## **ATTACHMENT VR-1**

## EXPLANATION OF VISUAL SENSITIVITY (VS)-VISUAL CHANGE (VC) SUMMARY TABLE (SEE ATTACHMENT VR-2S FOR COMPLETED SUMMARY TABLE)

					1						,						
VIEWPOINT			EXISTING VISUAL SETTING								VISUAL CHANGE IMPAC SIGNIFICA						
Key Viewpoint (KVP)	Description	Visual Quality		Viewer Concern	Visibility	Vie Distance Zone	wer Exposu Number of Viewers	Duration of View	Overall Viewer Exposure	Overall Visual Sensitivity	Description of Visual Change	Visual Contrast	Project Dominance	View Blockage	Overall Visual Change	Before Mitigation After Mitigation	Mitigation
1	2	3		4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
identifies (a) the name, (c) when Project or an A correspond to a correspond t	The description colu viewpoint and direct oads or other landma	, (b) the viewpoint for the Proposed re figure(s) that mn describes the ion of view with rks.	overal quality high). on fiel seaso absen <b>6. Distar</b> factors exposi middle for the the pro define to 2 m	ility. Visibility is one of four factors co Il assessment of viewer exposure. As y, visibility is assigned one of five ratir Visibility is determined by analyst juc Id evaluation of viewing proximity, visi onal variations, air quality, lighting, and nce of screening features (land and ve nce of screening features (land and ve nce Zone. Distance zone is the seco is contributing to the overall assessme sure and is assigned one of three ratin eground, or background). The viewing e EI Casco Project (the distance from oject feature) is determined by map a ad as foreground = 0 to 0.5 mile; midd niles; and background = greater than 2	for visual lgs (low to lgment, based ble detail, l presence or getation). and of four ent of viewer gs (foreground, distance zone he viewpoint to nalysis and is leground = 0.5 2 miles.	four of visibil of vie judgm rated simila low. the in three qualit The contribution of the contribution of the contribution of the expension of the expension of the contribution of the expension of the	contributing and ity, distance zo w. The determ hent. It is intuiti high, the summ rly true if all foo However, analy puts are mixed all Visual Sens contributing an y, viewer conce letermination is yoverall viewer e buting factors a be high. It is sin rate or all three ience becomes s.	equally weigh ne, number of ination is base we that if all co- hation will also ur inputs are m vst experience values. sitivity. This is d equally weig ern, and overal based on ana xposure, it is ir are rated high, milarly true if a e are low. How s key when the	viewers, and du d on analyst intributing facto be high. It is oderate or all for becomes key w a summation o hted factors of l viewer exposu lyst judgment. intuitive that if all the summation Il three inputs a vever, analyst inputs are mixe	uration rs are bur are when f the visual re. As I will re ed	Project Dominance. Project of of three factors contributing to t visual change and is assigned (subordinate, subordinate to co co-dominant to dominant, or do dominance is a qualitative asse analyst and is a measure of fea relative to other visible landsca field of view. View Blockage. View blockage factors contributing to the overa change and is assigned one of low to high. View blockage is a made by the analyst and descr any previously visible landscap blocked from view or the views some way impaired, as a result and/or position.	the overall ass one of five rat ordominant, co primant). Proj essment made ature's appare pe features ar pe features ar five ratings rat a qualitative ass ibes the exten e features are of those featu t of the project	sessment of ings -dominant, ect by the nt size nd the total of three t of visual nging from ssessment t to which e either 'res are in 's scale	OURCE OF COLUM olumn 1. Analyst as 2. Analyst de 3. Analyst de 4. Analyst de	N DATA signed termination termination	ists any mitigatior (in the text) as ap	n measures plicable to
quality of the of low-to-modera Additional guid Tables D.12-1 equally weigh concern [Colu the assessme While the asso factors, ultima judgment. 4. Viewer Concc hierarchy simi	existing landscape ar ate, moderate, moder dance for each of the l and D.12-2. Visual ted contributing facto imn 4] and viewer exp ent of overall visual se essment of visual qua tely, the rating is deto ern. Viewer concern ilar to visual quality (li	ate-to-high, or high. se ratings is provided in quality is one of three rs (along with viewer posure [Column 9]) to ensitivity (Column 10). ality considers several ermined by analyst is assigned a rating ow to high) and is	four fa viewer of view the an as am rivers observ reside 8. Durati equali	ber of Viewers. Number of viewers is actors contributing to the overall assess rexposure and can range from low to wers is generally a qualitative assess halyst though it can draw from quantita nount of use information for roads and and trails, and recreation sites. It als vations and a general understanding ential viewers.	ssment of high. Number nent made by ative data such highways, o includes field of potential	brief of the pridescr as we the dominic contri- typica subsecretion 12. Visua equal	description of the roposed or subj iption of the co ill as the effects escription will re- hance and/or vi buting to overa ally a narrative of equent three co al Contrast. Vi ly weighted fac	he change that lect action. It r mponents con s on the existin eference visua ew blockage— Il visual chang of the ratings id lumns (#'s 12, sual Contrast i tors contributir	tributing to the c ig landscape. C I contrast, proje the three factor e. The format i dentified in the 13, and 14). is the first of thr ng to the overall	ed by change Dften, ct rs s ee, <b>16.</b>	Overall Visual Change. This is contributing and equally weight contrast, project dominance, ar determination is based on anal overall visual sensitivity, it is ini contributing factors are rated hi also be high. It is similarly true moderate or all three are low. experience becomes key when values. Impact Significance Before/A column identifies impact signifi overall visual sensitivity and vis	ed factors of v nd view blocka yst judgment. tuitive that if a igh, the summ if all three inp However, ana the inputs are <b>fter Mitigatio</b> cance (as a fu	visual lge. The As with lation will outs are lyst e mixed n. This nction of	<ol> <li>Analyst de</li> <li>Analyst de</li> <li>Analyst de</li> <li>Analyst de</li> <li>Analyst de</li> <li>5 + 6 + 7 +</li> <li>3 + 4 + 9 +</li> <li>Analyst de</li> </ol>	termination termination termination 8 + Analyst Inter Analyst Interpre termination	ation	
based on any known information about the viewing population, existing land uses, and plan or policy designations that might indicate public importance. Ultimately, the rating is determined by analyst judgment.		assessment of viewer exposure. The duration of view is a qualitative assessment made by the analyst and essentially denotes the relative length of the viewing experience (brief, brief-to-moderate, moderate, moderate- to-extended, or extended).				assessment of visual change and is assigned one of five ratings (low, low-to-moderate, moderate, moderate-to- high, or high). Visual contrast is a qualitative assessment made by the analyst and describes the degree to which a project's visual characteristics differ from those established in the existing landscape.				determination is based on analyst judgment th Table D.12-4 does illustrate the general interre- between overall visual sensitivity ratings and o visual change ratings.		hough relationships	17. Determination based on analysis				

1. Key Viewpoint (KVP). The key viewpoint column identifies (a) the viewpoint number, (b) the viewpoint name, (c) whether the viewpoint is for the Proposed Project or an Alternative, and (d) the figure(s) that correspond to the viewpoint.	5. Visibility. Visibility is one of four factors contributing to the overall assessment of viewer exposure. As for visual quality, visibility is assigned one of five ratings (low to high). Visibility is determined by analyst judgment, based on field evaluation of viewing proximity, visible detail, seasonal variations, air quality, lighting, and presence or absence of screening features (land and vegetation).	9. Overall Viewer Exposure. This is a summation of the four contributing and equally weighted factors of visibility, distance zone, number of viewers, and duration of view. The determination is based on analyst judgment. It is intuitive that if all contributing factors are rated high, the summation will also be high. It is similarly true if all four inputs are moderate or all four are low. However, analyst experience becomes key when the inputs are mixed values.	13. Project Dominance. Project dominance is the second of three factors contributing to the overall assessment of visual change and is assigned one of five ratings (subordinate, subordinate to co-dominant, co-dominant, co-dominant to dominant, or dominant). Project dominance is a qualitative assessment made by the analyst and is a measure of feature's apparent size relative to other visible landscape features and the total field of view.	<b>17.</b> Mitigation. This column lists any mitigation measures that have been identified (in the text) as applicable to the impact.
<ol> <li>Description. The description column describes the location of the viewpoint and direction of view with reference to roads or other landmarks.</li> </ol>	<b>6.</b> Distance Zone. Distance zone is the second of four factors contributing to the overall assessment of viewer exposure and is assigned one of three ratings (foreground, middleground, or background). The viewing distance zone for the EI Casco Project (the distance from the viewpoint to the project feature) is determined by map analysis and is defined as foreground = 0 to 0.5 mile; middleground = 0.5 to 2 miles; and background = greater than 2 miles.	10. Overall Visual Sensitivity. This is a summation of the three contributing and equally weighted factors of visual quality, viewer concern, and overall viewer exposure. The determination is based on analyst judgment. As with overall viewer exposure, it is intuitive that if all contributing factors are rated high, the summation will also be high. It is similarly true if all three inputs are moderate or all three are low. However, analyst experience becomes key when the inputs are mixed values.	14. View Blockage. View blockage is the third of three factors contributing to the overall assessment of visual change and is assigned one of five ratings ranging from low to high. View blockage is a qualitative assessment made by the analyst and describes the extent to which any previously visible landscape features are either blocked from view or the views of those features are in some way impaired, as a result of the project's scale and/or position.	SOURCE OF COLUMN DATA         Column         1.       Analyst assigned         2.       Analyst determination         3.       Analyst determination         4.       Analyst determination
3. Visual Quality. The visual quality column describes the quality of the existing landscape and can be rated low, low-to-moderate, moderate, moderate-to-high, or high. Additional guidance for each of these ratings is provided in Tables D.12-1 and D.12-2. Visual quality is one of three equally weighted contributing factors (along with viewer concern [Column 4] and viewer exposure [Column 9]) to the assessment of overall visual sensitivity (Column 10). While the assessment of visual quality considers several factors, ultimately, the rating is determined by analyst judgment.	7. Number of Viewers. Number of viewers is the third of four factors contributing to the overall assessment of viewer exposure and can range from low to high. Number of viewers is generally a qualitative assessment made by the analyst though it can draw from quantitative data such as amount of use information for roads and highways, rivers and trails, and recreation sites. It also includes field observations and a general understanding of potential residential viewers.	<ol> <li>Description of Visual Change. This column provides a brief description of the change that would be caused by the proposed or subject action. It may include a description of the components contributing to the change as well as the effects on the existing landscape. Often, the description will reference visual contrast, project dominance and/or view blockage—the three factors contributing to overall visual change. The format is typically a narrative of the ratings identified in the subsequent three columns (#'s 12, 13, and 14).</li> </ol>	<b>15.</b> Overall Visual Change. This is a summation of the three contributing and equally weighted factors of visual contrast, project dominance, and view blockage. The determination is based on analyst judgment. As with overall visual sensitivity, it is intuitive that if all contributing factors are rated high, the summation will also be high. It is similarly true if all three inputs are moderate or all three are low. However, analyst experience becomes key when the inputs are mixed values.	<ol> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>5 + 6 + 7 + 8 + Analyst Interpretation</li> <li>3 + 4 + 9 + Analyst Interpretation</li> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>Analyst determination</li> </ol>
4. Viewer Concern. Viewer concern is assigned a rating hierarchy similar to visual quality (low to high) and is based on any known information about the viewing population, existing land uses, and plan or policy designations that might indicate public importance. Ultimately, the rating is determined by analyst judgment.	8. Duration of View. Duration of view is the fourth of four equally weighted factors contributing to the overall assessment of viewer exposure. The duration of view is a qualitative assessment made by the analyst and essentially denotes the relative length of the viewing experience (brief, brief-to-moderate, moderate, moderate, to-extended, or extended).	12. Visual Contrast. Visual Contrast is the first of three, equally weighted factors contributing to the overall assessment of visual change and is assigned one of five ratings (low, low-to-moderate, moderate, moderate-to-high, or high). Visual contrast is a qualitative assessment made by the analyst and describes the degree to which a project's visual characteristics differ from those established in the existing landscape.	16. Impact Significance Before/After Mitigation. This column identifies impact significance (as a function of overall visual sensitivity and visual change. This determination is based on analyst judgment though Table D.12-4 does illustrate the general interrelationship between overall visual sensitivity ratings and overall visual change ratings.	<ol> <li>Analyst determination</li> <li>12 + 13 + 14 + Analyst Interpretation</li> <li>10 + 15 + Analyst Interpretation</li> <li>Determination based on analysis</li> </ol>

This table is identical to Draft EIR Attachment VR-1.