5.12 VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES

5.12.1 Environmental Setting

In accordance CEQA Guidelines and the City of Los Angeles Draft CEQA Threshold Guide (1998) for determining impact significance, this section addresses the potential impacts to Visual and Aesthetic Resources (Visual Resources) in the project vicinity which may result from the construction of the force main and the significance of such impacts. The visual resources assessment includes the following information:

- Identifies those views potentially affected by the Project over which the public is most likely to express concern (critically sensitive public views);
- Describes the existing character and quality of those potentially affected critically sensitive views;
- Estimates the intensity of possible adverse visual impacts on those views;
- Evaluates the significance of the possible impacts; and
- As applicable, considers possible mitigation measures that could lessen the impacts to negligible levels of intensity.

Visual Sensitivity – Sensitivity is the social setting for visual resources. As applied to visual impact analyses, sensitivity refers to public attitudes about specific views, or interrelated views, and is the key to assessing how important a visual impact may be and whether or not it represents a significant impact.

To assess visual sensitivity, indicators of public concern were identified and sensitivity rated accordingly. The indicators are listed in Table 1 of Attachment A in Appendix I and reflect the concepts and methods of several federal agencies that treat sensitivity as a function of viewer activity, awareness, values, and goals.

The four levels of sensitivity are high, moderate, low and no sensitivity.

- **High Sensitivity.** High sensitivity suggests that at least some part of the public is likely to react strongly to a threat to visual quality. 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 substantial visual impacts. 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 or no concern about changes in the landscape. This may be because the affected views are not “public” (not accessible to the public) or because there are no indications that the public values the affected views.

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

**Sensitivity of Project Locale** – By definition, views from areas serving residential, recreational and tourism land uses, as well as from the transportation routes serving those land uses, are considered to be...
highly sensitive. The public is expected to value such views and to potentially react strongly to adverse changes to the visual character and quality of their surroundings.

The CCC’s primary concern over visual resources within the coastal zone is:

“...the protection of ocean and coastal views from public areas such as highways, roads, beaches, parks, coastal trails and accessways, vista points, coastal streams and waters used for recreational purposes, and other public preserves rather than coastal views from private residences where no public vistas are involved.”

This assessment considers the collective views throughout the Project area, which are important to the consideration of the significance of visual impacts. The following narrative describes the existing visual conditions within the Project areas and identifies the various levels of impacts to the visual character posed by the Project at each alternative location.

**MARINA DEL REY**

**Marquesas Way/Via Marina Alignment**

**Sensitivity** – Figure 5.12-1 shows the viewing positions used in this assessment. There are numerous highly sensitive viewing positions within and around Marina Del Rey, given its scenic, recreation and tourist-oriented attractions. Foremost among these are views from Via Marina, Admiralty Way and Fiji Way, which form a route designated as a scenic highway and also to be designated as a scenic drive (Scenic Highway Element, Los Angeles County General Plan; Coastal Plan Policies). Of specific importance to the proposed Project is Via Marina, from its intersection with Marquesas Way to where it turns sharply to the southwest to parallel the entrance channel for the marina. Along this stretch of road there would be cut-and-cover pipeline installation, as well as the construction of receive and push sites for micro-tunneling.

A number of recreation and tourist attractions are to be found in the marina: Burton Chace Park, Fisherman’s Village, Admiralty Park, Mother’s Beach, and the picturesque marina itself. Views from these locations, however, are not important to the analysis, as they do not include Project construction activities and sites. On the other hand, at the southeast end of Via Marina, where it turns to the southwest, there is a small park called Aubrey E. Austin Park. There, too, is the northeast end of the North Jetty Promenade, a popular walk along the scenic Marina Del Rey entrance channel. Views from Aubrey Park and the Promenade are also, by definition, highly sensitive, and the receive site for the micro-tunneling connection to the Marina Del Rey Alignment would be within full view of these recreation resources across Via Marina.

A moderately high-density multi-family residential area lines both sides of Marquesas Way and the west side of Via Marina. Both of these roads serve as the primary access to the residential areas flanking Ballona Lagoon and the Grand Canal to the west. The collective views from the residences on Via Marina and Marquesas Way are highly sensitive. Because these roads are part of the primary access to these residential areas, road-based views would be considered to be highly sensitive. As noted, Via Marina is also highly sensitive due to its scenic highway/scenic drive status.
Also, some aspects of the Project alternatives would be seen from boats passing along the entrance channel, and such views, being recreation oriented, are highly sensitive.

Critical Views – Critical views are partly defined as those that are the most sensitive, as described in the previous section. Where the public is considered to be potentially moderate to highly sensitive to changes in visual quality, there is likely to be a substantial concern over noticeably adverse visual impacts. An extensive, detailed account is provided in Appendix I.

Figures 5.12-2 and 5.12-3, show representative views of Marquesas Way and Via Marina, in the vicinity of the two optional push sites for micro-tunneling under Ballona Lagoon to the receive site opposite the VPP. Also shown in these figures are optional construction/laydown areas that would support the construction and operation of the two alternative push sites. Figure 5.12-4 shows the receive site at the VPP, which is in the vacant lot opposite the VPP, as well as push site Option 2, in the vacant lot on the east side of the canal. These sites would be within full view from the residences lining the east side of Ballona Lagoon/Grand Canal across from the plant, as well as those walking along the lagoon/canal or boating on it.

Figure 5.12-5 is a panoramic view from a residence along the east bank of the Grand Canal across from the VPP. This view shows the point where the canal becomes “Ballona Lagoon,” which is at the left corner of the VPP, in the upper image. Recreationists walking along the canal and the lagoon, or boating on these waters, would be expected to be highly sensitive to visual impacts. As noted above, the receive site for the Marquesas Way/Via Marina alignment alternative would be in the vacant lot shown in Figure 5.12-5.

Figure 5.12-6 shows the view from Aubrey E. Austin Park, looking to the northwest along Via Marina. This view shows the location of one option for the receive site for the under-channel micro-tunneling construction alternative. The site is within the parking lot shown in the upper image, and the construction/laydown area would also be within this parking lot. The view shown also represents that from the North Jetty Promenade and Via Marina.

Figure 5.12-7 is a panoramic view from the entrance channel that includes the Via Marina receive site, as well as Aubrey E. Austin Park. Views from the channel would not be the most critical, as they would be comparatively distant, relative to views from Via Marina, Aubrey E. Austin Park, and the North Jetty Promenade. While boats may pass along the northwest side of the channel and be within about 240 feet of the nearest Project feature, the North Jetty would block such views. From points nearer the center of the channel but within the ocean-bound lane, points from which the Project could be seen; the viewing positions would be not closer than about 350 feet or more. By contrast, from Aubrey E. Austin Park and Via Marina, one is only about 80 - 90 feet from where the receive site may be within the parking lot northwest of the park. Consequently, views from the entrance channel would not be considered further, as the focus of the assessment is on the most critical views.
Figure 5.12-2

Panorama Showing Site for Push Option 2 for Marquesas Way/Via Marina Cut-and-Cover Alternative, Seen from Marquesas Way/Via Dolce Intersection (VP 1).
Views of Via Marina/Marquesas Way Intersection, the Site for Site Push Option 1 for Marquesas Way/Via Marina Cut-and-Cover Alternative, Seen from, and near, Marquesas Way/Via Dolce Intersection (VPs 2 and 3).

Figure 5.12-3
Figure 5.12-4

(Top): View along the Grand Canal showing residences from which receive and push sites, cut-and-cover, or extraction shaft construction activities would be seen (VP 4). (Bottom): Hurricane St. at the Venice Pumping Plant, showing receive and alternative extraction shaft sites (VP 5).
View from Residence on East Side of Ballona Lagoon/Grand Canal
Showing the Venice Pumping Plant, a Receive Site for Micro-
Tunneling, and Optional Mined Tunneling Extraction Site (VP 6).

Figure 5.12-5
Panoramic View from Aubrey E. Austin Park, Looking Northwest along Via Marina. (Top): The Receive Site and Cut-and-Cover Construction for the Via Marina/Marquesas Way Alignment Alternative would be in the Parking Lot (VP 7)
A Panoramic View from the Marina del Rey Entrance Channel, Showing the Locations of the Receive Sites at Pacific Ave. and Via Marina, the Entrance to the Grand Canal, and Aubrey E. Austin Park (VP 8).
VENICE
Pacific Avenue Alignment

**Sensitivity** – In general, the Pacific Avenue Alignment Alternative would be within highly sensitive public views that include the collective residential views along the alignment, along Hurricane Street and Pacific Avenue, from Ballona Lagoon/Grand Canal, and those from a pedestrian trail lining the east side of the lagoon.

The collective residential views along Pacific Avenue and Hurricane Street are treated in this analysis as highly sensitive. Cut-and-cover activities would be visible from residences lining the east side of the Grand Canal across from the VPP and those along Hurricane Street. Residents along Pacific Avenue south of Hurricane Street to Via Marina would view cut-and-cover construction activities while approaching their homes and from their residences as construction progresses along the street.

Recreational opportunities within the community of Venice occur to the north of the Project site, including the famous Venice Beach, bike path and Ocean Front Walk. In general, public recreation use of area of the Project is less intensive than that of the North Venice Beach portion. Uses are primarily sunbathing, swimming, picnicking, active recreational uses on the sand, and fishing from the Marina Channel jetty. The walkways and waterways along the Venice Canals and Ballona Lagoon provide opportunities for more passive recreational and educational uses, such as bird watching, nature study, strolling, and sightseeing. A Class II Bikeway runs along Pacific Avenue, and non-motorized boating is permitted in the Venice Canals. Potentially, the Project activities would be seen by boaters along the lagoon, those walking along the beach access trail in the vicinity, and bicyclists using Pacific Avenue. Also, where Pacific Avenue intersects with Via Marina, there is the North Jetty Promenade, a frequently used walkway featuring observation decks from which the entrance channel may be appreciated. Fishing is a popular activity below the Promenade.

The south terminus of the subject alignment may be seen from the numerous pleasure craft that use the entrance channel.

**Critical Views** – The critical views would be any of those from along the alignment from Ballona Lagoon/Grand Canal, pedestrian beach access, Hurricane Street and Pacific Avenue and their adjoining residences, the bikeway along Pacific Avenue, the North Jetty Promenade, and from the entrance channel.

Figure 5.12-4 shows the route for the Pacific Avenue Alignment along Hurricane Street, within view of residences lining this street. Figure 5.12-5 shows the proximity of Ballona Lagoon/Grand Canal to the VPP and the north end of the Pacific Avenue Alignment Alternative. Figure 5.12-8 shows the length of Pacific Avenue from the pedestrian bridge at Lighthouse Street southeast to Via Marina, as well as Ballona Lagoon flanking it on the northeast side. The latter figure also shows that residences line both sides of Pacific Avenue at its southeast end where it meets Via Marina.

Figure 5.12-7 discloses the view of the receive site area as seen from the entrance channel, while Figure 5.12-9 shows the southeast terminus of this alignment alternative and the receive site for micro-tunneling under the Marina Del Rey entrance channel and Ballona Creek. The receive site would be close to the observation platform overhanging the revetment (upper image).
(Top): Looking Northwest along Pacific Ave. from the Intersection with Via Marina (VP 9).  (Bottom): Looking Southeast along Ballona Lagoon and Pacific Ave. from the Pedestrian Bridge at Lighthouse St. (VP 10).
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(Top): View of Receive Site and Construction/Laydown Area from the Corner of Pacific Ave. and Via Marina, Looking Northeast (VP 9).  (Bottom): View along the North Jetty Promenade from Observation Platform at End of Pacific Ave. and Via Marina (VP 11).

Figure 5.12-9
The cut-and-cover method of construction for this alternative was considered in the EIR but was deemed not viable due to numerous construction-related impacts; therefore, it is not detailed in this assessment. However, the tunneling method of construction is analyzed in this section.

**Dockweiler Beach Alignment**

The parking lot for Del Rey Lagoon Park provides access not only to the park, but also to Dockweiler Beach via a path that leads from the parking lot. Views from Pacific Avenue, the residences along it, Del Rey Lagoon Park, the parking lot at the park, and the beach access path, are all highly sensitive.

**Westchester/Playa Del Rey**

**Pacific Avenue/Vista Del Mar Alignment**

**Sensitivity** – At the northerly end of this alignment, the alignment extends to a push site for micro-tunneling under the entrance channel to either the Pacific Avenue or the Via Marina Alternative Alignments on the north side of the entrance channel. Here there is a boat launch ramp that may be affected due to construction of the push site, a bicycle path, a fishing bridge, and a residential area. The construction/laydown area that would support the micro-tunneling activities would be in the parking lot along the southwest side of the bridge. Views from areas of recreation and residential land uses, including the associated access routes, are highly sensitive.

The bridge links the bicycle path, which is along the jetty separating the entrance channel and Ballona Creek and the stretch of Dockweiler Beach south of the channel and creek.

Figure 5.12-10 shows views from the bridge over Ballona Creek, looking southeast. The upper image shows the push site area to the north of the bridge (left). The lower image is a better view of the residential area along Pacific Avenue. The bridge links the bicycle path, which is along the jetty separating the entrance channel and Ballona Creek and the stretch of Dockweiler Beach south of the channel and creek.

Figure 5.12-11 shows the scene from the intersection of 66th Avenue and Pacific Avenue, looking northwest and north, which includes the residential area along Pacific Avenue, with a glimpse of Del Rey Lagoon Park. Figure 5.12-12 presents two panoramas of this park, which abuts Pacific Avenue and from which details of Project construction activities would be visible. Along Vista Del Mar, there are multi-story residences, as seen in Figure 5.12-13, which presents photographs from the intersection at Waterview Street and a representative view from the Vista Del Mar. These street-based views are considered to generally represent those from the residences.

**Channel Crossing**

The launch shafts and the two alternative receptor sites, associated with micro-tunneling under the Marina Del Rey entrance channel and Ballona Creek, would be within public view. These sites are addressed relative to the cut-and-cover alternative alignments.
Views from Pacific Ave. Bridge: (Top): Push Site in Parking Lot for Under-Channel Alignment; (Bottom): View to Southeast along Pacific Ave., Showing Bicycle Path in Foreground (VP 12).
Pacific Ave. and 66th Ave. Looking Northwest, and (Bottom) Looking North (VP 13); Del Rey Lagoon Park is Seen to the Right.

Figure 5.12-11
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Panoramic Views of Del Rey Lagoon Park (Top): Looking to the Northwest, and (Bottom): Looking to the Southeast (VP 14).
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(Top) Vista del Mar and Waterview St. Looking Northwest to North; and (Bottom) Looking East to Southeast (VP 15).

Figure 5.12-13
**LARGE-DIAMETER (MINED) TUNNELING ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVES**

There are four Mined-Tunnel Alignment alternatives, which would present noticeable disturbance above ground at the sites for the starter and extraction shaft sites. These sites are within highly sensitive views from beach recreation sites, residential areas, and a designated scenic highway (Vista Del Mar). Alternatives 1 and 2 call for cut-and-cover construction as well, which would also be within recreational oriented and/or residential views.

**Alternative 2: LAX - Dockweiler Beach**

**Sensitivity** – This alternative calls for a mined-tunnel connection from the LAX property launch shaft to the extraction shaft on Dockweiler Beach and cut-and-cover connections between the VPP and the extraction shaft. The views affected by starter shaft and associated laydown area would be from Vista Del Mar (scenic highway) and residences lining the northeast side of Napoleon Street. As noted earlier, residential views and those from designated scenic highways are highly sensitive. The sensitive views potentially affected by the extraction shaft and the cut-and-cover part of the alignment were described relative to Alternative 1.

**Critical Views** – Figure 5.12-14, upper image, shows the general area for the starter shaft and laydown area for this alternative. Foreground views from the designated scenic highway (Vista Del Mar) and residences shown are of the greatest sensitivity and are highly critical. Critical views including the extraction shaft site for this alternative and the cut-and-cover part of the alignment are the same as for Alternative 1.

**Alternative 3: Direct Mined-Tunnel Connection from LAX Property to Venice Pumping Plant Via Dockweiler Beach**

**Sensitivity and Critical Views** – This alternative alignment would be a mined-tunnel construction alternative from the starter shaft on the LAX property directly to the extraction shaft in the vacant lot northwest of Hurricane Street and opposite the VPP, via Dockweiler Beach. Views of the starter shaft have been discussed relative to Alternative 2. As for Alternative 2, there would be as much as 300 feet of cut-and-cover construction from the starter shaft to the junction with the existing CIS under Vista Del Mar to the southwest.

The extraction shaft would be in the vacant lot across Hurricane Street from the VPP, as shown in Figure 5.12-5. The sensitivity and critical nature of the affected views potentially affected by the extraction shaft have been discussed relative to the Via Marina/Marquesas Way cut-and-cover alignment alternative.
Views from the Vista del Mar-Napoleon St. Intersection: (Top): LAX Site, Looking East to Southeast; and (Bottom): Dockweiler Beach and Vista del Mar, Looking Northwest (VP 16).
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(Top): Extraction Shaft Alternate Sites at Dockweiler Beach near Hurricane St. (VP 17); and (Bottom): at Venice Pumping Plant (VP 6).
Alternative 4: Direct Mined-Tunnel Connection from LAX Property to Venice Pumping Plant Under Ballona Lagoon

Sensitivity and Critical Views – This alternative alignment would be a continuous mined-tunnel construction alternative from the starter shaft on LAX property to the extraction shaft in the vacant lot on the northwest side of Hurricane Street, across from the VPP. The tunnel would be inland from the beach and generally under Vista Del Mar, Pacific Avenue and Ballona Lagoon. The starter shaft site and associated laydown site areas are shown in Figure 5.12-14, and sensitive and critical views relative to it have been described regarding Alternatives 2 and 3. Figure 5.12-15 shows the area within which the extraction shaft would be constructed. The laydown area is also expected to be within this vacant lot. The sensitivity and criticality of views from residences and the Grand Canal have been discussed relative to the Marquesas Way/Via Marina Alignment and the Pacific Avenue Alternative alignments.

Visual Character

In conformance with CEQA, detailed descriptions of the existing visual character and quality of the Project vicinity are limited to those views deemed to be “critical,” as defined in Section 2.1 of the Technical Study (provided in Appendix I). Accordingly, attention is directed primarily to those moderately to highly sensitive views that would be most affected by a Proposed Action. Where the greatest of impact intensity may occur, low sensitivity views will also be considered. The assessment of visual character serves as the baseline for the quality of Visual/Aesthetic Resources. The estimated visual impacts of the Project will be compared with the baseline conditions to assess the degree of adverse change (intensity) and significance of the potential impacts to the following:

- Inherent landscape features;
- Patterns; and
- Existing visual conditions.

Landscape character and existing visual conditions within critical public views are provided in Appendix I.

5.12.2 Thresholds of Significance

CEQA defines significant impacts as those having a “substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including … objects of … aesthetic significance” (Article 20, Section 15382).

Appendix G of CEQA (Environmental Checklist) more specifically identifies four areas of concern regarding a project’s potential impact on aesthetics:

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

A significant impact is, in accordance with the CEQA definition, a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the visual resources of the affected environment. An adverse “change,” relative to
Visual impact assessment occurs when features are changed, introduced, made less visible, or are removed, such that the resultant effect on public views is perceptibly incongruous with their inherent character. Changes that seem uncharacteristic are those that appear out of place, discordant, or distracting. The intensity of a visual impact depends upon how noticeable the adverse change may be. Noticeability is a function of project features and their context and viewing conditions (angle of view, distance, primary viewing directions, lighting, etc.). Four levels of visual impact intensity (noticeability) may occur. These are termed “Visual Modification Classes” (VM Classes) and are defined in Table 2, Attachment A of Appendix I. Significant (substantial) changes (significant visual impacts) are further defined as those that would:

- Result in an inconsistency with laws, ordinances, regulations, and standards (LORS) applicable to the protection of visual resources; or
- Cause a perceptible reduction of visual quality. The perception that visual quality has been reduced is partly a function of public sensitivity to adverse visual impacts. Table 2, Attachment A of Appendix I summarizes the relationship of impact intensity, sensitivity, and the perceived reduction in visual quality.

A third criterion is generally applied which stipulates that an impact must endure for greater than 1 year before it may be considered to be significant. However, in this assessment, no particular duration is stipulated because much of the sensitivity for the potentially affected views is due to recreation activities and sites in the vicinity of the Project.

The value to the public of a single peak-use season is assumed to be extremely important, and any substantial, adverse visual impacts on the aesthetics of the area during this period are considered to be significant, even if temporary or short term. Since no information is available regarding when Project construction would commence, it is assumed that construction would occur during the late spring and summer months.

According to CEQA, Threshold of Significance is that point where an adverse visual impact is deemed to be substantial (i.e., a perceptible reduction in visual quality). CEQA offers no specific criteria for what is deemed “substantial.” Therefore, criteria from other sources have been used to provide a systematic approach to this issue, which is summarized in Table 3, Attachment A of Appendix I. The matrix in the table illustrates the relationship of public sensitivity, impact intensity, and what is considered to be a substantial visual impact. The criteria are based upon the principles common to the three primary federal systems for visual resource management and analysis (United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, 1995; United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, 1978; USDOT, Federal Highway Administration, 1981). This approach has been applied to numerous CEQA-compliant documents over a 15-year period.

**City of Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds**

The City of Los Angeles Draft CEQA Thresholds Guide offers a list of 12 areas of concern to consider in assessing the significance of an impact in accordance with the CEQA Checklist. However, no specific significance criteria accompany this guideline to use in making that determination. Moreover, the Marquesas Way/Via Marina Alignment Alternative is not within the City of Los Angeles, so the City Guidelines do not apply to this alignment alternative.
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-2: Would the proposed Project or its alternatives cause substantial, adverse effects on a scenic vista?
This CEQA issue of concern is interpreted in this assessment as addressing the degree to which Project-related features interfere with a scenic vista, either by obstructing it or interfering with access to it. The City of Los Angeles Draft CEQA Thresholds Guide is relevant to this CEQA issue as follows:

- The extent of obstruction (e.g., total blockage, partial interruption, or minor diminishment) of recognized or valued views (such as natural topography, settings, manmade or natural features of visual interest, and resources such as mountains or the ocean); 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: Would the proposed Project or its alternatives cause substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within view from a state scenic highway?
One issue expressed by the City of Los Angeles Draft CEQA Thresholds Guide is relevant to this CEQA issue:

- Whether the project affects views from a designated scenic highway, corridor, or parkway.
AES-4: Would the proposed Project or alternatives result in a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
Relative to the City of Los Angeles Draft CEQA Thresholds Guide, the factors that are to be considered in determining whether the Project would have a significant impact through nighttime illumination are:

- 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.

AES-5: Would the proposed Project or alternatives result in substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses?
The City of Los Angeles Draft CEQA Thresholds Guide requires the consideration of the potential impact of shading by project-related structures. The current CEQA Checklist does not require consideration of shading; however, it did so at the time the Draft Thresholds Guide was prepared and is, therefore, listed here as an issue to be addressed. However, the analysis does not address this issue because the Project has no potential to create any shading impacts as defined by the City guidelines.

AES-6: Would the proposed Project or alternatives result in visual impacts that would not be consistent with applicable rules and regulations?
This impact is not expressed in the CEQA Checklist, but is listed in the City of Los Angeles Draft CEQA Thresholds Guide. As stated above, it is interpreted as asking whether the Project and its alternatives would result in any inconsistencies with applicable plans, policies, objectives, standards, ordinances, regulations or statutes.

5.12.3 Environmental Resources Impacts
The visible changes that would be brought about by the proposed Project and its alternatives, and their potential to create aesthetic impacts, are evaluated in detail in this section relative to each alignment alternative, as well as relative to the several construction alternatives to the propose Project (Mined-Tunneling Alignment alternatives). The significance of these visual impacts has been determined by applying criteria summarized is Section 5.12-2 (and detailed in Attachment A of Appendix I), and the guidelines developed by the City of Los Angeles.

Marina Del Rey Alternative: Marquesas Way/Via Marina
Critical sensitive public views and existing visual conditions are described in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of this Technical Appendix. The methodology for the following impact assessment is presented in detail in Attachment A of Appendix I.

The critical sensitive viewing positions along this alignment alternative include those from:

- Via Marina, a scenic highway and scenic drive;
- Aubrey E. Austin Park;
- North Jetty Promenade, east end;
- Marina Del Rey entrance channel;
- Marquesas Way, Via Dolce, and adjoining residences;
- Residences along the Grand Canal near the VPP;
- Grand Canal; and
- Residences at the northeast end of Hurricane Street.
OVERVIEW: EXISTING VISUAL CONDITIONS RELATIVE TO PROPOSED PROJECT FEATURES

Via Marina, Aubrey E. Austin Park, North Jetty Promenade, and Entrance Channel

The existing visual conditions for these critical views are all VMC 1: from positions along or within these sensitive public roads and areas, features within view have not been noticeably modified unfavorably by past activities (see Section 2.2 of the Technical Study provided in Appendix I). That is, no noticeably incongruous features are in sight. These existing views are shown in Figures 5.12-2 – 5.12-7. The Project activities and equipment associated with cut-and-cover pipeline installation and the construction and operation of the push and receive sites along this alignment alternative would be industrial in visual character. As such, these Project features would be incongruous with the established settings for the several potentially affected views.

From Via Marina, at its intersection with Marquesas Way, for about 0.5 mile to the southeast, cut-and-cover construction would occur in one of the two lanes serving travel to the southeast. At end of the in-street construction, the alignment would angle to the south into a parking lot serving nearby residences and proceed for approximately 1,000 feet to the tie-in with the under-channel pipeline at the receive site. For the length of the in-street construction, motorists would be restricted to one lane of travel and pass close to the cut-and-cover construction activities in the second lane. Where the alignment crosses over into the parking lot, one or more mature trees would be removed due to trenching activities and the movement of equipment. In the parking lot mentioned, cut-and-cover construction would be within the immediate foreground of residences along the southwest side of the lot, as well as in the foreground of views from the scenic highway/drive. To a limited extent, such activity would also be noticed from Aubrey E. Austin Park and the east end of the North Jetty Promenade. However, it would not be visible from the entrance channel due to intervening structures and vegetation.

The construction activity associated with the receive site would be in the foreground of views from the park and promenade, the residences noted, Via Marina, and, to a lesser extent, from the northwest lane of the entrance channel.

Marquesas Way, Via Dolce, and Adjoining Residences

The existing visual conditions for views from Marquesas Way and the adjoining residences is VMC 1 (Section 2.2). No incongruous features are within view.

Under push site Option 1, there would be no construction along Marquesas Way or within the “island” at the intersection with Via Dolce. Here, micro-tunneling would occur from the push site northeast of the Via Marina/Marquesas Way intersection to the receive site in the vacant lot across from the VPP. A small part of the cut-and-cover construction at Via Marina would be briefly in view but would be at a distance and not within primary views from most of the residences or along much of the street. An exception would occur for motorists driving on Marquesas Way when approaching the stop light at Via Marina. Here in-street construction would be seen for a relatively short part of the alignment where it would tie in with the micro-tunneling from the nearby parking lot northeast of the intersection.

Under push site Option 2, however, construction/laydown site for this option would be in the foreground of views from Marquesas Way, Via Dolce, and their adjoining residences. It would be located in the island defined by the intersection of Marquesas Way and Via Dolce (Figure 5.12-2, lower image).
Moreover, a public beach access path starts near the construction/laydown site and runs along the east side of Ballona Lagoon to the south. From the beginning of this path, the construction/laydown site would be within the foreground. The push site shaft would be in the vacant lot shown in the upper image of Figure 5.12-4. The construction activities here would be in the foreground of residences along the northeast side of Via Dolce at its intersection with Marquesas Way.

The activities and equipment associated with cut-and-cover pipeline installation along Marquesas Way, the construction/laydown area, and the construction and operation of push site Option 2. The shaft site would be screened by an acoustic curtain from 20 – 30 feet tall on four sides. Cranes would be substantially in view above these curtains, and truck traffic to and from the sites would occur intermittently throughout the construction shifts. As such, these Project features would be incongruous with the established settings for these potentially affected views.

**Grand Canal Residences, Grand Canal, and Hurricane Street Residences**

From residences along the east side of the Grand Canal and the Grand Canal itself, the VPP dominates views and the existing visual condition is VMC 4. This would also be true for residences along the northeast end of Hurricane, for views to the east. Given the visual dominance of the plant, the existing visual conditions are rated VMC 4. This means that for the views from the residences noted and the canal the existing visual quality is at its lowest.

Push site Option 2 and the receive site, both shown in Figure 5.12-4, would be in the foreground of the residences lining the east side of the canal, the canal itself, and residences at the northeast end of Hurricane Street. The receive site, like the push site, would be screened by an acoustic curtain 20 to 30 feet tall. Cranes would be well in view above these curtains, and truck traffic to and from the sites would occur at different points of the day. The curtained construction area and visible equipment would appear industrial and be incongruous with the generally residential setting.

**Impact Intensity, Significance and Duration**

The visual impacts for this alignment are discussed and summarized below relative to the thresholds for significance noted in Section 5.12.2.

**AES-1** The proposed Project or its alternatives would cause a substantial degradation of existing visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings. The impact would be significant but temporary as well as long term.

Concerning the six Los Angeles City Thresholds for Significance that are grouped under AES-1, the visual impacts are summarized as follows:

- One or more mature street trees, which contribute substantially to the value of the scenic highway/drive status of Via Marina, would be removed;
- No natural open space would be graded or developed;
- No structures are proposed for any natural open space;
- There would be a high degree of contrast between proposed features and existing features representing the valued aesthetic image of the area;
- No zone change is proposed; or
- There would be no positive contribution to the aesthetic value of the area.
Certain critical public views would be affected by the Project to the point that the impact would be significant. However, the duration would be temporary. Elsewhere, the VPP has adversely affected the quality of critical public views to the point that the additional impact of the Project would not significantly affect these views. The impact would worsen the existing visual quality, but the current visual condition, due to the VPP, is already at the lowest rating. A more detailed analysis follows.

**Via Marina and Adjoining Residences** – As noted, the Existing Visual Conditions for views from this designated scenic highway/drive are VMC 1. From this road the following Project features would be within foreground views, proceeding from its intersection with Marquesas Way to where it turns to the southwest:

- The 10-12,000 square feet construction/laydown area for push site option 1;
- The push site option 1 shaft construction area within the Via Marina/Marquesas Way intersection;
- Cut-and-cover construction along 0.5 mile of roadway and approximately 1,000 feet of parking lot;
- The receive site near the entrance channel.

These activities and their associated equipment and workforce would dominate views from this road and its flanking residences and would be industrial in character and incongruous with the setting. Note that the push site would occupy much of the Via Marina/Marquesas Way intersection and would be surrounded by an acoustic curtain 20 – 30 feet high. The equipment and activity within the curtains would be screened from view, but a crane would be substantially taller than the curtains. The site would have an apparent mass of a two- to three-story building due to the curtains.

The construction/laydown area, if square in configuration, would occupy an area 110 feet on a side. This storage of industrial equipment in a parking lot currently serving recreation and commercial uses within Marina Del Rey would appear discordant and dominate views.

Cut-and-cover construction along a 0.5-mile length of Via Marina would be immediately proximate to residences and motorists using this scenic highway. The associated activity and equipment would displace the current positive aesthetic features along the drive and dominate the views. A separate concern is the transition of the in-street construction to the parking lot, which would require the removal of one or more trees on the southwest side of Via Marina. This would be a noticeable loss of a valued visual resource.

From northwest end of Via Marina to the southeast where it passes by Aubrey E. Austin Park, the visual conditions would change from VMC 1 to VMC 4 (dominant), representing an Impact Intensity Level 3 (Table 3, Attachment A of Appendix I). Within a highly sensitive view, such an impact would be significant.

The loss of the street tree(s) would be long term, requiring many years to be mitigated by the maturation of new plantings. The duration of the other impacts is uncertain, as it is not known to what degree certain activities would occur concurrently. The cut-and-cover construction would last for about 3 months, and it is likely that most of the push and receive site construction would be completed concurrently. If not, the cumulative construction could last for about 5 months. In either case, the time frame would be considered to be temporary. *Conclusion: the impact would be significant and primarily temporary, except for the loss of mature street trees, which would be a long-term impact.*
Aubrey E. Austin Park, North Jetty Promenade, East End, and Marina Del Rey Entrance Channel
– The Existing Visual Condition for views from these critical public viewing areas is VMC 1. The most critical of these views is that from the park, followed by those from the promenade and the entrance channel. The only Project feature that would affect views from the park and promenade would be the 5,000 square feet construction/laydown area for receive site for the under-channel tunnel boring and the shaft site itself. The cut-and-cover construction would be largely obscured by the intervening street trees and hedges (see Figure 5.12-6).

The receive site would be surrounded by a 20- to 30-foot-tall acoustic curtain and would be peripheral to the primary views from the park. Given the parks proximity to the entrance channel, it is assumed that views most usually would be directed away from the receive site and toward the boating activity in the entrance channel and the ocean to the southwest. This would also be true for views from the North Jetty Promenade, which is proximate to the entrance channel. Also, views from the promenade toward the receive site are screened by mature trees within the park. Regarding views from the entrance channel, they would tend to be focused along the entrance channel either to the northeast or southwest, in the directions of travel.

The most critical of these views are those from the park. Although most viewing might be away from the receive site, the park is oriented for viewing to the northwest as well (toward the receive site). A conservative approach would be to assume that substantial attention is directed toward Via Marina and the receive site. Accordingly, the site would attract considerable attention to the point of competing with other features in view, if not dominating attention. The two- to three-story curtained area would appear out of place and discordant, not appearing to be an inherent feature of the largely residential area. The resulting visual condition would be VMC 3 (co-dominant). The change in visual conditions would be Intensity Level 2. Within a highly sensitive view, such impact intensity would be considered to be significant, although the cumulative duration of construction activities at the receive site would be 7 weeks and, therefore, temporary.

Due to the primary direction of views from the promenade and the entrance channel, coupled with screening by vegetation and attenuation by distance (for the Channel views), the affect of constructing the receive site at Via Marina is not expected to be substantial (not significant).

Marquesas Way, Via Dolce, and Adjoining Residences – The existing visual conditions for potentially affected views from these roads and residences is currently VMC 1. From these roads and residences, the following Project features would be within foreground views:

- The 10- to 12,000 square feet construction/laydown area for push site option 2;
- The push site option 2 shaft construction area;
- Cut-and-cover construction along Marquesas Way/Via Dolce that would connect with the push site Option 2 shaft site.

These activities and associated equipment and workforce would dominate views from the roads and residences noted. They would be industrial in character and incongruous with the setting. The construction/laydown area, if it were square in configuration, would occupy an area up to 110 feet long on each side, or an equilateral triangle up to 155 feet on a side (the available space is triangular). It would
appear that there is insufficient area in the designated “island” location at the intersection of these two streets, as there is less than 6,000 square feet of space there. Use of this space for a construction/laydown area is further complicated by the alignment of the cut-and-cover construction needed to bring the pipeline to push site Option 2. The alignment seemingly would need to traverse the laydown area in order to directly reach the push site, thereby diminishing the area available for laydown. Additional laydown space may be available in the vacant lot next to the push site construction area, but that space is limited as well. Consequently, some additional part of Via Dolce or Marquesas Way may have to serve as a construction/laydown area.

Using the island for a construction/laydown area would likely cause the damage and removal of the large, mature tree, as well as all of the landscape materials in the island. This island (see Figure 5.12-2) is an entry statement for residential area and the visual focus of traffic along both streets. The loss of the tree and other plantings would cause an irretrievable loss of visual quality.

The Option 2 push site, the 20 to 30-foot-tall acoustic curtained site would largely fill the vacant lot. This two- to three-story curtain wall would be on all four sides of the site, and would look like a featureless block structure incongruous with the setting. The crane inside the site would protrude well above the curtain walls, and the necessary truck traffic would be visible intermittently throughout the day.

The effect of cut-and-cover construction would be the same as described for the Via Marina views. Views from the roads would be dominated by the proximate construction. Additionally, since open-trench construction would need to proceed more or less straight to the push site in the vacant lot, the planted island area described above would be traversed by the alignment. The trench construction would unavoidably destroy plantings and cut the roots of the mature tree in the island. Using the area as a laydown site most likely would damage the tree, and trench construction would cause further damage. Together, the activities could cause the tree to be removed.

The visual impacts associated with the construction of the Option 2 push site, its operation, the use of the intersection island for a laydown site, and cut-and-cover construction would severally and together dominate views with features incongruous with the setting. The existing visual conditions would change from VMC 1 to VMC 4, representing and impact intensity of Level 3. Given the sensitivity of the views affected, the impact would be significant.

The duration of the construction activities note is as follows. The Option 2 push site shaft would be constructed within about 2 months, and the approximately 500 feet of cut-and-cover construction along Marquesas Way that would be required for this push site would take about 3 to 4 weeks. It is assumed that shaft construction and cut-and-cover activities would be concurrent, but at worst, if they were not, the duration would extend to 3 months instead of 2. The impacts, while significant, would be temporary in duration.

Grand Canal Residences, Grand Canal, and Hurricane Street Residences – The existing visual conditions for potentially affected views from these roads and residences is currently VMC 4 due to the presence of the VPP. From the residences and the canal, the following Project features would be within foreground views:
The Option 2 push site; and
The receive site in the vacant lot opposite the VPP.

These activities and equipment, activity, and workforce associated with the push site and receive site would be co-dominant with the VPP. The appearance of the acoustic curtain-enclosed sites, the protruding crane, and truck traffic have been described relative to AES-1. These features would be industrial in character and incongruous with the generally residential setting. However, because the Existing Visual Conditions are VMC 4, the conditions could not substantially worsen and the impact, while adverse, would not be significant. This adverse impact would endure for six weeks of construction for the receive site, but this would be concurrent with the construction of the push site, which would last for about 2 months. The adverse impact would, therefore, be temporary.

AES-2 The proposed Project or its alternatives would cause substantial, adverse effects on scenic vistas. The impact would be significant, primarily temporary but to a limited extent long term.

The impacts of the Project, relative to the two Los Angeles City Thresholds for Significance that are grouped under AES-2, are summarized as follow:

- There would be a significant impact due to partial obstruction of recognized and valued views due roadside cut-and-cover construction, construction/laydown areas, and optional push sites.
- The impact would significantly affect the recognized views currently available from lengths of public roadways (Via Marina, Marquesas Way, and Via Dolce).

Via Marina is a designated scenic highway/drive, and the views from this road represent a continuous series of scenic vistas culminating in view of the entrance channel. Also, there are scenic vistas from Aubrey E. Austin Park and the North Jetty Promenade, which extend out across the entrance channel, but in the case of the park, also extend along Via Marina. Furthermore, the views from the residences lining the east bank of the Grand Canal near the VPP are highly scenic vistas, which include the canal and the Ballona Lagoon to the southeast. The adverse impact on the views noted has been assessed in detail relative to AES-1. That on views from Via Marina and Aubrey E. Austin Park would be significant and primarily temporary, excepting the loss of street trees, which would be a long-term impact. The impact on views from the Grand Canal residences, the Grand Canal, and Hurricane Street residences would be adverse but not significant due to the existing effect of the VPP.

AES-3 The proposed Project or its alternatives would cause substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within view from a state scenic highway. The impact would be significant and long term.

The Los Angeles City Threshold factor for significance that is under AES-3 is as follows:

- The Project would significantly impact views from a designated scenic highway. This has been discussed.

The Project would result in the loss of mature street trees along Via Marina, a designated scenic highway (designated by the County of Los Angeles) and one mature tree at the intersection of Via Dolce and Marquesas Way. The impact of the loss of these trees has been described relative to AES-1, and would be significant and long term.
AES-4 The proposed Project or alternatives would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

No nighttime construction would be required for construction activities along the subject alignment alternative. However, if there were, the acoustic curtains would shield such lighting from view. The Los Angeles City Threshold factors for AES-4 do not, therefore, apply.

AES-5 The proposed Project or alternatives would not result in substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.

There are no shadow-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the proposed Project or its alternatives.

AES-6 The proposed Project or alternatives would result in visual impacts that would not be consistent with applicable rules and regulations. The impact would, therefore, be significant, but it would be temporary.

The applicable regulatory setting is the Los Angeles County LCP for Marina Del Rey, embodied in the Marina Del Rey LUP and discussed in Section 3.2. Policy “e-3” of the Plan established Via Marina as a scenic drive, and the Scenic Highway Element of the County General Plan identifies Via Marina as a scenic highway. It is assumed that unfettered and access to Via Marina and its continuous enjoyment by the public is implicitly a policy of the Plan, as would be the protection from adverse impacts the views from this road. The adverse impacts from Via Marina have been described and are deemed in this assessment not to be consistent with the Plan. The impact would be temporary, however.

Venice Alignment Alternatives: Pacific Avenue Alignment

The critical sensitive viewing positions along this alignment alternative include those from:

- Hurricane Street and adjoining residences;
- Pacific Avenue and adjoining residences;
- Bikeway along Pacific Avenue;
- Ballona Lagoon/Grand Canal;
- Public beach access path along easterly side of Ballona Lagoon; and
- The North Jetty Promenade.

OVERVIEW: EXISTING VISUAL CONDITIONS RELATIVE TO PROPOSED PROJECT FEATURES

Hurricane Street, Grand Canal at Hurricane Street, and Adjoining Residences

The existing visual condition for views from the northeast end of Hurricane Street, the Grand Canal in that immediate vicinity, and the residences nearby is VMC 4, as described in Section 2.2 of the Technical Study (Appendix I). As noted there, the views are dominated by the VPP. It and the chain-link fenced lot on the opposite side of the street are industrial in character. The VPP and lot are incongruous with the residential context, with the VPP being the subject of the view.

Cut-and-cover construction would occur in one of the two lanes of Hurricane Street and would be in the immediate foreground of motorists and residents along the street. Construction activities would also be noticeable from the residences lining the east side of the Grand Canal just northeast of the end of the street, as demonstrated in Figures 5.12-4 and 5.12-5.

Pacific Avenue and Residences, Southwest End of Via Marina, Bikeway, Ballona Lagoon, Beach Access Path and North Jetty Promenade
City of Los Angeles Venice Pumping Plant Dual Force Main Project Draft EIR

From these sensitive viewing positions, the existing visual conditions include no anomalous features incongruous with the character of the area and are rated VMC 1. Cut-and-cover construction would be within the foreground of views from the streets and residences listed, the bikeway, and the lagoon, but would be viewed at a distance of over 270 feet from the beach access path running along the easterly side of the lagoon. In addition, this alternative would require that a receive site be constructed along the North Jetty Promenade at the intersection of Via Marina and Pacific Avenue. To construct the receive site and the open-trench pipeline, one lane of Via Marina along the entrance channel and the adjoining public parking would be used for a construction/laydown area.

Impact Intensity, Significance and Duration
The visual impacts for this alignment are discussed and summarized below relative to the thresholds for significance noted in Section 5.12.2.

AES-1 The proposed Project or its alternatives would cause a substantial degradation of existing visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings. The impact would be significant but temporary.
Relative to the six Los Angeles City Thresholds for Significance that are grouped under AES-1, the impacts are summarized as follows:

- No features contributing to valued visual character or neighborhood image would be removed, altered, or demolished;
- No natural open space would be graded or developed;
- No structures are proposed for any natural open space;
- There would be a high degree of contrast between proposed features and existing features representing the valued aesthetic image of the area;
- No zone change is proposed; and
- There would be no positive contribution to the aesthetic value of the area.

Most of the critical public views would be affected by the Project such that the impact would be significant. However, the duration would be temporary. For views from Hurricane Street and residences at its northeast end, as well as the Grand Canal and residences close to this end of the street, the VPP has adversely affected the quality of critical public views to the point that the additional impact of the Project would not significantly affect these views. The impact would worsen the existing visual quality, but the current visual condition due to the VPP is already at the lowest rating. A more detailed analysis is available in Appendix I.

AES-2 The proposed Project or its alternatives would cause substantial, adverse effects on scenic vistas. The impact would be significant, primarily temporary but to a limited extent long term.
Relative to the two Los Angeles City Thresholds for Significance that are grouped under AES-2, the impacts may be summarized as follows:

- There would be a significant impact due to partial obstruction of recognized and valued views due to roadside cut-and-cover construction, construction/laydown areas, and a receive site; and
- The impact would significantly affect the recognized views currently available from lengths of public roadways (Via Marina and Pacific Avenue) and the bike path along Pacific Avenue.
Via Marina is a designated scenic highway/drive and the views from this road represent a continuous series of scenic vistas culminating in views of the entrance channel. Also, there are scenic vistas from the North Jetty Promenade, which extend out across the entrance channel. As well, scenic vistas of the Ballona Lagoon from the Class II bikeway along Pacific Avenue would be significantly impacted by cut-and-cover construction within the roadway. The potential adverse impact on the views noted has been assessed in detail relative to AES-1 and has been considered to be significant but temporary.

AES-3 The proposed Project or its alternatives would not cause substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within view from a state scenic highway.

The Los Angeles City Threshold factor for Significance relevant to this CEQA issue and is summarized as follows:

- The Project would significantly impact views from a designated scenic highway (see AES-1), but would not impact any specific scenic resources.

The Project would not directly damage features contributing to the visual aesthetics of the potentially affected views. Rather, the Project would introduce features into these views which are incongruous with the established setting and would block specific views (for instance, the receive site would interfere with views of the entrance channel from various viewing positions). These impacts have been addressed under AES-1 and AES-2.

Views from a designated scenic highway (Via Marina) would be adversely affected, but aesthetic features in view would not, as noted, be adversely impacted. A separate impact not specifically addressed by the City of Los Angeles Thresholds is that access to a designated scenic highway would be eliminated, temporarily (traffic would be restricted to local residence and controlled along one lane), as would access to the Promenade and the entrance channel views by the temporary elimination of public parking in the area. In essence, eliminating access to views represents an irretrievable loss of the resource (the scenic highway and public parking at least partly serving as access to scenic views) for the period of construction. This impact is addressed under AES-6 and would be temporary.

AES-4 The proposed Project or alternatives would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

No nighttime construction would be required for construction activities along the subject alignment alternative. However, if there were, the acoustic curtains would shield such lighting from view. The Los Angeles City Threshold factors for AES-4 do not, therefore, apply.

AES-5 The proposed Project or alternatives would not result in substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.

There are no shadow-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the proposed Project or its alternatives.

AES-6 The proposed Project or alternatives would result in visual impacts that would not be consistent with applicable rules and regulations. The impact would, therefore, be significant, but it would be temporary.

The applicable regulatory documents are the Venice Community Plan and the Venice LCP LUP, as this alignment alternative lies entirely within the boundaries of Venice. Section 5.9 details the applicable plans.
and policies. Coastal Resources Goal 18 of the Venice Community Plan calls for the preservation of the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas. The policy is to assure that projects are visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas. Moreover, design principles set forth in the Venice LUP requires that views of distinctive visual resources not be significantly disturbed. As discussed relative to AES-1, the Project would introduce features into view that are visually incompatible with the character of the affected area. Also, views of the entrance channel would be directly impacted, and the entrance channel arguably presents a distinctive visual resource. Because the Project would not be consistent with the regulatory setting, the visual impacts described would be considered significant. They would, however, be short term, lasting for about 7 months.

Westchester/Playa Del Rey Alignment Alternatives: Pacific Avenue/Vista Del Mar Alignment
The critical sensitive viewing positions along this alignment alternative include those from:

- Pacific Avenue Fishing Bridge;
- Bikeway along Pacific Avenue Bridge;
- Pacific Avenue and 62nd Street, including adjacent residences;
- Del Rey Lagoon and adjacent parking area;
- Dockweiler Beach Access from Pacific Avenue; and
- Vista Del Mar (scenic highway) and adjacent residences.

OVERVIEW: EXISTING VISUAL CONDITIONS RELATIVE TO PROJECT FEATURES
Pacific Avenue Fishing Bridge, Bikeway, Boat Launch, Pacific Avenue and 62nd Street, Residences Along 62nd Street
The existing visual condition for these critical views is VMC 1, as described in Section 2.2 of the Technical Study (Appendix I). Within views from positions along the bridge and bikeway, in the vicinity of the boat launch, at the northwest end of Pacific Avenue, and along 62nd Street, there are no noticeably incongruous features in sight. The existing views are shown in Figure 5.12-10. In this vicinity, the activities and equipment associated with cut-and-cover construction, as well as the construction and operation of the push site, would be within the immediate foreground. Such equipment and activities would have a decidedly industrial appearance that would be incongruous with the recreation and residential land uses and character there.

Pacific Avenue and Adjoining Residential Area, Del Rey Lagoon Park, Beach Access Path
From these sensitive viewing positions, the potentially affected views include no anomalous features incongruous with the character of the area and are rated VMC 1. On Figures 5.12-11 and 5.12-12, the residential area along Pacific Avenue, the adjacent Del Rey Lagoon Park, and one of its parking lots are shown. Cut-and-Cover construction would be within the foreground of views from the street and residences listed, Del Rey Lagoon Park and its parking lot, and the beach access path. Cut-and-cover construction would occur in one of the two lanes of Pacific Avenue and would be in the immediate foreground for park users, local residents, and those using the beach access path leading from the parking area along Pacific Avenue that also serves the park.

Vista Del Mar and Adjacent Residences
As is the case for the other views from this alignment alternative, the existing visual conditions are VMC 1, there being no noticeably incongruous features within view. On Figures 5.12-13 and 5.12-14, the
terminus of the alignment where the new pipeline would tie in with the existing CIS, as well as the character of the residential area and the quality of the ocean views available from this road, are shown. Cut-and-cover construction would be within one lane of Vista Del Mar and, therefore, be in the immediate foreground of views from the street and residences noted.

**Impact Intensity, Significance and Duration**

The visual impacts for this alignment are discussed and summarized below relative to the thresholds for significance noted in Section 5.12.2.

**AES-1** The proposed Project or its alternatives would cause a substantial degradation of existing visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings. The impact would be significant but temporary.

Relative to the six Los Angeles City Thresholds for Significance that are grouped under AES-1, the impacts are summarized as follows:

- No features contributing to valued visual character or neighborhood image would be removed, altered, or demolished;
- No natural open space would be graded or developed;
- No structures are proposed for any natural open space;
- There would be a high degree of contrast between proposed features and existing features representing the valued aesthetic image of the area;
- No zone change is proposed; and
- There would be no positive contribution to the aesthetic value of the area.

The critical public views noted would be affected by the Project such that the impact would be significant. The affected views are highly sensitive and Project construction activities would be within the immediate foreground of these views. Of particular importance is that Vista Del Mar is a scenic highway; and therefore, views from this road are especially important. However, the duration of the impacts noted would be temporary.

A detailed impact assessment follows:

**Pacific Avenue Fishing Bridge, Bikeway, Boat Launch, Pacific Avenue and 62nd Street, Residences along 62nd Street**

From these critical viewing positions, the following Project features would be within the foreground:

- The 10- to 12,000 square feet construction/laydown area for the push site;
- The push site; and
- Cut-and-cover construction at the northwest end of Pacific Avenue south of the entrance channel.

The activities, equipment, and workforce associated with these Project features would dominate these views and be incongruous with the setting, as noted. The push site would be located in the parking lot abutting the bridge on its northeast side. It would also have to accommodate some space for construction/laydown, as the primary location for this, the parking lot abutting the southwest side of the bridge, would be too small. Therefore, it is assumed that the push site would occupy the entire area between the boat launch and the bridge, including the northeast end of 62nd Street. The associated
construction/laydown site would occupy the entire parking lot flanking the southwest side of the bridge, as well.

As has been noted before, the push site (like the receive sites) would be surrounded by an acoustic screen that would be 20 to 30 feet high. A crane would be substantially higher than the curtain, so not all of the equipment would be shielded from view. Also, truck traffic required for the delivery of materials and supplies and muck hauling would be periodically within the subject views.

A limited stretch of cut-and-cover construction would affect the views noted, as this aspect of the Project terminates at the push site. Here the trenched pipeline would be tied in with the under-channel pipeline. Cut-and-cover construction would require a moveable construction/laydown area alongside of the open-trench construction, as well as a portion of the parking lots noted.

The existing visual conditions would change from VMC 1 to VMC 4 (dominant, incongruous features), representing an impact intensity of Level 3 (Table 3, Attachment A of Appendix I). Within a highly sensitive view, such an impact would be significant.

The duration of the impact on the subject views, the push site must be completed prior to tunnel boring and would require 2 months to construct. Tunnel boring would require from 1 to 2 months (Section 4.4, Project Description). Cumulatively, push site construction and boring would therefore be completed over a 4-month period. It is assumed that the short stretch of cut-and-cover construction within the subject views would occur within this time frame. Consequently, the visual impact of construction would be temporary.

Pacific Avenue and Adjoining Residential Area, Del Rey Lagoon Park, Beach Access Path
Relative to these critical viewing positions, it primarily would be cut-and-cover construction that would adversely impact the visual quality of the area. However, truck traffic required for the construction and operation of the push site, and for delivery of materials for open-trench construction, would also be within view and pose an adverse impact.

The activities, equipment, and workforce associated with pipeline installation, and the truck traffic noted, would occur within a few feet of the edge of Del Rey Lagoon Park, the nearby residences, parking for the residences and lagoon, and the beach access path. The scale, proximity, contrast, and movement of the equipment and workforce would unavoidably draw focused attention and dominate the scene. The existing visual conditions would change from VMC 1 to VMC 4 (dominant, incongruous features), representing an impact intensity of Level 3. Within the highly sensitive views noted, such an impact would be significant.

There would be about 2,000 feet of cut-and-cover construction along Pacific Avenue up to where it intersects with Vista Del Mar. At the rates of advance described in the summary Project Description in Section 4.4, construction along this road would be complete within about 3.5 months. Consequently, the visual impact of construction, while significant, would be temporary.
As would be the case for the Pacific Avenue stretch of the alignment, along Vista Del Mar, the primary aspect of the Project that would be within view would be cut-and-cover construction within one lane of the roadway. The impact of this construction would be as described earlier relative to other foreground views. There would be an impact of Level 3 intensity, and it would therefore be significant. The length of Vista Del Mar that would be affected would be about 1,600 feet long. At the rate of advance projected, it would take about 3 months to complete this part of the alignment. Therefore, the impact, while significant, would be temporary.

AES-2 The proposed Project or its alternatives would cause substantial, adverse effects on scenic vistas. The impact would be significant, primarily temporary but to a limited extent long term.

Relative to the two Los Angeles City Thresholds for Significance that are grouped under AES-2, the impacts may be summarized as follows:

- There would be a significant impact due to partial obstruction of recognized and valued views due to the construction and operation of a push site; and
- The impact would substantially affect recognized views currently available from a length of a public roadway and a portion of a bikeway.

Vista Del Mar is a designated scenic highway, and the views from this road represent a continuous series of scenic vistas of the Pacific Ocean and Dockweiler Beach. Also, there are scenic vistas from the bikeway along the South Jetty, the Pacific Avenue Fishing Bridge, and 62nd Street, which extend out across the entrance channel. The potential adverse impact on the views noted has been assessed in detail relative to AES-1 and has been considered to be significant but temporary.

AES-3 The proposed Project or its alternatives would not cause substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within view from a state scenic highway.

One Los Angeles City Threshold factor for Significance is relevant to this CEQA issue and the impact is summarized as follows:

- The Project would significantly impact views from a designated scenic highway (see AES-1 and -2), but would not impact any specific scenic resources within view of a scenic highway.

The Project would not directly damage features contributing to the visual aesthetics of the potentially affected views, particularly views from a scenic highway. Rather, the Project would introduce features into these views which are incongruous with the established setting. These impacts have been addressed under AES-1 and AES-2.

AES-4 The proposed Project or alternatives would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

No nighttime construction would be required for construction activities along the subject alignment alternative. However, if there were, the acoustic curtains would shield such lighting from view. The Los Angeles City Threshold factors for AES-4, therefore, do not apply.
AES-5 The proposed Project or alternatives would not result in substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.
There are no shadow-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the proposed Project or its alternatives.

AES-6 The proposed Project or alternatives would result in visual impacts that would not be consistent with applicable rules and regulations. The impact would, therefore, be significant, but it would be temporary.
Section 5.9 details the applicable plans and policies. The applicable regulatory document is the Coastal Resources chapter of the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Community Plan. Objective 18-5 is relevant: “Preserve coastal visual resources by protecting and enhancing scenic views of the ocean and wetlands from designated Scenic Highways, and public view sites.” Vista Del Mar is a designated scenic highway.

Policy 18-5.1 for this objective calls for the following relevant stipulations for siting and designing development in order to:

- Protect public views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas;
- Be visually compatible with the character of the surrounding area; and
- Retain existing views from designated public view areas and scenic highways.

Under this policy, “all new development in the Coastal Zone, including public works and recreational facilities, should be subordinate to its setting, and minimized in height and bulk to the extent feasible to accomplish view protection (emphasis added).” Siting the pipeline construction within a designated scenic highway is inconsistent with this policy. Doing so does not protect views to and long the ocean; the activities, equipment and workforce needed will be visually incompatible with the character of the surrounding area; and closing off one lane of this highway will substantially limit public enjoyment of this scenic highway.

Consequently, the impact of the Project is significant due to its inconsistency with Policy 18-5.1. The duration of the impact would be about 2 months, so, while significant, the impact would be temporary.

**MINED-TUNNEL CONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES**

The Mined-Tunnel Construction Alternatives comprise three viable alternative alignments. All require a starter shaft on LAX land southeast of the Napoleon Street/Vista Del Mar intersection. Alternative 2 requires an extraction shaft on Dockweiler Beach at the end of Hurricane Street and cut-and-cover construction to tie the pipeline to the VPP. Alternatives 3 and 4 entail direct, continuous tunneling from the LAX starter shaft to an extraction shaft in a vacant lot at the northeast end of Hurricane Street across from the VPP. Alternatives 3 and 4, relative to aboveground features, would be identical. Rather than by alternative, the impacts will be assessed relative to:

- The starter shaft;
- The extraction shaft at Dockweiler Beach;
- The extraction shaft at the VPP.

To summarize, Alternatives 3 and 4 would have the potential for significant, but short-term visual impacts due to the starter shaft, but would affect primarily private, residential views. Alternative 2 would have same “starter shaft” impacts—significant, but short term—but would also have the potential for
significant—albeit temporary—“extraction shaft” impacts that would affect private residential views, but also public views from Dockweiler Beach. Additionally, Alternative 2 would have the potential for significant, temporary visual impacts due to cut-and-cover construction of the Hurricane Street part of the alignment.

There will be no detailed discussion of the Hurricane Street cut-and-cover construction, as the impact on residential views along this street has been discussed relative to the Pacific Avenue Alternative Alignment within Venice. For Alternative 2, cut-and-cover construction would extend from the southwest end of Hurricane Street about 785 feet to the VPP, whereas for the Pacific Avenue alignment, it would extend about 450 feet from Pacific Avenue to the Plant. The nature and intensity of the impact would be the same. The Existing Visual Conditions are VMC 1 until reaching the plant, where they are VMC 4. The construction activities, equipment and workforce would dominate views (VMC 4), representing a substantial reduction in visual quality for views from most of Hurricane Street (impact intensity Level 3). The impact would, therefore, be significant. The 785-foot alignment would be completed in less than 6 weeks, so it will be temporary in duration.

**IMPACT INTENSITY, SIGNIFICANCE AND DURATION**

AES-1 The proposed Project or its alternatives would cause a substantial degradation of existing visual character or quality of a site and its surroundings. The impact would be significant but short term.

Relative to the six Los Angeles City Thresholds for Significance that are grouped under AES-1, the impacts are summarized as follows:

- No features contributing to valued visual character or neighborhood image would be removed, altered, or demolished;
- Natural open space would be graded or developed;
- A Structures is proposed for a natural open space;
- There would be a high degree of contrast between proposed features and existing features representing the valued aesthetic image of the area;
- No zone change is proposed; and
- There would be no positive contribution to the aesthetic value of the area.

The critical public views noted would be affected by the Project such that the impact would be significant. The affected views are highly sensitive and Project construction activities would be within the foreground of these views. Of particular importance are views from nearby residences and Vista Del Mar, a scenic highway. However, the duration of the impacts noted would be short term, lasting for about 2 years.

A detailed impact assessment follows:

**STARTER SHAFT**

The critical sensitive viewing positions potentially affected by the construction and operation of the starter shaft are from:

- The residences lining the northeast side of Napoleon Street and facing the Site;
- The beach access path along Napoleon Street; and
- Vista Del Mar, a scenic highway.
The existing visual conditions are VMC 1 for these potentially affected views. The starter shaft site would require about 12,000 square feet of space, including space for a construction/laydown site, and would be enclosed by a 20- to 30-foot-tall acoustic curtain just as would the push and receive sites relative to the bored tunneling construction alternatives. There will be two cranes on site that will be taller than the curtains, so these would be visible. The remainder of the facilities within this site would be screened from view. However, the 15 daily truck round trips would be noticeable, and there would be as much as 300 feet of cut-and-cover construction to tie the pipeline to the existing CIS within Vista Del Mar.

Residences and Beach Access Path
The beach access path runs along the fence skirting the northerly side of the LAX property along Napoleon Street. Views from there are closely similar to those from the residence on the other side of Napoleon, except that the residences are multi-story and views from the upper stories would be more elevated. Figure 5.12-14 shows the vacant LAX land in which the starter shaft would be sited, seen from viewpoint (VP) 16 (see Figure 5.12-1). This land appears substantially natural; there are no structures, but there are several unobtrusive roads within this area. The location of the site is approximate in this photograph. If it were to be sited as shown in Figure 5.12-1, it would be over 700 feet away from the viewing position from which the photograph was taken. By way of contrast, the nearest residence on Napoleon Street would be about 224 feet from the center point of this site, as shown in Figure 1. If the configuration of the starter shaft site were to be square, the site would be about 110 feet on a side (12,000 square feet). This means that the edge closest to the residences would be at least 55 feet closer than the center of the site, or just 164 feet. Seen at that distance, which is about half the length of a football field, a 20- to 30-foot-tall “box” 110 feet on a side would attract considerable attention, particularly since the open land around the site is featureless and some of the residences are oriented directly toward the site. Stated differently, the shaft site would be as tall as the residences from which it would be viewed, but it would occupy substantially more square footage.

Given that the land around the starter shaft site is vacant and that the starter shaft site would command attention to the point of at least competing with the ocean views to the southwest. The acoustic curtained “box” would not be a feature that would be mistaken for a building. The presence of the cranes extending above the curtains and the truck traffic would, together with the screening, lend an industrial character to the site. Moreover, it is not clear that all equipment would be within the enclosure. For instance, with a construction crew of 20 to 25 persons, 20 to 25 vehicles may need to be parked on site in order to allow the public to park along Vista Del Mar. Were the site to compete for attention, the visual conditions would be rated VMC 3, a reduction by two ratings from the current VMC 1. The impact intensity would be Level 2. Given the sensitivity of residential views, the impact would be significant.

The length of time needed to construct the starter shaft is not known at this time. However, it would be in operation for up to about 28 months during the mined tunneling. It is assumed that from the start of construction to completion, the shaft would be within view for at least 2.5 years but not longer than 3 years. The significant impact noted, then, would be short term.

Vista Del Mar – Views from Vista Del Mar (scenic highway) would tend to be directed toward the scenic Pacific Ocean and the beach below the road. The site would be oblique to the directions of travel and
peripheral to the main views to the southwest. For most of the public, the starter shaft might have to be pointed out to be noticed, given the primary direction of viewing, either along the road (to safely operate the vehicle) or toward the ocean, away from the site. In views from this road, visual quality would likely not be substantially lessened.

**EXTRACTION SHAFT—DOCKWEILER BEACH**

The critical sensitive viewing positions potentially affected by the construction and operation of the starter shaft are those from:

- The residences lining the Dockweiler Beach; and
- Dockweiler Beach

The existing visual conditions are VMC 1 for these potentially affected views. The extraction shaft site would require about 5,000 square feet of space, including the construction/laydown area and would be enclosed by a 20- to 30-foot-tall acoustic curtain just as would the starter shaft, and the push and receive sites (bored tunneling). There would be a crane on site that would be taller than the curtains, so it would be visible. The remainder of the facilities within this site would be screened from view. However, the daily truck round trips would be noticeable.

Apart from the multi-story residences, there is “Ocean Front Walk,” a pedestrian beach access running along the beach side of the residences. A few feet away from the extraction shaft site is a beach volleyball court, and passive beach uses may occur anywhere in the vicinity of the site. The extraction shaft site would be much smaller than the starter shaft site, being only 5,000 square feet in size. This would be a square 70 feet on a side. However, the site may be within 50 feet or less of the residences and pedestrian beach access path. It would inevitably dominate views from the residences with its industrial appearance, as it could be as tall as the residences (VMC 4). Moreover, the associated truck traffic would also be a distraction. The impact would be intensity Level 3, as the existing conditions are VMC 1. Relative to the highly sensitive views affected, the impact would be significant.

The period of its initial construction would be 10 weeks. After it is constructed, all equipment would be removed from the site and a steel plate would be placed over the shaft. It can be expected not to be especially noticeable at that point, as sand would naturally tend to cover the plate over time. The shaft would become operational at the point that the TBM needs to be extracted from the mined tunnel, which would be about 28 months later. The TBM would be extracted, and the pipeline tied into the pipeline installed with cut-and-cover construction, over a 1-week period. The cumulative 7-week period in which the shaft would be constructed and operated would be temporary.

**EXTRACTION SHAFT—VENICE PUMPING PLANT**

The critical sensitive viewing positions potentially affected by the construction and operation of the starter shaft are those from:

- The residences lining the east side of the Grand Canal near the VPP;
- The Grand Canal; and
- Residences along Hurricane Street at its northeast end.
The existing visual conditions are VMC 4 for these potentially affected views. The extraction shaft site has been described relative to the Dockweiler Beach extraction shaft site. It would appear industrial and be as large as the nearby multi-story residences. The visible part of the crane and truck traffic, coupled with the acoustic screened site, would attract considerable attention and compete for it with the existing VPP. However, the existing conditions are VMC 4, and while there would be adverse visual impact, no substantial reduction in visual quality would occur. Moreover, the duration of the impact would be temporary, lasting cumulatively just 7 weeks.

AES-2 The proposed Project or its alternatives would not cause substantial, adverse effects on scenic vistas

The Los Angeles City Thresholds for Significance that are grouped under AES-2, the impacts may be summarized as follows:

- There would be no significant impact due to partial obstruction of recognized and valued views; and
- The impact would not substantially affect recognized views currently available from a length of a public roadway and a portion of a bikeway.

Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 would not have the potential to obstruct any recognized or valued views, nor would they substantially affect recognized views from a public roadway or bikeway.

AES-3 The proposed Project or its alternatives would not cause substantial damage to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within view from a state scenic highway.

The Los Angeles City Threshold factor for Significance is relevant to this CEQA issue and the impact is summarized as follows:

- The Project would neither significantly impact views from a designated scenic highway (see AES-1 and -2) nor significantly impact any specific scenic resources within view of a scenic highway.

Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 would not significantly impact views from Vista Del Mar, the only scenic highway in the vicinity of these alternatives. Moreover, the construction of the starter and extraction shafts would not adversely affect any landscape features contributing to scenic quality.

AES-4 The proposed Project or alternatives would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

No nighttime construction would be required for construction activities along the subject alignment alternative. However, if there were, the acoustic curtains would shield such lighting from view. The Los Angeles City Threshold factors for AES-4, therefore, do not apply.

AES-5 The proposed Project or alternatives would not result in substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.

There are no shadow-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the proposed Project or its alternatives.

AES-6 The Proposed Project or alternatives would result in visual impacts that would not be consistent with applicable rules and regulations. The impacts would, therefore, be significant, but they would be temporary and short term.
Section 5.9 details the applicable plans and policies. The applicable regulatory document is the Coastal Resources chapter of the Westchester-Playa Del Rey Community Plan, relative to the starter shaft site. Concerning the two alternate extraction shaft sites, both are in Venice; the relevant regulatory documents are the Venice Community Plan and the Venice LCP LUP.

The Westchester-Playa Del Rey Community Plan, Objective 18-5 is relevant: “Preserve coastal visual resources by protecting and enhancing scenic views of the ocean and wetlands from designated Scenic Highways, and public view sites.” Vista Del Mar is a designated scenic highway. However, views from this scenic highway would not be significantly impacted.

Policy 18-5.1 for this objective calls for the following relevant stipulations for siting and designing development in order to:

- Protect public views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas;
- Be visually compatible with the character of the surrounding area; and
- Retain existing views from designated public view areas and scenic highways.

Under this policy, “all new development in the Coastal Zone, including public works and recreational facilities, should be subordinate to its setting, and minimized in height and bulk to the extent feasible to accomplish view protection (emphasis added).”

The starter shaft would not interfere with public views to and along the ocean. There are no public view areas in the vicinity, and the shaft site would not interfere with scenic highway-based views. However, the shaft site would not be visually compatible with the natural open space character of the LAX property. Consequently, the impact of the Project would not be entirely consistent with Policy 18-5.1 of the subject Plan. The impact, though, would be short term.

Coastal Resources Goal 18 of the Venice Community Plan calls for the preservation of the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas. The policy is to assure that projects are visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas. Moreover, design principles set forth in the Venice LUP requires that views of distinctive visual resources not be significantly disturbed. As discussed relative to AES-1, the starter and extraction shafts would be visually incompatible with the character of the affected area. Because the Project would not be consistent with certain policies and goals of the Venice regulatory setting, the visual impacts described would be considered to be significant. They would, however, temporary and short term in duration, lasting for 7 weeks in the case of the extraction shaft sites, and less than 3 years in the case of the extraction shaft.

### 5.12.4 Mitigation Measures

As noted in Section 5.12.3, the cut-and-cover, micro-tunneling, and mined-tunneling alternative construction activities, and their associated equipment and workforce, would all have the potential to cause significant visual impacts, to varying degrees, that would primarily be temporary in duration. With one exception, the Project or its alternatives would cause no damage to scenic resources (features contributing to the positive visual quality of potentially affected views), no new source of light and glare, and no negative shadow effects. Instead, depending on the alternative, the impacts would variably be due to:
The introduction to views of features not congruent with the existing visual character of the area;
Partial obstruction of views, or the limiting of access to the views;
Adverse effects on views from scenic highways or the temporary elimination of access to these highways; and
Inconsistency with one or more regulatory goals, objectives or policies.

Mitigation measures either entail redesigning a project so as to site it in an area not within sensitive public views, screening the Project features from view with landscaping, or re-designing the Project features to mimic those that are characteristic of the area. In the case of the Project, the visual impacts are due to construction activities, equipment and the presence and movement of the workforce, and not because of its appearance once it is complete. Because the visual impacts of construction are all temporary or short term, they end with the completion of the Project. No feasible measures can mitigate the impacts of construction to a level that is less than significant, for it is assumed that, by definition, such measures must occur within the context of undertaking the Project. That is, construction activities must occur. Regarding re-siting the alignment of the Project, the alignments are constrained by the starting and ending points. The area in between is characterized by dense, residential development, the presence of scenic highways, and the attraction of recreation opportunities. It would not be possible to avoid sensitive views.

Where specific positive landscape features are damaged, obscured, or removed, direct mitigation may take the form of adjusting the siting of an aspect of the project to avoid the impact, or replacing the feature if it is damaged or removed. In the case of the Marquesas Way/Via Marina Alignment Alternative, several mature street trees will be removed by cut-and-cover construction and/or the use of an area as a construction/laydown site. Based on available information, a choice to re-align the pipeline to avoid crossing from Via Marina into the parking lot serving the receive site, and re-locating the Option 2 push site construction/laydown area at the Via Dolce/Marquesas Way intersection, are not viable. The only feasible mitigation measure is:

AES-1 Replace street trees destroyed by construction activities with very large-diameter, mature trees. Depending on the species, this may or may not be possible.

Where impacts may not be directly mitigated, they may be offset by actions taken elsewhere to compensate for the loss of visual quality. It would be speculative to definitively list specific offsetting actions at this time. However, such actions generally would include:

- Landscaping public areas within affected neighborhoods where open space is currently degraded and unsightly;
- Screening from public view existing features that are incongruous with the character of their surroundings (such as the VPP); and/or
- Creating public access to currently unavailable scenic vistas (new beach access routes, paths, bikeways, public parking.

During public scoping meetings, some suggested that the existing VPP could be made to be more aesthetically pleasing. Currently, this industrial facility has reduced visual conditions in its vicinity to VMC 4. One most obvious measure would be to paint the facility a color matching nearby residences and removing the art deco-like treatment of the wall facing the Grand Canal. Plantings which soften the VPP’s profile or cover its walls with vines might be investigated, if there is the physical space available to
landscape the perimeter. A walkway abutting the blue wall fronting the Grand Canal (Figure 5.12-5, upper image) might be converted into a planter, or several large, decorative planters with tall shrubs or small trees might be installed along that part of the walk (since the walk ends here, the loss of this stretch of sidewalk would not be important to pedestrians). A small strip of fill at the northeast end of Hurricane Street could provide room for large trees that would block some views of the VPP. In the upper image of Figure 5.12-4, large trees are growing along the edge of the sidewalk. In the lower image in Figure 5.12-5, it is apparent that such plantings could be installed between the chain-link fence along the vacant lot and the sidewalk next to it. These trees, in time, would screen the lot and provide a more aesthetic edge to the Grand Canal. The residual impact of offsetting mitigations would be inversely proportional to the degree of public acceptance of the measures.

Regarding the improvement of the visual quality in public spaces, Figure 5.12-10 discloses, in the upper image, the opportunity to improve the appearance of the parking lot along the bridge in the vicinity of where the push site for under-channel tunneling would occur. The bank in the foreground might be planted to shield from view the parking lot and conceal or replace the jumbled chunks of concrete riprap. Similar plantings on the other side of the bridge along the parking area there (the site for the construction/laydown area) would aesthetically frame the bikeway’s entrance into Playa Del Rey.

5.12.5 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

All of the significant, temporary and short-term impacts described in Section 5.12.3 are unavoidable. These impacts will end, however, with the completion of construction. These impacts may be offset by actions taken elsewhere within the affected communities to improve the aesthetics of existing views. The acceptability of any measures contemplated are best addressed through public involvement.

The long-term impact of the destruction of mature street plantings along Via Marina and Marquesas Way might be improved to the point that the duration would be short term (less than 5 years in duration), if trees of a large size are planted. Several years of growth would be required for the trees to approach in height those that would be removed.

5.12.6 Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Of the projects listed as related to the proposed Project in the Introduction, Section 1.0, Table 1.7-1, only two would be relevant. In neither case would there be significant cumulative impacts.

Marina Del Rey Tide Gates Project – This Project entails the removal, rehabilitation and improvement of portions of the existing outlet structure for the Grand Canal located at the southeast end of the Grand Canal where it passes under Via Marina, along with where portions of the proposed Project would also occur. The one aspect of construction that would be relevant to cumulative impacts is that the “Gates” project may require the closure of one lane of Via Marina Street during construction, with traffic controlled by a flagman. The proposed Project also calls for such closure and traffic control. At the time of this assessment, no specific time frames for construction of either project had been identified. It can only be said that if the projects do not occur simultaneously, sequential construction would result in a prolonged period during which views from a designated scenic highway/drive (Via Marina) are unavailable to the public; e.g., it would seem likely that traffic along Via Marina would be restricted to local residential access because there would be no public parking along the road and, therefore, no place
to stop and enjoy the view. The impact of closing one lane due to the proposed Project would, by itself, represent a significant, albeit, temporary visual impact. Lane closure due to the Gates project would also be a temporary but significant visual impact. If the two projects were to occur sequentially, the combined effect would solely be to lengthen the duration of the impact to the point of being short term (1 to 5 years’ duration).

To mitigate the impact to visual resources, both projects should be completed within the same time frame if it is feasible to do so, thereby limiting the time during which the one lane of Via Marina would have to be closed.

**Venice Pumping Plant Sluice Gate Replacement Project** – This project involves the temporary diversion of sewer flows in order to bypass the VPP while the sluice gate within the VPP is rehabilitated. The bypass would be via a pipeline placed above ground along the Grand Canal from Driftwood Street to Hurricane Street along the Esplanade. The pumping mechanisms and pipeline would be in place for about 1 month. This project is relevant to the proposed Project in consideration of cumulative impacts because activities associated with the Project would occur in the same area as the southeast end of the “Sluice Gate” project (near the VPP).

The Initial Study for the Sluice Gate project found that there would be no significant visual impacts, based partly on their short duration. CEQA does not recognize specific time limits as thresholds of significance, nor does the City of Los Angeles Thresholds Guide. However, as noted, the existing visual condition for views potentially affected by the Sluice Gate project is VMC 4 due to the presence of the VPP. This industrial facility dominates the views from points in its vicinity. For that reason, not due to the duration of the impact, the Sluice Gate project would not be a significant impact, as the condition of the affected views cannot worsen. Likewise, together with the proposed Project, the Sluice Gate project would not cumulatively cause a significant impact, due to the existing condition of the area.