman Lake or Bald Mountain Pond was that the turbines would only have a slight impact on the view and/or that the respondent may not even notice the turbines, and that the respondent supports alternative energy or lives nearby (Table 20).

TABLE 18. EFFECT OF PROPOSED WIND FARM ON ENJOYMENT OF VISIT AT WYMAN LAKE

Rating	Wyman Lake 2012		Wyman Lake 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Very Negative Effect	2	13%	4	12%	6	12%
2	2	13%	5	15%	7	14%
3	0	0%	4	12%	4	8%
4 No Effect	6	40%	14	41%	20	41%
5	2	13%	4	12%	6	12%
6	2	13%	2	6%	4	8%
7 Very Positive Effect	1	7%	1	3%	2	4%
Total	15	~100%	34	~100%	49	~100%

TABLE 19. EFFECT OF PROPOSED WIND FARM ON ENJOYMENT OF VISIT AT BALD MOUNTAIN POND

Rating	Bald Mountain Pond 2012		Bald Mountain Pond 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Very Negative Effect	2	29%	0	0%	2	14%
2	0	0%	1	14%	1	7%
3	1	14%	1	14%	2	14%
4 No Effect	4	57%	5	71%	9	64%
5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
7 Very Positive Effect	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	7	100%	7	~100%	14	~100%

TABLE 20. RATING OF EFFECT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON ENJOYMENT OF VISIT AND REASON FOR RATING, JUNE 30- JULY 20, 2013

Reason For Rating	Very Negative Effect 1	2	3	No Effect 4	5	6	Very Positive Effect 7	Total	Percent of Total
WYMAN LAKE									
Slight Impact to View/May Not Notice	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	8	24%
Do not want to see human-made things	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6%
Support Wind Power/Renewable Energy	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	5	15%
Do not want to see wind farm	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	12%
Detracts from view	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	6	18%
Does not affect activity	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Just progress; I benefit from progress too	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Wind is better than other energy sources	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3%
Few wild places left in the world	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Most of the time, up the lake- falls	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Bad use of money, bad for land	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Live nearby	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	6%
Does not matter, will not bother me	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Total	4	5	4	14	4	2	1	34	~100%
Percent of Total	12%	15%	12%	41%	12%	6%	3%	100%	
BALD MOUNTAIN POND									
Slight Impact to View/May Not Notice	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	14%
Support Wind Power/Renewable Energy	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	29%
Do not want to see wind farm	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	14%
Wind is better than other energy sources	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	14%
If off in distance and cannot hear, would be ok	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	29%
Total	0	1	1	5	0	0	0	7	100%
Percent of Total	0	14%	14%	71%	0%	0%	0%	100%	

In 2012 and 2013, all of the respondents (with the exception of one at Wyman Lake) indicated that they were “Neither Unlikely nor Likely” to “Very Likely” to visit Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond in the future under current conditions (Tables 21 and 22). Approximately 80% of respondents in both 2012 and 2013 stated that the wind turbines would have “No Effect” on their likelihood to return or they would be “Very Likely to Visit” Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond in the future (Tables 23 and 24). In 2013, frequent reasons given for why respondents are likely to return include the turbines are hard to see, live nearby, will still come anyway, and come to participate in activities that the turbines will not impact, such as fishing, swimming, and watercraft (Table 25).

TABLE 21. LIKELIHOOD OF VISITING WYMAN LAKE IN THE FUTURE UNDER CURRENT CONDITIONS

Rating	Wyman Lake 2012		Wyman Lake 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Very Unlikely	1	6%	0	0%	1	2%
2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4 Neither Unlikely nor Likely	2	13%	2	6%	4	8%
5	1	6%	0	0%	1	2%
6	1	6%	1	3%	2	4%
7 Very Likely	11	69%	31	91%	42	84%
Total	16	100%	34	100%	50	100%

TABLE 22. LIKELIHOOD OF VISITING BALD MOUNTAIN POND IN THE FUTURE UNDER CURRENT CONDITIONS

Rating	Bald Mountain Pond 2012		Bald Mountain Pond 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Very Unlikely	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4 Neither Unlikely nor Likely	0	0%	2	29%	2	14%
5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
6	1	14%	0	0%	1	7%
7 Very Likely	6	86%	5	71%	11	79%
Total	7	100%	7	100%	14	100%

TABLE 23. EFFECT OF WIND TURBINES ON LIKELIHOOD OF VISITING WYMAN LAKE IN THE FUTURE

Rating	Wyman Lake 2012		Wyman Lake 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Very Unlikely to Visit	1	7%	0	0%	1	2%
2	0	0%	2	6%	2	4%
3	2	13%	4	12%	6	12%
4 No Effect	7	47%	13	38%	20	41%
5	0	0%	2	6%	2	4%
6	2	13%	0	0%	2	4%
7 Very Likely to Visit	3	20%	13	38%	16	33%
Total	15	100%	34	100%	49	100%

TABLE 24. EFFECT OF WIND TURBINES ON LIKELIHOOD OF VISITING BALD MOUNTAIN POND IN THE FUTURE

	Bald Mountain Pond 2012		Bald Mountain Pond 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Very Unlikely to Visit	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
2	0	0%	1	17%	1	9%
3	1	20%	0	0%	1	9%
4 No Effect	3	60%	2	33%	5	45%
5	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
6	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
7 Very Likely to Visit	1	20%	3	50%	4	36%
Total	5	100%	6	100%	11	100%

TABLE 25. RATING OF LIKELIHOOD FOR RETURNING UNDER SIMULATED CONDITIONS AND REASON FOR RATING, JUNE 30- JULY 20, 2013

Reason for Rating	Very Unlikely to Visit 1	2	3	No Effect 4	5	6	Very Likely to Visit 7	Total	Percent of Total
WYMAN LAKE									
Still Wyman Lake	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3%
Hard to see/Can barely see	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	6%
Expect wilderness	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	6%
Fishing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3%
Live nearby	0	0	0	4	0	0	3	7	21%
Here to do other stuff	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	6%
No change to experience	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Small part of total	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Not much change in likelihood but might be interesting to see them	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3%
Similar choice with or without	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Will still come anyway	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	12%
It is not bad compared to other possible things; more positive; cannot really see anyway	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3%
Does not impact the entire lake	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Depends on how visible the turbines are	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3%
Need for energy	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Nice place to swim	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3%
Detracts from scenery	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3%
We love it here	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3%
Where is power going? Sending out of state and we are buying from Canada	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
I enjoy going up the river; usually use jet skis	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3%
If I had to listen to them, I would not like, unless the fishing is good	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Does not bother me	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Total	0	2	4	13	2	0	13	34	100%
Percent of Total	0%	6%	12%	38%	6%	0%	38%	100%	
BALD MOUNTAIN POND									

Reason for Rating	Very Unlikely to Visit 1	2	3	No Effect 4	5	6	Very Likely to Visit 7	Total	Percent of Total
Hard to see/Can barely see	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	20%
Fishing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	20%
Will still come anyway	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	20%
No people on lake, not impairing enjoyment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	20%
I have lived around wind turbines, and do not like them; I wish they would put them at sea	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	20%
Total	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	5	100%
Percent of Total	0%	20%	0%	40%	0%	0%	40%	100%	

3.3 IMPORTANCE OF WIND POWER IN MAINE

The majority of interviewees at both Wyman Lake and Bald Mountain Pond stated that wind power is important for Maine (Tables 26 and 27). Approximately 80-90% of respondents rated wind power as having “Neutral Importance” to being “Very Important”. Reasons given for why wind power is important include a need for energy, energy independence, and it is good for the environment (Table 28).

TABLE 26. RATING OF HOW IMPORTANT WIND POWER IS FOR MAINE TO RESPONDENTS AT WYMAN LAKE

Rating	Wyman Lake 2012		Wyman Lake 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Very Unimportant	0	0%	1	3%	1	2%
2	1	8%	1	3%	2	5%
3	0	0%	1	3%	1	2%
4 Neutral Importance	4	33%	9	28%	13	30%
5	0	0%	5	16%	5	11%
6	1	8%	4	13%	5	11%
7 Very Important	6	50%	11	34%	17	39%
Total	12	~100%	32	~100%	44	100%

TABLE 27. RATING OF HOW IMPORTANT WIND POWER IS FOR MAINE TO RESPONDENTS AT BALD MOUNTAIN POND

Rating	Bald Mountain Pond 2012		Bald Mountain Pond 2013		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 Very Unimportant	1	17%	0	0%	1	8%
2	0	0%	1	14%	1	8%
3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4 Neutral Importance	0	0%	1	14%	1	8%
5	2	33%	2	29%	4	31%
6	1	17%	0	0%	1	8%
7 Very Important	2	33%	3	43%	5	38%
Total	6	100%	7	100%	13	~100%

TABLE 28. RATING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF WIND POWER IN MAINE AND REASON FOR RATING, JUNE 30-JULY 20, 2013

Reason for Rating	Very Unimportant 1	2	3	Neutral Importance 4	5	6	Very Important 7	Total	Percent of Total
WYMAN LAKE									
Need energy, business, work	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	13%
Good source, but should put someplace else	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	6%
Better for environment	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	6%
Other types energy available	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	10%
Well it is not silver bullet but part of mix maybe	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3%
Energy Independence	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6%
Best if it happens in Mass but do not want to be energy hypocrite- I use electric	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3%
Expense vs. gain	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3%
Energy needs of the state	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3%
Price of oil/electricity	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3%
I feel like there are other ways to get electric that would not be such an eye sore	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Do not know much about it	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	5	16%
Very important if power goes to Maine	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	6%
We don't need it; Benefits others elsewhere, not in Bingham;	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3%
Water power is good also	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	10%
It gives jobs to people like me	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3%
Total	1	1	1	9	4	4	11	31	100%
Percent of Total	3%	3%	3%	29%	13%	13%	35%	100%	
BALD MOUNTAIN POND									
Need energy, business, work	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	29%
Energy Independence	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	14%
Do not know much about it	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	14%
Very important if power goes to Maine	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	14%
I have lived next to turbines, and they are noisy; Not just noisy, but they vibrate	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	14%
In the long run, it is better	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	14%
Total	0	1	0	1	2	0	3	7	100%
Percent of Total	0%	14%	0%	14%	29%	0%	43%	100%	

APPENDIX A
SIMULATIONS

SIMULATION USED FOR 2012 SURVEYS

VISUAL SIMULATION FROM BALD MOUNTAIN POND

Bingham Wind Project

8/29/12



Prepared by LandWorks, Middlebury, VT



Existing Conditions Photograph



View Location Map



Simulation Information

Turbine Information	Model: Siemens 3.0 113 Hub height: 325'-6" (99.5 m) Rotor diameter: 370'-8" (113 m)
Photograph Information	Date and time: 8/25/12; 3:39 pm Location: Edge of Bald Mountain Pond near Appalachian Trail shelter; 45.271° N, 69.745° W Camera elevation above sea level: 1215' (370.3 m) Focal length (35mm equivalent): 56mm Simulation viewing distance: 16" (45.7 cm) Distance to nearest visible turbine: 7.14 miles (11.49 km)
Technical Information	Software: VectorWorks 2008; ArcGIS 3D Analyst; Google SketchUp Pro 7; Adobe Photoshop CS3 Digital elevation data source: http://www.megis.maine.gov/catalog

Prepared for
First Wind Energy, LLC

SIMULATION USED FOR 2013 SURVEYS

EXHIBIT 16: VISUAL SIMULATION FROM BALD MOUNTAIN POND

Bingham Wind Project

4/18/13



Prepared by LandWorks, Middlebury, VT



Simulation Information	
Turbine Information	Model: Vestas V112-3.0 MW Hub height: 308'-5" (94 m) Rotor diameter: 367'-6" (112 m)
Photograph Information	Date and time: 8/25/12; 3:39 pm Location: Southeastern shore of Island on Bald Mountain Pond; 45.266° N, -69.722° W Camera elevation above sea level: 1216' (370.63 m) Focal length (35mm equivalent): unknown Simulation viewing distance: 19" (48.26 cm) Distance to nearest visible turbine: 7.14 miles (11.49 km)
Technical Information	Software: VectorWorks 2008; ArcGis 3D Analyst; Google SketchUp Pro 8; Adobe Photoshop CS5 Digital elevation data source: USGS National Elevation Dataset 1/3 arc-second

NOTES:

1. This visual simulation is based on GIS data available at the time from MECIS and First Wind. Data is only as accurate as the original source and is not guaranteed by LandWorks.
2. This simulation depicts turbines, as well as visibility of access roads, collector lines, and associated clearing.
3. The photograph and field data used for this simulation were taken by Kelnachskatz using a Canon Rebel T1i #039500.

Prepared for
First Wind Energy, LLC

SIMULATION USED FOR 2012 SURVEYS

VISUAL SIMULATION FROM WYMAN LAKE

Bingham Wind Project

8/29/12



Prepared by LandWorks, Middlebury, VT



Existing Conditions Photograph



View Location Map



Simulation Information

Turbine information	Model: Siemens 3.0 113
	Hub height: 326'-6" (99.5 m)
	Rotor diameter: 370'-8" (113 m)
Photograph information	Date and time: 8/25/12; 11:44 am
	Location: On Wyman Lake at small picnic area near the public boat launch; 45.074° N, 69.920° W
	Camera elevation above sea level: 490' (149.4 m)
	Focal length (35mm equivalent): 56mm
	Simulation viewing distance: 16" (45.7 cm)
Technical information	Distance to nearest visible turbine: 6.62 miles (10.65 km)
	Software: VectorWorks 2008; ArcGIS 3D Analyst; Google SketchUp Pro 8; Adobe Photoshop CS5
	Digital elevation data source: http://www.megis.maine.gov/catalog

Prepared for
First Wind Energy, LLC

SIMULATION USED FOR 2013 SURVEYS

EXHIBIT 17: VISUAL SIMULATION FROM WYMAN LAKE

Bingham Wind Project

4/18/13



Prepared by LandWorks, Middlebury, VT



Simulation Information	
Turbine Information	Model: Vestas V112-3.0 MW Hub height: 308'-5" (94 m) Rotor diameter: 367'-6" (112 m)
Photograph Information	Date and time: 8/25/12; 11:44 am Location: On Wyman Lake at small picnic area near the public boat launch; 45.074° N, 69.920° W Camera elevation above sea level: 489' (149.05 m) Focal length (35mm equivalent): unknown Simulation viewing distance: 19" (48.26 cm) Distance to nearest visible turbine: 6.62 miles (10.65 km)
Technical Information	Software: VectorWorks 2008; ArcGIS 3D Analyst; Google SketchUp Pro 8; Adobe Photoshop CS5 Digital elevation data source: USGS National Elevation Dataset 1/3 arc-second

NOTES:

1. The visual simulation is based on GIS data available at the time from MEGS and First Wind. Data is only as accurate as the original source and is not guaranteed by LandWorks.
2. This simulation depicts turbines, as well as visibility of access roads, collector lines, and associated clearing.
3. The photograph and field data used for this simulation were taken by Kleinchenhoff using a Canon Rebel T5i (6095900).

Prepared for
First Wind Energy, LLC