Section 3.1

Aesthetics and Visual Resources

SECTION SUMMARY

This section characterizes the existing aesthetic conditions in the proposed project area and assesses how the construction and operation of the proposed Project or an alternative would alter them. The aesthetics and visual resources impact analysis evaluates and identifies potential impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project or an alternative on locally designated scenic highways, scenic resources, light and glare, and visual character of the proposed project area.

The primary features of the proposed Project and alternatives that could affect aesthetic resources includes the raising of up to six existing cranes, removal of up to two cranes, and the addition of up to four new cranes. Additional project-related features and activities such as dredging, pile driving, wharf crane rail extension, backlands repairs and improvements, and expansion of the TICTF on-dock rail are also considered in this analysis.

Section 3.1, Aesthetics and Visual Resources, provides the following:

- A description of existing visual characteristics in the Port area;
- A description of key areas from which the proposed Project or alternatives would be visible;
- A description of existing night lighting conditions;
- A description of applicable local, state, and federal regulations and policies regarding visual resources and scenic highway designations in the proposed project area;
- A discussion of the methodology used to determine whether the proposed Project or alternatives would result in an impact on aesthetic and visual resources; and
- An impact analysis of the proposed Project and three alternatives, which includes simulated photos of the future buildout conditions under the proposed Project.

Key Points of Section 3.1:

The proposed Project or an alternative would continue the operation of the site as a container terminal, and its operations would be consistent with other container terminals and other uses in the proposed project area.

Neither the proposed Project nor any of the alternatives would result in a significant impact on aesthetic resources under either CEQA or NEPA. Specifically:

- Neither the proposed Project nor any alternative would result in adverse effects to a scenic vista or a designated scenic resource by obstructing views.
Neither the proposed Project nor any alternative would be inconsistent with the working Port landscape or result in the obstruction of views from locally designated scenic routes in the proposed project area.

Neither the proposed Project nor any alternative would substantially change or degrade the visual character or quality of the proposed project area from representative key viewing locations.

Neither the proposed Project nor any alternative would result in blockages of views of visual resources such as the Vincent Thomas Bridge.

Neither the proposed Project nor any alternative would cause negative changes to the visual character and quality of the existing landscape in the proposed project area or surrounding areas.
3.1.1 Introduction

This section characterizes the existing aesthetic conditions in the proposed project area and assesses how the construction and operation of the proposed Project or an alternative would alter them. This visual evaluation employs assessment methods based, in part, on those used by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (USDOT 1988) and the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM). It also uses other accepted visual analysis techniques as summarized in *Foundations for Visual Project Analysis* (Smardon et al. 1986). The analysis addresses the aesthetic topics that the City of Los Angeles defines as aesthetics, views, and shading. The analysis includes a systematic documentation of the visual setting and an evaluation of visual changes associated with the proposed Project and alternatives.

3.1.1.1 Terminology Used in this Visual Analysis

The definitions of terms used in this section to describe and evaluate the visual resources of the proposed project site are listed below.

- A *viewshed* is the surface area visible from a particular location or sequence of locations (e.g., roadway or trail).
- *Focal views* provide focused visual access to a particular object, scene, setting, or feature of visual interest.
- *Panoramic* views provide unfocused visual access to a large geographic area for which the field of view can be quite wide and extend into the distance. Panoramic views are usually associated with vantage points located on high ground and can provide views of valued resources, such as mountains, valleys, cityscapes, or the ocean. They also can provide views of an area not commonly available.
- *Focal points* are areas that draw the attention of the viewer, such as prominent structural features and water features.
- Views might be discussed in terms of *foreground, middleground, and background views*. Foreground views are those immediately presented to the viewer and include objects at close range that could tend to dominate the view. The foreground generally includes the area extending 0.25 to 0.5 mile from the viewer. Middleground views occupy the center of the viewshed and tend to include objects that are the center of attention if they are sufficiently large or visually different from adjacent visual features. The middleground zone generally consists of the area that lies 0.5 to 3.0 miles from the viewer. Background views include distant objects and other objects that make up the horizon. Objects in the background fade to obscurity with increasing distance. In the context of the background, the skyline can be an important location because highlighted objects above this point are against the background of the sky or ocean. The background zone generally consists of the portion of the view that lies 3 miles and farther from the viewer.
- *Scenic views* or *vistas* are the panoramic public views that provide visual access to natural features, including views of the ocean, striking or unusual natural terrain, or unique urban or historic features (City of Los Angeles 2001).
Visual quality, as defined by FHWA, has to do with the excellence of the visual experience. The evaluative criteria that FHWA uses to determine the level of visual quality are vividness, intactness, and unity. FHWA defines vividness as “…the visual power or memorability of landscape components as they combine in striking and distinctive visual patterns.” The definition of intactness is “…the visual integrity of the natural and manmade landscape and its freedom from encroaching elements; this factor can be present in well-kept urban and rural landscapes as well as in natural settings.” Lastly, FHWA defines unity as “…the visual coherence and compositional harmony of the landscape considered as a whole; it frequently attests to the careful design of individual components in the landscape” (USDOT 1988).

### 3.1.2 Environmental Setting

#### 3.1.2.1 Existing Visual Conditions

**Project Landscape Context**

The proposed project site is located on Terminal Island, a highly industrialized area within the Port. The topography of Terminal Island is flat, with views of the hills of San Pedro to the west and the Vincent Thomas Bridge to the south. The most visually prominent features on Terminal Island from surrounding higher elevation areas are the shipping and container terminals and associated operations.

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 infrastructure required to support Port operations. As a result, the Port is now a large and distinctive landscape of its own. The general appearance of operations can be characterized by exposed infrastructure, open storage, industrial buildings, and mobile equipment (i.e., cranes, containers, and railcars) with high-visibility colors.

The visual character in the vicinity of the proposed Project is defined by Port-related industrial uses. Major features visible in the landscape of the Port include berths, warehouses, container yards, tank farms, processing plants, buildings, parking lots, fixed and mobile equipment, and related infrastructure such as bridges, intermodal facilities, rail lines and spurs, oil derricks, pipelines, and gantry cranes. Panoramic views of the working Port landscape are available from Lookout Point and Deana Dana Friendship Park.

A large number and variety of watercraft use Port facilities. These range from small recreational and commercial fishing boats to large vessels, such as container ships, crude oil carriers, and cruise ships. In recent years, the development trend throughout the Port has been toward berths and backlands capable of accommodating larger container ships and increased cargo throughput. As a result, longer berths and taller cranes with longer booms have been required. These changes have altered the visual character of the Port by increasing the scale of the facilities visible in the landscape.

**Project Site Features**

The existing 185-acre YTI Terminal includes: two operating berths (Berths 212–213 and Berths 214–216); one non-operational berth (Berths 217–220); 14 wharf gantry cranes
(10 operating) and mobile equipment used to handle containers (i.e., forklifts, RTGs, top-picks, yard tractors, and other equipment typical of terminal operations); an on-dock railyard and associated equipment; a cargo ship unloading area, a large parking/storage yard, a container and equipment wash area, a maintenance and repair area, a power shop area, a marine tower area, a fuel dispensing area, a gear room area, various supply storage areas, a warehouse and consolidation area, a crane maintenance area, and an administration building area. For a complete list of existing facilities at the YTI Terminal, refer to Section 2.4.4.1 and Figure 2-3 in Chapter 2, Project Description.

### 3.1.2.2 Methodology for Evaluating Existing Aesthetic Conditions

FHWA defines the components of visual experience to include the visual resources, which are evaluated in terms of the visual character and quality of the visible environment. It also defines and assesses viewer response in terms of the exposure of the public to the environment of interest and the sensitivity of the public to the character and quality of the proposed project area. The FHWA guidance was used for documenting and assessing the existing aesthetic conditions of the proposed project area.

### Visual Character

FHWA guidance directs the systematic description of the visual character of the proposed project setting. FHWA specifies (USDOT 1988):

Descriptions of visual character can distinguish at least two levels of attributes: pattern elements and visual character. Visual pattern elements are the primary visual attributes of objects; they include form, line, color, and texture. The form of an object is its visual mass, bulk, or shape. Line is introduced by the edges of objects or parts of objects. The color of an object is both its value or reflective brightness (light, dark) and its hue (red, green). Texture is apparent surface coarseness. Our awareness of these pattern elements varies with distance. From afar, only the largest objects are seen as individual forms and we may see a city hillside as textured surface. Distance also attenuates the intensity of color.

The visual relationships between these pattern elements can be important secondary visual attributes of an object or an entire landscape. For example, there is a great difference between the visual character of a two-lane country road and an eight-lane freeway, although both may exhibit similar line, color, and texture. The visual contrast between a highway project and its visual environment can frequently be traced to four aspects of pattern character: dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity.

Specific components in a landscape may be visually dominant because of position, extent, or contrast of basic pattern elements. Scale is the apparent size relationship between a landscape component and its surroundings; an object can be made to look smaller or larger in scale by manipulating its visual pattern elements. Visual diversity is a function of the number, variety, and intermixing of visual pattern elements. Continuity is the uninterrupted flow of pattern elements in a landscape and the maintenance of visual relationships between immediately connected or related landscape components.
Visual Quality

The existing visual quality was categorized using three components: vividness, intactness, and unity (USDOT 1988). The combined result of all three criteria indicated the degree of quality of the landscape.

- Vividness refers to the drama, memorability, or distinctiveness of contrasting landscape elements. The degree of vividness is influenced by four elements – landform, vegetation, water features, and manmade elements.
- Intactness is the integrity of the natural and built landscape, and the extent to which the landscape is free from visual encroachment.
- Unity is the degree to which landscape elements join together to form a coherent, harmonious visual pattern.

Viewing Audience and Sensitivity

Viewer sensitivity, or viewer concern about views that the public may experience, is assessed in terms of the character and quality of the proposed project area, the exposure to a scenic resource, the proximity of viewers to the resource, the relative elevation of viewers to the resource, the frequency and duration of views, number of viewers, and types and expectations of the viewer. Generally, visual sensitivity increases as the total number of viewers, frequency, and duration of viewing activities increase. The degree of visual sensitivity is treated as occurring at one of the following four levels (USDOT 1988).

- High Sensitivity. High sensitivity suggests that at least some part of the public is likely to react strongly to a threat to visual quality impairment. Concern is expected to be great because the affected views are rare, unique, or in other ways special to the region or locale. A highly concerned public is assumed to be more aware of any given level of adverse change and less tolerant than a public that has little concern. A small modification of the existing landscape may be visually distracting to a highly sensitive public and represent a substantial reduction in visual quality.

- Moderate Sensitivity. Moderate sensitivity suggests that the public would probably voice some concern over visual impacts of moderate to high intensity. Often the affected views are secondary in importance or are similar to others commonly available to the public. Noticeably adverse changes would probably be tolerated if the essential character of the views remains dominant.

- Low Sensitivity. Low sensitivity is considered to prevail where the public is expected to have little concern about changes in the landscape. Only a visual impact of the greatest intensity would be perceived as substantial (significant).

- No Sensitivity. There is no sensitivity where the potentially affected views are not “public” (not accessible to the general public) or where there are no indications that the affected views are valued by the public.

3.1.2.3 Local Scenic Routes

Local scenic routes are listed as City-designated scenic highways in Appendix E of the City General Plan Transportation Element (City of Los Angeles 1999a). Within the San Pedro community, the scenic highway designated route begins along John S. Gibson
Boulevard adjacent to the I-110 (Harbor Freeway) at Harry Bridges Boulevard, traverses under the Vincent Thomas Bridge, and continues along Harbor Boulevard before wrapping around Lookout Point and ending at the city limit at the western terminus of Paseo del Mar. There are four City-designated scenic highway segments within the vicinity of the proposed Project, including: (1) John S. Gibson Boulevard from Harry Bridges Boulevard to Channel Street, (2) Pacific Avenue from Channel Street to Front Street, (3) Front Street from Pacific Avenue to Harbor Boulevard, and (4) Harbor Boulevard south of the Vincent Thomas Bridge. These designated roadway segments are considered scenic and highly sensitive in acknowledgment of the views of harbor activities and the Vincent Thomas Bridge, which is visible to northbound and southbound motorists.

- **John S. Gibson Boulevard**, between Harry Bridges Boulevard and Channel Street, extends approximately 1.4 miles southbound from Harry Bridges Boulevard before becoming Pacific Avenue near the intersection with Channel Street. Northbound travelers along this scenic route have fleeting views of the Yang Ming and TraPac Container Terminal facilities. Southbound travelers have limited views of the Vincent Thomas Bridge and no views of the proposed project site in either direction because of the angle of the road, terrain, and street-level developments, as well as other container terminal cranes.

- **Pacific Avenue** extends for about 0.3 mile near Channel Street to Front Street. Northbound travelers on Pacific Avenue have peripheral views of China Shipping Container Terminal facilities and no views of the proposed project site. Views of the proposed project site for southbound travelers are unavailable due to existing development at Smith’s Island.

- **Front Street** extends 0.5 mile along the eastern base of Knoll Hill between Pacific Avenue and Harbor Boulevard. Northbound travelers on Front Street have views that center on the roadway and China Shipping Container Terminal but do not have views of the proposed project area. For southbound travelers, views toward the proposed project site are unavailable due to existing Port development in the foreground, cranes at Smith’s Island, idled trucks, and stacks of containers.

- **Harbor Boulevard** extends 1.2 miles south to its terminus at Crescent Avenue. From the northern section of Harbor Boulevard (in the vicinity of the Vincent Thomas Bridge), primary views include the working Port and transportation infrastructure. Portions of existing YTI cranes are partially visible in the distance. Harbor Boulevard is lined with widely spaced palm trees, which provide a moderately high level of intactness and unity in the views. From the southern section of Harbor Boulevard, views are more panoramic and less obstructed toward the bridge, with Port facilities and container-laden ships in the foreground.

As described above, views of the project site from surrounding local scenic routes are only available from Harbor Boulevard and are not available from John S. Gibson Boulevard, Pacific Avenue, or Front Street. Therefore, existing aesthetic conditions in terms of visual quality and sensitivity can only be described from Harbor Boulevard. Sensitivity from Harbor Boulevard is considered high due to its designation as a local scenic route; however, due to the intervening elements between Harbor Boulevard and the YTI terminal described above, the level of vividness and intactness considered to be low to moderate.
The Vincent Thomas Bridge is not a designated scenic route but provides panoramic views of the Main Channel, West Turning Basin, and Port Complex. Although the views are vivid and attractive, views from the bridge are generally fleeting and highly obstructed by its features (i.e., alignment, median, and mesh fencing). Furthermore, the bridge is accessible to vehicles only, and no provisions were made for pedestrian or bicycle use. The relatively narrow traffic lanes of the bridge are the primary features of forward views.

3.1.2.4 Key Viewing Areas

An analysis of existing views toward the proposed project site was conducted to identify key viewing areas most visible to sensitive viewer groups (commuters, pedestrians, patrons, and residents) and to determine if the proposed project site is visible from these areas. Based on a windshield survey, field observations, and a review of maps from the San Pedro Community Plan, three key viewing area locations were selected that were representative of the most sensitive views. Figure 3.1-1 provides the location of the three representative viewpoints (VPs).

Catalina Express Terminal (VP-1)

Catalina Express Terminal is a sea transportation terminal located near the western terminus of the Vincent Thomas Bridge. It offers daily passenger transport services between the Port and Catalina Island. The terminal also includes a parking lot, a terminal building with two restaurants, and a large outdoor area. The outdoor area accommodates public seating and eating areas along a waterfront promenade and also serves as a waiting area for terminal customers.

Figure 3.1-2 provides a representative view of the proposed project site from the Catalina Express Terminal under existing conditions. From this area, visitors are afforded panoramic views of the YTI Terminal and the Vincent Thomas Bridge, including focal views of cranes 5–12 and P18–P19 in the middleground. Views of container stacks at Berths 214–216 and 217–220 are also partially visible from VP-1 in the middleground; however, they do not represent focal points in the viewshed. Due to the distance and the configuration of the YTI Terminal, views of Berths 212–213 and cranes 1–4 are not available from this representative viewpoint.

Views of the proposed project site from VP-1 exhibit high levels of vividness due to the contrast of the sky and water (e.g., Turning Basin) with the YTI Terminal. Views are partially encroached upon by the Vincent Thomas Bridge and the Catalina Express Terminal in the foreground; however, VP-1 maintains a moderately high level of intactness and unity since these foreground elements do not distract views from the existing cranes, which provide prominent focal points for the viewer in the middleground. While panoramic views onto the proposed project site are available from VP-1, viewer sensitivity is anticipated to be low because viewer expectations from Catalina Express include views of the working Port, including container terminals, cranes, and container stacks.

Wilmington Waterfront Park (VP-2)

Wilmington Waterfront Park is a 30-acre public park in Wilmington and is bounded by Harry Bridges Boulevard to the south, Lagoon Avenue to the east, C Street to the north,
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and Figueroa Street to the west. The park includes various recreational amenities, including pedestrian bridges, play equipment, and open grass areas.

Figure 3.1-3 provides a view of the project site from Wilmington Waterfront Park along Harry Bridges Boulevard. Looking toward the proposed project site, views comprise Harry Bridges Boulevard and landscaping improvements, container stacks at the TraPac Terminal, and utility improvements along Harry Bridges Boulevard in the foreground, including wooden poles, overhead transmission lines, and concrete streetlights. Views of the tops of most of the cranes at the YTI Terminal are available in the middleground. There are no background views available from VP-2.

Due to the location and nearby Port development, visitors expect views of a working port, which are considered to be moderately sensitive. The overall level of vividness from VP-2 view is low due to an abundance of components within the viewshed and a lack of distinct visual patterns. Similarly, the levels of intactness and unity are low due to the amount of encroaching elements and lack of visual coherence and harmony across the viewshed.

**Banning’s Landing (VP-3)**

Banning’s Landing serves as a public landing for personal watercraft and includes a community center and parking area along the harbor. Figure 3.1-4 depicts the view of the YTI Terminal from Banning’s Landing. A walkway along the waterfront provides harbor views of the Vopak and Pasha Wharves in the foreground, followed by views of YTI Terminal cranes and the tops of container stacks in the middleground. Container ships docked at the YTI Terminal are visible from this location, in addition to ships docked at the Vopak Wharf. There are no background views from VP-3.

Due to the location within an industrial area of the Port, viewers would expect to see Port-related improvements, and views are considered to be moderately sensitive. While the proposed project site is contrasted with the sky and water, the presence of the Vopak and Pasha Wharves diminishes the degree of vividness to a moderate level. The level of intactness is also considered to be moderate since focal views of the YTI Terminal cranes are somewhat unavailable and partially blocked by other Port development and other docked boats at the Vopak Wharf. Similarly, the overall level of unity is considered to be moderate as other ships and Port development compromise the visual harmony from Banning’s Landing.

**Other Harbor Views**

The Main Channel is the primary route for much of the shipping traffic approaching the Port berths, and it receives a moderate level of use for non-shipping traffic, including cruise ships, passenger ferries, sightseeing boats, and recreational craft. Much of the land along the western edge of the channel is devoted to recreational rather than shipping uses. Several harbor cruise lines depart daily from Berths 77, 78, and 79 at Ports O’Call Village. These cruises cross the Main Channel and ship basins, including the West Basin, providing visitors with a variety of waterside views of seaport operations. Such views include the waterfront, wharves, cranes, and ships. As cruise ships and passenger ferries travel up the Main Channel from the Outer Harbor, the Vincent Thomas Bridge comes into view. However, in much of the area in the channel, the full profile of the span of the bridge is partially blocked by the cranes at the Evergreen Container Terminal on the eastern shoreline of the channel. After ships pass the curve in the channel near
Berth 87, the Evergreen cranes start to pass out of view and the view of the bridge and its main span become relatively unobstructed. It is perhaps in this area directly in front of the World Cruise Center that the bridge best fulfills its role as the designated “welcoming landmark” for the area. For those on passenger vessels traveling up the Main Channel, the proposed project area is visible in the area behind the bridge.

Views from other public areas in San Pedro that include Terminal Island and the Port complex are available from Knoll Hill and Ports O’ Call, as well as higher elevations in the western San Pedro neighborhoods, including Averill Park and Lookout Point. From Knoll Hill, views of the proposed project site are unavailable; however, limited views of portions of the cranes are available from select locations within Knoll Hill. Views onto the site are mostly blocked by other terminal cranes and container stacks. Similarly, views from Ports O’ Call are not available due to intervening container terminal stacks and other Port development. The proposed project site is not visible from higher elevations within the San Pedro neighborhood. From Averill Park and Lookout Point, the YTI Terminal is not distinctly visible due to distance and intervening landscaping, trees, and residential development.

3.1.2.5 Existing Nighttime Lighting Conditions

The nighttime lighting environment within the proposed project vicinity consists mainly of ambient light produced from container-handling operations and other facility lighting in the Port. The major sources of illumination at the Port are the hundreds of down lights and floodlights attached to the tops of the tall light standards. High intensity boom lights are attached on top of shipping cranes along the edge of the many channels that feed into the Los Angeles Harbor. Additional nighttime sources of light in the vicinity include streetlights on New Dock Street, Pier S Avenue, and other nearby streets, adjacent terminal operations, and the headlights of the vehicles traveling on the roads.

3.1.3 Applicable Regulations

3.1.3.1 Port of Los Angeles Master Plan

An update to the PMP was approved by the Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners in August 2013 to provide for the short- and long-term development, expansion, and alteration of the Port through 2030. The updated PMP includes the previous amendments to the plan that was first adopted in 1980. The CCC will consider the PMP and include it as part of the City’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) once the Draft EIR is certified. The PMP is an overall planning document but does not contain any element specific to visual resources.

3.1.3.2 City of Los Angeles General Plan

The City of Los Angeles General Plan is an advisory document that consists of 11 City-wide Elements (Framework, Transportation, Infrastructure Systems, Housing, Noise, Air Quality, Conservation, Open Space, Historic Preservation and Cultural Resources, Safety, and Public Facilities and Services) plus the Land Use Element. The Land Use Element, in turn, is composed of 35 local area plans, known as community plans, as well as counterpart plans for the Port of Los Angeles and Los Angeles International Airport.
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Part of the Land Use Element, the Port of Los Angeles Plan was designed to provide a 20-year guide to the continued development and operation of the Port (City of Los Angeles 1982). This plan is consistent with the PMP. In addition, Objective 4 of the plan addresses the aesthetic concerns of neighboring communities. The plan states:

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

Transportation Element (Scenic Highway Guidelines)

Appendix E of the Transportation Element has established recommended guidelines for scenic highways lacking adopted corridor plans and addresses roadway design, earthwork and grading, signage, landscaping, signs/outdoor advertising, and utilities (City of Los Angeles 1999b). Although there are no state scenic highways or officially designated scenic lookouts, the recommendations of the Transportation Element are applicable.

3.1.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.1.4.1 Methodology

An assessment of visual and aesthetic changes under the proposed Project was conducted using federal, state, and local guidance, and visual simulations. As noted above, FHWA guidance was used to assess and analyze the character, quality, and sensitivity of views under existing and proposed project conditions in consideration of the CEQA and NEPA requirements and the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, which are further described below. A visual survey was conducted of the Port and neighboring areas to establish baseline (existing) visual and aesthetic conditions at three viewpoints. Existing and simulated images of the proposed project site and surrounding areas from these viewpoints are depicted in Figures 3.1-2 through 3.1-4. The simulated images illustrate how the proposed project site would appear after adding, removing, and modifying cranes at the YTI Terminal. The simulations involved the creation of crane models, which were based on the existing dimensions and color of the existing cranes at the YTI Terminal. The configuration of the cranes, including the anticipated boom angles of each crane, were considered and included in the simulations. All other proposed project-related improvements, such as dredging and the TICTF and backlands improvements, would not be visible from any of the viewpoints, and those proposed changes are not illustrated in the visual simulations.

CEQA Baseline

Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a project that exist at the time of the NOP. These environmental conditions normally would constitute the baseline physical conditions by which the CEQA lead agency determines if an impact is significant. The NOP for the proposed Project was published in April 2013. For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the CEQA baseline takes into account the throughput for the 12-month calendar year preceding NOP publication (January through December 2012) in order to provide a representative characterization of activity levels throughout the complete calendar year.
preceding release of the NOP. In 2012, the YTI Terminal encompassed approximately
185 acres under its long-term lease, supported 14 cranes (10 operating), and handled
approximately 996,109 TEUs and 162 vessel calls. The CEQA baseline conditions are
also described in Section 2.7.1 and summarized in Table 2-1.

The CEQA baseline represents the setting at a fixed point in time. The CEQA baseline
differs from the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) in that the No Project Alternative
addresses what is likely to happen at the proposed project site over time, starting from the
existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative allows for growth at the
proposed project site that could be expected to occur without additional approvals,
whereas the CEQA baseline does not.

NEPA Baseline

For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the evaluation of significance under NEPA is defined
by comparing the proposed Project or other alternative to the NEPA baseline. The NEPA
baseline conditions are described in Section 2.7.2 and summarized in Table 2-1. The
NEPA baseline condition for determining significance of impacts includes the full range
of construction and operational activities the applicant could implement and is likely to
implement absent a federal action, in this case the issuance of a USACE permit.

Unlike the CEQA baseline, which is defined by conditions at a point in time, the NEPA
baseline is not bound by statute to a “flat” or “no-growth” scenario. Instead, the NEPA
baseline is dynamic and includes increases in operations for each study year (2015, 2016,
2017, 2020, and 2026), which are projected to occur absent a federal permit. Federal
permit decisions focus on direct impacts of the proposed Project to the aquatic
environment, as well as indirect and cumulative impacts in the uplands determined to be
within the scope of federal control and responsibility. Significance of the proposed
Project or the alternatives under NEPA is defined by comparing the proposed Project or
the alternatives to the NEPA baseline.

The NEPA baseline, for purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, is the same as the No Federal
Action Alternative. Under the No Federal Action Alternative (Alternative 2), no
dredging, dredged material disposal, in-water pile installation, or crane
installation/extension would occur. Expansion of the TICTF and extension of the crane
rail would also not occur. The No Federal Action Alternative includes only backlands
improvements consisting of slurry sealing, deep cold planning, asphalt concrete overlay,
restriping, and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and
pipes necessary to complete repairs. These activities do not change the physical or
operational capacity of the existing terminal.

The NEPA baseline assumes that by 2026 the terminal would handle up to approximately
1,692,000 TEUs annually, accommodate 206 annual ships calls at two berths, and be
occupied by 14 cranes (10 operating).

3.1.4.2 Thresholds of Significance

CEQA Criteria

The following thresholds based on the L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide (City of
Los Angeles 2006) are used to determine whether the proposed Project or an alternative
would result in significant impacts under CEQA.
AES-1: A project or alternative would have a significant impact if it would result in an adverse effect on a scenic vista from a designated scenic resource due to obstruction of view.

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

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

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

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

This City criterion is related to CEQA Appendix D Aesthetics questions I.a) “Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?” and I.b) “Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?” The L.A. CEQA Thresholds Guide states:

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

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

AES-3: A project or alternative would have a significant impact if it would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings.
This City criterion is related to CEQA Appendix D Aesthetics question I.c) “Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?” The L.A.CEQA Thresholds Guide states:

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

AES-4: A project or alternative would have a significant impact if it would create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

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

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

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

NEPA Criteria

The following threshold is used to determine if the proposed Project or an alternative would result in significant impacts under NEPA:

AES-5: A project or alternative would have a significant impact if it would result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response.

To evaluate the proposed Project and alternatives in the context of NEPA, the visual impact analysis was conducted based on the analytic principles of the FHWA’s Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects publication and BLM visual resource management systems. The FHWA visual impact assessment system requires the assessment of a project in terms of the degree of change it creates in the visual character and quality of its visual setting and the implications of those changes for viewer response. In assessing these changes, the FHWA approach calls for evaluation of the compatibility of pattern elements (i.e., form, line, color, and texture) of the introduced elements with the existing landscape setting and the compatibility of the pattern character of the new elements, based on consideration of the dimensions of dominance, scale diversity, and continuity. To consider the implications of the changes for viewer response, the FHWA method considers viewer exposure (the extent to which viewers see the proposed project changes); viewer sensitivity, which is a product of a combination of viewer activities and awareness; local values and goals regarding the landscape; and the cultural significance of the landscape features affected by the proposed Project.
This approach for the evaluation of aesthetic effects draws heavily on an analytic framework developed by Lawrence Headley of Headley Associates, Santa Barbara, California. The Headley approach has been applied successfully to analysis of a range of project types over the past 15 years. The Headley approach defines “visual impact” and “visual impact intensity” as follows (Lawrence Headley and Associates 2008):

- An “adverse change” in aesthetics/visual resources occurs when, relative to a public view:
  - An action will perceptibly change features of the physical environment so that they no longer appear to be characteristic of those inherent to the region and/or locale;
  - An action will introduce features to the physical environment that are perceptibly uncharacteristic of the region and/or locale; and/or
  - Visual access to the landscape or the visibility of one or more valued features of the landscape will be adversely affected (e.g., partially or totally blocked from view).

(Features that are or have become uncharacteristic are those that appear out of place, discordant or distracting.)

- The terms “intensity” and “magnitude” are used interchangeably. The magnitude—or intensity—of a visual impact is the degree to which existing visual conditions would change because of features of project construction and operation. Visual conditions are expressed in terms of visual modification (VM) classes (Table 3.1-1).

### Table 3.1-1: Visual Modification Class Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VM Class 1</th>
<th>VM Class 2</th>
<th>VM Class 3</th>
<th>VM Class 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not noticeable:</strong> Changes in the landscape that have occurred in the past, or potentially could occur in the future due to a proposed project, when within public view generally would be overlooked by all but the most concerned and interested viewers. They generally would not be noticed unless pointed out (inconspicuous because of such factors as distance, screening, low contrast with context, or other features in view, including the adverse impacts of past activities).</td>
<td><strong>Noticeable, visually subordinate:</strong> Changes in the landscape that have occurred in the past, or potentially could occur in the future due to a proposed project, when within public view would not be overlooked (noticeable to most without being pointed out). They could attract some attention but do not compete for it with other features in the field of view, including the adverse impacts of past activities.</td>
<td><strong>Distracting, visually co-dominant:</strong> Changes in the landscape that have occurred in the past, or potentially could occur in the future due to a proposed project, when within public view would compete for attention with other features in view. (Attention is drawn to the change about as frequently as to other features in the landscape.)</td>
<td><strong>Visually dominant, demands attention:</strong> Changes in the landscape that have occurred in the past, or potentially could occur in the future due to a proposed project, when within public view would be the focus of attention and tend to become the subject of the view. Such changes often cause a lasting impression of the affected landscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LAHD 2011.
In applying this classification system to evaluation of view changes, a number of factors affecting the context of views are considered: viewer activity; primary viewing direction(s); viewing distance; project exposure; duration of viewing; relationship of the subject view to the sequence available; the presence of existing features of competing visual interest; and established features tending to draw attention toward the project facilities (focal point sensitivity).

The intensity of the impact (the degree of change as identified by the visual modification class ratings) is compared to the existing level of visual quality and the sensitivity of the affected view to determine if a substantial negative reduction in visual character and quality is likely to occur.

3.1.4.3 Impact Determination

Proposed Project

Major elements of the proposed Project are described in Chapter 2, Project Description. Various infrastructure and improvements associated with the implementation of the proposed Project could be visible during construction and operation, including construction vessels during dredging activities at Berths 214–216 and 217–220; the raising of up to six existing cranes, removal of up to two cranes, and addition of up to four new cranes; the extension of the 100-foot gauge rail along the wharf deck; improvements/repairs at the backlands area for container terminal operations; and a new rail storage track within the existing TICTF on-dock rail yard. None of the proposed crane additions or modifications would exceed the height or outreach of the largest existing cranes at the site.

CEQA Impact Determination

Impact AES-1: Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The proposed Project would not remove, add, or modify features that substantially contribute to the scenic value or visual character of the area, and it would not require grading or development of designated open space. The modified and replacement cranes would be consistent with the existing features of the Port landscape and would not contrast with the valued landscape features of the area. Other proposed project-related improvements, including dredging, installation of sheet and king piles, landside crane rail extension, ground repairs and maintenance in the backlands, and on-dock rail expansion at the TICTF, would not be visible from surrounding areas and would not result in any effects on a scenic vista.

Areas north of the locally designated scenic route along Harbor Boulevard would provide views of some of the cranes after implementation of the proposed Project; however, these viewpoints are distant from the proposed project site and primarily include views of the Port. Also, the proposed crane additions and modifications would be constructed and painted to match the existing cranes at the proposed project site and would appear similar to the existing cranes. While the crane height and outreach would be extended for some cranes to match the existing height and outreach of the four largest super post Panamax cranes (cranes 5–8), none of the proposed project crane improvements would exceed the
tallest cranes at the site. As such, distant views of the cranes from the southern portion of Harbor Boulevard are not expected to result in substantial changes to views because the dominant visual features would continue to be of adjacent development and intervening landscaping. Views of the proposed project area from the northern portion of Harbor Boulevard, Front Street, Pacific Avenue, and John S. Gibson Boulevard are impeded by adjacent development or topographic features, and no impacts from these scenic routes would occur.

Although an increase in the size of some of the existing cranes would occur relative to the CEQA baseline, the proposed Project would not adversely affect the aesthetic value of the area because it would be visually consistent with development in the surrounding areas of the Port and its main effect would be to further contribute to the image of a working Port, consistent with the City’s scenic highway designation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**Impact AES-2: Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway.**

The nearest officially designated state scenic highway is approximately 31 miles north of the proposed Project (State Highway 2, from approximately three miles north of Interstate 210 in La Cañada to the San Bernardino County Line). The nearest eligible state scenic highway is approximately nine miles northeast of the proposed Project (State Highway 1, from State Highway 19 near Long Beach to Interstate 5 south of San Juan Capistrano). The proposed project site is not visible from either of these locations. In addition to Caltrans’ officially designed and eligible state scenic highways, the City of Los Angeles has City-designated scenic highways that are used for local planning and development decisions and considerations. John S. Gibson Boulevard, Pacific Avenue, Front Street, and Harbor Boulevard are City-designated scenic highways because they afford views of the Port and the Vincent Thomas Bridge. As discussed under AES-1 above, there are no anticipated significant impacts on a scenic highway because of the distance of the proposed project site to the scenic highways or because no substantive changes to views from local scenic highways would occur.

The proposed improvements would not detract from views of the Main Channel and the recreational and commercial areas along its western banks toward the Vincent Thomas Bridge. The proposed modified and replacement cranes would be visible to motorists traveling on the Vincent Thomas Bridge, but the cranes and other improvements would not substantially change the view of the proposed project site or the working Port setting in that view.

Views of the Vincent Thomas Bridge from the north along John S. Gibson Boulevard, Pacific Avenue, or Front Street would remain unchanged; therefore, the new proposed
project features would not detract from views of the bridge. Furthermore, while the
proposed cranes would be larger than the existing cranes, they would not exceed the
height or outreach of the four largest existing cranes (cranes 5–8) and would not appear
to be substantially larger from the southern portions of Harbor Drive due to the distance
from the proposed project site and the variety of other visual elements within the
viewshed. The primary elements of views would consist of other cranes and Port
facilities, consistent with existing views; therefore, impacts would be less than significant
under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts
Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-3: Construction and operation of the proposed Project
would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or
quality of the site and its surroundings.

Substantial degradation of the visual character of the proposed project area is not
anticipated because Terminal Island and the Port areas are composed of industrial uses
consistent with the proposed Project’s improvements. Further, shadow-sensitive uses
would not be shaded by structures or equipment under the proposed Project. Shading
produced by cranes or other improvements would be confined to the proposed project site
and adjacent waterways and industrial uses. As a result, impacts would be less than
significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts
Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-4: Construction and operation of the proposed Project
would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would
adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

Under the proposed Project, potential impacts from an increase in on-site lighting would
result from up to two additional cranes and four additional operating cranes at the
proposed project site (up to 14 operational cranes and two non-operational cranes,
compared to 10 operating and four non-operating cranes under existing conditions).
Existing cranes at the YTI Terminal do provide for some lighting at the site; however, the
primary sources of light are the existing 100-foot tall mast light poles located throughout
the backlands and at the TICTF. Mobile light sources also would be somewhat increased
because of additional trips by trucks, cars, and cargo-moving equipment on the access
road and in the backland areas, and trains along the expanded on-dock rail. The
incremental change in ambient lighting at the proposed project site is not expected to
substantially change existing levels of ambient light at sensitive areas because the
immediate area is subject to industrial lighting under existing baseline conditions. The
level of sensitivity to changes in nighttime lighting conditions brought about by the
proposed Project is low because the residential areas in San Pedro are elevated above the
proposed project site and located about 0.75 mile to the west from the terminal wharf. In
addition, the overall lighting conditions under the proposed Project would be relatively
indistinguishable from existing conditions at the residential areas in San Pedro.

The visibility of this new lighting and its contribution to ambient lighting conditions in
areas around the proposed project site would be attenuated by a number of design and
operational measures mandated by the lighting guidelines the Port has adopted for
development projects. These design guidelines include the following:

**Light Fixtures**
Distribute the fixtures symmetrically or asymmetrically to minimize light trespass.
Use prismatic glass reflectors to control the spread of the illumination.
Use dark-colored shade accessories to prevent light spillover.

**Light Controls**
1) Design lights for flexibility to accommodate the varying nature of many spaces at one
time or for security purposes.
2) Use photocells and timers to automatically control lighting where feasible.

**Pole Distribution and Height**
1) Peripheral lighting adjacent to the residential community should focus lighting away
from the residential community.
2) Where feasible, equip floodlights with shields to prevent (light) spillover.
3) If feasible, lower pole height adjacent to hillside residential areas.

The localized nature of new shielded and/or downwardly directed lighting, intervening
development, and the distance of the proposed project site to the San Pedro residential
area would minimize lighting effects of the proposed Project. Therefore, impacts would
be less than significant under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**
No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**
Impacts would be less than significant.
NEPA Impact Determination

Impact AES-5: Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response.

Local Scenic Routes

Northbound travelers on Pacific Avenue, John S. Gibson Boulevard, and Front Street would not have views of the cranes and vessels berthed at the proposed project site. Southbound travelers would also not have clear views of the proposed project features due to the angle of the roadway and intervening landscaping features and other Port-related development in the middleground. In addition, the replacement and modified cranes would not obstruct or detract from views toward the Vincent Thomas Bridge. For travelers on the southern portions of Harbor Boulevard, the cranes at the proposed project site would be visible as northeast-facing views. However, the buildings, docked ships, landscape elements, and other features in the foreground and middleground would substantially block views of the cranes. The viewshed would continue to comprise a working port, consistent with the City’s scenic highways designation.

Existing views from various locations along these scenic routes already have a well-established character as a working port environment. Therefore, the changes in views brought about by the modified and replacement cranes would be less than significant in relation to the overall character and visual quality of the City-designated scenic highways.

Key Viewpoints

Catalina Express Terminal (VP-1)

From the Catalina Express terminal, the features of the proposed Project that would be most prominent would be the removal of up to two cranes, relocation of up to four cranes, and addition of up to four cranes. (A simulated view under proposed project conditions is provided in Figure 3.1-2). Modifications of cranes at the proposed project site would not degrade views of the Vincent Thomas Bridge. Overall, the cranes would be consistent in scale with other elements of the view, and the relocated and added cranes would be visually consistent with the overall view context. Therefore, the proposed Project would not substantially change the existing visual quality or character of this view.

Wilmington Waterfront Park (VP-2)

From Wilmington Waterfront Park, views of the tops of the 10 cranes to be replaced or modified would continue to be visible, and the proposed Project would not result in substantial changes to the existing visual quality. From the viewpoint illustrated in Figure 3.1-3, the proposed project features would not adversely affect the visual quality of the Port, which consists overwhelmingly of manmade structures, including ship terminals, container stacks, utility improvements, and cranes. The modification and replacement of 10 cranes at the YTI Terminal would slightly increase the size of the cranes; however, the existing and simulated views would largely remain the same and would not substantially change the existing visual quality or character of views from Wilmington Waterfront Park.
From viewpoints along Banning’s Landing, the modified and replacement cranes would be visible in the middleground, about 0.5 mile in the distance, and would appear along the existing row of cranes, as shown in the visual simulation in Figure 3.1-4. Since the modified and replacement cranes would be similar to the existing cranes in general appearance (i.e., the same color and similar dimensions), the presence of the proposed cranes would not detract from the overall sense of visual unity of the view. Although the modified and replacement cranes would appear slightly larger than some of the existing cranes and project-related actions would result in a net of two additional cranes at the YTI Terminal compared to existing conditions, the primary elements of the view would consist of other Port facilities, consistent with the existing views.

### Table 3.1-2: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Scenic Routes</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Level of Visual Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Character:</strong> The local scenic routes are designated as such due to the views of the working Port. Although heavily developed, YTI Terminal cranes could be seen from selected portions of the route along Harbor Boulevard.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>VM Class 2 (Noticeable, visually subordinate): The primary proposed project features visible as noticeable elements in views from the southern portion of the Harbor Boulevard would be the cranes seen in the middleground. The proposed Project would increase the density of the cranes and slightly extend the visual row of cranes but would not block views of scenic resources or compete with other features in the field of view. No significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Quality:</strong> Views onto the YTI Terminal are limited along local scenic routes; however, portions of cranes can be seen in the background from sections of Harbor Boulevard. Views of the cranes from Harbor Boulevard are partially blocked or mixed with views of the Vincent Thomas Bridge. Also, terminal features are visible in the middleground from the southern portions of the Harbor Boulevard, which creates a low level of vividness, intactness, and unity.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>VM Class 2 (Noticeable, visually subordinate): The new cranes would be visible in the middleground behind the Catalina Express Terminal but would be located next to existing identical cranes. Views of the proposed cranes would be consistent with those of the existing YTI Terminal, and introducing new cranes is not expected to result in unanticipated elements for views from the Catalina Express Terminal. No significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catalina Express Terminal

**Visual Character:** Views of the Port area from the Catalina Express Terminal are mixed, with a sea terminal and Vincent Thomas Bridge in the foreground and the proposed project site, including the wharf cranes, in the middleground.

**Visual Quality:** Some of the existing YTI cranes can be seen in the middleground. The Turning Basin and Vincent Thomas Bridge create a moderately high level of vividness. Levels of intactness and unity are also moderately high as views of the cranes are combined with views of containers at the YTI Terminal. Views of the proposed project site and the terminal cranes are mixed with foreground (sea terminal and Vincent Thomas Bridge) and middleground (Turning Basin) features. This view has a moderately high level of vividness and intactness and unity.
Table 3.1-2: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Proposed Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Visual Character and Quality</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Level of Visual Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilmington Waterfront Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Character: The park affords views of the heavily developed Port, West Harry Bridges Boulevard, and existing cranes at the proposed project site.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>VM Class 2 (Noticeable, visually subordinate): The primary project features visible as noticeable elements in the view would be the cranes seen in the middleground. The proposed Project would increase the density of cranes and slightly contribute to the visual row of cranes but would not block views of scenic resources or compete with other features in the field of view. No significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Quality: The cranes are viewed in the middleground amidst existing power lines, vegetation, and heavily developed Port uses, and they create a low level of vividness. Levels of intactness and unity are also low.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>VM Class 2 (Noticeable, visually subordinate): The primary project features visible as noticeable elements in the view would be the cranes seen in the middleground. The proposed Project would increase the density of cranes and slightly extend the visual row of cranes but would not block views of scenic resources or compete with other features in the field of view. No significant impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternative 1 – No Project**

Under Alternative 1, no Port action or federal action would occur. LAHD would not implement any terminal improvements. No new cranes would be added, and no dredging would occur. This alternative would not include extension of the 100-foot gauge crane rail, expansion of the TICTF on-dock rail yard, or backland repairs.

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing YTI Terminal would continue to operate as an approximately 185-acre container terminal. Based on the throughput projections, terminal operations are expected to grow over time as throughput demands increase. Under Alternative 1, the existing YTI Terminal would handle approximately 1,692,000 TEUs by 2026, which would result in 206 annual ship calls at the terminal.
The No Project Alternative would not preclude future improvements to the proposed project site. However, any future changes in use or new improvements with the potential to significantly impact the environment would need to be analyzed in a separate environmental document.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

**Impact AES-1:** Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

There would be no changes to the visual landscape within the proposed project area under Alternative 1, as no upland, in-water, or over-water terminal improvements would occur. There would be no change in the proposed project site’s aesthetic value under Alternative 1 relative to the CEQA baseline conditions since no improvements would be implemented. Although this alternative would result in increased vessel calls relative to the CEQA baseline, increases in moored vessels at the terminal would not result in obstruction of recognized or valued views because the wharf is not located along a line of sight to a scenic resource. Therefore, Alternative 1 would have no impacts under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

No impacts would occur.

**Impact AES-2:** Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway.

There would be no changes to existing scenic resources along a scenic highway associated with the proposed Project, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings. Although this alternative would result in increased vessel calls relative to the CEQA baseline through 2026, increases in moored vessels at the terminal would have no impact on scenic resources.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

No impacts would occur.

**Impact AES-3:** Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

The proposed project site’s existing visual character would remain unaltered under Alternative 1, as would the site’s visual quality and surroundings, because no physical improvements would occur. Although this alternative would result in increased vessel
calls relative to the CEQA baseline, increased moored vessels at the terminal would not result in changes to the visual character of the proposed project area, which is that of a working container terminal. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts
No impacts would occur.

Impact AES-4: Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

Alternative 1 would not introduce additional sources of light on the proposed project site or within the proposed project area. The YTI Terminal’s existing light sources would remain unchanged since no crane modifications or new fixed light sources would be added to the terminal under Alternative 1. In addition, although this alternative would result in an increase in vessel calls relative to the CEQA baseline, increased moored vessels and truck and train trips at the terminal would not result in substantial increases in light that could affect residential areas; vessel lighting is relatively low intensity, and the nearest residential area in San Pedro is located over a mile from the terminal. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts
Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

Impact AES-5: Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response.

The impacts of this No Project Alternative are not required to be analyzed under NEPA. NEPA requires the analysis of a No Federal Action Alternative (see Alternative 2 in this document).

Mitigation Measures
Mitigation measures are not applicable.

Residual Impacts
An impact determination is not applicable.
Alternative 2 – No Federal Action

The No Federal Action Alternative would be the same as the NEPA baseline. It would include only the activities and impacts likely to occur absent further USACE federal approval (i.e., a USACE permit), but it could include improvements that require a local action. Under Alternative 2, no federal action would occur; however, backlands improvements at the existing YTI Terminal would be implemented. These improvements would include slurry sealing, deep cold planing, asphalt concrete overlay, restriping, and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete the repairs. Beyond these backlands improvements, LAHD would not expand the TICTF because no larger ships could be accommodated without a federal action and the expanded TICTF would only be necessary to accommodate larger ships. No in-water features (such as dredging or in-water pile installation), disposal of dredged material, or over-water features (such as new or modified cranes) would be implemented under the No Federal Action Alternative.

Under the No Federal Action Alternative, the existing YTI Terminal would continue to operate as an approximately 185-acre container terminal, and up to approximately 1,692,000 TEUs could be handled at the terminal by 2026. Based on the throughput projections, the No Federal Action Alternative would result in 206 annual ship calls at Berths 212–224.

CEQA Impact Determination

Impact AES-1: Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The visual changes resulting from backlands improvements on the proposed project site would not create significant aesthetic impacts under CEQA because, relative to the CEQA baseline, these improvements would be minor and would not substantially change the terminal configuration or backland structures. The primary terminal features visible from Harbor Boulevard are the cranes, and this alternative would not increase the number of cranes at the terminal. Although this alternative would result in an increase in vessel calls relative to the CEQA baseline, increased moored vessels would not result in changes to terminal operations, and the important views from Harbor Boulevard, that of a working port, would not be adversely affected by increases in moored vessels at the YTI Terminal. Consequently, this alternative would not detract from the aesthetic value of the working port area when viewed from the Harbor Boulevard and would not degrade views of a scenic vista. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.
Impact AES-2: Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway.

The minor terminal changes associated with Alternative 2 would not create significant visual impacts under this CEQA significance criterion. This alternative would not result in obstruction of recognized or valued views. The backlands improvements that would be implemented on the proposed project site under this alternative would not affect views from the Harbor Boulevard, due to the scale and nature of the improvements. Therefore, these changes would be consistent with the intent of this route, which is to provide views of a working port. The visual characteristics of the terminal and the terminal’s backlands area would be similar to the CEQA baseline conditions. As a consequence, this alternative would not damage a scenic resource or adversely affect recognized views available from Harbor Boulevard, bike path or trail, or other scenic vantage point. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-3: Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Although Alternative 2 would result in minor improvements to the terminal (backlands improvements), these improvements would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the proposed project site or its surroundings because they would be consistent with the industrial uses on Terminal Island and the Port as a whole. In addition, as described under Impact AES-1 and Impact AES-2, Alternative 2 would not result in significant impacts on views from Harbor Boulevard or scenic resources. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would not significantly degrade the existing visual character of the proposed project area or its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-4: Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

The backlands terminal improvements would not require the installation or operation of additional lighting. In addition, although this alternative would result in an increase in
vessel calls relative to the CEQA baseline, increased moored vessels at the terminal would not result in substantial increases in light that could affect residential areas; vessel lighting is relatively low intensity, and the nearest residential area in San Pedro is located over a mile from the terminal. Therefore, this alternative would not create new lighting terminal lighting or result in substantial increases in lighting from increased vessels relative to the CEQA baseline; impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

**Impact AES-5:** Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response.

Alternative 2 would include only backlands improvements consisting of slurry sealing; deep cold planing; asphalt concrete overlay; restriping; and removal, relocation, or modification of any underground conduits and pipes necessary to complete repairs. No construction of in-water or over-water features would occur under Alternative 2, and, therefore, no increase in marine vessels or safety impacts associated with construction of Alternative 2 improvements would occur. The No Federal Action Alternative would involve the same construction activities as would occur under the NEPA baseline. Therefore, there would be no incremental difference between Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would result in no impact under NEPA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

There would be no impacts.

**Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Improve Berths 217–220 Only**

This alternative includes all components of the proposed Project except dredging and pile driving at Berths 214–216. The following components of the proposed Project are unchanged under the Reduced Project Alternative:

- modifying up to six existing cranes;
- replacing up to four existing non-operating cranes;
- dredging 6,000 cy from a depth of -45 to -47 feet MLLW (with an additional 2 feet of overdredge depth, for a total depth of -49 feet MLLW), and installing 1,200 linear feet of sheet piles and king piles to support and stabilize the existing wharf structure at Berths 217–220;
disposing of dredged material at LA-2, the Berths 243–245 CDF, or another approved upland location;

- extending the existing 100-foot gauge landside crane rail through Berths 217–220;
- performing ground repairs and maintenance activities in the backlands area; and
- expanding the TICTF on-dock rail by adding a single rail loading track.

Under this alternative, there would be three operating berths after construction, similar to the proposed Project, but Berths 214–216 would remain at their existing depth. This alternative would require less dredging (by approximately 21,000 cy) and pile driving and a shorter construction period than the proposed Project. Based on the throughput projections, this alternative is expected to operate at its capacity of approximately 1,913,000 TEUs by 2026, similar to the proposed Project. However, while the terminal could handle similar levels of cargo, the reduced project alternative would not achieve the same level of efficient operations as achieved by the proposed Project. This alternative would not accommodate the largest vessels (13,000 TEUs). The depth achieved at Berths 217–220 would only be capable of handling vessels up to 11,000 TEUs, requiring additional vessels to call on the terminal to meet future growth projections up to the capacity of the terminal. Therefore, under this alternative, 232 vessels would call on the terminal in 2020 and 2026, compared to 206 vessels for the proposed Project. Additionally, because of the higher number of annual vessel calls, this alternative would result in a maximum of five peak day ship calls (over a 24-hour period) compared to four for the proposed Project.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

**Impact AES-1: Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.**

Under Alternative 3, berth dredging and pile driving improvements would occur at Berths 217–220, and no improvements would occur at Berths 214–216. As with the proposed Project, the additional cranes would increase the density of cranes along the berths; however, this would not significantly affect views from the Harbor Scenic Route because the additional cranes would be consistent with the existing views from all vantage points previously listed. Although an increase in vessels moored at the YTI Terminal would occur relative to the CEQA baseline, Alternative 3 would not adversely affect a scenic vista or scenic corridor designation because it would be visually consistent with the development in the surrounding areas of the Port and its main effect would be to further contribute to the working Port, consistent with the Harbor Scenic Route designation. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.
Impact AES-2: Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway.

As with the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not affect any state scenic highways, as none are located in the proposed project area. The proposed crane modifications under Alternative 3 would add to the existing cranes along the berths, similar to the proposed Project. The associated visual effects of Alternative 3 on scenic resources and as viewed from other areas such as from the locally designated scenic highways, the Catalina Express Terminal, the Wilmington Waterfront Park, and Banning’s Landing would be similar to those described for the proposed Project, aside from a slightly higher number of annual vessel calls and one additional vessel call on a peak day. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts
Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-3: Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Alternative 3 would experience a greater number of vessels annually and during the peak day than the number than occurred under the CEQA baseline. However, similar to the proposed Project, substantial degradation of the visual character of the proposed project area would not occur under Alternative 3 because these improvements would be consistent with the on-site and adjacent industrial uses on Terminal Island. The projected increase in annual and peak day vessel calls would not result in the blockage of scenic resources, substantial damage to scenic views of scenic resources, or shading of shadow-sensitive uses. These improvements would blend into the existing development at the YTI Terminal and adjacent terminal operations. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts
Impacts would be less than significant.

Impact AES-4: Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

The cranes proposed under Alternative 3 would include lights, which would increase lighting along the wharf, similar to the proposed Project. The visibility of this additional source of light and its contribution to ambient lighting conditions in areas around the
proposed project site would be attenuated by lighting guidelines, which would include
shielding and directing the crane lights downward to reduce off-site light scatter. Similar
to the proposed Project, the incremental change in ambient lighting conditions at the site
from the crane improvements under Alternative 3 would not create a substantial change
in existing levels of ambient light at residential areas because of shielding and from
attenuation due to the distance to the residential areas (over one mile).

In addition, compared to the CEQA baseline, Alternative 3 would result in increased
berthed vessels that would be illuminated at night. However, increased moored vessels at
the terminal would not result in substantial increases in light that could affect residential
areas; vessel lighting is of relatively low intensity and the nearest residential area in San
Pedro is located over a mile from the terminal. Therefore, impacts would be less than
significant under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures
No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts
Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination
Impact AES-5: Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not
result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character
and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer
response.

Alternative 3 would have similar impacts as the proposed Project from the three
representative viewpoints, relative to the NEPA baseline. The visual effects of
Alternative 3 would also be similar to those of the proposed Project due to a similar level
of aboveground terminal development. The improvements under Alternative 3 would
include the all of the elements of the proposed Project, with the exception of the dredging
and pile driving activities at Berths 214–216. All other improvements (crane
modification/replacement, dredging and pile driving at Berths 217–220, landside crane
rail extension through Berths 217–220, backlands improvements, and TICTF on-dock rail
expansion) would still occur. Similar to the proposed Project, the improvements under
Alternative 3 would not result in substantive changes to the overall character and quality
of the visual landscape and are not expected to result in a significant effect on viewer
response. Impacts would be less than significant under NEPA.
Table 3.1-3: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Alternative 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Visual Character and Quality</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Level of Visual Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Scenic Routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Character:</strong> The local scenic routes are designated as such due to the views of the working Port. Although heavily developed, YTI Terminal cranes could be seen from selected portions of the route along Harbor Boulevard.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>VM Class 2 (Noticeable, visually subordinate): The primary proposed project features visible as noticeable elements in views from the southern portion of the Harbor Boulevard would be the cranes seen in the middleground. The proposed Project would increase the density of some of the cranes and slightly extend the visual row of cranes but would not block views of scenic resources or compete with other features in the field of view. No significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Quality:</strong> Views onto the YTI Terminal are limited along local scenic routes; however, portions of cranes can be seen in the background from sections of Harbor Boulevard. Views of the cranes from Harbor Boulevard are partially blocked or mixed with views of the Vincent Thomas Bridge. Also, terminal features are visible in the middleground from the southern portions of the Harbor Boulevard, which creates a low level of vividness, intactness, and unity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalina Express Terminal</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>VM Class 2 (Noticeable, visually subordinate): The new cranes would be visible in the middleground behind the Catalina Express Terminal but would be located next to existing identical cranes. Views of the proposed cranes would be consistent with those of the existing YTI Terminal, and introducing new cranes is not expected to result in unanticipated elements for views from the Catalina Express Terminal. No significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Character:</strong> Views of the Port area from the Catalina Express Terminal are mixed, with a sea terminal and Vincent Thomas Bridge in the foreground and the proposed project site, including the wharf cranes, in the middleground.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Quality:</strong> Some of the existing YTI cranes can be seen in the middleground. The Turning Basin and Vincent Thomas Bridge create a moderately high level of vividness. Levels of intactness and unity are also moderately high as views of the cranes are combined with containers at the YTI Terminal. Views of the proposed project site and the terminal cranes are mixed with foreground (sea terminal and Vincent Thomas Bridge) and middleground (Turning Basin) features. This view has a moderately high level of vividness and intactness and unity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilmington Waterfront Park</strong></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>VM Class 2 (Noticeable, visually subordinate): The primary project features visible as noticeable elements in the view would be the cranes seen in the middleground. The proposed Project would increase the density of cranes and slightly contribute to the visual row of cranes but would not block views of scenic resources or compete with other features in the field of view. No significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Character:</strong> The park affords views of the heavily developed Port, West Harry Bridges Boulevard, and existing cranes at the proposed project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Quality:</strong> The cranes are viewed in the middleground amidst existing power lines, vegetation, and heavily developed Port uses, and they create a low level of vividness. Levels of intactness and unity are also low.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1-3: Summary of AES-5 Impacts for Alternative 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banning’s Landing</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Level of Visual Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Character</strong>: The landing affords views of the heavily developed Port, the Turning Basin, and cranes at the proposed project site.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>VM Class 2 (Noticeable, visually subordinate): The primary project features visible as noticeable elements in the view would be the cranes seen in the middleground. The proposed Project would increase the density of cranes and slightly extend the visual row of cranes but would not block views of scenic resources or compete with other features in the field of view. No significant impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Quality</strong>: The cranes are readily viewed in the middleground and create a moderate level of vividness. Levels of intactness and unity are also moderate.</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>Impacts would be less than significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**3.1.4.4 Summary of Impact Determinations**

Table 3.1-4 summarizes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations of the proposed Project and alternatives related to Aesthetics and Visual Resources, as described in the detailed discussion above. This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the impacts of the proposed Project and alternatives with respect to this resource. Identified potential impacts may be based on federal, state, or City significance criteria; LAHD criteria; and the scientific judgment of the report preparers.

For each impact threshold, the table describes the impact, notes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations, 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 this table.
### Table 3.1-4: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Aesthetics and Visual Resources Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impacts after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td><strong>AES-1:</strong> Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AES-2:</strong> Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AES-3:</strong> Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AES-4:</strong> Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AES-5:</strong> Construction and operation of the proposed Project would not result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response.</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 – No Project</td>
<td><strong>AES-1:</strong> Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic.</td>
<td>CEQA: No impact</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AES-2:</strong> Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway.</td>
<td>CEQA: No impact</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AES-3:</strong> Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</td>
<td>CEQA: No impact</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.1-4: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Aesthetics and Visual Resources Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impacts after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AES-4:</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-5:</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 1 would not result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response.</td>
<td>NEPA: Not Applicable</td>
<td>Mitigation not applicable</td>
<td>NEPA: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-1:</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-2:</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-3:</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-4:</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-5:</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 2 would not result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response.</td>
<td>NEPA: No impact</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>NEPA: No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.1-4: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Aesthetics and Visual Resources Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impacts after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AES-1</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-2</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a state scenic highway.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-3</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-4</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-5</td>
<td>Construction and operation of Alternative 3 would not result in substantial negative changes to the overall visual character and quality of a landscape that has a significant effect on viewer response.</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant</td>
<td>No mitigation is required.</td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.4.5 Mitigation Monitoring

Neither the proposed Project nor any of the alternatives would result in significant impacts on aesthetics or visual resources. Therefore, neither mitigation measures nor monitoring programs are required.

3.1.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts on aesthetics or visual resources would occur as a result of the proposed Project or alternatives.