Form 8400－4
（September 1985）
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 18 Linear BPS 4 from Highway 89



SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\substack{0}}^{\text {O }}$ | Rolling，moderate | Indistinct | Flat road，repeating vertical mileposts |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，undulating | Indistinct | Distinct，straight to curved |
| 응 | Brown／beige，gray／white，orange，red | Deep green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray，brown／beige |
| $\underset{\sim}{\text { 离 }}$ | Medium to coarse，striated，random | Medium－course，clumped | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{0}^{\text {o }}$ | addition of flattened landforms for buildings and berms for basin | swath of vegetation removed then revegetated | partially screened addition of geometric shapes of buildings，additional thin vertical features of substation and powerlines |
| $\stackrel{\text { 山 }}{3}$ | edges of landform disturbances noticeable | noticeable edges of pipeline disturbance | Bold，horizontal／vertical，rectangular associated with additional structures，though partically screened |
| \％ | lighter where disturbed | more greens in disturbed areas | same plus solid building color |
| $\text { 齐 } \stackrel{\text { w }}{\stackrel{\sim}{\rightleftharpoons}}$ | same | same | structures add additional texture |
| SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM |  |  | M |


| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |  | FEAT | URES |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEGREE |  | LAND／WATER BODY <br> （1） |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |
|  | CONSTRAST | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 은 } \\ & \text { 휸 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { そ. } \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 운 } \\ & \text { 휸 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 弟 } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oㅡㄴ } \\ & \text { 휸 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ~} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | \％ |
| $\sum_{\text {总 }}^{\text {邑 }}$ | Form |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |
|  | Line |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |
|  | Color |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |
|  | Texture |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  | x |  |  |

2．Does project design meet visual resource？ management objectives？Yes No
（Explain on reverse side）
$\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ on on private land．
3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？
$\square$ Yes No（Explain on reverse side）
Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures

Evaluator＇s Names
Allysia Angus，BLM；
Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane Simpson－
Colebank，Chris Bockey／Logan Simpson

Date
April 2020；
March 23， 2020
April 15， 2016

This linear KOP is along HWY 89 in both directions. The facility simulated is BPS-4, including the pump station. Other facilities features are screened by landform and vegetation from KOP image. See attached facility site plan and section. Visual and restoration mitigation measure described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The pump station building and ancillary facilities would be colored and textured to match surroundings using a non-reflective, textured surfacing in a random shape pattern and colored either a standard BLM environmental color or other custom color. Final color would be chosen by landowner prior to construction. BPS-4 would be just off HWY 89 on the east side near an existing substation and in a natural depression.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The proposed facilities are immediately adjacent to this linear KOP on the east side of HWY 89. They come into view when traveling eastbound only when about 500 feet away. For travelers going westbound, the facilities come into view from about a mile away and are intermittently visible until the facilities are passed by.

Angle of Observation: Along this linear KOP, for those traveling westbound the facilities are above them until they pass directly by it; for eastboard travelers the facilities are below them until they pass directly by. In both instances, landforms and vegetation partially screen the facilities.

Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view as motorists traveling at 65 MPH along HWY 89 pass through this area. From the west they would be intermittently visible from as far away as a mile and from the east from about 500 feet away.

Spatial Relationships: The structures would be located in a natural depression surrounded by landforms where another substation exists and another storage building is in the vicinity. This location with other developments and landform screening reduces the visual impact of the facilities. Being located adjacent to highway ROW would consolidate the linear disturbance of the pipeline to an already altered landscape swath.

Size/Scale: The facilities at this location are large and in the foreground but located near similar sized infrastructure. They are also located at the base of The Cockcomb, a dramatic landform that dominates the view.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition
SECTION 3-WATER CONVEYANCE SYSTEM




UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

Date－March 23， 2020

## District－Paria River

Resource Area－KEPA

Activity（program）－Lands and Realty

## ＊＊KOP 19 Road to Paria Interpretive Site

| SECTION A．PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  | KOPs <br> CProject Pump Station Project Transmission Lines Foreground（ $0=0.5$－mile） |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1．Project Name | 4．Location－Road to Paria | 5．Location Sketch |  |
| Lake Powell Pipeline | Interpretive Site |  |  |
| Pipeline Alignment | Township－42E |  |  |
| Both Alternatives | Range - 2W |  |  |
| 2．Key Observation Point KOP 19 | Section－3 |  |  |
| 3．VRM Class 3 |  |  |  |

SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 충 | Flat to rolling with steep cliff faces | Indistinct，low to medium | Distinct，flat roads，vertical utility poles |
| $\stackrel{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，simple | Complex，indistinct | Bold，straight，repeating vertical poles and posts |
| \％ | Brown／beige，gray／white，orange，vermillion red | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray，brown／beige |
|  | Fine to coarse，striated | Medium to fine，stippled to even，gradational | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {coil }}^{\text {co }}$ | same | Low | N／A |
| $\underset{\text { 宸 }}{ }$ | same | Broken，irregular | N／A |
| $\xrightarrow{\circ}$ | Slightly lighter where disturbed | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl． green and straw／yellow，bright green in disturbed areas | N／A |
| 㐫 ${ }_{\underline{\text { w }}}$ | same | Fine to medium，stippled to gradational | N／A |
| SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM |  |  |  |



Comments from item 2.

This KOP is from the Road to Paria Interpretive Site on the north sie of Highway 89 looking south across the highway toward the pipeline disturbance. No photo simulation was prepared for this KOP.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The restored and revegetated pipeline would at most create weak contrast from vegetation changes in the long term from this KOP.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The pipeline would run parallel to HWY 89 across from this KOP.
Angle of Observation: KOP is straight across from pipeline disturbance.
Length of Time the Project Is in View: From this KOP the length of time in view is a few seconds because it is based on those exiting the interpretive site and turning back onto HWY 89 from the Paria Movie Set Road. Those travelers stopping at the interpretive site would focus their attention to the Vermilion Clifffs to the north, not to the south.

Spatial Relationships: Being located adjacent to highway ROW would consolidate the linear disturbance of the pipeline to an already altered landscape swath.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


View from edge of interpretive site returning to HWY 89 (blue line= pipeline alignment). (Google Earth Street View).
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＊＊KOP \＃ 20 Linear for Hydro Station HS－1 From
US 89＊＊SECTION A．PROJECT INFORMATION

| US 89＊＊SECTION |
| :--- |
| 1．Project Name |
| Lake Powell Pipeline |
| Hydro Station HS－1／Pipeline／Transmission System |
| Both Alternatives |


| 4．Location |
| :--- | :--- |
| Along US 89 |

Township－43S
Range－ 3 W
2．Key Observation Point
KOP 20 Hydro Station HS－1 From US 89
3．VRM Class
3


SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

| 1．LAND／WATER |  | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {¢ }}$ | Gently rolling | Stands of low to medium shrubs（sage and rabbitbrush）are interspersed with stands of pinyon juniper． | Thin utility poles and lines and fences add both vertical and horizontal elements．The highway adds a band． |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，simple | Complex，indistinct，also horizontal | Thin utility poles and lines and fencing add vertical and horizontal elements．The highway adds a slightly curving band． |
| \％ | Landform is predominantly covered in vegetation but where visible it is coral colored． | Full range of green from dark juniper green to sage green to yellow green． | Grays and browns |
|  | Medium to smooth． | Medium to fine，clumped | Fine，to medium． |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\substack{0}}$ | addition of flattened landforms for buildings and berms for basin | Similar but removal of vegetation would create more obvious edges along edges of clearing． | Additional structures associated with substation and hydro station would add blocky forms as well as thinner vertical and horizontal ones． |
|  | Landform edge associated with clearing and grading would add horizontal lines． | The removal of vegetation will create additional edges between vegetated and not vegetated areas（ie building and driveway） | Increased amount of straight，vertical and horizontal |
| $\stackrel{\text { O}}{\text { O}}$ | Slightly lighter where disturbed． | more greens in disturbed areas | Gray／green structure；brown／beige poles；brown fence |
| 离岗 | Same． | Same． | Additional structures would increase texture to coarse－associated with building and substation． |
| SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING |  |  |  |



Comments from item 2.
For this proposed location, the KOP selected is a linear one along US 89, going in both directions. The facilities simulated are for a $138-\mathrm{kV}$ substation versus the original 69 kV substation. The proposal includes constructing a hydro power station (powerhouse, substation, transmission line, transformers, metal framework structure, retention basin, security fence and driveway) using the existing Kane Country access road as the facility access point. There is an existing 8 -foot-tall wildlife exclusion fence along the highway right of way at the HS-1 facility site with a gate at the existing Kane County access point. There is an existing 45 -foot-high wooden power pole near the gate. See attached facility site plan and section. Existing vegetation and landforms consist of sparse pinyon-juniper woodland and big sagebrush growing on gently rolling terrain. The pinyon are 12 to 15 tall and wide and the juniper are 6 to 8 feet tall. Nearby landforms consist of earthen mounds with gradual slopes ranging from 12 to 30 feet high.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures for proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The HS-1 facility would be approximately 520 feet wide (along US 89) and 265 feet deep (perpendicular to US 89) with the northern edge set back approximately 120 feet south of the existing wildlife fence. The proposed security fence is a 9 -foot-tall chain link with razor wire roll on top and would be located near the northern edge of the facility where it would be faintly seen behind the existing wildlife fence. Contrast from the security fence and existing gates would be reduced by using desert patina treatment to the galvanized surfaces. The powerhouse building would be bermed on the south side of an existing landform which would be preserved. The powerhouse building would be colored and textured to match surroundings such as using a non-reflective, textured surfacing in a random shape pattern and colored a BLM environmental color such as Shadow Gray. Final color will be chosen by the landowner prior to construction. The access road to the site will be on the existing Kane County road to avoid new disturbance and surface will be of a rock that matches the existing characteristic landscape. The building pad would be set approximately 14 feet below the access road elevation at US 89 reducing the visible height of the facilities. Reclamation of disturbed areas would reduce contrast by restoring color and texture that matches the characteristic landscape by using native materials or by using desert patina treatment to ground surfaces. New 55-foot-tall transmission line poles at the facility would angle at approximately 45 degree angles to connect to the linear power line to avoid clustering features near the powerhouse and substation facilities.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance - Linear KOP 20 is $1 / 2$-mile long in each direction along Highway 89 approaching HS - 1. Visual contrast would increase as viewers get closer to the HS - 1 site.

Angle of Observation - From both directions the angle of observation of the Proposed Action is shallow and the facilities would be partially to moderately visible within the natural landforms and vegetation between the viewers and the facilities.

Length of Time in View - The HS-1 structures could be in the foreground view for up to 28 seconds for viewers traveling at 65 mph along Highway 89. The HS - 1 structures would be approximately $1 / 2$-mile away from viewers when they first come into view.

Spatial Relationships: The structures would be located in off to the back side of a landform, providing some screening and lowering the profile. There are existing powerlines on site that reduce the naturalness. This location with existing infrastructure and landform screening reduces the visual impact of the facilities. Being located adjacent to highway ROW would consolidate the linear disturbance of the pipeline to an already altered landscape swath.

Relative size/scale -The proposed powerhouse building is 25 feet high and the portion visible from the static KOP 20 would be approximately 13 feet higher than the landform between the building and the highway. The proposed substation is located behind the powerhouse building with the overhead framework 56 feet tall and with 10 -foot-tall, 6 inch wide lightning rods at the corners. The framework would be visible 31 feet higher than the top of the powerhouse building.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition




UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 21 HP Reg Tank 2 from Great Western Trailhead

SECTION A．PROJECT INFORMATION


SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {\％}}^{\text {O }}$ | Gently rolling | Indistinct，low to medium | Vertical and horizontal fence |
| $\stackrel{\text { 山 }}{\text { U }}$ | Horizontal，simple | Complex，indistinct | Straight，vertical and horizontal |
| － | Brown／beige，orange | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal ciolors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray，brown／beige |
|  | Fine | Medium to fine，stippled to random | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{0}$ | Same with minor modifications for flattening areas，road，and adding berms for detention basis | More distinct swatch of vegetation removal／ restoration and cleared areas for facilities | additional fencing and surface structures |
| $\stackrel{\text { U }}{\text { U }}$ | similar but additional edges for disturbances | more distinct edges of disturbances | Increased amount of straight，vertical and horizontal |
| － | lighter where disturbed | additional greens in disturbed areas | same |
|  | same | same | same |
| SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM |  |  |  |


| 1. | DEGREE | FEATURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LAND／WATER BODY <br> （1） |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |
|  | CONSTRAST | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oㅡㄹ } \\ & \text { 흉 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 弟 } \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\delta} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 잉 } \\ & \text { 휸 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 产 } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { \% }}{\substack{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oㅡㄴ } \\ & \text { 훈 } \end{aligned}$ | \＃ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 盛 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\sum_{\underset{山}{n}}^{\sum_{山}^{n}}$ | Form |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |
|  | Line |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | Color |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | $x$ |
|  | Texture |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |

2．Does project design meet visual resource？ management objectives？Yes No （Explain on reverse side）

## 3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？

$\square$ Yes No（Explain on reverse side）
Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures

| Allysia Angus，BLM； | April 2020； |
| :--- | :--- |
| Barb Santner／Stantec； | March 23，2020； |
| Diane Simpson－Colebank，Chris Bockey／Logan Simpson | April 15，2016 |

## Comments from item 2.

This linear KOP is along HWY 89 travelling in both directions and from the Great Western Trailhead on the south side of HWY 89 viewing toward the high point regulating tank (HP Reg Tank). The facilities simulated from trailhead parking area show the road leading to HP Reg Tank and the fence because remaining structures are buried or lower in landscape and not visible from this point. See attached facility site plan and section. The facilities, which are primarily buried and/or flush to the ground, are located partially within scattered pinyon/juniper trees and on the downslope of a small landform and in a natural basin reducing their visibility.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. Site planning for the tank and pad locates the facilities behind existing trees, curves the facility access road and preserves existing trees shielding view of the high point regulating tank from the trailhead. A portion of the facility fence is weakly visible in the foreground of the visualization. The facilities would be more visible to those traveling along the highway than those using the trailhead.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The proposed facilities are immediately adjacent to this linear KOP on the side side of HWY 89 and to the west of the Great Western Trail Trailhead. From the highway traveling in both directions, the viewing distance is between 500 and 1000 feet because the facilities only come into view when in close proximity due to landform and vegetation screening. The access road comes off the trailhead entrance, and the fence is about 30 feet from the trailhead.

Angle of Observation: From the highway traveling in both directions the facilities are slightly below viewers. From the trailhead they are straight across and below viewing level.

Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view for a few seconds as motorists traveling at 65 MPH along HWY 89 pass by in either direction. From the trailhead the viewing time would extend as long as users choose to spend there but likely less than 10 minutes, and even then they wouldn't likely be focusing attention on the facilities.

Spatial Relationships: The structures would be located in a natural depression surrounded by landforms and some scattered trees. There is a length of wildfence along the highway ROW here and powerlines. This location in a depression with other developments and landform and vegetation screening reduces the visual impact of the facilities. Being located adjacent to highway ROW would consolidate the linear disturbance of the pipeline to an already altered landscape swath.

Size/Scale: Most facilities here are buried or flush to the ground. The fence is similar to what exists.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.



Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition


Regulating Tank Section


Form 8400-4
(September 1985)
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## **KOP 24 Highway 89 near Pioneer Gap

| SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Project Name <br> Lake Powell Pipeline | 4. Location - Highway 89 near Pioneer Gap | 5. Location Sketch |  |
| Pipeline Alignment | Township - 43S |  |  |
| Highway Alternative | Range - 4W |  |  |
| 2. Key Observation Point KOP 24 | Section-30 |  |  |
| 3. VRM Class 3 |  |  |  |

SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1. LAND/WATER | 2. VEGETATION | 3. STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\substack{0}}^{\text {O }}$ | Flat to rolling with some rocky outcrops on edges of landforms | Indistinct, low to medium | Rectangular/trapezoidal, distinct |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal, simple | Complex, indistinct | Horizontal road, repeating vertical posts and poles |
| \% | Brown/beige, reddish | Green to blue/gray, and seasonal colors incl. green and straw/yellow | Gray, brown/beige |
| $\stackrel{\text { x }}{\stackrel{\text { x }}{\stackrel{u}{ }}}$ | Fine | Fine to coarse, random | Fine |

SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION



## Comments from item 2.

This linear KOP is along Highway 89 near Seaman's Wash going in both directions. The pipeline would be on the south side of the highway. The pipeline would pass up and through a landform with rock outcropping in this area. This is also where public and private lands transition. Visual and restoration mitigation measures in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. Restoration over ten years post construction would reduce contrast greater than depicted on the five to ten year post construction condition photo simulation.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The pipeline would run parallel and immediately adjacent to the linear KOP for 0.5 miles in both directions.
Angle of Observation: KOP is often at direct viewing angle in some locations the pipeline goes up or down slight hills. The contrast it would create would be most visible when it goes uphill from the viewer, as is the case when heading west.

Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view the entire time that motorists traveling at 55-65 MPH along HWY 89.
Spatial Relationships: Being located adjacent to highway ROW would consolidate the linear disturbance of the pipeline to an already altered landscape swath.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


View eastbound along HWY 89 (pipeline alignment on right/south side). (Google Earth Street View).


View westbound along HWY 89 (pipeline alignment on right/south side) where pipeline would pass through rocky landform. (Google Earth Street View

UNITED STATES
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VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 26 Shinarump Cliffs Overlook

| SECTION A．PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1．Project Name | 4．Location－Shinarump | 5．Location Sketch |  |
| Lake Powell Pipeline | Cliffs Overlook |  |  |
| Pipeline Alingment | Township－42N |  |  |
| Southern Alternative | Range－10E |  |  |
| 2．Key Observation Point KOP 26 | Section－32 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 3. VRM Class } \\ & 2 / 3 / 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\substack{0}}^{\text {¢ }}$ | Flat to rolling，wide valley | Indistinct，low to medium | Trapezoidal utility towers |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，simple | Complex，indistinct | Straight，repeating vertical／horizontal／angular |
| \％ | Brown／beige，white／gray，orange | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray |
| $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{\boldsymbol{x}}}$ | Fine | Medium to fine，stippled to even | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

| 1．LAND／WATER |  | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {¢ }}$ | Flat to rolling，wide valley | More distinct，low to medium | N／A |
| $\stackrel{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，simple | Complex，more distinct | N／A |
| ¢ | Brown／beige，white／gray，orange，lighter where disturbed | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl． green and straw／yellow，green in disturbed areas | N／A |
| 离岂 | Fine | Medium to fine，stippled to even | N／A |

SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM

| 1. | DEGREE <br> OF <br> CONSTRAST | features |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LAND／WATER BODY <br> （1） |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 은 } \\ & \text { 흔 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ~ } \\ & \stackrel{\omega}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { \% }}{\substack{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oㅡㄹ } \\ & \text { 훈 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { Kin }}{\substack{3}} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\grave{c}}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\text { Kin }}{3} \\ & \stackrel{y}{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ®1 }}{\text { ¢ }}$ |
| $\sum_{\underset{山 己}{n}}^{\substack{n}}$ | Form |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |
|  | Line |  |  |  | x |  |  | $x$ |  |  |  |  | x |
|  | Color |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | x |
|  | Texture |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |

2．Does project design meet visual resource？ management objectives？Yes No （Explain on reverse side）

3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？ $\square$ Yes No（Explain on reverse side）
Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures

| Evaluator＇s Names | Date |
| :--- | :--- |
| Allysia Angus，BLM； | April 2020； |
| Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane Simpson－ <br> Colebank，Chris Bockey／Logan Simpson | March 23，2020； |
| April 15，2016 |  |

This KOP is from an informal viewing location on the edge of the Shinarump Cliffs looking southeast at the pipeline and permanent access road. The photo simulation is of the restored and revegetated pipeline trench and permanent access road.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The permanent access road surface will consist of gravel selected for color to match surrounding, native ground. The restored water pipeline trench and permanent access road would be noticeable, with the access road being more so.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The pipeline would run across the view perpendicular to the KOP and is about 1 mile away.
Angle of Observation: KOP is about 400 feet elevation higher than pipeline and road, allowing the scars they create to be seen.

Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view as long a viewer chooses to scan the landscape. It is assumed that if dispersed recreationists are exploring this area, they would be drawn to the cliff edge and spend extended periods looking out across the views.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 27 Dominguez－Escalante Historic Trail Crossing



SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ | Flat to gently rolling，wide valley | Indistinct，low to medium | Trapezoidal utility towers |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，simple | Simple，more distinct | Straight，repeating vertical／horizontal／angular |
| $\stackrel{\text { 증 }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | Brown／beige，orange | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray |
| $\stackrel{\text { x }}{\stackrel{\text { x }}{\stackrel{u}{ }}}$ | Fine | Medium to fine，even low scrub with scattered pinyon | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {coicl }}^{\text {co }}$ | same | similar but noticeable swath of vegetation removed then revegetated | N／A |
| $\stackrel{\text { 山 }}{\text { U }}$ | same | similar but with noticeable edges where vegetation would be removed and revegetated | N／A |
|  | lighter where disturbed | Additional greens in disturbed areas | N／A |
| 㐫岗 | same | same | N／A |


| DEGREE <br> OF CONSTRAST |  | features |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LAND／WATER BODY （1） |  |  |  | vegetation <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 은 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ॅ } \\ & \stackrel{y}{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\cong}{\vdots}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 弟 } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\delta}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oㅡㄹ } \\ & \text { iti } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\stackrel{\text { 㡀 }}{3}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ² }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ |
| $\sum_{\underset{山}{n}}^{\sum_{山}^{n}}$ | Form |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | x |
|  | Line |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | x |
|  | Color |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | x |
|  | Texture |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |

2．Does project design meet visual resource？
management objectives？
No
（Explain on reverse side）

3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？
$\square$ Yes No（Explain on reverse side）
Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures

## Evaluator＇s Names

Date
Allysia Angus，BLM；
Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane Simpson－ Colebank，Chris Bockey／Logan Simpson

April 2020；
March 23， 2020
April 15， 2016

Comments from item 2.

This KOP is on the Dominguez-Escalante Historic Trail where the pipeline and permanent access road cross it. This is not a location that many people visit. No photo simulation was prepared for this KOP.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The permanent access road surface will consist of gravel selected for color to match surrounding, native ground. The restored pipeline trench and permanent access road would be noticeable.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The pipeline would cross the trail perpendicular to it and extend in both directions, so this KOP is on the pipeline.
Angle of Observation: KOP is level with pipeline and road.
Length of Time the Project Is in View: This trail is not regularly traveled by foot or otherwise. This KOP was selected to show landscape character where the trail and pipeline intersect.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


View Southwest from Whitesage Wash Near Shinarump Cliffs Overlook


View West from Whitesage Wash to the West of the Dominguez-Escalante Historic Trail Crossing

Form 00－
（September 1985）

Date－March 23， 2020

## District－Arizona Strip

Resource Area－Arizona Strip FO

Activity（program）－Lands and Realty
＊＊KOP 28 Kanab Creek（ACEC）

| SECTION A．PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1．Project Name | 4．Location－Kanab Creek <br> Township－39N <br> Range－3W <br> Section－ | ．Location Sketch |  |
| Lake Powell Pipeline |  |  |  |
| Pipeline Alignment |  |  |  |
| Southern Alternative |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 2．Key Observation Point |  |  |  |
| KOP 28 |  |  |  |
| 3．VRM Class |  |  |  |
| 2／3／4 |  |  |  |

SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE SCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 안 | Flat to rolling with deeply cut wash／cliff faces | Indistinct，low to medium | Trapezoidal utility towers |
| 岂 | Horizontal，irregular，complex | Complex，indistinct | Straight，repeating vertical／horizontal／angular |
|  | Brown／beige，gray／white，orange，red | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray |
| $\underset{\text { 㶡 }}{\sim}$ | Fine to coarse，striated | Medium to fine，stippled to even | Fine |
| SECTION ．PROPOSED ACTIVITY S RIPTION |  |  |  |
|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| 은 | Similar but pipeline trenching would alter cliff faces． | swath of removed then revegetated vegetation associated with pipeline installtion | N／A |
| $\stackrel{\text { u }}{3}$ | similar but discernible lines associated with landform cuts for pipeline | additional lines along edges of cleared then revegetated swatch | N／A |
| \％ | lighter where disturbed | Additional greens in disturbed areas | N／A |
| 齐 $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{\text { r }}{\sim}}$ | similar but increased fine texture | same | N／A |
| SECTION ．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM |  |  |  |


| 1. | REE | FEATURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2．Does project design meet visual resource management objectives？ （Explain on reverse side） <br> Yes <br> No |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LAND／WATER ODY <br> （1） |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ONSTRAST | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & \text { 은 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ॅ̈ㅔ } \\ & \stackrel{y}{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { N }}{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & \text { 은 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 屵 } \\ & \stackrel{y}{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\overline{0}}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# } \\ & \text { 苞 } \\ & \text { O} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\substack{\text { N／}}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \text { ¿ } \end{aligned}$ | 3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？ <br> $\square$ Yes（Explain on reverse side）No <br> Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{\leftrightharpoons}$ | Form |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | X | Allysia Angus，BLM <br> Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane Simpson－Colebank，Chris Bockey／Logan Simpson | ate |
|  | Line |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | x |  | April 2020； |
| 岃 | Color |  |  | x |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  | March 23，2020； |
|  | Texture |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  | April 15， 2016 |

## SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.

This KOP is from the Kanab Creek canyon rim viewing southeast toward the proposed pipeline alignment. This is not a portion Kanab Creek that is not regularly visited. It is about 10 miles north of the location where most people enter to hike in the canyon and about 5 straight miles south of HWY 389. No photo simulation was prepared for this KOP. There are fence lines and a large transmission line in this area but otherwise it is undeveloped.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The restored pipeline trench would be visible on the slope above the creek. Disturbed slopes would be graded and shaped to replicate existing, nearby landforms. Boulders would be salvaged and replaced to replicate existing boulder features and landforms. Desert varnish would be used on soil, rock and boulders to replicate existing feature colors.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The pipeline alignment would be about 1500 feet from the KOP, but for casual observers this is a location unlikely to be seen by many.

Angle of Observation: KOP is directly across from and above the pipeline alignment as it goes into canyon.
Spatial Relationship: Being located near powerlines consolidates disturbances to the natural landscape in one corridor.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Existing Condition Image With Proposed Pipeline Alignment

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 29 Bitter Seeps Wash（ACEC）

| SECTION A．PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1．Project Name | 4．Location－Bitter Seeps | 5．Location Sketch |  |
| Lake Powell Pipeline |  |  |  |
| Pipeline Alignment | Township－40N |  |  |
| Southern Alternative |  |  |  |
| 2．Key Observation Point KOP 29 | Section－34 |  |  |
| 3．VRM Class 4 |  |  |  |

Date－March 23， 2020

## District－Arizona Strip

Resource Area－Arizona Strip FO

Activity（program）－Lands and Realty

SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ | Flat to rolling with deeply cut wash／steep vertical slopes and outcrops | Indistinct，low | Trapezoidal utility towers |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，irregular，complex | Complex，indistinct | Straight，repeating vertical／horizontal／angular |
| 응 | Brown／beige，orange，red | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray |
| $\text { 齐 } \stackrel{\text { 山 }}{\underset{\sim}{ }}$ | Medium to coarse，blocky | Medium to fine，stippled to even | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\substack{0}}^{\substack{\text { c }}}$ | similar but pipeline trenched would alter cliff faces | swatch of removed then revegetated vegetation associated with pipeline installation | N／A |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | similar be discernible lines associated with landform cuts for pipeline | additional lines along edges of cleared then revegetated areas | N／A |
| \％ | lighter where disturbed | Additionalgreens in disturbed areas | N／A |
| $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\stackrel{\text { x }}{\sim}}$ | similar but increased fine texture | same | N／A |
| SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM |  |  |  |


| 1. | DEGREE | FEATURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LAND／WATER BODY <br> （1） |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |
|  | CONSTRAST | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & \text { 은 } \\ & \text { \# } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 屵 } \\ & \text { 3} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { © }}{\substack{2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 00 } \\ & \text { 에 } \\ & \stackrel{4}{n} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 弟 } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ | － |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 屵 } \\ & \text { 3} \end{aligned}$ | ¢ |
|  | Form |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | Line |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | Color |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | Texture |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |

2．Does project design meet visual resource？
management objectives？Yes No
（Explain on reverse side）
（Explain on reverse side）
3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？
$\square$ Yes No（Explain on reverse side）
Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures

| Evaluator＇s Names | Date |
| :--- | :--- |
| Allysia Angus，BLM； | April 2020； |
| Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane | March 23，2020； |
| Simpson－Colebank，Chris Bockey／ | April 15，2016 |

Logan Simpson

Comments from item 2.

This KOP is from the Bitter Seeps Wash canyon rim viewing toward the proposed pipeline alignment. Bitter Seeps Wash is not regularly visited by the general public. It is about 1.5 miles from Mt Trumbull Road and about 5 straight miles south of HWY 389. No photo simulation was prepared for this KOP. There are fence lines and a large transmission line in this area but otherwise it is undeveloped.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The restored pipeline trench would be visible on the slope above the creek. Disturbed slopes would be graded and shaped to replicate existing, nearby landforms. Boulders would be salvaged and replaced to replicate existing boulder features and landforms. Desert varnish would be used on soil, rock and boulders to replicate existing feature colors.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The pipeline alignment would be about 600 feet from the KOP, but for casual observers this is a location unlikely to be seen by many.

Angle of Observation: KOP is directly across from and above the pipeline alignment as it goes into canyon.

Spatial Relationship: Being located near powerlines consolidates disturbances to the natural landscape in one corridor.
Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years postconstruction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Existing Condition Image With Proposed Pipeline Alignment

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 30 Mount Trumbull Road



Date－March 23， 2020

District－Arizona Strip

Resource Area－Arizona Strip FO

Activity（program）－Lands and Realty

SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {O }}$ | Flat to gently rolling | Indistinct，low | Trapezoidal utility towers |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，simple | Complex，indistinct | Straight，repeating vertical／horizontal／angular |
| \％ | Brown／beige，orange | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray |
| 齐 $\stackrel{\text { w }}{\sim}$ | Fine，Even | Medium to fine，stippled to even | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {¢ }}^{\substack{\text { O }}}$ | same | swatch of removed then revegetated vegetation associated with pipeline installation | N／A |
| 岂 | same | additional lines along edges of cleared then revegetated areas | N／A |
| － | lighter where disturbed | additional greens in disturbed areas | N／A |
|  | same | same | N／A |

SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM

| 1. | DEGREE | FEATURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LAND／WATER BODY <br> （1） |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |
|  | CONSTRAST | ＋000 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 데 } \\ & \vdots \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | －00 | \＃ \％ \％ O D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 剃 } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & \text { ion } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | \＃ \％ \％ O ¢ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ~ } \\ & \frac{0}{01} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |
| $\sum_{\text {总 }}^{\text {岂 }}$ | Form |  |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | Line |  |  |  | x |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | Color |  |  | x |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | Texture |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | X |

2．Does project design meet visual resource？ management objectives？Yes No
（Explain on reverse side）
3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？
$\square$ Yes No（Explain on reverse side）
Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures
Evaluator＇s Names Date

Allysia Angus，BLM；
Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane Simpson－Colebank，Chris Bockey／ Logan Simpson

April 2020；
March 23， 2020
April 15， 2016

## SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.
This KOP is on Mt Trumbull Road where the pipeline crosses. This road is used by recreationists going to Toroweap above the Colorado River in Grand Canyon and other canyons that lead into the Grand. This KOP is almost 5 straight miles south of HWY 389 . No photo simulation was prepared for this KOP. There is a large transmission line here but otherwise it is undeveloped.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The pipeline alignment would intersect with this KOP.
Spatial Relationship: Being located near powerlines consolidates disturbances to the natural landscape in one corridor.
Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 31 Kaibab－Paiute Tribal Headquarters



SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ | Flat to sloped，adjacent cliffs | Indistinct，low to medium | Rectangular，distinct，contrasting，horizontal roads，vertical utility poles／towers，signs and fences |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，simple | Simple，indistinct | Bold，straight，geometric，horizontal and repeating vertical |
| 응 | Brown／beige，orange，red | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray，brown／beige |
|  | Fine，even | Medium to fine，stippled to even | Fine to medium |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {O}}$ | same | noticeable swath of vegetation removed then re－vegetated | N／A |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | same | more distinct edges where vegetation would be removed then revegetated | N／A |
| － | lighter where disturbed | additional greens in disturbed areas | N／A |
| 齐 $\stackrel{\text { w }}{\sim}$ | same | same | N／A |



Comments from item 2.

This KOP is next to the Kaibab-Paiute Tribal Headquarters just off and to the north of Highway 389 and analyzes the proposed pipeline. The photo simulation prepared is for the restored pipeline trench.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures for proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The restored pipeline trench would create weak contrast associated with the vegetation.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The pipeline would run parallel to the highway in either direction of this KOP.
Angle of Observation: KOP is straight on view of pipeline alignment.
Length of Time the Project Is in View: The pipeline disturbance would be in view the entire time that motorists traveling at 65 MPH along HWY 389.

Spatial Relationships: Being located adjacent to highway ROW lined with transmission lines would consolidate the linear disturbance of the pipeline to an already altered landscape swath.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Westbound view along pipeline alignment on north side of highway between headquarters and highway. (Google Earth Street View).


Eastbound view along pipeline on north side of highway between gas station and highway. (Google Earth Street View).


Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 32 HS－2 Highway WB



SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {\％}}^{\text {안 }}$ | Flat to gently rolling | Indistinct，low | Vertical utility poles，flat road |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，simple | Complex，indistinct | Geometric，straight，repeating vertical／ horizontal，parallel |
| ¢ | Brown／beige | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray |
| 齐 $\stackrel{\text { 山 }}{\sim}$ | Fine，even | Medium to fine，stippled to even | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

| 1．LAND／WATER |  | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {¢ }}$ | same but with addition of a berm | more distinct in clearings | Addition of large，geometric forms， additional repeating thin vertical elements |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | same but with added lines associated with berm | more distinct along edges of clearings | Addition of bold，straight，horizontal and repetitious vertical lines． |
| － | lighter where disturbed | additional green sin disturbed areas | same plus solid building color |
| $\text { 齐 } \stackrel{\text { w }}{\stackrel{\sim}{ٍ}}$ | same | same | Addition of rigid building structures clustered with thin jagged metal frames into a flat to gently rolling finely textures landscape |

SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM

| 1. |  | FEATURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEGREE <br> OF <br> CONSTRAST | LAND／WATER BODY <br> （1） |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |
|  |  | 은 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ご } \\ & \stackrel{10}{3} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 은 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 弟 } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | ¢ |
|  | Form |  |  | x |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |
|  | Line |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |  |
|  | Color |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |
|  | Texture |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | X | x |  |  |  |

2．Does project design meet visual resource？ management objectives？Yes No
（Explain on reverse side）
$\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ on private land．

## 3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？

$\square$ Yes No（Explain on reverse side）
Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures

## Evaluator＇s Names

Allysia Angus，BLM； Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane Simpson－ Colebank，Chris Bockey／Logan Simpson

Date
April 2020；
March 23， 2020
April 15， 2016

## Comments from item 2.

For this proposed location, the KOP selected is a linear one along Highway 389, for a total of approximately 1-1/4 miles. The photo simulation is centered in the linear KOP on Highway 389 viewing westbound. The facilities simulated are for a power house, substation, access road, existing transmi ssion line, 10 ' facility fence and pipeline alignment. See attached facility site plan and section.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The power house structure and ancillary facilities would be colored and textured to match surroundings such as using a non-reflective, textured surfacing in a random shape pattern and colored a BLM environmental color or custom natural landscape color.

HS-2 (HWY) would be just off HWY 389 on the north side.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The proposed facilities are immediately adjacent to this linear KOP. From the east they come into view about 0.5 mile away but from the west they would be intermittently visible from 5+ miles away.

Angle of Observation: KOP is at straight on viewing angle or slighly below.
Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view as motorists traveling at 65 MPH along HWY 89 pass through this area. It would also be visible to those traveling north on Mt Trumball Road.

Spatial Relationships: Except for the powerlines and fences, these structures would be located in an area away from other development, thus drawing more attention. Being located adjacent to highway ROW and transmission lines would consolidate the linear disturbance of the pipeline to an already altered landscape swath.

Size/Scale: The facilities at this location are large and in the foreground thus creating strong contrast with the natural landscape into which they would be constructed.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Eastbound view along highway (facilites would be at blue line) (Google Earth Street View).


Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |



UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 33 Hydro Station 2－South from Co．Rd 239

| SECTION A．PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1．Project Name | 4．Location－Hydro Station | 5．Location Sketch |  |  |
| Lake Powell Pipeline | 2－South from Co．Rd 239 |  |  |  |
| Pipeline Alignment／HS－2 | Township－39N |  |  |  |
| Both Alternatives |  |  |  |  |
| 2．Key Observation Point KOP 33 | Section－1 |  |  |  |
| 3．VRM Class $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |  |  |

SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{0}^{\text {¢ }}$ | Flat to gently rolling | Indistinct，low | Vertical fence／posts，flat road |
| 岂 | Horizontal，simple | Complex，indistinct | Geometric，straight，repeating vertical／horizontal， parallel |
| \％ | Brown／beige | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Gray，brown |
|  | Fine，even | Medium to fine，stippled to even | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {¢ }}$ | same but with berm | more distinct in clearings | Addition of large，geometric forms， additional repeating thin vertical elements |
| $\stackrel{\text { u }}{3}$ | same but with additional lines associated with berm | more distinct along edges of clearings | Addition of bold，straight，horizontal and repetitious vertical lines． |
| $\stackrel{\text { O\％}}{0}$ | lighter where disturbed | additional greens in disturbed areas | same plus solid building color |
| 离宸 | same | same | Addition of rigid building structures clustered with thin jagged metal frames into a flat to gently rolling， finely textures landscape |

SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM

2．Does project design meet visual resource？
management objectives？Yes No N／A on private land
（Explain on reverse side）

## 3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？

$\square$ Yes No（Explain on reverse side）
Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures

## Evaluator＇s Names

Allysia Angus，BLM；
Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane Simpson－ Colebank，Chris Bockey／Logan Simpson

## Date

April 2020；
March 23， 2020
April 15， 2016

Comments from item 2.
For the HS-2 (Southern) location, the KOP selected is linear along Mt Trumbull Road for approximately 1-1/4 miles. The facilities include a hydro-station, berm, access road, substation, transmission line, 10 ' facility fence and pipeline alignment. See attached facility site plan and section.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The power house structure and ancillary facilities would be colored and textured to match surroundings such a surfacing in a random shape pattern and colored a BLM environmental color or custom natural landscape color.

HS-2 (Southern) would be just off Mt Trumbull Road on the east side.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The proposed facilities are immediately adjacent to this linear KOP. The facilities would be intermittently visible to those traveling the highway or road out to 5+ miles.

Angle of Observation: KOP is at straight on viewing angle.
Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view as motorists traveling at 30 MPH along along pass through this area. It would also be visible to motorists traveling along HWY 389.

Spatial Relationships: These structures would be located in an area away from other development, thus drawing more attention. Being located adjacent to a road would consolidate the linear disturbance of the pipeline to a slightly altered landscape swath.

Size/Scale: The facilities at this location are large and in the foreground thus creating strong contrast with the natural landscape into which they would be constructed.


View to South from Yellowstone Road near HS-2


View to North from Yellowstone Road near HS-2




UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Date - March 23, 2020
District -

Resource Area - Private Property

Activity (program) - Lands and Realty

## **KOP 34 Hydro Station 3 from Uzona Avenue

| SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Project Name | 4. Location-Hydro Station | 5. Location Sketch |  |
| Lake Powell Pipeline | 3 from Uzona Avenue |  |  |
| Pipeline Alignment/HS-3 | Township-43S |  |  |
| Both Alternatives | Range - 10w |  |  |
| 2. Key Observation Point | Section-32 |  |  |
| KOP 34 |  |  |  |
| 3. VRM Class |  |  |  |
| N/A |  |  |  |

SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1. LAND/WATER | 2. VEGETATION | 3. STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {co }}^{\text {¢ }}$ | Flat with backdrop of tall vertical cliff faces | Indistinct, low to medium | Rectangular, distinct, contrasting, horizontal roads, vertical utility poles/towers |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal, diverse | Complex, indistinct | Distinct, straight, horizontal and repeating vertical |
| 으응 | Brown/beige, gray/white, orange, vermillion red | Blue/gray to green, and seasonal colors incl. green and straw/yellow | White, gray, brown/beige |
| 齐 $\stackrel{\text { w }}{\stackrel{\sim}{ٍ}}$ | Fine to coarse, striated, random | Medium, random | Fine |

SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION



## SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.

This KOP is from Uzona Avenue viewing east toward hydro station -3 (HS-3). The proposed facilities are HS-3 and the pipeline alignment. The facilities simulated are for a power house, substation, access road, transmission line, 10' facility fence and the pipeline alignment. See attached facility site plan and section. Facilities are located on the western side of Colorado City/Hildale and are within 0.25 mile of numerous similar structures

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The power house structure and ancillary facilities would be colored and textured to match surroundings using a non-reflective, textured surfacing in a random shape pattern and colored either a standard BLM environmental color or a custom color.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: HS-3 is immediately adjacent to Uzona Road and within 0.25 mile of the edge of Colorado City/Hildale. It is also about 0.5 mile from HWY 389.

Length of Time the Project Is in View: Facilities would be in view constantly for those living and working nearby. It would be in view for however long it takes motorists to drive by on the road or highway at the slower travel speeds.

Relative Size or Scale: HS-3 would be similar in size to existing structures located nearby.
Spatial Relationships: Being located in close proximity to existing structures of similar size and shape would allow for visual absorption of this facility.


Existing Conditions -1


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition-1


Existing Conditions - 2


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition-2




UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 35 Linear Uzona Avenue－Canaan Wash



Date－March 23， 2020

## District－Cedar

Resource Area－St George FO

Activity（program）－Lands and Realty

SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underset{\text { ¢ }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | Wash／valley w／sloped to vertical valley walls | Indistinct，low to medium | Flat road and trails |
| $\stackrel{\text { 山 }}{\text { 山 }}$ | Horizontal to vertical，irregular，complex | Complex，indistinct | Gently curving |
| － | Brown／beige，orange，red | Green to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl． green and straw／yellow | Beige／brown／red |
| 齐 | Fine to coarse，blocky | Fine to medium，stippled to even | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\substack{0}}^{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | disruption to landforms in pipeline disturbance | swatch of vegetation removed then revegetated | N／A |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | edges of disturbance to landforms | additional lines along vegetation disturbances and revegetation edges | N／A |
| \％ | lighter where disturbed | more greens in disturbed areas | N／A |
| 齐 | same | same | N／A |
| SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM |  |  |  |


| 1. | DEGREE | FEATURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LAND／WATER BODY <br> （1） |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |
|  | CONSTRAST | －00 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 00 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | 은 | \＃ \％ \％ O ¢ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ~̈ㅀ } \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | －00 | \＃ \％ \％ ¢ ¢ | 帝 | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ |
|  | Form |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | Line |  |  | x |  |  |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
|  | Color |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  | x |
|  | Texture |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |

2．Does project design meet visual resource？ management objectives？Yes No
（Explain on reverse side） （Explain on reverse side）

3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？
$\square$ Yes No（Explain on reverse side）

Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures

## Evaluator＇s Names

Allysia Angus，BLM；
Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane Simpson－ Colebank，Chris Bockey／Logan Simipson

April 2020；
March 23， 2020
April 15， 2016

## Comments from item 2.

This KOP is located along Uzona Avenue near the intersection of Uzona Avenue and Canaan Wash. The proposed pipeline alignment follows the road and wash.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The restored pipeline alignment trench would be visible between the existing gravel road and existing cut bank. Disturbed slopes would be graded and shaped to replicate existing, nearby landforms. Boulders would be salvaged and replaced to replicate existing boulder features and landforms. Desert varnish would be used on soil, rock and boulders to replicate existing feature colors.

RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS
Viewing Distance: The pipeline would follow the road and wash and immediately adjacent.
Angle of Observation: KOP is often at direct viewing angle in some locations the pipeline goes up or down slight hills.
Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view when motorists travel slowing along the road.
Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition

Form 8400-4
(September 1985)
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## **KOP 37 Little Creek Overlook

| SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Project Name | 4. Location - Little Creek | 5. Location Sketch |  |  |
| Lake Powell Pipeline Pipeline Alignment/HS-4/ | Overlook |  |  |  |
| Transmission Lines | Township - 43S |  |  |  |
| Both Alternatives | Range - 12W |  |  |  |
| 2. Key Observation Point KOP 37 | Section-19 |  |  |  |
| 3. VRM Class 4 |  |  |  |  |

SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1. LAND/WATER | 2. VEGETATION | 3. STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{0}^{\text {¢ }}$ | Flat to rolling w/ variety of diverse vertical land forms | Indistinct, low, amorphous | Indistinct |
| 岂 | Horizontal, irregular, complex, diverse | Complex, indistinct | Indistinct, weak |
| - | Brown/beige, orange, red; deep blue water | Green, and seasonal colors incl. green and straw/yellow | White, gray, black |
| $\stackrel{\text { x }}{\stackrel{\text { x }}{\stackrel{~}{ }}}$ | Medium to fine; smooth water | Fine, scattered to stippled | Fine |

SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION


| 1. | DEGREE <br> OF <br> CONSTRAST | FEATURES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LAND/WATER BODY <br> (1) |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> (2) |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> (3) |  |  |  |
|  |  | $$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 悉 } \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \end{aligned}$ |  | \# | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K } \\ & \stackrel{N}{0} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { © } \\ & \text { © } \end{aligned}$ | ~00 | \# \% T0 \% ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { \% }}{\substack{0}}$ | ¢ |
| $\sum_{\underset{\sim}{4}}^{\sim}$ | Form |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  | X |  |  |
|  | Line |  |  |  | x |  |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |
|  | Color |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |
|  | Texture |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  |  | x |  |

2. Does project design meet visual resource?
management objectives? Yes No
(Explain on reverse side)
3. Additional mitigating measures recommended?
$\square$ Yes No (Explain on reverse side)

Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measures

## Evaluator's Names

Allysia Angus, BLM;
Barb Santner/Stantec; Diane SimpsonColebank, Chris Bockey/Logan Simpson

## Date

April 2020:
March 23, 2020; April 15, 2016

## Comments from item 2.

This KOP is from an informal viewing location on the edge of Little Creek Mountain looking south and west at the pipeline and HS-4 and powerlines. Sand Hollow Reservoir and Hurricane development are visible in back ground, a water catchment is visible in front of HS-4 but the fore and mid-ground are mostly undeveloped.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The power hour structure and ancillary facilities would be colored and textured to match surroundings using a non-reflective, textured surfacing in a random shape pattern and colored either a standard BLM environmental color or a custom color.

RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS
Viewing Distance: The pipeline would run across the valley along a dirt road, below the KOP about 1.25 miles away. HS-4 would be able 2.5 miles to the west.

Angle of Observation: KOP is high above the project features allowing them and ground disturbance to be seen.

Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view as long a viewer chooses to scan the landscape. It is assumed that if dispersed recreationists are exploring this area, they would be drawn to the cliff edge and spend extended periods looking out across the views.

Recovery Time: The landform reconstruction and staining where needed would occur immediately after pipeline is in place; the revegetation out ten years post-construction is estimated to create weak contrast in form, line and color.


Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition

Form 8400－4
（September 1985）
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET
＊＊KOP 38 Hydro Station 4 Transmission line from Frog Hollow Road


Date－March 23， 2020

## District－Cedar

Resource Area－St．George FO

Activity（program）－Lands and Realty

SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\substack{0}}^{\text {O }}$ | Flat to rolling with small irregular landforms and vertical cut faces along road | IIndistinct，low to medium | Flat Rroad |
| $\stackrel{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal，flowing | Complex，indistinct | Straight to curving road |
| － | Brown／beige，orange | GGreen to blue／gray，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | Beige to gray |
|  | Fine，even | Medium to fine，random | Fine |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {¢ }}^{\text {¢ }}$ | landform would be manipulated for pipeline and facilites including retention basin | swatch and patch of vegetation removed then vegetated | addition of large facilities with geometric and linear forms． |
| 岂 | edges of disturbance for pipeline and facilities | edges of vegetation disturbance and revegetation | additional lines of a variety of types as well as repetitive powerpoles and lines |
| $\stackrel{\text { O}}{\text { O}}$ | lighter where disturbed | Additional greens in disturbed areas | same plus solid building color |
| 㐫岕 | same | same | similar but with additional texture from structures |
| SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM |  |  |  |


| 1. | DEGREE | features |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2．Does project design meet visual resource？ management objectives？ （Explain on reverse side） |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | LAND／WATER BODY <br> （1） |  |  |  | VEGETATION <br> （2） |  |  |  | STRUCTURES <br> （3） |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | OF <br> CONSTRAST | \％ | \％ \％ \％ ¢ D | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 彦 } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{0}{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 인 } \\ & \text { 휸 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{1}{2} \end{aligned}$ | 号 | \％ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 南 } \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ | 3．Additional mitigating measures recommended？ Yes No（Explain on reverse side） <br> Contrast rating takes into account Environmental Protection and Mitigation Measure |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\underset{\sim}{n}}^{n} \\ & \sum_{u}^{n} \end{aligned}$ | Form |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  | x |  |  |  |  Date <br> Evaluator＇s Names April 2020； <br> Allysia Angus，BLM； <br> Barb Santner／Stantec；Diane Simpson－ <br> Colebank，Chris Bockey／Logan Simpson April 15，2016； |  |  |
|  | Line |  |  | x |  |  |  | x |  | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Color |  |  | X |  |  |  | X |  |  |  | x |  |  |  |  |
|  | Texture |  |  |  | x |  |  |  | x | x |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## SECTION D. (Continued)

## Comments from item 2.

This is a linear KOP along Frog Hollow Road. The visualizations are from Frog Hollow Road almost a mile from HS-4 viewing northwest in one direction toward the hydro station - (HS-4))and transmission line, only the transmission lines are visible here. See attached facility site plan and section.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. HS-4 is located behind a land form and is unseen from the KOP. The power house and ancillary facilities would be colored and textured to match surroundings using a non-reflective, textured surfacing in a random shape pattern and colored either a standard BLM environmental color such as Carlsbad Canyon or a custom color.

Another dirt road passes immediately by HS-4 and from that location, the facility would be highly visible.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: HS-4 would be approximately 1 mile from Frog Hollow Road which is more traveled than the road going adjacent to the facility.

Relative Size or Scale: HS-4 would be a large complex of structures in a mostly undeveloped landscape.
Spatial Relationships: HS-4 is about 3 miles from the southernmost developed area of Hurricane and about 5 miles from Sand Hollow Reservoir so it's distance from structures associated with those is too far away to blend. It is however located at the base of a cliff and is somewhat tucked into a less visible location that is not often visited for recreational purposes.


Existing Conditions -1


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition-1


Existing Conditions -2


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition-2







Form 8400－4
（September 1985）

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

## ＊＊KOP 39 Linear Hurricane Cliffs Road

## 1．Project Name Lake Powell Pipeline

HS－5 and Transmission Line
Both Alternatives

| 2．Key Observation Point |
| :--- |
| KOP 39 Linear |
| 3．VRM Class |
| 4 |

## SECTION A．PROJECT INFORMATION

SECTION B．CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1．LAND／WATER | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\text {\％}}^{\text {O }}$ | Wide，flat valley w／gentle slopes up to vertical land forms and cliffs | Indistinct，low | － |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal to vertical and angled，simple | Complex，indistinct | － |
| － | Gray，brown／beige，red／orange soils to south | Green，and seasonal colors incl．green and straw／yellow | － |
| 齐 $\stackrel{\text { 山 }}{\sim}$ | Fine to coarse | Medium to fine，stippled to gradational | － |

SECTION C．PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

| 1．LAND／WATER |  | 2．VEGETATION | 3．STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{0}$ | Wide，flat valley w／gentle slopes up to vertical land forms and cliffs；cut／fill bench for re－aligned road | swatch and large patch cleared for pipeline and facilities | Addition of large，geometric forms and repeating thin vertical features |
| $\stackrel{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal to vertical and angled，simple；straight to curved lines of cut／fill for re－aligned road | additional on edges of disturbances | additional of bold，straight，horizontal and repetitous vertical lines |
| \％ | Gray，brown／beige，lighter where disturbed | more greens in disturbed areas | Brown，gray，beige，khaki |
| 齐换 | same | Same | coarse from addition of rigid buildings and structures along with jagged metal frames and repeating vertica elements of powerpoles |

SECTION D．CONTRAST RATING SHORT TERM－X LONG TERM


Comments from item 2.

This linear KOP is along Hurricane Cliffs Road going in both directions. The facilities simulated are the pipeline and HS-5 and transmission lines, including the hydrostation (which here is $\sim 85 \mathrm{ft}$ high), substation, access road, fence, and a large bern to protect the structures from rockfalls. See attached facility site plan and section.

Visual and restoration mitigation measure described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The hydro station building and ancillary facilities would be colored and textured to match surroundings using a non-reflective, textured surfacing in a random shape pattern and colored either a standard BLM environmental color or other custom color.

HS-5 would be just off Hurricane Cliffs Road on the east side.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The proposed facilities are immediately adjacent to this linear KOP. HS-5 would be blocked from view by landform to the north where most casual observers would be. It would be visible primarily to the south.

Angle of Observation: KOP is at straight across from HS-5 but powerlines go up hill to the west.
Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view as motorists traveling at 65 MPH along HWY 89 pass through this area. Taller structures would be intermittently visible on the approaches from miles away to the east and from about a quarter mile away from the west.

Spatial Relationships: The structures would be located in an area away from other development, thus drawing more attention. Being located adjacent to high, jagged cliffs allows for absorption of some of the visual contrast.

Size/Scale: The facilities at this location are quite large and in the foreground thus creating strong contrast with the natural landscape into which they would be constructed.


Existing Conditions -1


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition - 1


Existing Conditions - 2


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition - 2





Form 8400-4
(September 1985)
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET
**KOP 41 Sand Hollow HS and Transmission Line

| SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Project Name | 4. Location - Sand Hollow | 5. Location Sketch |  |  |
| Lake Powell Pipeline Sand Hollow | State Park |  |  |  |
| HS and Transmission Line | Township - 42S |  |  |  |
| Both Alternatives | Range - 14W |  |  |  |
| 2. Key Observation Point KOP 41 | Section-25 |  |  |  |
| 3. VRM Class N/A |  |  |  |  |

SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

|  | 1. LAND/WATER | 2. VEGETATION | 3. STRUCTURES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\sum_{\sim}^{\text {¢ }}$ | Flat in foreground, rolling hills and flat mesas, flat water surface | Low, indistinct, irregular | Rectangular vehicle in foreground, few rectangular, distinct in background |
| $\underset{\text { 岂 }}{ }$ | Horizontal foreground, curving, angled, angled in background | Indistinct | Horizontal, vertical, regular, distinct in background |
| - | Brown to reddish tan, light to dark gray in background | Gray/green | White vehicle in foreground, few white to gray in background |
| 姿 | Fine to medium | Fine to medium in foreground, stippled | Few smooth to coarse in background |

SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION


## SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.

The KOP is from a Sand Hollow State Park campground looking northeast. The proposed facilities are a hydrostation (HS) and a transmission line. The facilities would include a power house, substation, access road, transmission line, 10' facility fence, berm and pipeline alignment. Refer to attached site plan and section.

Visual and restoration mitigation measures of proposed facilities described in the POD would reduce the degree of visual contrast. The power house structure and ancillary facilities would be colored and textured to match surroundings using a non-reflective, textured surfacing in a random shape pattern and colored either a standard BLM environmental color or a custom color.

Sand Hollow HS would be on the southeastern edge of the reservoir just east of the Sandpit Campground. The transmission lines would wrap around the campground and reservoir on the south side before swinging north toward the subdivision.

## RELEVANT ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS

Viewing Distance: The proposed facilities are 0.25 mile from the campground and right on the edge of the water. It would be about 1.5 miles across the reservoir from the main parking area.

Angle of Observation: KOP is at straight on viewing angle.

Length of Time the Project Is in View: The facilities would be in view for extended periods of time for those recreating at the state park.

Spatial Relationships: The structures would be near the Sandpit Campground but away from the more developed part of the state park. The broader area is quite close to residential development to the north and west.


Existing Conditions


Five to Ten Years Post Construction Condition


NOTE:
THIS DRAWING IS INTENDED TO ILLUSTRATE PRELIMINARY
PROJECT LAYOUT CONCEPTS FOR STUDY PURPOSES
ONLY. FEATURES ILLUSTRATED ON THIS DRAWING ARE
NOT TO BE USED AS A BASIS FOR DESIGN.

## LAKE POWELL PIPELINE PROJECT

UDWR FIGURE 4.196 (ii) MWH
SAND HOLLOW HYDROPOWER STATION SECTION THROUGH GENERATING UNIT


## Appendix B. 1 <br> Visibility Analysis Maps - Electric Transmission Systems Alignments

DISCLAIMER: The Visibility Analysis Maps - Electric Transmission Systems include project features and alignments that have been adjusted since 2016, primarily on the western side of project area. They also include some Key Observations Points that have been eliminated from analysis or slightly adjusted in location.


Map 1- Electric Transmission System


Map 2 - Electric Transmission System


Map 3 - Electric Transmission System


Map 4- Electric Transmission System


Map 5- Electric Transmission System


Map 6 - Electric Transmission System

## Appendix B. 2 <br> Visibility Analysis Maps-Proposed Buildings

DISCLAIMER: The Visibility Analysis Maps - Proposed Buildings include the visibility of the previously proposed 100 ' high natural gas exhaust stacks on the booster pump stations (in yellow). Those features are no longer part of the project proposal.


Visibility from Building at Intake Pump Station Facility


Visibility from Building at BPS-1 Facility


Visibility from Building at BPS-2 Facility


Visibility from Building at BPS-3 Facility


Visibility from Building at BPS-4 Facility


Visibility from Building at HS-1 Facility


Visibility from Building at HS-2 (Highway) Facility


Visibility from Building at HS-2 (Southern) Facility


Visibility from Building at HS-3 Facility


Visibility from Building at HS-4 Alt. Facility
DISCLAIMER: The proposed location for HS-4 is now almost 1 mile north of what is analyzed on this map. A visibility map for that location has not been prepared.


Visibility from Building at HS-5 Facility


Visibility from Building at Sand Hollow Terminal Station Facility

## Appendix B. 3

 Visibility Analysis Maps-Sensitive Linear KOPsDISCLAIMER: The Visibility Analysis Maps - Power Generating Alternatives include project features and alignments that have been adjusted since 2016, primarily on the western side of project area. They also include some Key Observations Points that have been eliminated from analysis or slightly adjusted in location.


Visibility of Project from Fredonia - Vermillion Cliffs Scenic Road / US 89A


Visibility of Project from Zion Park Scenic Byway


Visibility of Project from Old Spanish National Historic Trail, Map 1


Visibility of Project from Old Spanish National Historic Trail, Map 2


Visibility of Project from Old Spanish National Historic Trail, Map 3


Visibility of Project from Old Spanish National Historic Trail, Map 4


Visibility of Project from Old Spanish National Historic Trail, Map 5


Visibility of Project from Old Spanish National Historic Trail, Map 6


Visibility of Project from Dominguez-Escalante Historic Trail, Map 1


Visibility of Project from Dominguez-Escalante Historic Trail, Map 2


Visibility of Project from Dominguez-Escalante Historic Trail, Map 3


Visibility of Project from Dominguez-Escalante Historic Trail, Map 4


Visibility of Project from Dominguez-Escalante Historic Trail, Map 5


Visibility of Project from Dominguez-Escalante Historic Trail, Map 6


Visibility of Project from Honeymoon Historic Trail, Map 1


Visibility of Project from Honeymoon Historic Trail, Map 2


Visibility of Project from Honeymoon Historic Trail, Map 3


Visibility of Project from Honeymoon Historic Trail, Map 4


Visibility of Project from Honeymoon Historic Trail, Map 5


Visibility of Project from Honeymoon Historic Trail, Map 6


Visibility of Project from Temple Historic Trail

