Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

Section A. Project Information

Project Name	ON Line Project – Proposed Action and Action Alternative	**KOP Location**
Key Observation Point	KOP 1A, View to NW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
VRM Class	IV (Ely District)	E 0653953
		N 4303340

Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

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

Section C. Proposed Activity Description

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

Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	**Vegetation**	**Structures**
Form	4	4	2
Line	4	4	2
Color	4	4	2
Texture	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-middleground 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

Project Name	ON Line Project – Proposed Action and Action Alternative	**KOP Location**
Key Observation Point	KOP 1B, View to SE	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
VRM Class	IV (Ely District)	E 0653953
		N 4303340

Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

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

Section C. Proposed Activity Description

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

Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	**Vegetation**	**Structures**
Form	4	4	2
Line	4	4	2
Color	4	4	2
Texture	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-middleground 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

Project Name	ON Line Project – Proposed Action and Action Alternative	**KOP Location**
Key Observation Point	KOP 2A, View to NNE	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
VRM Class	IV (Ely District)	E 0695627
		N 4166057

Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

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

Section C. Proposed Activity Description

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

Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	**Vegetation**	**Structures**
Form	4	4	2
Line	4	4	2
Color	4	4	2
Texture	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-middleground 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

Project Name	ON Line Project – Proposed Action and Action Alternative	**KOP Location**
Key Observation Point	KOP 2B, View to SSW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
VRM Class	IV (Ely District)	E 0695627
		N 4166057

Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

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

Section C. Proposed Activity Description

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

Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	**Vegetation**	**Structures**
Form	4	4	2
Line	4	4	2
Color	4	4	2
Texture	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-middleground 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

Project Name	ON Line Project– Proposed Action and Action Alternative	**KOP Location**
Key Observation Point	KOP 3, View to N	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
VRM Class	III, IV (Ely District)	E 0675908
		N 4117412

Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

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

Section C. Proposed Activity Description

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

Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	**Vegetation**	**Structures**
Form	4	4	2
Line	4	4	2
Color	4	4	2
Texture	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-middleground 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

Project Name	ON Line Project – Proposed Action and Action Alternative	**KOP Location**
Key Observation Point	KOP 4, View to NNE	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
VRM Class	III, IV (Ely District)	E 0680234
		N 4092824

Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

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

Section C. Proposed Activity Description

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

Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	**Vegetation**	**Structures**
Form	4	4	2
Line	4	4	2
Color	4	4	2
Texture	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-middleground 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

Project Name	ON Line Project – Proposed Action and Action Alternative	**KOP Location**
Key Observation Point	KOP 5, View to NNW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
VRM Class	IV (Ely District)	E 0681414
		N 4085449

Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

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

Section C. Proposed Activity Description

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

Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	**Vegetation**	**Structures**
Form	4	4	2
Line	4	4	2
Color	4	4	2
Texture	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-middleground 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

Project Name	ON Line Project – Proposed Action and Action Alternative	**KOP Location**
Key Observation Point	KOP 6, View to NNW	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
VRM Class	IV (Las Vegas District)	E 0688692
		N 4028533

Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

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

Section C. Proposed Activity Description

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

Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	**Vegetation**	**Structures**
Form	4	4	3
Line	4	4	3
Color	4	4	3
Texture	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. The new transmission facility equipment is 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)