

3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

3.1.1 Introduction

This section describes the aesthetic qualities and visual resources within the Port, the Main Channel, and Outer Harbor area, and evaluates potential impacts on these aesthetic and visual conditions associated with implementing the Proposed Action.

3.1.2 Environmental Setting

3.1.2.1 The Port of Los Angeles/Port of Long Beach Landscape Region

The Port landscape is highly developed, reflecting more than a century of construction of breakwaters, dredging of channels, filling for creation of berths and terminals, and construction of infrastructure required to support Port operations (LAHD, 2005). As a result, the Port and the adjacent POLB now comprise a large and distinct landscape region that is visually dominated by berths, warehouses, container yards, tank farms, processing plants, buildings, and parking lots, as well as infrastructure such as bridges, intermodal facilities, rail lines and spurs, oil derricks, pipelines, gantry cranes, and other equipment.

The majority of the Port's facilities are functional in nature, characterized by exposed infrastructure, open storage, unfinished or unadorned building materials, and the use of safety-conscious, high-visibility colors such as orange, red, or bright green for mobile equipment such as cranes, containers, and railcars (LAHD, 2005).

In recent years, the development trend throughout the Los Angeles/Long Beach Port complex has been toward fewer, and more consolidated, berths and terminal backlands that accommodate larger container ships and increased cargo throughput. As a result, longer berths and cranes with longer booms have been required. These changes have affected the visual character of the Port by increasing the scale of facilities visible throughout the landscape (LAHD, 2005).

3.1.2.2 Site-Specific Attributes, Visual Quality, and Visibility

In total, there are six separate disposal sites associated with the Proposed Action, as described in ~~Section~~Chapter 2 and shown in Figure 2-2. ~~No alternative~~ None of the identified alternatives involves disposal at all six sites. Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 each involve disposal at different combinations of these sites. The following section provides a summary of the overall visual quality and visibility of each of the six disposal sites. The visual quality of the disposal sites is based on a broad spectrum of visual and aesthetic ~~factors~~features, including the following:

- Natural features, including topography, water courses, rock outcrops, and natural vegetation;
- The positive and negative effects of man-made alterations and built structures on visual quality;
- Visual composition, including an assessment of the vividness, intactness, and unity of patterns in the landscape; and
- Overall ~~site-specific~~ public visibility of the site.

The final visual quality rating assigned to each site is summarized in Table 3.1-1.

Table 3.1-1 Landscape Visual Quality Rating Scale

Rating	Explanation
Outstanding Visual Quality	A rating reserved for landscapes with exceptionally high visual quality. These landscapes are significant nationally or regionally. They usually contain exceptional natural or cultural features that contribute to this rating. They are what the public generally thinks of as "picture post card" landscapes. People are attracted to these landscapes to view them.
High Visual Quality	Landscapes that have high quality scenic value. This may be due to cultural or natural features contained in the landscape, or to the arrangement of spaces contained in the landscape that causes the landscape to be visually interesting or a particularly comfortable place for people. These landscapes have high levels of vividness, unity, and intactness.
Moderately High Visual Quality	Landscapes that have above-average scenic value but are not of high scenic value. The scenic value of these landscapes may be due to man-made or natural features contained within the landscape, to the arrangement of spaces in the landscape, or to the two-dimensional attributes of the landscape. Levels of vividness, unity, and intactness are moderate to high.
Moderate Visual Quality	Landscapes that are common or typical landscapes and have average scenic value. They usually lack significant man-made or natural features. Their scenic value is primarily a result of the arrangement of spaces contained in the landscape and the two-dimensional visual attributes of the landscape. Levels of vividness, unity, and intactness are average.
Moderately Low Visual Quality	Landscapes that have below-average scenic value but not low scenic value. They may contain visually discordant man-made alterations, but the landscape is not dominated by these features. They often lack spaces that people will perceive as inviting and provide little interest in terms of two-dimensional visual attributes of the landscape.
Low Visual Quality	Landscapes that have below average scenic value. They may contain visually discordant man-made alterations, and often provide little interest in terms of two-dimensional visual attributes of the landscape. Levels of vividness, unity, and intactness are below average.

Source: LAHD, 2005.

The public visibility of each site has been assessed according to three viewing distances, as follows:

- Close-range, or near distance views: approximately one-half mile or less;
- Middle distance views: approximately one-half mile to two miles; and
- Far-range, or distant views: approximately two miles or greater.

Berths 243-245. Berths 243-245 are located along the east side of the Port's Main Channel. The site is ~~made up~~ comprised of two vacant slips that formerly contained dry docks used for ship repair activities. Prominent features include large cranes, warehouses, and other buildings, facilities and heavy equipment related to large commercial vessels and shipping. Figures 3.1-1

and 3.1-2 provide near and middle distance views of the site, respectively, from the Port's Main Channel. The overall visual quality of the berths and their surrounding areas is considered low due to the dominance of heavy industrial/shipping features.

~~The~~This site is visible from parallel locations on the west side of the Main Channel, including the Ports O'Call Village and Mike's Main Channel Municipal Fish Market. Close and middle distance views of the site are limited to people who work in areas immediately adjacent to it, and commercial and recreational vessels traveling within the Port's Main Channel. Far distance views of the site are substantially obstructed and/or visually diminished by the buildings and other Port-related development surrounding it.

Northwest Slip. The 5-acre Northwest Slip disposal site is located in the Port's West Basin. ~~The~~This site is currently open water and includes Berths 130, 131, 134 and 135. The area is used for heavy shipping and industrial activities, and includes such features as cranes, oil rigs, warehouses, and outdoor storage facilities for truck trailer container racks and related equipment. Figure 3.1-3 provides middle distance views of the site and its surrounding areas. ~~Its~~ This site's overall visual quality is considered low due to the dominance of equipment and facilities used for intensive shipping and industrial activities.

Public access to, and viewing of, the site is extremely limited. Public roads in the site's vicinity include the 110 Freeway and John S. Gibson/Harry Bridges Boulevard, both of which are major transportation routes ~~within the region that~~ and are not considered "scenic." The only other means of public viewing of the site is by water; however, recreational boating and fishing in this part of the Port is minimal in comparison to other Port areas because there are no marinas or other recreational points of interest within the West Basin; it is dedicated to commercial shipping activities.

CSWH Expansion Area. The CSWH Expansion Area is located north of the San Pedro Breakwater and east of Cabrillo Beach and the Cabrillo Beach Boat Launch Ramp. Open water lies immediately to the east of the site, with Pier 400 and Angels Gate ~~lie~~ further to the east. The area immediately south of the site is open water. The San Pedro Breakwater and Cabrillo Beach Fishing Pier lie further to the south. To the west and southwest, the site is flanked by Cabrillo Beach, the Cabrillo Beach Boat Launch and, further inland, by small commercial and residential development. The north and northeast boundaries of the site are in close proximity to the Port's West and East Channels, and the entrance to the Port's Main Channel, respectively. The Port's West Channel includes private marinas, yacht clubs and commercial establishments. The East Channel is primarily dedicated to breakbulk, liquid bulk terminals, and Port-related operational facilities such as the Los Angeles Pilot Services and a fire station. The Port's Main Channel is

dominated by heavy shipping and industrial uses. The site and its surrounding open water areas are used routinely by recreational boaters and fishermen. The site is highly visible, in terms of near, middle and far distance views, from all directions. ~~Due to this factor,~~ Therefore, and in addition to the nearby land uses described above, the CSWH Expansion Area site is considered to have high visual quality in accordance with the definition provided in Table 3.1-1 (Landscape Visual Quality Rating Scale). An aerial view of the CSWH Expansion Area is provided on Figure 3.1-4, and existing views of the site are provided on Figures 3.1-5 and 3.1-6.

~~**Eelgrass Habitat Area.** The Eelgrass Habitat Area is located in the Outer Harbor immediately adjacent to and partially overlapping the eastern end of the CSWH Expansion Area, and therefore, has similar visual characteristics as the CSWH Expansion Area. It is surrounded by open water with the San Pedro Breakwater to the south, Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex to the west and southwest, the West and East Channels and entrance to the Main Channel to the north, and Angels Gate and Pier 400 to the east. Due to these nearby land uses and the open water surrounding this site, and in accordance with the definitions provided in Table 3.1-1 (Landscape Visual Quality Rating Scale), the Eelgrass Habitat Area is considered to have high visual quality and high visibility and is shown on Figure 3.1-4. Existing views of the site are provided on Figures 3.1-5 and 3.1-6.~~

Anchorage Road Soil Storage Site. The Anchorage Road Soil Storage Site (ARSSS) is located north of Cerritos Channel and Anchorage Road, west of Highway 47 and Ford Avenue, and east of Shore Road and the East Basin. The areas south and west of the site consist of various marinas, including Holiday Harbor, Yacht Haven, Colonial Yacht Anchorage, Lighthouse Yacht Anchorage, Cerritos Yacht Anchorage, and Island Yacht Anchorage. These marinas provide recreational opportunities for public boaters, including watercraft launching, storage, and repair services. As described below, the ARSSS is visible from roadways bordering the site on the east, south, and west. The area north of Anchorage Road and east of Shore Road is currently undeveloped. Property owned by the Long Beach Harbor Department is located further north of Anchorage Road. The area parallel to Anchorage Road on the south side of Cerritos Channel is comprised of container terminals and a portion of Pier S of the Long Beach Harbor, including a Dow Chemical, Inc. facility and the Long Beach Marine Terminal. As mentioned above, the ARSSS can be seen from the three roadways bordering the site on the east, south, and west. The site is also visible from watercraft traveling on the East Basin and Cerritos Channels. As presented on Figure 3.1-7, the visual quality of the site is considered to be moderately low due to the surrounding industrial characteristics and the existing sediment disposal at the site.

3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES



Figure 3.1-1
Near Distance View of Berths 243-245 Slip Fill Site



Figure 3.1-2
Middle Distance View of Berths 243-245 Slip Fill Site



Figure 3.1-3
Northwest Slip Middle Distance View



Figure 3.1-4
Cabrillo Shallow Water Habitat Expansion Site
– Aerial View



Cabrillo Shallow Water Habitat Expansion Site: View to North from Fishing Pier

Figure 3.1-5



Cabrillo Shallow Water Habitat Expansion Site: View to East from Cabrillo Boat Launch

Figure 3.1-6

3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES



0 500 1000 2000
Scale in Feet



Figure 3.1-7
Anchorage Road Soil Storage Site
– Aerial View

This page intentionally left blank.

Soil disposal activities may include on-site trenching to create depressed areas where dredged material would be disposed of; however, specific disposal activities and requirements would be determined during the construction phase, as appropriate for site-specific conditions. Depending on the disposal methods selected to be most appropriate given site-specific conditions, such dredged material could potentially be visible from outside the ARSSS. Figures 3.1-8 and 3.1-9 portray existing conditions at the ARSSS, which include both level and elevated areas. Although it is not currently known whether dredged material associated with the Proposed Action would result in level or elevated disposal conditions, ~~sediments disposed~~ given existing conditions at the ARSSS and in consideration of the existing visual quality of the area, disposal requirements of the Proposed Action would not introduce unique features and would not alter the existing visual environment at the ARSSS. There is currently sufficient disposal capacity available at the ARSSS to accommodate the needs of the Proposed Action.

~~LA-2. LA-2 is an~~ **Ocean Disposal**. The two viable ocean disposal sites are LA-2 and LA-3, which are respectively located 9.3 km (5 nautical miles [nmi], 5.8 miles) southwest of the San Pedro Breakwater (LA-2) and ~~388.0 km (20.5 4.3 nmi) west-northwest, 5.0 miles) southwest of~~ the entrance ~~of~~ Newport Harbor (LA-3) (USEPA and USACE, 2004). There are no manmade structures within or in close proximity to ~~this site~~ these sites and ~~its~~ the visual quality is considered high to outstanding due to ~~its~~ the open water and undeveloped nature.

From shore and other far-distance viewing locations ~~this site blends,~~ these sites blend into the San Pedro Bay's horizon line. Offshore, the ~~site is~~ sites are highly visible to commercial and recreational vessels within ~~its~~ the general vicinity under clear weather conditions.

3.1.3 Applicable Regulations

The following section provides a discussion of local goals, objectives, policies and programs that are applicable to the Proposed Action with regards to Aesthetics and Visual Resources. Discussion of the Proposed Action's consistency, or compliance, with each applicable local plan is provided under respective subsection headings for the plans. Compliance with environmental statutes on the federal and State levels is addressed in Section 8.0 (Compliance with Environmental Requirements).

3.1.3.1 Port Master Plan

The Port Master Plan, as amended, provides the regulations, guidelines, and overall planning framework for the short- and long-term development, expansion, and alteration of the Port (POLA, 1979). The Port Master Plan has been certified by the California Coastal Commission (CCC), is part of the Local Coastal Program (LCP) of the City of Los Angeles, and is consistent

with the Port of Los Angeles Plan, an Element of the General Plan for the City of Los Angeles (LAHD, 2005). See Section 3.1.3.3 below for more information on the Port of Los Angeles Plan (City of Los Angeles, 1982). The Port Master Plan does not contain any regulations or guidelines specific to visual resources (POLA, 1979).

3.1.3.2 City of Los Angeles General Plan

The City of Los Angeles General Plan comprises 11 Citywide Elements (Framework, Transportation, Infrastructure Systems, Housing, Noise, Air Quality, Conservation, Open Space, Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources, Safety, and Public Facilities and Services) plus the Land Use Element.

The Land Use Element of the City of Los Angeles' General Plan is composed of 35 local area plans, known as Community Plans, as well as plans for the Port and Los Angeles International Airport. The Port of Los Angeles Plan (City of Los Angeles, 1982) is intended to provide a 20-year guide to the continued development and operation of the Port, and is consistent with the Port Master Plan (LAHD, 2005). See Section 3.1.3.3 below for more information on the Port of Los Angeles Plan.

The Transportation Element of the General Plan has established recommended guidelines for Scenic Highways lacking adopted Corridor Plans, in its Scenic Highways Guidelines (City of Los Angeles, 1999a). Because the designated scenic roadways in the vicinity of the Proposed Action do not have adopted Corridor Plans, the recommendations of the Transportation Element are applicable. These recommendations are concerned with design and alignment of the roadway, earthwork and grading, planting and landscaping, signs and outdoor advertising, and utilities.

3.1.3.3 Port of Los Angeles Plan

The Port of Los Angeles Plan Land Use Map designates John S. Gibson Boulevard, Pacific Avenue, Front Street, and Harbor Boulevard as scenic routes in San Pedro in the immediate vicinity of the Port with specific acknowledgment of the views of harbor activities and the Vincent Thomas Bridge available to northbound and southbound motorists (City of Los Angeles, 1999b, 2004). Harbor Boulevard, south of the Vincent Thomas Bridge, similarly is designated as a scenic route because of Port views (City of Los Angeles, 1999b). The City has not adopted official guidelines governing the scenic corridors associated with designated scenic highways but has established interim guidelines as part of the Transportation Element addressing roadway alignment, earthwork, signage, landscaping, and utilities (City of Los Angeles, 1999a).

3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES



Figure 3.1-8
Anchorage Road Soil Storage Site: View to Southeast of Northwest Corner



Figure 3.1-9
Anchorage Road Soil Storage Site: View to East-Southeast of Northwest Corner

This page intentionally left blank.

No other area roadways are designated scenic routes, and there are no officially designated scenic lookouts.

The one objective of the plan that addresses aesthetic concerns is:

- Objective 4: To assure priority for water and coastal dependent development within the Port while maintaining and, where feasible, enhancing the coastal zone environment and public views of, and access to, coastal resources.

As determined by the analysis presented below in Sections 3.1.6.1 through 3.1.6.3, the Proposed Action would not result in degraded views or demonstrable negative effects to valued views, scenic vistas, or scenic highways. By nature of the Proposed Action being a Channel Deepening Project requiring the disposal of approximately 3.0 million cubic yards (mcy) of dredge material, enhancement of public views of coastal resources is not feasible because such enhancement would be inconsistent with required project actions, the purpose of which would give priority to water- and coastal-dependent development within the Port as required by Objective 4. Also in accordance with Objective 4 and as described in the following sections, the Proposed Action would maintain existing public views of and access to coastal resources, and would additionally enhance the coastal zone environment through the containment of existing contaminants in the Port (at the Berths 243-245 Confined Disposal Facility (CDF). ~~and through expansion of the existing Eelgrass Habitat Area in the Outer Harbor.~~ Therefore the Proposed Action is in compliance with Objective 4 of the Port of Los Angeles Plan.

3.1.3.4 San Pedro Community Plan

The City of Los Angeles' San Pedro Community Plan (City of Los Angeles, 1999c), Chapter 3 ("San Pedro Local Coastal Program Specific Plan") contains the following goal, policy and objectives applicable to the Proposed Action.

- Goal 6: Preservation of the scenic and visual quality of coastal areas. The California Coastal Act of 1976 declared the California Coastal Zone a distinct and valuable resource of vital and enduring interest to all people and exists as a delicately balanced ecosystem.
- Policy 6-2.1: That the scenic and visual qualities of San Pedro be protected as a resource of Community as well as regional importance, with permitted development sited and designed to: protect views of and along the ocean, harbor, and scenic coastal areas; minimize the alteration of natural landform; be visually compatible with the character of the surrounding area; and prevent the blockage of existing views for designated public scenic view areas and Scenic Highways.
- Objective 6-2: To protect, maintain and where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the Coastal Zone environment and its natural and man-made resources.

- Objective 6-6: To preserve existing scenic views of the ocean and harbor from designated Scenic Highways, scenic view sites, and existing residential structures.

The Plan also indicates that the City of Los Angeles plans to recognize and designate three sites (Osgood/Farley Battery site, Lookout Point site, and the Korean Bell site) in San Pedro, located southwest of the Port, as public view sites (scenic vistas). The Osgood/Farley Battery site is located at the Fort MacArther Museum in Angels Gate Park, west of South Gaffey Street in San Pedro and separated from the Port by residential developments; Lookout Point (Lookout Point Park) and the Korean Bell site (Korean Bell of Friendship and Bell Pavilion) are located near the intersection of Gaffey Street and 37th Street in San Pedro, immediately south of Angels Gate Park. None of these three proposed scenic vista sites has a view of the Port or of the proposed disposal sites. As determined by the analysis presented below in Sections 3.1.6.1 through 3.1.6.3, the Proposed Action would not result in degraded views or demonstrable negative effects to valued views, scenic vistas, or scenic highways. Therefore the Proposed Action is in compliance with Goal 6, Policy 6-2.1, Objective 6-2, and Objective 6-6 of the San Pedro Community Plan.

The other goals, objectives, policies and programs stipulated in the San Pedro Community Plan, as related to visual and aesthetic resources, are specific to standards for individual projects (commercial, industrial and residential) and community design and landscaping (City of Los Angeles, 1999c) and are not directly applicable to the Proposed Action.

3.1.3.5 Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan

The “Coastal Resources” Section of Chapter 3 of the City of Los Angeles’ Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan (City of Los Angeles, 1999d) stipulates the following policy and program, which are applicable to the Proposed Action:

- Policy 19-1.5: Provide public access and viewing areas for the public enjoyment and education of the Coastal Zone environment, including access to and viewing of recreational and industrial activities in the POLA consistent with public safety, efficient Port operation and the California Coastal Act. (See Relationship to the Port of Los Angeles).
- [Policy 19.1-5] Program: The Plan identifies the area bounded by C Street on the north, Broad Avenue on the east, Fries Avenue on the west, and the POLA on the south, including the commercial area at the foot of Avalon Boulevard, as a special study area for improved integration and linkage of Port activities with the Wilmington community. Allowance by variance for additional building height may be considered for developments which provide public viewing of the harbor (e.g. restaurants, observation decks, etc.).

As discussed in Section 2 (Project Description), the Wilmington Harbor City District of the City of Los Angeles is adjacent to the north and east sides of the Port. Views of the Port and of the

industrial and shipping activities that occur within the Port are existing features of the viewscape in the city areas bordering the Port. Due to existing industrial and shipping activities surrounding the proposed disposal sites and the spatial relationship of these sites to the Wilmington Harbor City District, the proposed disposal sites would not introduce unique features to the existing viewscape. The proposed ARSSS is potentially visible from residences near the intersection of East Anaheim Street and Alameda Street in Wilmington, and the Northwest Slip disposal site is visible from select residences along West C Street, although there is a distance of approximately 0.4 mile between the site and the affected residences and the site is most likely obscured from city views by container storage and cranes located immediately north of the Northwest Slip disposal site. The residences that have views of the proposed disposal sites are already surrounded by industrial and commercial uses and, as discussed above, the proposed disposal sites would not add unique or unusual visual features to the existing viewscape from these residences.

As determined by the analysis presented below in Sections 3.1.6.1 through 3.1.6.3, the Proposed Action would not result in degraded or obstructed views or demonstrable negative effects to valued views, scenic vistas, or scenic highways. Therefore the Proposed Action is in compliance with Policy 19-1.5 of the Wilmington-Harbor Community Plan (see Table 3.8-4 in Section 3.8, Land Use for additional details related to consistency with this plan).

As with the San Pedro Community Plan, addressed above, the other goals, objectives, policies and programs of the Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan that relate to visual and aesthetic resources are focused on commercial, industrial and residential projects and community design and landscaping that are not directly applicable to the Proposed Action.

3.1.4 Methodology

The analysis of the potential aesthetic and visual effects of the Proposed Action was conducted using standard methods for visual impact assessment. Off- and on-shore reconnaissance of the Port and its surrounding areas, as well as the six potential disposal areas, was conducted to systematically define their current visual conditions. During field reconnaissance, areas of active dredging at the Port were also assessed to qualitatively calibrate their visual effects. Review of local plans to identify goals, policies, objectives and programs related to the visual and aesthetic resources that may be affected by the Proposed Action was undertaken. A summary of these plans is provided above in Sections 3.1.3. Following these efforts, an impact assessment based upon how the Proposed Action may affect visual and aesthetic resources as they relate to the thresholds of significance addressed below (Section 3.1.5) was undertaken.

The CEQA and NEPA Baseline area for the Proposed Action comprises the visual and aesthetic characteristics of the disposal sites, which includes ~~a total of approximately 41,563~~ approximately 11,330 acres of open water areas at Berths 243-245, the Northwest Slip, and the CSWH, and LA-2, as well as; approximately 1,330 acres of open water at ocean disposal sites LA-2 and LA-3; and approximately 31 acres of land area at the ARSSS, which is currently used for soil storage. In assessing baseline conditions for the Proposed Action, as relevant to this analysis of Aesthetics and Visual Resources, visual and aesthetic features were characterized for each of the sites listed above and for the Port as a whole. These existing conditions are described in Section 3.1.2.2 (Site-Specific Attributes, Visual Quality, and Visibility) and summarized below:

- Berths 243-245 are presently vacant and surrounded by infrastructure utilized for intensive shipping purposes, including large cranes, warehouses, and other facilities and heavy equipment related to large commercial shipping vessels;
- The Northwest Slip is currently open water which accommodates Berths 130, 131, 134, and 135; the site is surrounded by cranes, oil rigs, warehouses, and other facilities related to heavy industrial and shipping activities;
- The CSWH is situated in open water with the nearest land uses including watercraft launching areas, several marinas, and small commercial developments;
- LA-2 is an open-water disposal site located approximately 5.8 miles off-shore with no man-made structures in the near vicinity;
- LA-3 is an open-water disposal site located approximately 5.0 miles off-shore with no man-made structures in the vicinity.
- ARSSS is an existing soil disposal site which has trucks and earthmoving equipment onsite and is surrounded by industrial land uses.

In consideration of the Port's collective visual and aesthetic attributes, baseline conditions are comprised by a dominance of industrial and shipping activities and equipment. Visual features include a multitude of heavy equipment and large vessels, as well as the existence of ongoing dredges and other equipment associated with the Channel Deepening Project.

3.1.5 Thresholds of Significance

The following significance criteria, based on the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles, 2006), were used to determine whether the Proposed Action would result in significant impacts. The Thresholds Guide specifies a number of factors to be taken into consideration on a case-by-case basis to establish whether a project would have a significant impact on aesthetic and visual resources. These factors are grouped into four areas and are used in assessing the potential significance of the aesthetic and visual resource effects on the Proposed Action.

- Aesthetics – “...the identification of visual resources and the quality of what can be seen, or the overall perception of the environment”
- Views – “...visual access and obstruction or whether it is possible to see a focal point or panoramic view from an area”
- Shading – “...the effects of shadows cast by existing or proposed structures on adjacent land uses”
- Nighttime illumination – “... the effects of a Proposed Action’s exterior lighting upon adjoining uses”

The Proposed Action would have a significant impact on aesthetic qualities and visual resources if it would:

AES-1 Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect.

This City of Los Angeles criterion is related to CEQA Appendix G Aesthetics question I.c) “Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?” The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* directs (City of Los Angeles, 2006):

The determination shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors:

- The amount or relative proportion of existing features or elements that substantially contribute to the valued visual character or image of a neighborhood, community, or localized area, which would be removed, altered, or demolished;
- The amount of natural open space to be graded or developed;
- The degree to which proposed structures in natural open space areas would be effectively integrated into the aesthetics of the site, through appropriate design, etc;
- The degree of contrast between proposed features and existing features that represent the valued aesthetic image of an area;
- The degree to which a proposed zone change would result in buildings that would detract from the existing style or image of the area due to density, height, bulk, setbacks, signage, or other physical elements;
- The degree to which the project would contribute to the area’s aesthetic value; and
- Applicable guidelines and regulations.

AES-2 Affect a recognized or valued view, scenic vista, or scenic highway.

This City of Los Angeles criterion is related to CEQA Appendix D Aesthetics questions I.a) “Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?” and I.b) “Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcrop-

pings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?” The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* states (City of Los Angeles, 2006):

The determination shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors:

- The nature and quality of recognized or valued views (such as natural topography, settings, manmade or natural features of visual interest, and resources such as mountains or the ocean);
- Whether the project affects views from a designated scenic highway, corridor, or parkway;
- The extent of obstruction (e.g., total blockage, partial interruption, or minor diminishment); and
- The extent to which the project affects recognized views available from a length of a public roadway, bike path, or trail, as opposed to a single, fixed vantage point.

AES-3 Create substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.

This City of Los Angeles criterion is related to CEQA Appendix D Aesthetics question I.c) “Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?” The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* specifies (City of Los Angeles, 2006):

A project impact would normally be considered significant if shadow sensitive uses would be shaded by project-related structures for more than three hours between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time) between late October and early April), or for more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time (between early April and late October).

AES-4 Create light or glare.

This City of Los Angeles criterion is related to CEQA Appendix D Aesthetics question I.d) “Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?” The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* states (City of Los Angeles, 2006):

The determination shall be made on a case-by-case basis, considering the following factors:

- The change in ambient illumination levels as a result of project sources; and
- The extent to which project lighting would spill off the project site and affect adjacent light sensitive areas.

3.1.6 Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

Potential impacts of the Proposed Action are described below in accordance with the Thresholds of Significance discussed in the preceding section.

3.1.6.1 Alternative 1: Port Development and Environmental Enhancement

Alternative 1, Port Development and Environmental Enhancement, would consist of disposing dredged material at the following disposal sites: Berths 243-245, Northwest Slip, CSWH Expansion Area; ~~Eelgrass Habitat Area~~, and LA-2.

A Confined Disposal Facility (CDF) would be created at the Berths 243-245 disposal site and would be covered with clean dredge material placed as surcharge to an elevation of approximately +30 feet MLLW, which would remain in place until a future geotechnical investigation and monitoring determines the fill has been consolidated. In the future, if the Port decides to remove the surcharge material (after the fill is fully consolidated), an appropriate CEQA document would be prepared to analyze potential impacts of surcharge removal.

Alternative 1 also includes disposal of dredged materials at the Northwest Slip site, which would create five new acres of land. This analysis addresses the potential impacts associated with disposing dredged material at the Northwest Slip and creating five acres of land in an area which is presently occupied by open water and utilized for shipping purposes. In the future, this five-acre area will be used to realign an existing roadway and facilitate more efficient truck movement in the surrounding wharf area. Potential impacts associated with developing and using the five-acre fill have been addressed in the Berth 136-147 Container Terminal Project Final EIS/EIR, prepared by the Los Angeles Harbor Department and the USACE, which is summarized in Section 3.14.

Impact AES-1: Alternative 1 would not have a significant demonstrable negative aesthetic effect.

The aesthetics impacts associated with Alternative 1 would generally be confined to areas with visual quality ranging from moderate to outstanding and with moderate to high public visibility.

Disposal activities under Alternative 1 would involve the presence of equipment and vessels surrounding each disposal site. The existing visual quality of the Berths 243-245 disposal site and the Northwest Slip sites is low to moderately low due to the dominance of equipment and facilities used for shipping and industrial activities. The existing features or elements of the visual character of these disposal sites include wharves, berths, cranes, container terminals, and other associated infrastructure. Because of the similar visual quality and visibility of the Berths 243-245 disposal site and the Northwest Slip sites, both will be addressed in the same discussion

below. However, the CSWH Expansion Area, ~~the Eelgrass Habitat Area~~, and LA-2 are different because the visual quality of these sites is high due to their contribution to the large expanse of open water. Additionally, the CSWH Expansion Area ~~and the Eelgrass Habitat Area~~ contributes to continuous views to the San Pedro Breakwater and the Pacific Ocean, ~~and their visibility is with~~ moderately high visibility.

Berths 243-245 and Northwest Slip. Construction would begin with demolition of the abandoned wharf structures and cranes within the slips (the wharf is shown in Figure 3.1-2), which would slightly improve the generally low visual character by reducing visual clutter from near and mid-distance views. However, the presence of construction equipment at the Berths 243-245 disposal site would contribute similar features and elements to the existing low to moderately low visual character in the form of the presence of dredging equipment. The presence of construction equipment at the Northwest Slip would not remove, demolish, or alter existing elements or features of this site, but would merely contribute similar features and elements to the existing low to moderately low visual character in the form of the presence of dredging equipment. No existing land-based natural open space would be graded or developed through the disposal of dredged sediment since no disposal would occur on land as a result of Alternative 1. A total of approximately 13 acres of open water within the Port would be “developed” by disposing of dredged sediment in order to create a CDF at the Berths 243-245 disposal site and a new 5-acre land area at the Northwest Slip. The existence of open water at Berths 243-245 and the Northwest Slip does not contribute to the valued aesthetic character of the areas due to the existing low to moderately low visual quality of the sites. Disposal activities would create temporary features consisting of disposal equipment at all disposal sites, and permanent features consisting of a CDF at the Berths 243-245 disposal site and a five-acre fill at the Northwest Slip, both of which would be light brown in color and would be graded to a level surface.

As described in Section 3.5 (Geology) sediment control measures would be implemented for temporarily stockpiled materials, including dredged sediment and surcharge, and such measures would be in compliance with regulatory requirements set forth by the RWQCB and the Los Angeles Building Code, as well as Best Management Practices for erosion and sedimentation control. These sediment control measures would be typical of such measures currently used for other projects in the Port and would not introduce unique visual features to Berths 243-245 or to the Northwest Slip project site. In addition, given the existing low to moderately low aesthetic quality of these sites, it is not expected that sediment control measures implemented through the project would result in visual impacts. The temporary presence of dredging and construction equipment at each disposal site would only present a temporary contrast and would not result in substantial or permanent visual impacts.

Similarly, due to the low to moderately low aesthetic quality of the project site, the permanent presence of the CDF at Berths 243-245 and the new land area at the Northwest Slip would not contrast with existing industrial features and would not contribute to visual impacts. Surcharge material at the CDF at Berths 243-245 would be of higher elevation than the surrounding area, and would consist of a level pile of light brown colored sediment, similar to other undeveloped areas within the Port such as Pier 400, Pier 300, the Southwest Slip, and areas surrounding the Seaplane Lagoon. The increased elevation of the surcharge, relative to existing conditions, would block near-distance views of the surrounding terminal at the former Southwest Marine Shipyard from the Main Channel, which is of low visual quality.

As described in Section 2.4 (Disposal Options), creation of new land area at the Northwest Slip would not require surcharge material for densification because fill (dredged) material for the Northwest Slip is coarse grained sand which densifies on its own, as opposed to the finer materials that would be placed in Berths 243-245, which require a period of settling, or consolidation. Permanent visual impacts would not occur at the Northwest Slip project site as a result of elevation or surface materials.

Disposal activities would not require any zone changes, and also would not result in buildings that would detract from the existing style or image of the areas surrounding each site. Disposal activities would be consistent with applicable guidelines and regulations. As described above, the visual quality at and surrounding the Berths 243-245 and Northwest Slip disposal sites are defined by the dominance of equipment and facilities used for shipping and industrial activities. The existing visual character of these disposal sites is dominated by industrial infrastructure including wharves, berths, cranes, and container terminals. Therefore, the temporary presence of construction equipment at the Berths 243-245 and Northwest Slip disposal sites would not introduce unusual or unique views to either site. Additionally, as previously discussed, creation of new land at the Northwest Slip also would not introduce unusual or unique views, given the existing visual character of the area. Although the presence of construction equipment and machinery at each of the disposal sites would not be unusual, it would constitute temporary, negative visual images. However, as previously mentioned, aesthetics impacts are generally confined to areas with moderate to outstanding visual quality as well as moderate to high public visibility, whereas Berths 243-245 and the Northwest Slip sites have low to moderately low visual quality due to the dominance industrial and shipping activities. Also due to the dominance of industrial and shipping activities, Berths 243-245 and the Northwest Slip do not have moderate to high public visibility. When considered in the context of the Port in its entirety, the proposed Alternative 1 components for Berths 243-245 and the Northwest Slip (including temporary presence of construction equipment, a new CDF at Berths 243-245, and new 5-acre

land area at the Northwest Slip), the project's contribution to aesthetic value of the area would not be adverse.

CSWH Expansion Area. Alternative 1 would temporarily alter the most prominent existing aesthetic feature at this site, a large expanse of open water, through the presence of equipment. However, the presence of equipment would not substantially alter the aesthetic value of the CSWH Expansion Area because it would be temporary in nature, and the visual quality would be restored when the equipment is removed upon completion of disposal activities. In addition, it would not be unusual to view shipping-related equipment in the Outer Harbor area as ships pass through this area daily to access berths in the interior of the Port. No natural open space would be graded or developed, and no aboveground structures would be constructed. The temporary presence of equipment during disposal activities would create a slight contrast with the existing high aesthetic quality of the existing expanse of open water. Use of the CSWH Expansion Area as a disposal location would not require any zone changes, and it would be consistent with ~~applicable~~ acceptable visual guidelines and regulations.

~~**Eelgrass Habitat Area.** Similar to the CSWH Expansion Area, the temporary presence of equipment at the Eelgrass Habitat Area would alter the most prominent existing visual feature at the site, a large expanse of open water. However, the presence of construction equipment would not substantially alter the aesthetic value of the site because it would be temporary in nature and it would not be unusual to view shipping-related equipment in the Outer Harbor area. No natural land-based open space would be graded or developed, however open water would be developed by the construction of a rock dike around the Eelgrass Habitat Area that would extend above the water surface. The dike would be constructed in the shape of a polygon. In order to protect the Eelgrass Habitat Area from erosion from short period storm waves, a rock dike would be constructed around the perimeter of all south, east, and west facing sides of the Eelgrass Habitat Area (DMJM Harris, 2007). The rock dike crest elevation of the above water sections will vary from +12 to +14 feet MLLW. The dike on the north side would be constructed to an elevation of approximately -6 feet MLLW to maintain water circulation within the area.~~

~~Materials used in construction of the dike would consist of light to dark colored rock similar in appearance to that of the existing breakwaters. The dike would remove only a small portion of the existing open water (1.7 acres) in the Outer Harbor, and would consist of natural materials similar to those that make up the nearby San Pedro Breakwater. Therefore, while the rock dike would interrupt the current view of the site (expanse of open water), it would be effectively integrated into the site's aesthetics by using natural materials similar to other features (breakwater, riprap and dikes) in the immediate vicinity. For similar reasons, the dike at the Eelgrass Habitat Area would only create a slight contrast with the existing features of open water~~

~~and views of the Pacific Ocean and San Pedro Breakwater. The dike at the Eelgrass Habitat Area would not negatively contribute to the site's aesthetic value, but would add another natural feature to the Outer Harbor area. As described above, the dike would consist of natural-looking rock that would be aesthetically consistent with the existing breakwaters. No zone changes would be required for the construction of the Eelgrass Habitat Area, and it would be consistent with applicable visual guidelines and regulations.~~

LA-2. The Ocean Disposal Site LA-2 has previously been assessed for use, per the 2004 EIS for the Proposed Site Designation of the LA-3 Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site off Newport Bay, Orange County, California (USACE and USEPA, 2004). Alternative 1 would involve the use of heavy machinery and construction equipment at the site to dispose of dredged material. This site has outstanding visual quality due to the surrounding open water and undeveloped nature. However, it is located several miles offshore, making it visible only to commercial and recreational vessels within the general vicinity, but not to onshore viewers. In addition, the vessel traffic due to disposal activities at LA-2 would be similar to the baseline traffic that exists in the area due to Port operation, and would be imperceptible to onshore and offshore viewers. Alternative 1 would temporarily alter the existing valued feature (expanse of open water) at LA-2 with the presence of disposal equipment; ~~however~~. However, this contrast would be minor because it ~~would be commonplace to view a vessel~~ is common to view vessels in this area and ~~would be for a short duration. this effect would be temporary.~~ No existing land-based natural open space would be graded or developed through the disposal of dredged sediment since no disposal would occur on land. Furthermore, no structures would be constructed. Disposal activities would not require any zone changes, and would be consistent with applicable guidelines and regulations.

Impact Determination

Alternative 1 would temporarily impact aesthetic resources through the presence of construction equipment at all disposal sites; however this would not be an unusual view ~~within the Port vicinity of the disposal sites.~~ Alternative 1 would also create permanent aesthetic impacts through the creation of a CDF at Berths 243-245 and the new 5-acre land area at the Northwest Slip, ~~and an aboveground rock dike at the Eelgrass Habitat Area.~~ The visual quality at Berths 243-245 and the Northwest Slip is already low to moderately low due to the dominance of industrial equipment and facilities, therefore while Alternative 1 would alter the aesthetic features of the sites, it would not create a negative aesthetic value. ~~However, the construction of an aboveground rock dike at the Eelgrass Habitat Area would create a slightly negative aesthetic effect, but it would be effectively integrated into the existing coastal character of the site, similar to the existing breakwater dike.~~ Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 1, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 1 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-2: Alternative 1 would not significantly affect a recognized or valued view, scenic vista, or scenic highway.

Berths 243-245 and Northwest Slip. Existing views of the Berths 243-245 disposal site and the Northwest Slip disposal sites are either fully or partially obstructed by existing Port development, and have low to moderately low visual quality due to the existence of the same development. Therefore, the nature and quality of recognized views at these disposal sites are generally poor, and the presence of disposal equipment would not obstruct any high quality recognized views, nor would it change the quality of the views. Furthermore, the creation of a CDF at Berths 243-245 and the 5-acre landfill at the Northwest Slip would contribute to, but not change, the industrial nature and low visual quality of views of these sites, as described above. Neither of these disposal sites would be visible from the public view sites/scenic vistas in San Pedro. Viewers on certain portions of Harbor Boulevard could see disposal activities and the CDF at Berths 243-245 and the 5-acre landfill at the Northwest Slip; however, the visual quality at this site is low and most of these views would be blocked by existing Port development. There would be no views of the Northwest Slip from scenic roadways.

Obstruction of views caused by the presence of equipment to close distance viewers at the disposal sites would be a minor diminishment, and no valued views would be obstructed due to the creation of a CDF at Berths 243-245 and the 5-acre landfill at the Northwest Slip because open water does not contribute to the visual quality of these sites. These sites are already obstructed from middle and far distance views. In addition, the disposal equipment and finished disposal sites would be low in vertical height, and therefore the extent of obstruction due to this equipment would consist of a minor diminishment. At least partial views of all the disposal sites can be seen from public roadways, although views of the sites can not be seen from the complete length of the roadway. The Berths 243-245 disposal site is visible from public roadways or paths through tourist areas west of the sites, including the Cabrillo Marina, Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex, and the Ports O'Call Village area, while the Northwest Slip site can be seen from the 110 Freeway and John S. Gibson/Harry Bridges Boulevard. Generally, disposal activities at both disposal sites would blend in with existing industrial and shipping operations, and therefore would not be significantly perceptible to viewers. However, both sites have low overall visual quality due to the dominance of industrial equipment and facilities, and when compared with the current views there would not be a significant difference in visual quality.

CSWH Expansion Area. The CSWH Expansion Area, while marked by manmade features such as the San Pedro Breakwater, Cabrillo Beach Fishing Pier, and the East and West Channels that include marinas, commercial establishments, and Port development, has high visual quality due to the large expanse of open water. Therefore, the presence of disposal equipment would change the nature and quality of the views of the CSWH Expansion Area. However, disposal activities and the presence of equipment is a common view at the Port, and would only be temporary. The CSWH Expansion Area would not affect any views from scenic highways or streets. There would be minor obstruction of views of this site from the Cabrillo Boat Launch, when looking east towards the site with the Outer Harbor, the San Pedro and Middle Breakwaters, and the Pacific Ocean in the background. Figure 3.1-6 provides a view of the existing view from the Cabrillo Boat Launch, looking east towards the CSWH Expansion Area.

The vessel traffic due to disposal would be similar to the baseline traffic which currently exists in the area due to normal Port operations. Marine vessel traffic in the Port and surrounding area is fully described in Section 3.9 (Marine Transport). The CSWH Expansion Area is visible from public roadways or paths through tourist areas west of the site, including the Cabrillo Marina, Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex, and the Ports O'Call Village area, as well as some roadways at high elevations within San Pedro. However, the disposal activities would be temporary, and would be consistent with existing Port traffic and operations.

~~**Eelgrass Habitat Area.** The presence of equipment at the Eelgrass Habitat Area would have similar obstruction of views as the CSWH Expansion Area due to its identical location in the Outer Harbor and high visual quality and high visibility. The difference from the CSWH Expansion Area would be that a rock dike extending approximately +12 to +14 feet MLLW (as described above for Impact AES-1) would be constructed around all south, east, and west facing sides of the Eelgrass Habitat Area. The dike would be constructed to 6 feet MLLW on the north side of the Eelgrass Habitat Area. The presence of the dike would change the nature and quality of views of the Eelgrass Habitat Area because there would be an obstruction to the uninterrupted views of the Pacific Ocean and expanse of open water. However, the dike would be constructed of natural rock similar to the material used in the San Pedro and Middle Breakwaters that are located just south of the Eelgrass Habitat Area. As previously described, materials used in construction of the dike would consist of light to dark colored rock with high similarity in appearance to the existing breakwater.~~

~~The dike at this site would be visible from public roadways or paths through tourist areas west of the site, including the Cabrillo Recreational Complex, the Ports O'Call Village area, and some roadways at high elevations within San Pedro. The rock dike at the Eelgrass Habitat Area would be visible from public roadways or paths through tourist areas west of the site. Cabrillo Beach is~~

located approximately 0.3 to 0.4 mile southwest of the site, Cabrillo Beach Park is located approximately 0.5 to 0.6 mile to the west, and Shoshonean Road in San Pedro, which runs along the coast to provide access for the Cabrillo Beach area, is approximately 0.7 to 0.8 mile west of the site. Although the new dike could potentially cause visual obstruction of the open ocean from these sites, the extent of such obstruction would be considered a minor diminishment because the dike would not be taller than 6 to 14 feet above the water (depending on the tide) and would be limited to a comparatively small portion of the Outer Harbor area. The extent to which the dike would affect the view of the Pacific Ocean, expanse of open water, and the breakwaters would change depending on the location of the viewer along the roadway or path when looking toward the Eelgrass Habitat Area.

LA-2. This site is located several miles offshore, making it visible only to commercial and recreational vessels within the general vicinity of the site, but not to onshore viewers. In addition, the vessel traffic due to disposal activities at LA-2 would be similar to the baseline traffic that exists in the area due to Port operation, and would be imperceptible to onshore and offshore viewers. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not affect the recognized and valued views of LA-2, and would not be seen from any scenic vistas or scenic highways.

Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 1 would create some view obstructions at the Berths 243-245 disposal site and the Northwest Slip disposal sites. However, these sites are of low to moderate visual quality due to their industrial nature and the existence of shipping equipment and vessels. These locations are also either partially or completely obstructed from view from various points, including scenic vistas and scenic highways. The views of the CSWH Expansion Area, the Eelgrass Habitat Area, and LA-2 are different in that each has high visual quality due to its contribution to the expanse of open water and, for the CSWH Expansion Area and the Eelgrass Habitat Area, views to the Pacific Ocean and breakwaters in the distance. In addition, the CSWH Expansion Area and the Eelgrass Habitat Area are is highly visible from areas to the west, particularly in the Cabrillo Recreational Complex area, the tourist areas in western portion of the Port, and roadways in this area. LA-2 is highly visible in its general vicinity. Therefore, the use of disposal equipment at the CSWH Expansion Area, the Eelgrass Habitat Area, and the LA-2 would cause view obstructions, but would be temporary in nature. Additionally, the rock dike constructed at the Eelgrass Habitat Area would cause a permanent obstruction of views, but this is low in height and made of natural materials similar to those used in existing features in the Outer Harbor area. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 1, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 1 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-3: Alternative 1 would not create substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.

Presence of equipment at disposal sites ~~and the construction of an aboveground rock dike at the Eelgrass Habitat Area~~ could produce shadows that would shade recreational uses ~~that may occur~~ in nearby open water. However, shadows would not be very long due to the short vertical height of equipment, with the possible exception of the crane arm. ~~and the dike. There would also be an~~ An exclusionary zone would be set up around ~~the~~ dredging and disposal areas where recreational activities would be restricted. ~~so that~~ As such, areas in which shadows would most likely occur would be prohibited to recreational boaters for safety reasons. In addition, most recreational activities, except for fishing, would not involve remaining stationary. Therefore, due to the short length of shadows, the inability for recreational activities to occur close to dredge and disposal sites, and the likelihood that recreational users would not be stationary, any potential shadowing would not shade shadow-sensitive uses for more than three hours between the hours of 9:00 am and 3:00 pm PST (between late October and early April) or for more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 am and 5:00 pm PST (between early April and late October). The presence of dredging and disposal equipment would constitute temporary aesthetic features of Alternative 1. In addition, surcharge piles generated by Alternative 1, which would be used to cap the CDF in Berths 243-245, also constitute temporary aesthetic features, as they would only remain in place until the site is fully graded.

Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 1 would produce short shadows due to the presence of equipment ~~and the aboveground rock dike at the Eelgrass Habitat Area~~ that could affect shadow-sensitive recreational uses. However, because of the short length of shadows, the inability for recreational activities to occur close to dredge and disposal sites, and the likelihood that recreational users would not be stationary for long periods of time, any potential shadowing would not create substantial negative shadow effects on nearby recreational uses. This impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 1, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 1 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-4: Alternative 1 would not create significant light or glare.

Dredging and disposal activities at the CSWH Expansion Area and the Eelgrass Habitat Area would continue during evening hours and would therefore require the use of minimal nighttime lighting. Section 3.3 (Biological Resources) discusses potential effects of changes in lighting on existing biological communities. Ambient illumination levels at all disposal sites would change due to the use of minimal navigational/safety lights on the project vessels and equipment. The lighting used on dredging and disposal equipment (barges, clamshell dredges, and tugboats) would not cause a significant change in ambient illumination when compared to the baseline, or existing lighting conditions at the Port. Similar and more intensive lighting conditions currently exist at the Port due to dredging activities being conducted in support of the previously approved Channel Deepening Project (baseline conditions) and the Port's regular shipping operations, respectively. In addition, because only minimal nighttime lighting would be used for dredging and disposal activities, it would not produce any lighting that would spill off the disposal sites and illuminate adjacent light-sensitive areas.

Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 1 would create minimal light due to the temporary use of nighttime lighting at certain disposal sites. This would constitute only a slight change in ambient nighttime illumination because, as discussed above, ambient nighttime lighting conditions in the Port are already characterized by similar lighting associated with dredging for the Channel Deepening Project, as well as lighting required for other Port operations including shipping activities. Existing lighting conditions are similar for all proposed disposal sites, including the CSWH Expansion Area and the Eelgrass Habitat Area, because all proposed disposal sites within the Port are located within close proximity to existing light sources at or associated with the Port. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 1, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 1 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

3.1.6.2 Alternative 2: Environmental Enhancement and Ocean Disposal

Alternative 2, Environmental Enhancement and Ocean Disposal, consists of placing dredge material at the following locations: CSWH Expansion Area, Eelgrass Habitat Area, Anchorage Road Soil Storage Site (ARSSS), LA-2, and LA-32. No new land area would be created as a result of this alternative.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in the same type and extent of development at the CSWH Expansion Area ~~and the Eelgrass Habitat Area disposal locations~~ as described for Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would also result in the same type and extent of disposal activities at LA-2, ~~although more sediment would be disposed of under Alternative 2, which would result in a longer duration of construction activities but would not affect the less significant impacts identified under Alternative 1.~~ As such, Alternative 2 would result in identical less than significant impacts as described for Alternative 1 at the CSWH Expansion Area, ~~the Eelgrass Habitat Area,~~ and LA-2. Therefore, the impact discussion for Alternative 2 is focused on the disposal sites that ~~was not included or discussed~~ were not evaluated under Alternative 1, the ARSSS and LA-3.

Impact AES-1: Alternative 2 would not have a significant demonstrable negative aesthetic effect.

ARSSS. The visual quality of the ARSSS is moderately low due to its existing use as a disposal site, and the surrounding industrial uses. Therefore, disposal of additional dredged material at the ARSSS would not remove, alter, or demolish the existing features or elements of the visual character at the site. Disposal at this site would be consistent with its current use and would merely maintain the current moderately low visual character of the site. Grading currently occurs at the ARSSS in order to properly maintain the existing disposal site and would occur with implementation of Alternative 2, however no natural open space exists at the ARSSS as it is already developed as a soil disposal site. There would be no change in this use or additional development as a result of Alternative 2. No structures would be developed at the ARSSS. This site is currently approved for and used as a disposal site for dredged material, therefore additional disposal at the site would not produce a visual contrast to the existing conditions. Use of the ARSSS for disposal does not require any zone changes. Given the ARSSS's existing low visual quality, the disposal of additional dredged sediment would not adversely change the site's aesthetic value. The use of this site as a disposal facility was previously approved; therefore additional disposal would be consistent with existing land uses.

LA-3. The Ocean Disposal Site LA-3 has previously been assessed for use as a sediment disposal site, per the 2004 EIS for the Proposed Site Designation of the LA-3 Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site off Newport Bay, Orange County, California (USACE and USEPA, 2004). Alternative 2 would involve the use of heavy machinery and construction equipment at the site to dispose of dredged material. This site has outstanding visual quality due to the surrounding open water and undeveloped nature. However, LA-3 is located five miles offshore, making it visible only to commercial and recreational vessels within the general vicinity, but not to onshore viewers. As with use of LA-2, the vessel traffic required for disposal activities at LA-

3 would be similar to the baseline traffic associated with Port operation, and would be imperceptible to onshore and offshore viewers. Disposal activities at LA-3 would temporarily alter the existing valued feature (expanse of open water) at LA-3; however, the difference would be minor because it is common to view vessels in this area and this effect would be temporary. No existing land-based natural open space would be graded or developed through the disposal of dredged sediment since no disposal would occur on land and no structures would be constructed. Disposal activities at LA-3 would not require zone changes and would be consistent with applicable guidelines and regulations, as would disposal activities at LA-2.

Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 2 would contribute minor negative aesthetic effects due to the presence of equipment at some dredge and disposal sites that would contrast with valued existing features, such as expanses of open water. However dredge and disposal activities are temporary, and therefore the impacts from the presence of equipment would be temporary. ~~The construction of an aboveground rock dike at the Eelgrass Habitat Area would contribute a permanent but minor change to the aesthetic value of the site by obstructing views of open water and the Pacific Ocean, but the dike would be low in height and made of natural materials that are similar to components used in other breakwaters in the Outer Harbor area.~~ Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 2, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 2 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-2: **Alternative 2 would not significantly affect a recognized or valued view, scenic vista, or scenic highway.**

ARSSS. There are no valued views at the ARSSS or its surroundings due to the moderately low visual quality of the site from its existing use as a disposal facility and the presence of various surrounding industrial uses, including backland container storage and marine terminals. This site is not visible from any scenic roadways. Although the ARSSS is visible to recreational boaters in the East Basin and Cerritos Channels, as shown in Figure 3.1-7, the site is not of high visual or scenic quality. Furthermore, due to existing soil disposal activities at the ARSSS, the existing views from the East Basin and Cerritos Channels is characterized by soil disposal activities and infrastructure. Disposal at the ARSSS would not obstruct views of the site or the Port. Use of equipment and the resultant landfill at this site would not obstruct any views due to the low vertical height of equipment and the deposition of sediment into a pit that is below ground level.

The ARSSS is visible from Shore Road on the west, Anchorage Road on the south, and Ford Avenue and SR-47 on the east. This site is currently being used as a disposal facility for dredged sediment, and the deposition of additional material would be imperceptible to viewers on these roadways.

LA-3. This site is located five miles offshore, making it visible only to commercial and recreational vessels within the general vicinity of the site, but not to onshore viewers. Vessel traffic associated with disposal activities at LA-3 would be similar to the baseline traffic that exists in the area due to Port operation, and would be imperceptible to onshore and offshore viewers. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not affect the recognized and valued views of LA-3, and would not be seen from any scenic vistas or scenic highways.

Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 2 would affect some recognized and valued views, and create some view obstructions from various points, including scenic highways, paths, or roadways, to the disposal sites due to the presence of equipment. However dredge and disposal activities are temporary, and therefore the impacts would also be temporary. ~~The construction of an aboveground rock dike at the Eelgrass Habitat Area would permanently affect views by obstructing views of open water and the Pacific Ocean, but the dike would be low in height and made of natural materials that are similar to components used in other breakwaters in the Outer Harbor area.~~ Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 2, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 2 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-3: Alternative 2 would not create substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.

There are several marinas located west and south of the ARSSS that could contain boats that are used as residences. These boat residences and potential recreational use of the open water surrounding the offloading site at Shore Road would be considered shadow-sensitive uses. Similar to the discussion under Impact AES-3 for Alternative 1 in Section 3.1.6.1, any shadows produced by the presence of equipment at this site would be short due to the short vertical height of equipment. Therefore, it is unlikely that any shadows produced would affect any of the boat residences located near the offloading point, or located south of the site in the Cerritos Channel because these residences are located too far from the equipment producing shadows. In addition,

with the establishment of exclusionary zones around the offloading zone, it is likely that areas where shadows would occur would be prohibited to recreational boaters. In addition, most recreational activities occurring in this area would not be stationary, and would consist of boats transiting to other locations.

Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 2 would produce short shadows due to the presence of equipment that could affect recreational uses. However, because of the short length of shadows, the establishment of exclusionary zones around dredge and disposal sites, and the likelihood that recreational users would not be stationary for long periods of time, any potential shadowing would not create substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses. This impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 2, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 2 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-4: Alternative 2 would not create significant light or glare.

Disposal activities at the ARSSS would not occur at nighttime; therefore no nighttime lighting would be necessary at this site. Furthermore, no additional lighting would be installed as part of Alternative 2. Thus, ambient illumination levels would not change. There are several marinas located west and south of the ARSSS that could contain boats that are used as residences, which would be considered light-sensitive uses. However, Alternative 2 would not change the existing lighting scheme at the ARSSS and no light caused by Alternative 2 would illuminate potential adjacent light-sensitive areas.

Impact Determination

Similar to Alternative 1 of the Proposed Action, disposal activities of Alternative 2 would not produce light or glare; however dredging activities would occur at nighttime and would, therefore, produce minimal nighttime lighting at disposal sites. This would constitute only a slight change in ambient nighttime illumination because similar lighting conditions currently exist at the Port due to dredging for the Channel Deepening Project and other Port operations. The impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 2, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 2 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

3.1.6.3 Alternative 3: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no construction activities related to the Proposed Action would occur. No new landfills or new shallow water areas would be created. Since all approved disposal sites have been completed, no further dredging would take place and the Channel Deepening Project would not be completed. Existing environmental conditions at the Proposed Action disposal sites would continue to exist. Approximately 1.025 mcy of material within the federally-authorized channel and 0.675 mcy of berth dredging would remain to be dredged and disposed. In addition the 0.815 mcy of surcharge on the Southwest Slip Area would remain to be removed and disposed. Additionally, the 0.08 mcy of contaminated dredge material would remain within the Main Channel of the Port.

Impact AES-1: Alternative 3 would not have a significant demonstrable negative aesthetic effect.

No dredging, transport, or disposal activities or the creation of new landfill would occur under Alternative 3, and the impacts associated with these activities would be avoided. The aesthetic quality of visual resources would not be affected.

Impact Determination

Under Alternative 3, no construction activities related to the Proposed Action would occur. The aesthetic quality of visual resources would not be affected. As such, no impacts to aesthetics would occur.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 3, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 3 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-2: Alternative 3 would not significantly affect a recognized or valued view, scenic vista, or scenic highway.

No dredging, transport, or disposal activities or the creation of new landfill would occur under Alternative 3, and the impacts associated with these activities would be avoided. Recognized or valued views, or views from scenic vistas and scenic highways would not be affected.

Impact Determination

Under Alternative 3, no construction activities related to the Proposed Action would occur. Recognized or valued views, or views from scenic vistas and scenic highways would not be affected. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 3, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 3 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-3: Alternative 3 would not create substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.

No dredging, transport, disposal activities, land creation would occur under Alternative 3, and the impacts associated with these activities would be avoided. No shadows would be created, and shadow-sensitive uses would not be affected.

Impact Determination

Under Alternative 3, no construction activities related to the Proposed Action would occur. As such, no impacts to shadow-sensitive uses would occur.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 3, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 3 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-4: Alternative 3 would not create significant light or glare.

No dredging, transport, disposal activities, land creation would occur under Alternative 3, and the impacts associated with these activities would be avoided. No light or glare would be created, therefore ambient illumination and light-sensitive areas would not be affected.

Impact Determination

Under Alternative 3, no construction activities related to the Proposed Action would occur. As such, no impacts to ambient illumination and light-sensitive areas would occur.

Mitigation Measures. Under Alternative 3, no significant adverse impacts would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Residual Impacts. No mitigation measures for implementation of Alternative 3 are required. Therefore, no residual impacts would occur.

3.1.7 Impact Summary

This section summarizes the conclusions of the impact analysis presented above in Section 3.1.6. Table 3.1-2 lists each impact identified for each alternative of the Proposed Action, along with the significance of each impact.

Implementation of Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would result in less than significant impacts associated with aesthetic quality, view obstruction, and the production of shadows and lighting in the area of some disposal sites. However, implementation of Alternative 3 would have no impacts to aesthetics or visual resources.

Table 3.1-2 Impact Summary

Impact	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
AES-1. A significant demonstrable negative aesthetic effect would not occur.	LTS	LTS	NI
AES-2. A recognized or valued view, scenic vista, or scenic highway would not be significantly affected.	LTS	LTS	NI
AES-3. Substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses would not occur.	LTS	LTS	NI
AES-4. Significant light or glare would not be created.	LTS	LTS	NI

S&U = Significant and Unavoidable SM = Significant but Mitigated
 LTS = Less than Significant NI = No Impact

3.1.8 Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to aesthetic qualities or visual resources would occur; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

3.1.9 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts would occur.

3.1.10 Mitigation Measure Monitoring

Since no mitigation measures are required for aesthetics and visual resources, a mitigation monitoring plan is not required.