

3.1

AESTHETICS/VISUAL RESOURCES

3.1.1 Introduction

This section describes the environmental setting for aesthetics/visual resources within the PMPU area, identifies applicable regulations, and analyzes the potential impacts that could result from implementing the proposed Program. Mitigation measures and the significance of impacts after mitigation also are described.

3.1.2 Environmental Setting

3.1.2.1 Regional Setting

3.1.2.1.1 Landscape Features

The PMPU area is located within San Pedro Bay, which includes the Port and the Port of Long Beach. The Port landscape is highly engineered, reflecting more than a century of construction of breakwaters, dredging of channels, filling for creation of berths and terminals, and construction of infrastructure to support Port operations. As a result, the ports now constitute a large and distinct landscape region. This landscape is characterized by berths, warehouses, container yards, tank farms, processing plants, buildings, and parking lots, as well as infrastructure such as bridges, intermodal (rail and truck) facilities, rail lines and spurs, pipelines, gantry cranes, and other equipment.

Land uses within the Port also include recreational destinations and commercial operations such as the World Cruise Center, sport fishing concessions, marinas, a hotel, retail shops, Cabrillo Beach and boat launch. For recreational activities, the Port provides slips for 5,000 pleasure craft, sport fishing boats, and charter vessels. Community facilities include a waterfront youth center, a boat launch ramp, and a public swimming beach. Educational facilities within the Port include the College of Oceaneering, Cabrillo Aquarium, and the Maritime Museum.

The appearance of many Port operations is functional in nature, characterized by exposed infrastructure, open storage, the use of unfinished or unadorned building

1 materials, and the use of safety-conscious, high-visibility colors such as orange, red,
2 or bright green for mobile equipment such as cranes, containers, and railcars.

3 In recent years, the development trend throughout the port complex has been toward
4 fewer and more consolidated berths and terminal backlands that accommodate larger
5 post-Panamax-sized container ships and increased cargo throughput. As a result,
6 longer berths and cranes with longer booms have been added. These changes have
7 affected the visual character of the Port by increasing the scale of facilities visible
8 throughout the area.

9 **3.1.2.1.2 Lighting Environment**

10 The Port includes approximately 32 terminals and other facilities, all of which are
11 illuminated at night. The Port is contiguous with the Port of Long Beach to the east,
12 with similarly illuminated facilities. The Port is a landlord port with oversight of its
13 tenants' facilities. The Port may develop a facility's lighting program and other site
14 improvements to meet tenant requirements, or it may review, modify, and approve
15 terminal designs and lighting programs submitted by tenants. Lighting programs,
16 including selection of fixtures, layout design, and hours of illuminated operations, are
17 unique to each port facility and vary according to operations (e.g., container versus
18 liquid bulk) and the kind of facilities on site (e.g., buildings, backlands, tank farms,
19 and cranes). Terminals operate on independent schedules, with increased day- and
20 nighttime operations when a ship is at berth and requires loading or unloading, or
21 during seasonal periods of high demand.

22 Although not a direct light source, open areas of water throughout the Port contribute
23 to the nighttime lighting environment by reflecting artificial illumination to the point
24 of increasing its effect. Sensitivity to light and glare may therefore be greater for
25 viewing positions adjacent to water surfaces.

26 LAHD requires all new or redeveloped facilities to adhere to lighting guidelines
27 established by its Engineering Division, but it does not enforce the guidelines
28 retroactively at existing facilities that are not undergoing redevelopment. Generally,
29 the newest facilities at the Port have been fitted with the most modern lighting
30 fixtures available.

31 **3.1.2.2 PMPU Area**

32 The environmental setting for the visual resources within the PMPU area is defined
33 as the "visual conditions" of this area during calendar year 2011, the CEQA baseline
34 period. Such conditions include physical features of the Port landscape and
35 conditions of lighting and glare in relation to potentially affected public views. In this
36 section, the baseline corresponds to "existing" visual conditions.

37 Existing visual conditions within the PMPU area were assessed as the degree to
38 which features and sources of lighting within public view appear to be consistent
39 with the established character of the existing setting. They are also a function of the
40 conditions under which the features are viewed, as described below. The existing
41 visual condition is the point of reference for assessing the intensity and significance
42 of visual impacts and is addressed only relative to critical public views. Such views

1 are those: 1) that are readily available to the public; 2) where there are indications the
2 public would be concerned over adverse changes to the views; and, 3) in which a
3 proposed action would be substantially visible.

4 **3.1.2.2.1 Critical Public Views**

5 Critical views are defined as those sensitive public views that would be most affected
6 by a proposed action (e.g., the greatest intensity of impact due to viewer proximity to
7 a project, the project's visibility, and the duration of the affected view). The analyses
8 are based on "worst-case" circumstances of maximum proposed Program exposure to
9 the most sensitive public views. A premise of the technical approach is that the range
10 of critical public views potentially affected by the proposed Program should be
11 represented by the views chosen for analysis.

12 Public sensitivity is not always related to obvious aesthetic appeal. The public may
13 confer visual significance on landscape components and areas that would otherwise
14 appear unexceptional (Federal Highway Administration [FHWA] 1981). For
15 example, unexceptional landscapes along tertiary roads may be particularly important
16 to local residents as undesignated open spaces. Other areas may have regional or
17 national cultural significance, but not be especially scenic. Nonetheless, their visual
18 character may be considered important to their cultural value (FHWA 1981).
19 Consequently, the approach for describing the existing conditions for the visual
20 impact analyses does not directly evaluate aesthetic appeal. Instead, the importance
21 of the affected landscape is inferred from the indicators of sensitivity, which may or
22 may not be a function of the aesthetic qualities of the environment.

23 The degree of visual sensitivity is considered to occur at one of the following four
24 levels.

- 25 ■ **High Sensitivity.** High sensitivity suggests that the majority of the public is likely
26 to react strongly to a threat to visual quality. A highly concerned public is
27 assumed to be more aware of any given level of adverse change and less tolerant
28 than a public that has little concern. A small modification of the existing
29 landscape may be visually distracting to a highly sensitive public and represent a
30 substantial reduction in visual quality. Additionally, high visual sensitivity is
31 assumed to exist where landscapes, particular views, or the visual characteristics
32 of certain features are protected through policies, goals, objectives, and design
33 controls in public planning documents.
- 34 ■ **Moderate Sensitivity.** Moderate sensitivity suggests that the public would
35 probably voice concern over substantial visual impacts. Often the affected views
36 are secondary in importance or are similar to others commonly available to the
37 public.
- 38 ■ **Low Sensitivity.** Low sensitivity is considered to prevail where the public is
39 expected to have little concern about adverse changes in the landscape, or only a
40 small minority may be expected to voice such concern, even where the adverse
41 change is substantial in intensity and duration.
- 42 ■ **No Sensitivity.** The views are not public, or there are no indications of public
43 concern over, or interest in, scenic/visual resource impacts on the affected area.

1 An analysis of sensitive public views of the PMPU area was conducted as a first step
2 in identifying those that are critical to the assessment of potential impacts on
3 aesthetics/visual resources in the PMPU area. An inventory of these sensitive public
4 views was developed based on review of maps and photographs of the affected areas.
5 Appendix C presents a consideration of sensitive public views of the PMPU area and
6 identifies those which are critical to the assessment of impacts on aesthetics and
7 visual resources within this area. Descriptions of existing conditions, based on the
8 subset of the sensitive public views that are most relevant to evaluations for the
9 PEIR, are presented below. The most important and representative public views have
10 been identified as critical to this impact assessment. These views occur from points
11 located along the Harbor Freeway near the “C” Street-off-ramp; in Wilmington along
12 “C” Street, within the Wilmington Waterfront Park, and at Banning’s Landing; within
13 the Main Channel, adjacent areas and the San Pedro Waterfront; within San Pedro at
14 Shields Drive, San Pedro Bluffs Residential Area, and Lookout Point Park; and, within
15 the south Port area at Cabrillo Beach and its vicinity. These are sufficiently close and/or
16 potentially influenced by the PMPU area to be considered in assessing baseline visual
17 conditions for impact evaluations.

18 3.1.2.2.2 Existing Visual Resource Condition

19 The existing visual condition of the PMPU area includes both the daytime visual
20 condition of the PMPU vicinity and the night lighting condition. The existing visual
21 condition of the landscape is assessed in terms of the character of features and
22 sources of lighting within public view, the degree to which such features and light
23 sources are congruent with the established, dominant character of the setting, and the
24 coherence of the pattern in which these features and lighting sources are distributed.

25 The existing visual condition serves as the point of reference for evaluating the
26 intensity of potentially adverse changes. This is a function of how noticeable newly
27 introduced incongruous features or lighting may be within current public views, and
28 the coherence of the landscape (pattern in which landscape features are distributed).
29 Visual condition is evaluated as being within one of four Visual Modification
30 Classes, as described below and defined in terms of “visual access,” meaning the
31 extent to which historically available scenic views have become blocked or less
32 accessible to the public.¹ The Visual Modification Classes are as follows:

- 33 ■ **Visual Modification Class 1.** The highest quality landscapes are those that are
34 Visual Modification Class 1, in which all features and their distribution, as well as
35 sources of lighting, appear to be characteristic of the established setting, and past
36 actions have not introduced incongruous changes or altered viewing conditions,
37 nor have such actions adversely affected the coherence (scale, pattern,
38 organization, composition) of the landscape and its lighting. Further, historically
39 available and important views remain uninterrupted, and historically available
40 access to public viewing positions has remained unimpeded.
- 41 ■ **Visual Modification Class 2.** Visual conditions that are Visual Modification
42 Class 2 occur where adverse changes in the landscape and/or lighting are
43 noticeable but subordinate to the features characteristic of the area. These changes

¹ The attribute of visual access is relevant to two of the six visual impact categories described in Section 3.1.4.1.2.3, Impact AES-1 and Impact AES-2.

1 may attract some attention, but do not compete with other features in the field of
2 view. Considerations include whether historically available scenic views may
3 have become partly blocked or less accessible, and/or whether historically
4 available views have become partially interrupted, and/or whether historically
5 available access to public viewing positions has become noticeably, but only
6 partly, impeded.

7 ■ **Visual Modification Class 3.** Visual conditions that are Class 3 occur where
8 adverse changes in the landscape and/or lighting are distracting to the point they
9 compete for attention with other features in view. Considerations include whether
10 historically available and scenic views have become substantially blocked and/or
11 inaccessible, and/or whether historically available and scenic views have become
12 largely interrupted, and/or whether the historically available access to public
13 viewing positions has become substantially impeded.

14 ■ **Visual Modification Class 4.** The lowest quality landscapes are Visual
15 Modification Class 4, where incongruous features introduced by past actions
16 dominate attention, or patterns natural to the area have been altered to the point of
17 incoherence. Considerations include whether historically available scenic views
18 have been totally blocked or made inaccessible, and/or lighting has been altered to
19 the point of dominating attention or causing glare, and/or whether historically
20 available scenic views have become totally blocked, and/or whether historically
21 available access to public viewing positions has been eliminated.

22 **Existing Visual Condition: Landscape Features**

23 Visual conditions are assessed relative to critical public views, representing those that
24 would be both sensitive and substantially exposed to the PMPU area. The following
25 factors define the visual condition of landscape features.

26 ■ **Visual Character (Physical Features and their Patterns of Distribution).** A
27 fundamental attribute of the existing visual condition of a landscape is its
28 established visual character, which is defined in terms of the physical features and
29 their distribution associated with the type of landscape that is the context for the
30 assessment. Features are treated as inherent (e.g., an established part of the
31 setting) if they reflect how the landscape was formed, how it functions, and how it
32 is structured.

33 ■ **Congruence (Intactness).** A second attribute of the existing visual condition of a
34 landscape is the degree to which its features currently are, or appear to be,
35 congruent with those inherent to the character type of the potentially affected area.
36 In terms of the FHWA methodology, the focus is the landscape's current state of
37 "intactness," representing the integrity of the character type in terms of the degree
38 to which it is free of "encroaching elements."

39 Congruence, therefore, is inversely related to the degree to which past actions have
40 noticeably and unfavorably affected landscape features and/or have noticeably
41 introduced features that individually or in aggregate do not appear to be consistent
42 with (inherent to) the underlying landscape character type. The aggregate of such
43 unfavorable (incongruous) changes would lessen the "intactness" of the landscape.

- 1 ■ **Coherence (Unity).** The third attribute of existing visual condition is the way in
2 which landscape features are arrayed and whether or not this distribution
3 expresses how the landscape was formed, how it functions, and how it is
4 structured. A landscape may be “intact” relative to the types of features present,
5 yet past actions may have affected their arrangement such that they are not
6 coherently arrayed in the context of the whole. In terms of FHWA methodology,
7 the degree of visual coherence defines the “unity” of the landscape. The relevance
8 of this attribute potentially increases with the congruence of the landscape.
9 Conversely, for a landscape with distractingly incongruent features, coherence is
10 not, by definition, possible.
- 11 ■ **Visual Access.** Apart from its physical features, the affected landscape is also
12 described in terms of the viewing conditions which control the public’s visual
13 access to the potentially affected landscape. These conditions include the public’s
14 physical access to viewing positions, the breadth of available views (panoramic or
15 narrowly focal), the duration and timing of views (e.g., seasonal views or views
16 restricted to certain parts of the day due to controlled access), whether the views
17 are from stationary or mobile positions (along roads, trails, or waterways), and the
18 viewing angle. Past actions may have limited physical access to formerly available
19 viewing positions or partially or totally blocked visual resources from public view,
20 shortened view duration, or altered when the views are available (i.e., entry
21 limited to certain hours of the day or times of the year).

22 Existing Visual Condition: Sources of Light and 23 Glare

24 The assessment of light and glare, for this analysis, is directed to proposed Program-
25 related sources of night lighting only. In this assessment “light” refers to artificial
26 light, or the degree of brightness generated by a given source. The Illuminating
27 Engineering Society of North America (IES) defines glare as “the sensation produced
28 by luminance in the visual field that is sufficiently greater than the luminance to
29 which the eye has adapted to cause annoyance, discomfort, or loss of visual
30 performance and visibility” (IES 1993).

31 For this assessment, the existing condition of light and glare is defined by the
32 following characteristics.

- 33 ■ **Lighting Character (Light Sources and Their Pattern of Distribution).** The
34 character of lighting is defined in this assessment by the types of lighting present
35 and their pattern of illumination. Illumination may be described in terms of: 1)
36 ambient lighting, the general overall level of lighting in a given area due to the
37 various light sources present; 2) corona, which is the diffuse halo of light that
38 exists above a lit area, usually against a dark background and discerned only at
39 substantial distances; and, 3) glare, as defined above: focused, intense, point-
40 source or reflected light. For this assessment, the views analyzed were too close to
41 the Port for the corona of collective lighting to be a factor, as this phenomenon is
42 observed only at greater distances, if at all.
- 43 ■ **Congruence (Intactness).** As with daytime visual conditions, this attribute is the
44 degree to which past actions have noticeably and unfavorably changed the type

1 and/or intensity of lighting in an area such that the result appears incongruent with
2 the inherent character of lighting in the area.

- 3 ■ **Coherence (Unity).** This attribute, as it pertains to lighting, is the internal
4 consistency of scale, pattern and organization of the sources and effect of lighting
5 relative to the potentially affected area.

6 **Existing Visual Conditions within Critical Public** 7 **Views**

8 As noted in Section 3.1.2.2.1, Critical Public Views, the most important and
9 representative public views regarding the assessment of potential impacts on
10 aesthetics and visual resources occur from points along a short stretch of the Harbor
11 Freeway; within Wilmington and San Pedro; along the Main Channel, its adjacent
12 areas and the San Pedro Waterfront; and, within the south Port area at Cabrillo Beach
13 and its vicinity.

14 These views are discussed in terms of visual character, congruence, and coherence.

15 **“C” Street Residential Area**

16 *Visual Character*

17 Critical views along “C” Street are from points within a residential character type at
18 the very edge of the community of Wilmington. Therefore, it is the visual character
19 of the neighborhood along the north side of “C” Street that is relevant to the baseline
20 visual conditions for views from this area. The adjacent Wilmington Waterfront Park
21 and more distant Port facilities are seen by the residents in terms of their immediate
22 surroundings and not those of the Port environment. Public sensitivity to adverse
23 visual impacts, as perceived from this area, is based on values, perceptions, attitudes,
24 and activities relative to living in this neighborhood. Features inherent to the
25 neighborhood include: the residences, the nearby Wilmington Recreation Center,
26 Neptune Field, and, Bayview Field. The Wilmington Waterfront Park is a feature that
27 is compatible with a residential area.

28 Views to the south from along “C” Street are currently panoramic across Wilmington
29 Waterfront Park. The park land in the foreground currently allows both the distant
30 views of San Pedro as well as the industrial area close by. Park landscaping
31 substantially screens views of features of the Port and San Pedro. The available “C”
32 Street views are essentially from points that are at the same elevation as the Port
33 backlands. As a result, the larger picture of the Port’s organization is blocked by the
34 El Paseo Promenade and its landform, which is elevated 16 feet above grade. An
35 additional aspect of the views is that the most critical are from stationary points—
36 from within the residences along “C” Street and their front yards—or from sidewalks.
37 Stationary views and those from walks permit prolonged attention to detail.

38 For the lighting environment, ambient lighting in the area is contributed mostly by
39 lighting within the Wilmington Waterfront Park and within the Port. By comparison,
40 lighting from streetlights on Harry Bridges Boulevard and along “C” Street is
41 inconspicuous. Port light sources occur in the backlands of the TraPac Terminal due
42 to boom lighting during off-loading of container ships, lighting associated with the

1 Administration Building, and by 100-foot-tall, pole-mounted directional floodlights,
2 both in the TraPac backlands and also in the distance at the Yang Ming and China
3 Shipping terminals.

4 *Congruence (Intactness) and Coherence (Unity)*

5 Views to the south that include the TraPac Terminal facilities are part of a sequence
6 of views that includes the larger residential area to the north, the mix of
7 commercial/industrial and residential land uses along “C” Street, and the Wilmington
8 Waterfront Park. The LADWP Harbor Generating Station dominates views to the
9 southeast, across the park. Due south, as noted, the TraPac Terminal’s cranes, berthed
10 container vessels, and high-mast floodlights are readily seen behind the Wilmington
11 Waterfront Park. To the west of Mar Vista Avenue, Tosco’s refinery defines the views
12 for residents in the vicinity.

13 Prior to completion of the Wilmington Waterfront Park, residents along “C” Street
14 were fully exposed to views of Port features defining an abrupt change in character to
15 the south, east, and west. At that time, the Port’s industrial features dominated the
16 available views. Today, nearly all near-grade Port features are blocked from view by
17 the El Paseo Promenade landform, as are the lower parts of the gantry cranes, high-
18 mast floodlights, and the Administration Building. Across the expanse of the park,
19 and seen in conjunction with park facilities and landscaping, Port facilities are
20 decidedly background features. Landscaping screens these Port facilities from view
21 and park features intercede in the foreground and compete with them for interest.
22 Within the “C” Street neighborhood, some commercial or industrial features are
23 inconsistent with the residential character, however, they occur at the east and west
24 sides of the neighborhood and are peripheral in views toward the Port.

25 Port features, though in the background, are large in scale and substantially
26 incongruous. They compete for attention with features consistent or compatible with
27 the predominately residential character of “C” Street. Based on this evaluation, the
28 existing visual condition relative to viewing positions along “C” Street is rated
29 ***Visual Modification Class 3.***

30 Regarding the night lighting environment, the level and type of lighting contributed
31 by the Port to the “C” Street residential area is incongruous with a residential setting
32 in type, level of illumination, and physical scale of the floodlight structures.
33 However, color of the lighting is in character with that emitted by the residential
34 streetlights along and near “C” Street. The incongruous features of lighting from the
35 TraPac and Yang Ming terminals dominate the nighttime scene from nearly all
36 vantage points along the street. Based on this evaluation, for points along “C” Street
37 and from the associated residences, the characteristics of night lighting due to Port
38 activities are inconsistent with that expected for a residential area, and dominate the
39 lighting environment. The existing nighttime visual conditions are, therefore, rated as
40 ***Visual Modification Class 4.***

Wilmington Waterfront Park

Visual Character

The character of the park is distinct from the adjoining neighborhood and Port environment because it is a large, urban park.

Congruence (Intactness) and Coherence (Unity)

As described for views from “C” Street, Port features are partly blocked from view at the park and seen as being in the background. They are, however, large in scale and substantially incongruous with features associated with an urban park, relative to viewing positions. They compete for attention with the park’s features and those of the residential area to the north. The park itself is coherently arrayed and designed. Based on this evaluation, the existing visual condition relative to viewing positions from points within the Park are rated **Visual Modification Class 3**.

From within the park, night lighting due to the Port’s high-mast floodlights and other sources are secondary to the substantial lighting afforded within the park. However, given the intensity of the Port lighting, it competes in intensity with the park’s lighting such that the existing condition of night lighting is rated as **Visual Modification Class 3**.

Banning’s Landing

Visual Character

Banning’s Landing is located at the north end of Slip 5, well within the Port environment. Facilities associated with the Vopak and Pasha terminals frame a view to the south that focuses on the Yusen Container Terminal. Lateral to this view to the southwest, warehouses lining the Rio Doce Pasha (RDP) wharves block all of the RDP facilities from view, except for the cranes lining Berths 174-176. Most notable in the distance beyond the warehouses is the arc of the Vincent Thomas Bridge low to the horizon, the white tank farm at the Conoco Phillips Liquid Bulk Terminal, and the China Shipping gantry cranes at the west end of the bridge. To the southeast, the Vopak dry and liquid bulk containers dominate the view, with little of the cranes along Berths 192-194 being visible.

The context for nighttime lighting, as is the case for the daytime character, is the Port environment. Immediately apparent is the effect of the water surface: backland floodlighting is magnified greatly by the reflective surface. Also, the characteristic orange glow of high-pressure sodium floodlighting, as well as its geometric and functional distribution, are in character with the terminal backlands.

Congruence (Intactness) and Coherence (Unity)

All features within the subject view are an inherent part of the Port’s development, function, and structure. The frame of reference is the industrial character of the Port and its specific function to receive or load goods for transport. The functions of the features in view are particularly clear: readily discerned cranes offloading goods from container ships berthed along the extensive system of wharves, warehouses, and

1 storage facilities. The pattern is also clearly visible: berthed ships; cranes; and storage
2 facilities are proximate to the interface of the wharves and the waterways.

3 The Port environment, as seen from Banning's Landing, is entirely congruent and
4 highly coherent. The distribution and geometry of the containers and flat water
5 surface together create a composition of the industrial facilities in view. Although the
6 halogen lights of the Community Center contrast sharply with the intensity and
7 orange color of prevailing sodium light fixtures, these are well shielded and
8 incidental to the overall view. The Port lighting in this scene is highly compositional
9 and congruent with the Port functions it serves. In the absence of incongruous
10 features and adverse impacts on the coherence of views and viewing conditions
11 caused by past actions, the existing daytime and nighttime visual conditions relative
12 to the Port environment are rated as *Visual Modification Class 1*.

13 **Harbor Freeway (I-110)**

14 *Visual Character*

15 Motorists traveling south along the Harbor Freeway (Interstate [I]-110) are aware that
16 they are passing through a major port. Industrial features of the Port environment
17 become more evident as one approaches from the north. Views from the southbound
18 lanes of the Harbor Freeway are dominated by petroleum refineries, numerous
19 existing cranes, the Vincent Thomas Bridge, and other tall features in the proposed
20 Program vicinity.

21 In the area between the Anaheim Street and "C" Street exits, semi-panoramic views
22 encompassing the West Basin are in line with the direction of travel for southbound
23 motorists. Here, the large gantry cranes at the TraPac and Yang Ming terminals
24 dominate the existing view. Just south of "C" Street, the PMPU area is sharply lateral
25 to the east, relative to the direction of travel. At that point, the freeway alignment
26 curves to the southwest away from the PMPU area. From there to the south, the
27 PMPU area is no longer within the primary views of southbound motorists, and such
28 views from the highway are not relevant to this assessment.

29 The subject views are from points within the Port environment. Therefore, views
30 from these highway lanes are evaluated relative to the character of the industrial Port
31 area. Views from the Harbor Freeway toward the Port reflect large-scale
32 transportation infrastructure that includes a wide freeway corridor and a heavily
33 developed port complex. These views are moderately memorable (a moderately high
34 level of "vividness," in terms used by the FHWA) due to the large number of tall
35 cranes visible in the foreground and the presence of ocean-going vessels berthed near
36 the freeway.

37 The nighttime lighting environment is characterized almost entirely by the high-mast
38 floodlighting of the backlands of the TraPac and Yang Ming terminals. However, the
39 lights do not introduce glare to the environment because views from the highway are
40 substantially elevated such that the lenses are well hidden from direct view by the
41 shields. For a part of the highway, the backland lighting is in line with the direction
42 of travel to the south before becoming peripheral to the east. Attention necessarily is
43 drawn to these lights. By comparison, the numerous, but small, lights of the oil
44 refinery to the west are barely noticeable. From the freeway and elsewhere about the

1 Port, the memorable characteristic of Port lighting stems from the array of high-mast
2 lighting across the backlands.

3 ***Congruence (Intactness) and Coherence (Unity)***

4 The Port's development has been functional: the extensive and varied array of
5 facilities and infrastructure serve in the transport of goods to and from the port
6 complex. The form of the Port (i.e., its pattern of development) exactly expresses its
7 function. Port features are highly congruent and coherently arranged, although the
8 patterns of the Port's development can only be discerned from a few public viewing
9 positions.

10 From the highway, the Port is viewed in conjunction with its greater context. The
11 sequence of views leading up to views of the Port includes a variety of land uses,
12 including residential and commercial development, as well as the Conoco Phillips
13 Los Angeles Oil Refinery to the west, an industrial facility differing in character from
14 that of the Port. While features of the Port itself are highly congruent and coherent,
15 the overall view from the highway inevitably juxtaposes features that, taken together,
16 are low in these qualities. Seen at freeway speeds, the historic development of the
17 Port and areas beyond its periphery creates a mosaic of visually incompatible land
18 uses; their features are incongruous with one another and without harmony. The same
19 can be concluded for the lighting environment on the approach to the Port. The
20 lighting for the mosaic of land uses presents a patternless array of varied types of
21 illumination before reaching the Port, where the lighting is geometrically arrayed in a
22 coherently functional relationship. These land uses compete for attention when
23 approaching the Port, being co-dominant with features characteristic of the Port
24 environment. The existing daytime visual condition accordingly is rated as ***Visual***
25 ***Modification Class 3***. Night lighting for land uses adjacent to the Port is subordinate
26 to the high-mast lighting of the Port backlands such that the nighttime visual
27 condition is rated ***Visual Modification Class 2***, relative to the Port environment.

28 ***Main Channel, Adjacent Areas, and San Pedro Waterfront***

29 ***Visual Character***

30 Critical views of the PMPU area from within the Main Channel and Outer Harbor
31 include those from pleasure craft, ferries, and cruise ships. South of Reservation
32 Point, close-up views of Pier 400 occur. These are from mobile positions and their
33 character is defined by the interrelated sequence of features seen when traveling to
34 and from the Port. Therefore, their context is the Port environment of dockside gantry
35 cranes, container ships, backland storage containers, warehouses, and liquid bulk
36 storage facilities. Also, the Port context includes the tourist and recreation facilities
37 that line part of the San Pedro Waterfront of the Main Channel and those that are in
38 the southwest corner of the Port (e.g., Cabrillo Beach, its vicinity, and Cabrillo
39 Marina).

40 For views from the tourist facilities within Ports O'Call Village along the San Pedro
41 Waterfront of the Main Channel and the San Pedro Marina, their context is also the
42 dockside gantry cranes, container ships, backland storage containers, warehouses,
43 and liquid bulk storage facilities. From these tourist facilities, views of the Main

1 Channel can be panoramic but also can be partly screened by docked pleasure craft in
2 the foreground.

3 Nighttime lighting is primarily due to high-mast lights along the east side of the
4 channel south of Vincent Thomas Bridge. There, terminal backlands flank the
5 channel and floodlighting there is prevalent. Cruise ships, ferries and pleasure craft,
6 of necessity, pass close to these Port features and sources of nighttime lighting;
7 therefore, foreground viewing of such features is a common, and expected,
8 experience from within the Main Channel and outer harbor. Likewise, for the tourist
9 attractions and the San Pedro Marina at Ports O'Call Village, these nighttime sources
10 of lighting are characteristic of the Port environment and the local ambiance.

11 ***Congruence (Intactness) and Coherence (Unity)***

12 All features seen from within and along the Main Channel and from within the outer
13 harbor are congruent with the Port environment. The views from this or any channel
14 in the Port are limited by the dockside Port development, and, apart from the
15 organization of facilities along the Main Channel, the Port's overall pattern of
16 development is not easily discernible. However, the Port's facilities which are within
17 view along the channel are functionally coherent in their distribution.

18 Based on these evaluations, the Port environment is the point of reference for
19 assessing the character of views from within and along the Main Channel, as well as
20 from within the Outer Harbor, and Port facilities in view are congruent with that
21 character and are coherently arranged. Therefore, in the context of the Port
22 environment the quality of the potentially affected views is rated ***Visual Modification***
23 ***Class 1.***

24 ***San Pedro***

25 A number of views from within San Pedro were considered in identifying critical
26 public views (refer to Appendix C). Of these, three were selected as being most
27 representative and important to the visual impact assessment. Views from Shields
28 Drive and San Pedro Bluffs represent residential areas, and the third is a view from
29 Lookout Point Park.

30 ***Shields Drive Residential Area***

31 **Visual Character**

32 Views across the West Basin toward the northeast exist for points within the Shields
33 Drive residential area along Shields Drive, a short stretch of MacArthur Avenue, and
34 from along West Elberon Avenue. The point of reference for the existing visual
35 condition is the surrounding residential area, not the character of the Port
36 environment. The Shields Drive neighborhood is defined by single-family homes and
37 their supporting infrastructure of roads and utilities. Views here are limited to the
38 foreground for the great majority of the homes in the area due to the proximity of
39 structures and urban plantings. Distant views are available only at the north and east
40 periphery, as described earlier. Night lighting in this neighborhood is contributed by
41 streetlights, consistent with the character of residential areas.

Congruence (Intactness) and Coherence (Unity)

Local features visible from Shields Drive and its vicinity are mainly inherent to the neighborhood's development, function and structure. Within this area, the residences, their yards, roads, and utilities are orderly and coherently arranged. However, the available views are not of sufficient breadth for the arrangement to be readily evident in the available views or to offer a "composed" landscape.

The industrial features within the nearby Port environment are not congruent with the type and scale of features found in the Shields Drive residential area. However, the Port is widely visible only from vantage points at the north and east edge of the neighborhood; these views are rare and marginal to the prevailing experience. The Port features seen from there conflict with the residential character, but in general are peripheral to the area and do not compete with the residential features for attention. For nighttime lighting, nearly the entire neighborhood is consistent with residential areas (congruent) and is arrayed along the street as expected (coherent). The high-mast lighting of the Port, though, occurs in the foreground of views from the north and east edge of the neighborhood, dominating the nighttime view. This assessment is relative to the most critical view within the neighborhood (the north and east edges) and, in this case, day and night the Port's environment dominates the scene. Based on this evaluation, the existing visual condition as it pertains to landscape features and nighttime lighting for this residential view is rated ***Visual Modification Class 4***.

San Pedro Bluffs and Lookout Point Park

Visual Character

Views from San Pedro Bluffs and Lookout Point Park are equivalent in several ways: they are from positions well elevated above the Port (180 feet and 240 feet above the water, respectively); are on moderately steep lands permitting views of the Port over structures in their vicinity; and, are close to being the same distance from the southern part of existing PMP Planning Area 9 (about 2 miles away from Pier 400).

Although similar, the two views differ in their context. The context for the view from San Pedro Bluffs residential area comprises the features of a residential area, including the homes in view and the infrastructure of streets and utilities. In contrast, the view from Lookout Point Park was specifically created to afford views of the Port and the Port of Long Beach. Furthermore, the park's orientation is such that the available views are centered on the features of the ports below. Consequently, in evaluating the character and quality of views from Lookout Point Park, the context for the assessment is the Port's environment.

Congruence (Intactness) and Coherence (Unity)

The differing contexts for the views from the San Pedro Bluffs residential area and Lookout Point Park have opposite implications. Relative to the San Pedro Bluffs residential area-based views, the Port's features are out of context (not congruent) with the setting. The panoramic views from these locations also include the outer harbor and open ocean to the southeast, and Catalina Island to the south, for some residents. The views are, then, a continuum of Port dominated views to the northeast and east and those to the southeast and south. Across the breadth of these views,

1 though, the features of the Port are dominant and affect the overall visual condition
2 for the entire field of view. On the other hand, compared to Lookout Point Park’s
3 “Port” context, all Port features within view are congruent with each other.

4 The consideration of coherence is relevant only when it is judged that features within
5 view are congruent with the character of the subject views. Therefore, within the San
6 Pedro residential context the question of coherence is not pertinent, but for Lookout
7 Point Park, it is relevant, as all Port features within view from there are congruent
8 with the Port’s character. Given the elevated viewing position, the layout for the part
9 of the Port that is in view is evident. For instance, the West Channel and Cabrillo
10 Marina can be distinguished from the Main Channel and North Channel in the
11 distance. Also, while the East Channel cannot be seen, the development along Berths
12 57-60 and 69-72 is in view. Faces C and D of Pier 400 are readily discerned and the
13 vacant land northeast of Face D is in view.

14 The context for nighttime lighting, as is the case for the daytime character, is the Port
15 environment. Night lighting in the proposed Program’s vicinity contributes no glare
16 or ambient lighting relative to the San Pedro Bluffs residential area or Lookout Point
17 because, as noted, the viewing positions are substantially higher than the lights, and
18 shielding blocks sight of the fixtures. For Lookout Point Park, the context for
19 nighttime lighting, as is the case for the daytime character, is the Port environment.
20 Relative to the San Pedro Bluffs residential area, the Port’s night lighting is not
21 characteristic of the residential light environment, but is distant and non-intrusive,
22 there being no glare or ambient lighting contributed to the residential area.

23 Based on this evaluation, Port features in view from the San Pedro Bluffs residential
24 area are not congruent with features commonly associated with residential areas. The
25 features dominate attention and the quality of the potentially affected views is rated
26 ***Visual Modification Class 4***. The Port’s night lighting is not characteristic of the
27 residential light environment, but it does not affect the areas’ ambient lighting and
28 does not introduce glare. Therefore, relative to light and glare, the quality of the view
29 is rated ***Visual Modification Class 1***.

30 In contrast, all features within the Port views available from Lookout Point Park are
31 congruent with those inherent to the Port’s development and operation, including the
32 nighttime lighting. Development over the years has been consistent in organization
33 and pattern, and is readily observed from the park. Therefore, the park-based view is
34 high in quality relative to the context of the Port’s environment, and the view is rated
35 ***Visual Modification Class 1***.

36 ***Cabrillo Beach and Vicinity***

37 ***Visual Character***

38 The critical views from Cabrillo Beach and its vicinity occur from a recreation area
39 that is within, but at the edge of, the Port environment. It is the character of the Port’s
40 features that forms the context for most of the panorama seen from the beach and its
41 vicinity. Therefore, these views are evaluated relative to the Port’s character.

42 Port features seen from the Cabrillo Beach Fishing Pier include parts of existing PMP
43 Planning Areas 1, 2, 7, and 9: Cabrillo Beach; the south edge of the Cabrillo Marina;

1 West Channel; Watchorn Basin; Port Liquid Bulk Terminal; Reservation Point; the
2 cranes at the APL Terminal on Pier 300; the APM Terminal cranes, backlands and
3 associated buildings; and, container ships docked along Piers 300 and 400 in the
4 North Channel. The distribution of cranes and the presence of cargo ships are part of
5 a dynamic process within the Port. Cargo ships come and go daily, while the cranes
6 are added, subtracted, or moved along rails next to the wharves.

7 Views to the southeast and south of the fishing pier include the east breakwater, the
8 entrance to the Port, Angel's Gate Lighthouse, and the west breakwater. Views of the
9 open ocean to the south are not available from the fishing pier.

10 The view from the main part of Cabrillo Beach extends to the outer harbor and its
11 entrance and both the east and west breakwaters. To the northeast, part of the
12 Cabrillo Marina is in view, but the view primarily is characterized by the Port Liquid
13 Bulk Terminal in the middleground and the APL Terminal and APM Terminal cranes
14 at Piers 300 and 400 in the distance.

15 The nighttime lighting environment is influenced almost entirely by the high-mast
16 floodlighting of the backlands of the APM Terminal. While the high-mast lighting is
17 especially noticeable during the evening, it does not introduce glare to the
18 environment. This is because these lights are among the newest within the Port, and
19 their lenses are designed to prevent light from spreading to offsite receptors.

20 *Congruence (Intactness) and Coherence (Unity)*

21 The Port's development has been functional, focused on the extensive and varied
22 array of facilities and infrastructure that serves in the transport of goods to and from
23 the port complex as well as recreation and tourism along the Port's western
24 perimeter. All Port features within sight from Cabrillo Beach and its vicinity,
25 including the array of nighttime lighting, are an inherent part of the Port's
26 development, function, and structure. That is, the Port's features are congruent with
27 one another.

28 The Port's form and structure are not readily apparent in views from Cabrillo Beach
29 since the various basins and channels cannot be seen due to intervening structures.
30 However, the functions of the many features in view are nonetheless clear. Readily
31 discerned in the distance are cranes adjacent to cargo ships berthed along the visible
32 wharves, and storage facilities. The pattern, to a limited extent, may also be discerned
33 in the form of berthed ships, cranes and storage facilities proximate to the interface of
34 wharves and waterways, and recreational facilities (e.g., marina, beach, marine
35 aquarium, bathhouse, and boat launch) peripheral to the industrial Port functions. The
36 context for nighttime lighting, as is the case for the daytime character, is the Port
37 environment. The high-mast floodlighting is the dominant feature in this regard.

38 Based on this evaluation, Port features in view from the Cabrillo Beach area are
39 highly congruent with one another and coherently arranged, although the patterns of
40 the Port's development can only be partly discerned from Cabrillo Beach and its
41 vicinity. In the context of the Port environment, the existing visual condition is rated
42 as ***Visual Modification Class 1***.

3.1.3 Applicable Regulations

The only regulations that apply to aesthetics and visual resources are local regulations. There are no applicable federal or state regulations.

3.1.3.1 Local Regulations

The regulatory setting is one indication of visual sensitivity. Where aesthetic values are protected by laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS), or are otherwise recognized in public policies and objectives, such views are treated as highly sensitive. Also, whether or not a visual impact is significant partly depends on whether it is consistent with the LORS supporting planning policies and objectives applicable to the protection of visual resources. Included are standards for lighting that address the control of offsite spillage of light and glare. The evaluation addresses whether the impact specifically violates laws, ordinances, and regulations; fails to meet specific standards; or is otherwise substantially inconsistent with overarching policies and objectives.

3.1.3.1.1 Port's Terminal Lighting Design Guidelines

All new and upgraded lighting within the Port will meet the standards of the terminal lighting design guidelines stipulated in the *Port of Los Angeles Portwide Light and Glare Survey Findings* (Port 2006). The standards incorporated therein are self-regulating in the sense that no new lighting within the Port may occur that does not meet the standards. Moreover, LAHD engineering has assured that a reduction in offsite light emissions would occur as a result of implementing the design standards of the guidelines. As a matter of policy, LAHD engineering would measure light levels at strategic points prior to upgrades to a new lighting system and after the upgrades to demonstrate that a reduction in light spill offsite has occurred (Haddadian 2012, personal communication).

General Guidelines

In general, the amount of lighting must be determined by the type of operation at a terminal or location and should consider the acceptable minimum lighting levels required for the safety of personnel. The overall lighting design should consider lighting design guidelines and recommendations established by the IES for each intended area category.

Wherever applicable, specified light fixtures will be equipped with maximum light control optical characteristics, able to direct produced light to areas intended to be illuminated, and cutting light and glare from areas to remain not illuminated. Use of floodlights shall be held to minimum. Floodlights shall be aimed away from residential areas surrounding the Port and shall incorporate light shields and glare guards. Use of floodlights requires review and approval by the LAHD Engineer. A designer shall submit point by point calculations and a lighting layout plan for approval prior to finalization of the design. Utilization of floodlights shall only be permitted if use of down-lighting is proven to be unfeasible.

Lighting for Container Yard and Similar Facilities

Light Level

The appropriate light levels for container yard facilities are per the following, unless the user has specific and special lighting requirements submitted for design consideration.

- Illumination level of maintained average of 3.5 footcandles horizontal with a minimum illumination of 1/3 of the maintained average and a maintained maximum of 3 times the maintained average. Coefficient of Utilization shall be no less than 0.90.

High-Mast Pole and Fixture Ring

Pole height is 100 feet with a fixture ring able to accommodate a minimum of 12 fixtures. Pole and fixture ring designs shall comply with Port High-Mast Pole specifications and drawings.

Light Fixtures: Light fixtures shall comply with Port High-Mast Lighting specifications and drawings.

Lighting Control: All lights are generally controlled by a photocell and timer to prevent the lights from coming on during daytime hours and allow the lights to be turned on at night, when the terminal operator determines it is necessary.

3.1.3.1.2 City of Los Angeles General Plan

The *City of Los Angeles General Plan* is a legal mandate that governs both private and public actions. It is a document comprising 10 citywide Elements (Air Quality, Conservation, Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources, Housing, Infrastructure Systems, Noise, Open Space, Public Facilities and Services, Safety, and Transportation), the Land Use Element for each of the city's 35 Community Planning Areas, as well as counterpart plans for the Port and LAX.

Conservation Element

The Conservation Element (City of Los Angeles 2001) surveys laws, requirements, and procedures that have been established for the protection of natural resources. Section 15, Land Form and Scenic Vistas, specifically states an objective and policy regarding the preservation of existing natural terrain, scenic features and vistas, and visual and physical access to view corridors, scenic features, and areas. The Conservation Element presents a definition of "scenic views or vistas" particularly relevant to the aesthetics and visual resources assessment: "Scenic views or vistas are the panoramic public view access to natural features, including views of the ocean, striking or unusual natural terrain, or unique urban or historic features." This definition has been incorporated into the consideration of Impact AES-1.

Section 15: Landforms and Scenic Vistas

Objective: To protect and reinforce natural and scenic vistas as irreplaceable resources and for the aesthetic enjoyment of present and future generations.

Policy: Continue to encourage and/or require property owners to develop their properties in a manner that would, to the greatest extent practical, retain significant existing land forms (ridge lines, bluffs, unique geologic features) and unique scenic features (historic, ocean, mountains, unique natural features) and/or make possible public view or other access to unique features or scenic views.

Transportation Element

Appendix E of the Transportation Element presents an inventory of designated scenic highways, including John S. Gibson Boulevard, Pacific Avenue, Front Street, and Harbor Boulevard as scenic routes. There also is specific acknowledgment of the views of harbor activities and the Vincent Thomas Bridge available to northbound and southbound motorists (City of Los Angeles 1999a). Front Street is also designated as a scenic route for its views toward the west of historic San Pedro. Harbor Boulevard, south of the Vincent Thomas Bridge, is designated as a scenic route because of Port views (City of Los Angeles 1999a). The city has not adopted formal guidelines governing the scenic corridors associated with designated scenic highways, but has established interim guidelines as part of the Transportation Element addressing roadway design, earthwork and grading, signage, landscaping, signs/outdoor advertising, and utilities (City of Los Angeles 1999b).

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

Public Facilities and Services Element

The Public Facilities and Services Element contains policies relating to the elimination of potentially adverse light “spillover” onto offsite areas. The following policy is applicable to development within the PMPU area:

Policy 9.40.3: Develop regulations to ensure quality lighting to minimize or eliminate the adverse impact of lighting due to light pollution, light trespass, and glare for facade lighting, security lighting, and advertising lighting including billboards.

3.1.3.1.3 The Port of Los Angeles Plan

The *Port of Los Angeles Plan* (City of Los Angeles 1982) is one of the local area plans known as Community or District Plans that collectively constitute the *City of Los Angeles General Plan Land Use Element*. The *Port of Los Angeles Plan* serves as the 20-year guide to continued development and operation of the Port with respect to land uses. It is a separate document from the PMP, but it is intended to be consistent with the PMP. One objective of the plan addresses aesthetic concerns, including maintaining (e.g., not adversely affecting) public views of coastal resources:

- 1 ■ **Objective 4:** To assure priority for water and coastal dependent development
2 within the Port while maintaining...the coastal zone environment and public
3 views of, and access to, coastal resources.

4 The *Port of Los Angeles Plan* also sets forth the following standard/criterion
5 applicable to lighting design within the Port:

- 6 ■ **IV. Industrial:** New industrial facilities in the Port shall be clearly defined and
7 separated or appropriately buffered from adjacent residential uses, when feasible.

8 **3.1.3.1.4 Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan**

9 Specifications in the *Wilmington-Harbor City Community Plan* for aesthetics and
10 visual resources that are relevant to Port development include objectives and policies
11 for industrial projects and open space (City of Los Angeles 1999c).

12 **Industrial**

- 13 ■ **Objective 3-3.** To improve the aesthetic quality and design of industrial areas,
14 eliminate blight and detrimental visual impact on residential areas, and establish a
15 stable environment for quality industrial development.

- 16 □ **Policy 3-3.1.** Require urban design techniques, such as appropriate building
17 orientation and scale, landscaping, buffering, and increased setbacks in the
18 development of new industrial properties to improve land use compatibility
19 with adjacent uses and to enhance the physical environment.

20 **Open Space**

- 21 ■ **Objective 5-1.** To preserve existing open space resources and where possible
22 develop new open space.
23 □ **Policy 5-1.1** Encourage the retention of passive and visual open space which
24 provides a balance to the urban development of the community.

25 **3.1.3.1.5 San Pedro Community Plan**

26 Land Use Policies and Programs of the *San Pedro Community Plan* (City of Los
27 Angeles 1999d) include the following goals, objectives, and policies that relate to
28 aesthetics/visual resources²:

29 **Land Use Policies and Programs**

30 ***Residential***

- 31 ■ **Objective 1-9:** To preserve visual resources in residential areas.

² The San Pedro Community Plan Update draft document was released in August 2012 but has not yet been adopted.

- 1 ■ **Policy 1-9.1:** The preservation of existing scenic views from surrounding
2 residential uses, public streets and facilities, or designated scenic view sites should
3 be a major consideration in the approval of zone changes, conditional use permits,
4 variances, divisions of land, and other discretionary permits.

5 ***San Pedro Local Coastal Program Specific Plan***

- 6 ■ **Goal 6:** To preserve the scenic and visual quality of coastal areas. The CCA of
7 1976 declared the California coastal zone a distinct and valuable resource of vital
8 and enduring interest to all people that exists as a delicately balanced ecosystem.
- 9 ■ **Objective 6-2:** To protect, maintain, and, where feasible, enhance and restore the
10 overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and human-made
11 resources.
 - 12 □ **Policy 6-2.1:** That the scenic and visual qualities of San Pedro be protected
13 as a resource of community as well as regional importance, with permitted
14 development sited and designed to: protect views to and along the ocean,
15 harbor, and scenic coastal areas; minimize the alteration of natural landform;
16 be visually compatible with the character of the surrounding area; and,
17 prevent the blockage of existing views for designated public scenic view
18 areas and Scenic Highways.
- 19 ■ **Objective 6-6:** To preserve existing scenic views of the ocean and harbor from
20 designated Scenic Highways, scenic view sites, and existing residential structures.

21 **3.1.3.1.6 City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code**

22 The City of Los Angeles Planning and Zoning Code contains two lighting-related
23 requirements applicable to the proposed Program as listed below. However, the *Port*
24 *of Los Angeles Portwide Light and Glare Survey Findings* terminal lighting design
25 guidelines fully address these two standards and require compliance before lighting
26 designs may be approved (Port 2006). Therefore, there is no potential for the
27 proposed Program to be inconsistent with these standards:

- 28 ■ Section 93.0117: Illumination of adjacent residential properties by exterior light
29 sources shall not exceed 2 footcandles and shall not be a source of direct glare on
30 said uses; and,
- 31 ■ Section 12.21 A 5(k): All lights used to illuminate a parking area shall be
32 designed, located, and arranged so as to reflect the light away from any streets and
33 adjacent premises.

34 It is assumed that plans for the proposed appealable/fill projects would be submitted
35 for the required approvals and that building permits would of necessity be obtained,
36 so the following two requirements would be satisfied during project planning and
37 permitting.

- 38 ■ Section 17.08 (c): Plans for street lighting shall be submitted to and approved by
39 the Bureau of Street Lighting.
- 40 ■ Section 91.6205 (a): A building permit shall be obtained from the department in
41 accordance with the provisions of Division 2 of Article 1 of Chapter IX of this

1 code for any signs that are regulated by this chapter. Where illuminated, an
2 electrical permit shall also be obtained as required by Article 3 of Chapter IX of
3 this code.

4 It is assumed that the Port would comply with the following two standards:

- 5 ■ Section 91.6205 (k)4: Signs are prohibited if they contain flashing, mechanical
6 and strobe lights in conflict with the provisions of Section 80.08.4 and 93.6215 of
7 this code; and,
- 8 ■ Section 91.6205 (m): No sign shall be illuminated in such a manner as to produce
9 a light intensity greater than 3 footcandles above ambient lighting, as measured at
10 the property line of the nearest residentially zoned property.

11 **3.1.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

12 **3.1.4.1 Methodology**

13 The analytical framework for assessing impacts and their significance is *The Visual*
14 *Modification Class Approach to Preparing NEPA and CEQA-compliant Visual*
15 *Impact Assessments* (Headley 2010). Visual impacts and their significance are
16 defined as follows.

17 A visual impact on aesthetics/visual resources occurs when:

- 18 ■ Features are altered, introduced, made less visible, or are removed, such that the
19 resultant effect on the views is perceptibly inconsistent with the inherent,
20 established character of the landscape; and/or,
- 21 ■ Access to public views is diminished such that the affected view has become
22 limited to some degree and/or physical access to public viewing positions has
23 become impeded.

24 A significant visual impact is one that:

- 25 ■ Causes a substantial adverse change in the visual resources of the affected
26 environment; and/or would cause views from scenic highways, designated scenic
27 routes, corridor and parkways, or public views that are otherwise recognized or
28 valued, to become substantially blocked or screened from view; and/or would
29 cause historically available public access to such views to become substantially
30 diminished.

31 A substantial adverse change in visual resources occurs when visual quality has been
32 noticeably reduced, as influenced by public sensitivity to the intensity of the impacts
33 and their duration. It is a premise of the methodology that a highly sensitive public is
34 more apt to notice adverse changes in visual resources of lesser intensity than a less
35 sensitive public and to regard such effects as “substantial” and therefore significant.

36 Whether or not they are substantial by the foregoing criteria, adverse changes in
37 visual resources are also considered substantial when the impact would result in an
38 inconsistency with LORS applicable to the protection of visual resources.

1 A final consideration is the duration of the impact. An impact is considered to be
2 substantial when visual quality has been noticeably reduced over an appreciable
3 period of time, usually 1 year or longer, as opposed to a shorter period.

4 Impacts to aesthetic/visual resources are evaluated with respect to the proposed
5 appealable/fill projects and land use changes under the proposed Program.

6 **3.1.4.2 Thresholds of Significance**

7 Appendix G of CEQA (Environmental Checklist) identifies four areas of concern
8 regarding a project's potential impact on aesthetics:

- 9 ■ Substantial, adverse effects on a scenic vista;
- 10 ■ Substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock
11 outcroppings, and historic buildings within (view from) a state scenic highway;
- 12 ■ Substantial degradation of existing visual character or quality of a site and its
13 surroundings; or,
- 14 ■ Creation of a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect
15 day or nighttime views in the area.

16 The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles 2006) lists 12 areas of
17 concern to consider in assessing the significance of an impact in accordance with the
18 CEQA Checklist. However, except in one case (the threshold for a significant impact
19 due to shading), the Thresholds Guide does not provide specific significance criteria
20 to use in making determinations. In the absence of specific significance criteria in the
21 Thresholds Guide, the methodology described in CEQA Appendix G has been
22 applied to the determination of significance.

23 All 12 issues of concern in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* are addressed in this
24 assessment, but are grouped relative to the four CEQA Checklist issues. An
25 exception occurs for project-caused shading. While the current CEQA Checklist does
26 not require consideration of this issue, it is listed along with the CEQA list of issues.
27 Impacts AES-1 through AES-6 listed below describe the potential impacts evaluated
28 for the Draft PEIR.

29 **AES-1:** The proposed Program would cause substantial, adverse effects on a
30 scenic vista.

31 The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* addresses Impact AES-1 under the heading of
32 “Obstruction of Views.” Therefore, this CEQA issue of concern is interpreted as
33 addressing the degree to which project-related features interfere with a scenic vista,
34 either by physically blocking or screening the vista from view, or by impeding or
35 blocking public access to a formerly available public viewing position.

36 “Views” are defined in the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* to mean “visual access to,
37 or the visibility of, a particular site from a given vantage point or corridor.” The
38 Thresholds Guide is concerned with “focal views” (those focusing on a specific
39 object, scene, setting, or feature of visual interest) as well as “panoramic views”
40 (wide-angle views including a section of urban or natural areas that provide a

1 geographic orientation not commonly available, such as urban skyline, valley,
 2 mountain range, ocean, or other water bodies). Section 15 of the *City of Los Angeles*
 3 *General Plan Conservation Element* (City of Los Angeles 2001) provides further
 4 guidance as to what constitutes a scenic vista or view: “Scenic views or vistas are the
 5 panoramic public view access to natural features, including views of the ocean,
 6 striking or unusual natural terrain, or unique urban or historic features.” The
 7 following factors are listed by the Thresholds Guide as relevant to CEQA issue
 8 AES-1 in considering visual impact significance:

- 9 ■ The nature and quality of recognized or valued views (such as natural topography,
 10 setting, man-made or natural features of visual interest, and resources such as
 11 mountains or the ocean);
- 12 ■ The extent of obstruction (e.g., total blockage, partial interruption, or minor
 13 diminishment); and,
- 14 ■ The extent to which the project affects recognized views available from a length
 15 of a public roadway, bike path, or trail, as opposed to a single, fixed vantage point.

16 For the purpose of the aesthetics/visual resources assessment, following the guidance
 17 of the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* and the Conservation Element, a scenic vista
 18 within the terms of CEQA shall include focal as well as panoramic views of both
 19 natural and man-made features of visual interest that are recognized or valued.
 20 Accordingly, for this assessment the following definition is applied:

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

28 **AES-2:** The proposed Program would cause substantial damage to scenic resources,
 29 including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic
 30 buildings, within [view from] a state scenic highway.

31 The following factor listed by the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* under the heading of
 32 “Obstruction of Views” is relevant to CEQA issue AES-2:

- 33 ■ Whether the project affects views from a designated scenic highway, corridor, or
 34 parkway.

35 CEQA issue AES-2 is concerned with impacts on the scenic resources within views
 36 from a state scenic highway. However, the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* emphasizes
 37 a concern over the obstruction of views from scenic highways, corridors, or parkways
 38 Therefore, this impact assessment more broadly applies AES-2 not only to impacts
 39 on scenic resources viewed from designated scenic routes, corridors, and parkways,
 40 but also to view obstruction relative to those routes, corridors, and parkways.

41 **AES-3:** The proposed Program would cause a substantial degradation of existing
 42 visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings.

1 CEQA issue AES-3 addresses the potential for project features to be incongruous
2 with the character and pattern of those that are inherent to the landscape within the
3 potentially affected public views, as well as to adversely affect the existing
4 coherence/unity of the landscape (Section 3.1.2.3.1).

5 The following six factors listed by the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* are relevant to
6 CEQA issue AES-3:

- 7 ■ The amount or relative proportion of existing features or elements that
8 substantially contribute to the valued visual character or image of a neighborhood,
9 community, or localized area, which would be removed, altered, or demolished;
- 10 ■ The amount of natural open space to be graded or developed;
- 11 ■ The degree to which proposed structures in natural open space areas would be
12 effectively integrated into the aesthetics of the site, through appropriate design,
13 etc;
- 14 ■ The degree of contrast between proposed features and existing features that
15 represent the valued aesthetic image of an area;
- 16 ■ The degree to which a proposed zone change would result in buildings that would
17 detract from the existing style or image of the area due to density, height, bulk,
18 setbacks, signage, or other physical elements; and,
- 19 ■ The degree to which the project would contribute to the aesthetic value of an area.

20 **AES-4:** The proposed Program would result in a new source of substantial light
21 or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

22 The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* lists the following factors relevant to CEQA issue
23 AES-4 in considering visual impact significance:

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

27 **AES-5:** The proposed Program would result in substantial negative shadow
28 effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.

29 The *L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* requires consideration of the potential impact of
30 shading by project-related structures. The current CEQA Checklist does not require
31 consideration of shading; however, this factor was included at the time the
32 Thresholds Guide was prepared and is, therefore, listed here as a supplemental issue.
33 The Thresholds Guide offers the following specific criterion as the threshold for
34 significance:

35 “A project impact would normally be considered significant if shadow-sensitive uses
36 would be shaded by project-related structures for more than three hours between the
37 hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. Pacific Standard Time (between late October and
38 early April), or for more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 5:00
39 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time (between early April and late October).”

1 Further guidance is offered in the following screening criterion.

2 “Would the project include light-blocking structures in excess of 60 feet in height above
3 the ground elevation that would be located within a distance of three times the height of
4 the proposed structure to a shadow-sensitive use on the north, northwest, or northeast?”

5 **AES-6:** The proposed Program would result in impacts inconsistent with
6 guidelines and regulations established to protect aesthetic/visual
7 resources.

8 This impact is relevant to CEQA, as extended through the *L.A. CEQA Thresholds*
9 *Guide*. Under Impact AES-6, an impact would be significant if it is not consistent with
10 LORS supporting policies and objectives applicable to the protection of features and
11 views of aesthetic/scenic value (“applicable rules and regulations”), as identified in
12 Section 3.1.3. An inconsistency could be due to an adverse effect that otherwise would
13 be less than significant. Therefore, consistency with the regulatory setting is listed as a
14 separate category of impact. The Thresholds Guide lists applicable guidelines and
15 regulations as relevant to CEQA issue AES-6 in considering visual impact significance.

16 **3.1.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation**

17 **Impact AES-1: The proposed Program would not cause** 18 **substantial, adverse effects on a scenic vista.**

19 The issue addressed by Impact AES-1 is the degree to which the proposed
20 appealable/fill project-related features would interfere with a scenic vista, either by
21 obstructing it or interfering with public access to points from which it is experienced.

22 Of the several critical public views analyzed, those from Wilmington Waterfront
23 Park, Banning’s Landing, Main Channel and San Pedro Waterfront, Lookout Point
24 Park, and San Pedro Plaza Park are treated as “recognized or valued views.” The
25 basis for this distinction is explained below in relation to the nature and quality of
26 these views.

27 **Planning Areas 2 - 4**

28 ***Construction and Operations***

29 ***Wilmington Waterfront Park***

30 No proposed appealable/fill projects or land use changes would be visible from
31 points within Wilmington Waterfront Park. The nearest proposed appealable/fill
32 project is the Yang Ming Terminal Redevelopment Project, which is located
33 approximately 1 mile southwest of the park. Land use changes in that vicinity entail
34 fill at Berths 120-121; cut at Berths 121-127; and, replacement of the liquid bulk
35 facility at Berths 118-120 (Kinder Morgan) with container cargo uses. However, the
36 Yang Ming Terminal Redevelopment Project and associated land use changes would
37 not be seen from the interior of the park. This is primarily due to the El Paseo
38 Promenade, which is elevated upon a 16-foot-high landform at the south edge of the
39 park. For nearly all points north of this landform, the Port’s ground-level features,

1 particularly stacked cargo in the backlands, are blocked from view. Exceptions occur
2 where lines of sight are directed toward four underpasses (three for pedestrian access,
3 one for vehicular access) along the elevated El Paseo Promenade. In these cases,
4 there are limited views of the at-grade facilities south of the Promenade. Otherwise,
5 only the gantry cranes, high-mast lighting, and administration building within the
6 TraPac Terminal backlands are readily seen in the background over the top of the
7 Promenade. The relatively distant appealable/fill project (Yang Ming Terminal
8 Redevelopment Project) and land use changes, however, would not be in view. From
9 the elevated Promenade, views extend to the south over the top of the containers, but
10 facilities along Berths 126-139 at the West Basin and TraPac Container terminals
11 would substantially block sight of the Yang Ming Terminal Redevelopment Project
12 and land use changes.

13 The nature and quality of recognized or valued views

14 Views from Wilmington Waterfront Park have been created by design and are
15 implicitly valued. At the south edge of the Wilmington Waterfront Park is the
16 elevated El Paseo Promenade. From this walk, the TraPac backlands and West Basin
17 are in view, by design, given the elevation of the walk and its location. Due to its
18 position along West Harry Bridges Boulevard, the Promenade is as much a part of the
19 Port environment as the urban park environment adjacent to the north. It is assumed
20 that the public, in choosing to access the Promenade, does so in appreciation of the
21 Port as a positive visual experience. As discussed earlier, in terms of the Port context,
22 visual quality is high, the existing conditions being rated a **Visual Modification**
23 **Class 1**.

24 The extent of the obstruction

25 As noted, the closest proposed appealable/fill project (i.e., Yang Ming Terminal
26 Redevelopment Project) and associated land use changes would not be within view
27 and could not, therefore, obstruct the valued views from the Wilmington Waterfront
28 Park.

29 The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike 30 paths, and trails

31 Roadways, bike paths, and trails in the vicinity of Wilmington Waterfront Park
32 provide views which are recognized or valued. These views would include some
33 portion of the proposed Program during construction and operation of the proposed
34 appealable/fill projects and land use changes.

35 ***Banning's Landing***

36 One proposed appealable/fill project, the Berths 187-189 Liquid Bulk Relocation
37 Project, and the associated land use changes from liquid bulk to open space and
38 institutional uses, would be within the field of view from Banning's Landing.
39 Construction activities associated with the removal of tankage along Berths 187-189
40 and future development related to the proposed land use changes would be highly
41 visible from Banning's Landing, but construction of the new wharf and the relocation
42 of tankage along Berths 191-194 would not be visible from Banning's Landing.

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views

In the mid-1980's, Wilmington residents requested that the Port provide a "window on the water" for the community. The Port's response was to facilitate the design and construction of Banning's Landing, a community center that offers a wall of windows facing south to capture views of the Port. The construction of this facility is recognition of the importance to the Wilmington community of the Port views. Such views are, therefore, demonstrably valued. The views from Banning's Landing are considered highly scenic within the context of the Port environment. As noted, visual quality is high, the existing conditions being rated a ***Visual Modification Class 1***.

The extent of the obstruction

Views toward the Vopak Terminal from Banning's Landing do not extend past Berths 187-189, so there are no Port features currently in view in that direction which would be blocked from sight due to the relocation of berthing and tanks at Berths 187-189 and/or operation of the proposed open space and institutional uses.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails

Roadways, bike paths, and trails in the vicinity of Banning's Landing provide views which are recognized or valued. These views would include some portion of the proposed Program during construction and operation of the proposed appealable/fill projects and land use changes.

Main Channel, Adjacent Areas, and San Pedro Waterfront

One proposed appealable/fill project, the Berths 187-189 Liquid Bulk Relocation Project, would be within view from the Main Channel, Slip 5, and the East Basin Marinas. It is possible that land use changes within the Southwest Marine Shipyard may be visible from points within the Main Channel and from the southeast end of Ports O'Call Village and the adjacent marina. No other proposed appealable/fill projects or land use changes would be seen from points elsewhere along the Main Channel, adjacent areas, or the San Pedro Waterfront.

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views

Non-shipping traffic, including cruise ships, passenger ferries, sightseeing boats, and recreational watercraft, occurs along the Main Channel from the East Basin Marinas to the Outer Harbor, excluding the Controlled Navigation Areas. Harbor views are inherent to the recreational boating experience, indicating they are valued, if not specifically recognized. San Pedro Waterfront views are similarly valued. Along the west side of the channel south of Vincent Thomas Bridge are numerous tourist and recreation attractions, including restaurants, shops, the San Pedro Marina, and commercial facilities within Ports O'Call Village. From the Main Channel and the San Pedro Waterfront, views predominately extend no farther than the wharves, cranes, stacked cargo containers, berthed cargo vessels, and other dockside facilities. As noted, in the context of the Port environment, the quality of the potentially affected views is ***Visual Modification Class 1***.

The extent of obstruction

Since views from the Main Channel and San Pedro Waterfront do not currently extend past the edge of the Main Channel and its adjacent areas, such as the East Basin Marinas, the proposed appealable/fill project (Berths 187-189 Liquid Bulk Relocation Project) and land use changes within the Southwest Marine Shipyard would have no potential for obstructing views to the interior of the PMPU area.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails

Roadways, bike paths, and trails in the vicinity of the Main Channel and adjacent areas and the San Pedro Waterfront provide views which are considered “recognized and valued.” These views would include some portion of the proposed Program during construction and operation of the proposed appealable/fill projects and/or land use changes.

Lookout Point Park

Four proposed appealable/fill projects would be within the field of view from Lookout Point Park: Al Larson Marina; Tri Marine Expansion; 338 Cannery Street Adaptive Reuse; and, Berth 300 Development. Land use changes in PMPU Planning Areas 3 and 4, including upgrades at the Berth 301 optional land use site, would also be within the panoramic field of view available from this park. These projects and changes in land use would be seen at viewing distances ranging from 1.8 to 3.8 miles.

The nature and quality of recognized or valued views

The view from Lookout Point Park was specifically created to afford views of the ports, and the context for the views is the Port environment. The views are dominated by Port features, such as the Port Liquid Bulk Terminal and APL and APM Terminal facilities along and within Piers 300 and 400, respectively. However, all of these facilities are congruent with the Port environment and coherently sited and, as noted, baseline visual conditions are *Visual Modification Class 1*. Therefore, it is assumed that the park was created in recognition of the value to the public of these views.

The extent of obstruction

The areas in which changes in land use and the proposed appealable/fill projects would occur are distant from Lookout Point Park. Given the viewing distances and that the park is 240 feet higher than the Port, construction and operation of the proposed appealable/fill projects and land use changes would not obstruct valued views.

The extent of the effect on recognized views from public roadways, bike paths, and trails

Roadways, bike paths, and trails in the vicinity of Lookout Point Park provide views which are considered “recognized and valued.” These views would include some portion of the proposed Program during construction and operation of the proposed appealable/fill projects and/or land use changes.

Impact Determination

Construction and Operations

The analysis identified four areas where there are views, or sequence of views, that are valued for their representing scenic vistas. These occur from the El Paseo Promenade in the Wilmington Waterfront Park; from Banning's Landing; along the Main Channel and from the San Pedro Waterfront; and, from Lookout Point Park. Additionally, valued views occur from roadways, bike paths, or trails in the vicinity of these four areas. For these views, there would be no obstruction foreseeable in the future due to implementing the proposed appealable/fill projects or land use changes. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No residual impacts would occur.

Impact AES-2: The proposed Program would not cause substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within [view from] a state scenic highway.

Planning Areas 2 – 4

Construction and Operations

The issue addressed in Impact AES-2 is the degree to which the proposed Program would adversely affect scenic resources within view from designated scenic highways, corridors, or parkways. Additional concerns are the degree to which there would be interference with a scenic vista currently available from such a highway, either by blocking it or interfering with public access to the point(s) from which the vista is experienced.

Appendix E of the General Plan Transportation Element (City of Los Angeles 1999a) designates as a "Scenic Highway" several connected streets. This "Scenic Highway" comprises 12 road segments, including: John S. Gibson Boulevard; N. Pacific Avenue; Front Street; Harbor Boulevard to Crescent Avenue; along Crescent Avenue to W. 22nd Street; west on W. 22nd Street to S. Pacific Avenue; south along S. Pacific Avenue to Shepard Street; east on Shepard Street to S. Paseo Del Mar; east on S. Paseo Del Mar to S. Western Avenue; north on S. Western Avenue to W. 25th Street; then east along W. 25th Street, which becomes Palos Verdes Drive. However, views from this Los Angeles City-designated "scenic highway" are not critical to this assessment for the following reasons:

- 1 ■ Views toward the PMPU area from these routes are substantially blocked by Port
2 facilities, residential development, topography, or a combination of these factors;
3 and,
- 4 ■ The PMPU area is not within the normal field of view of motorists, being from 60
5 to 90 degrees or more away from the direction of travel, depending on the location
6 and direction of travel.

7 These reasons are discussed in detail in Appendix C.

8 **Impact Determination**

9 *Construction and Operations*

10 No critical public views of the PMPU area are available from designated scenic
11 highways, routes, corridors or parkways. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

12 **Mitigation Measures**

13 No mitigation is required.

14 **Residual Impacts**

15 No residual impacts would occur.

16 **Impact AES-3: The proposed Program would not cause a** 17 **substantial degradation of existing visual character or quality of a** 18 **site and its surroundings.**

19 The issue addressed in Impact AES-3 is the degree to which the proposed Program
20 would contrast unfavorably and noticeably with features of the PMPU area.

21 **Planning Areas 2 – 4**

22 *Construction and Operations*

23 “C” Street and Wilmington Waterfront Park

24 There are no proposed appealable/fill projects or land use changes in proximity to the
25 park, as explained under Impact AES-1. This would also be true for views from “C”
26 Street. The nearest such project and the changes in land use would be 1 mile or more
27 distant. The elevated El Paseo Promenade and stacked cargo in the TraPac backlands
28 block views of Port features south of the backlands relative to viewing position along
29 “C” Street and within the park. The relatively distant proposed appealable/fill project
30 (Yang Ming Terminal Redevelopment Project) and associated land use changes
31 would therefore not be in view. From the elevated Promenade, views extend to the
32 south over the top of the stacked containers, but facilities along Berths 126-139 at the
33 West Basin and TraPac Container terminals substantially block sight of the Yang
34 Ming Terminal Redevelopment Project and associated land use changes. The
35 proposed appealable/fill project and land use changes would therefore introduce no
36 contrast with existing Port features. The visual condition for views from “C” Street

1 and Wilmington Waterfront Park would remain **Visual Modification Class 4 and 3**,
2 respectively.

3 Banning's Landing

4 One proposed appealable/fill project (Berths 187-189 Liquid Bulk Relocation
5 Project) would be within the field of view from Banning's Landing. Construction
6 activities associated with the removal of tankage along Berths 187-189 would be
7 highly visible from Banning's Landing, but construction of the new wharf and the
8 relocation of tanks along Berths 191-194 would not introduce features visible from
9 this area. The existing liquid bulk terminal would be replaced by open space and
10 institutional land uses.

11 The proposed appealable/fill project would be seen in the foreground to the southeast
12 of Banning's Landing. As noted in Section 3.1.2.2.2, Existing Visual Resource
13 Condition, Banning's Landing is well within the Port environment, and all features
14 within the potentially affected views are inherently part of that setting. The frame of
15 reference is the industrial character of the Port and its specific function to receive or
16 load goods for transport. Construction is an ongoing process of a Port evolving to
17 meet changing demands of international shipping, one that is expressive of Port
18 function and structure. When operational, this proposed appealable/fill project would
19 be entirely within the established character of the Port, and no unfavorable contrast
20 would result. Visual conditions there would remain **Visual Modification Class 1**.

21 Harbor Freeway (I-110)

22 Two proposed appealable/fill projects would occur in proximity to the Harbor
23 Freeway: the Yang Ming Terminal Redevelopment and China Shipping Fill projects.
24 Proposed changes in land use include an additional 6 acres of fill at Berths 120-121
25 and 3 acres of cut at Berths 121-127 for the Yang Ming Terminal. The liquid bulk
26 facility at Berths 118-120 would be eliminated and replaced with container cargo
27 uses. Sixteen acres of fill would be added at Berth 102 for the China Shipping
28 Container Terminal and designated for container cargo uses.

29 Neither of these projects and land uses would be within the critical highway-based
30 views described earlier in this assessment. Roadside obstructions conceal from view
31 the backlands of the TraPac, Yang Ming, and China Shipping terminals. The two
32 proposed appealable/fill projects would occur at the ground plane within the
33 backlands of the latter two terminals, so they would not be seen. Therefore, no
34 unfavorable contrast would result from these projects and the visual conditions would
35 remain **Visual Modification Class 3**.

36 Main Channel, Adjacent Areas and San Pedro Waterfront

37 The proposed appealable/fill project nearest to the Main Channel and adjacent areas
38 and the San Pedro Waterfront is the Al Larson Marina at Fish Harbor. It would not be
39 within critical public views, as would be the case for the two other projects at Fish
40 Harbor (Tri Marine Expansion and 338 Cannery Street Adaptive Reuse), Pier 300
41 (Berth 300 Development), and conversion of Berth 301 to liquid bulk or container
42 cargo uses. It is possible that land use changes within the Southwest Marine Shipyard
43 may be visible. The proposed changes include converting recreational boating to
44 maritime support and vacant land changing to maritime support and break bulk.
45 These land use changes may be noticeable from points within the Main Channel and

1 from the southeast end of Ports O'Call Village and the adjacent marina. Changes
2 from recreational boating and vacant land to maritime support and break bulk would
3 be entirely within the established character of the Port, and no unfavorable contrast
4 would result. Similarly, conversion of Berth 301 from maritime support to liquid bulk
5 or container cargo uses would be within the established character of the Port.
6 Therefore, the condition of the potentially affected views would continue to be rated
7 ***Visual Modification Class 1.***

8 Shields Drive

9 Two proposed appealable/fill projects and associated land use changes would occur
10 within the field of view from Shields Drive. The Yang Ming Terminal
11 Redevelopment Project, would entail 6 acres of fill at Berths 120-121, 3 acres of cut
12 at Berths 121-127, about 3,400 feet of new wharf, and a 20-acre backland expansion
13 near Berths 118-120. The China Shipping Fill Project would include a 16-acre fill at
14 Berth 102 for additional cargo uses.

15 The frame of reference for assessing impacts on views from Shields Drive is the
16 residential character of the area. Of the proposed appealable/fill projects, the Yang
17 Ming Terminal Redevelopment, though technically in the field of view, would not be
18 visible from Shields Drive. A number of terminal facilities would block views of
19 construction activity and features of operation. In contrast, the 16-acre fill for the
20 China Shipping Project would be in view. Within the China Shipping Terminal, fill
21 and expansion projects are characteristic of the area, and additional container storage
22 space would not be noticeable. However, in relation to views from a residential area,
23 industrial construction activities are not compatible. Nonetheless, the duration of the
24 activities would be temporary. When operational, these projects would be entirely
25 within the established character of the Port, would present no observable contrast
26 with existing features there, and not noticeably pose additional unfavorable contrast
27 in relation to the residential character of the Shields Drive residential area. The visual
28 condition for the affected views would continue to be ***Visual Modification Class 4.***

29 San Pedro Bluffs Residential Area

30 Four proposed appealable/fill projects would be within the field of view from San
31 Pedro Bluffs Residential Area: Al Larson Marina; Tri Marine Expansion; 338
32 Cannery Street Adaptive Reuse; and, Berth 300 Development. Proposed land use
33 changes, including conversion of Berth 301 to liquid bulk or container cargo uses,
34 would also be within the panoramic field of view from this area.

35 The San Pedro Bluffs Residential Area derives its valued aesthetic image from the
36 character of immediate residential setting in conjunction with distant views to the
37 southeast and south of the Outer Harbor, open ocean, and Catalina Island. The
38 presence and activity of construction equipment associated with development of
39 these projects technically would be incongruous with the residential character of the
40 San Pedro Bluffs. However, they would not be noticeable given the following factors.
41 First, there is no indication that construction activities for these projects would be
42 concurrent, so they would not be cumulatively visible at one time. Second, the
43 viewing distances range from about 1.9 to over 2.5 miles for these projects,
44 indicating that the presence and movement of equipment and work forces would not
45 be noticeable within the wider Port context. In conclusion, there would be no
46 observable contrast with the Port setting, all activities appearing to be part of the

1 distant Port environment and adding no additional increment of unfavorable contrast
2 relative to the residential setting of the San Pedro Bluffs.

3 During operation of the proposed appealable/fill projects, project features would be
4 distant (1.9 to 2.5 miles away). The proposed land use changes within the available
5 panorama would also be distant from the Bluffs (1.9 to 3.6 miles away). As would be
6 the case for construction activities, the features of these projects once complete and
7 the land use changes would blend with the overall Port context. The character of the
8 existing Port setting would be unaffected and continue to dominate views from the
9 Bluffs. No additional and unfavorable contrast with the features associated with the
10 San Pedro Bluffs Residential Area would be introduced by the proposed Program,
11 and the visual condition of the subject views would continue to be **Visual**
12 **Modification Class 4**.

13 Lookout Point Park

14 The proposed appealable/fill projects that would be in view from San Pedro Bluffs
15 Residential Area would also be in view from Lookout Point Park. The character of
16 the distant and panoramic view across the ports is a valued aesthetic image relative to
17 Lookout Point Park. Therefore, the Port's environment is the context for assessing
18 changes in visual condition potentially affecting views from this park. Regarding
19 construction of the proposed appealable/fill projects for the proposed Program, within
20 the Port context, the presence and activity of construction equipment and work forces
21 associated with these projects would be consistent with the ongoing Port process of
22 serving the changing requirements of international shipping, the cruise industry,
23 tourism, recreation, and improving the Port-community interface. The viewing
24 distances range from 1.8 to 2.5 miles for these projects. At such distances and
25 considered in the Port-wide context, the expected scale and type of the equipment
26 and the construction activities expected for each project would not be noticeable.
27 Therefore, construction of the proposed appealable/fill projects would not introduce
28 observable and unfavorable contrast with the Port setting.

29 Concerning the operation phase of the proposed appealable/fill projects and
30 anticipated land use changes within the field of view, the description relative to the
31 San Pedro Bluffs Residential Area largely applies to views from Lookout Point Park.
32 The projects and land use changes, all being distant, have limited potential
33 individually and collectively, to introduce features that would be discernible in the
34 subject views. Moreover, they would be seen as part of the varied mix of land uses
35 within the Port, and would not introduce an unfavorable contrast to the existing
36 visual conditions within the Port setting across the wide panorama available. The
37 existing setting would retain its character and the visual condition of the affected
38 views from Lookout Point Park would remain the same (**Visual Modification**
39 **Class 1**).

40 Cabrillo Beach and Vicinity

41 None of the proposed appealable/fill projects or land use changes would be within
42 views from points along Cabrillo Beach, its vicinity, and the fishing pier. These are
43 low-oblique views from points at or close to the elevation of the Port, and features of
44 the Cabrillo Marina, the Port Liquid Bulk Terminal, Reservation Point, and Piers 300
45 and 400 block views of these projects and land use changes. Of the various

1 appealable/fill projects and land use changes occurring under the PMPU, none would
2 contribute to the aesthetic value of the Port environment.

3 **Impact Determination**

4 *Construction and Operations*

5 The proposed Program would not contrast with the existing visual character or
6 quality of areas seen from critical public viewing positions or the “valued aesthetic
7 image” of those areas. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

8 **Mitigation Measures**

9 No mitigation is required.

10 **Residual Impacts**

11 No residual impacts would occur.

12 **Impact AES-4: The proposed Program would not result in a new**
13 **source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect**
14 **day or nighttime views in the area.**

15 **Planning Areas 2 – 4**

16 *Construction and Operations*

17 It is assumed that it is the Port’s policy to allow no nighttime construction lighting in
18 areas where the public would be exposed or would require measures to assure no
19 offsite spill of such lighting. Therefore, there would be no construction-related
20 impacts related to light and glare due to implementing the proposed appealable/fill
21 projects or land use changes under the proposed Program.

22 Regarding operation of the proposed appealable/fill projects and land use changes, all
23 new and upgrade lighting within the Port would meet the standards of the terminal
24 lighting design guidelines stipulated in the *Port of Los Angeles Portwide Light and*
25 *Glare Survey Findings* (Port 2006). LAHD engineering would measure the light level
26 at strategic points prior to upgrades to new lighting systems and light levels at the
27 same points after the upgrades to demonstrate that a reduction in light spill offsite
28 had occurred (Haddadian 2012, personal communication).

29 **Impact Determination**

30 *Construction and Operations*

31 Based on implementation of LAHD design guidelines, the proposed Program would
32 result in no increase in light emissions to offsite viewing positions. Therefore, no
33 impacts would occur.

1 **Mitigation Measures**

2 No mitigation is required.

3 **Residual Impacts**

4 No residual impacts would occur.

5 **Impact AES-5: The proposed Program would not result in**
6 **substantial shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.**

7 **Planning Areas 2 – 4**

8 *Construction and Operations*

9 Existing shadow-sensitive land uses occur only in PMPU Planning Area 1 within the
10 vicinity of the World Cruise Center, Catalina Terminal, Maritime Museum, Ports
11 O’Call Village, and within or near 22nd Street Park and Bloch Field, Cabrillo Marina,
12 and Cabrillo Beach. Only the proposed appealable/fill projects and land use changes
13 occurring southeast, south, and southwest of these public use areas would have the
14 potential to cast shadows on them. However, no such projects or land use changes
15 would occur in these areas, so no shadows would be cast upon shadow-sensitive land
16 uses.

17 Development associated with the proposed appealable/fill projects and land use
18 changes under the proposed Program would not affect shadow-sensitive land uses
19 outside the PMPU area. In general, shading produced by new facilities and
20 infrastructure would be limited to within individual project sites, adjacent waters, and
21 industrial areas.

22 **Impact Determination**

23 *Construction and Operations*

24 The proposed Program would not create new areas of shadow on any shadow-
25 sensitive land uses. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

26 **Mitigation Measures**

27 No mitigation is required.

28 **Residual Impacts**

29 No residual impacts would occur.

30 **Impact AES-6: The proposed Program would not result in impacts**
31 **inconsistent with guidelines and regulations established to**
32 **protect aesthetic/visual resources.**

Planning Areas 2 – 4

Construction and Operations

Under Impact AES-6, an impact would be significant if it were not consistent with LORS supporting policies and objectives applicable to the protection of features and views of aesthetic/scenic value. Because there would be no adverse impacts from the proposed Program, there would be no inconsistency with applicable rules and regulations.

Impact Determination

Construction and Operations

In the absence of visual impacts, there would be no inconsistency with applicable rules and regulations. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No residual impacts would occur.

3.1.5 Summary Impact Determination

Table 3.1-1 summarizes the impact determinations of the proposed Program related to aesthetics and visual resources. Identified potential impacts are based on state and city of Los Angeles significance criteria, and the scientific judgment of the report preparers.

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

Table 3.1-1. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Aesthetics/Visual Resources Associated with the Proposed Program

<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	<i>Impact Determination</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Impact After Mitigation</i>
<i>Construction</i>			
AES-1: Construction of the proposed Program would not cause substantial, adverse effects on a scenic vista.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
AES-2: Construction of the proposed Program would not cause substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within [view from] a state scenic highway.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact

Table 3.1-1. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Aesthetics/Visual Resources Associated with the Proposed Program

<i>Environmental Impacts</i>	<i>Impact Determination</i>	<i>Mitigation Measures</i>	<i>Impact After Mitigation</i>
AES-3: Construction of the proposed Program would not cause a substantial degradation of existing visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
AES-4: Construction of the proposed Program would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
AES-5: Construction of the proposed Program would not result in substantial shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
AES-6: Construction of the proposed Program would not result in impacts inconsistent with guidelines and regulations established to protect aesthetic/visual resources.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
<i>Operations</i>			
AES-1: Operation of the proposed Program would not cause substantial, adverse effects on a scenic vista.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
AES-2: Operation of the proposed Program would not cause substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within [view from] a state scenic highway.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
AES-3: Operation of the proposed Program would not cause a substantial degradation of existing visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
AES-4: Operation of the proposed Program would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
AES-5: Operation of the proposed Program would not result in substantial shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact
AES-6: Operation of the proposed Program would not result in impacts inconsistent with guidelines and regulations established to protect aesthetic/visual resources.	No impact	No mitigation is required	No impact

1 **3.1.6 Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

2 No significant unavoidable impacts to aesthetics/visual resources would occur as a
 3 result of implementation of the proposed Program.

This page intentionally left blank.