

3.1

AESTHETICS

3.1.1 Introduction

This section describes the affected visual environment of the proposed project area, including the applicable regulations and plans pertaining to aesthetics. This section also analyzes the potential impacts that would result from the proposed Project. Issues analyzed include the potential for the proposed Project to obstruct views from a scenic vista, damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings, result in adverse effects from shading, and create a new source of substantial light or glare.

The impact analysis determined that construction and operation of the proposed Project would result in less-than-significant impacts on scenic vistas, existing visual character and quality, and shading effects. The analysis also determined that there would be no impacts on state scenic highways during construction and operation of the proposed Project, no impacts related to light or glare during construction of the proposed Project, and less-than-significant impacts on light and glare during operation. No mitigation would be required for aesthetics-related changes that would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

3.1.1.1 Terminology

As used in this analysis, *views* refer to visual access and obstruction, or whether it is possible to see a focal point or panoramic scene from an area. *Focal views* provide focused visual access to a particular object, scene, setting, or feature of visual interest. *Panoramic views* provide unfocused visual access to a large geographic area for which the field of view can be quite wide and extends into the distance considerably. Panoramic views are usually associated with vantage points located on high ground and visual access to valued resources such as mountains, valleys, cityscapes, or bodies of water. They also can provide views not commonly available to the public or to private residents.

Views may be discussed in terms of *foreground*, *middleground*, and *background*. Foreground views are those immediately presented to the viewer and include objects at close range that may tend to dominate the view. Middleground views occupy the center of the viewshed and tend to include objects that are the center of attention if

1 they are sufficiently large or visibly different from adjacent visual features.
2 Background views include distant objects and other objects that make up the horizon.
3 Objects in the background eventually fade to obscurity with increasing distance. In
4 the context of background, the skyline or the ocean can be an important visual feature
5 because objects above this point are highlighted against the background of the sky or
6 water. These “skylined” elements are typically more evident to the viewer because
7 of their inherent contrast.

8 *Visual quality*, also referred to as *scenic quality*, is evaluated based on the relative
9 degree of vividness, intactness, and unity within a landscape, as modified by viewer
10 preference and sensitivity. *Vividness* is the visual power or memorability of
11 landscape components as they combine in striking and distinctive visual patterns.
12 *Intactness* is the visual integrity of the natural and human-built landscape and its
13 freedom from encroaching elements; this factor can be present in well-kept urban and
14 rural landscapes, and in natural settings. *Unity* is the visual coherence and
15 compositional harmony of the landscape considered as a whole; it frequently attests
16 to the careful design of individual components in the landscape. High-quality views
17 are highly vivid, are relatively intact, and exhibit a high degree of visual unity. Low-
18 quality views lack vividness, are not visually intact, and possess a low degree of
19 visual unity. (FHWA n.d.)

20 The following additional definitions pertain to terminology used in this visual
21 analysis:

- 22 ■ *aesthetics* generally refers to the identification of visual resources and the quality
23 of what can be seen, or the overall visual perception of the environment;
- 24 ■ *nighttime illumination* is the effect of exterior lighting upon adjoining uses;
- 25 ■ *scenic views* or *vistas* are “the panoramic public view access to natural features,
26 including views of the ocean, striking or unusual natural terrain, or unique urban
27 or historic features” (City of Los Angeles 2001);
- 28 ■ *shading* is the effect of shadows cast by structures on adjacent land uses; and
- 29 ■ *viewshed* is all of the surface area visible from a particular location or sequence
30 of locations (e.g., a roadway or trail).

31 *Viewer sensitivity*, or viewer concern about noticeable changes to views they could
32 experience, is based on the visibility of a scenic resource, the proximity of viewers to
33 the resource, the relative elevation of viewers to the resource, the frequency and
34 duration of views, the number of viewers, and the types and expectations of the
35 individuals and viewer groups. Generally, visual sensitivity increases as the total
36 number of viewers, frequency, and duration of viewing activities increases.

37 The degree of visual sensitivity is treated as occurring at one of the following four
38 levels:

- 39 ■ *High sensitivity* suggests that the majority of the public is likely to react strongly
40 to a threat to visual quality. A highly concerned public is assumed to be more

1 aware of any given level of adverse change and less tolerant than a public that
2 has little concern. A small modification of the existing landscape may be
3 visually distracting to a highly sensitive public and represent a substantial
4 reduction in visual quality.

- 5 ■ *Moderate sensitivity* suggests that the public would probably voice concern over
6 substantial visual impacts. Often, the affected views are secondary in importance
7 or are similar to others commonly available to the public.
- 8 ■ *Low sensitivity* prevails where the public generally is expected to have little
9 concern about adverse changes in the landscape, or only a small minority may be
10 expected to voice such concern, even where the adverse change is substantial in
11 intensity and duration.
- 12 ■ *No sensitivity* occurs when the views are not public, or there are no indications of
13 public concern over, or interest in, scenic/visual resource impacts on the affected
14 area.

15 3.1.2 Environmental Setting

16 The proposed Project would be located at Berths 56–60 and Berths 70–71 within a
17 section of the Los Angeles Harbor and Port that is adjacent to the community of San
18 Pedro, a highly urbanized area. Additionally, demolition of the existing SCMI
19 facility at Berth 260 on Terminal Island would occur.

20 The visual character of the proposed project vicinity is defined by the Port’s
21 industrial facilities as well as privately owned industrial uses adjoining the Port.
22 These include the following types of uses: canneries, boat repair yards, warehouses,
23 liquid and dry bulk storage facilities for oil, railroad spurs, shipping container
24 storage, and commercial shipping terminals, which are dominated by views of
25 stories-tall steel cranes used for loading and unloading cargo. The appearance of
26 many Port operations is utilitarian in nature, characterized by exposed infrastructure,
27 open storage, the use of unfinished or unadorned building materials, and the use of
28 safety-conscious, high-visibility colors such as orange, red, or bright green for mobile
29 equipment such as cranes, containers, and railcars.

30 The visual environment within the Port also includes recreational boating facilities
31 and marinas. A large number and variety of watercraft are present, ranging from
32 small recreational and commercial fishing boats to large vessels such as container,
33 crude oil carrier, and cruise ships. In addition, there are beaches and sport fishing
34 areas, cruise line terminals, retail shops, restaurants, and museum/aquarium facilities
35 catering to tourists.

36 The community of San Pedro is located to the west of the proposed project site,
37 mostly on a seaside bluff known as the Palos Verdes Peninsula. Downtown San
38 Pedro, located approximately 0.8 mile northwest of the site, contains medium-rise
39 government office buildings serving the City of Los Angeles, and state and federal
40 agencies. There are also large hotels, restaurants, and small-scale retail stores. The
41 predominant land use in San Pedro, however, is residential. Multiple-family and

1 single-family residences extend along Beacon Street at the eastern edge of the seaside
2 bluff and southwest along Crescent Avenue. A residential high rise (San Pedro VUE
3 Tower) is also located in downtown San Pedro between 5th and 6th Streets, one block
4 north of Harbor Boulevard. Inland from the proposed project site, the bluff rises to
5 elevations of approximately 300 feet above sea level, offering many residents
6 spectacular sweeping views of the Port and the open sea beyond.

7 The following sections provide an overview of existing viewer groups, visual
8 resources, and light and glare conditions within the proposed project area.

9 **3.1.2.1 Existing Viewer Groups and Viewer Sensitivity**

10 The principal viewer groups in the proposed project vicinity include the residents of
11 San Pedro, commuting motorists, workers within the area, and recreationists, such as
12 boaters in the harbor and at the Cabrillo Way Marina, as well as users of the 22nd
13 Street Park. The term *recreationist* is used to distinguish the sub-group of viewers
14 who are organizing their recreational activities around experiencing the visual
15 environment from those viewers who are engaged in competitive sports activities.
16 Viewers engaged in most active recreation, such as playing sports, tend to have only
17 an average sensitivity to visual quality and visual change. Although they are aware
18 of their surroundings, they are usually focused on the activity itself rather than
19 surrounding views.

20 Boaters are considered the key recreationist group in San Pedro. The nearest
21 sensitive viewing position to the west is at the Cabrillo Way Marina, approximately
22 0.3 mile from the proposed project site. People live on vessels docked at the marina,
23 so it constitutes a type of residential area, and views from the marina are, therefore,
24 highly sensitive. They are also highly sensitive because the marina is a recreational
25 public use area. However, views from the marina are from a few feet above the
26 water's surface, and Port and marina facilities intervene to substantially, if not
27 entirely, block views of features of the proposed project site. Boats docked in the
28 marina and existing warehouses and buildings on Berths 45–47 collectively intervene
29 such that it would be somewhat difficult to discern the proposed project area from
30 that location.

31 Tourists are very similar to recreational viewers. Depending on what brings them to
32 a particular location, tourists tend to be more or less sensitive to visual quality. If the
33 point of the visit is to enjoy scenery, then visual quality may be an important element
34 in their trip (sightseeing tourists). However, if their travel is intended to take
35 advantage of indoor activities, visual quality is of less importance. Moreover,
36 sightseeing tourists visiting the area for the first time, or on an infrequent basis,
37 would not be as familiar with the views, and thus would be less apt to notice
38 incremental changes that have transformed the Port's visual environment over time.
39 Consequently, their level of sensitivity would be considered low.

40 Because the residents of San Pedro would be exposed to views for a prolonged period
41 of time and typically have higher expectations that their visual surrounding be

1 maintained, they are generally considered to be a highly sensitive viewer group. This
2 is because their familiarity with the view, their investment in the area (as, for
3 example, homeowners or long-time residents), and their sense of ownership of the
4 view tends to be stronger than that of other types of viewers. In a way, the view from
5 residences and their yards represents a visual extension of residents' property, and
6 changes in this view are noticeable and can result in strong positive or negative
7 reactions. However, in this situation, the visual environment is already highly
8 developed, has a highly industrial character, and does not contain a very strong
9 natural element. Therefore, the visual sensitivity of residents is considered to be
10 moderate.

11 Commuters and workers are also considered to have lower viewer sensitivity because
12 their attention is focused on driving or work activities. As a consequence, they are
13 exposed to fleeting views during travel and only occasional views from the work
14 place.

15 Finally, it is important to note that this discussion addresses average viewer
16 sensitivity. Some viewers are more or less sensitive than their activity or ownership
17 would indicate. Individuals' reactions to views vary greatly depending upon a
18 number of factors, including how much they know or care about the view, their
19 personal tastes, and their opinions about the activity or location being viewed.

20 **3.1.2.2 Existing Visual Resources**

21 The visual setting surrounding the proposed project site varies with diverging
22 intensity of development, topographic characteristics, landscape features, and the
23 quality of views of the harbor and open sea afforded from specific locations.
24 Perception of the proposed project site and its setting is also informed by the level of
25 interest (sensitivity) different viewers have about the specific views available to
26 them.

27 The description of existing views that follows includes an overall assessment of
28 visual character prevailing in the views toward the proposed project site from
29 potentially sensitive viewing areas. A variety of existing views were chosen to
30 represent existing conditions based on field observations, photographs of the affected
31 area, and an assessment of each one's visual quality. Scenic quality is determined
32 based on professional judgment and experience that considers a broad array of
33 factors, including:

- 34 ■ natural features, such as topography, water courses, rock outcrops, and natural
35 vegetation;
- 36 ■ the positive and negative effects of human-made (anthropogenic) alterations and
37 built structures on visual quality; and
- 38 ■ visual composition, including an assessment of the vividness, intactness, and
39 unity of patterns in the landscape.

3.1.2.2.1 State Scenic Highways

The closest officially designated state scenic highway to the proposed project site is a segment of State Route (SR) 2, which is located approximately 33 miles to the north. The closest eligible state scenic highway is State Highway 1 from State Highway 19 near Long Beach to I-5 in San Juan Capistrano, which begins approximately 9 miles northeast of the proposed project site. As such, there are no designated or designation-eligible state scenic highways located within viewing distance of the proposed project site. Portions of Harbor Boulevard have been designated a local scenic highway by the City. See Section 3.1.3.1.4 below.

3.1.2.2.2 Existing Views of the Proposed Project Area

This section provides an overview of visual elements in the proposed project vicinity, focusing on views toward the proposed project site from sensitive viewing locations. This inventory of existing conditions describes prominent components in the visual setting that combine to form the area's overall visual character. Figure 3.1-1 provides the location of representative photo points utilized in the discussion of existing conditions.

The following viewshed locations occur at the proposed project site and as far as 1.3 miles from the proposed Project and are discussed below:

- 22nd Street Viewshed (Figure 3.1-2)
- 22nd Street Park Viewshed (Figure 3.1-2)
- Bloch Field Viewshed (Figure 3.1-3)
- Cabrillo Marina Viewshed (Figure 3.1-3)
- Federal Breakwater Viewshed (Figure 3.1-4)
- South Harbor Boulevard Viewshed (Figure 3.1-4)
- Inner Cabrillo Beach Viewshed (Figure 3.1-5)
- Lookout Point Park Viewshed (Figure 3.1-5)
- San Pedro Residential Community Viewshed (Figure 3.1-6)
- San Pedro Plaza Park Viewshed (Figure 3.1-6)

22nd Street Viewshed

22nd Street is an east–west trending roadway that is one of the main access routes to the proposed project site. A pedestrian sidewalk parallels 22nd Street to the north. Motorists, workers, recreationists, and tourists at this location would be considered sensitive viewers because of their exposure to proposed changes.

1 As shown in Photos 1 and 2 of Figure 3.1-2, foreground views looking southeast and
2 south-southeast, respectively from the intersection of 22nd and Signal Streets consist
3 entirely of the proposed project site. In the immediate foreground, Signal Street, the
4 former Canetti's Seafood Grotto, transit sheds, and several liquid bulk storage tanks
5 of varying heights and sizes associated with the former Westway Terminal can be
6 seen. Foreground views also include utilitarian uses such as roadways, electrical
7 distribution poles and lines, and security lighting poles and fixtures. Middleground
8 and background views are completely blocked by the numerous structures, storage
9 tanks, and transit sheds in the foreground views.

10 Industrial and commercial uses and development dominate the viewshed at this
11 location and define the overall visual character of this view, which results in a
12 generally congruent pattern of land uses. However, the highly developed nature of
13 this landscape exhibits a moderate to low degree of intactness, and some of the
14 buildings appear underutilized. The various elements in the view do not exhibit unity
15 because the height and scale of the anthropogenic structures are not harmonious.
16 Additionally, the numerous vertical elements in the foreground and middleground
17 create visual distractions that detract from the viewshed integrity. There are no views
18 of important or key visual features, the land form is flat and featureless, and views of
19 vegetation and open water are unavailable due to obstruction by the existing
20 structures, storage tanks, and transit sheds. For these reasons, viewer sensitivity
21 within the 22nd Street viewshed is considered low to moderate.

22 **22nd Street Park Viewshed**

23 22nd Street Park is an 18-acre park that opened in January 2010 on the site of a former
24 tank farm across from the 22nd Street Landing. The park is bounded by 22nd Street,
25 Crescent Avenue, and Miner Street, and offers walking and biking trails, shade trees,
26 a bocce ball court, restrooms, parking, and more than 4 acres of flat grassy area for
27 recreation. The waterfront can be seen from the park. Recreationists and tourists
28 would be considered sensitive viewers because of their exposure to changes at this
29 location.

30 In the immediate foreground, a portion of the 22nd Street Park, 22nd Street, 22nd Street
31 Landing, and several large warehouses are visible, with elements of the working Port,
32 including numerous transit sheds and structures, comprising the remainder of the
33 foreground views (see Photo 3 in Figure 3.1-2). In the right portion of the frame, the
34 masts of numerous sail boats docked in the Cabrillo Marina are visible, breaking up
35 views of the proposed project site. Middleground views also include elements
36 associated with the working Port, such as transit sheds, liquid bulk storage tanks, and
37 cranes. The upper floors of the historic Warehouse No. 1 and its iconic water tower
38 are visible above the transit shed at Berths 5-9 and 60. Angel's Gate lighthouse is
39 visible on the end of the Federal Breakwater in the right side of the view frame. The
40 remainder of the middleground views, transitioning to background views, consists of
41 the open waters of Los Angeles Harbor and the Pacific Ocean.

42 The overall visual character is defined by a mix of civic and utilitarian uses as well as
43 commercial and industrial development that exhibit a somewhat unified quality.

1 Open water views of the harbor and Pacific Ocean are available from the 22nd Street
2 Park viewshed; however, commercial and industrial developments, which are
3 considered the most prevailing elements in the viewshed, partially obstruct views of
4 the water and generally detract from the vividness of the open-water views.
5 Recreationists and tourists would be considered sensitive viewers from this location
6 and would have topographically superior views of the proposed project site as views
7 are from an elevated position relative to the immediately surrounding areas and are
8 unobstructed. For these reasons, viewer sensitivity within the 22nd Street Park
9 viewshed is considered to be moderate-to-high depending upon the form of recreation
10 in which the receptors are engaged.

11 **Bloch Field Viewshed**

12 Bloch Field, a public baseball field operated in partnership by the YMCA and
13 LAHD, is located just northwest of the proposed project site at the intersection of
14 South Crescent Avenue and Miner Street (see Photo 1 in Figure 3.1-3).
15 Recreationists would be considered sensitive viewers because of their exposure to
16 visual changes noticeable from this location. There are three distinct viewer groups
17 at Bloch Field; active recreationists using the ball diamond, gardeners at the adjacent
18 community garden area, and passive recreationists at the viewing area in the turf area
19 to the south. The viewing area, with its benches, allows viewers to pause and enjoy
20 the maritime activities at SP Slip and the transport of the variety of vessels plying the
21 water of the Main Channel. This vantage point could be construed as a vista point.
22 This type of viewer is considered the most visually sensitive because they are at
23 leisure and not involved in an activity that requires their attention. Photo 1 in Figure
24 3.1-3 represents a portion of the panoramic viewshed visual receptors are afforded by
25 this vantage point.

26 The Bloch Field viewshed offers low-lying views of the proposed project site with
27 railroad tracks, the GATX Annex Terminal site, and a portion of the proposed project
28 site in the foreground; the remainder of the proposed project site and additional Port
29 elements in the middleground; and interrupted views of the ocean in the background
30 partially blocked by intervening structures and mature trees. Immediate foreground
31 views also include a landscaped parking area with Port warehouses just southeast. In
32 addition, utilitarian uses such as fences, electrical distribution poles and lines, and
33 security poles and lights are scattered throughout the foreground. Several transit
34 sheds and liquid bulk storage tanks located on the proposed project site extend from
35 the distant foreground into the middleground of the view. Intermittent views of the
36 harbor are also available in the foreground and middleground. Distant background
37 views are obscured by the built environment.

38 Industrial uses dominate the viewshed and define the overall visual character of this
39 view, which results in a generally congruent pattern of land uses. However, the
40 highly developed nature of this landscape exhibits a moderate to low degree of
41 intactness. The various elements in the view do not exhibit unity because the height
42 and scale of the structures are not harmonious. Additionally, the numerous vertical
43 elements in the foreground and middleground create visual clutter. Although Los
44 Angeles Harbor and the Pacific Ocean, two key visual resources, serve to improve

1 and add interest to the view, these visual resources and focal points are somewhat
2 compromised by several intervening elements. For these reasons, viewer sensitivity
3 within the Bloch Field viewshed is considered moderate to low.

4 **Cabrillo Marina Viewshed**

5 Cabrillo Marina is located in the West Channel/Cabrillo Beach Recreational
6 Complex, near the southern portion of the Port. The marina accommodates both large
7 and small recreational vessels and is comprised of 885 permanent boat slips that
8 range in length from 25 to 75 feet. Some of the vessels are live-a-boards that can be
9 equated to residential viewers. Recreationists and tourists would be considered
10 sensitive viewers because of their exposure to changes at this location.

11 From this vantage point, foreground views consist of the boats docked at the Cabrillo
12 Marina, with Port-related uses of Watchorn Basin, the East Channel, the newly
13 constructed Cabrillo Way Marina, and the proposed project site to the east. Elements
14 of the Port and proposed project site in the distant foreground include several large
15 warehouses, transit sheds, and structures as well as utilitarian uses such as fences,
16 electrical distribution poles and lines, and security lighting. Middleground views also
17 include elements associated with the working Port, such as transit sheds, storage
18 tanks, and cranes (see Photo 2 in Figure 3.1-3). Intermittent views of the harbor are
19 also available in the foreground and middleground. Although partially blocked by
20 intervening structures, background views are comprised of the open waters of the
21 Pacific Ocean.

22 Although oriented toward the harbor, quality views of the open water lack vividness
23 and intactness because they are compromised by moored leisure vessels. Moreover,
24 while the human-made features derive a sense of order from their functional
25 characteristics, the highly developed nature of this landscape exhibits a low degree of
26 intactness. The various elements in the view do not exhibit unity because the height
27 and façades of the structures in the foreground and middleground are not harmonious.
28 Additionally, the numerous vertical elements (e.g., boat masts and cranes) create
29 disarray in the view. For these reasons, viewer sensitivity within the Cabrillo Marina
30 viewshed is considered to be low to moderate.

31 **Federal Breakwater Viewshed**

32 The Federal Breakwater is located within Cabrillo Beach Park, which is generally
33 accessible from Stephen White Drive, Bluff Place, and Shoshonean Road.
34 Recreationists and tourists would be considered sensitive viewers because of their
35 exposure to changes at this location.

36 Photo 1 in Figure 3.1-4 provides a representative view toward the proposed project
37 site from the Cabrillo Fishing Pier located at the end of the paved road on the
38 breakwater. The expansive open water occupies the foreground view with
39 middleground components that include the Cabrillo Marinas, the Outer Harbor, and a
40 cargo vessel at the Omni Terminal. The gantry cranes at the Evergreen Container

1 Terminal and the Vincent Thomas Bridge beyond can also be seen. Mountains
2 define the skyline in the background. Views of the proposed project site from within
3 the Federal Breakwater viewshed are typically over 1 mile distant. Photo1 in Figure
4 3.1-4 shows a large freighter berthed near Berth 50 at the Omni Terminal that blocks
5 the southern portion of the proposed project site. The north end of Warehouse No. 1
6 is visible behind the ship's pilot house. Omni Terminal is used for bulk storage, and
7 ships need to have off-loading capabilities on-board; consequently, this situation is
8 not usual. Recreationists are the main viewer group on the Federal Breakwater and
9 Cabrillo Fishing Pier, which creates an area that is visually sensitive. However,
10 because of the distance, intervening anthropogenic modifications, and the panoramic
11 nature of the view, viewer sensitivity is moderate.

12 South Harbor Boulevard Viewshed

13 South Harbor Boulevard aligns north-south along the west side of the Los Angeles
14 Main Channel and offers obscured views of the majority of the proposed project
15 site's channel-side area. This roadway is locally identified on the San Pedro
16 Community Plan map as a major scenic highway. The viewers from this location are
17 mostly motorists, residents (west of South Harbor Boulevard), and visitors and/or
18 patrons (including tourists and commercial viewers) of adjoining land uses, which
19 include mainly restaurants and commercial stores. Residents, motorists,
20 recreationists, and tourists would be considered sensitive viewers because of their
21 exposure to changes at this location.

22 Views of the proposed project site and surrounding area from the southern end of
23 South Harbor Boulevard primarily consist of roads and landscaped parking areas, a
24 grassy park area, Port structures (e.g., cranes, water tanks, and warehouses), and the
25 harbor. Foreground views are of South Harbor Boulevard and a landscaped sidewalk
26 as well as Bloch Field, the GATX Annex Terminal site, landscaped parking areas,
27 and several structures. Also, utilitarian uses (i.e., fences, security poles and lighting,
28 etc.) are scattered throughout the foreground view. A small portion of the proposed
29 project site occupies the distant foreground views and consists of numerous liquid
30 bulk storage tanks. Middleground views contain elements of the working port and
31 intermittent views of the harbor. Although partially blocked by intervening
32 structures and mature trees, background views are of the open waters of the Pacific
33 Ocean. Views to the proposed project site from this segment of South Harbor
34 Boulevard are partially screened by intervening structures and vegetation (see Photo
35 2 in Figure 3.1-4).

36 The overall visual character of this area is defined by the mix of industrial,
37 commercial, and civic land uses, which results in an incongruent pattern of land uses
38 as viewed from within the viewshed. The various elements do not exhibit unity
39 because the height and scale of the anthropogenic structures are not harmonious.
40 Additionally, the numerous vertical elements in the foreground and middleground
41 create visual disarray. Although Los Angeles Harbor and the Pacific Ocean, two key
42 visual resources, serve to improve and add interest to the view, they are compromised
43 by several intervening elements. For these reasons, viewer sensitivity within the
44 South Harbor Boulevard viewshed is also considered to be low to moderate.

1 **Inner Cabrillo Beach Viewshed**

2 Inner Cabrillo Beach is a historical and heavily used sheltered urban beach,
3 aquarium, and park complex located inside the breakwater, along the San Pedro
4 shore, in the western harbor and affords views similar to those from the Fishing Pier.
5 Recreationists and tourists would be considered sensitive viewers because of their
6 exposure to changes at this location.

7 Views of the proposed project site are illustrated in Photo 1 of Figure 3.1-5.
8 Foreground views include the sandy beach area, breakwater, and open waters of the
9 harbor. In addition, the Cabrillo Marina and Cabrillo Way Marina occupy a large
10 portion of the distant foreground where numerous sail boats are visible with their
11 masts disrupting views of the proposed project site. Middleground views include the
12 proposed project site as well as elements of the working Port. These elements
13 include numerous transit sheds, a multi-story building, liquid bulk storage tanks, and
14 large cranes as well as boats and ships. Utilitarian uses (e.g., tall security
15 poles/lighting) are also scattered throughout the middleground.

16 The overall visual character of the proposed project site and surrounding area is
17 defined by the mix of harbor views, commercial uses (marina), and industrial land
18 uses and development. Although there are several land use types within the view,
19 they exhibit a generally unified and congruent pattern when seen from the viewshed.
20 The open-water views of the harbor are a key visual feature that positively
21 contributes to visual quality by increasing vividness. For these reasons, viewer
22 sensitivity within the Inner Cabrillo Beach viewshed is considered to be moderate.

23 **Lookout Point Park Viewshed**

24 Lookout Point Park, located along Gaffey Street between 34th and 36th Streets, is an
25 identified scenic vista in the San Pedro Community Plan, and is situated at a higher
26 elevation relative to the proposed project site than the other viewsheds. The park
27 offers panoramic views of the proposed project site to recreationists, tourists, and
28 other visitors; and much of the San Pedro Waterfront is visible from this location.
29 Recreationists, tourists, and residents would be considered sensitive viewers because
30 of their exposure to changes at this location.

31 Views from the park include the tops of residential buildings that are upslope from
32 Carolina Street and yet downslope from the park, associated trees and shrubbery that
33 are below the horizon, and the existing background structures of the Port (e.g.,
34 cranes, water tanks, and warehouses). As shown in Photo 2 of Figure 3.1-5, visual
35 elements in the immediate foreground include a fence and vegetative buffer as well
36 as multi-family residential buildings. Middleground views are dominated by
37 recreational and industrial Port uses with partial views of the open water. The
38 landscape slopes down toward the proposed project site and consists primarily of
39 paved areas with associated support structures, such as administrative buildings and
40 storage facilities, working equipment, and vehicles. Along the horizon, views are
41 dominated by the presence of towering gantry cranes and other large vertical

1 elements arranged in a visually uniform and congruent pattern. Open water views of
2 the harbor and Pacific Ocean are also visible to the east.

3 The overall visual character of the proposed project site and surrounding area is
4 defined by the mix of residential development, harbor views, commercial uses
5 (marina), and industrial land uses and development. Although there are several land
6 use types within the view, they exhibit a generally unified and congruent pattern.
7 There are some interesting views of the working Port, and the waterfront provides an
8 aesthetically pleasing feature as well. The open-water views of the harbor and
9 Pacific Ocean are a key visual feature that positively contributes to visual quality by
10 increasing vividness. In addition, the mountainous features in the background of the
11 view contribute positively to the overall visual quality. For these reasons, viewer
12 sensitivity within the Lookout Point Park viewshed is considered to be moderate to
13 high.

14 **San Pedro Residential Community Viewshed**

15 The San Pedro residential community is located generally west of the proposed
16 project site, west of South Harbor Boulevard, and northwest of South Crescent
17 Avenue. The topography is varied with level areas adjacent to the Port that rise to the
18 rolling hillsides of the Palos Verdes Peninsula to the west, with dramatic sea cliffs
19 and shorelines at the Pacific Ocean. This residential community is dominated by
20 multi- and single-family residential units, with most of the housing being over 30
21 years old. Residents and commuters would be considered sensitive viewers because
22 of their exposure to changes at this location.

23 Visibility of the proposed project site and surrounding area from within the San
24 Pedro residential community viewshed is limited due to the flat terrain and the
25 presence of large commercial buildings and industrial facilities in the foreground.
26 From the inner residential areas, views of the site are blocked by intervening
27 structures and vegetation, including single- and multi-story residential structures and
28 large, mature trees in the foreground. However, views of the proposed project site
29 and surrounding area are available along the outskirts of the residential area adjacent
30 to South Crescent Avenue. In the immediate foreground, 22nd Street Park and large
31 warehouses are visible, with elements of the working Port, such as numerous transit
32 sheds, liquid bulk storage tanks, and cranes, comprising the remainder of the
33 foreground views. Middleground views also include elements associated with the
34 working Port, such as transit sheds, storage tanks, and cranes (see Photo 1 in Figure
35 3.1-6). The remainder of the middleground reveals the open waters of Los Angeles
36 Harbor and the Pacific Ocean. Although partially blocked by intervening structures
37 and mature vegetation and trees, background views also show the open waters of the
38 Pacific Ocean.

39 The overall visual character of this area is defined by the mix of industrial,
40 commercial, and residential land uses, which results in an incongruent pattern as
41 viewed from within the San Pedro residential community viewshed. Also, the key
42 visual features are the 22nd Street Park and the open-water of Los Angeles Harbor and
43 the Pacific Ocean, which serve to enhance the vividness of the view; however, views

1 of the harbor and ocean are compromised by industrial and marina development,
2 which detracts from the vividness of the open water views. Residential viewers
3 typically have the highest sensitivity to changes in the visual environment. For the
4 reasons mentioned above, viewer sensitivity within the San Pedro residential
5 community viewshed is considered to be moderate.

6 **San Pedro Plaza Park Viewshed**

7 San Pedro Plaza Park is a pocket park located on the bluff above South Harbor
8 Boulevard between 7th and 13th Streets. It is elevated approximately 20 feet above
9 South Harbor Boulevard and approximately 50 feet above water's edge. Multiple-
10 story apartment buildings, single-family residences, and churches are located along
11 the west side of Beacon Street, which parallels the park to the west. Views of the
12 proposed project site are readily available along the 40-foot-wide San Pedro Plaza
13 Park. Recreationists would be considered sensitive viewers because of their exposure
14 to changes at this location.

15 Views of the proposed project site from the San Pedro Park Plaza are occupied by
16 roads and landscaped parking areas, with Port structures (i.e., cranes, water tanks,
17 and warehouses) and the harbor in the background (see Photo 2 in Figure 3.1-6).
18 Although the park includes mature trees and shrubbery that partially constrain views
19 to the proposed project site, foreground views from within the park are comprised of
20 utilitarian uses such as South Harbor Boulevard, landscaped parking areas, and
21 security poles and lighting features. In addition, Port uses such as structures, berths,
22 and docked boats are visible from the viewshed and extend from the distant
23 foreground into the middleground. The proposed project site occupies a portion of
24 the middleground, with large storage tanks, numerous transit sheds, and paved
25 roadways visible. In addition, views of large cranes, the Main Channel, and Los
26 Angeles Harbor are available in the middleground. Scattered throughout the
27 foreground and middleground are numerous utilitarian uses, such as fences and
28 security lighting/poles, which contribute to the urbanized character of the area.
29 Although partially obstructed by intervening structures and vegetation, the Pacific
30 Ocean can be seen in the background.

31 The overall visual character of the viewshed is defined by the mix of transportation,
32 parking, and other utilitarian uses, as well as commercial and industrial development,
33 which results in a somewhat incongruent pattern of land uses. These land uses lack a
34 sense of unity and visual coherence due to the varying heights, architectural finishes,
35 and color schemes of their developed components. Also, the key visual features in
36 this viewshed are the open-water of Los Angeles Harbor and the Pacific Ocean,
37 which serve to enhance the vividness of the view; however, views of the open water
38 are compromised by industrial and commercial development and mature trees, which
39 detract from the vividness of the open water views. For reasons described above,
40 viewer sensitivity within the San Pedro Park Plaza viewshed is also considered to be
41 moderate to low.

3.1.2.3 Existing Light and Glare

The two major causes of light emissions are *glare* and *spill light*. Glare occurs when one sees a bright object against a darker background, such as when a person experiences oncoming headlights while driving at night. Spill light is caused by misdirected light that illuminates areas outside the area intended.

Nighttime lighting in the proposed project vicinity is produced from streetlights, vehicle headlights, and interior and exterior building lighting (residential, office, commercial), as well as significant amounts of light associated with the all-night Port operations at cargo and bulk terminals (see Photo 1 in Figure 3.1-7). High-intensity boom lights are located on top of shipping cranes along the edge of the many channels that feed into Los Angeles Harbor to the east of the proposed project site. The Vincent Thomas Bridge, northeast of the proposed project site, has streetlights and blue-colored lights along its outside.

Under nighttime conditions, the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long Beach to the east are part of the brightly illuminated landscape surrounding the proposed project site, which appears as a dimly lit area within this much larger landscape (see Photo 1 in Figure 3.1-7). The major sources of illumination on the proposed project site are security, street, and roadway lighting. Headlights from vehicles travelling along Signal Street and trucks delivering goods to the existing transit sheds are another source of transitory nighttime lighting.

Glare conditions on the proposed project site are low in relation to offsite conditions because of the highly developed nature of the surrounding area. Because the proposed project site does not contain structures with highly reflective architectural finishes, the overall daytime glare environment is considered low. Reflections in the water and array of lights in the opaque and softer sky at dusk are illustrated in Photo 2 of Figure 3.1-7.

3.1.3 Applicable Regulations and Policy Documents

Various plans and policy documents set forth regulations and guidelines for design quality, streetscape, and light and glare that relate to the development of the proposed project site. These include the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles, the Port of Los Angeles Plan, the San Pedro Community Plan, and local planning and zoning ordinances related to site lighting. Objectives, goals, and policies from these documents that are pertinent to the proposed Project are listed below. See Section 3.8, "Land Use and Planning," for a consistency analysis of the relevant policies.

3.1.3.1 San Pedro Waterfront and Promenade Design Guidelines

The San Pedro Waterfront and Promenade Design Guidelines address the general character and vision of the San Pedro Waterfront and provide the guiding vision for future development in each of the waterfront districts. The Guidelines serve as a general guide to public and private development and recommends land and water uses, street layouts, building height limits; building setback requirements, and other development regulations that give prominence to the waterfront, activate the area, and provide continuous waterfront access. The Guidelines also provide general building design standards that apply throughout the San Pedro Waterfront area.

3.1.3.2 The General Plan of the City of Los Angeles

The General Plan is a legal mandate that governs both private and public actions within the City of Los Angeles. It contains 10 citywide elements plus the Land Use Element, which includes plans for each of the City's 35 Community Planning Areas (CPAs). It also includes counterpart plans for the Port and the Los Angeles International Airport.

3.1.3.2.1 Port of Los Angeles Plan (Land Use Element)

The Port Plan, which is part of the General Plan Land Use Element, was adopted in 1982, and was designed to provide a 20-year official guide to the continued development and operation of the Port (City of Los Angeles 1982). Separate from the PMP, the Port Plan addresses aesthetics and visual quality issues within the Port and for areas outside in nearby communities.

3.1.3.2.2 San Pedro Community Plan

The San Pedro Community Plan (CP) is intended to promote an arrangement of land uses, streets, and services that will encourage and contribute to the economic, social, and physical health, safety, welfare, and convenience of the people who live and work in the community. The plan is also intended to guide development in order to create a healthful and pleasant environment. Goals, objectives, policies, and programs are created to meet the existing and future needs and desires of the community through the year 2010. The last comprehensive review of the San Pedro CP was completed on September 30, 1980, and revised by the General Plan Zoning Consistency Program in 1987 and through ongoing periodic plan review and plan amendments. The San Pedro CP addresses aesthetics and visual quality issues for areas outside the community plan boundaries (such as the Port) in four sections, as described below. (City of Los Angeles 1999.)

3.1.3.3 Port of Los Angeles Leasing Policy

On February 1, 2006, the Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners approved a comprehensive leasing policy for the Port that not only establishes a formalized, transparent process for tenant selection but also includes environmental requirements as a provision in Port leases. In January 2008, the Commissioners approved amendments to Section 3.3 and Directive No. 2 of the leasing policy. The leasing policy specifies that all tenants are required to adhere to the applicable Port environmental regulations as terms and conditions of their leases. With respect to aesthetics, these regulations include those related to lighting and facility appearance. All other applicable policies are those outlined in this section and those that would otherwise be required in the terms of the lease based on LAHD's sustainability goals.

3.1.4 Impact Analysis

3.1.4.1 Methodology

Aesthetic experiences can be highly subjective and vary from person to person; therefore, the evaluation of aesthetic resources requires the application of a process that objectively identifies the visual features of the area, their importance, and the sensitivity of receptors that view them. The proposed project-related changes to the aesthetic character of the site and surrounding area are identified and qualitatively evaluated based on the modification of physical conditions and viewer sensitivity. For a list of terminology used within the impact analysis, refer to Section 3.1.1.1, above.

An inspection of the proposed project site and the potentially affected environs, and a review of public scoping comments, served to identify indicators of public sensitivity. An analysis of the surrounding area was also conducted to identify areas where the proposed Project would be most visible and to assess the quality of views of the proposed project site. The range and quality of views to and from the proposed Project were determined by reviewing topographic and street maps, as well as photos of areas within or adjoining the proposed project site. The range of sensitive views was then considered, and representative views in which the proposed facilities would be most noticeable were selected for detailed analysis. This decision was based primarily on proximity and degree of proposed project exposure. Consideration was also given to how viewers within each setting would experience the proposed Project due to varying degrees of visibility and distance from the proposed Project; as well as the structures, vegetation, topographic features, or other intervening obstacles that were present. Because objects within the foreground have more detail, views from such locations would be more detailed compared to the objects that are less distinguishable in the distance. Hence, the potential sensitivity of close-in viewers was considered higher than those who have more distant views of the proposed project area.

3.1.4.1.1 Analytical Framework

The analytical framework to determine proposed project-related impacts on aesthetic resources in the vicinity of the proposed Project includes the following:

- identification of key visual elements in the proposed project area and characterization of overall visual quality,
- identification of user groups with sensitive views into the proposed project area and photographic documentation of representative views,
- qualitative analysis through the application of anticipated changes to views as a result of implementation of the proposed Project,
- evaluation of the significance of the impacts based upon the requirements of CEQA, and
- formulation of mitigation measures that would lessen the degree of significance, as needed.

3.1.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles 2006) was developed as a supplement to the CEQA checklist. The guide divides visual resources into four elements in the visual environment: aesthetics (character and quality of the visual landscape), obstruction of views (visual access to focal points and panoramas), shading (the effect of shadows on adjacent land uses), and nighttime illumination (the effect of nighttime lighting on adjacent land uses). The guide suggests that each CEQA threshold be evaluated within the context of a visual element and that some thresholds address multiple elements. The guide provides 14 factors to help assess when an impact would trigger a threshold and be considered a potentially significant, adverse impact. The factors encourage a more detailed analysis of project components and their effects on visual resources than suggested by the CEQA threshold criteria alone. They are organized by visual element and are listed below.

Aesthetics

1. Would the removal, alteration, or demolition of existing features or elements that substantially contribute to the valued visual character or image of the project area be relatively noticeable?
2. Would the amount of natural open space to be graded or developed adversely affect the visual character of the area?
3. Would proposed structures in natural open space areas be effectively integrated into the aesthetics of the site through appropriate design?
4. Would there be a high degree of contrast between proposed features and existing features that represent the valued aesthetic image of an area? Contrast could be

1 represented as a beneficial or adverse image and would need to result in an
2 adverse change to the image of the area to be considered a significant impact.

- 3 5. Would buildings detract from the existing style or image of the area due to
4 density, height, bulk, setbacks, signage, or other physical elements?
5 6. Would project elements contribute negatively to the aesthetic value of an area by
6 changing visual character through the introduction of obtrusive or inharmonious
7 elements?
8 7. Would the project be inconsistent with applicable guidelines and regulations
9 related to aesthetics and views?

10 **Obstruction of Views**

- 11 8. Would there be a substantial negative effect on the nature and quality of
12 recognized or valued views such as natural topography, settings, man-made or
13 natural features of visual interest, and resources such as mountains or the ocean?
14 9. Would there be a substantial negative effect on views from a designated scenic
15 highway, corridor, or parkway?
16 10. Would there be substantial obstruction (total blockage, substantial interruption,
17 or substantial diminishment) of recognized or valued views?
18 11. Would recognized views available from a length of public roadway, bike path, or
19 trail (as opposed to a single, fixed vantage point) be adversely affected?

20 **Shading**

- 21 12. Would there be substantial shading of shadow-sensitive uses for more than three
22 hours between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time
23 (between late October and early April), or for more than four hours between the
24 hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time (between early April and
25 late October)?

26 **Nighttime Illumination**

- 27 13. Would there be a substantial adverse change in ambient illumination levels as a
28 result of project sources?
29 14. Would light spill off the project site and adversely affect adjacent light-sensitive
30 areas?

31 Based upon proposed project elements and the visual landscape of the Port, the
32 following thresholds are used for determining significance of the proposed Project's
33 impacts on visual resources. These impacts encompass the CEQA Appendix G
34 thresholds as well as the visual elements included in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds*
35 *Guide*.

36 **AES-1:** A project would have a significant impact if it would result in an adverse
37 effect on a scenic vista from a designated scenic resource due to obstruction of views.

1 **AES-2:** A project would have a significant impact if it would substantially damage
2 scenic resources (including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic
3 buildings) within a state scenic highway.

4 **AES-3:** A project would have a significant impact if it would substantially degrade
5 the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.

6 **AES-4:** A project would have a significant impact if it would result in an adverse
7 effect due to shading on the existing visual character or quality of the site or its
8 surroundings.

9 **AES-5:** A project would have a significant impact if it would create a new source of
10 substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the
11 area.

12 **3.1.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation**

13 **3.1.4.3.1 Construction Impacts**

14 **Impact AES-1a: Construction of the proposed Project would** 15 **not result in an adverse effect on a scenic vista from a** 16 **designated scenic resource due to obstruction of views.**

17 Impact AES-1a evaluates the degree to which proposed project-related features
18 would interfere with a scenic vista due to obstruction of views. The proposed Project
19 would temporarily include construction activities that could be visible in public views
20 from designated scenic roadways (South Harbor Boulevard) (factors 9 and 11) or
21 within recognized valued views (Lookout Point Park) (factors 8 and 10). The effects
22 of proposed project construction on a scenic vista due to obstruction of views are
23 analyzed below.

24 Note that impacts related to adverse changes in visual quality within a view are
25 addressed under Impact AES-3a.

26 **South Harbor Boulevard Viewshed**

27 Construction of the proposed Project, including demolition of the existing SCMI
28 facilities at Berth 260, would require the use of heavy construction equipment, such
29 as bulldozers, water trucks, excavators, graders, haul trucks, pavers, rollers, concrete
30 trucks, trenchers, forklifts, and cranes. The various onsite construction equipment
31 components and activities would be visible from the southern end of South Harbor
32 Boulevard because of their size and configuration in the viewshed. Use of this
33 construction equipment would likely add tall, vertical features into the view that may
34 punctuate the horizon and somewhat obscure views of the Port, harbor, and Pacific
35 Ocean. However, the construction equipment would be similar in appearance and
36 smaller than existing Port cranes in the background of the view. In addition, onsite

1 construction would only occupy a small portion of the overall viewshed available
2 from South Harbor Boulevard and would be located within the viewshed for a
3 temporary period during construction. Therefore, impacts would be less than
4 significant.

5 **Lookout Point Park**

6 Heavy equipment required for demolition of the SCMI facilities and construction of
7 the proposed Project would be visible from Lookout Point Park, which is located
8 approximately 1.3 miles southwest of the proposed project site and 1.7 miles from
9 Berth 260; Lookout Point Park is also situated 250 feet above the proposed project
10 site and Berth 260. As stated above, the construction equipment and activities would
11 likely add tall vertical features into the view that may punctuate the horizon and
12 somewhat obscure views of the Port, harbor, and Pacific Ocean. However,
13 construction activities would be similar in appearance and likely smaller than existing
14 Port cranes and other Port-related features located in the background of the view. In
15 addition, the proposed project construction area would only occupy a small portion of
16 the overall viewshed and would be located within the viewshed for a temporary
17 period during construction. As such, construction of the proposed Project would not
18 adversely affect existing scenic vistas or obstruct views available from Lookout Point
19 Park. Impacts would be less than significant.

20 **Impact Determination**

21 Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed Project would
22 not adversely obstruct views from South Harbor Boulevard and Lookout Point Park;
23 therefore, the proposed Project's impacts on scenic vistas would be less than
24 significant.

25 **Mitigation Measures**

26 No mitigation is required.

27 **Residual Impacts**

28 Impacts would be less than significant.

29 **Impact AES-2a: Construction of the proposed Project would** 30 **not substantially damage scenic resources (including, but** 31 **not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic** 32 **buildings) within a state scenic highway.**

33 Impact AES-2a evaluates the degree to which proposed project-related features
34 would damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway (factor 9). The closest
35 officially designated state scenic highway to the proposed project site is a segment of
36 SR 2, which is located approximately 33 miles to the north. As such, there are no
37 designated state scenic highways located within viewing distance of the proposed

1 project site; however, portions of Harbor Boulevard have been designated a local
2 scenic highway by the City. Views from this roadway that could be affected by
3 construction activities at the proposed project are identified in the Harbor Boulevard
4 Viewshed and addressed under Impact AES-1a and 1b.

5 **Impact Determination**

6 There are no designated state scenic highways within the proposed project area. No
7 impact would occur during construction of the proposed Project.

8 **Mitigation Measures**

9 No mitigation is required.

10 **Residual Impacts**

11 No impact would occur.

12 **Impact AES-3a: Construction of the proposed Project would** 13 **not substantially degrade the existing visual character or** 14 **quality of the site or its surroundings.**

15 Impact AES-3a evaluates the degree to which proposed project-related features
16 would degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area (factors 1-7). Site
17 preparation and grading activities required for demolition of the existing SCMI
18 facilities at Berth 260 and construction of the proposed Project would be visually
19 apparent because of the removal of pavement as well as the creation of graded areas.
20 Additionally, demolition and construction would require the use of heavy
21 construction equipment, such as bulldozers, water trucks, excavators, graders, haul
22 trucks, pavers, rollers, concrete trucks, trenchers, forklifts, and cranes. It is
23 anticipated that construction of the proposed Project would be completed in two
24 phases over an approximately 12-year time frame ending in 2024.

25 Because of their size and configuration in the viewsheds, the various construction
26 equipment components and activities would be visible from several viewing locations
27 throughout the viewsheds discussed above under Section 3.1.2.2.2, including 22nd
28 Street, 22nd Street Park, Bloch Field, Cabrillo Marina, Federal Breakwater, Inner
29 Cabrillo Beach, San Pedro Residential Community, and San Pedro Plaza Park.
30 Temporary fencing would be installed around the proposed project site during
31 construction, which would partially shield views of construction activities and
32 equipment. Construction activities generally include both a disturbance of existing
33 natural and human-made features and the development of structures, which
34 temporarily lack architectural treatments designed to improve visual character and
35 quality. These could cause noticeable changes in visual character if they occur close
36 to vantage points and are uncharacteristic of the existing refined setting.
37 Construction of the new buildings and structures would also include the use of
38 temporary towers and cranes, which could interfere with existing views.

1 Construction activities from the proposed Project would be visible from those
2 locations that currently have views of the proposed project site, as identified above,
3 and would temporarily disrupt the existing visual character and quality of the
4 proposed project site. However, such activities are not inconsistent with Port
5 operations in that area. Also, construction equipment and activities would be largely
6 contained on the proposed project site and would not affect surrounding views.
7 Finally, individual construction activities, though long-term as a whole, would be
8 temporary and intermittent. Overall, construction activities would add an industrial
9 element to an area already characterized as industrial and commercial. Construction
10 activities are likely to reduce the cohesiveness of the site and surrounding area,
11 thereby reducing the overall visual quality; however, surrounding land uses include
12 industrial uses, and construction is common in this area. The areas surrounding the
13 proposed project site include commercial and industrial uses that exhibit a highly
14 urbanized and functional character, including the permanent presence of cranes and
15 other bulk loading and unloading associated with container ships. As such,
16 construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed Project would
17 not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its
18 surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

19 **Impact Determination**

20 Because construction activities would be temporary and intermittent and would not
21 be inconsistent with the existing visual character or quality of the site or its
22 surroundings, impacts on the visual quality and character of the proposed project area
23 during proposed project construction would be less than significant.

24 **Mitigation Measures**

25 No mitigation is required.

26 **Residual Impacts**

27 Impacts would be less than significant.

28 **Impact AES-4a: Construction of the proposed Project would** 29 **not result in an adverse effect due to shading on the existing** 30 **visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.**

31 Impact AES-4a evaluates the degree to which proposed project-related features
32 would result in adverse effects from shading (factor 12). Construction of the
33 proposed Project, including demolition of the existing SCMI facilities at Berth 260,
34 would require the use of heavy equipment such as bulldozers, water trucks,
35 excavators, graders, haul trucks, pavers, rollers, concrete trucks, trenchers, forklifts,
36 and cranes. Use of this heavy equipment would not result in the generation of
37 variable shading in the area immediately surrounding the proposed project site.
38 Furthermore, because shadow-sensitive viewers (residents of the San Pedro
39 community and users of 22nd Street Park, Bloch Field, and Cabrillo Way Marina)

1 would be located a minimum of 0.3 mile from the proposed project site, they would
2 be unaffected by any minor shading produced during proposed project construction.
3 As such, construction of the proposed Project would not result in significant shading
4 that would affect the existing visual character or quality of the site or its
5 surroundings.

6 **Impact Determination**

7 The shading effects from construction would be limited to transient shading from
8 equipment and the structure erection process. Therefore, the proposed project
9 construction would not result in substantial shading of shadow-sensitive uses.
10 Impacts would be less than significant.

11 **Mitigation Measures**

12 No mitigation is required.

13 **Residual Impacts**

14 Impacts would be less than significant.

15 **Impact AES-5a: Construction of the proposed Project would** 16 **not create a new source of substantial light or glare that** 17 **would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area.**

18 Impact AES-5a evaluates the degree to which construction of the proposed project
19 would introduce substantial adverse change in nighttime lighting and/or generate spill
20 light adversely affecting adjacent light-sensitive areas (factors 13 and 14). As
21 explained under Section 3.1.2.3 above, the existing nighttime lighting environment of
22 the proposed project vicinity is dominated by the lighting of the Port, which results in
23 a high degree of ambient lighting.

24 Construction of the proposed Project would not occur during nighttime hours.
25 Therefore, there would be no sources of construction-related light or glare.

26 **Impact Determination**

27 Construction would not result in any significant light or glare because construction of
28 the proposed Project would only occur during daytime hours. Therefore, no impact
29 would occur.

30 **Mitigation Measures**

31 No mitigation is required.

1 **Residual Impacts**

2 No impact would occur.

3 **3.1.4.3.2 Operational Impacts**

4 **Impact AES-1b: Operation of the proposed Project would**
5 **not result in an adverse effect on a scenic vista from a**
6 **designated scenic resource due to obstruction of views.**

7 Impact AES-1b evaluates the degree to which proposed project-related features
8 would interfere with a scenic vista due to obstruction of views (factors 8 through 11).
9 Additionally, impacts related to the introduction of the new buildings are discussed as
10 they relate to compatibility with existing features of the site (factors 5 and 6). The
11 proposed Project would rehabilitate the existing transit sheds on Berths 57–60. New
12 construction would be limited to a new 2-story, 11,500-square-foot building at Berth
13 56, a new 1-story, 3,600-square-foot addition to Berth 57 transit shed, and two new
14 structures at Berths 70–71: a 2-story, 50,000-square-foot government office building
15 and a 5-story, 100,000-square-foot building designed to house an 80,000-square-foot
16 wave tank. The new structures would be similar in height, scale, and profile to
17 existing structures. No new multistory structures would be developed that would
18 exceed the height of the largest building on the proposed project site: Municipal
19 Warehouse No. 1. (See Section 3.4, “Cultural Resources,” for an analysis of the 5-
20 story wave tank in terms of the potential effects on the eligible historic district status
21 and the adjacent historic 6-story Municipal Warehouse No. 1.) As such, although the
22 proposed Project would increase the number of onsite buildings, the vertical profile
23 of existing and new buildings would be similar to that which currently exists.
24 Moreover, the existing block wall surrounding the former Westway Terminal site
25 would be removed, and, as part of a separate process, the demolition and site
26 remediation efforts at Berths 70–71 would be completed, further improving the visual
27 conditions from the current baseline conditions. The 5-story wave tank would
28 replace dozens of the multi-story liquid bulk storage tanks currently in existence at
29 Berths 70–71.

30 Other proposed project features and site modifications would be low-scale and would
31 not result in additional vertical features that would have the potential to obstruct
32 existing views.

33 **Harbor Boulevard Viewshed**

34 Overall, as described under Section 3.1.2.2.2 above, scenic views of the working
35 Port, harbor, and Pacific Ocean from the southern end of Harbor Boulevard are
36 already partially obscured by existing structures and mature trees. The proposed
37 Project would add a few new buildings as described above, and, with the exception of
38 the 5-story wave tank building, the new buildings would not exceed 2 stories, which
39 would be no taller than the many structures (including the liquid bulk storage tanks)
40 already at the proposed project site. In addition, the 5-story wave tank building

1 would be smaller than the existing Municipal Warehouse No. 1 building and would
2 also replace a large number of multi-story liquid bulk storage tanks currently at
3 Berths 70–71, though these storage tanks are not visible from Harbor Boulevard.
4 However, with the proposed wave tank constructed, only a small portion of the open
5 sky just above the existing transit shed at Berth 57 would be obstructed. Given the
6 distance and the small amount of open sky obstructed, this change would not be
7 substantial.

8 The docking of marine vessels at the proposed floating docks or at Berths 57–60 and
9 70–71 are consistent with the working Port and would enrich the views of the
10 waterfront by adding marine activities; however, these activities would not be
11 viewable from the Harbor Boulevard Viewshed, as demonstrated in Figure 3.1-4.
12 Because the vessels that would dock at the proposed project site would not be located
13 in the immediate foreground of the view available from Harbor Boulevard, and
14 because the vessels would only occupy a small portion of the overall viewshed,
15 existing views of the harbor and the Pacific Ocean would be maintained even while
16 vessels are docked at Berths 57–60 and Berths 70 and 71. As such, a substantial
17 view obstruction would not occur.

18 Therefore, proposed project impacts related to obstructing views from the City-
19 designated view corridor of Harbor Boulevard would be less than significant.

20 **Lookout Point Park Viewshed**

21 The elevation of the park at approximately 250 feet above the proposed project site
22 positions the proposed Project in the middleground of the view.

23 Overall, as described under Section 3.1.2.2.2 above, scenic views of the working
24 Port, harbor, and Pacific Ocean from the Lookout Point Park include the presence of
25 towering gantry cranes and other large vertical elements arranged in a visually
26 uniform and congruent pattern. Open water views of the harbor and Pacific Ocean
27 are also visible to the east. Middleground views are dominated by recreational and
28 industrial Port uses with partial views of the open water. The landscape slopes down
29 toward the proposed project site and consists primarily of paved areas with associated
30 support structures, such as administrative buildings and storage facilities, working
31 equipment, and vehicles.

32 Given the distance of the Lookout Point viewshed from the proposed project site, as
33 shown in Figure 3.1-5, even the addition of a 5-story 100,000-square-foot building
34 would not represent a substantial change in the existing viewshed condition.
35 Therefore, the proposed Project would not develop structures or include features that
36 would substantially obscure scenic views of the Port, harbor, or Pacific Ocean as
37 viewed from the Lookout Point Park Viewshed.

38 The docking of vessels at the site would be temporary and variable, and would be a
39 minimum of 1.4 miles away from Lookout Point Park. Because these vessels would
40 not be located in the immediate foreground of the view available from Lookout Point
41 Park, and because the vessels would only occupy a small portion of the overall

1 viewed, existing views of the harbor and the Pacific Ocean would be maintained
2 even while vessels are docked at Berths 57-60, the floating docks at Berth 57, and
3 Berths 70 and 71. As such, views across the harbor and of the working Port and
4 Pacific Ocean would be maintained while vessels were docked, and substantial view
5 obstruction would not occur.

6 No other proposed project features would have the potential to obstruct scenic views
7 available from Lookout Point Park. Therefore, because the proposed project features
8 would all be located in the middleground of the view, and because Lookout Point
9 Park is located at a higher elevation in relation to the proposed Project, adverse
10 effects on scenic vistas available from Lookout Point Park due to obstruction of
11 views would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

12 **Impact Determination**

13 Operation of the proposed Project, including the construction of the 5-story wave
14 tank, would have a less-than-significant impact on scenic vistas from Harbor
15 Boulevard and Lookout Point Park in terms of obstructing of views. Furthermore,
16 the views of and from the proposed project site would be improved and new viewing
17 opportunities of the harbor and open waters would be created through completion of
18 the waterfront promenade and public plaza. For these reasons, no significant adverse
19 visual impacts would result from the proposed Project.

20 **Mitigation Measures**

21 No mitigation is required.

22 **Residual Impacts**

23 Impacts would be less than significant.

24 **Impact AES-2b: Operation of the proposed Project would** 25 **not substantially damage scenic resources (including, but** 26 **not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic** 27 **buildings) within a state scenic highway.**

28 Impact AES-2b evaluates the degree to which proposed project-related features
29 would damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway (factor 9). The closest
30 officially designated state scenic highway to the proposed project site is a segment of
31 SR-2, which is located approximately 33 miles to the north. As such, there are no
32 designated state scenic highways located within viewing distance of the proposed
33 project site; however, portions of Harbor Boulevard have been designated a local
34 scenic highway by the City. Views from this roadway that could be affected by
35 proposed project elements are identified in the Harbor Boulevard Viewshed and
36 addressed under Impact AES-1a and 1b.

1 **Impact Determination**

2 There are no designated state scenic highways within the proposed project area. No
3 impact would occur.

4 **Mitigation Measures**

5 No mitigation is required.

6 **Residual Impacts**

7 No impact would occur.

8 **Impact AES-3b: Operation of the proposed Project would**
9 **not substantially degrade the existing visual character or**
10 **quality of the site or its surroundings.**

11 Impact AES-3b evaluates the degree to which proposed project-related features
12 would degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area (factors 1 through
13 7). The proposed Project would adaptively reuse existing transit sheds and structures
14 located on Berths 57–60 by constructing self-contained structures within the existing
15 warehouse envelopes. Although the existing transit sheds and warehouses are vacant
16 or underutilized and require rehabilitation to accommodate new uses, they are all
17 considered to be eligible for historic designation; thus, the structures exhibit visually
18 interesting and unique characteristics that contribute to the valued image and historic
19 designation of City Dock No. 1. As detailed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,”
20 several aesthetic improvements to the existing building façades would be
21 implemented as part of the proposed Project; and renovation of the transit sheds
22 would be completed in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards for
23 buildings eligible or listed on the CRHR, NRHP, and/or City of Los Angeles
24 Landmark. These improvements would aesthetically enhance the visual quality of
25 the site, thereby increasing the overall vividness of the views available from
26 surrounding viewpoints.

27 As also detailed in Chapter 2, the new structures would be similar in height, scale,
28 and profile to existing structures. From an aesthetic perspective, no buildings are
29 proposed that would be out of character with the existing onsite structures in terms of
30 size or scale as even the 5-story, 100,000-square-foot wave tank building would be
31 one story shorter than the existing Municipal Warehouse No. 1 building. In addition
32 to the wave tank, between Berths 57 and 58 and at the end of Berth 60, the proposed
33 Project may include two approximately 225-square-foot fenced outside areas with
34 structures to support the marine research operations, such as filters, pipe works,
35 protein skimmers, and ozone towers reaching up to 12 feet high. Such areas would
36 be consistent with the current surrounding aesthetic with industrial warehouses and
37 liquid bulk storage tanks, but would also be consistent with the proposed research
38 activities that would occur at the proposed project site. Therefore, there would not be

1 a high degree of contrast between the proposed and existing features, and new
2 construction would exhibit an overall unified character with existing structures.

3 The proposed Project would also demolish the existing 1.32-acre SCMI facility on
4 Terminal Island at Berth 260. As a non-descript office building with adjacent storage
5 facilities built in the 1970s, this facility is not an element considered to have aesthetic
6 value and does not contribute to the valued visual character of the proposed project
7 site and surrounding area.

8 As mentioned above, the proposed Project would also allow for the docking of small
9 vessels in the East Channel and the docking of up to three vessels reaching up to 250
10 feet in length in the East and Main Channels. The addition of docked boats in the
11 viewshed would not represent a substantial change in the visual character or quality
12 of the proposed project site or its surroundings because the docking of large and
13 small vessels is a common occurrence in the immediate surrounding area. Cabrillo
14 Way Marina, located adjacent to the proposed project site on the west, accommodates
15 885 permanent boat slips, ranging in length from 25 to 75 feet. Finally, large cargo
16 and shipping vessels are occasionally accommodated by the Omni Terminal adjacent
17 to the proposed project site on the southwest as well as at the larger Port facilities to
18 the northeast; these vessels are much larger than those that would be docked at the
19 proposed project site. As such, the introduction of additional small boats and large
20 vessels into the East and Main Channels would not represent a significant change in
21 the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

22 The following discussion provides an analysis from each of the identified viewsheds
23 from Section 3.1.2.2.2 above.

24 **22nd Street Viewshed**

25 The proposed 5-story wave tank would be approximately 500 feet distant from the
26 camera location of Figure 3.1-2; therefore, its bulk and mass would be deeper into the
27 foreground but would most likely still block views of Warehouse #1. The proposed
28 Project would remove the tank farm thereby effectively opening the Signal Street
29 view corridor and removing the visual disarray created by the random tank patterns
30 and sizes. Also, the adaptive reuse and renovation of Berth 57 would improve the
31 aesthetic appeal of the structure while maintaining the historical fabric of the working
32 Port.

33 Implementation of the proposed Project would improve the aesthetic quality and
34 create a more cohesive land use pattern for the 22nd Street Viewshed. This area will
35 be the gateway to the proposed project site, and the Port would continue the
36 architectural and landscape treatments used throughout the completed portions of the
37 promenade, adding to the cohesiveness and vividness of the viewshed. The visual
38 impacts on the 22nd Street Viewshed would be less than significant.

1 22nd Street Park Viewshed

2 The proposed Project would involve minor modifications to the 22nd Street Park
3 Viewshed. From this vantage point and view direction a portion of the wave tank
4 would be visible in the eastern (left) portion of the view frame. However, Municipal
5 Warehouse No.1 would be taller, more prominent, and have a larger footprint.
6 Moreover, the wave tank would generally only block a portion of the view to the
7 gantry cranes in the background. Also, as stated earlier, the focal point from this
8 vantage is further to the north (right) of the valuable open water views. This vantage
9 point is also on a bike trail and near a popular walking trail. Recreationists engaged
10 in fitness activities would generally be less aware of views than passive
11 recreationists.

12 Overall, the changes to the 22nd Street Viewshed as a result of the proposed Project's
13 implementation would not be substantial. The wave tank would have a smaller
14 footprint and a shorter vertical presence than Warehouse No.1 and therefore would
15 not appear incompatible with the proposed project area, if properly designed.
16 Furthermore, it would not obscure any sensitive visual resources from the 22nd Street
17 Park Viewshed. Therefore, the proposed project impacts on the 22nd Street Park
18 Viewshed are considered to be less than significant.

19 Bloch Field Viewshed

20 The only proposed changes in the view would be the removal of the liquid bulk
21 storage tanks at the Westways Terminal and installation of the new proposed wave
22 tank. The removal of the bulk liquid storage tanks could be considered a positive
23 visual affect. The upper portion of the wave tank would be visible above the transit
24 sheds on the west side of the proposed project area. From this vantage point the
25 wave tank would not act as a visual obstruction because blue water views currently
26 are not available. The wave tank proposed would be of a slightly smaller mass than
27 the existing Warehouse No. 1 and, consequently, while noticeable, would not be out
28 of scale with its surroundings.

29 The Bloch Field Viewshed is a panoramic experience. Its focal point is the maritime
30 activities at the SP slip and the ship traffic of the Main Channel. The view
31 represented in Photo 1 of Figure 3.1-3 covers only a small portion of the viewshed.
32 The proposed project features would not interrupt these viewing opportunities or
33 create structures that are disharmonious with the landscape of the working Port. The
34 removal of the structures in the Westways Terminal is an improvement to the existing
35 conditions. For these reasons, the proposed project impact on the Bloch Field
36 Viewshed is considered to be less than significant.

37 Cabrillo Marina Viewshed

38 The only visible proposed project element in this view would be the proposed wave
39 tank, which would be north (left) of the 6-story Warehouse No.1. The wave tank
40 would be smaller than Warehouse No.1 and would therefore be consistent in terms of

1 height, bulk, and scale with the surrounding area. No other proposed project
2 elements would be visible from this vantage point and view direction.

3 The visual receptors at the Cabrillo Marina are recreationists and, in some cases, live-
4 aboard residents, both of which can be construed as sensitive visual receptors.
5 However, the working Port predates the marina so it has become a visual variation in
6 the waterfront landscape fabric. Focal points for the Cabrillo Marina are towards the
7 harbor, Cabrillo Beach, and Angel's Gate. The wave tank would not obscure those
8 valuable views as it would only obscure the gantry cranes from this perspective.
9 Because the wave tank's bulk and scale would not be larger than the nearby
10 Warehouse No.1 or detract from the area's scenic quality, the visual impacts of the
11 proposed Project on the Cabrillo Marina Viewshed are considered less than
12 significant.

13 **Federal Breakwater Viewshed**

14 The Federal Breakwater Viewshed is located southwest of the proposed project site
15 near the Cabrillo Beach Fishing Pier at the eastern end of Inner Cabrillo Beach. The
16 nearest proposed project component is over 1 mile from this vantage point. The only
17 visible proposed project element would be the wave tank, which, from this
18 perspective, may be partially obscured by the mass of Warehouse No. 1.
19 Recreationists at this location may be engaged in either passive or active recreational
20 pursuits.

21 Because the Federal Breakwater Viewshed is over 1 mile distant from the proposed
22 project site, even a large structure like Warehouse No. 1 tends to recede into the
23 background, taking up only a small portion of this compelling panoramic view. The
24 built environment of the working port lies between the viewer and the proposed
25 project site creating a visual distraction. The proposed Project also would not
26 adversely disrupt views of the distant mountains or the Vincent Thomas Bridge;
27 therefore, proposed project impacts on the Federal Breakwater Viewshed are
28 considered less than significant.

29 **South Harbor Boulevard Viewshed**

30 The proposed wave tank would be the only proposed project element visible from
31 this viewshed. The wave tank would be positioned north (left) of Warehouse No. 1
32 near the left edge of the presented view frame (Figure 3.1-4).

33 The Harbor Boulevard Viewshed is panoramic. The Westways Terminal storage
34 tanks are clearly visible outside and to the left of the view frame. These tanks would
35 be removed as part of the proposed Project. The wave tank would be partially
36 obscured by the warehouses on Berth 57, and would be smaller and shorter than
37 Warehouse No. 1 and would not appear to be out-of-scale or disharmonious.
38 Valuable open water views to the west (right) would not be obscured nor would any
39 scenic resources. For these reasons, the impacts on the Harbor Boulevard Viewshed
40 are considered less than significant.

1 Inner Cabrillo Beach Viewshed

2 The only proposed project element visible from this observation point would be the
3 wave tank, which would be north (left) of Warehouse No. 1. The wave tank would
4 be more compact and lower than Warehouse No. 1. The majority of viewers at
5 Cabrillo Beach would be involved in passive recreational activities and would be
6 considered sensitive receptors.

7 The incremental addition to the built environment that the wave tank would
8 contribute would represent only a small portion of this panoramic viewshed, and
9 Warehouse No. 1 may even obscure a portion of the wave tank from this vantage
10 point. Moreover, the intervening built environment blocks the lower portions of the
11 proposed project site. The wave tank would not block or detract from the view of the
12 distant mountains. Given its distance and the extent of the panoramic views from this
13 locale the proposed project impacts on the Inner Cabrillo Beach Viewshed is
14 considered less than significant

15 Lookout Point Park Viewshed

16 The proposed Project would introduce the proposed wave tank into the middleground
17 of the view and would also remove the tank farm to the north (left) of Warehouse No.
18 1, which even at 6-stories appears small in this vast and complex landscape. The
19 wave tank would be smaller than Warehouse No. 1 and would not be inconsistent
20 with the surrounding landscape. Given the distance to the proposed project area and
21 the vastness and complexity of the Lookout Point Park Viewshed, proposed project
22 impacts would be less than significant.

23 San Pedro Residential Community Viewshed

24 The view direction presented in Figure 3.1-6 is not the focal point of the San Pedro
25 Community Viewshed. The focal point may be construed as west (right) where
26 views of the West Channel, Los Angeles Harbor, and Angel's Gate are readily
27 available to residential receptors and pedestrians. The only proposed project element
28 that would be visible is the wave tank building, which would have a smaller footprint
29 and vertical presence than the existing Warehouse No. 1. The wave tank would be
30 located north (left) of this 6-story historic warehouse. The wave tank would add a
31 new element to this portion of this panoramic viewshed; however, its presence would
32 be consistent with the landscape of the working Port. It would not cause view
33 obstruction of valuable blue water views or other scenic resources. The removal of
34 the aging tank farm would be a positive influence on the viewshed as well. For these
35 reasons, the proposed Project's impacts on the San Pedro Residential Community
36 Viewshed are considered to be a less than significant.

37 San Pedro Park Plaza Viewshed

38 The focal point of the San Pedro Park Plaza Viewshed is to the east towards maritime
39 activities at the SP Slip and the Main Channel. The linear trees along the east edge of
40 the park do not provide many clear viewing opportunities toward the proposed

1 project site. The wave tank would be north (left) of Warehouse No. 1. Its vertical
2 presence could obscure a portion of the blue water views; however, the wave tank
3 would have a reduced bulk and scale when compared with Warehouse No. 1 and
4 consequently would fit with the surrounding landscape.

5 Moreover, the removal of the tank farm would have two visual benefits: it would
6 remove an adverse visual element and would open up additional blue water views
7 that would provide more open views of the water than the wave tank would obscure.
8 For these reasons, the proposed Project's impact on the San Pedro Park Plaza
9 Viewshed is considered less than significant.

10 **Impact Determination**

11 Overall, the proposed Project would serve to improve the visual quality of the
12 proposed project site and surrounding area by redeveloping an existing industrial and
13 commercial area that is currently underutilized. In several cases, the proposed
14 renovations would improve the vividness of views available from the 22nd Street, 22nd
15 Street Park, Bloch Field, Cabrillo Marina, Federal Breakwater, Inner Cabrillo Beach,
16 San Pedro residential community, and San Pedro Plaza Park viewsheds, thereby
17 improving the overall visual quality of the proposed project site. The proposed
18 project components would be consistent with the existing commercial and industrial
19 developed character of the surrounding area and uses. In addition to its overall
20 general consistency with the visual character of the surrounding area, the proposed
21 Project would maintain the character of the proposed project site by adaptively
22 reusing existing structures and only introducing compatible structures into an area
23 that currently supports existing commercial and industrial development. As such, the
24 visual character and quality of the proposed project site and surrounding area from
25 22nd Street, 22nd Street Park, Bloch Field, Cabrillo Marina, the Federal Breakwater,
26 Inner Cabrillo Beach, the San Pedro residential community, and the San Pedro Plaza
27 Park would not be degraded by the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts would be
28 less than significant.

29 **Mitigation Measures**

30 No mitigation is required.

31 **Residual Impacts**

32 Impacts would be less than significant.

33 **Impact AES-4b: Operation of the proposed Project would 34 not result in an adverse effect due to shading on the existing 35 visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.**

36 Impact AES-4b evaluates the degree to which proposed project-related features
37 would result in adverse effects from shading (factor 12). Operation would have little
38 effect on shade-sensitive viewers because, in addition to the rehabilitation of the

1 transit sheds at Berths 57–60, the proposed Project would only construct three
2 buildings/structures over one story. Two of the three would be two stories: the
3 11,500-square-foot Learning Center at Berth 56 and the 50,000-square-foot
4 government office building at Berth 70. Both of these buildings are consistent with
5 heights of nearby structures. The third building is the proposed 5-story wave tank.
6 However, this building would be distant enough from existing structures to avoid
7 prolonged shading of any existing structures and would not be close enough to the
8 Main Channel to shade any water (see Figure 2-5). The nearest sensitive viewers
9 (users of Cabrillo Way Marina) would be located a minimum of 0.3 mile from the
10 nearest new structure and would not be affected by the minimal amounts of new
11 shading that would occur as a result of the new structures. The proposed Project
12 would also allow for the temporary docking of large vessels up to 250 feet in length
13 at Berths 58–60 and 70–71 that would result in new intermittent shaded area
14 immediately surrounding the docked vessels. However, the area immediately
15 surrounding these Berths is dominated primarily by industrial uses that are not
16 sensitive to and would not be affected by periodic shading. As such, the proposed
17 Project’s placement on existing developed berths a moderate distance from shade-
18 sensitive uses (i.e., residents and recreationists) would ensure that any new shading
19 would have a less-than-significant effect on the existing visual character or quality of
20 the site or its surroundings.

21 **Impact Determination**

22 Shading effects from operations would be limited to shading from existing structures
23 that have undergone adaptive reuse, a few new buildings that would be of similar
24 height to the existing onsite structures, and the 5-story wave tank that would be
25 positioned with some distance between the nearest existing buildings as well as the
26 Main Channel. Therefore, proposed project operation would not result in substantial
27 shading of shadow-sensitive uses. Impacts would be less than significant.

28 **Mitigation Measures**

29 No mitigation is required.

30 **Residual Impacts**

31 Impacts would be less than significant.

32 **Impact AES-5b: Operation of the proposed Project would 33 not create a new source of substantial light or glare that 34 would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area.**

35 Impact AES-5b evaluates the degree to which operation of the proposed Project
36 would introduce substantial adverse change in nighttime lighting and/or generate spill
37 light adversely affecting adjacent light-sensitive areas (factors 13 and 14). Current
38 lighting levels at the site are relatively minor and offer security lighting on the
39 existing structures without high levels of illumination or flood lighting to create near

1 daytime conditions that are associated with cargo terminals. New glare-producing
2 features associated with the proposed Project would be minimal because the proposed
3 Project would introduce few new buildings and structures and adaptively reuse the
4 existing transit sheds. These new buildings and structures would likely include both
5 reflective (e.g., glass) and non-reflective building materials (e.g., stone), but the
6 increase in glare from building materials would be minimal given the overall setting
7 and the building profiles and limited use of reflective materials. The proposed
8 Project is designed to comply with the policies outlined in Section 3.1.3, “Applicable
9 Regulations and Policy Documents,” including the San Pedro Waterfront and
10 Promenade Design Guidelines. In addition, the proposed Project would allow for the
11 docking of small boats near Berth 57 and large vessels near Berths 70 and 71 that
12 could result in a minor increase in glare from light reflecting off boat and vessel
13 windows. Overall, the proposed Project would contribute low amounts of glare to the
14 existing daytime glare conditions, but this contribution would be negligible within
15 the context of the glare produced by surrounding residential, commercial, and
16 industrial Port uses. Therefore, impacts due to glare would be less than significant.

17 The proposed Project would include additional lighting, both at ground level and pole
18 lighting, primarily for pedestrian safety and aesthetic enhancement. This lighting
19 would be developed adjacent to the new buildings and structures, along walkways,
20 and along the proposed pedestrian promenade. The additional nighttime and
21 streetscape lighting would be consistent with the lighting used in surrounding
22 commercial development and public spaces. The intent of the lighting scheme would
23 be to improve safety considerations and security on the proposed project site.
24 Furthermore, at night, the proposed lighting features would be balanced between
25 providing adequate security lighting and minimizing spillover light.

26 The proposed Project would also allow for the temporary docking of large vessels at
27 Berths 58–60 and 70–71; these vessels would contribute to existing ambient lighting
28 conditions in the form of flood lighting. These flood lights would be noticeable from
29 surrounding areas because they would be a new source of nighttime lighting.
30 However, the nearest light sensitive receptors (i.e., users of Cabrillo Way Marina)
31 would be located a minimum of 0.4 mile from the docked vessels. Also, given the
32 small number of vessels able to dock at once, this lighting would not be significant
33 enough to create a substantial adverse change in the ambient lighting conditions,
34 which are created primarily by large-scale industrial Port uses and activities.

35 Nighttime lighting of Port operations to the northeast would remain a brightly lit
36 backdrop for the proposed Project. Overall, the proposed project lighting would
37 contribute low to moderate amounts of lighting to the existing ambient nighttime
38 lighting conditions, but would be negligible within the context of the functional
39 lighting of the Port.

40 Lighting associated with the proposed Project would comply with the San Pedro
41 Waterfront and Promenade Design Guidelines, which include lighting
42 recommendations to minimize light pollution, spill light, and glare while promoting
43 goals to create an attractive and safe daytime and nighttime waterfront that supports
44 local economic growth. Lighting would also comply with the PMP, which requires

1 an analysis of design and operational effects on existing community areas. Per the
2 Port’s leasing policy, all tenants are required to complete a lighting study. The
3 lighting study would be conducted in order to assess and mitigate any potentially
4 significant adverse lighting impacts on sensitive uses. Finally, lighting design would
5 comply with the policies outlined in Section 3.1.3, “Applicable Regulations and
6 Policy Documents.” Design consistency with these guidelines and regulations would
7 ensure that views of the area would not be adversely affected. Therefore, impacts
8 would be less than significant.

9 **Impact Determination**

10 Proposed project lighting would be minimal and would be designed to comply with
11 the policies outlined in Section 3.1.3, “Applicable Regulations and Policy
12 Documents,” the San Pedro Waterfront and Promenade Design Guidelines, and the
13 PMP; and would represent a minimal increase in light and glare sources compared to
14 existing conditions. For these reasons, the proposed Project would not result in any
15 significant impacts from spillover light or from an increase in ambient lighting or
16 glare.

17 **Mitigation Measures**

18 No mitigation is required.

19 **Residual Impacts**

20 Impacts would be less than significant.

21 **3.1.4.3.3 Summary of Impact Determinations**

22 Table 3.1-1 summarizes the impact determinations of the proposed Project related to
23 aesthetics, as described in the detailed discussion in Sections 3.1.4.3.1 and 3.1.4.3.2
24 above. Identified potential impacts may be based on federal, state, and City of Los
25 Angeles significance criteria, LAHD criteria, and the conclusions of the technical
26 reports.

27 For each type of potential impact, the table describes the impact, notes the impact
28 determinations, describes any applicable mitigation measures, and notes the residual
29 impacts (i.e., the impact remaining after mitigation). All impacts, whether significant
30 or not, are included in this table.

1 **Table 3.1-1. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Aesthetics Associated**
 2 **with the Proposed Project**

<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	<i>Impact Determination</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Impacts after Mitigation</i>
3.1 AESTHETICS			
Construction			
AES-1a: Construction of the proposed Project would not result in an adverse effect on a scenic vista from a designated scenic resource due to obstruction of views.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
AES-2a: Construction of the proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources (including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings) within a state scenic highway.	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact
AES-3a: Construction of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
AES-4a: Construction of the proposed Project would not result in an adverse effect due to shading on the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
AES-5a: Construction of the proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
Operations			
AES-1b: Operation of the proposed Project would not result in an adverse effect on a scenic vista from a designated scenic resource due to obstruction of views.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
AES-2b: Operation of the proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic	No impact	No mitigation is required.	No impact

<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	<i>Impact Determination</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Impacts after Mitigation</i>
resources (including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings) within a state scenic highway.			
AES-3b: Operation of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
AES-4b: Operation of the proposed Project would not result in an adverse effect due to shading on the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant
AES-5b: Operation of the proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area.	Less than significant	No mitigation is required.	Less than significant

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

3.1.4.4 Mitigation Monitoring

After the implementation of existing design and lighting guidelines by LAHD, no significant adverse impacts from aesthetics would occur as a result of the proposed Project; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.1.4.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Based on the design considerations including the San Pedro Waterfront and Promenade Design Guidelines, and adherence to applicable aesthetic and lighting policies, the proposed Project would not result in any significant unavoidable impacts.

