

3.1

AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES

3.1.1 Introduction

3.1.2 Environmental Setting

3.1.2.1 Critical Public Views

3.1.2.1.2 Critical Viewing Positions

The region of influence includes the Port, the Port of Long Beach, and sensitive land uses near these ports (e.g., parks, beaches, tourist facilities, and residential areas). Communities within the region include San Pedro, Rancho Palos Verdes, Wilmington, and Long Beach. Figure 3.1-2 is a map showing the viewing positions referred to in the analyses. The representative critical viewing positions chosen for detailed analysis of the proposed Project and its alternatives are listed in Table 3.1-1. These are located west and northwest of the proposed Project, particularly those along Cabrillo Beach and its vicinity (Viewing Positions 1 and 2, Figures 3.1-3, 3.1-4, 3.1-5, 3.1-6, and 3.1-7); the residential area in the San Pedro Bluffs above Cabrillo Beach and Lookout Point Park (Viewing Positions 3 and 4, Figure 3.1-8); and Angel's Gate Park (Viewing Positions 5 and 6, Figure 3.1-9 and Figure 3.1-10).

The proposed Project site is also visible from the more distant Deane Dana Friendship Park and Nature Center in San Pedro (Friendship Park) and the east-facing slopes of the Rancho Palos Verdes residential area (represented by Viewing Position 7, Figure 3.1-11, upper image); and from Averill Park in San Pedro (Viewing Position 8, Figure 3.1-11, lower image).

One other park in the Project vicinity may be mentioned. Point Fermin Park is contiguous with Angel's Gate Park along its southern edge and extends to the west along the south side of Paseo del Mar and to the east up to a point due south of South Carolina Place. The vantage points within the park along the rugged bluffs afford panoramic views of the coast toward Santa Catalina Island. However, from no point within this park may the proposed Project site be seen. This park used to extend substantially further to the east up to the westernmost edge of Cabrillo Beach, and, perhaps, the proposed Project site may once have been visible from this area.

However, storm damage has eroded the base of the cliffs and destroyed a major portion of the park east of South Carolina Place. For public safety this portion has been closed. Therefore, because the proposed Project site is not within view, no points within the park are considered to be critical viewing positions.~~Additionally, four viewing positions were chosen as important and representative in assessing the No Federal Action/No Project and Reduced Project Alternatives. One is within San Pedro Plaza Park, Viewing Position 9 (Figure 3.1-12), and three are located at Ports O'Call Village, Viewing Positions 10, 11, and 12 (Figures 3.1-13 and 3.1-14). From these viewing positions, LAHD Berths 238-240 (see Figure 3.1-2) are visible, being directly across the Main Channel from Ports O' Call Village. Such views are important because these berths would receive a portion of additional forecasted marine tanker calls that would occur in the absence of the proposed Project or under the Reduced Project Alternative.~~

Additional critical viewing positions include four that were chosen as important and representative in assessing the No Federal Action/No Project and Reduced Project Alternatives. One is within San Pedro Plaza Park, Viewing Position 9 (Figure 3.1-12), and three are located at Ports O'Call Village, Viewing Positions 10, 11, and 12 (Figures 3.1-13 and 3.1-14). From these viewing positions, LAHD Berths 238-240 (see Figure 3.1-2) are visible, being directly across the Main Channel from Ports O' Call Village. Such views are important because these berths would receive a portion of additional forecasted marine tanker calls that would occur in the absence of the proposed Project or under the Reduced Project Alternative.

Aside from those portions of the communities of San Pedro and Rancho Palos Verdes to the west of the site, residential areas in the vicinity of the proposed Project include that part of San Pedro well to the northwest (north of Vincent Thomas Bridge) and the community of Wilmington, due north. The point within San Pedro northwest of the proposed Project site with the most unencumbered views is Knoll Hill, the site for a temporary off-leash dog park (Figure 3.1-2). The upper image in Figure 3.1-15 shows the view to the east-southeast from there. As indicated by the image, the Vincent Thomas Bridge along the right side of the view substantially intercedes in the view of Port facilities south of the bridge. Elsewhere within this part of San Pedro, views of Port features south of the bridge are similarly screened by the bridge, if not blocked entirely by residences and landscaping in the immediate neighborhood.

The lower image in Figure 3.1-15 is the view to the south from Banning's Landing, a community center serving Wilmington (located as shown in Figure 2-2). This is the community's only view to the interior of the Port and is highly important to the community. The facility is located at that point within Wilmington closest to the proposed Project site. The proposed Project, however, would not be visible from here, as illustrated by the photograph. Docked cargo ships, cranes, and stacked cargo within the Yusen Container Terminal at Berths 215–217 due south of Banning's Landing block the proposed Project site and vicinity from view.

In summary, the proposed Project would not be visible from the part of San Pedro northwest of the proposed Project, and from Wilmington, to its north. Views from Wilmington and the northwest part of San Pedro will not, therefore, be considered further in this assessment.

Table 3.1-1. Critical Views Assessed, their Existing Visual Condition, and their Application to the Proposed Project and/or Its Alternatives

Viewing Position	Description	Visual Modification Class	Viewing Positions Applicable to:		
			Proposed	No Federal Action/ No Project	Reduced Project
VP 1	Cabrillo Beach	VMC 1	X	X	X
VP 2	Cabrillo Beach	VMC 1	X	X	X
VP 3	San Pedro Bluffs Residential	VMC 4	X	X	X
VP 4	Lookout Point Park	VMC 1	X	X	X
VP 9	San Pedro Plaza Park	VMC 1	NA	X	X
VP 10	Ports O' Call Village	VMC 1	NA	X	X
VP 11	Ports O' Call Village	VMC 1	NA	X	X
VP 12	Ports O' Call Village	VMC 1	NA	X	X

Most of the views of the Project site from residential areas within the City of Long Beach are obscured by the downtown buildings. This screening effect is increased by the flat topography of the surrounding area (Deep Draft FEIS/FEIR; USACE and LAHD, 1992). According to the Deep Draft FEIS/FEIR, some Los Angeles Harbor facilities may be visible from high-rise residential structures in downtown Long Beach along Ocean Boulevard. However, none of the proposed Project features would likely be noticeable because: 1) The entirety of Long Beach Harbor's facilities would intervene and/or dominate attention, and; 2) the viewing distances are such that the proposed Project features would be comparatively small in scale, as seen in the wide context of the surrounding Port facilities. The nearest Project feature, Tank Farm Site 2, would be about four miles away and seen in the context of the Vincent Thomas Bridge and surrounding Terminal Island facilities. The Marine Terminal and Tank Farm Site 1 would be over five miles away and on the west (far) side of the APM Terminal backlands.

Relative to the No Federal Action/No Project and Reduced Project Alternatives, two crude oil offloading berths in the Port of Long Beach would be affected. Additional marine tanker activity would occur in the future at Port of Long Beach Berths 84-87 and Port of Long Beach Berths 76-78 (see Figure 1-6). These berths are within Channel No. 2, and located 0.5 miles northeast of the Gerald Desmond Bridge/West Ocean Boulevard; 0.5 miles west of the Pico Avenue, U.S. Highway 710 and North Harbor Scenic Drive; and 0.9 to 1.6 miles northwest of the high-rise hotels and civic center at the west end of downtown Long Beach along Ocean Boulevard. Of the travel routes listed, only for North Harbor Scenic Drive are the views sensitive; in this case they are highly sensitive. However, ships docked at LAHD Berths 84-87 and 76-78 cannot be seen from this road due to obscuring roadside Port facilities. Pico Avenue serves industrial traffic (no sensitivity), and there are no indications of sensitivity for views from U.S. 710. Moreover, ships docking at the berths noted cannot be readily seen from these routes. Assuming that the high-rise hotels along

Ocean Boulevard partly serve tourists visiting the attractions within and along the Long Beach Harbor, views from these structures are considered highly sensitive. However, scenic Harbor attractions are to the south and southwest. LAHD Berths 84-87 and 76-78 are 105 degrees to 120 degrees toward the northwest, thereby being peripheral to these sensitive views.

To summarize, proposed Project features and those of the No Federal Action/No Project and Reduced Project Alternatives would not be within sensitive views from downtown Long Beach because of distance, the scale of the proposed Project features, and the dominance of nearby Port facilities. Therefore, views from Long Beach are not considered further in this assessment.

3.1.3 Applicable Regulations

3.1.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.1.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation

3.1.4.3.1 Proposed Project

3.1.4.3.1.1 Project Features Not within Critical Public Views

Tank Farm Site 2

Tank Farm Site 2 is a ~~38.137~~^{38.137}-acre site located south of Seaside Avenue and west of Terminal Way and is surrounded by the industrial context of the Port. [Neighboring the site would be a 1.1-acre site on which would be located the proposed Project's Administration Building, an approximately 15,000 square foot two- or three-story building that would provide offices, meeting spaces, restrooms, and a lunchroom.](#) To ~~its~~^{the} southwest [of Tank Farm Site 2 and the Administration Building](#) are large above-ground covered coal conveyor belts previously used by the Los Angeles Export Terminal (LAXT), and approximately 1 mile southwest is the U.S. Customs House. The Terminal Island Container Transfer Facility (TICTF) is located about 0.5 mile to the west. East of Tank Farm Site 2 is the San Pedro Bay Ports boundary, east of which is the Pier T Marine Terminal, which includes the Hanjin Shipping Company Container Terminal, Weyerhaeuser Company, Pacific Coast Recycling, Arco Oil Terminal, and Fremont Forest Products.

Being in the midst of the surrounding San Pedro Bay Ports facilities, Tank Farm Site 2 [and the Administration Building](#) would not be discerned from the nearest public viewing positions, which are within high-rise residential structures in downtown Long Beach along Ocean Boulevard (Section 3.1.2.1.2).

Pipelines

Pipelines to be constructed include Pipeline Segments 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3, 4, and 5, as described in Chapter 2. All pipelines, with the exception of the water crossings at the Pier 400 causeway bridge and the Valero pipe bridge across the Dominguez Channel, would be installed below ground (trench and cover, boring, or directional drilling). Pavement breakers, excavators, and haul trucks would be used in this process.

However, whether above ground or below ground, no aspect of pipeline construction or operation would be within sensitive public views. Nearly all of the alignment is well within Port lands. That part passing to the south of Alameda Street along the northern periphery of the Port area is not within sensitive public views. Traffic along Alameda Street is solely related to the industrial land uses in the area. There are no visually sensitive public land uses (residential areas, recreation or tourist destinations) served by this street. Moreover, nearly all of this alignment would be installed using directional drilling.

Construction Staging Areas

The location of temporary construction yards serving the construction of the proposed Project are shown in Figure 2-12 and itemized in Table 2-8. The areas closest to critical public views are Areas 427 and 420, located at the southwest corner of Pier 300 and northwest of Reservation Point. The next closest is Area 412, on the east side of Pier 400. None of these staging areas, or those that are more distant, would be within sensitive views. Either Port infrastructure entirely blocks views of the sites, or a combination of distance, angle of view, or infrastructure renders the sites indiscernible.

3.1.4.3.1.2 Project Features within Critical Public Views

Marine Terminal

The Marine Terminal site is a 5-acre parcel of unimproved land located at Berth 408 within a long and narrow strip of Pier 400; it extends in a “dog-leg” along part of both Faces C and D for a total of nearly 3,000 feet (see Figure 2.2, Chapter 2, Project Description). The width of the terminal site tapers from a maximum of about 103 feet near Tank Farm Site 1 along Face D, to about 30 feet at the northwest end of the Face C portion.

- In-Water Structures. Unlike wharves in the Port that serve container ships, the dock structures serving the marine terminal will not line the face of the pier but will, for the most part, be several hundred feet offshore. Two trestles will extend 300 feet straight out from the rip-rap bank of Pier 400. One, the north trestle, will support a roadway to the unloading platform, and the other will connect with the gangway tower and crane. Other facilities include fixed mooring structures spanning 1,200 feet (dolphins), walkways, and a floating utility boat dock to the north of the other structures. The trestles, platforms, and walkways are all low-profile, being 20 feet above the water surface. Relative to the adjoining walkways and platforms, the dolphins would be about 28 feet tall; the gangway tower would be 60 feet high; and the unloading arms would be 80 feet above their platform. The latter would be drained and stored when not in use.
- Landside Structures. ~~Three~~ Two buildings are proposed for construction within the Marine Terminal:
 - *Terminal Control Building*: This would be a one- or two-story building of about 6,000 square feet that would provide space for the terminal operator and personnel responsible for operation of the Marine Terminal, tank farm distribution system, and the terminal security system. It would be located

dockside near the south trestle, and, for this assessment, it is assumed that the building would be two stories high.

- ~~Administration Building: This would be an approximately 15,000 square foot two or three story building that would provide offices, meeting spaces, restrooms, and a lunchroom. The administration building and its parking lot would be located along the Face D portion of the proposed Marine Terminal near its intersection with Face C. At the time the Draft SEIS/SEIR was prepared, the configuration of this building had not been finalized. For visual analysis purposes, it is assumed the building would be a three story structure.~~
- Security Building. This building would be a single-story building having a 1,500 square foot footprint. Figure 2-3 shows this building to be on along Face C of the Marine Terminal. ~~adjacent to the north side of the Administration Building.~~
- Landscaping. A schematic Landscape Plan has been prepared for the Marine Terminal, with buffer plantings to occur along the northern half of Face C and extending along ~~for~~ Face D ~~starting at the Administration Building and extending~~ 460 feet toward Tank Farm Site 1.
- Lighting. Terminal lighting would be designed to minimize spillage of light from the property and would include navigation lighting to define the limits of the dock. The unloading platform would have a variety of lights, including an 80-foot-tall tower with from four to eight 400-watt fixtures, based on calculated needs. This light would illuminate the loading arms and connection to the ship. To meet Port of Los Angeles Lighting Guidelines, the tower light would be directional and face east, thereby avoiding light emissions to the west toward sensitive land uses. Also, to meet Port standards, the fixtures would have refractors designed to minimize offsite light spillage from the proposed Project site or to the surface of the water. The light tower is expected to perform identically to high-mast directional lighting along the west side of the APM Terminal, which emit no light to the west. Lower deck level lights would illuminate equipment and piping where needed. Additionally, there may be low-level lighting on the loading arms to assist with nighttime maintenance or operations.

It is assumed that night lighting seldom would be required when tanker ships are not present offloading crude oil. The exception would occur during periodic nighttime maintenance activities.

To demonstrate that no increase in off-site light emissions would occur as a result of the proposed Project when it is in operation, Port engineering would measure the light level at strategic off-site points prior to the installation of new lighting and also would measure the light levels at the same points after the installation (Section 3.1.3.1.1: Port of Los Angeles's Terminal Lighting Design Guidelines).

- Construction. Construction of the Face C wharf would require the use of typical land-based equipment (e.g., low-boy trailer trucks, cranes,

dozers/tractors), as well as the use of water-based construction barges mounted with cranes and pile driving equipment. During the construction phase, no activities would occur between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the week and before 8:00 a.m. or after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. There would be no construction on Sunday. Therefore, there would be no nighttime construction lighting.

Tank Farm Site 1

This tank farm site is 10.7 acres in size and is about midway along Face D of Pier 400, abutting the west side of the California Least Tern Preserve. The tank farm would consist of two 250,000 barrel (bbl) petroleum transfer tanks 52 feet high and 202 feet in diameter; one 50,000 bbl surge tank 90 feet in diameter and 32 feet high; a 15,000 bbl MGO tank 53 feet in diameter and 46 feet high; and a vapor tank 40 feet in diameter and 42 feet high. Additionally, there would be a one- to two-story motor control center building of approximately 4,800-square feet that would contain the electrical switchgear, low voltage step down transformers, and the motor control center that services all electrical equipment. Similar to current practice at the Port, it is expected that the new tanks and motor control center building would be painted flat white or grey in color.

There would be four 30-foot-tall directional lights along the east boundary that would face to the west. The fixtures would have refractors and corresponding light curves that are designed to minimize off-site light spillage from the proposed Project site. Tank stairs, platforms, and instrument locations would have lights with shields and deflectors to direct light at the work area only. These would be smaller than the 30-foot-tall lights.

As would be the case for Marine Terminal lighting, to demonstrate that no increase in off-site light emissions would occur as a result of the proposed Project, Port Engineering Division would measure the light level at strategic off-site points prior to the installation of new lighting and also would measure the light levels at the same points after the installation.

Construction of the tanks would require use of low-boy trailer trucks to bring in tank panels and to pour foundations, as well as cranes to lift and install tank panels, and roof elements. Several earth movers and clam shell-type cranes would also be required. The hours of construction would be as reported for construction of the Marine Terminal, and there would be no nighttime construction lighting.

Marine Tankers

Berth structures would be able to accommodate VLCC marine tankers up to a length of 1,100 feet and a beam (width) of 200 feet. All tankers would be moored starboard (right) side to the mooring facility. When fully loaded, a VLCC tanker's deck would be about 31 feet above the water's surface, but when unloaded (at "ballast draft"), the deck would be 41 feet higher. That is, when arriving to Berth 408 fully loaded, the tanker would present its lowest profile, gradually rising as it is offloaded of its crude oil. Then, when departing empty, the ship would be at its highest draft, the deck being 72 feet above the water as it leaves the Port.

The number of tanker calls per year is expected to range from 129 to 201 for the 2010, 2015 and 2025-2040 periods, with the number dependent on size of the vessels. A higher proportion of large vessels carrying larger loads would mean fewer vessel calls per year. Conversely, a higher proportion of smaller vessels would mean a greater number of vessel calls.

For the following visual assessment of the impact of proposed Project features on critical public views, visual simulations have been prepared. These are shown in Figures 3.1-15 through 3.1-18.

Barges

In addition to the tanker calls at Berth 408, barges delivering marine gas oil (MGO) will call at the Marine Terminal approximately once every two months by 2010 and once a month by 2025. There would be no barge calls under the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative, and there would be fewer than one call per month for any time period for the Reduced Project Alternative. These barges would typically come from other liquid bulk terminals within the San Pedro Bay Ports. They would be low in profile and comparatively small, relative to Port facilities at or near Berth 408, and their calls would be infrequent, as noted. Therefore, the movement and presence of the barges would not meaningfully contribute to the visual effect of the proposed Project or its alternatives.

3.1.4.3.1.3 Impact AES-1: The proposed Project would not adversely affect a scenic vista.

The issue addressed by **Impact AES-1** is specifically a CEQA-stated concern over the degree to which project-related features would interfere with a scenic vista, either by obstructing it or interfering with public access to it. Included is the impact on focal or panoramic views from mobile or stationary viewing positions. The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles 2006) lists the following factors as relevant to this CEQA issue.

- “The nature and quality of recognized or valued views (the natural or man-made setting and specific features of visual interest)”;
- “The extent of the obstruction”;
- “The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails.”

What constitutes a “recognized or valued” view has been defined in Section 3.1.4.2.1. For clarity, that definition is repeated here:

- A view is “recognized or valued” if the City of Los Angeles through its General Plan and Elements has listed, designated or in some manner explicitly or implicitly addressed a view or feature in a plan, policy or objective for its aesthetic or visual resource value; or, if not meeting that criterion, the potentially affected view is demonstrably high in quality, and its value is indicated by how the public uses the area from which the view occurs (e.g., a recreation site, informal but well-used scenic turnout, a tourist attraction, residential area, historic or archeological site).

As discussed in Section 3.1.4.2.1, **Impact AES-1** does not relate to a NEPA threshold of significance and is not analyzed relative to NEPA regulations.

Views from Cabrillo Beach and Vicinity

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views. The views from Cabrillo Beach and its vicinity are represented by Figures 3.1-3, 3.1-4, 3.1-5, and 3.1-7. The visual character of the potentially affected views is that of the working Port environment, in conjunction with recreation and tourist facilities at its western periphery. Also in view are the San Pedro Bluffs residential area close by to the west, and the community of Rancho Palos Verdes in the distance. As noted in Section 3.1.2.2.3.1, the views are dominated by Port features, such as the Port Liquid Bulk Terminal, APL and APM Terminal facilities along, and within, Piers 300 and 400 respectively, and the presence of docked cargo ships at those terminals. All of these facilities are congruent with the Port environment and coherently sited, so the baseline visual conditions are Visual Modification Class 1: visual quality is high within the context of the Port environment. The quality of the view, together with the beach's serving recreation uses, indicate that views of the Port environment from Cabrillo Beach and other recreation facilities in its vicinity are valued, if not specifically recognized by policies or objectives stated in the City of Los Angeles General Plan or its Elements.

The extent of obstruction. The construction phase of the Marine Terminal and adjacent tank farm would cause no view obstruction. The viewing distance is 1.3 miles for Viewing Position 1, and the scale of the equipment and the limited extent of the construction activities in this view, compared with the total amount of Port facilities on Pier 400, are such that no noticeable obstruction of Port features could occur.

Regarding the proposed Project's operation phase, Figures 3.1-16 and 3.1-17 show visual simulations of the major proposed Project features that would be visible from the Cabrillo Beach Fishing Pier from Viewing Position 1. Figure 3.1-16 shows the Marine Terminal, dockside and in-water facilities, and the proposed Tank Farm at Site 1, ~~and landscaping around the Administration Building,~~ in the absence of a docked marine tanker. In this view, the dockside equipment, ~~Administration Building,~~ and Terminal Control Building are shown. All of the structures present inconspicuous profiles as seen against the existing Port facilities in the vicinity and would not materially block Port features from view.

Figure 3.1-17 shows a docked Max-VLCC marine tanker after it has offloaded its oil (i.e., at maximum height), ~~the Administration Building,~~ and the proposed Tank Farm at Site 1 to its right. The tanker shown is the largest anticipated by the proposed Project, and is depicted in a state where it is floating at its highest level just prior to departure. The visual simulation is, therefore, "worst case" in the sense of representing the largest marine tanker in its most visible state. As a point of reference, when it arrives at its dock fully loaded, the tanker depicted would float substantially lower, to the point that none of the red colored part of the ship would show. The image is also "worst case" in that it shows no other ships berthed at Pier 400, so the one simulated tanker draws more attention than if one or more cargo ships were also in view.

Nearly all of the other features of the Marine Terminal are blocked from view by the tanker, ~~the exception being the three-story Administration Building~~. The only Port features which would be visually obstructed by Project features would be some stacked cargo containers and a few buildings in the backlands of the APM Terminal, concealed when a marine tanker is present, and several gantry cranes within the Port of Long Beach five miles away, partially blocked by the tank farm.

It is assumed that it is the entirety of the panorama visible from Cabrillo Beach that is valued, both that from the outer beach (south of the breakwater) and the inner beach. The proposed Project features would obstruct a small fraction of the features visible across that inner beach panorama, as shown in the Figures 3.1-3, 3.1-4, and 3.1-5, which together present that panorama. Moreover, as described later in this report relative to **Impact AES-3**, the proposed Project's facilities and the marine tankers docking at the terminal would be congruent with other features of the Port environment and not contrast with the setting. The introduction of proposed Project features that are consistent with the Port visual environment would, then, offset the marginal obstruction of Port facilities that would occur due to those Project features.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails. As noted in Section 3.1.2.1.2.4, Class I and II bikeways are coincident with the designated Scenic Highway described in that section. From no stretch of this "Highway" (a sequence of interconnected roads) is there a view of the proposed Project. Neither, then, are there such views from the bikeways along these roads. One Class I Bike Lane does not occur along the Scenic Highway. It descends from S. Pacific Avenue along Stephen M. White Drive to Cabrillo Beach. However, views of the Project site are mostly blocked by trees. Where there are glimpses of the site, the views are of the same character and quality as those from Cabrillo Beach and its vicinity, albeit greatly limited in breadth. As noted above, no view obstruction would occur relative to those views, so none would occur relative to the Bike Lane.

Summary. Visual quality for views from Cabrillo Beach and its vicinity is high in the context of the Port environment, and such views are assumed to be valued, though not specifically recognized for scenic quality. It is assumed that it is the entirety of the panoramas that are available from both the outer and inner beach areas that are valued, as there are no focused, specific "scenic vistas" available from the beach and its environs. Construction equipment and activities would not meaningfully block views of Port features. In the operational stage, while proposed Project features would block some APM Terminal backland facilities from view, as well as distant gantry cranes in the Port of Long Beach, the blockage would not be appreciable in the context of the breadth of views available from the beach. Also, the proposed Project's facilities and the marine tankers docking there are features that would be consistent with the Port's features and considered part of the valued views. They would supplant those Port features blocked from view, and there would be no net obstruction. Therefore, there would be no adverse impact on views from Cabrillo Beach and its vicinity relative to **Impact AES-1**.

Views from San Pedro Bluffs Residential Area

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views. The critical views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area are represented by Figure 3.1-8, upper image, which depicts the view from the northeast to the east from Viewing Position 3. The context

for this view is the character of the surrounding residential area. As noted in Section 3.1.2.2.3.2, the Port's features are not congruent with those associated with a residential area. For views in their direction, they dominate attention, and such views from Viewing Position 3 are considered to be low in quality, rated Visual Modification Class 4.

The policies and objectives set forth in the City of Los Angeles General Plan and its Elements do not specifically recognize as "valued" those views that are directed toward the Port. As defined in Section 3.1.4.2.1, then, views of the Port from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area are not deemed in this assessment to be recognized or valued views. However, the views from the residences in this area also include the outer harbor and the open ocean beyond, as well as the presence and movement of sailboats, ferries and cruise ships, and such views are assumed to be regarded as valued, if not specifically recognized for their scenic quality.

The extent of obstruction. Views of the Port and views of the outer harbor and open ocean are experienced from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area in conjunction with one another. However, construction and operational features of the proposed Project would not intercede in the valued views of the outer harbor and the open ocean, as such views are directed to the southeast, away from the proposed Project site. Therefore, there would be no potential for Project features to block or otherwise affect these valued views.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails. There are no roadways, bike paths or trails in the vicinity of the San Pedro Bluffs the views from which are recognized for scenic quality and from which the proposed Project may be seen. The City of Los Angeles-designated "Scenic Highway" described in Section 3.1.2.1.2.4 offers no views of the proposed Project site. Therefore, this issue area is not relevant to views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area.

Summary. The visual quality for views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area directed toward the Port is low in the context of a residential environment. Therefore, such views are not considered to be valued for their scenic quality, as defined in Section 3.1.4.2.1. Whether the proposed Project's features would noticeably block Port features from view is irrelevant, given that the valued views are to the southwest toward the outer harbor and open ocean. The proposed Project's features would not occur within lines of sight directed to the southwest and could not block such views or otherwise affect public access to them. Therefore, there would be no adverse impact on views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area relative to **Impact AES-1.**

Lookout Point Park

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views. The critical views from Lookout Point Park are represented in Figure 3.1-8, lower image, which shows the view from Viewing Position 4. The view from Lookout Point Park was specifically created to afford views of the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (Section 3.1.2.2.3.2), and the context for the views is the Port environment. The views are dominated by Port features, such as the Port Liquid Bulk Terminal and APL and APM Terminal facilities along, and within, Piers 300 and 400 respectively. All of

these facilities are congruent with the Port environment and coherently sited, so the baseline visual conditions are Visual Modification Class 1: visual quality is high within the context of the Port environment. Therefore, it is assumed that the park was created in recognition of the value to the public of these views.

The extent of obstruction. As would be the case for the view from the San Pedro Bluff residential area evaluated, construction equipment and activities would appear small in scale and limited in distribution compared to the panorama of Port development within view. Seen at distance of 2.0 miles, these activities would not noticeably obstruct views of Port features. Moreover, as seen from the park construction activities, even if noticed, would not appear incongruous in the Port setting.

Concerning the operational phase, Figures 3.1-18 and 3.1-19 show visual simulations of the major proposed Project features as seen from Lookout Point Park (Viewing Position 4). Figure 3.1-18 shows the Marine Terminal, dockside and in-water facilities, the Terminal Control Building, ~~Administration Building and landscaping in its vicinity~~, and Tank Farm Site 1. Figure 3.1-19 shows the Marine Terminal, ~~the Administration Building and adjacent landscaping~~, and a docked Max-VLCC Marine Tanker after it has offloaded its oil (i.e., so it is at maximum, and therefore “worst case,” height), and the proposed Tank Farm at Site 1. The image is also “worst case” in that it shows no other ships berthed at Pier 400, so the one simulated tanker draws more attention than if one or more cargo ships were also in view.

In the absence of a docked marine tanker (Figure 3.1-18), the two-story terminal control building would visibly block only a small part of the stacked cargo in the backlands to the east. No other Port features would be blocked from view by dockside and in-water structures, given the viewing distance (2.0 miles) the elevation of the viewing position, and the low profile of those features. Figure 3.1-19 shows that the tanker ~~and Administration Building~~ would block from view only a few Port features in the backlands of the APM Terminal on Pier 400, while the tank farm would slightly intercede in views of the ocean east of the tank farm.

In conclusion, the proposed Project features would obstruct an exceedingly small fraction of the features visible across the panorama available, as shown in the visual simulations and in conjunction with the part of the panorama to the northeast not shown. Moreover, as described later in this report relative to **Impact AES-3**, the proposed Project’s facilities and the marine tankers docking at the terminal would be congruent with other features of the Port environment and not contrast with the setting. What small obstruction of APM Terminal facilities that would occur would be offset by the introduction of proposed Project features that are consistent with the Port visual environment.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails. There are no roadways, bike paths or trails in the vicinity of Lookout Point Park the views from which are accorded the distinction of being recognized and from which the proposed Project would be seen. Therefore, this issue area is not relevant to views from Lookout Point Park.

Summary. The quality of views from Lookout Point Park is high in the context of the Port’s visual character. It is assumed that the entirety of the panorama available

from the park is valued, as there are no focused “scenic vistas” from there. While proposed Project features would block some APM Terminal backland features from view and slightly interrupt views of the ocean east of Tank Farm Site 1, the blockage would not be appreciable in the context of the breadth of views available, the viewing distance, and the elevation of the viewing position. Also, the proposed Project’s facilities and the marine tankers docking there are features that would be consistent with the Port’s features and would be considered part of the valued views. They would supplant those Port features blocked from view, and there would be no net obstruction. Therefore, there would be no adverse impact on views from Lookout Point Park relative to **Impact AES-1**.

Views from within and along the Los Angeles Main Channel and Outer Harbor

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views. The critical views from within and along the Main Channel and outer harbor are those from pleasure craft, ferries, and cruise ships and tourist attractions within Ports O’ Call Village and the San Pedro Marina. To summarize from Section 3.1.2.2.3.3, the context for these views is the character of the Port environment. This context not only includes dockside gantry cranes, container ships, backland storage containers, warehouses, and liquid bulk storage facilities, but also the tourist and recreation facilities that line part of the west side of the Main Channel and those in the southwest corner of the Port (Cabrillo Beach, its vicinity, and Cabrillo Marina). All features in view are congruent with those associated with the Port. The overall pattern of development in the Port cannot be appreciated, but Port facilities in view along the Main Channel are distributed systematically (rows of gantry cranes, areas of stacked cargo containers, groups of liquid bulk storage tanks), representing a coherent sequence. In the context of the Port environment, the quality of the potentially affected views from within the Main Channel is Visual Modification Class 1. However, there is no substantial evidence that those departing or entering a working port on pleasure craft, ferries and cruise ships especially recognize close views of industrial facilities as scenic or otherwise valued for aesthetic qualities. Consequently, **Impact AES-1** is not considered applicable to views from and along the Main Channel.

The extent of obstruction. There being no recognized or valued scenic vistas from within or along the Main Channel or within the outer harbor, consideration of impacts on a scenic vista does not apply to views from there, Therefore, consideration of obstruction of views also does not apply.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails. Harbor Boulevard, which flanks the west side of the Main Channel, is part of a designated Scenic Highway. However, views from this road do not include the proposed Project site. Likewise, views from the Class II Bicycle Lane along this road do not include the Project site. Therefore, this issue area is not relevant to the assessment of impacts on Aesthetics/Visual Resources.

Summary. The visual quality (visual condition) for views from within and along the Main Channel and outer harbor is high in the context of the Port environment (Visual Modification Class 1). However, there is no substantial evidence these views are especially recognized or valued for being scenic. Therefore, there would be no

impact on views from within and along the Main Channel and within the outer harbor in terms of **Impact AES-1**

CEQA Impact Determination

Relative to CEQA, of the critical views under consideration, there are indications that those from Cabrillo Beach, the San Pedro residential area, and Lookout Point Park are valued, if not specifically recognized for their scenic qualities. None of these valued views would be obstructed by proposed Project features, nor would public access to these viewing positions be in any manner impaired. In conclusion, there would be no adverse visual impact relative to **Impact AES-1**. Under CEQA, this would be deemed to be a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

As established in section 3.1.4.2.2, **Impact AES-1** does not relate to a NEPA threshold of significance.

Mitigation Measures

Not applicable.

Residual Impacts

Not applicable.

3.1.4.3.3 Reduced Project Alternative

Under the Reduced Project Alternative, as described in Section 2.5.2.2, construction and operation at Berth 408 would be identical to the proposed Project with the exception of the lease cap limiting throughput in certain years. However, as explained in Section 2.5.2.2, the lease cap would not change the amount of crude oil demanded in southern California, and therefore the analysis of the Reduced Project Alternative also includes the impacts of marine delivery of incremental crude oil deliveries to existing liquid bulk terminals in the San Pedro Bay Ports in years where demand exceeds the capacity of the lease-limited Berth 408.

As described in Section 2.5.2.2, the impact assessment for the Reduced Project Alternative also assumes existing terminals would eventually comply with the MOTEMS, that the LAHD and the Port of Long Beach would renew the operating leases for existing marine terminals, and that existing terminals would comply with CAAP measures as of the time of lease renewal (i.e., 2008 for Port of Long Beach

Berths 84-87, 2015 for LAHD Berths 238-240, and 2023 for Port of Long Beach Berths 76-78).

As would be the case for the proposed Project, under this alternative the Project features which would be within view would include:

- Marine Terminal and Dock Structures at Pier 400: a narrow, 5.0-acre site extending about 3,000 feet that would include access trestles, fixed dock and mooring structures, platforms and walkways, gangway tower, and unloading arms, among other facilities.
- Three-Two buildings within Marine Terminal: ~~Administration Building, Terminal Control Building, and Security Building~~
- Landscaping. A schematic Landscape Plan has been prepared for the Marine Terminal, with buffer plantings to occur along the northern half of Face C and for Face D ~~in the vicinity of the Administration Building and its parking area.~~
- Tank Farm Site 1: four liquid tanks of varying sizes and one vapor tank, Motor Control Building, and miscellaneous site equipment
- Marine Tankers: Vessel calls to the Marine Terminal would be 129 in 2010 and 132 calls per year for 2015 - 2040 by tankers of varying sizes, the largest being 1,100 feet in length with a beam of 200 feet.

At LAHD Berths 238-240 the projected increase in throughput would result in increased vessel calls that would be within critical public views. Under the Reduced Project Alternative, while there would be no increase in tanker calls at this terminal in 2010 or 2015, by 2025 and 2040 annual tanker calls would increase by 114 and 131, respectively, over the CEQA Baseline of 60-72 annual vessel calls per year (Table 1-2). Expressed as weekly traffic, tanker calls would increase from the 1.3 tankers per week occurring during the Baseline, to between 3.5 and 3.8 tanker calls per week for 2025 and 2040.

- Lighting: one 80-foot-tall tower light with an array of four to eight fixtures and lower deck level lighting, loading arm lighting, and dock navigational lights at the Marine Terminal; 30-foot-tall lights, work-area, and security lighting at the tank farm

For all critical views analyzed, except for those from San Pedro Plaza Park and Ports O'Call Village, the visual effect of the Reduced Project Alternative would not differ materially from that expected of the proposed Project. This is because the design, construction and operation of the Marine Terminal and Tank Farm Site 1 would be the same under the two scenarios. The analysis of the proposed Project addressed the presence of the largest of marine tankers that would call at the terminal with no assumptions regarding the duration of each vessel call. It was concluded that this feature, together with the other project features in view, would not represent an adverse impact, irrespective of how long each tanker would be in view. Fewer vessel calls of the same size class tanker at the Marine Terminal under the Reduced Project Alternative, therefore, would also not adversely affect critical public views of the terminal.

The visual effect of the Reduced Project Alternative differs from that of the proposed Project solely in the effect of the increased vessel calls at LAHD Berths 238-240, as discussed below.

3.1.4.3.3.1 Impact AES-1: The Reduced Project Alternative would not adversely affect a scenic vista.

Refer to Section 3.1.4.3.1.3 for a detailed assessment of the impact on views of the Marine Terminal and Tank Farm Site 1 relative to **Impact AES-1**. The effect of the proposed Project on these views, discussed in that section, is identical to that of the Reduced Project Alternative and is summarized below. However, the effect of increased vessel calls at LAHD Berths 238-240, which is specific to this alternative as well as the No Federal Action/No Project Alternative, is addressed in more detail.

The issue addressed by **Impact AES-1** is specifically a CEQA-stated concern over the degree to which Reduced Project-related features would interfere with a scenic vista, either by obstructing it or interfering with public access to it. As discussed in section 3.1.4.2.2, **Impact AES-1** does not relate to a NEPA threshold of significance and is not analyzed relative to NEPA regulations. Relative to the critical public views chosen to represent the range of such views that potentially would be affected, there would be no adverse changes on scenic vistas.

Views from Cabrillo Beach and Vicinity

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views. All Port facilities in view are congruent with the Port environment and are coherently sited, so the baseline visual conditions are Visual Modification Class 1: visual quality is high within the context of the Port environment. It is assumed that views of the Port environment from Cabrillo Beach and other recreation facilities in its vicinity are valued, if not specifically recognized.

The extent of obstruction. Construction of the Marine Terminal and adjacent tank farm would cause no view obstruction. Considering the largest marine tankers that would call at the terminal, the only Port features which would be visually obstructed by features of the Reduced Project Alternative would be some stacked cargo containers and a few buildings in the backlands of the APM Terminal, concealed when a marine tanker is present, and several gantry cranes within the Port of Long Beach five miles away, partially blocked by the tank farm.

In the absence of the marine tanker, features of this alternative that are along the proposed dock would not present a substantial profile and would not appreciably interrupt views of the backlands.

To summarize, the features of the Reduced Project Alternative would obstruct a small fraction of the features visible across the panoramic view affected. The features introduced would be congruent with other features of the Port environment and not contrast with the setting (see **Impact AES-3**, proposed Project). The introduction of features that are consistent with the Port visual environment would, then, offset the marginal obstruction of Port facilities that would occur due to those features.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails. Class I and II bikeways are coincident with the designated Scenic Highway described in Section 3.1.2.1.2.4 (a sequence of interconnected roads). From no point along these bikeways and the Scenic Highway is there a view of the sites for the Marine Terminal or tank farm. A Class I Bike Lane extends from S. Pacific Avenue along Stephen M. White Drive and through the Cabrillo Beach parking lot. Where the bikeway reaches the road to the Fishing Pier, the views are panoramic and equivalent to those from Cabrillo Beach and its vicinity. As would be the case for the latter views, no view obstruction would occur due to features of the Reduced Project.

Views from San Pedro Bluffs Residential Area

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views. The context for views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area is the character of the residential features in the vicinity. As noted in Section 3.1.2.2.3.2, the Port's features are not congruent with those associated with a residential area. Views directed toward the Port are dominated by incongruent features and are considered to be low in quality, rated Visual Modification Class 4. There are no indications that they are recognized as being valued in policies or objectives set forth in the City of Los Angeles General Plan or its Elements. As defined in Section 3.1.4.2.1, then, views of the Port are not deemed in this assessment to be recognized or valued views.

However, the views from the residences in this area also include views of the outer harbor and the open ocean beyond, as well as the presence and movement of sailboats, ferries and cruise ships, and are assumed to be regarded as valued, if not specifically recognized, for their scenic quality.

The extent of obstruction. Views of the Port and views of the outer harbor and open ocean are seen in conjunction with one another. However, construction and operational features of the Reduced Project would not intercede in the valued views of the outer harbor and the open ocean, as such views are to the southwest of the Reduced Project site. Therefore, there would be no potential for this alternative's features to block or otherwise affect the views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area that are valued.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails. There are no roadways, bike paths or trails in the vicinity of the San Pedro Bluffs the views from which are recognized for scenic quality and from which the Reduced Project may be seen. The City of Los Angeles-designated "Scenic Highway" described in Section 3.1.2.1.2.3 offers no views of the Reduced Project site. Therefore, this issue area is not relevant to views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area.

Summary. The visual quality for views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area directed toward the Port is low in the context of a residential environment. Therefore, such views are not considered to be valued for their scenic quality, as defined in Section 3.1.4.2.1. Whether the Reduced Project's features would noticeably block Port features from view is irrelevant, given that the valued views are to the southwest toward the outer harbor and open ocean. The Reduced Project's features would not occur within lines of sight directed to the southwest and could not

block such views or otherwise affect public access to them. Therefore, there would be no impact on views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area relative to **AES-1**.

Views from Lookout Point Park

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views. The view from Lookout Point Park was specifically created to afford views of the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (Section 3.1.2.2.3.2), and the context for the views is the Port environment. The views are dominated by Port facilities, but all of these are congruent with the Port environment and coherently sited, so the baseline visual conditions are Visual Modification Class 1: visual quality is high within the context of the Port environment. Therefore, it is assumed that the park was created in recognition of the value to the public of these views.

The extent of obstruction. Construction equipment and activities would appear small in scale and limited in distribution compared to the panorama of Port development within view. Seen at distance of 2.0 miles, these activities would not noticeably obstruct views of Port features. Moreover, as seen from the park construction activities, even if noticed, would not appear incongruous in the Port setting.

Concerning the operational phase, Figures 3.1-18 and 3.1-19 show visual simulations of the major features as seen from Lookout Point Park (Viewing Position 4). Figure 3.1-18 shows the Marine Terminal, dockside and in-water facilities, the Terminal Control Building, ~~Administration Building and adjacent landscaping~~, and Tank Farm Site 1. Figure 3.1-19 shows the Marine Terminal, ~~the Administration Building and its landscaping~~, and a docked Max-VLCC Marine Tanker after it has offloaded its oil (i.e., so it is at maximum, and therefore “worst case,” height), and the proposed Tank Farm at Site 1. The image is also “worst case” in that it shows no other ships berthed at Pier 400, so the one simulated tanker draws more attention than if one or more cargo ships were also in view.

In the absence of a docked marine tanker (Figure 3.1-18), the two-story terminal control building would visibly block only a small part of the stacked cargo in the backlands to the east. No other Port features would be blocked from view by dockside and in-water structures, given the viewing distance (2.0 miles) the elevation of the viewing position, and the low profile of those features. Figure 3.1-19 shows that the tanker ~~and Administration Building~~ would block from view only a few Port features in the backlands of the APM Terminal on Pier 400, while the tank farm would slightly intercede in views of the ocean east of the tank farm.

In conclusion, the Reduced Project’s features would obstruct an exceedingly small fraction of the features visible across the panorama available. Moreover, as described later relative to **Impact AES-3**, the Reduced Project’s facilities and the marine tankers docking at the terminal would be congruent with other features of the Port environment and not contrast with the setting. What small obstruction of APM Terminal facilities that would occur would be offset by the introduction of Reduced Project features that are consistent with the Port’s visual environment.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails. There are no roadways, bike paths or trails in the vicinity of Lookout

Point Park the views from which are accorded the distinction of being recognized and from which the Reduced Project would be seen. Therefore, this issue area is not relevant to views from Lookout Point Park.

Summary. The quality of views from Lookout Point Park is high in the context of the Port's visual character. It is assumed that the entirety of the panorama available from the park is valued, as there are no focused "scenic vistas" from there. The creation of the park indicates recognition of the view as valued. While Reduced Project features would block or interrupt some Port features from view, the blockage would not be appreciable in the context of the breadth of views available, the viewing distance, and the elevation of the viewing position. Also, the Reduced Project's facilities and the marine tankers docking there are features that would be consistent with the Port's features and would be considered part of the valued views. They would supplant those Port features blocked from sight, and there would be no net obstruction. Therefore, there would be no impact on views from Lookout Point Park relative to **AES-1**.

Views from within and along the Los Angeles Main Channel and Outer Harbor

The nature and quality of recognized and valued view. The context for views from within and along the Main Channel is the character of the Port environment, and the quality of these views in this context is rated as Visual Modification Class 1. Regardless of the high quality indicated by the visual condition of these views, there is no evidence that those departing or entering this working port on pleasure craft, ferries and cruise ships, or those frequenting the tourist attractions in Ports O' Call Village, generally recognize close views of industrial facilities as scenic or otherwise valued for aesthetic qualities. However, views of the Port from Harbor Boulevard are deemed to be both recognized and valued in that this road is part of a designated Scenic Highway.

The extent of obstruction. There being no recognized or valued scenic vistas from within the Main Channel, Ports O' Call Village, and the outer harbor, consideration of obstruction of the subject views from these locations does not apply to this analysis. Concerning the valued and recognized views from Harbor Boulevard section of the City of Los Angeles-designated Scenic Highway in the vicinity of LAHD Berths 238-240, nothing of the Main Channel and its dockside features is in view due to intervening structures and landscaping within Ports O' Call Village.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails. Harbor Boulevard, which flanks the west side of the Main Channel, is part of a designated Scenic Highway as stated, and a Class II Bicycle Lane flanks this road. However, the Main Channel and Port facilities along it are not within view from this road and bikeway.

Views from San Pedro Plaza Park

Figure 3.1-12 shows the panoramic view across Ports O' Call Village and the Main Channel from Viewing Position 9 at San Pedro Plaza Park. In this view, marine tankers docking at LAHD Berths 238-240 block view of the dock and much of that terminal's tank farm but themselves are features of interest within the Port context. That is, Port features blocked from view are supplanted by those marine tankers

when docked there also features inherent to the working port environment, and there is no net loss from view of Port features in the exchange.

Under the Reduced Project Alternative, vessel calls at Berths 238-240 would increase from 1.3 per week during the Baseline to 3.5 to 3.8 per week in 2025 and 2040, respectively. However, the tankers would be of the same size class (Panamax) as those calling at this terminal today. That is, there would be no change in the size of the tankers calling at LAHD Berths 238-240, but such tankers would be more generally present in views of this terminal from San Pedro Plaza Park from 2025 through 2040. The tankers, though more generally present, would supplant Port features blocked from view. Therefore, no net obstruction of Port features would occur.

CEQA Impact Determination

No recognized or valued views would be obstructed by features of the Reduced Project Alternative, so there would be no adverse visual impact relative to **Impact AES-1**. Under CEQA, this would be deemed to be a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required

Residual Impacts

Less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

As established in section 3.1.4.2.2, **AES-1** does not relate to a NEPA threshold of significance.

Mitigation Measures

Not applicable.

Residual Impacts

Not applicable.

3.1.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts