

## **APPENDIX I**

---

### **Visual Resource Information**



View to the east from KOP 1, existing conditions.



View to the southwest from KOP 2, existing conditions.

**Figure I-1**



View to the southwest from KOP 3, existing conditions.



View to the southwest from KOP 4, existing conditions.

**Figure I-2**



View from KOP 2, existing conditions.



Simulated view of North Area RDA from KOP 2 during active mining.



Simulated view from KOP 2 after successful reclamation.

**Figure I-3**



View from KOP 3, existing conditions.



Simulated view of expanded East Sage RDA from KOP 3 during active mining.



Simulated view from KOP 3 after successful reclamation.

**Figure I-4**



View from KOP 4, existing conditions.



Simulated view of expanded Mooney Leach Pad from KOP 4 during active mining.



Simulated view from KOP 4 after successful reclamation.

**Figure I-5**

## **Visual Contrast Rating Worksheets**

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA – Proposed Action and Alternatives A and B	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 1, View to E During active mining	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III and IV	E 0607680 N 4422822

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Light tan	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	3	2	4
<b>Line</b>	3	2	4
<b>Color</b>	2	2	4
<b>Texture</b>	2	2	4

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes. During active mining, elements of the Proposed Action such as RDAs and leach pads would create additional areas of contrast with surrounding undisturbed landforms and vegetation. This contrast would be moderate because of the existing disturbance that is visible and the distance of the disturbance from the observer. VRM Class III and IV allow for moderate contrast.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA – Proposed Action and Alternatives A and B	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 1, View to E Following reclamation	
<b>VRM Class</b>	III and IV	E 0607680
		N 4422822

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Light tan	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section D. Contrast Rating

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

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes. Following successful reclamation, the degree of contrast from reclaimed areas would be weak and project elements would tend to blend in with the surroundings.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA – Proposed Action and Alternatives A and B	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 2, View to SW During active mining	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV	E 0623503 N 4431354

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Tan	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	3	2	4
<b>Line</b>	3	2	4
<b>Color</b>	2	2	4
<b>Texture</b>	2	2	4

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes. During active mining the North Area RDA would contrast with surrounding undisturbed landforms and vegetation. The contrast would be moderate because of the distance from the observer and relatively small portion of the view affected. Class IV allows for moderate contrast.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA – Proposed Action and Alternatives A and B	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 2, View to SW Following reclamation	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	IV	E 0623503 N 4431354

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Tan	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section D. Contrast Rating

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

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes. Following successful reclamation, the degree of contrast would be weak and the North Area RDA would tend to blend in with the surrounding area.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA – Proposed Action and Alternatives A and B	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 3, View to SW During active mining	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III	E 0631057 N 4424899

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Tan	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	3	1	4
<b>Line</b>	3	1	4
<b>Color</b>	1	1	4
<b>Texture</b>	1	1	4

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** No. During active mining the East Sage RDA would contrast with surrounding undisturbed landforms and vegetation. The contrast would be strong because of the large portion of the view affected.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA – Proposed Action and Alternatives A and B	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 3, View to SW Following reclamation	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III	E 0631057 N 4424899

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	None
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	None
<b>Color</b>	Tan	Gray-green, dark green	None
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational	None

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	3	2	4
<b>Line</b>	3	2	4
<b>Color</b>	2	2	4
<b>Texture</b>	2	2	4

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes. Following successful reclamation, the degree of contrast of the East Sage RDA would be moderate because of the distance and the similarity to the color and texture of surrounding land. The RDA would tend to blend in with the existing hills. Management objectives for VRM Class III allow for moderate contrast.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA – Proposed Action and Alternative A	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 4, View to SW During active mining	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III	E 0630734 N 4420006

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	Irregular (power poles)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	Vertical
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational/abrupt	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Indistinct, irregular	Irregular
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Complex	Vertical
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green	Gray-green	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Abrupt	Smooth

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	1	1	4
<b>Line</b>	1	1	4
<b>Color</b>	1	1	4
<b>Texture</b>	1	1	4

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** No. During active mining the leach pad would contrast with surrounding undisturbed landforms and vegetation. The contrast would be strong because of the scale and marked differences in color and texture.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA – Proposed Action and Alternative A	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 4, View to SW Following reclamation	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III	E 0630734 N 4420006

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	Irregular (power poles)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	Vertical
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational/abrupt	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Indistinct, irregular	Irregular
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Complex	Vertical
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green	Gray-green	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Abrupt	Smooth

### Section D. Contrast Rating

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

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes. Following successful reclamation the degree of contrast would be moderate. The color and texture of the reclaimed leach pad would blend more with surrounding landforms and vegetation but the form would likely not appear entirely natural. Management objectives for VRM Class III allow for moderate contrast.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA –Alternative B	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 4, View to SW During active mining	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III	E 0630734 N 4420006

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	Irregular (power poles)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	Vertical
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational/abrupt	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Indistinct, irregular	Irregular
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Complex	Vertical
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green	Gray-green	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Abrupt	Smooth

### Section D. Contrast Rating

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	1	1	4
<b>Line</b>	1	1	4
<b>Color</b>	1	1	4
<b>Texture</b>	1	1	4

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** No. During active mining the leach pad, although smaller than the Proposed Action and Alternative A, would still contrast with surrounding undisturbed landforms and vegetation. The contrast would be strong because of the scale and marked differences in color and texture.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009

## Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

### Section A. Project Information

<b>Project Name</b>	Bald Mountain Mine NOA –Alternative B	<b>KOP Location</b>
<b>Key Observation Point</b>	KOP 4, View to SW Following reclamation	UTM Zone 11, NAD83
<b>VRM Class</b>	III	E 0630734 N 4420006

### Section B. Characteristic Landscape Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat to rolling terrain	Indistinct, irregular	Irregular (power poles)
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal and diagonal	Complex	Vertical
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green, dark green	Gray-green, dark green	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Coarse, rough	Smooth, gradational/abrupt	Smooth

### Section C. Proposed Activity Description

	Land/Water	Vegetation	Structures
<b>Form</b>	Flat terrain	Indistinct, irregular	Irregular
<b>Line</b>	Horizontal	Complex	Vertical
<b>Color</b>	Tan, gray-green	Gray-green	Dark brown
<b>Texture</b>	Smooth	Abrupt	Smooth

### Section D. Contrast Rating

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

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

**Does project design meet visual resource management objectives?** Yes. Following successful reclamation, the degree of contrast would be moderate. The color and texture of the reclaimed leach pad would blend more with surrounding landforms and vegetation but the form would likely not appear entirely natural. Management objectives for VRM Class III allow for moderate contrast.

**Additional mitigating measures recommended.** None.

**Evaluator:** R. Duncan, JBR Environmental Consultants

**Date:** July 2007, revised February 2009