Appendix A

VRAP Management Classification System Forms



✓	MCS
	VIΔ

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY (√)	
BASIC ()		FORECASTING ()	
DETAILED ()		DATE 5/20/2012	
PROJECT NAME Eufaula La	ke EIS	TIME	
LOCATION Regional Lands	саре	WEATHER	
VIEWPOINT ()	ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage	
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of	
PROJECT DETAILS AND CO	DMMENTS		
		TIME PERIOD	YFARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The upland vegetation and terrestrial habitats present within the Eufaula Lake study area are described below as presented in *Ecoregions of Oklahoma* (Woods et al. 2005). Oklahoma contains vast plains, elevated karst plains, hills, and folded, low mountains. There is a strong east-west zonation of vegetation and climate in Oklahoma. Precipitation increases eastward, rainfall variability increases westward, and both the mean annual temperature and the length of the growing season increase southward. Soils influence the degree to which moisture is available for plant life (Woods et al. 2005). Much of Oklahoma's natural upland vegetation has been lost to overgrazing, burning, logging, erosion, and cultivation. Today, the state is a mosaic of grazing land, cropland, woodland, forests, and abandoned farmland. Wheat and alfalfa are the main crops with grain sorghum, soybeans, cotton, and corn grown in lesser quantities (Woods et al. 2005).

The Eufaula Lake study area falls within four different ecoregions: the Northern Cross Timbers, the Osage Cuestas of the Central Irregular Plains, Scattered High Ridges and Mountains of the Arkansas River Valley, and the Lower Canadian Hills of the Arkansas River Valley (Woods et al. 2005). These ecoregions give the study area a varying aesthetic of steep, rocky slopes, sandy lowlands, tall hills with dry forest, and scattered grasslands.

The Northern Cross Timbers are located on the northern and western portions of the Eufaula Lake study area, to the north of the main channel of the South Canadian River. The Northern Cross Timbers consist of hills, cuestas, and ridges that are naturally covered by a mosaic of oak savanna, scrubby oak forest, eastern redcedar (*Juniperus virginiana*), and tall grass prairie. Post oak (*Quercus stellata*), blackjack oak (*Quercus marlandica*), and understory grasses dominate on porous, course-textured soils derived from sandstone, while tall grass prairie occurs on fine-textured soils derived from limestone or shale. Streams are typically shallow and have sandy substrates. Today, livestock farming and Large oilfields are the main land uses of this ecoregion; however, they are not highly visible from within the study area (Woods et al. 2005).

The Osage Cuestas ecoregion is located on the very northern section of the study area. This ecoregion is an irregular to undulating plain that is underlain by interbedded, westward-dipping sandstone, shale, and limestone. East-facing cuestas and low hills occur. Topography and vegetation are distinct from nearby ecoregions. Natural vegetation is mostly tall grass prairie, but a mix of tall grass prairie and oak—hickory forest occurs in eastern areas. Forests and woodlands, dominated by post oak, blackjack oak, and black hickory (*Carya texana*), are native on stony hilltops. Today, rangeland, cropland, riparian forests, and on rocky hills, oak woodland or oak forest occur (Woods et al. 2005).

The Lower Canadian Hills ecoregion covers the majority of the study area south of the Northern Cross Timbers. This ecoregion is underlain by Pennsylvanian-age shale, sandstone, and coal. It acts as a transition between the drier Cross Timbers to the west and moister parts of the Arkansas Valley to the east. Native vegetation is a mixture of oak woodland, tall grass prairie, oak—hickory forest, and oak—hickory—pine forest. In general, wooded hills are more widespread than in the nearby Arkansas Valley Plains and Osage Cuestas. Streams tend to have deeper pools and more habitat diversity than in the Northern Cross Timbers. Today, steep slopes are wooded and used for timber, woodland grazing, or recreation. Gently sloping uplands are used as pastureland or hayland. Cropland or pastureland occur on bottomlands. Other main land uses include poultry farming, coal mining, and natural gas production.

The Scattered High Ridges and Mountains ecoregion represents a small southeastern portion of the study area just south of the community of Blocker. This ecoregion is more rugged and wooded than the surrounding ecoregions. It is covered by savannas, open woodlands, or forests dominated or codominated by upland oaks, hickory, and shortleaf pine (*Pinus echinata*); loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*) occurs, but is not native. This ecoregion is largely underlain by Pennsylvanian sandstone and shale. Land uses are similar to those in the Lower Canadian Hills.

No

No

No

√ Yes

If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

This area is highly used for recreation.

The area is known for art deco architecture

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 5/20/2012

NOTES: Regional Landscape

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	- Large, open lake - Secluded natural coves - Small rocky streams - Steep rocky shoreline - Beaches	- Lightly developed coves with or without small docks	- Highly developed coves with or without very high dock denisty - Eroded streams - Eroded shoreline
LANDFORM	- Tall hills, cuestas, and ridges - Steep rocky shoreline - Natural beaches	- Flat natural areas - Flat residential areas - Lightly graded areas	- Flat oil/gas fields - Eroded shoreline - Extensively graded areas
VEGETATION	- Naturally barren rocky land - Mature hillside forest	- Forested wetlands - Shrub/Scrub and herbaceous wetlands - Small residential yards - Natural-looking parkland	- Large and dense residential areas with few trees - Barren oil/gas fields - Barren industrial areas - Recreational areas with few trees
LAND USE	- Undeveloped land - Recreational Areas - Well-designed, culturally significant buildings (e.g. art deco).	- Moderately developed land - Low- to medium-density residential areas - Low density docks - Roadway overpasses	- Industrial areas - Marinas/high density docks - High density developed areas if not very well maintained - Highway causeways
USER ACTIVITY	- Water recreation - Picnicking - Fishing - Hunting - Nature Watching	- Low- to medium-density residences	- Commercial and industrial operations - High density residences if not very well maintained.

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

The area is known for a high density of art deco architecture.

Wide panoramic views are of particular value to people who live, work, and recreate at the lake.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 5/20/2012

ZONE: Regional Landscape

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES:

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	X			
LANDFORM	Х			
VEGETATION		Х		
LAND USE		Х		
USER ACTIVITY		Х		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	Х			
TOTALS	9	6		

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE	15	
*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more	= distinct, 1-2 =	average, and 0 = minimal
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	√ Yes	No
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?	✓ Yes	No
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?	✓ Yes	No
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?	✓ Yes	No
Total "Yes'	4	

✓	MCS
	VIΔ

FORM 1 SIMILARITY ZONE (✓) INVENTORY (✓) FORECASTING () BASIC () DETAILED () DATE 5/21/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION LSZ 1 - Forest WEATHER PERSONNEL L. Burbage VIEWPOINT () ZONE (1) WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The Forest similarity zone largely consists of oak-dominated woodlands. The different ecoregions exhibit slightly bdifferent dominating species assemblages due to differences in water availability, soils, geology, and topography. The understory of most upland forested areas is somewhat thin and can be seen through, especially in the winter. The understory of forested wetlands may be more dense. The Northern Cross Timber ecoregion is dominated by oak savanna and scrubby oak forest with post oak (Quercus stellata) and blackjack oak (Quercus marlandica). The Osage Cuestas ecoregion forests are dominated by post oak, blackjack oak, and black hickory (Carya texana). The Lower Canadian Hills ecoregion forests are dominated by oak woodland, oak-hickory forest, and oak-hickory-pine forest. The Scattered High Ridges and Mountains forests are dominated by upland oaks, hickory, and shortleaf pine (Pinus echinata).

The Forest similarity zone is most visible on hillsides and ridges, and is a very dominating part of the overall aesthetic of Eufaula Lake. The forests appear rugged and rocky, with large boulders and small escarpments often visible, especially near the shore. The ridges of the many forested hills creates a sense of mystery in the lake, hiding large portions of it from view. As a result, the lake appears much smaller to the viewer than it actually is. From within the Forest similarity zone, the view of the lake depends on the exact topography and vegetation of the location. In some locations, the lake is hidden behind hills and ridges. Where the lake is not screened by hills, however, it is only partially screened by trees. Since the understory in the forest is most often rather thin, the lake and opposite shoreline are very visible, especially in winter.

This zone includes scattered residential homes on wooded or partially cleared lots. Many homes are situated to view a panorama of the lake and forestlands. The forested areas also include many wildlife management areas and are used extensively for hunting and fishing. Lake users queried during the February and April visual resources surveys noted that undeveloped wetlands and forested areas are of particular value to them.

Some of the forested areas are quite littered. Remote areas with access roads have been reported to attract illegal activity. During the visual surveys, it was noted that some remote areas are littered with bottles and cans, food containers, shotgun shells, and miscellaneous refuse. In general, however, this litter can only be seen when the user is within the littered area, and is not seen from the lake or nearby shorelines.

The areas for this similarity zone were established within a 3,000-ft buffer from the normal lake level of 585 feet above mean sea level using the USGS 2006 National Land Cover Dataset (USGS 2011). The zone consists of deciduous forest, evergreen forest, and mixed forest data.

No

No

No

Yes

Does this area contain any other significant attributes?

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

This area is highly used for recreation.

Some forests are managed for wildlife.

If yes, explain

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 5/21/2012

NOTES: LSZ 1 - Forest

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	- Large, open lake views - Secluded natural coves - Small rocky streams - Steep rocky shoreline	- Beaches adjacent to forest	- Eroded shoreline
LANDFORM	- Tall hills, cuestas, and ridges - Steep rocky shoreline	- Beaches adjacent to forest	- Eroded shoreline
VEGETATION	- Mature hillside forest	- Forested wetlands	
LAND USE	- Undeveloped land - Recreation and hunting	- Low density residences - Low density docks - Highway throughways	- Illegal activity or poaching
USER ACTIVITY	- Recreation - Fishing - Hunting	- Low density residences	

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

Wide panoramic views of the lake, forested hillsides, and forested ridges are of particular value to people who live, work, and recreate at the lake.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 5/21/2012

ZONE: LSZ 1 - Forest

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES:

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	Х			
LANDFORM	Х			
VEGETATION	Х			
LAND USE	X			
USER ACTIVITY	X			
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	X			
TOTALS	18			

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE	18		
*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more	e = distinct,	1-2 = average, a	nd 0 = minimal
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	Yes	√ No	
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?	√ Yes	No	
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter? Most forested areas are free from litter. Areas with extensive littering are not very visible from the lake or adjacent shorelines	✓ Yes	No	
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?	√ Yes	No	
Wide panoramic views of the lake, forested hillsides, and forested ridges are of particular value to people who live, work, and recreate at the lake. Total "Yes	s" <u>3</u>	_	

✓	MCS
	VIΔ

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓) INVENTORY (✓) BASIC () FORECASTING () DETAILED () DATE *5/22/2012* PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION LSZ - Grassland/Prairie/Pasture WEATHER PERSONNEL L. Burbage VIEWPOINT () ZONE (2) WITHOUT PLAN () WITH PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The Grassland/Prairie/Pasture similarity zone consists of areas with short herbaceous vegetation. These areas include native grasslands and prairie, rangeland for cattle, abandoned farmland, and maintained grasses in urban/recreational areas that do not fall under other landscape similarity zones (such as Park/Recreational, Residential, and Commercial/Industrial). The majority of these areas are away from the lakeshore, in the more gently sloping or flat inland areas. This type of land use covers extensive areas in the region; however, it covers only about half the land use in the study area due to the topography surrounding the lake. It should be noted that the study area only includes such lands that are within 3,000 feet of the lakeshore and that this characterization does not necessarily apply other areas away from the lake.

This similarity zone, especially areas that are pastured, can offer wide, sweeping views of the landscape, but only occasional views of Lake Eufaula, since it is generally at a much lower elevation. Views of the lake sometimes occur near the top of gentle slopes, where a portion of the lower slope is also kept as short vegetation such that trees do not block the view. However, in most locations, the surrounding topography and lakeside forested areas screen the view of the lake. Streams are not common in this similarity zone, as their surrounding hillslopes are generally wooded.

Native prairie openings can be found in undisturbed, protected areas and areas with a higher frequency of fire; however, prairie land has been much reduced from its historic distribution due to conversion to other land uses and fire suppression (Woods 2005). Where they do occur, they are typically small and surrounded by forested areas.

Grasslands and grazed pasture can have a dry, somewhat barren aesthetic; however, many areas exhibit a wide diversity of colorful wildflowers during part of the year. Such areas with wildflowers are of particular aesthetic value near recreational areas and highways, where they can be viewed by more people.

Much of this area is dotted with natural gas and oil extraction wells, which can sometimes detract from the overall aesthetic. Where they are present, their industrial appearance is incongruous with the surrounding rangeland landscape. However, the oil wells do contribute to a sense of place a somewhat nostalgic reminder of American history and culture.

The areas for this similarity zone were established within a 3,000-ft buffer from the normal lake level of 585 feet above mean sea level using the USGS 2006 National Land Cover Dataset (USGS 2011). The zone consists of herbaceous grassland, pasture, hay, and urban/recreational grasses data.

INVENTORY (✓)

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓) BASIC () FORECASTING () DETAILED () DATE *5/22/2012* PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION LSZ - Grassland/Prairie/Pasture WEATHER PERSONNEL L. Burbage VIEWPOINT () ZONE (2) WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of YEARS TIME PERIOD WATER RESOURCE **STREAM** RIVER LAKE/RES **WETLANDS SWIFT RAPID MOVEMENT** NONE **MEANDER SCALE SMALL MEDIUM** LANDFORM **√**ROLLING HILLS **PLAINS** COASTAL HILLS **TYPE VEGETATION 5**0-75% COVER 0-25% 25-50% **PRESENT** SUBSTANTIAL DIVERSITY NONE LITTLE **PRESENT** SEAS. CHANGE NONE LAND/WATER USE ✓UNDEVELOPED ✓RURAL **WILDERNESS SUBURBAN** INTENSITY **√**AGRICULTURE RESIDENTIAL RECREATION COMMERCIAL **TYPE** ACCESS TRAIL SECOND. RD. ✓PRIMARY RD. **TYPE WALKWAY USER ACTIVITY √**LOW **DEGREE MEDIUM √**LOW **FREQUENCY MEDIUM** LITTER/POLLUTION NONE **AMOUNT PRESENT** ADJACENT SCENERY ✓ SOMEWHAT SIMILARITY NOT VERY SOUNDS **√**PRESENT **PRESENCE ABSENT DOMINANT √**INCONSPICUOUS **TYPE** DISCORDANT **HARMONIOUS SMELLS PRESENCE ABSENT DOMINANT** INCONSPICUOUS **TYPE** DISCORDANT **HARMONIOUS** VISIBILITY **√**PARTIALLY SCREENED PANORAMA **AMOUNT SCREENED** NORMAL **SUPERIOR POSITION INFERIOR** Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes If yes, explain Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks? Yes

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 5/22/2012

NOTES: LSZ 2 - Grassland/Prairie/Pasture

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES		- Occasional views of Lake Eufaula	
LANDFORM		- flat, open land - Rolling hills	
VEGETATION	- Colorful wildflowers	- Grasses	- Barren areas
LAND USE	- Protected wildflowers and prairie areas	- Rangeland - Occasional homesites	- Oil and gas extraction
USER ACTIVITY			- Oil and gas industry

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 5/22/2012

ZONE: LSZ 2 - Grassland/Prairie/Pasture

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES:

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		X		Few water resources present
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION		X		
LAND USE		X		
USER ACTIVITY		Х		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		Х		
TOTALS	0	12		

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE	12	
The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or mo	ore = distinct, 1-	-2 = average, and 0 = minima
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	Yes	√ No
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlif observation?	fe Yes	√ No
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?	✓ Yes	No
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?	Yes	√ No
Total "V	ر _م د" 1	

✓	MCS
	VIΔ

FORM 1 INVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE (✓) BASIC () FORECASTING () DETAILED () DATE 8/13/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION LSZ 3 - Farmland WEATHER VIEWPOINT () ZONE (3) PERSONNEL L. Burbage WITHOUT PLAN () WITH PLAN () of CDM SMith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS YEARS TIME PERIOD

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The Farmland similarity zone represents a very small portion of the study area. Cropland occurs in stream valleys and bottomlands in the Lower Canadian Hills, Scattered High Ridges and Mountains, and Northern Cross Timbers ecoregions; whereas it occurs on nearly level plains in the Osage Cuestas ecoregion (Woods 2005).

Cropland was identified in McIntosh and Pittsburg Counties. A good portion of the farmland is located on government-owned property. Although information regarding the type of crop growing at specific locations is not available, general information about crop types grown in these counties was obtained from the 2007 Census of Agriculture (USDA 2009). Crops grown in these counties were corn (over 430 acres), wheat (1,113 acres), oats (144 acres), soybeans (over 185 acres), peanuts (156 acres), and vegetables (203 acres). Forageland (e.g. hay and greenchop) covered 112,356 acres, and orchards covered 1,847 acres. It should be noted that these values are for the entire area of the two counties, not just the study area. However, the data is likely representative of the type and relative amounts of different crops in the study area.

Views of cropland from Eufaula Lake are most often screened by trees along the lake fringe; however, some cropland is visible from the lake, especially in winter. The view of cropland has a pastoral aesthetic, in keeping with and complimentary to the tranquil feeling of other areas surrounding the lake, such as forest and grasslands.

The areas for this similarity zone were established within a 3,000-ft buffer from the normal lake level of 585 feet above mean sea level using the USGS 2006 National Land Cover Dataset (USGS 2011). The zone consists of row crops, small grains, orchards/vinyards, and fallow land data. It should be noted, however, that additional cropland can be seen in aerial photography that was identified in the dataset as being in the Grassland/Prairie/ Pasture; this land is most often land used for hay.

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)

BASIC ()

DETAILED ()

VIEWPOINT ()

WITH PLAN ()

INVENTORY (✓) FORECASTING () DATE 8/13/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION LSZ 3 - Farmland **WEATHER** PERSONNEL L. Burbage ZONE (3) WITHOUT PLAN () CDM SMith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of

YEARS TIME PERIOD WATER ✓ LAKE/RES RIVER WETLANDS RESOURCE **STREAM** SWIFT RAPID **MEANDER MOVEMENT** NONE **SCALE SMALL MEDIUM** LANDFORM **√**PLAINS COASTAL **TYPE ROLLING HILLS** HILLS **VEGETATION** COVER 0 0-25% 25-50% 50-75% ✓ NONE SUBSTANTIAL DIVERSITY LITTLE **PRESENT** SEAS. CHANGE NONE **PRESENT** LAND/WATER USE UNDEVELOPED √RURAL **WILDERNESS** INTENSITY **SUBURBAN** ✓ AGRICULTURE RESIDENTIAL **TYPE** RECREATION COMMERCIAL **ACCESS** TRAIL WALKWAY SECOND. RD. **TYPE** PRIMARY RD. **USER ACTIVITY √**LOW **DEGREE MEDIUM √**LOW **FREQUENCY MEDIUM** LITTER/POLLUTION NONE **AMOUNT PRESENT** ADJACENT SCENERY ✓ SOMEWHAT SIMILARITY NOT SOUNDS **√**PRESENT **PRESENCE ABSENT** ✓INCONSPICUOUS **TYPE** DISCORDANT **SMELLS DOMINANT PRESENCE ABSENT** INCONSPICUOUS **HARMONIOUS TYPE** DISCORDANT VISIBILITY **√**PARTIALLY SCREENED **AMOUNT SCREENED** PANORAMA NORMAL **POSITION INFERIOR** SUPERIOR Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes If yes, explain Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks? Yes

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 8/13/2012

NOTES: LSZ 3 - Farmland

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	- Partially Screened views of Eufaula Lake	- Wetlands	- Agricultural drainage ditches
LANDFORM		- Flat; bottomlands and level plains	
VEGETATION		- Corn, wheat, oats, soybeans, peanuts, vegetables - Orchards - hay fields - trees surrounding farm fields	
LAND USE		- Agricultural	
USER ACTIVITY		- Agricultural	

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

Although this similarity zone is not used by many people and the areas viewed from the lake are few, it is in keeping with and complimentary to the nature of the surroundings.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 8/13/2012

ZONE: LSZ 3 - Farmland

PERSONNEL

NOTES:

L. Burbage

14

Total "Yes" 3

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		X		Mostly wetlands; lake view occasional.
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION		Х		
LAND USE	X			
USER ACTIVITY		Х		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	X			
TOTALS	6	8	0	

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE	14		
*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more	= distinct, 1	-2 = average, and () = minimal
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	Yes	√ No	
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?	✓ Yes	No	
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?	√ Yes	No	
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource? The pastoral nature of farmland areas is	✓ Yes	No	

complimentary to the surrounding area.

✓	MCS
	VIΔ

FORM 1 SIMILARITY ZONE (✓) INVENTORY (✓) BASIC () FORECASTING () DETAILED () DATE 7/12/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION LSZ 4 - Wetlands WEATHER VIEWPOINT () ZONE (4) PERSONNEL L. Burbage of CDM Smith WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The Wetlands similarity zone is located in large areas adjacent to Eufaula Lake, as well as fringing shallows adjacent to other similarity zones. Wetland types include forested broad-leaved deciduous, scrub-shrub broadleaved deciduous, and herbaceous emergent (as classified by Cowardin et al, 1979).

Dominant forested wetland trees include river birch (Betula nigra), pond cypress (Taxodium distichum var. imbricarium), and sycamore (Platanus occidentalis), with river birch, American elm (Ulmus americana), green ash (Fraxinus pennsylvanica), and sugarberry (Celtis laevigata) in the subcanopy. Dominant species in scrub-shrub wetlands included black willow (Salix nigra), buttonbush (Cephalanthus occidentalis), green ash, water locust (Gleditsia aquatica), American germander (Teucrium canadense), common rush (Juncus effusus), fox sedge (Carex vulpinoidea), hop sedge (Carex lupulina), and roundleaf greenbriar (Smilax rotundifolia). Dominant species found in emergent wetlands included cattail (Typha latifolia), common rush, poverty rush, (Juncus tenuis), spikerush (Eleocharis palustris), duckweed (Lemna Minor), and salvinia (Salvinia molesta).

Most wetland areas are located inside coves where low-lying land and shallowly inundated areas are protected from wave action. Large areas of wetlands occur in some of the wildlife management areas. Wetland areas are largely either hidden from view or unnoticeable from the interior of the lake, but are seen up-close by boaters and those fishing near the shore and within coves, as well as people hunting in the wildlife management areas.

Wildlife is particularly evident in all wetland areas, not just in the wildlife management areas. Wildlife particularly visible within the study area include waterfowl, wading birds, songbirds, birds of prey, beaver, muskrat, and deer.

When asked during the February and April visual resources surveys, lake users noted that undeveloped wetlands and forested areas are of particular value to them.

The areas for this similarity zone were established within a 3,000-ft buffer from the normal lake level of 585 feet above mean sea level using the USGS 2006 National Land Cover Dataset (USGS 2011). The zone consists of emergent herbaceous wetlands and woody wetlands data.

SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? No Yes If yes, explain Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

INFERIOR

POSITION

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks? Yes No

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 7/12/2012

NOTES: LSZ 4 - Wetlands

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	- forested wetlands, esp. those with pond cypress - Large tracts of wetlands surrounded by undisturbed uplands - Wetlands adjacent to parks	- Wetlands fringing developed areas	- Wetlands fringing industrial or urban areas if significant amounts of trash have collected
LANDFORM		- flat	
VEGETATION	- Mature trees - Flowering shrubs - Flowering herbaceous plants	- Non-flowering herbaceous plants or those with inconspicuous flowers - Saplings in disturbed wetlands	- Small areas covered with Salvinia or duckweed
LAND USE	- Recreational areas - Wildlife management		
USER ACTIVITY	- Recreation - Hunting - Bird/nature watching - Fishing		

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

Many of the wetlands are wildlife management areas

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

Lake users have noted that the natural wetland areas are of importance.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 7/12/2012

ZONE: LSZ 4 - Wetlands

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES:

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	X			
LANDFORM		Х		
VEGETATION	Х			
LAND USE	Х			
USER ACTIVITY	Х			
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	Х			
TOTALS	15	2	0	

	TOTAL ASSESSMENT VAL	UE	17		
*The following will give you the value for Spe	ecial Considerations: A sum o	f 3 or more = d	listinct,	1-2 = average, and 0 = m	inimal
Does the zone contain any Cultural or I	Historic Landmarks?		Yes	√ No	
Is this zone, or areas within it, known fo observation?	or its distinct visual quality and		/ Yes	No	
Is this zone free from pollutants and litte	er?	,	/ Yes	No	
Are there other aesthetic elements that	add to this resource?	•	/ Yes	No	
The natural wetland areas are those that use the lake recreat	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	Total "Yes"	3		

✓	MCS
	VIΔ

FORM 1 INVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE (✓) BASIC () FORECASTING () DETAILED () DATE 7/13/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION LSZ 5 - Recreation Area WEATHER VIEWPOINT () ZONE (5) PERSONNEL L. Burbage of CDM Smith WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS YEARS TIME PERIOD

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

Recreation areas surrounding Eufaula Lake include campgrounds, picnic areas, beaches and swimming, and opportunities for fishing, hiking, and nature watching. Marinas located within public recreation areas are considered separately as they have a character distinct from other recreational areas. Many parks are developed with campsites, restrooms, showers, boat ramps, group shelters, playgrounds, and ballfields.

Most recreation areas have undeveloped forest, but only a few have official hiking trails. Recreation area users most often drive through forested areas on their way to more developed park areas. Opportunities for viewing wildlife, meadows, and woodlands are still abundant, however, since the more developed areas are usually bordered by forest, wetland, or Eufaula Lake. Some recreation areas have very developed facilities, with playgrounds and group shelters; these facilities can experience very high usership. As a result, the overall aesthetic the user experiences varies from active play area to tamed nature to back country. Some litter can be present, especially during high use periods, but in general the recreational areas are kept free of significant litter.

Park users questioned during the aesthetics surveys noted that they value the undeveloped shoreline views from park areas, as well as the surrounding undeveloped forest. Most people encountered were fishing or camping. However, other users not observed during the surveys, for example, beach-goers, may value some of the more developed or tamed nature aspects of the recreational areas.

The areas for this similarity zone were established within a 3,000-ft buffer from the normal lake level of 585 feet above mean sea level. Recreation areas were identified from the Eufaula Lake Master Plan and Shoreline Management Plan. Recreational areas included in this similarity zone are those zoned Public Recreation Areas, not including marinas located within Public Recreation Areas.

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

√ No

Yes

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 7/13/2012

NOTES: LSZ 5 - Recreation Area

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	- Undeveloped shoreline - Undeveloped beaches	- Undeveloped Shoreline - Developed beaches	- Rip-rap or bulkheaded
LANDFORM	- Shoreline views of large boulders/escarpments - Views of nearby hills	- Gently sloping shoreline - Flat areas	
VEGETATION	- Undeveloped mature forest - Wildflower meadow	- Grassy parkland	- Bare trampled ground
LAND USE	- Recreation		
USER ACTIVITY	- Recreation		

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

This similarity zone consists of designated recreational areas.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

Recreational area users have noted that they value views of undeveloped shoreline and the surrounding woodlands.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 7/13/2012

ZONE: LSZ 5 - Recreation Area

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES:

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	Х			
LANDFORM		Х		
VEGETATION	Х			
LAND USE	Х			
USER ACTIVITY	Х			
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	X			
TOTALS	15	2	0	

*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or mor	re = distinct, 1-	·2 = average, a	nd 0 = minimal
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	Yes	√ No	
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?	e ✓ Yes	No	
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter? Some litter is present, but the similarity zone is generally litter-free.	√ Yes	No	
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?	√ Yes	No	
Recreational areas are of high value to those visiting Eufaula Lake. Total "Ye	es" 3		

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE

17

✓	MCS	
	VIA	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)		INVENTORY (✓)	
BASIC ()		FORECASTING ()	
DETAILED ()		DATE 6/12/2012	
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lo	ake EIS	TIME	
LOCATION LSZ 6 - Resident	tial - Medium Density	WEATHER	
VIEWPOINT ()	ZONE (6)	PERSONNEL L. Burbage	
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith	
PROJECT DETAILS AND CO	OMMENTS		
		TIME PERIOD	YFARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The Residential - Medium Density LSZ includes area subdivisions and residential neighborhoods, ranging from high-end to modest. A few areas have neglected homes. Many of the neighborhoods are subdivisions of relatively recent construction. This zone includes homes with medium to large size lots; most lots have a lawn. Neighborhoods have developed in areas that have lake access for docks, are near lake access points, or have lake views. In general, neighborhoods tend to be more developed and cleared on the north side of the lake, and more wooded on the south side.

Public comments have included those requesting mowing permits and the ability to clear more viewlines to the lake. Although some of these comments were from people who lived near the lake, many were from developers looking to develop lakefront property for sale.

The areas for this similarity zone were established within a 3,000-ft buffer from the normal lake level of 585 feet above mean sea level using the USGS 2006 National Land Cover Dataset (USGS 2011). The zone consists of developed-open space, developed-low intensity, and developed-medium intensity data. Although some of the data is termed "open space" and "low intensity", the level of development is consistent with medium-density development in the Eufaula Lake area, such as residential subdivisions.

SUAL RESOURCE	INVENTORY/F	ORECAST		FORM 2	2 VIA	
SIMILARITY ZONE (()		INVENTORY (✓)			_
BASIC ()	,		FORECASTING ()			
` '			` '			
DETAILED ()			DATE <i>6/12/2012</i>			
PROJECT NAME Eufo			TIME			
LOCATION LSZ 6 - Re	sidential - Medium	Density	WEATHER			
VIEWPOINT ()	ZONE (6)		PERSONNEL L. Burk	bage		
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT		CDM Smith	3		
, ,		FLAN ()				
PROJECT DETAILS AN	ND COMMENTS		of			
			TIME PERIOD	YEARS		_
WATER						
RESOURCE	STREAM	RIVER	✓ LAKE/RES	WETLANDS	MARINE	
	NONE		•			
	•	MEANDER	SWIFT	RAPID	FALLS	
SCALE	SMALL		✓ MEDIUM		√ LARGE	
LANDFORM						
TYPE	COASTAL	√ PLAINS	√ ROLLING HILLS	√ HILLS	MOUNTAINS	
		•				
VEGETATION					,	
COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	√ 50-75%	√ 75-100%	
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	✓ PRESENT	SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE	
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT	0020171111111	SUBSTANTIAL	
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		V PRESENT		SUBSTAINTIAL	
LAND/WATER USE						
INTENSITY	WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	RURAL	√ SUBURBAN	URBAN	
TYPE	RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	/	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL	
			·			
ACCESS	TDAII	\A(A) \(\alpha\)	(OFOOND DD	(DDIMADY DD	LUCLBAVAV	00/
TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	✓ SECOND. RD.	✓PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	BOA
USER ACTIVITY						
DEGREE	LOW		√ MEDIUM		HIGH	
FREQUENCY	LOW		MEDIUM		√ HIGH	
					•	
LITTER/POLLUTION	,					
AMOUNT	NONE		√ PRESENT		EXTENSIVE	
ADJACENT SCENERY	•					
	NOT		√ SOMEWHAT		VERY	
SIMILARITY	NOT		SOMEWHAT		VERT	
SOUNDS						
PRESENCE	ABSENT		√ PRESENT		DOMINANT	
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓INCONSPICUOUS	S	✓ HARMONIOUS	
	•					
SMELLS			/			
PRESENCE	ABSENT		√ PRESENT		DOMINANT	
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓INCONSPICUOU	S	HARMONIOUS	
VICIDII ITV						
VISIBILITY			/		/	
AMOUNT	SCREENED		✓PARTIALLY SCRI	EENED	PANORAMA	
POSITION	INFERIOR		√NORMAL		✓ SUPERIOR	
Door this area contain	any athar aignifican	t attributas?	Vaa	√ No		
Does this area contain a lf yes, explain	any other significan	i ailiibules?	Yes	▼ INO		
11 700, Oxpidit						
Is this area known for it	s wildlife observatio	n?	Yes	√ No		
December 1		. 1. 2. 1	V	√ No		
Does this area contain	any other cultural oi	nistoric landmarks?	Yes	▼ No		

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 6/12/2012

NOTES: LSZ 6 - Residential - Medium Density

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	- Parorama views of the lake - Views of undeveloped shoreline	- Views of shoreline in neighborhoods	- Views of highly developed shoreline - Views of high-density docks
LANDFORM	- Steep hills	- Rolling hills - Flat land	
VEGETATION	- Forested neighborhoods	- Turf - Specimen trees - Landscaped yards	- Yards with few trees - Neglected yards
LAND USE		- Residential - Schools - Churches	- Neighborhoods that are particularly run down
USER ACTIVITY		- Residential	

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 6/12/2012

ZONE: LSZ 6 - Residential - Medium Density

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES:

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		Х		All levels are present, however the typical view is of neighborhood shorelines
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION		Х		All levels are present, however the typical view is of neighborhood yards.
LAND USE		X		
USER ACTIVITY		Х		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		X		
TOTALS	0	12	0	

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE	12		
*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more	= distinct, 1	1-2 = average, and 0 = minima	al
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	Yes	✓ No	
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?	Yes	√ No	
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?	√ Yes	No	
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?	Yes	✓ No	
Total "Yes	."1	_	

✓	MCS
	VIA

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)		INVENTORY (✓)	
BASIC ()		FORECASTING ()	
DETAILED ()		DATE 8/10/2012	
PROJECT NAME Eufaula La	ike EIS	TIME	
LOCATION LSZ 7 - Urban ar	nd Commercial/Industrial	WEATHER	
VIEWPOINT ()	ZONE (7)	PERSONNEL L. Burbage	
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith	
PROJECT DETAILS AND CO	DMMENTS		
		TIME PERIOD	YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The Urban and Industrial/Commercial similarity zone occupies very little area in the study area. It consists of downtown areas, shopping centers, small industrial businesses, and self-storage facilities. It is mostly concentrated around Eufaula and includes the downtown area of Eufaula and small commercial/industrial operations northwest of Eufaula near the intersection of US 69 and Highway 9. Other areas include those near the intersection of US 69 and Highway 150, and small areas in Crowder and north of Porum Landing. The areas in this similarity zone are not adjacent to Eufaula Lake; rather, they are set back from the shoreline and are typically not visible from the lake nor have a view of it.

These areas are largely paved with little vegetation; some are unpaved. Downtown Eufaula is well-maintained and attractive for tourism. Shopping areas outside of downtown Eufaula vary from well-maintained to somewhat neglected. Industrial areas are generally unattractive to passer-by. Downtown Eufaula has some litter, although not a lot. The few industrial areas can often be very littered or have junk piles. Shopping areas can vary from having little litter to rather littered.

The areas for this similarity zone were established within a 3,000-ft buffer from the normal lake level of 585 feet above mean sea level using the USGS 2006 National Land Cover Dataset (USGS 2011). The zone consists of developed - high intensity data. In the Eufaula Lake area, this data corresponds to urban centers, small industrial facilities, and shopping areas. It should be noted that, although there are urban centers other than Eufaula near Eufaula Lake, these areas are not within the 3,000-ft buffer study area.

FORM 2

SUAL RESOURCE	INVENTORT/F	URECAST		FORIVI 2	VIA	_
SIMILARITY ZONE (′)	I	NVENTORY (√)			
BASIC ()	•		FORECASTING ()			
DETAILED ()			DATE 8/10/2012			
PROJECT NAME Eufo	rula Lako EIC		TIME			
LOCATION LSZ 7 - Url			WEATHER			
VIEWPOINT ()	ZONE (7)		PERSONNEL L. Burb	age		
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT	PLAN ()	CDM Smith			
PROJECT DETAILS AN	ND COMMENTS		of			
		-	TIME PERIOD	YEARS		_
WATER						
	CTDEAM	םו/בם	LAKE/DEC	WETLANDS	MADINE	
RESOURCE	STREAM	RIVER	LAKE/RES	WETLANDS	MARINE	
MOVEMENT	NONE	MEANDER	SWIFT	RAPID	FALLS	
SCALE	SMALL		MEDIUM		LARGE	
LANDFORM						
TYPE	COASTAL	√ PLAINS	ROLLING HILLS	HILLS	MOUNTAINS	
		•				
VEGETATION		10.000	0= =00/		== 40051	
COVER	0	√ 0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%	
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	PRESENT	SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE	
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL	
LAND/WATER USE						
	WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	RURAL	SUBURBAN	√ URBAN	
INTENSITY					· /	
TYPE	RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	√ COMMERCIAL	✓ INDUSTRIAL	
ACCESS						
TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	✓PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	В
				•		
USER ACTIVITY						
DEGREE	LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH	
FREQUENCY	LOW		MEDIUM		√ HIGH	
LITTER/POLLUTION						
	NONE		√ PRESENT		/ EVTENION/E	
AMOUNT	NONE		♦ PRESENT		✓ EXTENSIVE	
ADJACENT SCENERY						
SIMILARITY	√ NOT		√ SOMEWHAT		VERY	
SOUNDS						
	ADCENT		DDECENT		DOMINIANT	
PRESENCE	ABSENT		PRESENT		DOMINANT	
TYPE	DISCORDANT		INCONSPICUOUS	5	HARMONIOUS	
SMELLS			,			
PRESENCE	ABSENT		PRESENT		DOMINANT	
TYPE	DISCORDANT		INCONSPICUOUS	3	HARMONIOUS	
	DIOGORDANI		,	-	,	
VISIBILITY			1			
AMOUNT	SCREENED		√ PARTIALLY SCRE	ENED	PANORAMA	
POSITION	INFERIOR		NORMAL		SUPERIOR	
Does this area contain a	any other significan	t attributas?	Yes	√ No		
If yes, explain	arry ourier significant	เ สเบเมนเธอ !	169	₩ INU		
ii yoo, expiaiii				,		
Is this area known for its	s wildlife observatio	n?	Yes	√ No		
D		,,,,,,,,,,	.,	√ No		
Does this area contain a	any other cultural o	r historic landmarks?	Yes	V No		

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 8/10/2012

NOTES: LSZ 7 - Urban and Commercial/Industrial

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES			- Drainage ditches
LANDFORM		- Generally flat terrain	
VEGETATION		- Street trees - Maintained turf	- Mowed areas (not maintained turf) - Barren ground
LAND USE	- Downtown Eufaula	- Shopping centers	- Industrial areas
USER ACTIVITY	- Tourism	- Shopping - Employment	

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Local zoning and ordinances may affect land use and industrial operations.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

Downtown Eufaula is attractive for tourists.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 8/10/2012

ZONE: LSZ 7 - Urban and Commercial/Industrial

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES:

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES			X	Very few water resources - only a few drainage ditches
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION			Х	Vegetation is generally lacking or poorly maintained
LAND USE		X		
USER ACTIVITY		X		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		Х		
TOTALS	0	8	2	

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VA	LUE10	
*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum	of 3 or more = distinct,	1-2 = average, and 0 = minimal
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	Yes	√ No
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality an observation?	d/or wildlife Yes	√ No
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?	Yes	√ No
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?	√ Yes	No
Downtown Eufaula is attractive for tourism.	Total "Yes" 1	

	✓ MCS		
FORM 1	VIA		

	SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)		INVENTORY (✓)	
	BASIC ()		FORECASTING ()	
	DETAILED ()		DATE 8/11/2012	
	PROJECT NAME Eufaula Els	S	TIME	
	LOCATION LSZ 8 - Transpor	rtation	WEATHER	
	VIEWPOINT ()	ZONE (8)	PERSONNEL L. Burbage	
	WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM SMith	
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS				
			TIME PERIOD	YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This zone consists of highway and primary road corridors that are most frequently traveled. These corridors include the following: US 69, I-40, Highways 9, 9a, 31, 72, 113, and 150, Old Highway 69. The zone also includes railways.

US 69 and I-40 are both divided limited-access highways with wide, cleared edges. State highways are two-lanes with cleared shoulders. Where these roads cross the study area, they offer wide, panoramic views of Eufaula Lake, partially screened views of secluded coves and wetlands, and often dramatic views of the surrounding topography. This is especially the case on bridges and causeways.

Scenic vistas from bridges and causeways have been identified as being of particular importance. These vistas offer views of varying terrain, geologic formations, and vegetative cover that are unique as compared to the surrounding plains. A consideration of the Eufaula Lake Project was to protect and maintain "natural vegetation and shorelines in both undeveloped and underdeveloped areas of the lake ... so as to provide a visual quality and ecological quality that is lacking in many other recreation projects throughout the nation" (USACE 2010).

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL () COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula EIS DATE 8/11/2012

NOTES: LSZ 8 - Transportation PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	- Eufaula Lake - Secluded coves		
LANDFORM	- Hills, ridges, and geologic formations	- Flat areas	
VEGETATION	- Forested hillsides - Wetlands	- Residential landscaping - Commercial landscaping	- Cleared or barren areas
LAND USE		- Highway/Major Road - Railroad	
USER ACTIVITY		- Travel - Transport of goods	

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

Attractive and interesting views of Eufaula Lake are of particular importance for tourism and recreation.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula EIS

DATE 8/11/2012

ZONE: LSZ 8 - Transportation

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES: Ratings are for views from the Transportation

similarity zone.

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	Х			Rating is for views of the surrounding area from the Transportation similarity zone
LANDFORM	Х			Rating is for views of the surrounding area from the Transportation similarity zone
VEGETATION	Х			Rating is for views of the surrounding area from the Transportation similarity zone
LAND USE		Х		
USER ACTIVITY		Х		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		Х		
TOTALS	9	6	0	

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE	15
*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or	more = distinct, 1-2 = average, and 0 = minimal
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	Yes ✓ No
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wil observation?	dlife ✓ Yes No
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?	Yes ✓ No
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource? Views of Eufaula Lake and the surrounding topography and vegetation from transportation corridors are considered unique and valuable. Total	✓ Yes No

✓	MCS
	VΙΔ

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1 SIMILARITY ZONE (✓) INVENTORY (✓) FORECASTING () BASIC () DETAILED () DATE 7/23/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION LSZ 9 - Marinas WEATHER VIEWPOINT () PERSONNEL L. Burbage ZONE (9) of CDM Smith WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The Marinas similarity zone includes the following:

- · Eufaula Lake Marina at Eufaula Lake State Park
- · Belle Starr Marina at Belle Starr Park
- · Eufaula Cove Marina in Eufaula
- · Dutchess Creek Marina at Porum Landing
- · Cole's Evergreen Marina near Brooken Cove
- · Highway 9 Marina at Highway 9 Landing
- · Area 51 Marina at Arrowhead State Park

This zone includes the land occupied by the marinas as well as docks, no-wake zones, and adjacent water where the users' views are dominated by marina activities.

The marinas have a somewhat industrial quality due to the materials the docks are constructed of (sheet metal, metal poles, plastic floats, etc) as well as the general upkeep of the landscape. The marinas are kept as functional places where users are not generally expected to linger. Rather, the marinas are simply an embarkation point for recreational activities. The degree to which the marinas accumulate litter depend on location and seasonality. Litter can especially accumulate where it is wind-blown into wetland areas. Trailers and boat storage can detract considerably from views both from within the marinas and from the water. Many marinas have piles of miscellaneous materials and/or junk. At some locations, such as Belle Starr Marina and portions of Cole's Evergreen Marina, users driving on undefined unpaved areas have left the ground barren, eroding, and unattractive.

Marina users experience unpleasant noise and odor more often than in the other similarity zones. Revving boat motors and exhaust are commonplace. Spilled fuel and oil is common in marinas and can create a sheen on the water.

While the overall aesthetic of marinas is not particularly attractive, they do allow users to keep and access their boats so that they can enjoy many other unique scenic qualities and recreational opportunities of Eufaula Lake.

Yes

If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL ()

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 7/23/2012

NOTES: LSZ 9 - Marinas

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	- Panoramic views of Eufaula Lake	- Eufaula Lake coves	- Water and wetlands where litter, fuel, and/or oil has accumulated
LANDFORM		- flat	
VEGETATION	- Forested areas within marinas - Views of adjacent or opposite-shore forestland and wetlands	- Marinas with trees	- Marinas without trees - Barren areas
LAND USE		- Boat moorage	- Land-based boat and trailer storage - Storage of miscellaneous materials - Junk piles - Litter
USER ACTIVITY		- Preparation for recreational activities	

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 7/23/2012

ZONE: LSZ 9 - Marinas

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES:

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES			Х	The water resources most noticeable are those in the immediate dock areas.
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION			Х	The vegetation most noticeable is that in the dock, storage, and boat ramp areas.
LAND USE			Х	
USER ACTIVITY		Х		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*				
TOTALS	0	4	3	Х

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE	7	
*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more =	distinct, 1	-2 = average, and 0 = minimal
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	Yes	✓ No
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?	Yes	√ No
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?	Yes	√ No
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?	Yes	√ No
Total "Yes"	0	-

✓ MCS
VIA

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)		INVENTORY (✓)	
BASIC ()		FORECASTING ()	
DETAILED ()		DATE 7/24/2012	
PROJECT NAME Eufauld	a Lake EIS	TIME	
LOCATION LSZ 10 - High	Density Docks	WEATHER	
VIEWPOINT ()	ZONE (10)	PERSONNEL L. Burbage	
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith	
PROJECT DETAILS AND	COMMENTS		
		TIME PERIOD	YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The High-Density Docks area consists of areas within the lake itself where there are dense concentrations of docks. Quantitative criteria were not used to define these areas; rather, the size of the viewscape, length of shoreline, distance between docks, and sightlines were considered. Areas were delineated based on whether the presence of docks would be a dominating feature in the viewscape.

High-density dock areas are generally in protected coves near residential areas. When in small coves, these areas are not very visible to lake users as the surrounding landscape and vegetation screens their view; however, larger coves are more easily seen by people boating on the lake and on opposite shores.

The size of docks varies greatly. Some docks are small (for one or two boats) and uncovered - these docks are relatively unobtrusive. Other docks with roofs and storage areas block the view of the surrounding water and landscape and are much more noticeable. Some docks are very large and accommodate many boats. These roofed docks generally have a storage area for each slip. They can be a very dominating feature in the landscape.

Some public comments have complained about litter near docks, including pieces of styrofoam floats that have broken off. A few comments complained about the visual quality of areas with dense docks. Noise levels can at times be obtrusive in high-density dock areas due to the number of people, use of radios, revving boat motors, and the fact that the water allows sound to travel well. Exhaust fumes can also occasionally be obrustive.

High-density dock areas can be unattractive in the landscape, especially when they block views of the shore and the surrounding topography does not offer views of the unique landscape and geology of the Eufaula Lake area. However, many public comments complained about the moratorium on new dock construction, and many requested that their particular properties be allowed to have docks. It is clear that many lakeshore landowners want to construct a dock so they can have a boat at their property so they can enjoy many of the scenic and aquatic amenities Eufaula Lake has to offer.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL ()

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 7/24/2012

NOTES: LSZ 10 - High Density Docks

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES		- Eufaula Lake coves	- Shore views dominated or blocked by docks
LANDFORM	- Adjacent land with varying topography and geological features - Adjacent beaches	- Flat adjacent land	- Flat adjacent land where the view is blocked by docks
VEGETATION	- Adjacent natural areas	- Adjacent maintained residential landscapes with trees	- Adjacent residential landscapes without trees
LAND USE	- Adjacent natural areas	- Adjacent well-maintained residences	- Adjacent poorly-maintained residences
USER ACTIVITY		- Residential recreation	

Are there any federal/state/local (institutional) policies that directly affect the visual and aesthetic resources of the area? If so, then list below.

Eufaula Lake and as bordering government lands are managed by USACE. The USACE Shoreline Management Plan and Eufaula Lake Master Plan guide land use of government lands by adjacent residences, dock permissibility and density, public recreation, wildlife management, and other purposes.

Note any important technical recognition in the area, i.e. important scenic areas often used for literary/artistic purposes, wildlife habitat, archaeological site, etc.

Note other important issues concerning aesthetic resources that you think will affect the assessment.

√ MCS

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE 7/24/2012

ZONE: LSZ 10 - High Density Docks

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

NOTES:

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES			Х	Docks block views of water resources or dominate the view
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION			Х	Docks block views of vegetation and/or dominate the view in many areas of this zone
LAND USE		X		
USER ACTIVITY		Х		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*			X	
TOTALS	0	6	3	

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE	9	
*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more =	distinct, 1-	2 = average, and 0 = minimal
Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?	Yes	✓ No
Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?	Yes	√ No
Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?	Yes	√ No
Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?	Yes	√ No
Total "Yes"	0	

STUDY AREA: Eufaula Lake EIS

DATE: 8/13/2012

PERSONNEL: L. Burbage

MANAGEMENT CLASS TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE

Preservation 17 and above
Retention 14-16
Partial Retention 11-13
Modification 8-10
Rehabilitation 7 and below

	ZONE #	TAV	CLASSIFICATION	COMMENTS
1.	Forest	18	Preservation	
2.	Grassland/Pasture/Prairie	12	Partial Retention	
3.	Farmland	14	Retention	
4.	Wetlands	17	Preservation	
5.	Recreation Area	17	Preservation	
6.	Residential – Medium Density	12	Partial Retention	
7.	Urban – Commercial/Industrial	10	Modification	
8.	Transportation	15	Retention	
9.	Marinas	7	Rehabilitation	
10.	High-Density Docks	9	Modification	
Gen	eral Regional Landscape	15	Retention	

Appendix B

VRAP Visual Impact Assessment Forms



VICILAL DE	SOURCE IN		
VISITAL RE	SOURCE IN	V = NI () K Y / F	-CIRECASI

MCS √ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY (✓)		
BASIC (✓)		FORECASTING ()		
DETAILED ()		DATE 2/21/2012		
PROJECT NAME Eufau	la Lake EIS	TIME 12:30 PM		
LOCATION Near Dutche	ess Creek Island	WEATHER Sunny and co	old	
VIEWPOINT (1)	ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL L. Burbag	e & M. Petty	
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND	COMMENTS			
		TIME PERIOD	YEARS	

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the shoreline east of Dutchess Creek Island, facing east. The shoreline view consists of a mix of forested land, large maintained lawns with mature trees, and residences. One dock with two slips is present.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, forest, lawns, and residences

Background: Sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl

Noise: Quiet waves. Activity: None.

The viewscape is a moderately developed shoreline with well-maintained houses/yards. The viewscape is typical of a moderately developed shore on this lake in the northern crosstimbers ecoregion, with a mix of oak forest and grassland on a terrain of low hills and plains.

Yes

If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

MILDIN	RESOURCE	INVENTORY	/EODECAST

MCS ✓ VIA

_				1 01111111
	SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY (✓)	
	BASIC (✓)		FORECASTING ()	
	DETAILED ()		DATE 4/12/2012	
	PROJECT NAME Eufaula L	ake EIS	TIME 9:00 AM	
	LOCATION Near Dutchess	Creek Island	WEATHER Sunny and mild	
	VIEWPOINT (1)	ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL L. Burbage & N	1. Petty
	WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith	
	PROJECT DETAILS AND CO	OMMENTS		
			TIME PERIOD	YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the shoreline east of Dutchess Creek Island, facing east. The shoreline view consists of a mix of forested land, large maintained lawns with mature trees, and residences. One dock with two slips is present.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, forest, lawns, and residences

Background: Sky

Wildlife: None Noise: Quiet waves. Activity: None.

The viewscape is a moderately developed shoreline with well-maintained houses/yards. The viewscape is typical of a moderately developed shore on this lake in the northern crosstimbers ecoregion, with a mix of oak forest and grassland on a terrain of low hills and plains.

Trees are in leaf and screen the residences and yards such that they are not very noticable, giving a rural aesthetic.

Yes

If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

VISUAL RESOURCE IN	IVENTORY/FORECAST			FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY ()			
BASIC (√)		FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()		DATE			
PROJECT NAME Eufaul	a Lake EIS	TIME			
LOCATION Near Dutche	ss Creek Island	WEATHER			
VIEWPOINT (1)	ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL L. E	Burbage		
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of CDM Smi	ith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND	COMMENTS				
		TIME PERIOD	25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline and uplands east of Dutchess Creek Island, facing east, in 25 years under the No Action Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently. The left side of the viewscape would be zoned Protected, and the right side would be zoned Limited Development. It is likely that a small number of docks would be built adjacent to existing some residences in the limited development area. Since the area is moderately developed with residences and has supporting roadways, it is likely that a couple additional houses and docks would be built on this shoreline. It was assumed that the yards of the new houses would be cleared similar to others nearby; extending close to the shore while keeping larger landscape trees as well as those over four-inches diameter within the government-owned shoreland. As such, the houses would be rather visible from the water during the winter but relatively well screened during the growing season.

The viewer would notice slightly more houses and docks under the No Action Alternative than are currently present. The aesthetic would therefore be more rural-residential than rural.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS √ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✔)	FORECASTING (✓)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Near Dutchess Creek Island	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 1 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline east of Dutchess Creek Island, facing east, in 25 years under Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 1, the shoreline allocations in this viewscape all be zoned as Protected and owners of any houses that might be built would not be able to clear within the government-owned shoreline and would be screened from view. The viewscape is expected to remain as it is currently. The viewer would see a much more rural landscape than under the No-Action Alternative.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Near Dutchess Creek Island	DATE TIME		

WEATHER

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

ALTERNATIVE ()

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 1

WITHOUT FLAN CONDITION			Ī	Ī	I	I	I	1
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	С	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	SC	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	SC	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
√	
\checkmark	
	√
2	

Total

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✔)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Near Dutchess Creek Island	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 2 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the water of the shoreline east of Dutchess Creek Island in 25 years, facing east, under Alternative 2.

Under Alternative 2, the shoreline allocations in this viewscape would be the same as under the No Action Alternative, with the exception that the Limited Development Zone would have a 70-foot conservation buffer. As such, houses that would be built would not be able to mow to the water's edge. This buffer is unlikely to provide much additional screening, however, since the native vegetation in this area consists of thin dry oak forest.

The viewscape at this location is expected to be the same under Alternative 2 as under the No Action Alternative. The aesthetic would be somewhat rural-residential.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6	

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Near Dutchess Creek Island VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 1 ALTERNATIVE (2) DATE TIME WEATHER

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

of CDM Smith

✓ VIA

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION					1			
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	С	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	С	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		√,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES NO

Total

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Near Dutchess Creek Island	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 3 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline east of Dutchess Creek Island, facing east, in 25 years under Alternative 3.

Under Alternative 3, the Protected shoreline allocation in this viewscape would be change to Limited Development. The shoreline in this view would have a 45-foot baseline buffer. As such, houses that would be built would not be able to mow to the water's edge. This buffer is unlikely to provide much additional screening, however, since the native vegetation in this area consists of thin dry oak forest.

Since docks would be permitted in areas previously zoned Protected, development pressure is expected to increase and residences with docks are likely to be constructed. As such, the viewscape at this location is expected to be much more residential than under the No Action Alternative.

ASSESSI	// ENT

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS
LOCATION Near Dutchess Creek Island
VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 1

DATE TIME WEATHER

ALTERNATIVE (3)

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION								•
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	S	
VEGETATION	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	S	
LANDUSE	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		√,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

 $[\]ensuremath{^{\star}}\xspace The following will give you the value for Special Considerations:$

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES NO

Total

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Near Dutchess Creek Island	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 4 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline east of Dutchess Creek Island, facing east, in 25 years under Alternative 4.

Under Alternative 4, the Protected shoreline allocation in this viewscape would be change to Limited Development. The shoreline in this view would have a 45-foot baseline buffer. As such, houses that would be built would not be able to mow to the water's edge. This buffer is unlikely to provide much additional screening, however, since the native vegetation in this area consists of thin dry oak forest.

Since docks would be permitted in areas previously zoned Protected, development pressure is expected to increase and residences with docks are likely to be constructed. As such, the viewscape at this location is expected to be much more residential than under the No Action Alternative.

VIEWBOINT	ASSESSMENT	
VIEWPOINI	ASSESSMENT	

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Near Dutchess Creek Island VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 1

DATE TIME **WEATHER**

ALTERNATIVE (4)

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION	i		ı	ı	1	ı	ı	i
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В	Α		-1	SC	MI	D D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	S	
VEGETATION	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	S	
LANDUSE	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations:

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
✓	
✓	
	√
2	

Total

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1 ✓ VIA INVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE () BASIC (√) FORECASTING () DETAILED () DATE 2/21/2012 TIME 1:15 PM PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East WEATHER Sunny and cold VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage and M. Petty of CDM Smith WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS YEARS TIME PERIOD

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the shoreline and uplands at Standing Rock Cut, facing southwest through the cut. The landform consists of the rolling hills of north and south sides of Standing Rock Cut. The right side of the view (the north side of the cut) consists of a forested land and a shoreline with an undeveloped aesthetic. The left side of the view (the south side of the cut) consists of medium-density residences with large maintained lawns, lots cleared to the shoreline, and scattered trees. As a result, the shoreline on the south side has a highly developed aesthetic. Four large covered docks are present on this side. The water of Lake Eufaula and the sky are also dominant features in this viewscape.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, forest, lawns, and residences

Background: Sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl

Noise: Quiet waves. Activity: None.

Yes

If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

	MCS
✓	VIA

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

INVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE () BASIC (√) FORECASTING () DETAILED () DATE 4/12/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME 10:15 AM WEATHER Sunny and mild LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage of CDM Smith WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS YEARS TIME PERIOD

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the shoreline and uplands at Standing Rock Cut, facing southwest through the cut. The landform consists of the rolling hills of north and south sides of Standing Rock Cut. The right side of the view (the north side of the cut) consists of a forested land and a shoreline with an undeveloped aesthetic. The left side of the view (the south side of the cut) consists of medium-density residences with large maintained lawns, lots cleared to the shoreline, and scattered trees. Summer leaves on the trees provide minor screening of residences. As a result, the shoreline on the south side has a highly developed aesthetic. Four large covered docks are present on this side. The water of Lake Eufaula and the sky are also dominant features in this viewscape.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, forest, lawns, and residences

Background: Sky

Wildlife: None Noise: Quiet waves Activity: None

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline and uplands at Standing Rock Cut, facing southwest through the cut, in 25 years under the No Action Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently. The left and right sides of the viewscape would be zoned Limited Development, and the center would be zoned Protected. The left-hand side of the view is developed, but a couple more docks are likely to be built. On the right-hand side, a dock is likely to be built at the existing residence, but this area is slightly further in the distance.

The viewer would notice a slight increase in the density of docks; however, this would have a minor effect due to the large docks that are already visible.

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()		
DETAILED ()	DATE 4/12/2012		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME 10:15 AM		
LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East	WEATHER Sunny and mild		
VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 1 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline and uplands at Standing Rock Cut, facing southwest through the cut, in 25 years under Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 1, the Limited Development shoreline allocations change to Protected. Existing docks would be grandfathered. Since no additional docks would be permitted, development pressure for lakeshore residences is expected to be low. As a result, the viewscape is expected to remain similar to current conditions.

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 2

ALTERNATIVE (2)

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION								•
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
√	
✓	
	✓
2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (√)		
BASIC (√)	FORECASTING ()		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 2 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the water of the shoreline and uplands at Standing Rock Cut, facing southwest through the cut, in 25 years under Alternative 2.

Under the Alternative 2, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently. The left and right sides of the viewscape would be zoned Limited Development, and the center would be zoned Protected. The left-hand side of the view is developed, but a couple more docks are likely to be built. On the right-hand side, a dock is likely to be built at the existing residence, but this area is slightly further in the distance.

The viewer would notice a slight increase in the density of docks; however, this would have a minor effect due to the large docks that are already visible.

This alternative would have the same visual effect as the No Action Alternative.

Yes

Yes

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (1/)	DETAILED ()		

DATE

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 2

TIME ALTERNATIVE (2)

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

WEATHER PERSONNEL L. Burbage

of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN GONDITION	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY Compatible C Somewhat Compatible C Not Compatible	ALE CONTRAST Minimal Moderate Severe	ATIAL DOMINANCE Subordinant Co-dominant Dominant	
	DIST	AVEI	MINIMAL	DIFF	COM COM SC S	SCAI MI N MO N S S	SPATIAL S Subor C Co-dc D Domii	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	С	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	MI	С	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	_
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0	С	МІ		

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIF	I CANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		\		
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓		

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES 2

		MCS	
	FORM 1	√ VIA	
INVENTORY (✓)			
FORECASTING ()			
DATE			
TIME			
WEATHER			
PERSONNEL I Burhage			

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

FORE BASIC (✓) DETAILED () DATE PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East **WEAT** VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE () **PERS** WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 3 WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

TIME PERIOD

This view is from the water of the shoreline and uplands at Standing Rock Cut, facing southwest through the cut, in 25 years under Alternative 3.

Under the Alternative 3, the Protected shoreline would change to Limited Development. The shoreline in this view would have a 45-ft baseline buffer. A large portion of the viewscape would become available for docks. Private land in this the new Limited Development area is located close to the shoreline, and the topography is conducive to development. As such, development pressure would be expected to increase in this newly available area.

The viewer would notice a considerable increase in residences and docks as compared to the No Action Alternative.

This alternative would have the same visual effect as the Alternative 4.

Yes

Yes

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS
LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East
VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 2

ALTERNATIVE (3)

DATE TIME WEATHER

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

of CDM Smith

✓ VIA

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIF	I CANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		\		
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓		

 $[\]ensuremath{^{\star}}\xspace The following will give you the value for Special Considerations:$

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
✓	
✓	_
	√
2	

	MCS			
FORM 1	√ VIA			
		_		

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

INVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE () FORECASTING () BASIC (√) DETAILED () DATE PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East **WEATHER** VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 4 WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS YEARS TIME PERIOD

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the shoreline and uplands at Standing Rock Cut, facing southwest through the cut, in 25 years under Alternative 4.

Under the Alternative 4, the Protected shoreline would change to Limited Development. The shoreline in this view would have a 45-ft baseline buffer. A large portion of the viewscape would become available for docks. Private land in this the new Limited Development area is located close to the shoreline, and the topography is conducive to development. As such, development pressure would be expected to increase in this newly available area.

The viewer would notice a considerable increase in residences and docks as compared to the No Action Alternative.

This alternative would have the same visual effect as the Alternative 3.

Yes

Yes

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

/IEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6	

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Standing Rock Cut - East VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 2

ALTERNATIVE (4)

DATE TIME **WEATHER**

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

of CDM Smith

✓ VIA

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT I EAR CONDITION	Ì	I	I	I	Ī	Ī	Ī	1
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В	Α		-1	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		√,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
√	
✓	
	✓
2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1 ✓ VIA NVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE () BASIC (√) FORECASTING () DETAILED () DATE 2/21/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME 3:00 PM LOCATION Roundtree Landing WEATHER Sunny and cold VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage and M. Petty WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith WITH PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the shoreline on the north side of Roundtree Landing, facing west. The view consists of undeveloped forested land and wetlands surrounding a small cove. The landform gently slopes towards the shore, such that only the land near the shoreline is visible. Vegetation in winter is dense in some locations, but less so in others, allowing glimipses into a few more open areas within deciduous trees. Small areas of shoreline are eroding with vertical banks, but combined with the wild aesthetic of the land, they lend a sense of the sublime as small demonstrations of the power of nature. The water of Lake Eufaula and the sky are dominant features in this viewscape. This view offers excellent opportunities for viewing wildlife.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, forest, and wetland

Background: Sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl

Noise: Quiet waves. Activity: None.

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

√ No

Yes

VISUAL RESOURCE INVE	NTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY (✓)		
BASIC (✔)		FORECASTING ()		
DETAILED ()		DATE 4/12/2012		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula La	ke EIS	TIME 3:00 PM		
LOCATION Roundtree Landi	ng	WEATHER Sunny and mild		
VIEWPOINT (3)	ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND CO	MMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the water of the shoreline on the north side of Roundtree Landing, facing west. The view consists of undeveloped forested land and wetlands surrounding a small cove. The landform gently slopes towards the shore, such that only the land near the shoreline is visible. The growing season vegetation is dense compared to the dry forested slopes that surround Eufaula Lake and the viewscape is welcoming and serene, with a sense of mystery due to the curvature of the cove. Small areas of shoreline are eroding with vertical banks. The water of Lake Eufaula and the sky are dominant features in this viewscape. This view offers excellent opportunities for viewing wildlife.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, forest, and wetland

Background: Sky

Wildlife: None Noise: Quiet waves Activity: None

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✔)	FORECASTING (✓)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Roundtree Landing	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline on the north side of Roundtree Landing, facing west, in 25 years under the No Acton Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently. No development would be permitted, and the viewscape would remain serene with a sense of mystery due to the curvature of the cove. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent.

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✔)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Roundtree Landing	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 1 WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline on the north side of Roundtree Landing, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 1. Under this alternative, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently. No development would be permitted, and the viewscape would remain serene with a sense of mystery due to the curvature of the cove. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent.

This alternative would have the same visual impact as the No Action Alternative.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	DATE		
LOCATION Roundtree Landing	TIME		
VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 3	WEATHER		
ALTERNATIVE (1)	PERSONNEL L. B urbage		

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	С	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		√,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\
✓	
✓	
	√
2	

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Roundtree Landing	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 2 WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME DEDIOD 25	VEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline on the north side of Roundtree Landing, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 2. Under this alternative, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently. No development would be permitted, and the viewscape would remain serene with a sense of mystery due to the curvature of the cove. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent.

This alternative would have the same visual impact as the No Action Alternative.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	DATE		
LOCATION Roundtree Landing	TIME		
VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 3	WEATHER		
ALTERNATIVE (2)	PERSONNEL L. B urbage		

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION								1
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	С	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B	·		0	С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B	_	0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES NO

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Roundtree Landing	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 3 WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline on the north side of Roundtree Landing, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 3. Under this alternative, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently. No development would be permitted, and the viewscape would remain serene with a sense of mystery due to the curvature of the cove. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent.

This alternative would have the same visual impact as the No Action Alternative.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✔)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	DATE		
LOCATION Roundtree Landing	TIME		
VIEW/DOINT MAD REFERENCE 2	WEATHER		

PERSONNEL L. B urbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

ALTERNATIVE (3)

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT I LAN CONDITION	i	1	1	1	1	ı	ı	1
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	С	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
✓	
✓	
	√
2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Roundtree Landing	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 4 WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the water of the shoreline on the north side of Roundtree Landing, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 4. Under this alternative, the shoreline allocations would change to Public Recreation. A lease to the Carlton Landing development would be granted for the construction and operation of a public marina. The marina would offer 300 to 400 slips in several large covered docks. The marina would occupy a large portion of the water in the cove and would dominate the visual landscape. Tent campsites and passive recreation would be offered on the right-hand side of the view, but these areas would not be as noticeable as the marina.

The marina would likely to be very active during summer months. If this marina is similar to other marinas on Eufaula Lake, it would have a somewhat industrial quality due to the materials the docks are constructed of (sheet metal, metal poles, plastic floats, etc) as well as the general upkeep of the marina landscape. The degree to which the marina and cove might accumulate litter would depend on management practices and seasonality. Litter can especially accumulate where it is wind-blown into wetland areas.

Under Alternative 4, the viewer would experience unpleasant noise and odor (typical of marinas) that would not be experienced under the No Action alternative. Revving boat motors and exhaust would commonplace. Spilled fuel and oil is common in marinas and would likely create an occasional sheen on the water in some areas of the cove.

The overall aesthetic of this location under Alternative 4 would be dramatically different than the No Action alternative. The serene aesthetic of the cove would be lost, opportunities for viewing wildlife would be restricted to the right-hand side, and wildlife would likely be disturbed due to the activity in the area. Fishing from boats would most likely not often occur at this location under Alternative 4, as users would motor to more remote locations to fish due to the increased noise, water disturbance, and in-lake timber clearing.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSM	ENT					F(ORM 6	√ VIA	_
BASIC (✓)			DE	ETAILED) ()				-
PROJECT NAME Eufaula LOCATION Roundtree La VIEWPOINT MAP REFER ALTERNATIVE (4)	ınding		TII	ATE ME EATHEF ERSONN	R NEL <i>L. B urbo</i>	age			
PROJECT DETAILS AND	COMMEN	NTS		,	of <i>CDM Smit</i>	h			_
USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION									
USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION	I								
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS	
WATER RESOURCES	В		А	-2	NC NC	S S	С		-
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	S	S		_
VEGETATION	В	Α		-1	SC	S	S		-
LANDUSE	В		Α	-2	NC	S	D		-
USER ACTIVITY	В	Α		-1	SC	S	D	With-plan user activity is an average or right side of the view, and minimal va	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		В	А	-1					_
LANDSCAPE COMPOSIT	ION			INC	ONSPICOUS	SIGNI	FICANT	PROMINENT	_
Er and Gorn E Gorni Gorn		WITH P	LAN		01101 10000	0.014		√	-
		WITHO	UT PLAN			1			- -
*The following will give you A sum of 3 or more distinct	i, 1-2 avei	rage, and	0 minimal			YES	NO NO	_	
Does the zone	COIIIaiii a	iny Cultura	ai 01 1 115101	ic Lanui	iiai No !		Y		
Is this zone, or and/or wildlife			wn for its o	distinct v	isual quality		✓		

0

Total

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

MCS
MCS

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1 ✓ VIA

	SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY (√)				
	BASIC (✔)		FORECASTING ()				
	DETAILED ()		DATE 2/21/2012				
	PROJECT NAME Eufaula La	ake EIS	TIME 2:15 PM				
LOCATION Carlton Landing			WEATHER Sunny and cold				
	VIEWPOINT (4)	ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage and I	M. Petty			
	WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith				
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS							
			TIME PERIOD	YEARS			

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the cove and shoreline at Carlton Landing, facing northwest. The landform on both sides of the cove is of rolling hills, so the land adjacent to the shoreline is most dominant. The left-hand view (the west side of the cove) consists of natural forest (on government-owned property). The understory of the winter forest is relatively thin, allowing a view into the forest interior. Further into the cove on this side, on Carlton Landing property, the view consists of thinned canopy trees with a completely cleared midstory and understory. The view in this area extends through the trees until approximately 250 feet from the shore. Construction activity is slightly visible behind and among the remaining trees. The shoreline along the entire west side of the cove is rocky.

The shoreline on the north (middle) and east (right-hand) sides of the cove, consists of natural forest and wetland. The East side of the cove is the west bank of Roundtree Landing.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, trees and construction

Background: Sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl Noise: Construction equipment.

Activity: Construction behind trees at Carlton Landing. One small boat with two fishermen present.

The natural undisturbed portions of the view are serene and offer excellent opportunities for viewing wildlife. The construction activity at Carlton Landing detracts from the scenic quality considerably, but this activity is temporary.

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

√ No

Yes

	MCS
✓	VIA

FORM 1

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

NVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE () FORECASTING () BASIC (√) DETAILED () DATE 4/12/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME 11:50 PM LOCATION Carlton Landing WEATHER Sunny and mild VIEWPOINT (4) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage of CDM Smith WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the cove and shoreline at Carlton Landing, facing northwest. The landform on both sides of the cove is of rolling hills, so the land adjacent to the shoreline is most dominant. The left-hand view (the west side of the cove) consists of natural forest (on government-owned property). Growing season vegetation limits the depth of the view of the forest interior. Further into the cove on this side, on Carlton Landing property, the view consists of thinned canopy trees with a completely cleared midstory and understory. The view in this area extends through the trees until approximately 250 feet from the shore. Construction activity is slightly visible behind and among the remaining trees. The shoreline along the entire west side of the cove is rocky.

The shoreline on the north (middle) and east (right-hand) sides of the cove, consists of natural forest and wetland. The East side of the cove is the west bank of Roundtree Landing.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, trees and construction

Background: Sky

Wildlife: None

Noise: Construction equipment

Activity: Construction behind trees at Carlton Landing, one small boat with two people fishing

The natural undisturbed portions of the view are serene and offer excellent opportunities for viewing wildlife. The construction activity at Carlton Landing detracts from the scenic quality considerably, but this activity is temporary.

					MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FO	DRECAST			FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)		FORECASTING	(√)		
DETAILED ()		DATE			
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS		TIME			
LOCATION Carlton Landing		WEATHER			
VIEWPOINT (4) ZONE ()		PERSONNEL L	. Burbage		
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT P	LAN (✓)	of CDM Si	mith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS					
		TIME PERIOD	25	YEARS	

This view is from the water of the shoreline at Carlton Landing, facing northwest, in 25 years under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently. Government lands would be zoned Protected, however, the Carlton Landing private lands extend below the shoreline elevation. A waterfront park is planned for this area. Use of the park by residents will increase noise levels and some litter would be expected; however, the park is expected to be an amenity favored by Carlton landing residents.

The No Action Alternative does not grant Carlton Landing the requested lease for a marina of 300 to 400 slips. As a result, it is expected that the development at Carlton Landing would be much smaller than developer's current plan for a mixed-use community. It is expected that the developer would build 140 lots, and that their proposed town center would not be constructed. Under this alternative, the developer has indicated that the area behind the planned waterfront park would consist of multi-family residential buildings. These buildings would be visible through the mature trees of the waterfront park.

The government-owned lands would remain protected under the No Action Alternative, and would exhibit many of the same qualities that are currently present. These areas would be slightly less serene, however, due to increased activity in the Carlton Landing waterfront park area. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent in the government-owned lands.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS √ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (√)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Carlton Landing	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (4) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 1 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PRO IECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the water of the shoreline at Carlton Landing, facing northwest, in 25 years under Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 1, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently at this location. Government lands would be zoned Protected, however, the Carlton Landing private lands extend below the shoreline elevation. A waterfront park is planned for this area. Use of the park by residents will increase noise levels and some litter would be expected; however, the park is expected to be an amenity favored by Carlton landing residents.

Alternative 1 does not grant Carlton Landing the requested lease for a marina of 300 to 400 slips. In addition, the government-owned lakeshore adjacent to other parts of Carlton Landing (i.e. the south side of Longtown Arm) would change from Limited Development to Protected and docks would not be permitted. As a result, it is expected that the development at Carlton Landing would be much smaller than developer's current plan for a mixed-use community. It is expected that the developer would build 140 lots and that their proposed town center would not be constructed (similar to the No Action Alternative). The developer has indicated that the area behind the planned waterfront park would consist of multi-family residential buildings. These buildings would be visible through the mature trees of the waterfront park. There would be fewer docks and less development on adjacent private lands than the No Action Alternative; however, these areas are not part of the viewshed assessed for this location. As a result under Alternative 1, the overall aesthetic of the viewpoint is essentially the same as the No Action Alternative.

The government-owned lands in this view would remain protected under the Alternative 1, and would exhibit many of the same qualities that are currently present. These areas would be slightly less serene, however, due to increased activity in the Carlton Landing waterfront park area. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent in the government-owned lands.

The overall aesthetic effect of Alternative 1 would be extremely similar to that of the No Action Alternative.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✔)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Carlton Landing VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 4 ALTERNATIVE (1)	DATE TIME WEATHER PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS	of CDM Smith		

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	A/B		·	0	С	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B	_	0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

*The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
√	
	√
	√
1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✔)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Carlton Landing	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (4) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 2 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the shoreline at Carlton Landing, facing northwest, in 25 years under Alternative 2.

Under Alternative 2, the shoreline allocations would remain as they are currently at this location. Government lands would be zoned Protected, however, the Carlton Landing private lands extend below the shoreline elevation. A waterfront park is planned for this area. Use of the park by residents will increase noise levels and some litter would be expected; however, the park is expected to be an amenity favored by Carlton landing residents.

Alternative 2 does not grant Carlton Landing the requested lease for a marina of 300 to 400 slips. As a result, it is expected that the development at Carlton Landing would be much smaller than developer's current plan for a mixed-use community. It is expected that the developer would build 140 lots and that their proposed town center would not be constructed (similar to the No Action Alternative). The developer has indicated that the area behind the planned waterfront park would consist of multi-family residential buildings. These buildings would be visible through the mature trees of the waterfront park.

The government-owned lands in this view would remain protected under the Alternative 2, and would exhibit many of the same qualities that are currently present. These areas would be slightly less serene, however, due to increased activity in the Carlton Landing waterfront park area. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent in the government-owned lands.

The overall aesthetic effect of Alternative 2 would be the same as that of the No Action Alternative.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Carlton Landing VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 4 ALTERNATIVE (2)	DATE TIME WEATHER PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>		

of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

WITHOUT FLAN CONDITION			I	I	1	1	1	
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	С	MI	С	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		√,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		I	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
✓	
	√
	√
1	

M	C	S
M	u	S

FORM 1 ✓ VIA SIMILARITY ZONE () INVENTORY () FORECASTING (√) BASIC (√) DETAILED () DATE PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION Carlton Landing WEATHER ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage VIEWPOINT (4) WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 3 WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the shoreline at Carlton Landing, facing northwest, in 25 years under Alternative 3.

Under Alternative 3, the shoreline allocations for government-owned lands would change from Protected to Limited Development at this location. The Carlton Landing private lands extend below the shoreline elevation, however; these lands are not subject to USACE shoreline zoning. A waterfront park is planned for this Carlton Landing private lands in this area. Use of the park by residents will increase noise levels and some litter would be expected; however, the park is expected to be an amenity favored by Carlton landing residents.

Alternative 3 does not grant Carlton Landing the requested lease for a marina of 300 to 400 slips. As a result, it is expected that the development at Carlton Landing would be much smaller than developer's current plan for a mixed-use community. It is expected that the developer would build 140 lots and that their proposed town center would not be constructed (similar to the No Action Alternative). The developer has indicated that the area behind the planned waterfront park would consist of multi-family residential buildings. These buildings would be visible through the mature trees of the waterfront park.

Under Alternative 3, the government-owned lands in this view would change from Protected to Limited Development. However, within the viewshed assessed for this location, these areas are not expected to become developed or have docks. The peninsula of Roundtree Landing (to the east) consists entirely of government-owned property, so houses would not be built, and docks are not permitted on undeveloped land. Docks are also not likely to be built on the government-owned land to the west (within the assessed viewshed), as docks outside the cove (on the south-facing shore) would be be in more suitable locations for developed areas given the Carlton Landing plan and street layout.

The government lands on Roundtree landing would exhibit many of the same qualities that are currently present. These areas would be slightly less serene, however, due to increased activity in the Carlton Landing waterfront park area. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent on Roundtree Landing. However, The government lands within the assessed viewshed on the west side of the cove would most likey have a slightly altered aesthetic. Although a buffer of trees at least 45 feet wide would be required, and there would likely be an even larger forested area remaining between the viewer and residences with shoreline use permits due to the Carlton Landing street layout, views through the trees of cleared areas are likely. In addition, it is likely that Carlton Landing residents will walk through and/or recreate at this location, which could result in trampling vegetation and the accumulation of litter as sometimes occurs on other non-maintained lands that the public have access to on Eufaula Lake.

Docks and development on other adjacent land (i.e. the south side of Longtown Arm) would be permitted, as those areas would be zoned Limited development. However, these lands are not part of the viewshed assessed for this location.

The overall aesthetic effect of Alternative 3 would be the similar to the No Action Alternative, but with slightly reduced scenic qualities to the government-owned land on the west side of the cove.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSM	IENT					F	ORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)			DE	TAILE	O ()			
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Carlton Landing VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 4 ALTERNATIVE (2) PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS DATE TIME WEATHER PERSONNEL L. Burbage								
USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION								
USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION	N							
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	1 0	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В	Α		-1	C 0 0 2	2 2 0) MI	С	The cove would feel a bit more developed due to a view of adjacent cleared land through trees on the west side.
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	SC	МІ	С	The cove would feel a bit more developed due to a view of adjacent cleared land through trees on the west side.
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	SC	МІ	С	The cove would feel a bit more developed due to a view of adjacent cleared land through trees on the west side.
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				
LANDSCAPE COMPOSIT	TON	WITH P	LAN UT PLAN	INC	CONSPICOUS	SIGN	IFICANT	PROMINENT
*The following will give you A sum of 3 or more distinct Does the zone	t, 1-2 ave	rage, and	0 minimal			YES	S NO	<u> </u>
Is this zone, or and/or wildlife			wn for its d	listinct v	visual quality		,	<u> </u>
Is this zone fre	ee from po	llutants ar	nd litter?				✓	

1

Total

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

FORM 1 √ VIA INVENTORY () SIMILARITY ZONE () BASIC (√) FORECASTING (√) DETAILED () DATE PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION Carlton Landing WEATHER VIEWPOINT (4) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage WITH PLAN () Alternative 4 WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS 25 TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water of the shoreline at Carlton Landing, facing northwest, in 25 years under Alternative 4.

Under Alternative 4, the shoreline allocations for government-owned lands would change from Protected to Public Recreation at this location. In addition, the Master Plan classification for this land would change from Multiple Resource Management - Future/Inactive Recreation to High Density Recreation. It should be noted that Carlton Landing private lands extend below the shoreline elevation and are not subject to USACE shoreline zoning. A waterfront park is planned for this Carlton Landing private lands at this viewpoint.

Alternative 4 also grants Carlton Landing a lease for a marina of 300 to 400 slips on the opposite (northeast) side of Roundtree Landing. Although not visible from this location, the marina would support the development of the full 950-acre Carlton Landing plan proposed by the developer. Accordingly, the Carlton Landing development is expected to eventually include 2,570 homes, a school, organic farm, town center, community pools, open spaces, and dog parks. It is expected that development would occur at a rate of approximately 79 lots per year over a 25- to 30-year timeframe. The town center would consist of multi-story buildings that would be visible through the mature trees of the waterfront park. Noise from the town center would also travel through the park to the viewpoint location.

Alternative 4 also includes recreational development of government-owned lands on Roundtree Landing and those adjacent to Carlton Landing to the south. The Carlton Landing plan includes a water park or equestrian stables, a 35acre group/summer camp for up to 300 campers, tennis center, sports field, tent camp sites, picnic tables, and walking and equestrian trails on Roundtree Landing (in addition to the marina). The government-owned land south of the Carlton Landing development would be developed into a nature center and recreation area with a swim beach, sports field, outdoor classrooms, an amphitheater, lakeshore observation towers, natural playground, and walking and biking trails. These amenities would be centered on the east side of the government-owned land, near the viewpoint location.

The changes to the government-owned lands would result in a dramatic change in the character of this location as compared to the No Action Alternative. Although most of the existing wooded area on Roundtree Landing is expected to remain, the understory would likely be much less dense due to trampling around trails and camping areas. In addition, this area might attract illegal activity, loitering, and the accumulation of litter, as is sometimes seen in other remote wooded locations that the public have access to on Eufaula Lake. The visible governmentowned land on the south side of Carlton Landing would change dramatically as compared to the No Action Alternative due to the development of the swim beach, picnic area, and filtered views of the sports field through the trees. Although the other public amenities west of the swim beach would not be visible at this location, they would result in a much higher usership of the overall area with increases in noise and litter and a corresponding decrease in wildlife observation opportunities from the viewpoint.

The overall aesthetic effect of Alternative 4 would be dramatically different than the No Action Alternative. The serene natural aesthetic of the cove would be greatly reduced and the user experience would be more typical of an active waterfront area.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSM	IENT					F	ORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)			DI	ETAILE	O ()			
					R NEL <i>L. Burba</i>	ge		
PROJECT DETAILS AND	COMMEN	NTS			of <i>CDM Smit</i>	h		
USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION USE THE LETTER "B" FOR								
WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION	۱ 	I	1 1			Ī	I	I
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В		Α	-2	NC		С	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	S	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	В	Α		-1	SC	МО	D	
USER ACTIVITY	В	А		-1	SC	МІ	D	View will contain both recreational and picnickin opportunities as well as commercial operations
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		В	А	-1				
LANDSCAPE COMPOSIT	ION	WITH F	οι ΔΝΙ	INC	ONSPICOUS	SIGNI	FICANT	PROMINENT
			UT PLAN			١,	/	<u> </u>
*The following will give you A sum of 3 or more distinc				erations	:	YES	l NO	

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

0

YEARS

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1 √ VIA INVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE () FORECASTING () DATE 2/21/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME 4:30 PM LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park WEATHER Sunny and cold PERSONNEL L. Burbage and M. Petty ZONE () WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

TIME PERIOD

The view is from the water of Daisy Hallum Cove, about 0.8 mile northeast of Gaines Creek Park, during the winter. The surrounding land consists of thin deciduous forest on craggy hillslope. A portion of the shoreline has a narrow band of forested bottomland. The hill behind it rises, in some places sharply, to an elevation up to 700 ft above mean sea level. A few high-end houses are present, situated such they have panoramic views of the lake. The houses do have some cleared areas surrounding them; however, extensive lawns are not present likely due to the uneven and rocky terrain. As such the houses are partially screened by winter trees. Three docks with roofs are present, two of which have associated walkways from the house to the shoreline.

Foreground: Water surface Midground: Shore, forest Background: Hilltop, sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl

Noise: Quiet waves Activity: None

BASIC (√) DETAILED ()

VIEWPOINT (5)

WITH PLAN ()

The viewscape has an enclosed feeling due to the surrounding tall hills. The rocks and boulders on the hillslopes are examples of the interesting geological features present in the Eufaula Lake area.

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

FORM 1 √ VIA NVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE () FORECASTING () BASIC (√) DETAILED () DATE 4/12/2012 TIME 2:15 PM PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park WEATHER Sunny and mild, windy VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith WITH PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The view is from the water of Daisy Hallum Cove, about 0.8 mile northeast of Gaines Creek Park, during late spring. The surrounding land consists of deciduous forest. The boulders and rocks that occur on the steep slope are screened by the leaves of the trees. A portion of the shoreline has a narrow band of forested bottomland. The hill behind it rises, in some places sharply, to an elevation up to 700 ft above mean sea level. A few highend houses are present, situated such they have panoramic views of the lake. The houses do have some cleared areas surrounding them; however, extensive lawns are not present likely due to the uneven and rocky terrain. As such the houses are considerably screened by the leaves of the trees. Three docks with roofs are present, two of which have associated walkways from the house to the shoreline.

Foreground: Water surface Midground: Shore, forest Background: Hilltop, sky

Wildlife: None Noise: Quiet waves Activity: None

The viewscape has an enclosed feeling due to the surrounding tall hills. The screening of the houses by vegetation gives the cove a feeling of being relatively undeveloped and untamed during the growing season.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN (✔)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the water in Daisy Hallum Cove, facing east, in 25 years under the No Action Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, the shoreline along the cove would continue to be zoned Limited Development. There is an area of the shoreline, approximately 200 feet long, where private lands extend below the shoreline elevation and are not subject to shoreline management zoning. A number of houses would be expected to be built on the hillside under this alternative. Although the surrounding area is somewhat rural, there are roads positioned to provide access to property along the top and some of the sides of the hills. Medium-density residential housing currently exists on the north point of the cove (off the left hand side of the view). Additional access drives have already been cleared for future development in a few places near the high-end houses, so it would be likely that houses will be built on these lots in the future, as well as on additional nearby land that does not yet have cleared access drives. It is assumed that these houses would be in keeping with the style of the other recently-constructed high-end houses nearby, and would similarly be tucked into the trees with only small lawns in most locations due to the rocky and uneven terrain. An exception might be for the property that extends below the shoreline elevation, as there would be no restrictions on removing trees between the house and the water, the terrain at this location is not overly steep. The ability to clear the land to the water's edge is popular among a number of area residents. Docks would likely be built for each of these houses similar to the docks at the adjacent houses. Shoreline Use Permits issued under the No Action alternative would not require a shoreline buffer, so some clearing or mowing could occur up to the lakeshore.

Under the No Action Alternative, some of the existing undeveloped and untamed feeling of the cove would be lost due to the development of the houses and especially of the more visible docks, and especially during the winter. The viewscape would continue to have enclosed feeling due to the surrounding tall hills. Although a number of residences would be added, opportunities for viewing wildlife would likely still be excellent due to the limited clearing of lots.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✔)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 1 WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the water in Daisy Hallum Cove, facing east, in 25 years under Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 1, the shoreline zoning along the cove would change from to Limited Development to Protected. However, there is an area of the shoreline, approximately 200 feet long, where private lands extend below the shoreline elevation and are not subject to shoreline management zoning. Although there are roads positioned to provide access to property along the top and some of the sides of the hills in this view, development pressure is likely to be low if additional docks are not permitted on the lake. Any houses that are built would be at least partially screened since the vegetation on the government-owned property would remain intact. These houses would also likely clear only small lawns due to the rocky and uneven terrain in most locations.

Development pressure would be expected to be higher for the property which extends below the shoreline elevation. Since this section of shore is not subject to Shoreline Management Plan restrictions, a dock could still be built under Alternative 1. As such, this property would likely be developed in keeping with the style of other recently-constructed high-end houses nearby.

Under Alternative 1, more of the existing undeveloped and untamed feeling of the cove would be retained than under the No Action Alternative, and it would appear mostly as it is today. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would continue to be excellent.

	ASSESSMENT	
IEVVE CHINI	AGGEGGIVIEN	

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS DATE
LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Cr. Park IME
VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 5 WEATHER

ALTERNATIVE (1) PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

of CDM Smith

FORM 6

✓ VIA

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITTOOTT EARTOONDITTOO	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY Compatible C Somewhat Compatible C Not Compatible	SALE CONTRAST Minimal Moderate Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE Subordinant Co-dominant Dominant	
	Š	¥	Σ			S W S	S S C C	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	Α	В		+1	С	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	С	MI	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	MI	D	
LANDUSE	Α	В		+1	С	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY	Α	В		+1	С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN			√ .
	WITHOUT PLAN			✓

 $^{{}^{\}star}\mathsf{The}$ following will give you the value for Special Considerations:

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\
✓	
✓	
	√
2	_

	MCS
✓	VIA

LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park

WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 2 WITHOUT PLAN (✓)

ZONE ()

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

BASIC (√)

DETAILED ()

VIEWPOINT (5)

INVENTORY ()
FORECASTING (✓)

DATE TIME WEATHER

PERSONNEL L. Burbage
of CDM Smith

TIME PERIOD

25 YEARS

FORM 1

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water in Daisy Hallum Cove, facing east, in 25 years under Alternative 2.

Under Alternative 2, the shoreline zoning along the sides of the cove would change from to Limited Development to Protected, while the zoning in the back of the cove would remain as Limited Development. In the center of the back of the cove there is an area of the shoreline, approximately 200 feet long, where private lands extend below the shoreline elevation and are not subject to shoreline management zoning.

Although the surrounding area is somewhat rural, there are roads positioned to provide access to property along the top and some of the sides of the hills. Development pressure would likely be low on the sides of the cove under Alternative 2, since docks would not not be permitted in these areas. Development would likely occur, however, in the back of the cove in the Limited Development zone. Access drives have already been cleared in this area for future development in a few places near the high-end houses. It is assumed that new houses would be in keeping with the style of the other recently-constructed high-end houses nearby, and would similarly be tucked into the trees with only small lawns in most locations due to the rocky and uneven terrain. An exception might be for the property that extends below the shoreline elevation, as there would be no restrictions on removing trees between the house and the water, the terrain at this location is not overly steep. The ability to clear the land to the water's edge is popular among a number of area residents. Docks would likely be built for each of these houses similar to the docks at the adjacent houses. Some additional docks could be expected to be built for houses that are there now. Shoreline Use Permits issued under the Alternative 2 would require a 70-foot conservation buffer, so some screening would occur even if Shoreline Use Permits were issued.

Under Alternative 2, the existing undeveloped and untamed feeling of the cove would be slightly decreased, but not nearly as much as under the No Action Alternative. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would continue to be excellent.

/IEW/POINT	ASSESSMENT	

DETAILED () BASIC (✔)

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS DATE LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Cr. Park IME VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 5 **WEATHER**

PERSONNEL L. Burbage ALTERNATIVE (2)

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION					1			,
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDUSE	Α	В		+1	С	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY	Α	В		+1	С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

of CDM Smith

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN			√ .
	WITHOUT PLAN			✓

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\
✓	
✓	
	✓
2	

FORM 6

✓ VIA

	MCS
✓	VIA

FORM 1

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park

WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 3 WITHOUT PLAN (✓)

ZONE ()

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

BASIC (√) DETAILED ()

VIEWPOINT (5)

INVENTORY ()
FORECASTING (

✓)

DATE TIME WEATHER

PERSONNEL L. Burbage of CDM Smith

TIME PERIOD 25 YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water in Daisy Hallum Cove, facing east, in 25 years under Alternative 3.

Under Alternative 3, the shoreline along the cove would continue to be zoned Limited Development. There is an area of the shoreline, approximately 200 feet long, where private lands extend below the shoreline elevation and are not subject to shoreline management zoning. In addition, the rezone request for the shoreline of the proposed Falcon Tree subdivision would be granted. This area is on the opposite side of the ridge that makes up the back right corner of the cove in this viewpoint analysis. The distance between the shoreline of Daisy Hallum Cove and that of Falcon Tree is about 0.25 mile.

A number of houses would be expected to be built on the hillside under this alternative. Although the surrounding area is somewhat rural, there are roads positioned to provide access to property along the top and some of the sides of the hills. Medium-density residential housing currently exists on the north point of the cove (off the left hand side of the view). The development of a subdivision at Falcon Tree would likely stimulate additional housing development in the area, including on the side of the ridge in the assessed viewpoint. Additional access drives have already been cleared for future development in a few places near the high-end houses, so it would be likely that houses will be built on these lots in the future, as well as on additional nearby land that does not yet have cleared access drives. It is assumed that these houses would be in keeping with the style of the other recently-constructed high-end houses nearby, and would similarly be tucked into the trees with only small lawns in most locations due to the rocky and uneven terrain. An exception might be for the property that extends below the shoreline elevation, as there would be no restrictions on removing trees between the house and the water, the terrain at this location is not overly steep. The ability to clear the land to the water's edge is popular among a number of area residents. Docks would likely be built for each of these houses similar to the docks at the adjacent houses. Shoreline Use Permits issued under the Alternative 3 would require a 45-foot shoreline buffer. The buffer would provide some visual screening, but most development would be further up on the hill, where hillside vegetation would the that which provides any screening.

Under Alternative 3, a few more houses and docks would likely be built as compared to the No Action Alternative due to additional development pressure created by the nearby Falcon Tree subdivision. The overall aesthetic of the cove would tip towards appearing somewhat densely developed with a high dock density, especially in winter when the trees would not provide as much screening as they do in summer. The viewscape would continue to have enclosed feeling due to the surrounding tall hills. Although a number of residences would be added, opportunities for viewing wildlife would begin to decline due to habitat fragmentation.

۱/۱	ΕW	IDO	TIME	ASSE	CCM	ENT
VI		VPU	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	A337	· ンンIVI	

FORM 6

√ VIA

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS DATE
LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Cr. Park TIME
VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 5 WEATHER

ALTERNATIVE (3) PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION								
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	С	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN			√ .
	WITHOUT PLAN			✓

 $^{{}^{\}star}\mathsf{The}$ following will give you the value for Special Considerations:

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
	✓
✓	
	√
1	

FORM 1

✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE () INVENTORY () FORECASTING (√) BASIC (√) DETAILED () DATE PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park **WEATHER** ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage VIEWPOINT (5) WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 4 WITHOUT PLAN (✓) of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the water in Daisy Hallum Cove, facing east, in 25 years under Alternative 4.

Under Alternative 4, the shoreline along the cove would continue to be zoned Limited Development. There is an area of the shoreline, approximately 200 feet long, where private lands extend below the shoreline elevation and are not subject to shoreline management zoning. In addition, the rezone request for the shoreline of the proposed Falcon Tree subdivision would be granted. This area is on the opposite side of the ridge that makes up the back right corner of the cove in this viewpoint analysis. The distance between the shoreline of Daisy Hallum Cove and that of Falcon Tree is about 0.25 mile.

A number of houses would be expected to be built on the hillside under this alternative. Although the surrounding area is somewhat rural, there are roads positioned to provide access to property along the top and some of the sides of the hills. Medium-density residential housing currently exists on the north point of the cove (off the left hand side of the view). The development of a subdivision at Falcon Tree would likely stimulate additional housing development in the area, including on the side of the ridge in the assessed viewpoint. Additional access drives have already been cleared for future development in a few places near the high-end houses, so it would be likely that houses will be built on these lots in the future, as well as on additional nearby land that does not yet have cleared access drives. It is assumed that these houses would be in keeping with the style of the other recently-constructed high-end houses nearby, and would similarly be tucked into the trees with only small lawns in most locations due to the rocky and uneven terrain. An exception might be for the property that extends below the shoreline elevation, as there would be no restrictions on removing trees between the house and the water, the terrain at this location is not overly steep. The ability to clear the land to the water's edge is popular among a number of area residents. Docks would likely be built for each of these houses similar to the docks at the adjacent houses. Shoreline Use Permits issued under the Alternative 4 would require a 45-foot shoreline buffer. The buffer would provide some visual screening, but most development would be further up on the hill, where hillside vegetation would the that which provides any screening.

Under Alternative 4, a few more houses and docks would likely be built as compared to the No Action Alternative due to additional development pressure created by the nearby Falcon Tree subdivision. The overall aesthetic of the cove would tip towards appearing somewhat densely developed with a high dock density, especially in winter when the trees would not provide as much screening as they do in summer. The viewscape would continue to have enclosed feeling due to the surrounding tall hills. Although a number of residences would be added, opportunities for viewing wildlife would begin to decline due to habitat fragmentation.

/IEW/DOINT	ASSESSMENT	
/IEVVPL JIIV I	ASSESSIVIENT	

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS DATE
LOCATION Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Cr. Park IME
VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 5 WEATHER

ALTERNATIVE (4) PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION								,
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	D	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	С	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN			√ .
	WITHOUT PLAN			✓

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations:

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal $\,$

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\
	√
✓	
	√
1	

Total

FORM 6

✓ VIA

FORM 1

✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)	
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()	
DETAILED ()	DATE 2/22/2012	
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME 6:30 PM	
LOCATION 1-40 Bridge and Causeway	WEATHER Sunny and cold	
VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage and M.	Petty
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith	
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS		
	TIME PERIOD	YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The view is from the east causeway of the I-40 bridge over Deep Fork, facing north during the winter. The view consists of the lake, the opposite north and northeast shorelines, and the side of the highway. The land on the opposite shore consists of thin deciduous forest on craggy hillslope that in places rises somewhat steeply from the lake. The majority of the shoreline is rocky with boulders and bluffs rising directly from the water in some places. Additional boulders and bluffs on the hillside are visible through the thin forest. The slopes rise to about 600 feet above mean sea level, where they meet broad plains. The plains are not visible behind the trees at the top of the slope.

A small densely developed residential neighborhood is present on the north shore, in the left side of the viewscape. This neighborhood is located on a small area where the slope allows for yards to be cleared close to the shoreline. A row of close-set modest homes is very visible through the winter trees. Four covered docks are associated with this neighborhood; one of these has six slips. Although this neighborhood and its associated docks are highly visible in winter, they are a small part of the viewshed. The rocky bluffs are much more dominant and the main focus of the view. A small cluster of homes is partly visible through the trees at the top of the hill on the northeast shore. There is one dock at this cluster, partially hidden within the bend of a small cove. Almost equidistant between these two communities, one modest home is visible. Pickup trucks and what appear to be storage trailers are visible through the trees next to this home.

Mature forested hillsides and small coves are seen between the residential areas. The ruggedness of the terrain gives an unspoiled and untamed aesthetic to the general landscape.

The highway corridor is highly littered and loud with traffic. However, the dramatic landscape is so prominent that the viewers gaze is pulled across the lake to the opposite shore. Regular clearing of vegetation is apparent so that this view is maintained.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, forested slope, rocky bluffs, residences

Background: Sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl

Noise: Highway traffic Activity: Highway traffic

The viewscape is a wide panorama of Eufaula Lake. The view is particularly interesting as a feature along I-40 as it stands in sharp contrast to the open dry plains or forested bottomlands that are seen along nearby stretches of the highway. The boulder-strewn shoreline and rocky, rugged bluffs are examples of the interesting geological features present in the Eufaula Lake area. The draw the viewers eye and are particularly dramatic. The bridge provides a sudden, open view of the water and bluffs that tell passing travellers that they have come upon a special feature in the landscape.

√ No

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

FORM 1

✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE () INVENTORY (✓) FORECASTING () BASIC (√) DETAILED () DATE 4/11/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME 11:30 AM LOCATION 1-40 Bridge and Causeway WEATHER Partly cloudy and MILD VIEWPOINT (6) PERSONNEL L. Burbage and B. Brown ZONE () WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The view is from the east causeway of the I-40 bridge over Deep Fork, facing north during late spring. The view consists of the lake, the opposite north and northeast shorelines, and the side of the highway. The land on the opposite shore consists of deciduous forest on a hillslope that in places rises somewhat steeply from the lake. The majority of the shoreline is rocky with boulders and bluffs rising directly from the water in some places. The slopes rise to about 600 feet above mean sea level, where they meet broad plains. The plains are not visible behind the trees at the top of the slope.

A small densely developed residential neighborhood is present on the north shore, in the left side of the viewscape. This neighborhood is located on a small area where the slope allows for yards to be cleared close to the shoreline. The homes are partially screened by the forest canopy adjacent to the lake. Four covered docks are associated with this neighborhood; one of these has six slips. This neighborhood is not a focal point in the landscape as it is largely screened and the rocky bluffs are much more dominant and the main focus of the view. A small cluster of homes at the top of the hill on the northeast shore is completely screened by the forest canopy. There is one dock at this cluster, partially hidden within the bend of a small cove. Almost equidistant between these two communities, one home is slightly visible through the trees.

Mature forested hillsides and small coves are seen between the residential areas. The ruggedness of the terrain and the nearly full screening of residential neighborhoods from view gives an unspoiled and untamed aesthetic to the general landscape.

The highway corridor is highly littered and loud with traffic. However, the dramatic landscape is so prominent that the viewers gaze is pulled across the lake to the opposite shore. Regular clearing of vegetation is apparent so that this view is maintained.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, forested slope, rocky bluffs, screened residences

Background: Sky

Wildlife: None

Noise: Highway traffic Activity: Highway traffic

The viewscape is a wide panorama of Eufaula Lake. The view is particularly interesting as a feature along I-40 as it stands in sharp contrast to the open dry plains or forested bottomlands that are seen along nearby stretches of the highway. The boulder-strewn shoreline and rocky, rugged bluffs are examples of the interesting geological features present in the Eufaula Lake area. The draw the viewers eye and are particularly dramatic. The bridge provides a sudden, open view of the water and bluffs that tell passing travellers that they have come upon a special feature in the landscape.

√ No

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST			FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)		FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()		DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS		TIME		
LOCATION 1-40 Bridge and Causeway		WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (6) ZON	IE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN () WIT	HOUT PLAN (√)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS				

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

The view is from the east causeway of the I-40 bridge over Deep Fork, facing north, in 25 years under the No Action Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, the government-owned lands on the opposite shore would continue to be zoned Limited Development. A number of houses would be expected to be built on the opposite hillside under this alternative, as county roads provide easy access for development and an intersection with I-40 is close by. The location would be desirable for building, with the homes having panoramas of Deep Fork. Docks would likely be built, but they would require stairs or ramps from the rocky shore in some places. Homes would likely be partially screened by tree canopies during the growing season, but would be highly visible during the winter. The No Action Alternative does not impose a vegetation buffer along the shoreline.

The development of additional homes and docks in this viewshed would eliminate the unspoiled and untamed aesthetic of this landscape. They would visually compete with and detract from the boulders, bluffs, and mature forest that currently dominate the view. The view would still be a significant departure from other features along the I-40 corridor, but it would not have the same dramatic effect that it currently exhibits.

The characteristics of the I-40 causeway itself would not be expected to change. These characteristics are a minor component of the overall view.

Yes

FORM 1

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

✓ VIA SIMILARITY ZONE () INVENTORY () FORECASTING (✓) BASIC (√) DETAILED () DATE PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION 1-40 Bridge and Causeway WEATHER VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 1 WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

The view is from the east causeway of the I-40 bridge over Deep Fork, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative

Under Alternative 1, future development and land use patterns would be considerably different than under the No Action Alternative. The zoning for most of the government-owned lands on the opposite shore would change from Limited Development to Protected. The small community located on the north side of the cove (in the left side of the viewscape) would remain zoned as Limited Development, as would approximately 550 feet of adjacent shoreline to the east.

Development pressure would be lower under this alternative as compared to the No Action Alternative because docks would not be permitted for the majority of undeveloped land. Two homes might be built on the land that remains zoned Limited Development. The Limited Development zoned land would be desirable for development since county roads provide easy access and an intersection with I-40 is close by. Since the hillslope of this area is not very steep, docks would likely be built for these new homes. The new homes would likely be partially screened by tree canopies during the growing season, but would be highly visible during the winter. These homes, along with the adjacent existing neighborhood, would be only a small part of the viewshed.

The development of an estimated two additional homes and docks in this viewshed would not considerably change the character of the viewshed. The rugged terrain between the new and existing homes would continue to give a generally unspoiled and untamed aesthetic to the general landscape. The rocky bluffs would continue to be a dominant feature in the landscape, much more so than under the No Action Alternative.

Under Alternative 1, a 70-foot conservation buffer would be enacted along the shoreline, where no clearing of vegetation would be allowed. Due to the distance from the viewer, as well as the vegetation and topographical features of the hillside, this buffer would not have a different visual impact than the non-buffered No Action Alternative.

The characteristics of the I-40 causeway itself would not be expected to change, and would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. These characteristics are a minor component of the overall view.

The visual character of the viewscape under Alternative 1 would be in sharp contrast to the dry plains and forested bottomlands that are seen along the nearby stretches of the highway. The boulder-strewn shoreline and rocky, rugged bluffs would be much more of a focal point than under the No Action Alternative, and this view would illustrate the special qualities of the Eufaula Lake landscape.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION 1-40 Bridge and Causeway VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 6

TIME WEATHER

DATE

ALTERNATIVE (1)

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

of CDM Smith

✓ VIA

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	Α	В		+1	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION	Α	В		+1	С	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	Α	В		+1	С	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY	Α	В		+1	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations:

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\
✓	
√	
	√
2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST	FORM 1	MCS VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()	
BASIC (✔)	FORECASTING (✓)	
DETAILED ()	DATE	
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME	
LOCATION I-40 Bridge and Causeway	WEATHER	
VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage	

TIME PERIOD

of CDM Smith

25

YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 2 WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

The view is from the east causeway of the I-40 bridge over Deep Fork, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative

Under Alternative 2, future development and land use patterns would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. The government-owned lands on the opposite shore would continue to be zoned Limited Development. A number of houses would be expected to be built on the opposite hillside under this alternative, as county roads provide easy access for development and an intersection with I-40 is close by. The location would be desirable for building, with the homes having panoramas of Deep Fork. Docks for these homes would likely be built, but they would require stairs or ramps from the rocky shore in some places. Some additional docks would likely be built for existing homes. Both the new and existing homes would likely be partially screened by tree canopies during the growing season, but would be highly visible during the winter.

The development of additional homes and docks in this viewshed would eliminate the unspoiled and untamed aesthetic of this landscape. They would visually compete with and detract from the boulders, bluffs, and mature forest that currently dominate the view. The view would still be a significant departure from other features along the I-40 corridor, but it would not have the same dramatic effect that it currently exhibits.

Under Alternative 2, a 70-foot conservation buffer would be enacted along the shoreline, where no clearing of vegetation would be allowed. Due to the distance from the viewer, as well as the vegetation and topographical features of the hillside, this buffer would not have a different visual impact than the non-buffered No Action Alternative.

The characteristics of the I-40 causeway itself would not be expected to change, and would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. These characteristics are a minor component of the overall view.

The visual character of the viewscape under Alternative 2 would be the same as the No Action Alternative.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION 1-40 Bridge and Causeway

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 6

ALTERNATIVE (2)

DATE

TIME

WEATHER

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITTEGTT EAR GONDITION	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY Compatible C Somewhat Compatible C Not Compatible	ALE CONTRAST Minimal Moderate Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE Subordinant Co-dominant Dominant	
	DIS	AVE	Z	미	CO SC NC	SC/ MI MO S	SS CC C	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	SC	MI	С	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	С	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
√	
✓	
	√
2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		_
BASIC (✔)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION I-40 Bridge and Causeway	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		

YEARS

25

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

of CDM Smith

TIME PERIOD

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 3 WITHOUT PLAN ()

The view is from the east causeway of the I-40 bridge over Deep Fork, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative

Under Alternative 3, future development and land use patterns would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. The government-owned lands on the opposite shore would continue to be zoned Limited Development. A number of houses would be expected to be built on the opposite hillside under this alternative, as county roads provide easy access for development and an intersection with I-40 is close by. The location would be desirable for building, with the homes having panoramas of Deep Fork. Docks for these homes would likely be built, but they would require stairs or ramps from the rocky shore in some places. Some additional docks would likely be built for existing homes. Both the new and existing homes would likely be partially screened by tree canopies during the growing season, but would be highly visible during the winter.

The development of additional homes and docks in this viewshed would eliminate the unspoiled and untamed aesthetic of this landscape. They would visually compete with and detract from the boulders, bluffs, and mature forest that currently dominate the view. The view would still be a significant departure from other features along the I-40 corridor, but it would not have the same dramatic effect that it currently exhibits.

Under Alternative 3, a 45-foot conservation buffer would be enacted along the shoreline, where no clearing of vegetation would be allowed. Due to the distance from the viewer, as well as the vegetation and topographical features of the hillside, this buffer would not have a different visual impact than the non-buffered No Action Alternative.

The characteristics of the I-40 causeway itself would not be expected to change, and would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. These characteristics are a minor component of the overall view.

The visual character of the viewscape under Alternative 3 would be the same as the No Action Alternative.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION 1-40 Bridge and Causeway

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 6

ALTERNATIVE (2)

DATE

TIME

WEATHER

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITTEGTT EAR GONDITION	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY Compatible C Somewhat Compatible C Not Compatible	ALE CONTRAST Minimal Moderate Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE Subordinant Co-dominant Dominant	
	DIS	AVE	Z	미	CO SC NC	SC/ MI MO S	SS CC C	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	SC	MI	С	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	С	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
√	
✓	
	√
2	

/ISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION 1-40 Bridge and Causeway	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH DIAN (/) Alternative A WITHOUT DIAN ()	of CDM Smith		

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

The view is from the east causeway of the I-40 bridge over Deep Fork, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative 4.

Under Alternative 4, future development and land use patterns would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. The government-owned lands on the opposite shore would continue to be zoned Limited Development. A number of houses would be expected to be built on the opposite hillside under this alternative, as county roads provide easy access for development and an intersection with I-40 is close by. The location would be desirable for building, with the homes having panoramas of Deep Fork. Docks for these homes would likely be built, but they would require stairs or ramps from the rocky shore in some places. Some additional docks would likely be built for existing homes. Both the new and existing homes would likely be partially screened by tree canopies during the growing season, but would be highly visible during the winter.

The development of additional homes and docks in this viewshed would eliminate the unspoiled and untamed aesthetic of this landscape. They would visually compete with and detract from the boulders, bluffs, and mature forest that currently dominate the view. The view would still be a significant departure from other features along the I-40 corridor, but it would not have the same dramatic effect that it currently exhibits.

Under Alternative 4, a 45-foot conservation buffer would be enacted along the shoreline, where no clearing of vegetation would be allowed. Due to the distance from the viewer, as well as the vegetation and topographical features of the hillside, this buffer would not have a different visual impact than the non-buffered No Action Alternative.

The characteristics of the I-40 causeway itself would not be expected to change, and would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. These characteristics are a minor component of the overall view.

The visual character of the viewscape under Alternative 4 would be the same as the No Action Alternative.

Yes

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()	_

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS DATE LOCATION *1-40 Bridge and Causeway* TIME VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 6 ALTERNATIVE (4)

WEATHER PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	МІ	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	SC	MI	С	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
√	
✓	
	√
2	

MCS
MCS

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1 ✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY (√)	
BASIC (✔)		FORECASTING ()	
DETAILED ()		DATE 2/22/2012	
PROJECT NAME Eufaula	Lake EIS	TIME 5:30 PM	
LOCATION US 69 Bridge a	t Bridgeport	WEATHER	
VIEWPOINT (7)	ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage and	M. Petty
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith	
PROJECT DETAILS AND C	OMMENTS		
		TIME PERIOD	YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the north causeway of the US 69 bridge at Bridgeport, facing north during winter. The view consists of the lake, the shoreline at Bridgeport, and the side of the highway. The land on the shore is gently sloping and a protected sandy beach is present. In many areas, scrubby willows flank the shoreline.

Beyond the shoreline, the land is relatively flat. A relatively dense neighborhood sits back from the shore, but it is rather well-hidden due to dense woodland and the flat terrain. Extensive thinning of the understory on the west side of the viewshed exposes some of the homes there. A large mowed area extends from homes on the east side of the viewshed to the water's edge, but a small spit of scrub-shrub/forested wetland provides some screening. Some small meadow areas are also present near the shoreline.

The highway corridor is highly littered and loud with traffic. The wide vista of the lake draws the viewer's attention, but the bridge and causeway are still prominent features in the viewshed. Some deciduous trees and shrubs have grown along the causeway but are easily seen through in winter.

Foreground: Highway, Water surface Midground: Shore, trees, beach

Background: Sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl Noise: Highway Traffic Activity: Highway Traffic

The viewscape is a wide panorama of Eufaula Lake and the nearby shore. The very left side of the viewshed offers an extended viewing distance, which gives a sense of enormity to the Lake. The flatness of the land in the center and right of the viewshed are accentuated by this view. Overall, the effect is of relatively unspoiled sandy shore.

√ No

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

	MCS
✓	VIA

FORM 1

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

ZONE ()

WITHOUT PLAN ()

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

BASIC (√) DETAILED ()

VIEWPOINT (7)

WITH PLAN ()

INVENTORY (✔)
FORECASTING ()
DATE 4/11/2012
TIME 12:45 PM

WEATHER Sunny and mild

PERSONNEL L. Burbage and B. Brown

of CDM Smith

TIME PERIOD YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the north causeway of the US 69 bridge at Bridgeport, facing north during late spring. The view consists of the lake, the shoreline at Bridgeport, and the side of the highway. The land on the shore is gently sloping and a protected sandy beach is present. In many areas, scrubby willows flank the shoreline.

Beyond the shoreline, the land is relatively flat. A relatively dense neighborhood sits back from the shore, but it is rather unnoticeable due to dense woodland and the flat terrain. Extensive thinning of the understory has occurred on the west side of the viewshed, but leaves on the trees hide the homes there. A large mowed area extends from homes on the east side of the viewshed to the water's edge, but a small spit of scrub-shrub/ forested wetland provides almost complete screening. Some small meadow areas are also present near the shoreline.

The highway corridor is highly littered and loud with traffic. The wide vista of the lake draws the viewer's attention, but the bridge and causeway are still prominent features in the viewshed. Some deciduous trees and shrubs have grown along the causeway and block part of the view.

Foreground: Highway, Water surface Midground: Shore, trees, beach

Background: Sky

Wildlife: None

Noise: Highway Traffic Activity: Highway Traffic

The viewscape is a wide panorama of Eufaula Lake and the nearby shore. The very left side of the viewshed offers an extended viewing distance, which gives a sense of enormity to the Lake. The flatness of the land in the center and right of the viewshed are accentuated by this view. The leaves on the trees screen the nearby community almost completely from view. Overall, the effect is of relatively unspoiled sandy shore.

√ No

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

VISUAL RESOURCE INVE	NTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS √ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✔)		FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()		DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lal	ke EIS	TIME		
LOCATION US 69 Bridge at E	Bridgeport	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (7)	ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COM	MMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the north causeway of the US 69 bridge at Bridgeport, facing north, in 25 years under the No Action Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, zoning of most of the government-owned lands in the viewscape would remain Protected. The land on the very left side would remain Limited Development. Most of the private lands in the view are already developed; the only area that might have additional homes built would be on the very right side of the viewscape, behind the sandy beach. The flat nature of the land and the trees on the government-owned lands would help screen the view of these homes; however, the government-owned land is narrow in this location and homes would likely be partially visible.

Although docks would be permitted on the lands on the left side of the view, those lands are on a relatively exposed shoreline with a long fetch. Docks would likely not be built in this area due to damaging wave action.

The characteristics of the US 69 causeway itself would not be expected to change. Some of the trees may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve the lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the No Action Alternative would be similar to current conditions. The wide panorama of Eufaula Lake and the nearby shore would continue to convey a sense of enormity to the lake and of relatively unspoiled sandy shore.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 1 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the north causeway of the US 69 bridge at Bridgeport, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 1, the viewscape would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. The government-owned lands currently zoned Protected would remain so, and the land zoned Limited Development (on the left side) would change to Protected. Most of the private lands in the view are already developed; the only area that might have additional homes built would be on the very right side of the viewscape, behind the sandy beach. The flat nature of the land and the trees on the government-owned lands would help screen the view of these homes; however, the government-owned land is narrow in this location and homes would likely be partially visible. No docks would be permitted on the lands in this viewscape.

The characteristics of the US 69 causeway itself would also be the same as under the No Action Alternative. Some of the trees may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve the lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the Alternative 1 would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. The wide panorama of Eufaula Lake and the nearby shore would continue to convey a sense of enormity to the lake and of relatively unspoiled sandy shore.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✔)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 7 ALTERNATIVE (1)	DATE TIME WEATHER PERSONNEL		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS	of CDM Smith		

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B				С	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B				С	MI	S	
VEGETATION		A/B			С	MI	S	
LANDUSE	A/B	·			С	МІ	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B				С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\checkmark
✓	
	✓
	√
1	

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 2 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			
	TIME PERIOD 25	YEARS	

This view is from the north causeway of the US 69 bridge at Bridgeport, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative 2.

Under Alternative 2, the viewscape would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. Zoning of most of the government-owned lands in the viewscape would remain Protected, and the land on the very left side would remain Limited Development. Most of the private lands in the view are already developed; the only area that might have additional homes built would be on the very right side of the viewscape, behind the sandy beach. The flat nature of the land and the trees on the government-owned lands would help screen the view of these homes; however, the government-owned land is narrow in this location and homes would likely be partially visible.

The characteristics of the US 69 causeway itself would also be the same as under the No Action Alternative. Some of the trees may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve the lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the Alternative 2 would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. The wide panorama of Eufaula Lake and the nearby shore would continue to convey a sense of enormity to the lake and of relatively unspoiled sandy shore.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport	DATE TIME		

WEATHER

of CDM Smith

PERSONNEL L. Burbage ALTERNATIVE (2)

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 7

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION					ı			1
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B				С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM	A/B				С	МІ	S	
VEGETATION		A/B			С	МІ	S	
LANDUSE	A/B				С	МІ	S	_
USER ACTIVITY	A/B				С	МІ	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
√	
	√
	√
1	

	MCS
/	\/IA

FORM 1

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

SIMILARITY ZONE () INVENTORY () FORECASTING (√) BASIC (√) DETAILED () DATE PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport WEATHER VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 3 WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the north causeway of the US 69 bridge at Bridgeport, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative 3.

Under Alternative 3, the viewscape would be very different than under the No Action Alternative. Zoning of the Protected government-owned lands in the viewscape would change to Limited Development. The land on the very left side would remain Limited Development. Most of the private lands in the view are already developed; the only area that might have additional homes built would be on the very right side of the viewscape, behind the sandy beach. The flat nature of the land and the trees on the government-owned lands would help screen the view of these homes; however, the government-owned land is narrow in this location and homes would likely be partially visible. A 45-foot shoreline buffer would be required, which would help screen homes from view even if the understory of the woodland were to be cleared, especially during the growing season.

The change to Limited Development would allow docks to be built in an area where they had not been (and would not be under the No Action Alternative). The shoreline in most of the viewshed is relatively protected from fetch due to the US 69 causeway. Docks would likely be desired by those living in the community behind the government-owned property. Other nearby coves that are protected from fetch tend to have a high density of docks. A similar dock density would be expected for this viewscape. Litter may become visible in the landscape, as items would be blown off of docks and could accumulate in wetland areas. Similar to areas with docks elsewhere on the lake, pieces of styrofoam could break off of the dock floats and similarly collect along the shoreline.

The characteristics of the US 69 causeway itself would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. Some of the trees may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve the lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the Alternative 3 would be very different than under the No Action Alternative. The wide panorama of Eufaula Lake and the nearby shore would continue to convey a sense of enormity to the lake, but the high dock density would eliminate the sense of relatively unspoiled sandy shore. Although few homes would likely be visible, it would be clear to the viewer that this is a densely developed area.

Yes

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✔)	DETAILED ()	

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 7

ALTERNATIVE (3)

DATE

TIME

WEATHER

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT LAN CONDITION	i	1	1	ı	1	I	ī	1
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	D	
LANDFORM	В	Α		-1	SC	MI	S	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	S	
LANDUSE	В		Α	-2	SC	MI	D	
USER ACTIVITY	В	Α		-1	SC	MI	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
✓	✓
	✓
	✓
1	

	MCS
✓	VIA

FORM 1

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

SIMILARITY ZONE () INVENTORY () FORECASTING (√) BASIC (√) DETAILED () DATE PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME LOCATION US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport WEATHER VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 4 WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the north causeway of the US 69 bridge at Bridgeport, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative 4.

Under Alternative 4, the viewscape would be very different than under the No Action Alternative. Zoning of the Protected government-owned lands in the viewscape would change to Limited Development. The land on the very left side would remain Limited Development. Most of the private lands in the view are already developed; the only area that might have additional homes built would be on the very right side of the viewscape, behind the sandy beach. The flat nature of the land and the trees on the government-owned lands would help screen the view of these homes; however, the government-owned land is narrow in this location and homes would likely be partially visible. A 45-foot shoreline buffer would be required, which would help screen homes from view even if the understory of the woodland were to be cleared, especially during the growing season.

The change to Limited Development would allow docks to be built in an area where they had not been (and would not be under the No Action Alternative). The shoreline in most of the viewshed is relatively protected from fetch due to the US 69 causeway. Docks would likely be desired by those living in the community behind the government-owned property. Other nearby coves that are protected from fetch tend to have a high density of docks. A similar dock density would be expected for this viewscape. Litter may become visible in the landscape, as items would be blown off of docks and could accumulate in wetland areas. Similar to areas with docks elsewhere on the lake, pieces of styrofoam could break off of the dock floats and similarly collect along the shoreline.

The characteristics of the US 69 causeway itself would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. Some of the trees may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve the lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the Alternative 4 would be very different than under the No Action Alternative. The wide panorama of Eufaula Lake and the nearby shore would continue to convey a sense of enormity to the lake, but the high dock density would eliminate the sense of relatively unspoiled sandy shore. Although few homes would likely be visible, it would be clear to the viewer that this is a densely developed area.

Yes

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 7

ALTERNATIVE (4)

DATE

TIME

WEATHER

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT LAN CONDITION	i	1	1	ı	1	I	ī	1
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	D	
LANDFORM	В	Α		-1	SC	MI	S	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	S	
LANDUSE	В		Α	-2	SC	MI	D	
USER ACTIVITY	В	Α		-1	SC	MI	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		√,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\checkmark
✓	✓
	✓
	✓
1	

S
٤

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1

✓	VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE () INVENTORY (✓)

BASIC (✓) FORECASTING ()

DETAILED () DATE 2/22/2012

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME 11:30 AM

LOCATION Arrowhead State Park

VIEWPOINT (8)

ZONE ()

WEATHER Partly cloudy and cold

PERSONNEL L. Burbage and M. Petty

WITH PLAN ()

Of CDM Smith

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

TIME PERIOD YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from a picnic area and water access on the west side of Arrowhead State Park, facing west during winter. The view consists of the lake, the opposite shoreline, and some of the picnic area. The land on the opposite shore is hilly with deciduous forest. A few cleared areas are present on the hillside, as is a utility easement. A few homes on the opposite shore are slightly visible through the trees.

The picnic area is also used for fishing. An unpaved road parallels the shore and is driven and parked on by people fishing. Some erosion of the bank in the picnic area is evident.

Foreground: Picnic area, water surface Midground: Shore, forested hillsides

Background: Sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl

Noise: Birds chirping

Activity: A few people fishing from the picnic area

The overall effect of this viewscape is of a large but relatively quiet cove and the opposite shore. It is peaceful and has the aesthetic of domesticated nature within the park. People driving and parking on the dirt road next to the shore decrease the overall tranquility of the location somewhat. The opposite shore and hillslope appear undeveloped and natural. Opportunities for viewing wildlife are excellent.

No

√ No

Yes

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

MCS
MCS

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1

√ VIA

NVENTORY (✓) SIMILARITY ZONE () BASIC (√) FORECASTING () DETAILED () DATE 4/10/2012 PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS TIME 5:00 PM LOCATION Arrowhead State Park WEATHER Partly cloudy and mild VIEWPOINT (8) ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith WITH PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS TIME PERIOD **YEARS**

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from a picnic area and water access on the west side of Arrowhead State Park, facing west during late spring. The view consists of the lake, the opposite shoreline, and some of the picnic area. The land on the opposite shore is hilly with deciduous forest. A few cleared areas are present on the hillside, as is a utility easement. The few homes on the opposite shore are mostly hidden by the foliage on the trees.

The picnic area is also used for fishing. An unpaved road parallels the shore and is driven and parked on by people fishing. Some erosion of the bank in the picnic area is evident.

Foreground: Picnic area, water surface Midground: Shore, forested hillsides

Background: Sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl Noise: Birds chirping, radio

Activity: A few people fishing from the picnic area

The overall effect of this viewscape is of a large but relatively quiet cove and the opposite shore. It is peaceful and has the aesthetic of domesticated nature within the park, however, the radio decreases the overall tranquility of the location, as do people driving and parking on the dirt road next to the shore. The opposite shore and hillslope appear undeveloped and natural. Opportunities for viewing wildlife are excellent.

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

√ No

Yes

VISUAL RESOURCE INVE	ENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()		INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✔)		FORECASTING (✓)		
DETAILED ()		DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula La	ike EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Arrowhead State	e Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (8)	ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN ()	WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND CO	MMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from a picnic area and water access on the west side of Arrowhead State Park, facing west, in 25 years under the No Action Alternative.

Under the No Action Alternative, government-owned lands on the opposite shoreline would remain zoned as Protected. A few houses are likely to be built on the opposite hillside due to the availability of neighborhood roads. These houses and yards would be relatively screened by the forest, but would be slightly more visible in winter. The overall appearance of the hillside would remain largely undeveloped, however.

Park activities are expected to be the same under the No Action Alternative as they are currently. Some additional bank erosion could be expected due to trampling of the shoreline vegetation and people driving and parking on the dirt road.

The character of the viewscape under the No Action Alternative would be that of a relatively quiet cove and the opposite shore. It would be peaceful with the aesthetic of domesticated nature within the park, however, noise from other park users would at times decrease the overall tranquility of the location, as would people driving and parking on the dirt road next to the shore. The opposite shore and hillslope would appear relatively undeveloped and natural. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS √ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Arrowhead State Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (8) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 1 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from a picnic area and water access on the west side of Arrowhead State Park, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 1, the viewscape would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. Government-owned lands on the opposite shoreline would remain zoned as Protected. A few houses are likely to be built on the opposite hillside due to the availability of neighborhood roads. These houses and yards would be relatively screened by the forest, but would be slightly more visible in winter. The overall appearance of the hillside would remain largely undeveloped, however.

Park activities are expected to be the same under Alternative 1 as they would under the No Action Alternative. Some additional bank erosion could be expected due to trampling of the shoreline vegetation and people driving and parking on the dirt road.

The character of the viewscape under Alternative 1 would be the same as under the No Action Alternative with a relatively quiet cove and the opposite shore. It would be peaceful with the aesthetic of domesticated nature within the park, however, noise from other park users would at times decrease the overall tranquility of the location, as would people driving and parking on the dirt road next to the shore. The opposite shore and hillslope would appear relatively undeveloped and natural. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	✓ VIA
BASIC (✔)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Arrowhead State Park VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 8 ALTERNATIVE (1) PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS	DATE TIME WEATHER PERSONNEL L. Burbage of CDM Smith		
USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION			
USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION			

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION			1					•
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B				С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B			С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION		A/B			С	MI	С	
LANDUSE	A/B				С	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B	·			С	МІ	D	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		√ ,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\checkmark
√	
	✓
	√
1	

Total

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Arrowhead State Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (8) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 2 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from a picnic area and water access on the west side of Arrowhead State Park, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 2.

Under Alternative 2, the viewscape would be the same as under the No Action Alternative. Government-owned lands on the opposite shoreline would remain zoned as Protected. A few houses are likely to be built on the opposite hillside due to the availability of neighborhood roads. These houses and yards would be relatively screened by the forest, but would be slightly more visible in winter. The overall appearance of the hillside would remain largely undeveloped, however.

Park activities are expected to be the same under Alternative 2 as they would under the No Action Alternative. Some additional bank erosion could be expected due to trampling of the shoreline vegetation and people driving and parking on the dirt road.

The character of the viewscape under Alternative 2 would be the same as under the No Action Alternative with a relatively quiet cove and the opposite shore. It would be peaceful with the aesthetic of domesticated nature within the park, however, noise from other park users would at times decrease the overall tranquility of the location, as would people driving and parking on the dirt road next to the shore. The opposite shore and hillslope would appear relatively undeveloped and natural. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✔)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Arrowhead State Park VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 8 ALTERNATIVE (2) PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS	DATE TIME WEATHER PERSONNEL L. Burbage of CDM Smith		
USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION			
USE THE LETTER "B" FOR			

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION			1					•
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B				С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B			С	МІ	С	
VEGETATION		A/B			С	MI	С	
LANDUSE	A/B				С	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B	·			С	MI	D	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		√ ,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\checkmark
√	
	✓
	√
1	

Total

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Arrowhead State Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (8) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 3 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from a picnic area and water access on the west side of Arrowhead State Park, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 3.

Under Alternative 3, the viewscape would be somewhat more developed than it would be under the No Action Alternative. The zoning for most of the visible government-owned lands on the opposite shoreline would change from Protected to Limited Development, with a 70-foot shoreline buffer. A portion of the opposite shoreline on the right side of the view would remain Protected. Since the private lands on the hillside of the opposite shores are already developed, the same number of new houses are likely to be built as under the No Action Alternative. However, the change in zoning would allow existing homes to construct docks, which would be visible to park users. The overall appearance of the opposite shore would become slightly developed.

Park activities are expected to be the same under Alternative 3 as they would under the No Action Alternative. Some additional bank erosion could be expected due to trampling of the shoreline vegetation and people driving and parking on the dirt road.

The character of the viewscape under Alternative 3 would be more developed than it would under the No Action Alternative. The cove and opposite shore would be slightly more active. The user experience in the park would still be relatively peaceful at most times, with the aesthetic of domesticated nature. Noise from other park users would be expected to be the same as under the No Action Alternative, and would at times decrease the overall tranquility of the location, as would people driving and parking on the dirt road next to the shore. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✓)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Arrowhead State Park VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 8 ALTERNATIVE (3)	DATE TIME WEATHER PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS	of CDM Smith		

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	SC	МІ	D	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
<u> </u>	_
	✓
	✓
1	

Total

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS √ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (√)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Arrowhead State Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (8) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 4 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from a picnic area and water access on the west side of Arrowhead State Park, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 4.

Under Alternative 4, the viewscape would be somewhat more developed than it would be under the No Action Alternative. The zoning for all of the visible government-owned lands on the opposite shoreline would change from Protected to Limited Development, with a 70-foot shoreline buffer. Since the private lands on the hillside of the opposite shores are already developed, the same number of new houses are likely to be built as under the No Action Alternative. However, the change in zoning would allow existing homes to construct docks, which would be visible to park users. A few more docks could be built than under Alternative 3. The overall appearance of the opposite shore would become slightly developed.

Park activities are expected to be the same under Alternative 4 as they would under the No Action Alternative. Some additional bank erosion could be expected due to trampling of the shoreline vegetation and people driving and parking on the dirt road.

The character of the viewscape under Alternative 4 would be more developed than it would under the No Action Alternative. The cove and opposite shore would be slightly more active. The user experience in the park would still be relatively peaceful at most times, with the aesthetic of domesticated nature. Noise from other park users would be expected to be the same as under the No Action Alternative, and would at times decrease the overall tranquility of the location, as would people driving and parking on the dirt road next to the shore. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain excellent.

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT		FORM 6	√ VIA
BASIC (✔)	DETAILED ()		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS LOCATION Arrowhead State Park VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 8 ALTERNATIVE (4)	DATE TIME WEATHER PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS	of CDM Smith		

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

	i	1	1	ı	1	1	1	1
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B	·		0	SC	МІ	D	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\checkmark
√	
	√
	√
1	_

Total

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

BASIC (√)

DETAILED ()

VIEWPOINT (9)

WITH PLAN ()

FORM 1 ✓ VIA INVENTORY (✓) FORECASTING () DATE 2/20/2012 TIME 12:00 PM LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park WEATHER Cloudy and cold ZONE () PERSONNEL L. Burbage and M. Petty WITHOUT PLAN () of CDM Smith

YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

TIME PERIOD

This view is from the bridge on Highway 31 north of Elm Point Park, facing west during winter. The view consists of the lake, forested tall hills and Elm Point Park on the the opposite shoreline, and the Highway 31 causeway. The forested land on the opposite shore is steep and appears undeveloped. Elm Point Park is on the left side of the view, closer to the viewer. The park has mature trees and grass with no understory. A boat ramp is visible, and the shoreline has a section of rip-rap.

The highway has frequent traffic and the shoulder is highly littered. The wide vista of the lake draws the viewers attention, but the bridge and causeway are still prominent features in the viewshed. Some deciduous trees and shrubs have grown along the causeway but are easily seen through in winter.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, Elm Point Park, forested hillsides

Background: Hilltops, sky

Wildlife: Migratory waterfowl

Noise: Traffic Activity: Traffic

The overall effect of the viewscape is that of developed parkland and undeveloped opposite shore. The park is peaceful, but looks like it is heavily used. The opposite shore and hillslope appear undeveloped and natural. Opportunities for viewing wildlife are good.

√ No

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park

ZONE ()

WITHOUT PLAN ()

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

BASIC (√) DETAILED ()

VIEWPOINT (9)

WITH PLAN ()

FORM 1 ✓ VIA

INVENTORY (✓)

FORECASTING ()

DATE 4/11/2012

TIME 3:00 PM

WEATHER Overcast and mild

PERSONNEL L. Burbage and B. Brown

of CDM Smith

TIME PERIOD YEARS

In your own words, describe the visual resource of the zone. In doing so, try to describe the elements that unify the area so that it can be considered a zone. Make note of other aesthetic characteristics that are present.

This view is from the bridge on Highway 31 north of Elm Point Park, facing west during late spring. The view consists of the lake, forested tall hills and Elm Point Park on the the opposite shoreline, and the Highway 31 causeway. The forested land on the opposite shore is steep and appears undeveloped. Elm Point Park is on the left side of the view, closer to the viewer. The park has mature trees and grass with no understory. A boat ramp is visible, and the shoreline has a section of rip-rap.

The highway has frequent traffic and the shoulder is highly littered. The wide vista of the lake draws the viewers attention, but the bridge and causeway are still prominent features in the viewshed. Some deciduous trees and shrubs have grown along the causeway but are easily seen through in winter.

Foreground: Water surface

Midground: Shore, Elm Point Park, forested hillsides

Background: Hilltops, sky

Wildlife: None Noise: Traffic

Activity: Traffic, one small boat with one person fishing

The overall effect of the viewscape is that of developed parkland and undeveloped opposite shore. The park is peaceful, but looks like it is heavily used. The opposite shore and hillslope appear undeveloped and natural. Opportunities for viewing wildlife are good.

√ No

Yes

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN (√)	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the bridge on Highway 31 north of Elm Point Park, facing west, in 25 years under the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, government-owned lands on the opposite shore would stay zoned as they are currently. Elm Point Park would be zoned Public Recreation. An approximately 700-foot long section of shoreline north of the park (to the right side of the view) would remain Limited Development. The remaining visible shore to the north (within the assessed viewscape) would remain Protected. A few houses would likely be built on the opposite shore due to the availability of roadways; these houses would enjoy panoramic views of the lake. Houses adjacent to land zoned Limited Development would likely have docks. Shoreline Use Permits would allow these houses to clear the forest understory to the water's edge. Houses built adjacent to the land zoned Protected would not be allowed docks nor could they clear the understory of government-owned lands.

The view of Elm Point Park is expected to remain the same under the No Action Alternative. Activity at the park would be noticeable, especially activity around the boat ramp.

The character of Highway 31 would not be expected to change. Some of the vegetation may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the No Action Alternative would be slightly more developed than current conditions. The additional houses and docks on the opposite shore would eliminate some of the natural aesthetic of the view. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain good.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 1 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the bridge on Highway 31 north of Elm Point Park, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 1.

Under Alternative 1, government-owned lands currently zoned Public Recreation or Protected would stay the same. The land owned Limited Development would change to Protected. A few houses would likely be built on the opposite shore due to the availability of roadways; these houses would enjoy panoramic views of the lake. Since the government-owned land would be zoned Protected, houses would not be allowed docks nor could they clear the understory of government-owned lands. As a result, the forested hillside would look less developed than it would under the No Action Alternative.

The view of Elm Point Park is expected to remain the same under Alternative 1 as it would under the No Action Alternative. Activity at the park would be noticeable, especially activity around the boat ramp.

The character of Highway 31 would be the same under Alternative 1 as it would under the No Action Alternative. Some of the vegetation may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the Alternative 1 would be slightly less developed than under the No Action Alternative. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain good under both alternatives.

IEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS DATE

LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point TIME

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 9 WEATHER

ALTERNATIVE (1) PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION								•
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
LANDUSE	Α	В		+1	С	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
WITH PLAN			✓,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations: A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
✓	
	√
	√
1	

Total

✓ VIA

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	MCS ✓ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (√)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 2 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the bridge on Highway 31 north of Elm Point Park, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 2.

Under Alternative 2, government-owned lands would be zoned the same as they would be under the No Action Alternative. An approximately 700-foot long section of shoreline north of Elm Point Park (to the right side of the view) would remain zoned as Limited Development, with a 70-foot conservation buffer. The remaining visible shore to the north (within the assessed viewscape) would remain Protected. A few houses would likely be built on the opposite shore due to the availability of roadways; these houses would enjoy panoramic views of the lake. Houses adjacent to land zoned Limited Development would likely have docks. Shoreline Use Permits would allow these houses to clear the forest understory up to 75 feet from the water's edge. Houses built adjacent to the land zoned Protected would not be allowed docks nor could they clear the understory of government-owned lands.

The view of Elm Point Park is expected to remain the same under Alternative 2 as it would under the No Action Alternative. Activity at the park would be noticeable, especially activity around the boat ramp.

The character of Highway 31 would be the same under Alternative 2 as it would under the No Action Alternative. Some of the vegetation may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the Alternative 2 would be almost the same as under the No Action Alternative. The 75-foot conservation buffer required for Shoreline Use Permits in the Limited Development Area would somewhat screen the houses there, but the docks would still be very visible. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain good under both alternatives.

IEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS DATE
LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge N of Elm Point Park
VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 9 WEATHER

ALTERNATIVE (2) PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION	i	1		1	1	ı	ı	i
	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY C Compatible SC Somewhat Compatible NC Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST MI Minimal MO Moderate S Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE S Subordinant C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	С	МІ	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	С	МІ	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	С	МІ	С	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	С	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

of CDM Smith

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
WITH PLAN			√,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations:

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	✓
✓	
	√
	√
1	

Total

✓ VIA

VICUAL DESCUIDES INVENTORVICORES AST		FORM 4	MCS ✓ VIA
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (√)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 3 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the bridge on Highway 31 north of Elm Point Park, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 3.

The viewshed under Alternative 3 would look much more developed than under the No Action Alternative. Under Alternative 3, government-owned lands, with the exception of Elm Point Park, would change to Limited Development with a 45-foot baseline buffer. Development pressure for the private lands on the hillside would increase since docks would be permitted along the shoreline, access roads are present, and private lots enjoy panoramic views of the lake. Shoreline Use Permits would allow these houses to clear the forest understory up to 45 feet from the water's edge. Although litter would likely increase along the shore due to items blowing off docks and pieces breaking off of styrofoam floats, these items would not be visible from the viewer's location.

The view of Elm Point Park is expected to remain the same under Alternative 3 as it would under the No Action Alternative. Activity at the park would be noticeable, especially activity around the boat ramp.

The character of Highway 31 would be the same under Alternative 3 as it would under the No Action Alternative. Some of the vegetation may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the Alternative 3 would be more developed than it would under the No Action Alternative. The 45-foot baseline buffer required for Shoreline Use Permits in the Limited Development Area would somewhat screen the houses, but the docks would still be very visible. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain good under both alternatives.

IEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS DATE LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge N of Elm Point Park TIME VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 9 **WEATHER**

PERSONNEL L. Burbage ALTERNATIVE (3)

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN GONDITION	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY Compatible C Somewhat Compatible C Not Compatible	ALE CONTRAST Minimal Moderate Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE Subordinant Co-dominant Dominant	
	.SIQ	AVE	Z	山山		SCA MI MO	SPA S C D	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
VEGETATION	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
WITH PLAN			√,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations:

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\checkmark
✓	
	√
	√
1	

Total

✓ VIA

			MCS
VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST		FORM 1	√ VIA
SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()		
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)		
DETAILED ()	DATE		
PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS	TIME		
LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park	WEATHER		
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL L. Burbage		
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 4 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of CDM Smith		
PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS			

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

This view is from the bridge on Highway 31 north of Elm Point Park, facing west, in 25 years under Alternative 4.

The viewshed under Alternative 4 would look much more developed than under the No Action Alternative. Under Alternative 4, government-owned lands, with the exception of Elm Point Park, would change to Limited Development with a 45-foot baseline buffer. Development pressure for the private lands on the hillside would increase since docks would be permitted along the shoreline, access roads are present, and private lots enjoy panoramic views of the lake. Shoreline Use Permits would allow these houses to clear the forest understory up to 45 feet from the water's edge. Although litter would likely increase along the shore due to items blowing off docks and pieces breaking off of styrofoam floats, these items would not be visible from the viewer's location.

The view of Elm Point Park is expected to remain the same under Alternative 4 as it would under the No Action Alternative. Activity at the park would be noticeable, especially activity around the boat ramp.

The character of Highway 31 would be the same under Alternative 4 as it would under the No Action Alternative. Some of the vegetation may grow larger, but it is likely that some maintenance clearing will occur to help preserve lake views.

The visual character of the viewscape under the Alternative 4 would be more developed than it would under the No Action Alternative. The 45-foot baseline buffer required for Shoreline Use Permits in the Limited Development Area would somewhat screen the houses, but the docks would still be very visible. Opportunities for viewing wildlife would remain good under both alternatives.

IEWPOINT ASSESSMENT	FORM 6

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS DATE
LOCATION Highway 31 Bridge N of Elm Point Park
VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 9 WEATHER

ALTERNATIVE (4) PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS of CDM Smith

USE THE LETTER "A" FOR WITH PLAN CONDITION

USE THE LETTER "B" FOR WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION

WITHOUT PLAN CONDITION	DISTINCT 3	AVERAGE 2	MINIMAL 1	DIFFERENCE	COMPATIBILITY Compatible Somewhat Compatible Not Compatible	SCALE CONTRAST I Minimal O Moderate Severe	SPATIAL DOMINANCE Subordinant Co-dominant Dominant	
		⋖	2		O O O O	ο M N N N	တိတ္သ	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
VEGETATION	В	Α		-1	SC	МІ	С	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	МІ	С	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION		INCONSPICOUS	SIGNIFICANT	PROMINENT
	WITH PLAN		√,	
	WITHOUT PLAN		✓	

^{*}The following will give you the value for Special Considerations:

A sum of 3 or more distinct, 1-2 average, and 0 minimal

Does the zone contain any Cultural or Historic Landmarks?

Is this zone, or areas within it, known for its distinct visual quality and/or wildlife observation?

Is this zone free from pollutants and litter?

Are there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource?

YES	NO
	\checkmark
✓	
	✓
	√
1	

Total

✓ VIA

S	ı	I	Ν	Л	Ν	Л	Δ	١I	5	٧	/	Δ	2	9	3	F	S	S	1	V	ΙF	- 1	V	Т

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION

BASIC (**√**) DETAILED ()
DATE 8/26/2012

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

ALTERNATIVE (1)

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE

71002001112111 171202	_	_	_	_		_
VIEWPOINT #	1	2	3	4	TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
WATER	0	0	0	0		
LANDFORM	0	0	0	0		
VEGETATION	0	0	0	0		
LANDUSE	0	0	0	0		
USER ACTIVITY	0	0	0	0		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	0	0	0	0		

MODIFIER RATING

CR = Compatability Rati	ng S	CR = \$	Scale	Contra	ast Ra	iting S	DR =	Spati	al Dor	ninan	ce Rat	ing		JORIT ING	Υ
	S	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	R	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	R	SCR	SDR
WATER	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	С			
LANDFORM	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	С			7
VEGETATION	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	С	С	МІ	D	С	MI	С		$\overline{}$	
LANDUSE	SC	МІ	S	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С			
USER ACTIVITY	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	MI	С			
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION															
P Prominent S Significant I Inconspicuous		S			S			S			S				

SI	П	M	M	Δ	R۱	7	Δ	SS	٦F	S	SI	M	FI	N	т
•	_		ш	$\overline{}$			_	\sim		u	u	м	_		-

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()
DATE 8/27/2012

ALTERNATIVE (1)
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PERSONNEL L. Burbage

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE

ACCECOMENT VALUE	_	_	_	_	_	_
VIEWPOINT #	5	6	7	8	TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
WATER	+1	+1	0	0		
LANDFORM	0	0	0	0		
VEGETATION	0	+1	0	0		
LANDUSE	+1	+1	0	0		
USE ACTIVITY	+1	+1	0	0		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	0	0	0	0		
						_

MODIFIER RATING

CR = Compatability Rat	ing S	CR = \$	Scale	Contra	ast Ra	ting S	SDR =	: Spati	al Dor	ninan	ce Rat	ing		JORIT ING	Υ
	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	D			
LANDFORM	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С			7
VEGETATION	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С			
LANDUSE	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	MI	С			
USE ACTIVITY	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	D	/		
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION															
P Prominent S Significant I Inconspicuous		Р			S			S			S				

SUMMARY ASSESSI	MEN.	Т									F	ORI	И 7	VI	Α	
PROJECT NAME Eufat LOCATION ALTERNATIVE (1) WITH PLAN ()			JT PL <i>A</i>	AN ()	BASIO DATE PERS			DE Burbo	TAILE age	ED ()				
PROJECT DETAILS AN	ID CO	MME	NTS													
VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE																
VIEWPOINT #		9											TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	Q	UOTIE	ENT
WATER		0											9		+0.22	
LANDFORM		0											9		0	
VEGETATION		0											9		+0.11	
LANDUSE		+1											9		+0.33	1
USE ACTIVITY		0											9		+0.22	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		0											9		0	
							١	/ISU	AL IM	PAC	ΓASS	SESS	MENT VALUE:		+0.89)
MODIFIER RATING																
CR = Compatability Rati	ing S	CR = :	Scale	Contra	ast Ra	iting S	SDR =	Spati	ial Dor	minan	ce Ra	ting			IORIT ING	Υ
	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR		CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	С	МІ	D											С	МІ	D
LANDFORM	С	МІ	D											С	МІ	С
VEGETATION	С	МІ	С											С	МІ	С
LANDUSE	С	МІ	С											С	МІ	С
USE ACTIVITY	С	МІ	С											С	МІ	S/C
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION																

S

P Prominent

S Significant
I Inconspicuous

S

SUMMARY ASSESSI	MEN.	Т									F	ORI	VI 7	٧	ΊA	
PROJECT NAME Eufate LOCATION ALTERNATIVE (2) WITH PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AN	WI	THOU	T PLA	AN ()	DATE		T) EL <i>L.</i>			ED ()				
VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE																
VIEWPOINT #		1			2			3			4		TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS		QUOTII	ENT
WATER		0			0			0			0					
LANDFORM		0			0			0			0					
VEGETATION		0			0			0			0					
LANDUSE		0			0			0			0					
USE ACTIVITY		0			0			0			0					
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		0			0			0			0					
MODIFIER RATING CR = Compatability Rati	na Si	CR = 9	Scale	Contra	ast Ra	atina S	SDR =	: Snati	al Dor	minan	ce Rat	ina			JORIT TING	Υ
2. Sompardomy rudi	S S	SCR	SDR	SOUTH OF	SCR	SDR	S S	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR		ا ا	SCR	SDR
WATER	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	D	С	MI	С				
LANDFORM	С	МІ	С	С	MI	С	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	С				/

С

С

 $C \mid C$

С

С

MI

MI

MI

S

С

C MI

С

MI

MI

S

D

S

S

С

С

С

VEGETATION

USE ACTIVITY

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION

P Prominent

S Significant
I Inconspicuous

LANDUSE

С

С

С

MI

MI

S

С

S

S

С

С

С

MI

MI

S

SI	П	M	M	Δ	R۱	7	Δ	SS	٦F	S	SI	M	FI	N	т
•	_		ш	$\overline{}$			_	\sim		u	u	м	_		-

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

ALTERNATIVE (2)

DATE 8/27/2012 PERSONNEL L. Burbage

WITHOUT PLAN () WITH PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE

	_	_	_	_	_	_
VIEWPOINT #	5	6	7	8	TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
WATER	0	0	0	0		
LANDFORM	0	0	0	0		
VEGETATION	0	0	0	0		
LANDUSE	+1	0	0	0		
USE ACTIVITY	+1	0	0	0		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	0	0	0	0		

MODIFIER RATING

mpatability Rating SCR = Scale Contrast Rating SDR = Spatial Dominance Rating														JORIT TING	Y
S	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR		CR	SCR	SDR
С	MI	D	SC	МІ	D	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	D				
С	МІ	D	SC	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С				\overline{I}
С	МІ	D	SC	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С				
С	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С				
С	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	С	MI	D				
	Ρ			S			S			S					
	C C C	C MI C MI C MI C MI	C MI D C MI D C MI S C MI S	C MI D SC C MI D SC C MI S SC C MI S SC	C MI D SC MI C MI D SC MI C MI D SC MI C MI S SC MI C MI S SC MI	C MI D SC MI C C MI D SC MI C C MI S SC MI C C MI S SC MI C	C MI D SC MI D C C MI D SC MI C C C MI D SC MI C C C MI D SC MI C C C MI S SC MI C C C MI S SC MI C C	C MI D SC MI C C MI C MI S SC MI C C MI C MI S SC MI C C MI	C MI D SC MI C C MI S C MI S SC MI C C MI S C MI S SC MI C C MI S	C MI D SC MI D C MI D C C MI D SC MI C C MI D C C MI D SC MI C C MI S C C MI S SC MI C C MI S C C MI S SC MI C C MI S C	C MI D SC MI D C MI S C MI D C MI S C MI D C MI S C MI S	C MI D SC MI D C MI D D MI D	C MI D SC MI D C MI C C MI S C MI C C MI S C MI C C MI S C MI D </td <td>C MI D SC MI D C MI C C MI S C MI C C MI S C MI C C MI S C MI D</td> <td>C MI D SC MI D C MI C C MI S C MI D<!--</td--></td>	C MI D SC MI D C MI C C MI S C MI C C MI S C MI C C MI S C MI D	C MI D SC MI D C MI C C MI S C MI D </td

SUMMARY ASSESSI												ORI	VI 7	VI	Α	
PROJECT NAME Eufai	ula La	ke EIS				BASI)	DE	TAILE	ED ()				
LOCATION ALTERNATIVE (2)						DATE		-ı /	Durh	200						
	14/1	TUOI	IT PLA	NI (`	PERS	OININ	EL L.	Burbo	ige						
WITHFLAN ()	VVI	11100	II F L F	(I	,											
PROJECT DETAILS AN	ID CO	MME	NTS													
VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE																
VIEWPOINT #		9											TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	Q	UOTIE	ENT
WATER		0											9		0	
LANDFORM		0											9		0	
VEGETATION		0											9		0	
LANDUSE		0											9		0.11	
USE ACTIVITY		0											9		0.11	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		0											9		0	
							\	/ISU/	AL IM	PACT	ASS	SESS	L MENT VALUE:		+0.22	
MODIFIER RATING				<u> </u>			l									
CR = Compatability Rati	ing S	CR = :	Scale	Contra	ast Ra	nting S	SDR =	Spati	al Dor	ninano	ce Ra	ting		MAJ RAT	ORIT	Υ
	<u>~</u>	SCR	SDR	~	SCR	SDR	~	SCR	SDR	<u>~</u>	SCR	SDR		~	SCR	SDR
	R	S	S	유	S	SI	R	S	S	R	S	SI		S	S	S
WATER	С	МІ	D											С	МІ	D
LANDFORM	С	МІ	D											С	МІ	С
VEGETATION	С	МІ	С											С	МІ	С
LANDUSE	С	МІ	С											С	MI	С
USE ACTIVITY	С	МІ	С											С	МІ	S/C

S

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION

S

P Prominent

S Significant
I Inconspicuous

SUMMARY ASSESSM	IENT			FOI	RM 7	VIA
PROJECT NAME Eufaun LOCATION ALTERNATIVE (3) WITH PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AND	WITHOUT PLA		BASIC (✔) DATE PERSONNEL <i>L. Bu</i>	DETAILED () urbage		
VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE		1	1			1
VIEWPOINT #	1	2	3	4	TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
WATER	-1	-1	0	-1		
LANDFORM	0	0	0	0		
VEGETATION	-1	-1	0	0		
LANDUSE	-1	-1	0	0		
USE ACTIVITY	0	0	0	0		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	0	0	0	0		
MODIFIER RATING			<u> </u>			

CR = Compatability Ra	ating S	CR = :	Scale	Contra	ast Ra	ting S	SDR =	: Spati	al Dor	ninan	ce Rat	ing		JORIT ΓING	Υ
	S	SCR	SDR	R	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	SC	МІ	D	SC	МІ	D	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	С			
LANDFORM	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	С			$\overline{/}$
VEGETATION	SC	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С	С	МІ	D	С	МІ	С		$\overline{}$	
LANDUSE	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С			
USE ACTIVITY	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С			
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION															
P Prominent		S			S			S			S				
S Significant															
I Inconspicuous															

S	ı	I	Ν	Л	Ν	Л	Δ	١I	5	٧	/	Δ	2	9	3	F	S	S	1	V	ΙF	- 1	V	Т

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION
ALTERNATIVE (3)

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

DATE 8/27/2012 PERSONNEL L. Burbage

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE

	_	_	_	_	_	_
VIEWPOINT #	5	6	7	8	TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
WATER	0	0	-1	-1		
LANDFORM	0	0	-1	0		
VEGETATION	0	0	0	0		
LANDUSE	0	0	-2	-1		
USE ACTIVITY	0	0	-1	0		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	0	0	0	0		

MODIFIER RATING

CR = Compatability Rati	ng S	CR = \$	Scale	Contra	ast Ra	iting S	DR =	Spati	al Dor	ninano	ce Rat	ing		JORIT TING	Y
	R	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR
WATER	С	МІ	D	SC	МІ	D	SC	МІ	D	SC	МІ	D			
LANDFORM	С	МІ	D	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С			7
VEGETATION	С	МІ	D	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	S	SC	MI	С		$\overline{}$	
LANDUSE	С	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	D	SC	МІ	С			
USE ACTIVITY	С	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	D			
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION															
P Prominent S Significant I Inconspicuous		Р			S			S			S				

SUMMARY ASSESSI	MEN [.]	т									ı	FOR	И 7	VI	Α	
PROJECT NAME Eufa LOCATION ALTERNATIVE (3) WITH PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AN	WI	THOU	JT PLA	AN ()	DATE			DE Burbo	TAILE	ED ()				
VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE														_		
VIEWPOINT #		9											TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	Q	UOTIE	ENT
WATER		0											9		-0.56	
LANDFORM		0											9		-0.11	
VEGETATION		-1											9		-0.33	
LANDUSE		0											9		-0.56	
USE ACTIVITY		0											9		-0.11	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		0											9		0	
							\	/ISU/	AL IM	PAC1	ΓASS	SESS	MENT VALUE:		-1.67	
MODIFIER RATING CR = Compatability Rat	ing S	CR = :	Scale	Contra	ast Ra	ating S	SDR =	Spati	al Dor	ninano	ce Ra	ting			IORIT ING	Y
	CR	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR		CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	SC	МІ	D											SC	МІ	D
LANDFORM	SC	МІ	D											С	МІ	С
VEGETATION	SC	МІ	С											SC	MI	С
LANDUSE	SC	МІ	С											SC	МІ	С
USE ACTIVITY	SC	МІ	С											SC	MI	С
	1									I						

S

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION

S

P Prominent

S Significant
I Inconspicuous

SUMMARY ASSESSI	MENT	FOR	М 7	VIA			
PROJECT NAME Eufau LOCATION ALTERNATIVE (4) WITH PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AN	WITHOUT PLA		BASIC (✔) DATE PERSONNE		ETAILED ()		
VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE							
VIEWPOINT #	1	2		3	4	TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
WATER	-1	-1		-2	-2		
LANDFORM	0	0		0	0		
VEGETATION	-1	-1		-1	0		
LANDUSE	-1	-1		-2	-1		
USE ACTIVITY	0	0		-1	-1		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	0	0		-1	-1		
MODIFIER RATING							MAJORITY

CR = Compatability Rati	CR = Compatability Rating SCR = Scale Contrast Rating SDR = Spatial Dominance Rating														RATING		
	CR	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	R	SCR	SDR		R	SCR	SDR	
WATER	SC	МІ	D	SC	МІ	D	NC	S	С	NC	МІ	С					
LANDFORM	С	МІ	S	С	МІ	С	С	S	S	С	МІ	S					
VEGETATION	SC	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С	SC	S	S	С	МІ	С					
LANDUSE	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	С	NC	S	D	SC	МО	D					
USE ACTIVITY	С	МІ	С	С	МІ	С	SC	S	D	SC	МІ	D					
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION																	
P Prominent S Significant I Inconspicuous		S			S			Р			Р						

S	1	I	٨	Л	Ν	Л	Δ	Œ	S.	٧	7	Δ	2	3	3	F	S	S	1	V	F	1	J	т

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME Eufaula Lake EIS

LOCATION
ALTERNATIVE (3)

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

DATE 8/27/2012 PERSONNEL L. Burbage

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE

		_	_	_	_	
VIEWPOINT #	5	6	7	8	TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
WATER	0	0	-1	-1		
LANDFORM	0	0	-1	0		
VEGETATION	0	0	0	0		
LANDUSE	0	0	-2	-1		
USE ACTIVITY	0	0	-1	0		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	0	0	0	0		

MODIFIER RATING

CR = Compatability Rat	ing S	SCR = Scale Contrast Rating SDR = Spatial Dominance Rating														Υ
	CR	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR		S	SCR	SDR
WATER	С	МІ	D	SC	МІ	D	SC	МІ	D	SC	МІ	D				
LANDFORM	С	МІ	D	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С				7
VEGETATION	С	МІ	D	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С			7	
LANDUSE	С	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	D	SC	MI	С				
USE ACTIVITY	С	МІ	S	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	С	SC	МІ	D				
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION																
P Prominent		Ρ			S			S			S					
S Significant I Inconspicuous																

		_													_	
PROJECT NAME Eufant LOCATION ALTERNATIVE (4) WITH PLAN () PROJECT DETAILS AN	IT PL <i>A</i>	AN ()	BASIO DATE PERS	•		DE Burbo	TAILE			M 7	VI	Α			
VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE	1			ı			ı			ı			ı	ı		
VIEWPOINT #		9											TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	Q	UOTIE	ENT
WATER		0											9		-0.89	
LANDFORM		0											9		-0.11	
VEGETATION		-1											9		-0.44	
LANDUSE		0											9		-0.89	
USE ACTIVITY		0											9		-0.33	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		0											9		-0.22	
							١	/ISU/	AL IM	PAC1	Γ AS	SESS	MENT VALUE:		-2.89	
MODIFIER RATING CR = Compatability Rati	ng S(CR = ;	Scale	Contra	ast Ra	ating S	DR =	Spati	al Dor	ninano	ce Ra	ting		MAJ RAT	ORIT ING	Υ
	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	S	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR		CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	SC	МІ	D											SC	МІ	D
LANDFORM	SC	МІ	D											С	МІ	S/C
VEGETATION	SC	МІ	С											SC	МІ	С
LANDUSE	SC	МІ	С											SC	МІ	С
USE ACTIVITY	sc	MI	С											SC	МІ	С

S

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION

S

P Prominent

S Significant
I Inconspicuous