Scenic Quality Rating Summaries

3 Explanation of Rating Criteria

Landform

Topography becomes more interesting as it gets steeper or more massive, or more severely or universally sculptured. Outstanding landforms may be monumental, as the Grand Canyon, the Sawtooth Mountain Range in Idaho, the Wrangell Mountain Range in Alaska, or they may be exceedingly artistic and subtle as certain badlands, pinnacles, arches, and other extraordinary formations.

Vegetation

Give primary consideration to the variety of patterns, forms, and textures created by plant life. Consider short-lived displays when they are known to be recurring or spectacular. Consider also smaller scale vegetational features which add striking and intriguing detail elements to the landscape (e.g., gnarled or windbeaten trees, and joshua trees).

Water

That ingredient which adds movement or serenity to a scene. The degree to which water dominates the scene is the primary consideration in selecting the rating score.

Color

Consider the overall color(s) of the basic components of the landscape (e.g., soil, rock, vegetation, etc.) as they appear during seasons or periods of high use. Key factors to use when rating "color" are variety, contrast, and harmony.

Adjacent Scenery

Degree to which scenery outside the scenery unit being rated enhances the overall impression of the scenery within the rating unit. The distance which adjacent scenery will influence scenery within the rating unit will normally range from 0-5 miles, depending upon the characteristics of the topography, the vegetative cover, and other such factors. This factor is generally applied to units which would normally rate very low in score, but he influence of the adjacent unit would enhance the visual quality and raise the score.

Scarcity

This factor provides an opportunity to give added importance to one or all of the scenic features that appear to be relatively unique or rare within one physiographic region. There may also be cases where a separate evaluation of each of the key factors does not give a true picture of the overall scenic quality of an area. Often it is a number of not so spectacular elements in the proper combination that produces the most pleasing and memorable scenery - the scarcity factor can be used to recognize this type of area and give it the added emphasis it needs.

Cultural Modifications

Cultural modifications in the landform/water, vegetation, and addition of structures should be considered and may detract from the scenery in the form of a negative intrusion or complement or improve the scenic quality of a unit. Rate accordingly.

1 Scenic Quality Rating Summary

KOP	Feature	View	Jerry Gonsalves	Kristin Lantz	Jennifer Stock	Paul Weller	Averaged Total	FINAL RATING
KOP 15	Intake 2W	Existing	-	18 <u>.0</u>	19 <u>.0</u>	18.75	18.58	С
		Simulated	-	13 <u>.0</u>	9 <u>.0</u>	10 <u>.0</u>	10.67	Е
KOP 34	Intake 3E:	Existing	-	14 <u>.0</u>	15 <u>.0</u>	13.5	14.17	D
	January 2012 (Alts 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 6A, 6B, 7, 8)	Simulated	-	9 <u>.0</u>	10.5	8.5	9.33	Е
KOP 34	Intake 3E:	Existing	-	15.0	15.5	13.5	14.75	D
	July 2013 (Alts 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 6A, 6B, 7, 8)	Simulated	-	11.5	12.25	6.0	9.92	Е
KOP 34	Intake 3E:	Existing	-	14 <u>.0</u>	15 <u>.0</u>	13.5	14.17	D
	January 2012 (Alt 4)	Simulated	-	9 <u>10</u> .5	9.5 12.25	7.5 11.75	8.83 11.5	Е
KOP 34	Intake 3E:	Existing	-	15.0	15.5	13.5	14.67	D
	July 2013 (Alt 4)	Simulated	-	13. 0 5	11 13.75	9.0 12.25	11.25 13.17	Е
KOP 45	Intake 4E	Existing	-	18 <u>.0</u>	19.5	18.75	18.75	С
		Simulated	-	12 <u>.0</u>	13 <u>.0</u>	10 <u>.0</u>	11.67	Е
KOP 45	Intermediate Forebay (Alts 1A, 2A, 3, 5, 6A, 7, 8)	Existing	-	9.5	11.5	14 <u>.0</u>	11.67	Е
		Simulated	-	8.5	10.25	12.5	10.42	Е
KOP 95	Isleton Road Shaft Site	Existing	-	16.5	14 <u>.0</u>	13 <u>.0</u>	14.50	D
		Simulated	-	13.5	11.5	8.25	11.08	Е
KOP 109	Channel Modification at Hammer Island	Existing	13 <u>.0</u>	-	16 <u>.0</u>	12.25	13.75	D
		Simulated	12.5	-	15.5	10.25	12.75	Е
KOP 113	Canal from I-5	Existing	8 <u>.0</u>	-	13 <u>.0</u>	5.25	8.75	Е
		Simulated	6.5	-	12.5	4.5	7.83	F
KOP 128	Canal crossing SR 12	Existing	11.5	-	11.5	15.25	12.75	Е
		Simulated	11 <u>.0</u>	-	9 <u>.0</u>	11.75	10.58	Е
KOP 147	Canal crossing SR 4	Existing	5.5	-	10 <u>.0</u>	3.75	6.42	F
		Simulated	5.5	-	10 <u>.0</u>	2.25	5.92	F
KOP 195	Canal crossing SR 4	Existing	12 <u>.0</u>	-	14 <u>.0</u>	9.25	11.75	Е
		Simulated	7.5	-	11.5	5.5	8.17	F
KOP 219	Fish Screen at Walnut Creek	Existing	21 <u>.0</u>	-	19.5	20.5	20.33	С
		Simulated	10.5	-	14.5	9.25	11.42	Е
KOP 252	Operable Barrier at Brannan SRA	Existing	15.5	-	20 <u>.0</u>	15.5	17.00	D
		Simulated	10 <u>.0</u>	-	12.5	9 <u>.0</u>	10.50	Е
KOP 256	Intake 2E (Alt 4)	Existing	20.5	-	20 <u>.0</u>	15 <u>.0</u>	18.5 <u>0</u>	С
		Simulated	1 0.0 2.5	-	8 <u>.5</u>	2.5 3.75	6.83 <u>8.25</u>	F
	Intermediate Forebay (Alt 4)	Existing	<u>-11.0</u>	<u>11.0</u> -	12.5	12.5	12 <u>.00</u>	Е
		Simulated	<u>-8.5</u>	<u>8.5</u> -	8 <u>.0</u>	8.5	8.33	F
	ic Quality Ratings:	C =19						
	29–32	D =_—14		- 0-3				
B =	24–28	E = <u> </u>	-13					