

Appendix A

VRAP Management Classification System Forms

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1

**✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC ()	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE 5/20/2012
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Regional Landscape</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT () ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of
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 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, coarse-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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC ()
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Regional Landscape*
 VIEWPOINT () ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *5/20/2012*
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

of
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	✓ 0-25%	✓ 25-50%	✓ 50-75%	✓ 75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	✓ PRESENT	SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	✓ UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	✓ SUBURBAN	✓ URBAN
TYPE	✓ RECREATION	✓ AGRICULTURE	✓ RESIDENTIAL	✓ COMMERCIAL	✓ INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	✓ TRAIL	✓ WALKWAY	✓ SECOND. RD.	✓ PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	---------	-----------	---------------	---------------	-----------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	✓ LOW		✓ MEDIUM		✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	✓ LOW		✓ MEDIUM		✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		✓ PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	-----------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		✓ SOMEWHAT		✓ VERY
------------	-----	--	------------	--	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		✓ HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		✓ HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED		✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	✓ INFERIOR		✓ NORMAL		✓ SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? ✓ Yes No
 If yes, explain *This area is highly used for recreation.*

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? ✓ Yes No

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks? ✓ Yes No
The area is known for art deco architecture

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 3

✓ MCS

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA *Eufaula Lake EIS*

DATE *5/20/2012*

NOTES: *Regional Landscape*

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large, open lake - Secluded natural coves - Small rocky streams - Steep rocky shoreline - Beaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lightly developed coves with or without small docks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highly developed coves with or without very high dock density - Eroded streams - Eroded shoreline
LANDFORM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tall hills, cuestas, and ridges - Steep rocky shoreline - Natural beaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flat natural areas - Flat residential areas - Lightly graded areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Flat oil/gas fields - Eroded shoreline - Extensively graded areas
VEGETATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Naturally barren rocky land - Mature hillside forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forested wetlands - Shrub/Scrub and herbaceous wetlands - Small residential yards - Natural-looking parkland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large and dense residential areas with few trees - Barren oil/gas fields - Barren industrial areas - Recreational areas with few trees
LAND USE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Undeveloped land - Recreational Areas - Well-designed, culturally significant buildings (e.g. art deco). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moderately developed land - Low- to medium-density residential areas - Low density docks - Roadway overpasses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Industrial areas - Marinas/high density docks - High density developed areas if not very well maintained - Highway causeways
USER ACTIVITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water recreation - Picnicking - Fishing - Hunting - Nature Watching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low- to medium-density residences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK**FORM 4****✓ 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	X			
VEGETATION		X		
LAND USE		X		
USER ACTIVITY		X		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	X			
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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC ()	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE 5/21/2012
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>LSZ 1 - Forest</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT () ZONE (1)	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of
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 different 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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Large, open lake views - Secluded natural coves - Small rocky streams - Steep rocky shoreline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beaches adjacent to forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eroded shoreline
LANDFORM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tall hills, cuestas, and ridges - Steep rocky shoreline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beaches adjacent to forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eroded shoreline
VEGETATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mature hillside forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forested wetlands 	
LAND USE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Undeveloped land - Recreation and hunting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low density residences - Low density docks - Highway throughways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Illegal activity or poaching
USER ACTIVITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recreation - Fishing - Hunting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 4

✓ 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	X			
LANDFORM	X			
VEGETATION	X			
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 = 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? *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" 3

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC ()	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE 5/22/2012
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>LSZ - Grassland/Prairie/Pasture</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT () ZONE (2)	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of
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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)

BASIC ()

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

LOCATION *LSZ - Grassland/Prairie/Pasture*

VIEWPOINT () ZONE (2)

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)

FORECASTING ()

DATE *5/22/2012*

TIME

WEATHER

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

of

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

WATER

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

COVER

0

0-25%

✓ 25-50%

✓ 50-75%

75-100%

DIVERSITY

NONE

✓ LITTLE

✓ PRESENT

✓ SUBSTANTIAL

EXTENSIVE

SEAS. CHANGE

NONE

✓ PRESENT

SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY

WILDERNESS

✓ UNDEVELOPED

✓ RURAL

SUBURBAN

URBAN

TYPE

RECREATION

✓ AGRICULTURE

RESIDENTIAL

COMMERCIAL

✓ INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE

TRAIL

WALKWAY

✓ SECOND. RD.

✓ PRIMARY RD.

HIGHWAY

BOAT

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE

✓ LOW

MEDIUM

HIGH

FREQUENCY

✓ LOW

MEDIUM

HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT

✓ NONE

PRESENT

EXTENSIVE

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY

NOT

✓ SOMEWHAT

✓ VERY

SOUNDS

PRESENCE

ABSENT

✓ PRESENT

DOMINANT

TYPE

DISCORDANT

✓ INCONSPICUOUS

HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE

ABSENT

✓ PRESENT

DOMINANT

TYPE

DISCORDANT

✓ INCONSPICUOUS

HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT

SCREENED

✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED

✓ PANORAMA

POSITION

INFERIOR

✓ NORMAL

SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes?
If yes, explain

Yes

✓ No

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

Yes

✓ No

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

Yes

✓ No

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK**FORM 4****✓ 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		X		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		X		
TOTALS	0	12		

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE 12

*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 NoAre there other aesthetic elements that add to this resource? Yes No Total "Yes" 1

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

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

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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)
 BASIC ()
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *LSZ 4 - Wetlands*
 VIEWPOINT () ZONE (4)
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *7/12/2012*
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 CDM Smith
 of
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	✓ 75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		PRESENT		✓ SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	✓ UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	✓ RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	✓ TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	---------	---------	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	✓ LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	✓ LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		SOMEWHAT		✓ VERY
------------	-----	--	----------	--	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		✓ HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		✓ HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED		PARTIALLY SCREENED		PANORAMA
POSITION	INFERIOR		✓ NORMAL		SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? ✓ Yes No

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

PROFESSIONAL (✓)

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA *Eufaula Lake EIS*

DATE *7/12/2012*

NOTES: *LSZ 4 - Wetlands*

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

	DISTINCT	AVERAGE	MINIMAL
WATER RESOURCES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - forested wetlands, esp. those with pond cypress - Large tracts of wetlands surrounded by undisturbed uplands - Wetlands adjacent to parks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wetlands fringing developed areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wetlands fringing industrial or urban areas if significant amounts of trash have collected
LANDFORM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - flat 	
VEGETATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mature trees - Flowering shrubs - Flowering herbaceous plants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-flowering herbaceous plants or those with inconspicuous flowers - Saplings in disturbed wetlands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small areas covered with Salvinia or duckweed
LAND USE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recreational areas - Wildlife management 		
USER ACTIVITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 4

✓ 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		X		
VEGETATION	X			
LAND USE	X			
USER ACTIVITY	X			
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	X			
TOTALS	15	2	0	

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE 17

*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

The natural wetland areas are of particular importance to those that use the lake recreationally

Total "Yes" 3

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	INVENTORY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BASIC <input type="checkbox"/>	FORECASTING <input type="checkbox"/>
DETAILED <input type="checkbox"/>	DATE <i>7/13/2012</i>
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>LSZ 5 - Recreation Area</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT <input type="checkbox"/> ZONE <i>(5)</i>	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN <input type="checkbox"/> WITHOUT PLAN <input type="checkbox"/>	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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.

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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)
 BASIC ()
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *LSZ 5 - Recreation Area*
 VIEWPOINT () ZONE (5)
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *7/13/2012*
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
CDM Smith
 of
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE	✓ STREAM NONE SMALL	RIVER MEANDER	✓ LAKE/RES SWIFT MEDIUM	✓ WETLANDS RAPID	MARINE FALLS 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		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE	✓ WILDERNESS RECREATION	✓ UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE	✓ RURAL RESIDENTIAL	SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL	✓ URBAN INDUSTRIAL
----------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	--------------------

ACCESS

TYPE	✓ TRAIL	✓ WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	✓ PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	---------	-----------	-------------	---------------	---------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE FREQUENCY	✓ LOW		✓ MEDIUM		✓ HIGH	<i>User activity varies seasonally.</i>
	✓ LOW		✓ MEDIUM		✓ HIGH	

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		✓ PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	-----------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		✓ SOMEWHAT		✓ VERY
------------	-----	--	------------	--	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE	✓ ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT INCONSPICUOUS		✓ DOMINANT HARMONIOUS	<i>Sounds vary by seasonal user intensity.</i>
---------------	---------------------	--	-------------------------	--	-----------------------	--

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT INCONSPICUOUS		DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
---------------	-------------------	--	-------------------------	--	---------------------

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION	SCREENED INFERIOR		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED NORMAL		✓ PANORAMA SUPERIOR
-----------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------	--	---------------------

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No

If yes, explain *Recreational areas are of high value to those visiting Eufaula Lake.*

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

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

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

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

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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC ()	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE <i>6/12/2012</i>
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>LSZ 6 - Residential - Medium Density</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT () ZONE (6)	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)
 BASIC ()
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *LSZ 6 - Residential - Medium Density*
 VIEWPOINT () ZONE (6)
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *6/12/2012*
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
CDM Smith
 of
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE	STREAM ✓ NONE SMALL	RIVER MEANDER	✓ LAKE/RES SWIFT ✓ MEDIUM	WETLANDS RAPID	MARINE FALLS ✓ 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		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE	WILDERNESS RECREATION	UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE	RURAL ✓ RESIDENTIAL	✓ SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL	URBAN INDUSTRIAL
----------------	--------------------------	----------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	✓ SECOND. RD.	✓ PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	---------------	---------------	---------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW		MEDIUM		✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		✓ PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	-----------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		✓ SOMEWHAT		VERY
------------	-----	--	------------	--	------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT ✓ DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT ✓ INCONSPICUOUS		DOMINANT ✓ HARMONIOUS
---------------	------------------------	--	------------------------------	--	--------------------------

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT ✓ INCONSPICUOUS		DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
---------------	----------------------	--	------------------------------	--	------------------------

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION	SCREENED INFERIOR		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED ✓ NORMAL		✓ PANORAMA ✓ SUPERIOR
-----------------	----------------------	--	----------------------------------	--	--------------------------

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

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

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parorama views of the lake - Views of undeveloped shoreline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Views of shoreline in neighborhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Views of highly developed shoreline - Views of high-density docks
LANDFORM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Steep hills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rolling hills - Flat land 	
VEGETATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forested neighborhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Turf - Specimen trees - Landscaped yards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yards with few trees - Neglected yards
LAND USE		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residential - Schools - Churches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neighborhoods that are particularly run down
USER ACTIVITY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 4

✓ 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		X		<i>All levels are present, however, the typical view is of neighborhood shorelines</i>
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION		X		<i>All levels are present, however, the typical view is of neighborhood yards.</i>
LAND USE		X		
USER ACTIVITY		X		
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, 1-2 = 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" 1

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC ()	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE <i>8/10/2012</i>
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>LSZ 7 - Urban and Commercial/Industrial</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT () ZONE (7)	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)
 BASIC ()
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *LSZ 7 - Urban and Commercial/Industrial*
 VIEWPOINT () ZONE (7)
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *8/10/2012*
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
CDM Smith
 of
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	✓ 0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	PRESENT	SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	RURAL	✓ SUBURBAN	✓ URBAN
TYPE	RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	✓ COMMERCIAL	✓ INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	✓ PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	---------------	---------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	NONE	✓ PRESENT	✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	------	-----------	-------------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	✓ NOT	✓ SOMEWHAT	VERY
------------	-------	------------	------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	SCREENED	✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED	PANORAMA
POSITION	INFERIOR	✓ NORMAL	SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No

If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

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

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

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			- <i>Drainage ditches</i>
LANDFORM		- <i>Generally flat terrain</i>	
VEGETATION		- <i>Street trees</i> - <i>Maintained turf</i>	- <i>Mowed areas (not maintained turf)</i> - <i>Barren ground</i>
LAND USE	- <i>Downtown Eufaula</i>	- <i>Shopping centers</i>	- <i>Industrial areas</i>
USER ACTIVITY	- <i>Tourism</i>	- <i>Shopping</i> - <i>Employment</i>	

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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 4

✓ 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	<i>Very few water resources - only a few drainage ditches</i>
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION			X	<i>Vegetation is generally lacking or poorly maintained</i>
LAND USE		X		
USER ACTIVITY		X		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		X		
TOTALS	0	8	2	

TOTAL ASSESSMENT VALUE 10

*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

Downtown Eufaula is attractive for tourism.

Total "Yes" 1

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	INVENTORY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BASIC <input type="checkbox"/>	FORECASTING <input type="checkbox"/>
DETAILED <input type="checkbox"/>	DATE <i>8/11/2012</i>
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>LSZ 8 - Transportation</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT <input type="checkbox"/> ZONE <i>(8)</i>	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN <input type="checkbox"/> WITHOUT PLAN <input type="checkbox"/>	of <i>CDM SMith</i>
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).

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)
 BASIC ()
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula EIS*
 LOCATION *LSZ 8 - Transportation*
 VIEWPOINT () ZONE (8)
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *8/11/2012*
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
CDM SMith
 of
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	✓ 0	✓ 0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	(✓) 75-100%	() indicates views of
DIVERSITY	✓ NONE	✓ LITTLE	PRESENT	SUBSTANTIAL	(✓) EXTENSIVE	the surrounding
SEAS. CHANGE	✓ NONE		PRESENT		(✓) SUBSTANTIAL	landscape outside of
						the similarity zone.

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	(✓) WILDERNESS	(✓) UNDEVELOPED	(✓) RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	✓ PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	---------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	NONE	✓ PRESENT	EXTENSIVE
--------	------	-----------	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	✓ NOT	SOMEWHAT	VERY
------------	-------	----------	------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED	✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED	✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	✓ INFERIOR	✓ NORMAL	✓ SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

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

PROFESSIONAL ()

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA *Eufaula EIS*

DATE *8/11/2012*

NOTES: *LSZ 8 - Transportation*

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

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

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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 4

✓ 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	X			<i>Rating is for views of the surrounding area from the Transportation similarity zone.</i>
LANDFORM	X			<i>Rating is for views of the surrounding area from the Transportation similarity zone.</i>
VEGETATION	X			<i>Rating is for views of the surrounding area from the Transportation similarity zone.</i>
LAND USE		X		
USER ACTIVITY		X		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		X		
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 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
- Views of Eufaula Lake and the surrounding topography and vegetation from transportation corridors are considered unique and valuable.*
- Total "Yes" 2

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC ()	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE 7/23/2012
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>LSZ 9 - Marinas</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
ZONE (9)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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.

PROFESSIONAL ()

COMPOSITE ()

STUDY AREA *Eufaula Lake EIS*

DATE *7/23/2012*

NOTES: *LSZ 9 - Marinas*

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

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

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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 4

✓ 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			X	<i>The water resources most noticeable are those in the immediate dock areas.</i>
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION			X	<i>The vegetation most noticeable is that in the dock, storage, and boat ramp areas.</i>
LAND USE			X	
USER ACTIVITY		X		
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*				
TOTALS	0	4	3	X

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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC ()	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE 7/24/2012
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>LSZ 10 - High Density Docks</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT () ZONE (10)	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 obtrusive.

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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**✓ MCS
VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)
 BASIC ()
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *LSZ 10 - High Density Docks*
 VIEWPOINT () ZONE (10)
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *7/24/2012*
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
CDM Smith
 of
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE	✓ STREAM NONE SMALL	RIVER MEANDER	✓ LAKE/RES SWIFT MEDIUM	WETLANDS RAPID	MARINE FALLS LARGE
-------------------------	---------------------	---------------	-------------------------	----------------	--------------------

LANDFORM

TYPE	COASTAL	✓ PLAINS	✓ ROLLING HILLS	✓ HILLS	MOUNTAINS	<i>Landform is of adjacent land</i>
------	---------	----------	-----------------	---------	-----------	-------------------------------------

VEGETATION

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	✓ 50-75%	75-100%	<i>Vegetation is of adjacent land</i>
DIVERSITY	NONE	✓ LITTLE	✓ PRESENT	SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE	
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL	

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE	WILDERNESS RECREATION	UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE	✓ RURAL RESIDENTIAL	✓ SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL	URBAN INDUSTRIAL
----------------	-----------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	------------------

ACCESS

TYPE	✓ TRAIL	✓ WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	---------	-----------	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE FREQUENCY	✓ LOW		✓ MEDIUM		✓ HIGH	<i>User activity varies by season and day of week</i>
	✓ LOW		✓ MEDIUM		✓ HIGH	

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	NONE		✓ PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	------	--	-----------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	✓ NOT		SOMEWHAT		VERY
------------	-------	--	----------	--	------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
	✓ DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
	✓ DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION	✓ SCREENED		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED		PANORAMA
	✓ INFERIOR		✓ NORMAL		SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

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

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

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.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

FORM 4

✓ 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			X	<i>Docks block views of water resources or dominate the view</i>
LANDFORM		X		
VEGETATION			X	<i>Docks block views of vegetation and/or dominate the view in many areas of this zone</i>
LAND USE		X		
USER ACTIVITY		X		
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

MANAGEMENT CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY

FORM 5

✓MCS

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. <i>Forest</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>Preservation</i>	
2. <i>Grassland/Pasture/Prairie</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>Partial Retention</i>	
3. <i>Farmland</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>Retention</i>	
4. <i>Wetlands</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>Preservation</i>	
5. <i>Recreation Area</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>Preservation</i>	
6. <i>Residential – Medium Density</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>Partial Retention</i>	
7. <i>Urban – Commercial/Industrial</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Modification</i>	
8. <i>Transportation</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>Retention</i>	
9. <i>Marinas</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Rehabilitation</i>	
10. <i>High-Density Docks</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>Modification</i>	
<i>General Regional Landscape</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>Retention</i>	

Appendix B

VRAP Visual Impact Assessment Forms

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

LOCATION *Near Dutchess Creek Island*

VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)

FORECASTING ()

DATE *2/21/2012*

TIME *12:30 PM*

WEATHER *Sunny and cold*

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage & M. Petty*

CDM Smith

of

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE
MOVEMENT
SCALE

STREAM
✓ NONE
SMALL

RIVER
MEANDER

✓ LAKE/RES
SWIFT
MEDIUM

WETLANDS
RAPID

MARINE
FALLS
✓ 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

SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY
TYPE

✓ WILDERNESS
RECREATION

UNDEVELOPED
AGRICULTURE

✓ RURAL
✓ RESIDENTIAL

✓ SUBURBAN
COMMERCIAL

URBAN
INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE

TRAIL

WALKWAY

SECOND. RD.

PRIMARY RD.

HIGHWAY

✓ BOAT

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE

✓ LOW

MEDIUM

HIGH

FREQUENCY

✓ LOW

MEDIUM

HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT

✓ NONE

PRESENT

EXTENSIVE

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY

NOT

SOMEWHAT

✓ VERY

SOUNDS

PRESENCE

ABSENT

✓ PRESENT

DOMINANT

TYPE

DISCORDANT

✓ INCONSPICUOUS

✓ HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE

ABSENT

✓ PRESENT

DOMINANT

TYPE

DISCORDANT

✓ INCONSPICUOUS

✓ HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT

SCREENED

PARTIALLY SCREENED

✓ PANORAMA

POSITION

INFERIOR

✓ NORMAL

SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes?

Yes

✓ No

If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

Yes

✓ No

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

Yes

✓ No

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

LOCATION *Near Dutchess Creek Island*

VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN (✓)

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()

FORECASTING (✓)

DATE

TIME

WEATHER

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

CDM Smith

of

TIME PERIOD 25 YEARS

WATER

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

COVER

0

✓ 0-25%

✓ 25-50%

50-75%

75-100%

DIVERSITY

NONE

LITTLE

PRESENT

✓ SUBSTANTIAL

EXTENSIVE

SEAS. CHANGE

NONE

✓ PRESENT

SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY

✓ WILDERNESS

UNDEVELOPED

✓ RURAL

✓ SUBURBAN

URBAN

TYPE

RECREATION

AGRICULTURE

✓ RESIDENTIAL

COMMERCIAL

INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE

TRAIL

WALKWAY

SECOND. RD.

PRIMARY RD.

HIGHWAY

✓ BOAT

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE

LOW

✓ MEDIUM

HIGH

FREQUENCY

LOW

✓ MEDIUM

HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT

✓ NONE

PRESENT

EXTENSIVE

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY

NOT

SOMEWHAT

✓ VERY

SOUNDS

PRESENCE

ABSENT

✓ PRESENT

DOMINANT

TYPE

DISCORDANT

✓ INCONSPICUOUS

✓ HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE

ABSENT

✓ PRESENT

DOMINANT

TYPE

DISCORDANT

✓ INCONSPICUOUS

✓ HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT

SCREENED

PARTIALLY SCREENED

✓ PANORAMA

POSITION

INFERIOR

✓ NORMAL

SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes?

Yes

✓ No

If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

Yes

✓ No

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

Yes

✓ No

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE (✓)	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Near Dutchess Creek Island</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 1</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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*
 VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *1*
 ALTERNATIVE ()

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	SC	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Near Dutchess Creek Island</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 2</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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

✓ VIA

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

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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Near Dutchess Creek Island</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 3</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Near Dutchess Creek Island*
 VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 3* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD 25 YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE	✓ STREAM NONE SMALL	RIVER MEANDER	✓ LAKE/RES SWIFT MEDIUM	WETLANDS RAPID	MARINE FALLS 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		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE	✓ WILDERNESS RECREATION	UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE	✓ RURAL RESIDENTIAL	✓ SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL	URBAN INDUSTRIAL
----------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	------------------

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		✓ SOMEWHAT		VERY
------------	-----	--	------------	--	------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT		✓ DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
			✓ INCONSPICUOUS		

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT		✓ DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
			✓ INCONSPICUOUS		

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION	SCREENED INFERIOR		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED		✓ PANORAMA SUPERIOR
			✓ NORMAL		

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B	A		-1	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	S	
VEGETATION	B	A		-1	SC	MI	S	
LANDUSE	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Near Dutchess Creek Island</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) Alternative 4 WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Near Dutchess Creek Island*
 VIEWPOINT (1) ZONE (1/2/6)
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 4* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD 25 YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE	✓ STREAM NONE SMALL	RIVER MEANDER	✓ LAKE/RES SWIFT MEDIUM	WETLANDS RAPID	MARINE FALLS 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		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE	✓ WILDERNESS RECREATION	UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE	✓ RURAL RESIDENTIAL	✓ SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL	URBAN INDUSTRIAL
----------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	------------------

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		✓ SOMEWHAT		VERY
------------	-----	--	------------	--	------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
			✓ INCONSPICUOUS		✓ HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
			✓ INCONSPICUOUS		✓ HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION	SCREENED INFERIOR		PARTIALLY SCREENED		✓ PANORAMA SUPERIOR
			✓ NORMAL		

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B	A		-1	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	S	
VEGETATION	B	A		-1	SC	MI	S	
LANDUSE	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Standing Rock Cut - East*
 VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *2/21/2012*
 TIME *1:15 PM*
 WEATHER *Sunny and cold*
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage and M. Petty*

of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE	✓ STREAM NONE SMALL	RIVER MEANDER	✓ LAKE/RES SWIFT MEDIUM	WETLANDS RAPID	MARINE FALLS 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		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE	✓ WILDERNESS RECREATION	✓ UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE	✓ RURAL RESIDENTIAL	✓ SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL	URBAN INDUSTRIAL
----------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	------------------

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		✓ SOMEWHAT		VERY
------------	-----	--	------------	--	------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
			✓ INCONSPICUOUS		

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
			✓ INCONSPICUOUS		

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION	SCREENED INFERIOR		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED NORMAL		✓ PANORAMA SUPERIOR
-----------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------	--	---------------------

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes ✓ No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes ✓ No

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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE <i>4/12/2012</i>
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME <i>10:15 AM</i>
LOCATION <i>Standing Rock Cut - East</i>	WEATHER <i>Sunny and mild</i>
VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 1</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Standing Rock Cut - East*
 VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 1* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *4/12/2012*
 TIME *10:15 AM*
 WEATHER *Sunny and mild*
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE	✓ STREAM NONE SMALL	RIVER MEANDER	✓ LAKE/RES SWIFT MEDIUM	WETLANDS RAPID	MARINE FALLS 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		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE	✓ WILDERNESS RECREATION	✓ UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE	✓ RURAL RESIDENTIAL	✓ SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL	URBAN INDUSTRIAL
----------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------	------------------

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		✓ SOMEWHAT		VERY
------------	-----	--	------------	--	------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
			✓ INCONSPICUOUS		

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
			✓ INCONSPICUOUS		

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION	SCREENED INFERIOR		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED		✓ PANORAMA SUPERIOR
			✓ NORMAL		

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Standing Rock Cut - East</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 2</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0	C	MI		

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Standing Rock Cut - East</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 3</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

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

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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B	A		-1	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS**
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Standing Rock Cut - East</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (2) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 4</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

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

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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B	A		-1	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

LOCATION *Roundtree Landing*

VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)

FORECASTING ()

DATE *2/21/2012*

TIME *3:00 PM*

WEATHER *Sunny and cold*

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage and M. Petty*

of *CDM Smith*

TIME PERIOD

YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE
MOVEMENT
SCALE

✓ STREAM
NONE
SMALL

RIVER
MEANDER

✓ LAKE/RES
SWIFT
✓ MEDIUM

WETLANDS
RAPID

MARINE
FALLS
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

SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY
TYPE

✓ WILDERNESS
RECREATION

UNDEVELOPED
AGRICULTURE

RURAL
RESIDENTIAL

SUBURBAN
COMMERCIAL

URBAN
INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE

TRAIL

WALKWAY

SECOND. RD.

PRIMARY RD.

HIGHWAY

✓ BOAT

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE
FREQUENCY

✓ LOW
✓ LOW

MEDIUM
MEDIUM

HIGH
HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT

✓ NONE

PRESENT

EXTENSIVE

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY

NOT

SOMEWHAT

✓ VERY

SOUNDS

PRESENCE
TYPE

ABSENT
DISCORDANT

✓ PRESENT
INCONSPICUOUS

✓ DOMINANT
HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE
TYPE

ABSENT
DISCORDANT

✓ PRESENT
✓ INCONSPICUOUS

DOMINANT
HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT
POSITION

SCREENED
INFERIOR

✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED
NORMAL

PANORAMA
SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes?

✓ Yes

No

If yes, explain *Roundtree Landing is known to have an ecosystem of particular value, including rare species habitat.*

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

✓ Yes

No

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

Yes

✓ No

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Roundtree Landing*
 VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *4/12/2012*
 TIME *3:00 PM*
 WEATHER *Sunny and mild*
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE	✓ STREAM NONE SMALL	RIVER MEANDER	✓ LAKE/RES SWIFT MEDIUM	WETLANDS RAPID	MARINE FALLS 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		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE	✓ WILDERNESS RECREATION	UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE	RURAL RESIDENTIAL	SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL	URBAN INDUSTRIAL
----------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	---------------------	------------------

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	✓ LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	✓ LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		SOMEWHAT		✓ VERY
------------	-----	--	----------	--	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT INCONSPICUOUS		✓ DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
---------------	-------------------	--	-------------------------	--	-----------------------

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT INCONSPICUOUS		DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
---------------	-------------------	--	-------------------------	--	---------------------

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION	SCREENED INFERIOR		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED NORMAL		PANORAMA SUPERIOR
-----------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------	--	-------------------

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? ✓ Yes No

If yes, explain *Roundtree Landing is known to have an ecosystem of particular value, including rare species habitat.*

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? ✓ Yes No

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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Roundtree Landing</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 1</i> WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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*
 LOCATION *Roundtree Landing*
 VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *3*
 ALTERNATIVE *(1)*

DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Roundtree Landing</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 2</i> WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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*
 LOCATION *Roundtree Landing*
 VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *3*
 ALTERNATIVE *(2)*

DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 1

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Roundtree Landing</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 3</i> WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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*
 LOCATION *Roundtree Landing*
 VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *3*
 ALTERNATIVE *(3)*

DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Roundtree Landing</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 4</i> WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

LOCATION *Roundtree Landing*

VIEWPOINT (3) ZONE ()

WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 4* WITHOUT PLAN (✓)

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()

FORECASTING (✓)

DATE

TIME

WEATHER

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

of *CDM Smith*

TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE
MOVEMENT
SCALE

STREAM
✓ NONE
SMALL

RIVER
MEANDER

✓ LAKE/RES
SWIFT
✓ MEDIUM

WETLANDS
RAPID

MARINE
FALLS
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

SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY
TYPE

✓ WILDERNESS
RECREATION

UNDEVELOPED
AGRICULTURE

RURAL
RESIDENTIAL

SUBURBAN
COMMERCIAL

✓ URBAN
INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE

TRAIL

WALKWAY

SECOND. RD.

PRIMARY RD.

HIGHWAY

✓ BOAT

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE

LOW

MEDIUM

✓ HIGH

FREQUENCY

LOW

MEDIUM

✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT

NONE

✓ PRESENT

EXTENSIVE

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY

✓ NOT

SOMEWHAT

VERY

SOUNDS

PRESENCE

ABSENT

✓ PRESENT

DOMINANT

TYPE

✓ DISCORDANT

INCONSPICUOUS

HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE

ABSENT

✓ PRESENT

DOMINANT

TYPE

✓ DISCORDANT

✓ INCONSPICUOUS

HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT

SCREENED

✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED

PANORAMA

POSITION

INFERIOR

✓ NORMAL

SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes?
If yes, explain

Yes No

Is this area known for its wildlife observation?

Yes No

Does this area contain any other cultural or historic landmarks?

Yes No

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Roundtree Landing*
 VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *3*
 ALTERNATIVE *(4)*

DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B		A	-2	NC	S	C	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	S	S	
VEGETATION	B	A		-1	SC	S	S	
LANDUSE	B		A	-2	NC	S	D	
USER ACTIVITY	B	A		-1	SC	S	D	<i>With-plan user activity is an average of distinct values for the right side of the view, and minimal values for the left side</i>
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		B	A	-1				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	0	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Carlton Landing</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (4) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 1</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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 *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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Carlton Landing</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (4) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 2</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 *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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Carlton Landing</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (4) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 3</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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 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 likely 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 ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Carlton Landing*
 VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *4*
 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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B	A		-1	C	MI	C	<i>The cove would feel a bit more developed due to a view of adjacent cleared land through trees on the west side.</i>
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A/B			0	SC	MI	C	<i>The cove would feel a bit more developed due to a view of adjacent cleared land through trees on the west side.</i>
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	SC	MI	C	<i>The cove would feel a bit more developed due to a view of adjacent cleared land through trees on the west side.</i>
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Carlton Landing</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (4) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 4</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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 35-acre 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 government-owned 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 ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Carlton Landing*
 VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *4*
 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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B		A	-2	NC	MI	C	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	S	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	B	A		-1	SC	MO	D	
USER ACTIVITY	B	A		-1	SC	MI	D	View will contain both recreational and picnicking opportunities as well as commercial operations
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		B	A	-1				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	0	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE <i>2/21/2012</i>
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME <i>4:30 PM</i>
LOCATION <i>Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park</i>	WEATHER <i>Sunny and cold</i>
VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage and M. Petty</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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

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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park*
 VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *4/12/2012*
 TIME *2:15 PM*
 WEATHER *Sunny and mild, windy*
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE	✓ STREAM NONE SMALL	RIVER MEANDER	✓ LAKE/RES SWIFT MEDIUM	WETLANDS RAPID	MARINE FALLS 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		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE	WILDERNESS RECREATION	✓ UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE	✓ RURAL RESIDENTIAL	SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL	URBAN INDUSTRIAL
----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	---------------------	------------------

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	✓ LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	✓ LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		SOMEWHAT		✓ VERY
------------	-----	--	----------	--	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT INCONSPICUOUS		✓ DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
---------------	-------------------	--	-------------------------	--	-----------------------

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE	ABSENT DISCORDANT		✓ PRESENT INCONSPICUOUS		✓ DOMINANT HARMONIOUS
---------------	-------------------	--	-------------------------	--	-----------------------

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION	✓ SCREENED INFERIOR		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED NORMAL		PANORAMA SUPERIOR
-----------------	---------------------	--	-----------------------------	--	-------------------

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes ✓ No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? ✓ Yes No

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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 1</i> WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

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

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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A	B		+1	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDUSE	A	B		+1	C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A	B		+1	C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 2</i> WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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 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.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

DATE

LOCATION *Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Cr. Park* IME

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE 5

WEATHER

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDUSE	A	B		+1	C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A	B		+1	C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 3</i> WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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 be 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park*
 VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 3* WITHOUT PLAN (✓)
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	✓ 25-50%	✓ 50-75%	75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	✓ PRESENT	SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	✓ SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	HIGHWAY	✓ BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	---------	--------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	✓ LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	✓ LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-----------

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		SOMEWHAT		✓ VERY
------------	-----	--	----------	--	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		✓ DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED		✓ PARTIALLY SCREENED		PANORAMA
POSITION	✓ INFERIOR		NORMAL		SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Daisy Hallum Cove, near Gaines Creek Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (5) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 4</i> WITHOUT PLAN (✓)	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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 be 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.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	D	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

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

TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

RESOURCE MOVEMENT SCALE
 STREAM NONE SMALL
 RIVER MEANDER
 LAKE/RES SWIFT MEDIUM
 WETLANDS RAPID
 MARINE FALLS 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 SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY TYPE WILDERNESS RECREATION UNDEVELOPED AGRICULTURE RURAL RESIDENTIAL SUBURBAN COMMERCIAL URBAN INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE TRAIL WALKWAY SECOND. RD. PRIMARY RD. HIGHWAY BOAT

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE FREQUENCY LOW *User degree and frequency of the panoramic scenery are low.* MEDIUM HIGH
 LOW *User degree and frequency of the highway are high.* MEDIUM HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT NONE PRESENT EXTENSIVE *Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not noticed by the traveller.*
 ADJACENT SCENERY SIMILARITY NOT *Adjacent scenery along the highway is very different. The scenery in the panorama, however, is typical of Eufaula Lake.* SOMEWHAT VERY *Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.*

SOUNDS

PRESENCE TYPE ABSENT DISCORDANT PRESENT INCONSPICUOUS DOMINANT HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE TYPE ABSENT DISCORDANT PRESENT INCONSPICUOUS DOMINANT HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT POSITION SCREENED INFERIOR PARTIALLY SCREENED NORMAL PANORAMA SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No

If yes, explain *The bluffs on the shoreline are excellent examples of the interesting geological features at Eufaula Lake.*

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No

Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE <i>4/11/2012</i>
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME <i>11:30 AM</i>
LOCATION <i>I-40 Bridge and Causeway</i>	WEATHER <i>Partly cloudy and MILD</i>
VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage and B. Brown</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

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

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A	B		+1	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
VEGETATION	A	B		+1	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A	B		+1	C	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY	A	B		+1	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>I-40 Bridge and Causeway</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 2</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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.

The view is from the east causeway of the I-40 bridge over Deep Fork, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative 2.

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 *I-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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	SC	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>I-40 Bridge and Causeway</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 3</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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.

The view is from the east causeway of the I-40 bridge over Deep Fork, facing north, in 25 years under Alternative 3.

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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *I-40 Bridge and Causeway*
 VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 3* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD 25 YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	✓ 50-75%	75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	✓ PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	✓ SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	✓ RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW		✓ MEDIUM	<i>User degree and frequency of the panoramic scenery are medium. User degree and frequency of the highway are high.</i>	✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		✓ EXTENSIVE	<i>Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not noticed by the traveller. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.</i>
SIMILARITY	✓ NOT	<i>Adjacent scenery along the highway is very different. The scenery in the panorama, however, is somewhat similar to other scenery at Eufaula Lake.</i>	✓ SOMEWHAT		VERY	

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT		INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	SCREENED		PARTIALLY SCREENED		✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	INFERIOR		NORMAL		✓ SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? ✓ Yes No
 If yes, explain *The bluffs on the shoreline are excellent examples of the interesting geological features at Eufaula Lake.*

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? ✓ Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *I-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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	SC	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>I-40 Bridge and Causeway</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (6) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 4</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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.

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.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B			0	SC	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	2	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE 2/22/2012
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME 5:30 PM
LOCATION <i>US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage and M. Petty</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport*
 VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)
 FORECASTING ()
 DATE *2/22/2012*
 TIME *5:30 PM*
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage and M. Petty*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	✓ 25-50%	50-75%	75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	✓ PRESENT	SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	✓ UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	✓ LOW	<i>User degree and frequency of the panoramic scenery are low.</i>	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	✓ LOW	<i>User degree and frequency of the highway are high.</i>	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE	PRESENT	✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	---------	-------------

Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT	SOMEWHAT	✓ VERY
------------	-----	----------	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	SCREENED	PARTIALLY SCREENED	✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	INFERIOR	✓ NORMAL	SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes ✓ No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? ✓ Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE 4/11/2012
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME 12:45 PM
LOCATION <i>US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport</i>	WEATHER <i>Sunny and mild</i>
VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage and B. Brown</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 1</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport*
 VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 1* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	✓ 50-75%	75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	✓ PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	✓ UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	✓ RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	✓ RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	<i>BOAT</i>
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	-------------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	✓ LOW	<i>User degree and frequency of the panoramic scenery are low.</i>	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	✓ LOW	<i>User degree and frequency of the highway are high.</i>	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE	PRESENT	✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	---------	-------------

Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT	SOMEWHAT	✓ VERY
------------	-----	----------	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	SCREENED	PARTIALLY SCREENED	✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	INFERIOR	✓ NORMAL	SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B				C	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B				C	MI	S	
VEGETATION		A/B			C	MI	S	
LANDUSE	A/B				C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B				C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 2</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport*
 VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 2* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	✓ 50-75%	75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	✓ PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	✓ UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	✓ RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	✓ RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	<i>BOAT</i>
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	-------------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	✓ LOW	<i>User degree and frequency of the panoramic scenery are low.</i>	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	✓ LOW	<i>User degree and frequency of the highway are high.</i>	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE	PRESENT	✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	---------	-------------

Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT	SOMEWHAT	✓ VERY
------------	-----	----------	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	SCREENED	PARTIALLY SCREENED	✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	INFERIOR	✓ NORMAL	SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport*
 VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *7*
 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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B				C	MI	D	
LANDFORM	A/B				C	MI	S	
VEGETATION		A/B			C	MI	S	
LANDUSE	A/B				C	MI	S	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B				C	MI	S	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 3</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport*
 VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 3* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	✓ 50-75%	75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	✓ PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	RURAL	✓ SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	✓ RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	✓ RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW	✓ MEDIUM	<i>User degree and frequency of the panoramic scenery are medium. User degree and frequency of the highway are high.</i>	✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW	✓ MEDIUM		✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	NONE	✓ PRESENT	✓ EXTENSIVE	<i>Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter could accumulate near docks and be blown into wetland areas.</i>
ADJACENT SCENERY		✓ SOMEWHAT	VERY	
SIMILARITY		NOT		

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	SCREENED	PARTIALLY SCREENED	✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	INFERIOR	✓ NORMAL	SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B	A		-1	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM	B	A		-1	SC	MI	S	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	S	
LANDUSE	B		A	-2	SC	MI	D	
USER ACTIVITY	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>US 69 Bridge at Bridgeport</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (7) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 4</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B	A		-1	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM	B	A		-1	SC	MI	S	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	S	
LANDUSE	B		A	-2	SC	MI	D	
USER ACTIVITY	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*LOCATION *Arrowhead State Park*

VIEWPOINT (8) ZONE ()

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY (✓)

FORECASTING ()

DATE *2/22/2012*TIME *11:30 AM*WEATHER *Partly cloudy and cold*PERSONNEL *L. Burbage and M. Petty*
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 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.

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Arrowhead State Park*
 VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *8*
 ALTERNATIVE *(1)*

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B				C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B			C	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B			C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A/B				C	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B				C	MI	D	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Arrowhead State Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (8) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 2</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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)

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	A/B				C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B			C	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B			C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A/B				C	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B				C	MI	D	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B						

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Arrowhead State Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (8) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 3</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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 *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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B	A		-1	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	SC	MI	D	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Arrowhead State Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (8) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 4</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

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 *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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES	B	A		-1	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
VEGETATION		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY	A/B			0	SC	MI	D	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY (✓)
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING ()
DETAILED ()	DATE <i>2/20/2012</i>
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME <i>12:00 PM</i>
LOCATION <i>Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park</i>	WEATHER <i>Cloudy and cold</i>
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage and M. Petty</i>
WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park*
 VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

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

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	✓ 75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	✓ RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW	✓ MEDIUM	HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW	✓ MEDIUM	HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE	PRESENT	✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	---------	-------------

Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT	SOMEWHAT	✓ VERY
------------	-----	----------	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED	PARTIALLY SCREENED	✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	✓ INFERIOR	NORMAL	SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park*
 VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN (✓)
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD 25 YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	✓ 75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	✓ RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-------------

Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		SOMEWHAT		✓ VERY
------------	-----	--	----------	--	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT		INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED		PARTIALLY SCREENED		✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	✓ INFERIOR		NORMAL		SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes ✓ No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? ✓ Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 1</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park*
 VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 1* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	✓ 75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	✓ RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW		✓ MEDIUM		HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE		PRESENT		✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	--	---------	--	-------------

Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT		SOMEWHAT		✓ VERY
------------	-----	--	----------	--	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT		INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT		✓ PRESENT		DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT		✓ INCONSPICUOUS		HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED		PARTIALLY SCREENED		✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	✓ INFERIOR		NORMAL		SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE	A	B		+1	C	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 2</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park*
 VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 2* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	50-75%	✓ 75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	✓ RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW	✓ MEDIUM	HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW	✓ MEDIUM	HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE	PRESENT	✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	---------	-------------

Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT	SOMEWHAT	✓ VERY
------------	-----	----------	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED	PARTIALLY SCREENED	✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	✓ INFERIOR	NORMAL	SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

DATE

LOCATION *Highway 31 Bridge N of Elm Point Park*

TIME

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *9*

WEATHER

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	C	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	C	MI	D	
VEGETATION	A/B			0	C	MI	C	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	C	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 3</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

**MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park*
 VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 3* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	✓ 50-75%	75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	✓ SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE	PRESENT	✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	---------	-------------

Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT	SOMEWHAT	✓ VERY
------------	-----	----------	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED	PARTIALLY SCREENED	✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	✓ INFERIOR	NORMAL	SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No ✓
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? ✓ Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

DATE

LOCATION *Highway 31 Bridge N of Elm Point Park*

TIME

VIEWPOINT MAP REFERENCE *9*

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
VEGETATION	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST**FORM 1****MCS
✓ VIA**

SIMILARITY ZONE ()	INVENTORY ()
BASIC (✓)	FORECASTING (✓)
DETAILED ()	DATE
PROJECT NAME <i>Eufaula Lake EIS</i>	TIME
LOCATION <i>Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park</i>	WEATHER
VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()	PERSONNEL <i>L. Burbage</i>
WITH PLAN (✓) <i>Alternative 4</i> WITHOUT PLAN ()	of <i>CDM Smith</i>
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 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.

VISUAL RESOURCE INVENTORY/FORECAST

FORM 2

MCS
✓ VIA

SIMILARITY ZONE ()
 BASIC (✓)
 DETAILED ()
 PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*
 LOCATION *Highway 31 Bridge North of Elm Point Park*
 VIEWPOINT (9) ZONE ()
 WITH PLAN (✓) *Alternative 4* WITHOUT PLAN ()
 PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

INVENTORY ()
 FORECASTING (✓)
 DATE
 TIME
 WEATHER
 PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 of *CDM Smith*
 TIME PERIOD *25* YEARS

WATER

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

COVER	0	0-25%	25-50%	✓ 50-75%	75-100%
DIVERSITY	NONE	LITTLE	PRESENT	✓ SUBSTANTIAL	EXTENSIVE
SEAS. CHANGE	NONE		✓ PRESENT		SUBSTANTIAL

LAND/WATER USE

INTENSITY	✓ WILDERNESS	UNDEVELOPED	✓ RURAL	✓ SUBURBAN	URBAN
TYPE	RECREATION	AGRICULTURE	RESIDENTIAL	COMMERCIAL	INDUSTRIAL

ACCESS

TYPE	TRAIL	WALKWAY	SECOND. RD.	PRIMARY RD.	✓ HIGHWAY	BOAT
------	-------	---------	-------------	-------------	-----------	------

USER ACTIVITY

DEGREE	LOW	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH
FREQUENCY	LOW	MEDIUM	✓ HIGH

LITTER/POLLUTION

AMOUNT	✓ NONE	PRESENT	✓ EXTENSIVE
--------	--------	---------	-------------

Litter is extensive adjacent to the highway, but is not a dominant feature. Litter is not seen in the overall landscape.

ADJACENT SCENERY

SIMILARITY	NOT	SOMEWHAT	✓ VERY
------------	-----	----------	--------

SOUNDS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	✓ DISCORDANT	INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

SMELLS

PRESENCE	ABSENT	✓ PRESENT	DOMINANT
TYPE	DISCORDANT	✓ INCONSPICUOUS	HARMONIOUS

VISIBILITY

AMOUNT	✓ SCREENED	PARTIALLY SCREENED	✓ PANORAMA
POSITION	✓ INFERIOR	NORMAL	SUPERIOR

Does this area contain any other significant attributes? Yes No
 If yes, explain

Is this area known for its wildlife observation? Yes No
Waterfowl and birds of prey can be seen by travellers.

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

VIEWPOINT ASSESSMENT

FORM 6

✓ VIA

BASIC (✓)

DETAILED ()

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

DATE

LOCATION *Highway 31 Bridge N of Elm Point Park*

TIME

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

	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 Subordinate C Co-dominant D Dominant	COMMENTS
WATER RESOURCES		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
LANDFORM		A/B		0	SC	MI	D	
VEGETATION	B	A		-1	SC	MI	C	
LANDUSE		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
USER ACTIVITY		A/B		0	SC	MI	C	
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*		A/B		0				

LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION	INCONSPICUOUS	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

	YES	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?		✓
Total	1	

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

LOCATION

DATE

ALTERNATIVE (1)

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE

VIEWPOINT #	9				TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
WATER	0				9	+0.22
LANDFORM	0				9	0
VEGETATION	0				9	+0.11
LANDUSE	+1				9	+0.33
USE ACTIVITY	0				9	+0.22
SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS*	0				9	0
					VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE:	+0.89

MODIFIER RATING

CR = Compatibility Rating SCR = Scale Contrast Rating SDR = Spatial Dominance Rating

MAJORITY RATING

	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR		CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	C	MI	D											C	MI	D
LANDFORM	C	MI	D											C	MI	C
VEGETATION	C	MI	C											C	MI	C
LANDUSE	C	MI	C											C	MI	C
USE ACTIVITY	C	MI	C											C	MI	S/C
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION																
P Prominent S Significant I Inconspicuous		S													S	

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

LOCATION

DATE

ALTERNATIVE (2)

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE

VIEWPOINT #	9				TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
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
VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE:						<i>+0.22</i>

MODIFIER RATING

CR = Compatibility Rating SCR = Scale Contrast Rating SDR = Spatial Dominance Rating

MAJORITY RATING

	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR		CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	C	MI	D											C	MI	D
LANDFORM	C	MI	D											C	MI	C
VEGETATION	C	MI	C											C	MI	C
LANDUSE	C	MI	C											C	MI	C
USE ACTIVITY	C	MI	C											C	MI	S/C
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION																
P Prominent S Significant I Inconspicuous		S													S	

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

LOCATION

DATE

ALTERNATIVE (4)

PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*

WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

**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

CR = Compatibility Rating SCR = Scale Contrast Rating SDR = Spatial Dominance Rating

MAJORITY RATING

	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR		CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	SC	MI	D	SC	MI	D	NC	S	C	NC	MI	C	/	/	/	/
LANDFORM	C	MI	S	C	MI	C	C	S	S	C	MI	S				
VEGETATION	SC	MI	S	SC	MI	C	SC	S	S	C	MI	C				
LANDUSE	SC	MI	C	SC	MI	C	NC	S	D	SC	MO	D				
USE ACTIVITY	C	MI	C	C	MI	C	SC	S	D	SC	MI	D				
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION																
P Prominent	S			S			P			P						
S Significant																
I Inconspicuous																

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS*

BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()

LOCATION

DATE *8/27/2012*

ALTERNATIVE (3)

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 = Compatibility Rating SCR = Scale Contrast Rating SDR = Spatial Dominance Rating

MAJORITY RATING

	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR		CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	C	MI	D	SC	MI	D	SC	MI	D	SC	MI	D	/	/	/	/
LANDFORM	C	MI	D	SC	MI	C	SC	MI	S	SC	MI	C				
VEGETATION	C	MI	D	SC	MI	C	SC	MI	S	SC	MI	C				
LANDUSE	C	MI	S	SC	MI	C	SC	MI	D	SC	MI	C				
USE ACTIVITY	C	MI	S	SC	MI	C	SC	MI	C	SC	MI	D				
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION																
P Prominent	P			S			S			S						
S Significant																
I Inconspicuous																

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

FORM 7

VIA

PROJECT NAME *Eufaula Lake EIS* BASIC (✓) DETAILED ()
 LOCATION DATE
 ALTERNATIVE (4) PERSONNEL *L. Burbage*
 WITH PLAN () WITHOUT PLAN ()

PROJECT DETAILS AND COMMENTS

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE

VIEWPOINT #	9				TOTAL # OF VIEWPOINTS	QUOTIENT
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
					VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT VALUE:	-2.89

MODIFIER RATING

CR = Compatibility Rating SCR = Scale Contrast Rating SDR = Spatial Dominance Rating

MAJORITY RATING

	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR	CR	SCR	SDR		CR	SCR	SDR
WATER	SC	MI	D											SC	MI	D
LANDFORM	SC	MI	D											C	MI	S/C
VEGETATION	SC	MI	C											SC	MI	C
LANDUSE	SC	MI	C											SC	MI	C
USE ACTIVITY	SC	MI	C											SC	MI	C
LANDSCAPE COMPOSITION																
P Prominent S Significant I Inconspicuous		S													S	