

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 1, View to NW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV (Elko District)	E 0698913 N 4449860

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Flat (highway)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Divided by diagonal band	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Tan	Gray-green	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Bold (crossing signs)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Divided by diagonal band	Vertical (supports for signs)
<b>Color</b>	Dark gray pavement, tan shoulder	Gray-green	Vivid contrasting signage, dark gray pavement
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Private rail line is in foreground-midground zone. Tracks would not be visible except from a very short distance. Railroad crossing signage would be noticeable but, at highway speeds, only briefly. VRM Class IV allows for strong contrast.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 2, View to W	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III (Ely District)	E 0703347 N 4437633

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple, non-directional	Irregular, indistinct (buildings, fence)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Distant diffuse edge	Weak, irregular
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green	Indistinct
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Non-uniform

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple, non-directional	Indistinct (rail line, pipeline, support structures)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Distant diffuse edge	Weak, irregular
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green	Indistinct
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Non-uniform

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Mt. Wheeler transmission line, new rail line, and pipeline are in foreground-middleground zone. Rail line and water pipeline would be hidden by shrubs. Trains on the tracks would be visible but would not dominate the view because of the distance from KOP. At 2.5 miles the Mt. Wheeler transmission line would be difficult to see.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 3, View to E	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III, IV (Ely District)	E 0681007 N 4418887

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Flat (highway)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Horizontal
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green	Gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Indistinct
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Diffuse
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green	Subtle
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Uniform

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in background zone, over 7 miles distant. Rail line and water pipeline would also be hidden by shrubs. Trains on the tracks could be visible but they would be infrequent and would not attract attention because of the distance from the KOP. Mt. Wheeler transmission line would likely be very difficult to see.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 3, View to E	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III, IV (Ely District)	E 0681007 N 4418887

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Flat (highway)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Horizontal
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green	Gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Indistinct (power plant, transmission lines)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Geometric
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green	Concrete gray, coated metal, painted buildings
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in background zone. North Plant Site components would be 8.5 miles distant and inconspicuous despite their large size. Segment 1A transmission lines would be 8 miles distant and Segment 1B transmission lines would be 3 miles distant on VRM Class IV land. Because of the distance from KOP 3 to elements of North Plant Site Alternative, they would not attract attention and management objectives for both Class III and Class IV would be met.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 4, View to N	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	II, III (Ely District)	E 0693335 N 4407750

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Flat (highway)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Indistinct (rail line and pipeline not visible)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Diffuse
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Subtle
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Uniform

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. Rail line and water pipeline would be hidden by shrubs. Trains on the tracks would be visible but they would be infrequent would not attract attention because of the distance from the KOP. Mt. Wheeler transmission line would be greater than 0.5 mile distant.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 4, View to N	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	II, III (Ely District)	E 0693335 N 4407750

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Flat (highway)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by highway	Indistinct (power plant, transmission lines)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Diffuse
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Subtle
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Uniform

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

North Plant Site would be approximately 10 miles distant and would be difficult to see. Mt. Wheeler transmission line, rail line, and water pipeline would be greater than 0.5 mile distant. These project elements would not attract attention and management guidelines for Class II and III would be met. The portion of transmission line Segment 1A (alternative) that would be visible in the view north from KOP 4 would be over 2 miles distant and on VRM Class III land. It would not dominate the view and management guidelines for Class III would be met.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 5, View to W	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	II, III, IV (Ely District)	E 0693154
		N 4407678

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by dirt road	Flat (road, fence)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by dirt road	Indistinct (rail line and pipeline not visible)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Diffuse
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Subtle
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Uniform

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. Rail line and water pipeline would be hidden by shrubs. Trains on the tracks would be visible but they would be infrequent. The Mt. Wheeler transmission line, rail line, and water pipeline would be greater than 0.5 mile distant and would not tend to attract attention. Management goals for VRM Class II and II would be met.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 5, View to W	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	II, III, IV (Ely District)	E 0693154 N 4407678

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by dirt road	Flat (road, fence)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by dirt road	Indistinct (transmission lines)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Diffuse
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Subtle
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Uniform

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Transmission line Segment 1A, Mt. Wheeler transmission line, rail line, and water pipeline are in foreground-midground zone in VRM Class II and III; Segment 1B is in the background zone in VRM Class IV. The rail line and water pipeline would likely not be visible and the Mt. Wheeler transmission line and Segment 1A transmission lines are likely far enough away that they would not attract attention when viewed from KOP 5.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 6, View to W	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III, IV (Ely District)	E 0692437
		N 4391804

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by dirt road	Flat (road, fence, buildings)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Light brown, gray	Gray-green, tan	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by dirt road	Indistinct (rail line and pipeline not visible)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Diffuse
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Subtle
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Uniform

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-middleground zone. Rail line and water pipeline would be hidden by shrubs. Trains on the tracks would be visible but they would be infrequent. The trains and the Mt. Wheeler transmission line would be approximately 0.25 miles distant and would not dominate the view from KOP 6.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 6, View to W	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III, IV (Ely District)	E 0692437 N 4391804

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by dirt road	Flat (road, fence, buildings)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms divided by dirt road	Large, prominent support structures and wires
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Divided by diagonal band	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives? Yes.**

The rail line, water pipeline, and Mt. Wheeler Transmission line are in foreground-middleground zone (approximately 0.25 miles distant) in VRM Class III. Transmission line Segment 1C would be over 3 miles distant on VRM Class IV. The rail line and water pipeline would be hidden by shrubs and trains on the tracks would be visible but they would be infrequent. At these distances, project elements would not dominate the view and management objectives would be met for VRM Class III and IV.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended. None.**

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 7, View to N	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III (Ely District)	E 0691573
		N 4365127

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Linear, regular (poles) small buildings, fences
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal	Vertical, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Dark brown, tan
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth, patchy

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Large, prominent plant structures
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Concrete gray, coated metal, painted buildings
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in background zone approximately 5 miles distant. Plant structures would be difficult to see from KOP 7 because of the distance. Consistent with VRM Class III objectives when viewed from KOP 7.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** August 2008

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 7, View to N	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III (Ely District)	E 0691573 N 4365127

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Linear, regular (poles) small buildings, fences
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal	Vertical, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Dark brown, tan
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth, patchy

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Indistinct (pipeline and rail facilities not visible)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal	Diffuse
<b>Color</b>	Light brown	Gray-green, tan	Subtle
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Uniform

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	4
<b>Line</b>	4	4	4
<b>Color</b>	4	4	4
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	4

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements would not be visible from KOP 7 under the North Plant Site Alternative.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** August 2008

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 8, View to SW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III, IV (Ely District)	E 0660184 N 4366048

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Rolling hills	Irregular, divided by highway	Flat (highway)
<b>Line</b>	Undulating	Divided by curving road	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Light brown, gray	Dark and light green, gray	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, patchy	Coarse, patchy	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Rolling hills	Irregular, divided by highway	Large, prominent (support structures and wires)
<b>Line</b>	Undulating	Divided by curving road	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Light brown, gray	Dark and light green, gray	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, patchy	Coarse, patchy	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	2
<b>Line</b>	4	4	2
<b>Color</b>	4	4	2
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	2

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. The large transmission line support structures would contrast with the existing landscape but they are far enough away from the highway that they should not dominate the view. The rolling hills would tend to hide the structures much of the time and the substation would not be visible.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 8, View to N	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV (Ely District)	E 0659761 N 4365858

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Rolling hills, steep road cut	Irregular, bounded by highway	Flat (highway)
<b>Line</b>	Linear	Horizontal line	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Light brown, gray	Dark and light green, gray	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, patchy	Coarse, patchy	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Rolling hills	Irregular, divided by highway	Large, prominent (support structures and wires)
<b>Line</b>	Undulating	Divided by curving road	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Light brown, gray	Dark and light green, gray	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, patchy	Coarse, patchy	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. The large transmission line support structures would contrast with the existing landscape but they would be largely hidden by the hill on the north side of the highway. Wires crossing the highway would be visible but for only a short time at highway speeds.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 9, View to NW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV (Ely District)	E 0653953 N 4303340

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms bounded by highway	Flat (highway)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Straight
<b>Color</b>	Light gray highway	Gray-green	Dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms bounded by highway	Large, prominent (support structures and wires)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Light gray highway	Gray-green	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	2
<b>Line</b>	4	4	2
<b>Color</b>	4	4	2
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	2

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. Transmission line support structures near the highway would contrast with the existing landscape but the nearest would be approximately 600 feet away. Wires crossing the highway would be visible but for only a short time at highway speeds.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 9, View to SE	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV (Ely District)	E 0653953 N 4303340

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	None
<b>Color</b>	Gray-green	Gray-green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	None

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Large, prominent (support structures and wires)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Gray-green	Gray-green	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	2
<b>Line</b>	4	4	2
<b>Color</b>	4	4	2
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	2

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. Transmission line support structures near the highway would contrast with the existing landscape but the nearest would be approximately 600 feet away. Wires crossing the highway would be visible but for only a short time at highway speeds.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 10, View to NNE	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV (Ely District)	E 0695627 N 4166057

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Flat (highway, building, vertical support structures)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Simple
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Light gray, dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Large, prominent (support structures and wires)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	2
<b>Line</b>	4	4	2
<b>Color</b>	4	4	2
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	2

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. Transmission line support structures near the highway would contrast with the existing landscape but the nearest would be approximately 600 feet away. Wires crossing the highway would be visible but for only a short time at highway speeds.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 10, View to SSW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV (Ely District)	E 0695627 N 4166057

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Regular (support structures, fence)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Vertical, simple
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green, tan	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Large, prominent (support structures and wires)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Gray tan	Gray-green, tan	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Medium, uniform	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	2
<b>Line</b>	4	4	2
<b>Color</b>	4	4	2
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	2

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. Transmission line support structures near the highway would contrast with the existing landscape but the nearest would be approximately 600 feet away. Wires crossing the highway would be visible but for only a short time at highway speeds.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 11, View to N	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III, IV (Ely District)	E 0675908 N 4117412

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Rolling hills	Simple forms	Flat (highway)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Simple
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Light/dark gray
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, patchy	Medium, uniform	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Rolling hills	Simple forms	Large, prominent (support structures and wires)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, patchy	Medium, uniform	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	2
<b>Line</b>	4	4	2
<b>Color</b>	4	4	2
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	2

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. Transmission line support structures near the highway would contrast with the existing landscape but the nearest would be approximately 600 feet away. Wires crossing the highway would be visible but for only a short time at highway speeds.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 12, View to NNE	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III, IV (Ely District)	E 0680234 N 4092824

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Rolling hills	Simple forms	Flat, regular (highway, support structures)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Vertical, simple
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, patchy	Patchy	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Rolling hills	Simple forms	Large, prominent (support structures and wires)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Horizontal boundary	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, patchy	Patchy	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	2
<b>Line</b>	4	4	2
<b>Color</b>	4	4	2
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	2

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. Transmission line support structures near the highway would contrast with the existing landscape but the nearest would be approximately 600 feet away. Wires crossing the highway would be visible but for only a short time at highway speeds.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 13, View to NNW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV (Ely District)	E 0681414 N 4085449

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Flat, regular (highway, support structures)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Diagonal boundary	Vertical, simple
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Dark brown, gray
<b>Texture</b>	Uniform	Patchy	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Large, prominent (support structures and wires)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Diagonal boundary	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Uniform	Patchy	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	2
<b>Line</b>	4	4	2
<b>Color</b>	4	4	2
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	2

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. The nearest new transmission line support structures would be approximately 1,800 feet away. The new transmission line support structures would be larger than the existing ones but the contrast would be less when viewed from the highway because of the greater distance.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Ely Energy Center – Proposed Action and North Plant Site Alternative	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 14, View to NNW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV (Las Vegas District)	E 0688692 N 4028533

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Vertical support structures
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Diagonal boundary	Vertical, simple
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Dark brown, light gray
<b>Texture</b>	Uniform	Patchy	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Simple forms	Indistinct (support structures, switching station equipment)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Diagonal boundary	Bold, geometric
<b>Color</b>	Gray, tan	Gray-green	Coated metal
<b>Texture</b>	Uniform	Patchy	Coarse, contrasty

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	4	4	3
<b>Line</b>	4	4	3
<b>Color</b>	4	4	3
<b>Texture</b>	4	4	3

Degree of Contrast: 1 = Strong; 2 = Moderate; 3 = Weak; 4 = None

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes.

Project elements are in foreground-midground zone. The new transmission lines and switching station equipment are approximately 3.5 miles away and would likely not be visible from the KOP. Management objectives for Class IV would be met.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan

**Date:** April 2007 (Revised August 2008)