

Appendix H

Visual Resources

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

H.0 Visual Resources

The visual resources evaluation for this project is being conducted in accordance with the objectives and methods described in the BLM *Visual Resource Management (VRM) Guidelines* (BLM 1986a) and the BLM *Manual Handbook - Visual Resource Contrast Rating* (BLM 1986b). The objective of the VRM Guidelines is to manage public lands in a manner that would protect the quality of the scenic or visual values of those lands.

The BLM VRM guidelines were used for visual resource assessment because Reclamation and the NPS do not have any formalized guidance procedures for assessing visual resources. The visual resource inventory process provides Reclamation and NPS managers with a means for determining visual values. The baseline inventory consists of the evaluation of the following three items:

- 1) **Scenic quality evaluation:** The scenic quality of an area is determined by completing a visual resource inventory process based on seven key factors: landform, vegetation, water, color, adjacent scenery, scarcity, and cultural modifications. During the VRM evaluation process, each of these factors is ranked on a comparative basis with similar features within the physiographic province. The areas being evaluated are subdivided into scenic quality rating units for rating purposes. Rating areas are delineated on a basis of like physiographic, visual, and manmade modification characteristics.

Scenic quality evaluations were conducted from selected key observation points (KOP) along the proposed SCOP alignment. The scenic quality was then rated based on BLM VRM guidelines, using BLM Scenic Quality Field Inventory – Bureau Form 8400-5. Once the KOPs were identified, each rating unit was ranked depending on the type of user, the amount of use, public interest, adjacent land uses, special areas, and consideration of other factors. In accordance with BLM guidelines, a ranking number between 1 and 5 was then assigned to each key factor, totaled, and assigned a classification letter. The scenic quality was classified as follows:

- Class A: High scenic quality (totals of 19 or more),
 - Class B: Medium scenic quality (totals between 12 and 18),
 - Class C: Low scenic quality (totals lower than 11).
- 2) **Sensitivity level analysis:** Sensitivity levels are a measure of public concern for scenic quality. Visual sensitivity is dependent upon user (or viewer) attitudes, the amount of use, and the types of activities in which people are engaged when viewing an object. Overall, higher degrees of visual sensitivity are correlated with areas where people live and with people who are engaged in recreational outdoor pursuits or participate in scenic or pleasure driving. Conversely, areas of industrial or commercial use are considered to have low to moderate visual sensitivity because the activities conducted in these areas are not significantly affected by the quality of the environment. As with the scenic quality evaluation, the VRM sensitivity-level analysis requires delineation of rating units. However, for sensitivity levels, the delineation should be based on those factors that drive the sensitivity.

Adjacent land uses may have an effect on the visual sensitivity of the project area, so they are measured as well. Lands that are currently being developed for residential communities are not considered sensitive. This is based on the rationale that at the time of the analysis of existing conditions, the area is essentially a construction site.

Special areas are another element of the sensitivity analysis. This element of the analysis takes into account the management objectives of designated areas such as Wilderness Areas, Natural Areas, Wild and Scenic Areas, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs). The portions of the proposed SCOP alignment that enter the Wetlands Park would be considered very sensitive.

Sensitivity level analysis was conducted from the selected KOPs and then rated based on the BLM VRM guidelines using BLM Sensitivity Level Rating Sheet 8400-6. Each rating unit was ranked according to the visual sensitivity areas listed above.

- 3) Delineation of distance zones. Landscapes are subdivided into three distance zones based on relative visibility from travel routes or observation points. The three zones are foreground-middleground (F/M), background, and seldom seen. The foreground-middleground zone includes areas seen from highways, rivers, or other viewing locations that are less than 3 to 5 miles away. The background zone includes areas that are visible beyond the foreground-middleground zone but are less than 15 miles away. Other areas are in the seldom-seen zone.

H.1 Methodology

Views that can be seen from travel routes or observation points were identified along each alternative of the proposed SCOP project. The KOPs consisted of foreground, middleground, and background observations in relation to the surrounding landscapes. The majority of the proposed SCOP pipeline would be at or below grade and would not be visible from a seldom-seen zone. Therefore, KOPs were not identified for this distance zone.

Based on the above three factors, federally administered lands are placed into one of four visual resource inventory classes. The relative value of the visual resource is indicated by one of four classes. Classes I and II are the most valued, Class III represents a moderate value, and Class IV is of least value. The following VRM objectives are established for each of the classes:

- Class I: The objective of Class I is to preserve the existing character of the landscape. This class provides for natural ecological changes; however, it does not preclude very limited management activity. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be very low and must not attract attention. This class includes primitive (wilderness) areas, some natural areas, wild sections of national wild and scenic rivers, and other congressionally and administratively designated areas where decisions have been made to preserve a natural landscape.
- Class II: The objective of Class II is to retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. Management activities may be seen, but should not attract the attention of the causal observer. Any changes must repeat the basic

element of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

- Class III: The objective of Class III is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be moderate. Management activities may attract attention, but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. As in Class II, changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.
- Class IV: The objective of Class IV is to provide management activities that require major modifications of the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt should be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic elements.

A total of twelve KOPs were established throughout the study area (Figure 3.10-1). These KOPs were selected based on three factors: (1) the major, potentially sensitive, viewer groups that may be affected by the action under study; (2) the types of planned improvements that would have varied visual impact consequences; and (3) the orientation of the viewers toward the project areas. The following subsections describe the existing conditions at these KOPs, and evaluate the scenic quality, viewer sensitivity, and distance zones in the area of the proposed pipeline alignment. These sections describe the existing resources using the BLM VRM terminology.

For the purposes of the visual analysis, the site of the proposed KOPs is defined as the separate areas to potentially be affected by construction of the SCOP and the ancillary improvements and facilities. The KOPs are described in terms of their location, access roads, landscape, visual/color variety, and panoramic visual quality. For descriptive purposes, the proposed EI alignment is separated into six segments. These segments are described in detail in Section 2.2.1:

- Reach 1
- Reach 2
- Reach 3
- COH Forcemain
- South Lateral Pipeline
- EI Terminus Site

Each of the segments has a unique location, shape, and function. Most of Reach 2 and 3 have been previously assigned a VRM classification of Class III by the BLM (BLM 1998). Accordingly, only the north end of Reach 2 and the south end of Reach 3 were evaluated. Private land and land managed by Reclamation and NPS in the project area have not previously been assigned a VRM classification by the BLM.

The visual characteristics in the vicinity of the proposed EI alignment are different than those in the vicinity of the LCS. Therefore, the existing visual resources for the EI and the LCS are discussed below in separate subsections.

H.2 Effluent Interceptor and Ancillary Facilities Setting

An analysis of the scenic quality, sensitivity level, and distance zone delineations were completed for each segment of the EI alignment that has not been previously assigned a VRM classification by the BLM. The analysis is described in the following section and is followed by a detailed description of the existing visual conditions. Finally, a Visual Resource Classification has been assigned to each of these segments.

H.2.1 Scenic Quality Summary

The scenic quality rating range within the EI and Terminus is from 3 to 10. This places all segments of the study area in category C, low scenic quality (Table H.2-1).

H.2.2 Sensitivity Levels

Sensitivity is measured by the level of public concern for scenic quality. The Wetlands Park and Rainbow Garden/Lava Butte Roads have a medium sensitivity. However, generally the sensitivity level in the areas of the EI and ancillary facilities is low. Table H.2-2 provides a summary of the existing types of users, the amount of use, and the level of concern of users concerning the visual quality of the project area. Determination of sensitivity level was assigned based on an overall average sensitivity level among these three criteria.

H.2.3 Delineation of Distance Zones

The locations of the KOPs are shown in Figure 3.10-1. As explained previously, the three major distance zones are foreground, middleground, and background.

The viewing areas in Reaches 1, 2, 3, COH Forcemain, and the South Lateral Pipeline are mostly within the F/M distance zones from travel routes or observation points. Background zones would include mountain areas to the north and east of the EI alignment. Public roads or parks that would provide recreational viewing areas toward the proposed project are located in areas defined by the BLM as background zones (3 to 5 miles), and the only thing discernible from this zone would be forms or outlines of the project activities during construction. Therefore, background visual analysis has not been considered in the overall analysis of the existing visual conditions. The majority of the Reaches would be at or below ground level and therefore the seldom-seen zone has not been considered in the overall analysis of the existing visual conditions.

Table H.2-1 Effluent Interceptor and Ancillary Facilities Scenic Quality Summary.

| Key Factors | Reach 1 | Reach 2 areas not Classified by BLM | Reach 3 areas not Classified by BLM VRM as Class III | COH Forcemain | South Lateral Pipeline | EI Terminus |
|--------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Landform | Low, alluvial fan, though not dominant or exceptional | Low, alluvial fan, though not dominant or exceptional | Slight rise in elevation though not dominant or exceptional | Slight rise in elevation, rolling hills, washes | Slight rise in elevation, rolling hills, washes | Low foothills with few interesting landscape features |
| Rank | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Vegetation | Area mostly cleared of vegetation. Tamarisk in background | Some variety in vegetation, but does not exhibit interesting forms, textures, or patterns. Riparian vegetation to the south along the Las Vegas Wash | Some variety in vegetation, but does not exhibit interesting forms, textures, or patterns | Area of cut and cover mostly cleared. Tunnel area shows some variety, but does not exhibit interesting forms, textures or patterns | Riparian vegetation at confluence of C-1 Channel and Las Vegas Wash | Some variety in vegetation, but the area is mostly cleared. Riparian vegetation to the north along the Las Vegas Wash |
| Rank | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Water | Running water visible for all areas of this Reach | Generally not visible from this reach | Not visible from this reach | Generally visible at wash area only | Generally not visible from this reach | Not visible from this site |
| Rank | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Color | Fore-and middle-ground void of color variations | Subtle color variations with limited contrast | Subtle color variations with limited contrast | Subtle color variations with limited contrast | Variation and contrast in color provided by green strip of washes | Subtle color variations with limited contrast |
| Rank | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |

Table H.2-1 Effluent Interceptor and Ancillary Facilities Scenic Quality Summary (continued).

| Key Factors | Reach 1 | Reach 2 areas not Classified by BLM | Reach 3 areas not Classified by BLM VRM as Class III | COH Forcemain | South Lateral Pipeline | EI Terminus |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Adjacent Scenery | Moderately enhances the overall visual quality due to the connection to a relatively undisturbed panoramic landscape | Dominated by previously disturbed areas broken by the crossing of many dirt roads | Dominated by previously disturbed areas broken by the crossing of many dirt roads. Panoramic views broken by power lines and water towers | Dominated by previously disturbed areas and industrial and construction activities. | Dominated to the south, east and west by development. Adjacent to the north is the Las Vegas Wash which enhances the overall visual quality due to the level of vegetation | Foreground views broken by the crossing of many dirt roads. Middleground scenery enhances the overall visual quality due to the connection to a relatively undisturbed panoramic landscape. |
| Rank | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Scarcity | Features are very common to the region | Features are very common to the region | Features are very common to the region | Features are very common to the region | Features are very common to the region | Middleground mountain view somewhat less common to the overall area. |
| Rank | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Cultural Modification | Extreme and change the scenic quality to urban residential | Moderate due to dominance of dirt roads | Moderate due to dominance of dirt roads | To the east and west are extreme. Along area of tunnel portion moderate due to dominance of dirt roads. | To the south, east and west are extreme and change the scenic quality to urban residential | Extreme due to dominance of dirt roads and earth moving activities. |
| Rank | -4 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -4 | -4 |
| Total Rank | 8 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 5 |

Table H.2-2 Effluent Interceptor and Ancillary Facilities User Summary for Sensitivity Level.

| KOP/Reach | Type of User | Amount of Use | Level of Concern | Sensitivity Level |
|---|---------------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| KOP #1 Las Vegas Wash/CLV facility/Reach 1 | Construction Workers | Low based on the relatively small number of workers. | Concern is low based low public response to activities. | Low |
| KOP #2 Wetlands Park/Reach 2 | Recreation/hiker | Moderate because Wetlands Park is not fully developed. | High based on public interest to maintain visual quality within the Wetlands Park. | Medium |
| KOP #3 Rainbow Garden/Lava Butte Roads/ Reach 3 | Mainly recreation, some workers | Limited to mostly weekend recreation. | Interest medium to low based on type of recreation use (off-road vehicles). | Medium |
| KOP #4/Terminus Site | Worker, some recreation | High based on construction activities adjacent to site. | Low based on approved construction sites. | Low |
| KOP #5/South Lateral – Las Vegas Wash and C-1 Channel | Worker, some recreation | Medium based on number of workers. | Low adjacent land is graded for future development. | Low |
| KOP#7/Telephone Line Road/Reach 2 | Workers, some recreation | Low use for maintenance, recreation limited to weekend. | Low based on use and surrounding disturbance. | Low |

H.2.4 Visual Resource Class Rating

Based on the analysis of the scenic quality, sensitivity level, and distance zones, all of the EI segments and ancillary facilities’ settings that have not been previously classified by BLM were designated as Class IV (Table H.2-3). This classification was determined based on the analysis procedure outlined by the BLM of the scenic quality, sensitivity level, and distance zones.

Table H.2-3 Effluent Interceptor and Ancillary Facilities Visual Inventory Classes.

| KOP/Reach | Scenic Quality | Sensitivity Level | Distance Zones | Class |
|------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------|
| #1/Reach | C | L | F/M | IV |
| #2*/Reach 2 | B | M | F/M | III |
| #3/Reach 3 | C | M | F/M | IV |
| #4/Terminus | C | L | F/M | IV |
| #5/South Lateral | C | L | F/M | IV |
| #7/Reach 2 | C | L | F/M | IV |

Note:

* KOP #2 is in the area designated as Class III by BLM.

H.3 Lake Conveyance System

The NPS is Congressionally directed to not allow park resources and values to be impaired, but it is allowed to use management discretion to allow impacts to park resources when necessary. There are three proposed LCS alignments with two proposed discharge locations. One discharge location is in the vicinity of the Boulder Islands. The second discharge location is in the Las Vegas Bay. Each of the alternatives has a unique location, shape, and function. The visual quality of the three alternatives is described in general terms below.

For the purposes of the visual analysis, the site of the proposed alternatives is defined as the separate areas to potentially be affected by construction and operation of the LCS and the ancillary facilities (Figure 3.10-1). The KOPs within the LMNRA have been identified as:

- Lake Mead Parkway at the location where the LCS would pass under the road,
- Lakeshore Drive where the NRMT3-East working shaft would be located,
- Lakeshore Drive (two KOPs) at the locations where the Boulder Islands South and the Las Vegas Bay alternatives of the LCS would pass under the road,
- Boulder Beach from the beach near the public campground area,
- Las Vegas Bay from the public scenic overlook area.

An analysis of the scenic quality was completed for each identified KOP. The analysis is described in the following sections and is followed by a detailed description of the existing visual conditions. These KOPs are described in terms of their location, landscape, visual/color variety, and panoramic visual quality. Next, sensitivity level, and distance zones delineation were completed for each KOP. Finally, a Visual Resource Classification was assigned to each of these KOPs.

H.3.1 Scenic Quality Summary

Generally, except for the area along Lake Mead Parkway, the scenic quality of the LCS received a scoring of 19 or more, which places the KOPs in category A, high scenic quality (Table H.3-1).

H.3.2 Sensitivity Levels

There is a high degree of sensitivity in the vicinity of the three proposed alternatives with the exception of the Lake Mead Parkway thoroughfare. Table H.3-2 provides a summary of the existing types of users, the amount of use, and level of interest in the visual quality of the project area.

Table H.3-1 Lake Conveyance System - Scenic Quality Summary
Scenic Quality Rating Areas and Evaluation.

| Key Factors | Lake Mead Parkway at Three Kids Mine | Lakeshore Drive at NRMT3-East Site | Lakeshore Drive | Boulder Beach | Las Vegas Bay |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Landform | Slight rise in elevation, rolling hills, washes | Sloping arroyo toward Lake Mead | Meandering road through slight rise/dips in elevation | Mix of color, texture and line between water and mountains | Rolling hills with lake view with a mix of color texture and line between water and mountains |
| Rank | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| Vegetation | Bush scrub in foreground, barren in background | Brush scrub and invasives – relatively lush at time of site visit | Bush scrub in foreground, barren in background | Bush scrub and invasives | Low to no vegetation |
| Rank | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Water | Not visible from this site | Visible from the road- dominant to view of the area | Visible from parts of the drive | Water is dominant to view of the area | Water is dominant to view of the area |
| Rank | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Color | Green to brown with limited contrast | Green with contrast provided by gray of ground and blue-gray of water | Gray-green with contrast provided by blue-gray of water | High variation and contrast provided by gray-green of surrounding rock. Focal point is blue-gray of water | High variation and contrast provided by gray of surrounding rock and blue-gray of water |
| Rank | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| Adjacent scenery | Dominated by previously disturbed areas broken by the crossing of many dirt roads, panoramic views broken by power lines | Dominated by washes and desert areas | Dominated by washes and desert areas typical of Mojave Desert scrub | Dominated by wash, desert area, campgrounds and roads | Dominated by washes and desert areas typical of Mojave Desert Scrub |
| Rank | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Scarcity | Features are very common to the region | Views of lakes are uncommon in the Mojave Desert Region | Views of lakes are uncommon in the Mojave Desert Region | Views of lakes are uncommon in the Mojave Desert Region | Views of lakes are uncommon in the Mojave Desert Region |
| Rank | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Cultural modification | Moderate due to dominance of dirt roads, adjacent mining operations and construction | Moderate due to roads and nearby AMSWTP | Little to no cultural modification except for road | Moderate due to adjacent campground, roads and visitor facilities | Moderate due to adjacent roads and visitor facilities |
| Rank | -4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Rank | 0 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 21 |

Table H.3-2 Lake Conveyance System User Summary for Sensitivity Level.

| KOP/Area | Type of User | Amount of Use | Level of Concern | Sensitivity Level |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| #6/Lake Mead Drive at Three Kids Mine | Recreational user and commuter | High-greater than 45,000 visits/year | Low, based on surrounding activities of mining and construction | Low |
| #8/Boulder Beach | Recreational user | High-greater than 10,000 visitor days/year | High, based on user of the beach, recreationist with desire to maintain visual quality | High |
| #9, 10/Lakeshore Drive | Recreational user/sight-seeing | High-greater than 45,000 visits/year | High, based on user of the road recreationist with desire to maintain visual quality | High |
| #11/Las Vegas Bay | Recreational user/sight-seeing | High-greater than 10,000 visitor days/year | High, based on user of the overlook at the bay to maintain visual quality | High |
| #12/Lakeshore Drive at NRMT3-East | Recreational user/sight seeing | High-greater than 10,000 visitor days/year | High based on user of the highway to maintain visual quality | High |

H.3.3 Delineation of Distance Zones

Views from the designated KOPs are within the F/M distance zones from travel routes or observation points. The majority of the LCS is underground and would not be seen from any of the designated KOPs. Portions of the proposed project that would be above ground include facilities at the EI Terminus and access portals that could possibly be seen from the KOP on Lake Mead Parkway.

Background zones would include mountain areas to the north and east of the LCS alignment. Public roads that would provide viewing areas toward the proposed project are in the areas defined by the BLM as background zones, and the only thing discernible from this zone would be forms or outlines of the project activities during construction. Therefore, background visual analysis has not been considered in the overall analysis of the existing visual conditions. All of the LCS pipeline and most of the ancillary facilities would be at or below ground level and therefore the seldom-seen zone has not been considered in the overall analysis of the existing visual conditions.

H.3.4 Visual Resource Class

Based on the analysis of the scenic quality, sensitivity level, and distance zones, the LCS area, except for KOP #6-Lake Mead Parkway, was designated as Class II (Table H.3-3). This classification was determined based on the analysis procedure outlined by the BLM of the scenic quality, sensitivity level, and distance zones.

Table H.3-3. Lake Conveyance System Visual Inventory Classes.

| KOP/Area | Scenic Quality | Sensitivity Level | Distance Zones | Class |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------|
| #6/Lake Mead Drive at Three Kids Mine | C | L | F/M | IV |
| #8/Boulder Beach | A | H | F/M | II |
| #9/Lakeshore Drive | A | H | F/M | II |
| #10/Lakeshore Drive | A | H | F/M | II |
| #11/Las Vegas Bay | A | H | F/M | II |

H.4 Impact Analysis Methodology

The BLM VRM System consists of two stages, inventory and analysis. The inventory stage involves identifying the visual resources of an area and assigning them to inventory classes using BLM's visual resource inventory process. As discussed in Section H.1, the BLM developed the VRM classes for areas within the Wetlands Park during preparation of the BLM Resource Management Plan (BLM 1998). A visual inventory for all other sections of the proposed project was conducted and is described in detail in Section H.1.

The degree to which an activity affects the visual quality of a landscape depends on the visual contrast created between a project and the existing landscape. The contrast can be measured by comparing the project features with the major features in the existing landscape. The basic design elements of form, line, color, and texture are used to make this comparison and to describe the visual contrast created by the project. This assessment process provides a means for determining visual impacts and for identifying measures to mitigate these impacts (BLM 1986b).

Public lands have a variety of visual values. These different values warrant varying levels of management. Because it is neither desirable nor practical to provide the same level of management for all visual resources, it is necessary to systematically identify and evaluate these values to determine the appropriate level of management.

Because the proposed project would cross several different types of visual areas, with each having a different visual value, a series of KOPs along the proposed project area were designated (Figures 3.10-1). A KOP is one or a series of points on a travel route or at a use area or a potential use area, where the view of an activity would be most revealing (Section H.1).

The character of the existing visual environment within the site vicinity was documented in the field and by thorough analyses of area maps. Viewer groups within the view-shed limit were identified (Table H.2-2). Viewer responses to visual changes from the alternatives were inferred from a variety of factors including:

- Viewer exposure,
- Types of viewers,
- Number of viewers,

- Duration of view, and
- Viewer activities.

Viewer exposure includes distance and viewing angle. The distance that a man-made structure can be seen on a clear day is generally 1 mile. The viewer type, and associated viewer sensitivity, is distinguished among viewers in residential, recreation/open space, and tourist commercial areas, with the first two having relatively high sensitivity and the last having lower sensitivity. Activities can either encourage a viewer to observe the surrounding area more closely (scenic driving) or discourage close observation (commuting in heavy traffic). All of these viewer elements were considered when evaluating the alternatives.

The existing conditions and visual contrast rating was completed in Section H.1. To compare existing VRM designations with potential impacts, one BLM Form 8400-4, Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet was completed for each KOP associated with each proposed action alternative (Attachment A). The worksheet provides the tool for determining if the potential impacts from the proposed alternatives are compatible with BLM VRM classifications. Worksheets for the no-action alternative were not generated because under this alternative, the proposed SCOP project would not be constructed and the existing VRM classification and management designation would not experience potential impacts.

Photos were taken at each KOP for the purpose of developing visual simulations. Copies of the photos are included in Attachment B. These photos were taken at the KOP locations shown in Figure 3.10-1 of the EIS. Simulations are extremely important to portray the relative scale and extent of a project. However, based on the results from the Visual Contract Rating Worksheets for each KOP, visual simulations of possible change to the viewshed were developed for only KOP 4 of the EI (Figure 4.10-1). This was based on the rationale that change in visual resources from KOPs in association with activities with the proposed SCOP operation would be insignificant, because the proposed pipeline and facilities would be underground. The visual simulation of KOP 4 includes the Terminus Facility.

Visual simulations were not developed for temporary disturbances to the viewshed from construction activities. This is based on the rationale that construction would be temporary, and following construction, disturbed areas would be re-vegetated. The shafts and PRS located on LMNRA land would be at grade and not observable to the casual viewer. Also, access to working shafts would be along existing roads, which would represent no change to the existing viewshed. Because of these reasons, changes in form, line color and texture are not expected. Visual simulation of possible change at Boulder Island/Las Vegas Bay was not developed, because there would not be any visible structures at the site.