ATTACHMENT VR-1
EXPLANATION OF VISUAL SENSITIVITY (VS)-VISUAL CHANGE (VC) SUMMARY TABLE
(SEE ATTACHMENT VR-2S FOR COMPLETED SUMMARY TABLE)

VIEWPOINT		EXISTING VISUAL SETTING								VISUAL CHANGE					IMPACT SIGNIFICANCE	
				Viewer Exposure												
Key Viewpoint (KVP)	Description	Visual Quality	Viewer Concern	Visibility	Distance Zone	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

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.

2. Description. The description column describes the location of the viewpoint and direction of view with reference to roads or other landmarks.

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.

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.

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).

6. 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 El 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.

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.

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).

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.

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.

11. 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).

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.

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.

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.

15. 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.

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 interrelationships between overall visual sensitivity ratings and overall visual change ratings.

17. Mitigation. This column lists any mitigation measures that have been identified (in the text) as applicable to the impact.

SOURCE OF COLUMN DATA

Column

1. Analyst assigned
2. Analyst determination
3. Analyst determination
4. Analyst determination
5. Analyst determination
6. Analyst determination
7. Analyst determination
8. Analyst determination
9. 5 + 6 + 7 + 8 + Analyst Interpretation
10. 3 + 4 + 9 + Analyst Interpretation
11. Analyst determination
12. Analyst determination
13. Analyst determination
14. Analyst determination
15. 12 + 13 + 14 + Analyst Interpretation
16. 10 + 15 + Analyst Interpretation
17. Determination based on analysis

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