ERRATA: SECTION 3.16, AESTHETICS AND VISUAL QUALITY

Errata No.	Draft EIR/EIS Reference		Errata Final EIR/EIS	
	Section	Page	Correction and Rationale	Errata Page Reference
1	Section 3.16.2.3	3.16-19, 3.16-21	Revised Table 3.16-1 to reflect an update to the City of Anaheim's Platinum Triangle Master Land Use Plan and to revise and add dates in the table notes	16-151
2	Section 3.16.5.3	3.16-47	Corrected firework timing at Angel Stadium	16-151
3	Section 3.16.5.3	3.16-47	Added in-progress improvements to Honda Center	16-152

EIR/EIS = environmental impact report/environmental impact statement; No. = number

3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

3.16 Aesthetics and Visual Quality

3.16.1 Introduction

Section 3.16, Aesthetics and Visual Quality, of the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section (project section) Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) describes the potential impacts of the No Project Alternative and the High-Speed Rail (HSR) Project Alternatives, otherwise called Shared Passenger Track Alternative A and Shared Passenger Track Alternative B, and describes impact avoidance and minimization features (IAMF) that will avoid, minimize, or reduce these impacts. Mitigation measures are proposed to further reduce, compensate for, or offset impacts of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Section 3.16 also defines the aesthetics and visual resources in the region and describes the affected environment in the resource study area (RSA).

PURPOSE

Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Through the public involvement process, interested parties have identified visual impacts as a concern. The presence of new infrastructure such as overhead contact systems, communications towers, high-speed rail vehicles, viaducts, tunnels, and stations are examples of facilities with the potential to create visual impacts. This section discusses these potential visual changes.

The following technical reports serve as the basis for the information in this section and are available on request:

- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Aesthetics and Visual Resources Technical Report* (Authority 2025a)
- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Historic Architectural Survey Report (HASR)* (Authority and FRA 2019)
- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Historic Architectural Survey Report (HASR), Addendum 1* draft (Authority 2025b)
- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section High-Speed Rail Passenger Rail Corridor Finding of Effect* (Authority 2020)
- *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Finding of Effect, Addendum 1* (Authority 2025c)

Additional details on aesthetics and visual quality are provided in the following appendices in Volume 2 of this Draft EIR/EIS:

- Appendix 2-A, Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features
- Appendix 2-B, Applicable Design Standards
- Appendix 3.1-A, Regional and Local Policy Inventory and Consistency Analysis

This section includes detailed analysis of environmental resources, affected environment, environmental consequences, and mitigation measures based on the guidance provided in *Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Methodology Guidelines*, Versions 5.9 and 5.11 (Authority 2017a, 2022). Seven other resource sections in this Draft EIR/EIS provide additional information related to impacts on aesthetics and visual quality, including:

- **Section 3.2, Transportation:** Construction and operational changes caused by the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on the regional transportation system, including HSR crossings of transportation rights-of-way, shared transportation corridors, realigned roadways, and grade separations.

- **Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration:** Construction and operational changes caused by the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on sensitive receptors that result in the need for noise barriers.
- **Section 3.12, Socioeconomics and Communities:** Construction and operational changes caused by the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on community character and cohesion.
- **Section 3.13, Station Planning, Land Use, and Development:** Construction and operational changes caused by the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on land use patterns and development.
- **Section 3.15, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space:** Construction and operational changes caused by the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on natural areas, parks, open space, and recreationists, including impediments to views.
- **Section 3.17, Cultural Resources:** Construction and operational changes caused by the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives on resources with cultural or historic significance.
- **Section 3.19, Cumulative Impacts:** Construction and operational changes caused by the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

3.16.1.1 Definition of Resources

The following are definitions for aesthetics and visual quality analyzed in this Draft EIR/EIS:

- **Visual or Landscape Character:** Visual or landscape character refers to an impartial description of what the landscape consists of, defined by the relationships between existing, visible natural and built landscape features. These relationships are considered in terms of form, line, color, texture, dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity. Visual character-defining resources and features include landforms, vegetation, land uses, buildings, transportation facilities, overhead utility structures and lighting, open space, viewpoints, and views to visual resources, waterbodies, historic structures, and downtown skylines.
- **Visual Resources:** A visual resource is any visible site, object, or feature of the landscape. Visual resources are components of the natural, cultural, or project environments. *Natural visual resources* include land, water, sky, vegetation, and animals that compose the natural environment. *Cultural visual resources* include buildings, structures, and artifacts that compose the cultural environment. *Project visual resources* include geometrics, structures, and fixtures that compose and give character to the project environment. Visual resources also include State-designated scenic routes and views toward and in natural areas, parks, and urban areas that have been identified as having historic or cultural importance or that include buildings of similar historic or cultural importance or notable landmark status.
- **Visual Quality:** Visual quality is a result of the interactive experience between viewers and their environment. The *Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Methodology Guidelines*, Versions 5.9 (Authority 2017a) and 5.11 (Authority 2022), were used to evaluate aesthetics and visual quality impacts. This methodology is based on the federal guidelines provided in the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) *Guidelines for the Visual Impact Assessment of Highway* Projects (FHWA 2015). Under this visual quality analysis system, visual quality is determined by evaluating the viewed landscape's characteristics in terms of natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence. The analysis of natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence informs the overall visual quality ratings. Visual quality is rated as low, moderate-low, moderate, moderate-high, or high. To determine overall visual quality, the natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence are also rated, and the ratings of these three factors determine the overall visual quality.
- **Viewers:** Viewers in the RSA are neighbors who can see the project and travelers who would use it. The following are types of neighbors and travelers:

  - Neighbors: Residential, recreational, institutional, civic, retail, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and travelers on roadways with views of the project footprint. Neighbors are those people who are adjacent to the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives and have views of the project footprint.
  - Travelers: Travelers are those people who have views from the project footprint (i.e., rail users) with transitionary views of the project and passing landscapes.

- Neighbors and travelers can be further subdivided into categories that help to establish viewer preferences and their sensitivity to changes in visual resources. Viewer preferences are determined as part of the inventory phase, and viewer sensitivity is determined in the analysis phase.

- **Viewer Sensitivity:** Viewer sensitivity is an assessment of the concern viewer groups may have to changes in the visual character of visual resources based on two factors: (1) viewer awareness to visual changes (measure of attention, focus, and protection) and (2) viewer exposure to visual changes (proximity, duration, number of people affected, or extent). The FHWA method recognizes viewer activity and awareness, values, and cultural significance as key factors in predicting viewer sensitivity. Project effects that are not visible or that are highly screened will not be as noticeable as project effects in the visual foreground (0 to 0.25 or 0.5 mile). For example, although retail neighbors and commuting travelers are generally moderately sensitive viewers, viewer sensitivity in established downtown areas can be high. In these areas—particularly in parks or along pedestrian-oriented sidewalks—viewers are likely to have expectations/preferences of a built environment with a higher level of cultural order associated with an identifiable urban core. Workers in the workplace are generally considered to have moderate or low sensitivity because visual quality is not typically a focus or expectation associated with their activity; however, their exposure to the view is high. Local values as reflected in public policies related to community design and cultural significance, as reflected in the designated historic status of a site, are also potential indicators of high viewer sensitivity.

3.16.2 Laws, Regulations, and Orders

This section describes the federal, state, and local laws, regulations, orders, and plans that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality. General National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requirements for assessment and disclosure of environmental impacts are described in Section 3.1, Introduction, and are therefore not restated in this resource section. NEPA and CEQA requirements specific to the evaluation of aesthetics and visual quality are, however, described in this section.

3.16.2.1 Federal

U.S. Department of Transportation Act (Section 4(f)) (49 U.S. Code [U.S.C.] 303)

Compliance with Section 4(f) is required for transportation projects undertaken by an operating administration of the U.S. Department of Transportation or that may receive federal funding or discretionary approvals. Section 4(f) protects the natural beauty of publicly owned land of parks, recreational areas, wildlife refuges, as well as historic sites of national, state, or local significance on public or private land. The California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) may not approve the use of a Section 4(f) property, as defined in 49 U.S.C. 303C, unless it determines that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to avoid the use of the property and the action includes all possible planning to minimize harm resulting from such use, or the project has a *de minimis* impact on the 4(f) property consistent with the requirements of 49 U.S.C. 303(d).

Federal Railroad Administration, Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 *Federal Register* 28545)

On May 26, 1999, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) released *Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts* (FRA 1999). These FRA procedures describe the FRA's process for assessing the environmental impacts of actions and legislation proposed by the agency and for the preparation of associated documents (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). The FRA

Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts states that "the EIS should identify any significant changes likely to occur in the natural environment and in the developed environment. The EIS should also discuss the consideration given to design quality, art, and architecture in project planning and development as required by U.S. Department of Transportation Order 5610.4." These FRA procedures state that an EIS should consider possible impacts on aesthetics and visual quality.

National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. 300101, et seq.)

The National Historic Preservation Act establishes the federal government policy on historic preservation. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. Potential adverse effects include changes in the physical features of the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance or the introduction of visual elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features.

Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1701, et seq., 102(a), 103(c), 201(a), 505(a))

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act requires that public lands be managed to protect and minimize damage to scenic and aesthetic values. Under the act, the Bureau of Land Management uses a Visual Resource Management System (113 Stat. 224, Public Law 106-45-A, August 10, 1999) to manage resources under its jurisdiction. As applicable to sections in or affecting areas managed by the Bureau of Land Management, the evaluation of aesthetic and visual quality shall consider the rules or guidance under the Visual Resource Management System for the purpose of applying area specific management priorities.

3.16.2.2 State

State Scenic Highways (Streets and Highways Code Sections 260 to 263)

The State Scenic Highways Program lists highways that are either eligible for designation as a scenic highway or already designated as a scenic highway. A highway may be designated as scenic on the basis of the amount of natural landscape that can be seen by travelers, the scenic quality of the landscape, and the extent to which development intrudes on the travelers' enjoyment of the view (Caltrans 2010). The Streets and Highways Code establishes state responsibility for protecting, preserving, and enhancing the natural beauty of California's scenic routes and areas that require special scenic conservation and treatment. No highway in the RSA for visual and aesthetic quality has been either officially designated or determined eligible for designation as a scenic highway.

3.16.2.3 Regional and Local

This section discusses relevant regional and local programs, policies, regulations, and permitting requirements. The project section would primarily be in Los Angeles and Orange Counties and the cities of Los Angeles, Vernon, Commerce, Bell, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, La Mirada, Buena Park, Fullerton, and Anaheim. The community of Boyle Heights and district of Alameda and the city of Orange are also in the RSA. Table 3.16-1 lists local plans and policies that were identified and considered for analysis. This analysis reviewed the general plans for the cities of Vernon, Commerce, and Montebello and found no goals or policies relating to aesthetics and visual quality (including scenic views/corridors/highways). Therefore, this analysis excludes those general plans from the discussion presented below.

Table 3.16-1 Regional and Local Plans and Policies

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
Los Angeles County	
Los Angeles County 2035 General Plan (2025)	The *Los Angeles County General Plan* was adopted on July 14, 2022, and revised in March 2025. The general plan includes the following policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Policy C/NR 13.1: Protect scenic resources through land use regulations that mitigate development impacts. ▪ Policy C/NR 13.3: Reduce light trespass, light pollution and other threats to scenic resources. ▪ Policy C/NR 13.4: Encourage developments to be designed to create a consistent visual relationship with the natural terrain and vegetation. ▪ Policy C/NR 13.5: Encourage required grading to be compatible with the existing terrain. ▪ Policy C/NR 13.6: Prohibit outdoor advertising and billboards along scenic routes, corridors, waterways, and other scenic areas.
LA River Master Plan (2022)	The *LA River Master Plan* seeks to build on prior and current planning efforts to reimagine the Los Angeles River from a single-use corridor to a tangible, multi-benefit resource that connects people, culture, water, open space, and wildlife. Research and analysis for the plan is based on a data-driven watershed and community approach. Relevant goals are: ▪ Provide equitable, inclusive, and safe parks, open space, and trails. ▪ Support healthy connected ecosystems. ▪ Enhance opportunities for equitable access to the river corridor. ▪ Foster opportunities for continued community engagement, development, and education.
City of Los Angeles	
City of Los Angeles General Plan, Framework Element (2024)	The City of Los Angeles originally adopted the *Citywide General Plan Framework, an Element of the City of Los Angeles General Plan* in 1996 and amended it in 2023. The general plan was most recently updated in 2024. The Framework Element contains the following goal that is applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Goal 3K: Transit stations to function as a primary focal point of the City's development
Boyle Heights Community Plan (2024)	The City of Los Angeles adopted the *Boyle Heights Community Plan* in 1998 and updated and approved the plan in September 2024. The community plan contains the following policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ LU 17.4: Incorporate architectural details, building material, and ornamentation that reflect the local context and historic development patterns in Boyle Heights. ▪ LU 22.3: Encourage new development to incorporate public art along building facades and in outdoor areas. ▪ LU 22.4: Grant opportunities to local artists from Boyle Heights when commissioning artwork for both the public realm and private projects.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
Downtown Community Plan (2024)	The *Central City Plan* (2003) was updated and adopted as the *Downtown Community Plan* in May 2023. The *Downtown Community Plan*, amended in 2024, contains the following policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ LU 11.14: Discourage hostile architecture and other urban design elements that prevent inclusive and equitable use of public space. ▪ LU 15.1: Ensure that where new development occurs, it complements the physical qualities and distinct features of existing historic resources. ▪ LU 15.4: Encourage innovative design that creates the preservation worthy buildings of the future. ▪ PO 8.2: Maintain functional use of the rail facilities, while allowing for bold and innovative design along parcels adjacent to the Los Angeles River (River).
Alameda District Specific Plan (1996)	The City of Los Angeles adopted the *Alameda District Specific Plan* in 1996. The plan contains the following guideline that is applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Urban Design Guidelines – Residential Projects. Urban Design Guideline 1. Open Space areas between residential buildings and rail facilities shall incorporate extensive visual screening and landscaping as a buffer between the two land uses.
Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan (2007)	The City of Los Angeles adopted the *Los Angeles River Revitalization Master Plan* in 2007. The plan provides a framework for restoring the river's ecological function and transforming it into an amenity for residents and visitors to the city. It includes the following revitalization vision and goals (summarized) that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Chapter 4. Revitalize the River. – Recommendation #4.11: Ensure public safety by using alternate "greening" techniques in areas where the concrete remains necessary for flood damage prevention. To provide an improved aesthetic environment for the concrete-lined channel in areas where the concrete needs to remain in order to protect life and property from flooding, the Plan advocates drawing on existing City precedents for greening freeway retaining and sound walls with hanging vines ▪ Chapter 5. Green the Neighborhoods. The overall beauty of Los Angeles can become incredibly enhanced through the creation of greener neighborhoods with more open space, trees, and parks. The River Greenway (planned) would be linked to an overall network of "green street" connections. ▪ Chapter 6. Capture Community Opportunities. This plan's vision calls for transforming the river into a safe, accessible, healthy, green, and celebrated place, with the goal of making the river the focus of activity and helping to foster civic pride. ▪ Chapter 7. Create Value. Goals include improving the quality of life by increasing the attractiveness of the city and enhancing public health for both residents and visitors as a place to live, work, and visit; and the creation of environmentally sensitive, sustainable urban design and land use guidelines.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
Redevelopment Plan for the City Center Redevelopment Project (2002)	The City of Los Angeles adopted the *Redevelopment Plan for the City Center Redevelopment Project* in 2002. The plan includes the following objectives that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ To create a symbol of pride and identity which gives the Central City a strong image as the major center of the Los Angeles region. ▪ To achieve excellence in design, based on how the Central City is to be used by people, giving emphasis to parks, green spaces, streetscapes, street trees, and places designed for walking and sitting, and to develop an open space infrastructure that will aid in the creation of a cohesive social fabric. ▪ To develop and implement public art into the urban fabric, integrating art into both public and private developments. ▪ To preserve key landmarks which highlight the history and unique character of the city, blending old and new in an aesthetic realization of change or growth with distinction, and facilitating the adaptive reuse of structures of architectural, historic or cultural merit.
City of Bell	
City of Bell 2030 General Plan, Land Use and Sustainability Element (2022)	The City of Bell adopted the *City of Bell 2030 General Plan* in 2018 and updated it in 2022. The general plan includes the following policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Land Use and Sustainability Element Policy 5. The City of Bell shall encourage a high level of quality in construction and site design features. The City shall create and implement specific design guidelines to promote higher quality in construction. ▪ Land Use and Sustainability Element Policy 6. The City of Bell shall promote design and development strategies (landscaping, shared parking, mixed-use development, etc.) to address the strip commercial development found along arterial roadways. The City shall ensure that new development is compatible with style and design of the surrounding environment through new development standards and design guidelines.
City of Pico Rivera	
City of Pico Rivera General Plan, Land Use Element (2014)	The City of Pico Rivera adopted the Land Use Element of the *City of Pico Rivera General Plan* in October 2014, which contains the following goals and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Goal 3.2. Enhance key entryways and gateways to the city to create a distinct sense of arrival and identify a central space for civic gathering to promote a positive image and strengthen the identity of Pico Rivera. – Policy 3.2-1 Gateway Design and Improvement. Create a city-wide entry and wayfinding signage program to create clear entry statements at key gateways to the city, to improve the identification of important destinations throughout the city, to distinguish and brand the city and for beautification. Design gateway treatments for key entryways into the city that incorporate landscaping, signage, public art, and/or structural elements that communicate a sense of arrival. ▪ Goal 3.5 Recognize the importance of the Whittier Narrows Dam, Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River channels in shaping the character, identity and physical structure of the community by protecting and enhancing these features. – Policy 3.5-1 Trails. Expand bicycle and pedestrian trails, where feasible along the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River channels. – Policy 3.5-2 Habitat. Identify areas where natural habitats along the Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River channels could be restored.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
	– Policy 3.5-3 Recreation. Identify opportunities for passive recreation areas within and along the Whittier Narrows Dam, Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River channels. – Policy 3.5-4 Open Space and Landscaping. Identify opportunities to provide open space/parks and/or landscaping along the Whittier Narrows Dam, Rio Hondo and San Gabriel River channels that will soften and enhance the edges adjacent to these natural features. ▪ Goal 3.6 Improve the community image by ensuring a consistent level of high quality design and ongoing maintenance and improvement of existing development. – Policy 3.6-1 Design Guidelines. Ensure a consistent level of high quality design through the development of design guidelines and a design review process for new development. At a minimum, the design guidelines should provide direction on the following: o Site design o Building design o Parking and circulation o Landscaping o Services and Accessory Structures ▪ Goal 3.7 Protect and enhance existing residential neighborhoods, assuring that they are safe, attractive, provide quality housing choices and are designed and maintained to enhance livability. – Policy 3.7-1 Design. Regulate the design and site planning of new development in and adjacent to residential neighborhoods to ensure compatibility between the new development and the existing residential areas. – Policy 3.7-2 Neighborhood Revitalization. Promote revitalization of neighborhoods in need by maintaining public improvements, encouraging infill development compatible with the scale and character of existing development, and supporting public and private efforts to upgrade and maintain neighborhood appearance and the existing housing stock. ▪ Goal 3.9 A wide range of quality industries that provides job opportunities for Pico Rivera's residents while ensuring compatibility with nearby residential neighborhoods. – Policy 3.9-1 New Industrial Development. Promote high quality industrial development and redevelopment that is compatible with surrounding uses and enhances the adjacent streetscape. – Policy 3.9-4 Design and Buffer. Ensure that industrial developments are sited and adequately buffered from surrounding neighborhoods and development to minimize negative impacts such as visual pollution, noise, odors, truck activities, and other such conflicts on non-industrial uses. ▪ Slauson Avenue Corridor: – Beautification and Intensification Objectives ▪ Incorporate appropriate design guidelines for commercial and industrial development to create a more unified theme and encourage higher quality development. ▪ Renovate existing industrial and commercial development through façade improvements, upgraded landscaping, consistent signage, screening and buffering. – Mobility and Streetscape Objectives

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
	▪ Establish a comprehensive streetscape and landscape program that includes right-of-way improvements to street trees, street lighting, streetscape elements (sidewalk/crosswalk paving, street furniture) and public signage. ▪ Enhance transit stops, shelters and connectivity to corridor uses. ▪ Strengthen pedestrian linkages to adjacent neighborhoods. ▪ Passons Grade Separation: – Objectives ▪ A new linear park should be included in the redevelopment of the vacant parcel north of the rail line. ▪ The redevelopment of this area should improve the appearance of the edges facing the rail line through landscaping and other buffering and screening treatments.
City of Santa Fe Springs	
Re-Imagine Santa Fe Springs 2040 General Plan (2022)	*Re-Imagine Santa Fe Springs 2040 General Plan* was adopted in April 2022. The general plan contains the following policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Policy LU-1.4: Transit Oriented Development. Develop transit-oriented districts around commuter rail stations to maximize access to transit and create vibrant new neighborhoods. ▪ Policy LU-1.5: Apply appropriate screening, buffers, transitional uses, and other controls to transition from industrial and commercial uses to any adjacent residential uses and thus reduce potential noise and air pollution impacts. ▪ Policy LU-11.1: Signature Design. Require developments along major corridors and at City entries to use distinctive architectural, landscaping, and site design treatments. ▪ Policy LU-11.2: Public Art. Encourage public artwork within public rights of-way, along streetscapes, at gateways, and integrated into private projects in a manner visible to the public and that encourages the City's cultural and historical elements. ▪ Policy LU-11.6: Industrial Design. Insist upon distinctive architecture, landscaping, and shade trees along street frontages and on private property that defines the character of industrial and commercial districts. ▪ Policy LU-11.12 Light Pollution. Minimize light pollution by limiting the amount and type of lighting within new developments. ▪ Policy C-5.2 Minimize Community Impacts. Investigate means to establish buffers such as walls, landscape screening, and/or barriers along truck, rail, and freeway routes and adjacent to rail yards to minimize noise, vibration, and aesthetics impacts.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
Adopted Specific Plan for the Development of the Waste Disposal, Inc. Site (2020)	The City of Santa Fe Springs adopted the *Adopted Specific Plan for the Development of the Waste Disposal, Inc. Site* on April 1, 2020, which includes the following passages that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Statement of Purpose. The implementation of this Specific Plan will lead to the redevelopment and reuse of the Site, assure environmental safety on the project site, improve the visual atmosphere and function of the immediate area, and ensure that any future development will ultimately enhance the community of Santa Fe Springs and the surrounding area. ▪ Development Standards. Perimeter Landscaping. In order to enhance the overall character of the City and to provide additional open space, the Planning Commission has instituted an "urban forest" requirement on all new developments. The urban forest provides raised, meandering, and undulating sidewalks around the perimeters of properties in areas facing city streets. Appropriate street trees and raised lawns shall be planted along the rights-of-way. In addition, to further encourage the use of the areas as a form of open space, benches and trash receptacles should be placed intermittently near the walkways.
City of Norwalk	
Vision Norwalk – The City of Norwalk General Plan, Land Use Element and Community Design Element (2023)	The City of Norwalk adopted *Vision Norwalk: the City of Norwalk General Plan* in 1996 and updated it most recently in 2023. The general plan contains the following policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Encourage developments to be well located and functionally integrated with adjacent transit facilities. ▪ Encourage the maintenance and enhancement of areas important to the creation of a positive image for Norwalk. ▪ New residential, commercial, industrial, and public facility and right-of-way developments should be reviewed to determine consistency and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood, district, and overall community. ▪ Capital Improvements, including public right-of-way improvements, will be designed to define neighborhoods, districts, gateways, and a hierarchy of streets.
City of Norwalk General Plan, City Center Area Plan (2023)	The City of Norwalk adopted *Vision Norwalk – the City of Norwalk General Plan* in 1996 and updated it most recently in 2023. The City Center Area Plan contains the following objectives and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Consider the establishment of urban design guidelines, which will provide for an aesthetically pleasing, pedestrian-friendly, and economically viable business core and which will encourage uses which are mutually supportive. ▪ Encourage complementary and appropriate land uses adjacent to public transportation stations and routes. ▪ Promote regulations and standards which encourage developments to be functionally integrated with adjacent transportation facilities and networks. ▪ Support the preservation of historic structures and places. ▪ Consider the establishment of a Landscape Plan for all rights-of-way in the City Center, pedestrian walkways, and open space areas, which will support the purpose and intent of the Specific Plan.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
Specific Plan Area No. 1[1] (1996)	The City of Norwalk adopted the *Specific Plan Area No. 1* guidance document in 1996. It includes the following objectives and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ To assure the development is substantial with highly desirable characteristics and attributes of excellence of design and execution in order to promote a quality civic image. ▪ To provide a highly attractive, stimulating, and innovative living environment that will tend to stimulate the surrounding area and improve the development characteristics of the area. ▪ To minimize any potential adverse impacts on surrounding residential areas, especially as they relate to visual, aesthetic and traffic effects. ▪ To allow for imaginative and qualitative site planning and architectural design creating a unique and individual character within the development, and contributing to the overall enhancement of the City Centre environment. ▪ Special attention shall be given to the provision for substantial visual and acoustic buffering between the development and adjacent residential areas.
Specific Plan Area No. 8 (1996)	The City of Norwalk adopted the *Specific Plan Area No. 8* guidance document in 1996. It includes the following objectives and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ To assure the development is substantial with highly desirable characteristics, and attributes of excellence of design and execution in order to promote a quality civic image. ▪ To minimize any potential adverse impacts on surrounding residential areas, especially as they relate to visual, aesthetic and traffic effects. ▪ To allow for imaginative and qualitative site planning and architectural design, which will contribute to the overall enhancement of the Civic Center environment. ▪ Special attention shall be given to the provision for substantial visual and acoustic buffering between the development and adjacent residential areas.
Specific Plan Area No. 9 (1996)	The City of Norwalk adopted the *Specific Plan Area No. 9* guidance document in 1996. It includes the following objectives and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Provide a highly attractive, stimulating, and innovative living environment that will tend to stimulate the surrounding area and improve the development characteristics of the area. ▪ Landscaping, fencing, roof materials, and architectural design shall be integrated to provide an appearance of outstanding visual quality to adjacent residential and commercial properties and to motorists and pedestrians on the bounding arterial street.

[1] The purpose of the specific plan areas in Norwalk is to facilitate the systematic implementation of the general plan and to serve as a basis for review of more detailed plans. They are intended to establish a development pattern to achieve a functionally and visually integrated development; ensure adequate design and controls to mitigate factors such as visual features detrimental to a proposed project and its users and tenants or to nearby residents; capitalize upon certain special qualities and opportunities of a designated area while permitting a degree of flexibility favorable to unique and imaginative designs; and encourage and promote a high quality of design and environment.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
Specific Plan Area No. 11 (1996)	The City of Norwalk adopted the *Specific Plan Area No. 11* guidance document in 1996. It includes the following objectives and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Provide a highly attractive, stimulating, and innovative living environment that will tend to stimulate the surrounding area and improve the development characteristics of the area. ▪ Landscaping, fencing, roof materials, and architectural design shall be integrated to provide an appearance of outstanding visual quality to adjacent residential and commercial properties and to motorists and pedestrians on the bounding arterial street.
City of La Mirada	
City of La Mirada General Plan, Land Use Element and Circulation Element (2003)	The City of La Mirada adopted the *City of La Mirada General Plan* in March of 2003. The general plan Land Use and Circulation Elements contain the following goals and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Land Use Element Goal 6.0: Achieve aesthetic enhancements citywide to distinguish La Mirada ▪ Circulation Element Policy 5.2: Protect the public's assets and community aesthetics against unmitigated impacts of above-ground telecommunications infrastructure development.
County of Orange	
County of Orange General Plan, Land Use Element, Transportation Element, Growth Management Element (2025)	The *County of Orange General Plan* is a blueprint for growth and development and focuses primarily on the unincorporated area. The *County of Orange General Plan* was last updated in 2025, and consists of an introductory chapter, a demographics chapter, and nine elements: Land Use, Transportation, Public Services and Facilities, Resources, Recreation, Noise, Safety, Housing, and Growth Management. The general plan contains the following goals and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Land Use Element, Policy 7: To require new development to be compatible with adjacent areas. ▪ Land Use Element, Policy 9: To guide development so that the quality of the physical environment is enhanced. ▪ Resources Element, Goal 1: Retain the character and natural beauty of the environment through the preservation, conservation, and maintenance of open space. ▪ Resources Element, Policy 1.1: Retain the character and natural beauty of the environment through the preservation, conservation, and maintenance of open space. ▪ Resources Element, Policy 5: To protect the unique variety of significant landforms in Orange County through environmental review procedures and community and corridor planning activities. ▪ Transportation Element, Goal 1: Preserve and enhance unique or special aesthetic and visual resources through sensitive highway design and the regulation of development within the scenic corridor. ▪ Transportation Element, Objective 1.1: Protect and enhance the County's beauty, amenities, and quality of life within the unincorporated areas.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
City of Buena Park	
Buena Park 2035 General Plan (2022)	The City of Buena Park amended the *Buena Park 2035 General Plan* in 2022. The general plan contains the following goals and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Goal LU-3: Effective management of growth and change. – Policy LU-3.1: Ensure that development activities acknowledge the protection and enhancement of quality of life in the City's neighborhoods. ▪ Goal LU-15: Land uses that are connected and coordinated with existing and future transportation facilities. – Policy LU-15.1: Promote convenient and attractive pedestrian linkages across and along streets. ▪ Goal LU-21: Distinctive and attractive design of the public realm that promotes a positive image and identity. – Policy LU-21.1: Focus on improving the appearance of corridors in the City by implementing landscaping, enhanced paving, unique streetscape amenities, appropriately-scaled lighting, and placement of utility connections underground. – Policy LU-21.2: Support the development of a comprehensive gateway program, including a hierarchy of entry monuments and wayfinding signage throughout the City. – Policy LU-21.3: Support landscaping treatments that complement a comprehensive streetscape program and that maximize water conservation through plant species and irrigation techniques. – Policy LU-21.4: Strive to develop a system of key landmarks that contribute to the character and image of the City, and encourage new buildings and/or monuments to function as neighborhood or district markers. ▪ Goal LU-22: New development and redevelopment that contributes to a positive visual image of the City. – Policy LU-22.1: Support development in focus areas that encourages a mix of land uses, central gathering spaces, walkable streets, interesting architecture, and public art. – Policy LU-22.2: Promote good quality design that considers site and building scale and mass that enhances the experience of employees and customers. ▪ Goal LU-23: New development and redevelopment that fosters social interaction, connectivity, and sense of place. – Policy LU-23.1: Encourage connectivity between focus areas, nodes, and neighborhoods through visually-interesting and logical networks of paths that provide access for pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit patrons.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
Amendment 2007 to the Merged, Amended and Restated Redevelopment Plan for the Buena Park Consolidated Project Area (2007)	The City of Buena Park adopted *Amendment 2007 to the Merged, Amended and Restated Redevelopment Plan for the Buena Park Consolidated Project Area* in 2007. The plan contains the following goals that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ 4. Encouragement of modern, integrated, and diverse development with high concern for architectural, landscape, and urban design character. ▪ 11. Development of distinct commercial districts with a consistent image and character, which relate positively to adjacent land uses. ▪ 14. Expanded open spaces for recreational uses and the preservation of views, natural character, and topography. In addition to the goals listed above, implementation of this Amended Plan seeks to reach specific goals for Project Area I/Central Business District [CBD]: ▪ 1. Preservation and enhancement of the varied and distinctive character of the Central Business District, as well as the promotion of the CBD as a cultural center.
City of Fullerton	
The Fullerton Plan, Community Development and Design Element and Resource Management Element (2025)	The City of Fullerton adopted *The Fullerton Plan* in 2012 and updated it most recently in 2025. The *Fullerton Plan* is organized into four Master Elements and within each Master Element is the specific Element. The general plan contains the following goals and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ P1.2 Subregional Coordination: Support projects, programs and policies to promote compatibility and mutually beneficial built environments and land uses with adjacent jurisdictions and other agencies. ▪ P1.3 Protection and Restoration of Natural Resources: Support projects, programs, policies and regulations to protect, and where appropriate restore, the natural landscape, topography, drainage ways, habitat, and other natural resources when planning improvements to existing and new neighborhoods and districts. ▪ P1.11 Compatibility of Design and Uses: Support programs, policies and regulations to consider the immediate and surrounding contexts of projects to promote positive design relationships and use compatibility with adjacent built environments and land uses, including the public realm. ▪ P2.3 Distinctive Landmarks: Support projects, programs, policies and regulations to preserve existing landmarks and encourage the creation of new landmarks that reinforce Fullerton's identity and image. ▪ P2.4 Sense of Place: Support projects, programs, policies and regulations to reinforce the character and sense of place of established neighborhoods and districts by preserving and enhancing the attributes which contribute to neighborhood and district identity, vitality and livability.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
Fullerton Transit Village Specific Plan (2004)	The City of Fullerton adopted the *Fullerton Transit Village Specific Plan* in 2004. The plan provides the following design guidelines that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Site Planning. The overall community design concept for the Fullerton Transit Village at Fullerton is that of a pedestrian-friendly transit-oriented lifestyle that reflects the eclectic, urban nature of the elements surrounding the site. ▪ Architectural Character. Two historic structures provide the inspiration for the architectural character of the project. The Fullerton Train Depot, located to the north of the site, across the railroad tracks, is a Spanish Colonial style structure built in 1930. The Crystal Ice House, a brick commercial structure built in 1910, is directly adjacent to the northwest portion of the site. The proposed residences will represent interpretations of both the Industrial and Spanish Colonial styles, thereby reflecting the historic architectural diversity of the surrounding neighborhood. ▪ Landscape Architecture, Landscape Concept. The community landscape concept is intended to create a distinctive, diverse environment that will lend identity and character to the Specific Plan area.
Fullerton Municipal Airport Master Plan Update (2004)	The City of Fullerton adopted the *Fullerton Municipal Airport Master Plan Update* in 2004. The plan contains the following relevant policy that is applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ For Runway Protection Zones there is a "right to prohibit electrical interference, glare, misleading lights, visual impairments, and other hazards to aircraft flight from being created on the property."

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
City of Anaheim	
City of Anaheim General Plan, Land Use Element (2025)	The City of Anaheim adopted the *City of Anaheim General Plan* in 2004 and revised the Land Use Element in April 2025. The Land Use Element contains the following goals and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Goal 1.1: Preserve and enhance the quality and character of Anaheim's mosaic of unique neighborhoods. – Policy 2 of Goal 1.1: Ensure that new development is designed in a manner that preserves the quality of life in existing neighborhoods. ▪ Goal 3.1: Pursue land uses along major corridors that enhance the City's image and stimulate appropriate development at strategic locations. – Policy 3 of Goal 3.1: Ensure quality development along corridors through adherence to established development standards and Community Design Element goals, policies and guidelines. – Policy 4 of Goal 3.1: Continue to pursue additional open space, recreation, and landscaping amenities along major transportation routes. ▪ Goal 4.1: Promote development that integrates with and minimizes impacts to surrounding land uses. – Policy 1 of Goal 4.1: Ensure that land uses develop in accordance with the Land Use Plan and Zoning Code in an effort to attain land use compatibility. – Policy 2 of Goal 4.1: Promote compatible development through adherence to Community Design Element policies and guidelines. – Policy 3 of Goal 4.1: Ensure that developers consider and address project impacts upon surrounding neighborhoods during the design and development process. – Policy 4 of Goal 4.1: Require new or expanded uses to provide mitigation or buffers between existing uses where potential adverse impacts could occur. – Policy 6 of Goal 4.1: Require landscape and/or open space buffers to maintain a natural edge for proposed private development directly adjacent to natural, public open space areas.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
City of Anaheim General Plan, Green Element (2025)	The City of Anaheim adopted the *City of Anaheim General Plan* in 2004 and revised individual elements through early 2025. The Green Element was amended July 14, 2020, and contains the following goals and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Goal 2.1: Preserve views of ridgelines, natural open space, and other scenic vistas wherever possible. – Policy 2 of Goal 2.1: Encourage development that preserves natural contours and views of existing backdrop ridgelines or prominent views. ▪ Goal 11.1: Encourage land planning and urban design that support alternatives to the private automobile such as mixed-use, provision of pedestrian and bicycle amenities, and transit-oriented development. – Policy 7 of Goal 11.1: Provide everyday opportunities to connect with nature through the promotion of trails, bicycle routes, and habitat friendly landscaping. ▪ Goal 14.3: Ensure that future development near regional open space resources will be sensitively integrated into surrounding sensitive habitat areas. – Policy 1 of Goal 14.3: Require new development to mitigate light and glare impacts on surrounding sensitive habitat and open space areas, where appropriate. ▪ Goal 23.2: Complete the City's comprehensive program of corridor landscaping, including entryways, medians, and parkways, to strengthen the identity of major corridors and the City as a whole. – Policy 2 of Goal 23.2: Adopt landscape themes that give special identity to each corridor and reinforce the City's overall image. – Policy 3 of Goal 23.2: Develop specialized landscape and design treatment for key entryways, intersections and powerline easements identified on the Green Plan, in accordance with the Community Design Element.
City of Anaheim General Plan, Community Design Element (2025)	The City of Anaheim adopted the *City of Anaheim General Plan* in 2004 and revised individual elements through early 2025. The Community Design Element was amended May 23, 2017, and contains the following goals and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Goal 1.1: Create an aesthetically pleasing and unified community appearance within the context of districts and neighborhoods. – Policy 1 of Goal 1.1: Continue to designate and provide monumentation for important primary and secondary entry points into the city, especially along major corridors. – Policy 4 of Goal 1.1: Pursue unifying streetscape elements for major corridors, including coordinated streetlights, landscaping, public signage and street furniture, to reinforce Anaheim's community image. – Policy 5 of Goal 1.1: Identify and preserve/enhance view corridors for major landmarks, community facilities, and natural open space in the planning and design of all public and private projects. – Policy 7 of Goal 1.1: Screen public and private facilities and aboveground infrastructure support structures and equipment, such as electrical substations, and water wells and recharge facilities, with appropriately scaled landscaping or other methods of screening. – Policy 8 of Goal 1.1: Construct public and private facilities and support structures (e.g., water pipes, irrigation and electrical controls, vents) to blend with the surrounding environment.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
	– Policy 9 of Goal 1.1: Minimize visual impacts of public and private facilities and support structures through sensitive site design and construction. This includes, but is not limited to: appropriate placement of facilities; undergrounding, where possible; and aesthetic design (e.g., cell tower stealthing). ▪ Goal 2.1: Attractively landscape and maintain Anaheim's major arterial corridors and prepare/implement distinctive streetscape improvement plans. – Policy 3 of Goal 2.1: Continue to underground overhead utility lines along the City's arterial corridors. – Policy 4 of Goal 2.1: Ensure adherence to sign regulations, which address issues of scale, type, design, materials, placement, compatibility, and maintenance for uses along freeways, toll roads and major arterial corridors. ▪ Goal 10.1: Anaheim sign guidelines address distinctive, appropriately scaled and/or coordinated signs throughout commercial, industrial, and mixed-use areas. – Policy 2 of Goal 10.1: Where freestanding signs are necessary, they should be designed in a vertical format with consistent lettering, color and style, capturing the architectural theme of the commercial area of which they are a part. – Policy 4 of Goal 10.1: Encourage high-quality signage, including wall signs, raised letter signs, projecting, double-faced signs, and customized logos. – Policy 5 of Goal 10.1: Encourage signs that complement the architecture of the building without dominating it. ▪ Goal 11.1: Architecture in Anaheim has diversity and creativity of design and is consistent with the immediate surroundings. – Policy 1 of Goal 11.1: In areas of diverse character, encourages project design that represents architectural elements of the neighborhood or surrounding commercial areas. – Policy 2 of Goal 11.1: Encourage architectural designs that are visually stimulating and varied, yet tasteful, containing rich contrasts and distinctive architectural elements. ▪ Goal 12.1: Opportunities to expand the Art in Public Places program to include all areas of the city will be explored, thereby enriching public places and strengthening the City's identity. – Policy 1 of Goal 12.1: Continue and expand the Arts in Public Places program by selecting suitable sites throughout the City that would benefit from the inclusion of public art.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
Platinum Triangle Master Land Use Plan (2017)	The City of Anaheim amended the *Platinum Triangle Master Land Use Plan* on February 28, 2017. The plan includes the following planning principles: ▪ Principle 2.1.1, Balance and Integrate Uses. In order to maximize long-term property value, the Platinum Triangle will not only provide new balanced development opportunities for office, residential and sports/entertainment and allow for existing industrial uses to continue, but link the various uses together with walkable streets, open space and consistent landscape. Regardless of market strengths for any one use at a given time, the opportunity and value for all uses will be enhanced by a supportive, integrated and multi-use district approach. ▪ Principle 2.1.3, Create a Unique, Integrated, Walkable Urban Environment. To achieve the potential of the Platinum Triangle in terms of quality of life and land value, a vibrant, walkable urban environment is required. Comfortable walking environments linking jobs, attractive housing, open space and local services, while reducing the need to drive, are attributes that require guidance and facilitation. It will be essential that each new project make a contribution toward this new urban quality and character. ▪ Principle 2.2.4 Create a street/ground floor zone that is attractive, safe, and engaging. Great urban neighborhoods have attractive, safe and interesting streets that are enjoyable to experience as both a pedestrian and driver. Such streets require quality ground floor architectural treatments, consistent setbacks, landscape and sufficient interaction with the adjacent uses, so that a sense of community and security is achieved. On the arterial streets this will be achieved through landscape, street trees, entries, patios and attractive architecture. On the connector streets, individual dwelling entries and stoops will enhance the pedestrian experience. Setbacks have been established that provide a balance between full utilization of the site for development and creating sufficient room for landscape. The setbacks are the narrowest on the connector streets with lower traffic volumes, encouraging a more intimate, and human-scale street space. The major intersections within the Platinum Triangle will be framed by landmark architecture that lets visitors know they have arrived at a major destination. ▪ Principle 3.2, Stadium District Development Principles. Provide an internal, pedestrian-scale “promenade” street that allows walkable access to the transit stations and links the transit oriented development to the adjacent districts. Provide attractive urban streets lined with active ground floor uses and a scale of street width and building placement that creates security and a comfortable human scale, and that energizes ground floor retail and entertainment uses.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
The Anaheim Colony: Vision, Principles and Design Guidelines (2003)	The City of Anaheim adopted the *Anaheim Colony Vision, Principles and Design Guidelines* in 2003. The document contains the following principles and guidelines that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Guiding Principle 1: The Colony is Anaheim's historic and cultural center. ▪ Guiding Principle 5: The Colony's commercial streets have strong, unifying historical design themes. ▪ Visual continuity is created through similarities in scale, height, signage, massing, street furniture, and landscaping. ▪ Guiding Principle 6: The Colony's public spaces provide quality gathering places, comfort and focal points. ▪ Guiding Principle 7: New development within the Colony respects the historic context. ▪ Guiding Principle 8: Certain areas outside the boundaries of the Anaheim Colony Historic District should be considered zones of influence of the historic district and subject to its design guidelines. ▪ Public Landscaping 8: The historic boundaries of the original Colony should be delineated with distinctive tree and hedge planting. Tree selection should emphasize the vertical orientation of the original Colony fences. ▪ Streetscape.1: Along beautiful commercial streets, all the elements – buildings, signs, landscaping and street furniture – should work together to create a unified and coherent visual identity and public space. ▪ Streetscape.3: Streetscapes provide visual interest, continuity and identity and should include a consistent blend of themed street furniture, consisting of streetlights, banners, benches, bollards, newsracks, bus stops, and trash receptacles.

Plan or Policy Title	Summary
City of Orange	
Orange General Plan, Land Use Element, Natural Resources Element, and Urban Design Element (2025)	The City of Orange adopted the *Orange General Plan* in 2010, and revised individual elements in 2015 and 2025. The general plan contains the following goals and policies that are applicable to aesthetics and visual quality: ▪ Land Use Policy 1.5: Prioritize recreation and open space uses at Irvine Lake and protect historic visual resources in east Orange. ▪ Land Use Policy 3.3: Improve vehicular, pedestrian, and visual connections between commercial areas and the rest of the community. ▪ Land Use Policy 7.5: Work with and encourage other agencies and service providers to minimize potential visual and environmental impacts of their facilities on Orange. The Open Space Ridgeline designation is designed to preserve visually significant ridgelines and steep hillsides. The City has adopted a hillside grading policy that prohibits development or grading on ridgelines with this designated land use. ▪ Natural Resources Goal 7.0: Protect significant view corridors, open space, and ridgelines within the urban environment. – Policy 7.1: Preserve the scenic nature of significant ridgelines visible throughout the community. – Policy 7.2: Designate Santiago Canyon Road east of Jamboree Road as a City Scenic Highway to preserve the scenic nature of the open space adjacent to the road. – Policy 7.3: Encourage the development of landscaped medians and parkway landscaping along arterial streets in public and private projects, and encourage the state to provide freeway landscaping. – Policy 7.5 Encourage the retention and enhancement of scenic corridors and visual focal points within the community. ▪ Urban Design Goal 1.0: Promote streetscapes that enhance the economic vitality and overall visual quality of commercial corridors, support the circulation network, and support pedestrian-scale streets and patterns of activity. – Policy 1.1: Enhance the streetscape along the city's major commercial corridors and other major streets through coordinated public and private improvements to convey a positive image of the district, contribute to its economic vitality and perception of the city, and improve visual and physical transitions into adjacent neighborhoods. Streetscape designs should include wide sidewalks to accommodate unified landscaping, trees, lighting, paving, street furniture, and other public improvements appropriate to the scale of the streets. – Policy 1.3: Ensure that streetscape improvements provide for an environment that offers a pleasant experience for motorists, pedestrians, and transit riders. – Policy 1.4: Coordinate with local utility providers to identify priority areas for undergrounding or relocation of overhead electrical and telephone/cable wires to remove visual clutter of existing infrastructure.

Sources: City of Anaheim 2003, 2017, 2025; City of Bell 2022; City of Buena Park 2007, 2022; City of Fullerton 2004a, 2004b, 2025; City of La Mirada 2003; City of Los Angeles 1996, 2002, 2007, 2024a, 2024b, 2024c; City of Norwalk 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 2023; City of Orange 2025; City of Pico Rivera 2014; City of Santa Fe Springs 2020, 2022; County of Los Angeles 2025; County of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County Public Works 2022; County of Orange 2025
CBD = Central Business District

3.16.3 Consistency with Plans and Laws

As indicated in Section 3.1.5.3, Consistency with Plans and Laws, CEQA and NEPA require a discussion of inconsistencies or conflicts between a proposed undertaking and federal, state,

regional, or local plans and laws. CEQA and FRA NEPA implementing procedures require the discussion of any inconsistency or conflict between a proposed action and federal, state, regional, or local plans and laws. Where inconsistencies or conflicts exist, the Authority must provide a description of the extent of reconciliation and the reason for proceeding if full reconciliation is not feasible under NEPA (64 *Federal Register* 28545, 14(n)(15)), and must discuss the inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans under CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d)).

Several federal and state laws, listed in Section 3.16.2.1, Federal, and Section 3.16.2.2, State, pertain to aesthetics and visual quality. The Authority, as the lead agency proposing to build and operate the HSR system, is required to comply with all federal and state laws and regulations and to secure all applicable federal and state permits prior to initiating construction of the project. Pursuant to U.S.C. Title 23 Section 327, under the NEPA Assignment Memorandum of Understanding between the FRA and the State of California, effective July 22, 2024, the Authority is the federal lead agency for environmental reviews and approvals for all Authority Phase 1 and Phase 2 California HSR System projects.

The Authority is a state agency and is therefore not required to comply with local land use and zoning regulations; however, it has endeavored to design and build the HSR project so that it is consistent with land use and zoning regulations. The Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would be consistent with all regional and local policies. Refer to Appendix 3.1-A for a complete consistency analysis of local plans and policies.

3.16.4 Methods for Evaluating Impacts

The evaluation of impacts on parks, recreation, open space, and school district play areas is a requirement of NEPA and CEQA. The following sections define the RSA and summarize the methods used to analyze impacts on aesthetics and visual quality. As summarized in Section 3.16.1, Introduction, several other sections also provide additional information related to aesthetics and visual quality.

3.16.4.1 Definition of Resource Study Area

As defined in Section 3.1.5.4, Methods for Evaluating Impacts, the RSA is the geographic boundary in which the Authority conducted environmental investigations specific to each resource topic. For aesthetics and visual quality, the RSA in urban environments, where visibility is often restricted by the presence of buildings, is at least the project footprint plus 0.25 mile, depending on the visibility of project components. The RSA is considered the area in the foreground, which is the area of highest visual concern. Table 3.16-2 provides a general definition and boundary description for the RSA as depicted on Figure 3.16-1.

The RSA for direct impacts on aesthetics and visual quality in urban environments is at least the project footprint, which accounts for the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units. This accounts for each area's landform (topography), land cover (vegetation and structures), and atmospheric conditions (dust, fog, precipitation), which can limit human sight.

Considering the anticipated scale of the project and the urban environment of the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units, the zone of highest visual concern generally is not expected to extend beyond a foreground distance of 0.25 mile from the project footprint. Beyond foreground viewing distances of 0.25 mile, the project section would have a limited visual presence. Although there are instances in which visual changes may be experienced beyond 0.25 mile from the project footprint, this distance was selected for the extent of the RSA because views would generally be blocked by tall vegetation, buildings, and other intervening development.


Where project elements in the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units would be elevated on berms or structures, the potential increased visibility of the project section was evaluated in highly site-specific ways. In addition, views of the alignments from specific "view corridors" along major arterials, channels or rivers, freeways, railways, or

other transportation corridors were also addressed as appropriate throughout the analysis and were considered in the selection of representative key viewpoints (KVP) along the proposed alignment.

Table 3.16-2 Definition of Aesthetics and Visual Quality Resource Study Area

General Definition[1]	Resource Study Area Boundary
Aesthetics and Visual Quality	
Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit	The Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit extends from the project footprint's northern terminus at U.S. Highway 101 to the southern limits of the city of Los Angeles.[2]
Gateway Cities Landscape Unit	The Gateway Cities Landscape Unit captures residential, recreational, and commercial views to the project footprint throughout the communities of Vernon, Commerce, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, and Buena Park.
Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit	The Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit encompasses the cities of Fullerton and Anaheim until the project reaches its southern terminus at ARTIC.

[1] Landscape units are used to "break up" long, linear projects into logical geographic entities for which impacts from a proposed project can be assessed, and can be conceived of as a spatially defined landscape with a particular visual identity—a distinctive "outdoor room" (FHWA 2015). Refer to Section 3.16.4.3, Methods for Impact Analysis, for further information.
[2] The project footprint includes all areas required to build, operate, and maintain all permanent high-speed rail facilities, including permanent right-of-way, permanent utility and access easements, and temporary construction easements.
ARTIC = Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center



Source: ESRI 2024

Figure 3.16-1 Resource Study Area for Aesthetics and Visual Quality

3.16.4.2 Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features

The Shared Passenger Track Alternatives incorporate standardized HSR features to avoid and minimize impacts. These features are referred to as IAMFs. The Authority will incorporate IAMFs during project design and construction; therefore, the analysis of impacts of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in this section factors in applicable IAMFs. Appendix 2-A provides a detailed description of IAMFs that are included as part of the project design. IAMFs applicable to aesthetics and visual quality include:

- **AVQ-IAMF#1: Aesthetic Options.** Prior to construction, the Authority-designated contractor shall document, through issuance of a technical memorandum, how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual effects. The Authority seeks to balance providing a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the local context for the numerous HSR nonstation structures across the state. Examples of aesthetic options will be provided to local jurisdictions that can be applied to nonstandard structures in the HSR system. Refer to *Aesthetic Options for Non-Station Structures*, 2017 (Authority 2017b).
- **AVQ-IAMF#2: Aesthetic Review Process.** Prior to construction, the Authority-designated contractor will document that the Authority's aesthetic review process has been followed to guide the development of nonstation area structures. Documentation will be through issuance of a technical memorandum to the Authority. The Authority will identify key nonstation structures recommended for aesthetic treatment, consult with local jurisdictions on how best to involve the community in the process, solicit input from local jurisdictions on their aesthetic preferences, and evaluate aesthetic preferences for potential cost, schedule, and operational impacts. The Authority will also evaluate compatibility with project-wide aesthetic goals, include recommended aesthetic approaches in the construction procurement documents, and work with the Authority-designated contractor and local jurisdictions to review designs and local aesthetic preferences and incorporate them into final design and construction. Refer to *Aesthetic Options for Non-Station Structures*, 2017.

Other resource IAMFs applicable to impacts on aesthetics and visual quality include:

- **AQ-IAMF#1:** Fugitive Dust Emissions
- **BIO-IAMF#11:** Maintain Construction Sites and Best Management Practice Training

In Section 3.16.6, Environmental Consequences, each impact narrative describes how these project features are applicable and, where appropriate, effective at avoiding or minimizing potential impacts to less-than-significant levels under CEQA.

3.16.4.3 Methods for Impact Analysis

This section describes the methods the Authority used to analyze potential aesthetics and visual quality impacts from implementing the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. These methods apply to both NEPA and CEQA analyses unless otherwise indicated. Refer to Section 3.1.5.4 for a description of the general framework for evaluating impacts under NEPA and CEQA. Refer to the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Aesthetics and Visual Quality Technical Report* (Authority 2025a) for information regarding the methods and data sources used in this analysis. Laws, regulations, and local planning documents (refer to Section 3.16.2, Laws, Regulations, and Orders) that regulate aesthetics and visual quality were also considered in the evaluation of impacts on aesthetics and visual quality. The analysis also includes reviews of data and impact analyses in other Draft EIR/EIS sections as noted in Section 3.16.1. For project construction and operational actions that would result in impacts, feasible mitigation measures are identified to avoid or minimize impacts or to compensate for impacts.

The *Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement Environmental Methodology Guidelines*, Version 5.11 is used to evaluate aesthetics and visual quality impacts. This methodology is based on the federal guidelines provided in the FHWA *Guidelines for the Visual Impact Assessment of Highway Projects* (FHWA 2015). The assessment methodology provides an approach and terminology for analyzing impacts on visual quality by evaluating the

compatibility of impacts on visual resources, and viewer *sensitivity*. The methodology for visual impact assessment includes the four phases:

- **Establishment Phase:** Establish the RSA for aesthetics and visual quality, including affected viewsheds and landscape units.
- **Inventory Phase:** Inventory and describe the affected environment, affected viewers, and existing visual quality and identify KVPs to be used for the visual assessment. This inventory is based on field work conducted along the alignment in consultation with the Authority and the FRA, when work on this analysis started, with updates occurring with project changes or resources added through further consultation with technical subject matter experts for aesthetics, cultural, and recreational resources.
- **Analysis Phase:** Assess visual compatibility and viewer sensitivity and analyze the project's visual impacts.
- **Mitigation Phase:** Propose methods to mitigate significant visual impacts.

The Authority used the following methods to evaluate potential direct and indirect impacts from construction on aesthetics and visual quality.

Landscape Units and Key Viewpoints

Landscape units are the geographic unit on which impacts on visual character, viewers, and visual quality are assessed. Landscape units are defined by viewsheds, landscape, and land use type, including the existing visual character and types of viewers. With an understanding of the visual character in the RSA, the Authority defined *landscape units* to capture visual environments sharing similar character. Landscape units are used to "break up" long linear projects into logical geographic entities for which impacts from a proposed project can be assessed, and can be conceived of as a spatially defined landscape with a particular visual identity—a distinctive "outdoor room" (FHWA 2015). These units generally have similar visual characteristics (or character), although the visual characteristics of smaller locations within each landscape unit may differ from the overall unit's character. The landscape units addressed in this analysis (Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim) represent spatially closed or visually bounded areas, each having distinct landscape character, interrelated visual elements, or specific viewer groups.

Within each landscape unit, KVPs were established in locations where the visual character is representative of the landscape unit and experienced by viewer groups in the RSA. To assist in characterizing the existing visual conditions of the landscape units, and to assist in determining impacts on them, KVPs are used to provide examples of existing views of the landscape within each landscape unit. KVPs are also used to illustrate how a proposed project would change those views. KVPs represent specific locations within a landscape unit from which a proposed project would be visible. These locations are typically selected to represent either (1) "typical" views from common types of viewing areas from which a proposed project could be seen, such as a highway or residential area; or (2) specific areas such as parks, viewpoints, and historic districts that may be affected by a proposed project. KVPs are useful for depicting the range of visual character and visual quality found within a landscape unit. The views from KVPs selected for analysis serve as site-specific examples of existing visual conditions so the Authority can simulate the view with the project section in place to assess impacts.

Visual Resources and Visual Quality

Visual resources are components of the natural, cultural, or project environments, such as sites, objects, or features of the landscape, that are capable of being seen. *Natural visual resources* include land, water, vegetation, and animals that compose the natural environment. *Cultural visual resources* include buildings, structures, and artifacts that compose the cultural environment. *Project visual resources* include geometrics, structures, and fixtures that compose the project environment. Visual resources also include State-designated scenic routes and views toward and in natural areas, parks, and urban areas that have been identified as having historic

or cultural importance or that include buildings of similar historic or cultural importance or notable landmark status.

The noteworthy visual resources were identified throughout each landscape unit. Visual resources were evaluated according to several factors, including size, scale, and massing; overall visual interest and contribution to local visual character; architectural importance or uniqueness; cultural/historic importance; proximity to the rail corridor; and available lines of sight to or from the resource and the proposed alignment. For this discussion, visual resources include views toward or in natural areas, typical views from residential, commercial, and industrial areas, and long views across the landscape that are evocative of the natural environment of each region. The visual resources inventory includes several parks, recreational facilities, and cultural resources. For further discussion on the project's impacts on those resources, please refer to the respective technical reports and Draft EIR/EIS sections for those resource areas.

Visual quality is a result of the interactive experience between viewers and their environment. Under the Authority's and FHWA's visual quality analysis system, visual quality is determined by evaluating the viewed landscape's characteristics in terms of natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence. The analysis of natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence informs the overall visual quality ratings. Visual quality is rated as low, moderate-low, moderate, moderate-high, or high. To determine overall visual quality, the natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence are also rated, and the ratings of these three factors determine the overall visual quality. The existing visual quality of the RSA was determined by analysts who are familiar with the Authority's and FHWA's methodology and who visited the RSA on several occasions. Changes in compatibility of the impact and the sensitivity of the impact yield the degree of the impact on visual quality as being either beneficial, adverse, or neutral.

According to the *Guidelines for the Visual Impact Assessment of Highway Projects* (FHWA 2015), *compatibility* is defined as the ability of the environment to absorb the proposed project, with both the project and environment having harmonious or congruent visual character. The proposed project can be considered compatible (not contrasting) or incompatible (contrasting) with the natural, cultural, or project environments.

Field Study

Several field visits were conducted of the RSA during different seasons to document the existing aesthetic and visual quality. Documentation of existing visual resources included identifying landforms, vegetation, land uses, buildings, transportation facilities, overhead utility structures and lighting, open space, viewpoints and views to visual resources, waterbodies, historic structures, other developed areas, and apparent upkeep and maintenance of property. The field study also included a review of the engineering drawings of the project section infrastructure components and aerial and satellite images of the RSA.

3.16.4.4 Method for Evaluating Impacts Under NEPA

NEPA implementing procedures, regulations, and guidance provide the basis for evaluating project effects (as described in Section 3.1.1). The criteria of context and intensity are considered together when determining the severity of changes introduced by the project.

- **Context:** For this analysis, the *context* includes adopted local plans, policies, and regulations; existing visual character; presence of parks and recreational destinations; historic districts and properties; important visual resources; and viewer groups.
- **Intensity:** For this analysis, *intensity* is determined by assessing the degree to which the project would result in changes to the context, including the introduction or alteration of features that substantially contrast with the inherent or established visual character of a view or landscape (blocking, removing, or changing a regionally or locally important visual resource or view) where the viewer sensitivity would increase the perceived impact of a visual change. Guidance from federal agencies specifies the following factors to consider when determining the significance of an effect on aesthetics and visual resources:

- Introduction of elements that would conflict with the visual character of a historic district or federally or state-listed or eligible historic property
- Substantial effects on a park, recreational destination, or other feature or area identified as an important visual resource
- Introduction or alteration of features that substantially contrast with the inherent or established character of a view or landscape
- Blocking, removing, or changing a regionally or locally important visual resource or view that results in a dramatic change in the visual character or quality of the resource or view
- Consideration of viewer response where a negative response would increase the perceived effect of a visual change

These factors contribute to visual disturbance and affect viewers, visual character, and visual quality during construction and operation.

3.16.4.5 Method for Determining Significance Under CEQA

CEQA requires that an EIR identify the significant environmental impacts of a project (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126). By contrast, under NEPA, significance is used to determine whether an EIS would be required; NEPA requires that an EIS be prepared when the proposed federal action (project) as a whole has the potential to "significantly affect the quality of the human environment." Accordingly, Section 3.16.9, CEQA Significance Conclusions, summarizes the significance of the environmental impacts on aesthetics and visual quality from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. The Authority is using the following thresholds to determine if a significant impact on aesthetics and visual quality would occur as a result of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. A significant impact is one that would:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings in a designated state scenic highway corridor.
- In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, a significant impact would result if the project conflicts with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.
- Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Visual change and the sensitivity of people who view the affected landscape determine the level and degree of impact of a proposed project. For this project, level of impact was determined for KVPs according to the following:

- If a visual change of two categories or more (for example, from high to moderate) occurred and the changes were observed by viewers with high or moderate viewing sensitivity, the visual quality impact was considered to be significant for the CEQA determination.
- If a visual change of one or more categories occurred (for example, high to moderate-high or moderate to low) in an area with viewers who have high viewer sensitivity, the visual quality impact was considered to be significant for the CEQA determination.
- If viewers with moderate to low sensitivity observed a visual change of one category, the visual quality impact was considered to be less than significant for the CEQA determination.
- Visual changes observed by viewers with low viewer sensitivity were assumed to have visual quality impacts that were considered to be less than significant for the CEQA determination.

In many instances, the presence of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would alter visual character, but not enough to lower the visual quality category. These impacts are considered less than significant for the CEQA determination.

Other considerations include whether the project would (1) introduce elements that would substantially conflict with the visual character of a historic district or a federally or state-listed or eligible historic property, or (2) substantially affect the scenic values of a park, recreational destination, or other feature or area that has been identified as an important visual resource.

3.16.5 Affected Environment

This section describes the affected environment for aesthetics and visual quality in the RSA. This information provides the context for the environmental analysis and evaluation of impacts. Although resources that have not been built yet are labeled as “planned” or “proposed,” these resources are considered existing in the analysis because they may be built prior to the start of construction of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Resources are considered “planned” or “proposed” if the resource has been identified in one of the regional or local plans described in Section 3.16.2.3, Regional and Local, or has been identified on a local jurisdiction’s current projects list.

A summary of stakeholder issues and concerns from public outreach efforts can be found in Chapter 9, Public and Agency Involvement.

To ensure clarity in presentation, the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives are divided into three landscape units: Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit; Gateway Cities Landscape Unit; and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit.

3.16.5.1 Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit


Overall Setting

The Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit extends from the project’s northern terminus at U.S. Highway 101 to the southern limits of the city of Los Angeles and generally includes land used for manufacturing, warehousing, rail yards, and other commercial and industrial uses as well as some mixed-use parcels with residences. This landscape unit captures KVPs and viewer groups throughout the landscape unit. The locations of the KVPs are presented alongside their visual simulations in Section 3.16.6.3, Project Impacts. The visual character throughout the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit is typified by an industrial/commercial corridor and development surrounding the existing railway. Visual resources are fairly sparse and include, but are not limited to, the downtown Los Angeles skyline and mature street trees, the form, color, and movement of which stand in pleasant contrast to surrounding surface materials, while also, in some cases, contributing to a unified streetscape design.

Below is a description of the visual resources within the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit, based on analysis of aerial and satellite mapping, site surveys, and policy documents.

Existing Visual Resources and Character

Visual resources in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit are mapped on Figure 3.16-2, then briefly discussed in the following natural, cultural, and project visual resources sections. The Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit comprises a dense, urban setting including the downtown skyline with its skyscrapers and residential neighborhoods scattered throughout. The Los Angeles River and bike path, Santa Monica Mountains, Verdugo Mountains, San Gabriel Mountains, and San Rafael Hills are key visual resources, as are the identified historic bridges and cultural landmarks in this landscape unit. The visual resources are organized in accordance with the methodology outlined in Section 3.16.4.3 wherein *natural* visual resources include land, water, vegetation, and animals that compose the natural environment; *cultural* visual resources include buildings, structures, and artifacts that compose the cultural environment; and *project* visual resources include geometrics, structures, and fixtures that compose the project environment. For more detailed maps and information on visual resources, please refer to the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Aesthetics and Visual Quality Technical Report* (Authority 2025a).



Source: ESRI 2024

Figure 3.16-2 Visual Resources and Key Viewpoints in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit

Natural Visual Resources

1. Los Angeles River and Bicycle Path and Planned Extension

For purposes of this analysis, the Los Angeles River and Los Angeles River Bike Path and Los Angeles River Trail Extension (Planned) are combined because of geographic proximity but are separately described below.

1a. Los Angeles River

Headwaters of the Los Angeles River originate in the Simi Hills and Santa Susana Mountains. The river flows through Los Angeles County from Canoga Park in the western end of the San Fernando Valley to its mouth in the city of Long Beach, nearly 48 miles to the southeast. The Los Angeles River now flows through a concrete channel on a fixed course, which was built after a series of floods in the early twentieth century. The section of the Los Angeles River within the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit is a concrete-lined flood control channel with little vegetation or wildlife habitat, which is in contrast to the more natural, unchanneled sections of the river to the north.

1b. Los Angeles River Bike Path (Cultural Visual Resource)

The Los Angeles River bicycle path is a Class I bicycle and pedestrian path in the greater Los Angeles area, running north/east along the Los Angeles River. The Los Angeles River bicycle path consists of two main parts and other shorter sections that currently do not connect with each other along the river. The 7.4-mile section of bikeway through the Glendale Narrows is known as the Elysian Valley Bicycle and Pedestrian Path. The bike path also runs from the city of Vernon to the city of Long Beach; this section is referred to as the Los Angeles River Bikeway. Access to the river in downtown Los Angeles is limited because of the rail lines on both sides of the river.

Cultural Visual Resources

The Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit is typified by land used for manufacturing, warehousing, rail yards, and other commercial and industrial uses as well as some mixed-use parcels with residences.

2. Olvera Street and Los Angeles Plaza Park

Olvera Street is in the oldest part of downtown Los Angeles and part of El Pueblo de Los Angeles Historic Monument, also known as the Los Angeles Plaza Historic District. Olvera Street is a block-long, narrow, tree-shaded, brick-lined Mexican marketplace with old structures, painted stalls, street vendors, cafés, restaurants, and gift shops. The 44-acre park area was designated a state historic monument in 1953 and listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 1972 (Authority 2025a).

3. Downtown Los Angeles Skyline

Looking north throughout the project alignment areas and existing rail corridor, various iconic skyscrapers and buildings line downtown Los Angeles, backdropped by the San Gabriel Mountains, which provide scenic relief from various vantage points throughout Southern California.

4. Southern California Gas Company Complex

The Southern California Gas Company Complex consists of four buildings built during the years from 1932 to 1936: the Office and Lab building, Auto Service and Gas Station building, Weigh Station, and Shop building. The complex was determined eligible for the NRHP with State Historic Preservation Officer concurrence for architecture, with a 1919 to 1936 period of significance that reflects the date that Southern California Gas Company first began to operate from the legal parcel boundary through the complex's most recently built building. The Office and Lab building and the Shop building display elements of the Spanish Colonial Style architecture, and the Auto Service and Gas Station building is an example of Streamline Moderne architecture. Contributing elements consist of the four buildings in the complex boundaries. Only the Shop building could be observed from the public right-of-way. The Shop building's character-defining features include its two front gables over a rectangular plan, stucco cladding, loading bays with metal roll-up doors, multilight windows (one has been painted over), pilasters, and medallions in the gable end.

5. Southern California Gas Company Administration Building

The Southern California Gas Company Administration Building was determined eligible for listing in the NRHP with State Historic Preservation Officer concurrence for architecture and its period of significance is 1923, the year of its construction. This building is an important example of the work of the prominent Los Angeles architectural firm Curlett and Beelman. Character-defining features consist of the building's rectangular plan and four-story plus basement height; piers; sawtooth roof; minimal classical detailing around the two west-facing entrances; medallions on the primary elevation that depict gas-related infrastructure and the year build date; and multilight steel windows all four elevations, including three-story-tall windows along the primary (west) elevation and the north elevation.

Project Visual Resources

6. Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS)

LAUS was built in 1939 in downtown Los Angeles at 800 N Alameda Street, between U.S. Highway 101 and Cesar Chavez Avenue. LAUS was added to the NRHP in 1980. It is a major transportation hub, providing access to Amtrak, Metrolink, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Red and Purple Lines (to North Hollywood and Mid-Wilshire, respectively), and Metro Gold Line (to Pasadena and East Los Angeles), along with several surface transportation modes. The station is a mix of Spanish Mission, Moorish, and Streamline Moderne architectural styles. The station is also home to the Metro at Gateway Plaza, a 26-floor tower that opened in 1995. LAUS is part of an existing railway corridor, called the Los Angeles – San Diego – San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor (LOSSAN Corridor), which has been extant since approximately 1876.

7. First Street Bridge

The First Street Bridge, spanning the Los Angeles River from approximately Mission Road on the east to Vignes Street on the west, was determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in 1986 at the local (city/county) level of significance. The First Street Bridge was listed as a City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument (HCM) on January 30, 2008. Contributing elements include the reinforced-concrete open-spandrel viaduct and the arch ribs and struts, the spandrel beams and columns, piers, abutments, and wingwalls.

8. Fourth Street Bridge

The Fourth Street Bridge, spanning the Los Angeles River from Mission Road on the east to Santa Fe Avenue on the west, was determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in 1986 at the local level of significance. The Fourth Street Bridge was listed as a City of Los Angeles HCM on January 30, 2008. The Fourth Street Bridge is of a Gothic Revival design. Contributing elements include ornamental pylons with lancet arched openings, decorative bronze lanterns, pointed arched pilasters, and pointed capping; trefoil railing detail; tapered concrete light poles with finials and paired decorative bronze lanterns; and closed spandrel barrel arches.

9. Sixth Street Bridge

The Sixth Street Bridge, spanning the Los Angeles River from approximately Boyle Avenue on the east to Mateo Street on the west, was determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in 1986 at the local level of significance. The Sixth Street Bridge was listed as a City of Los Angeles HCM on January 30, 2008. The Sixth Street Bridge was demolished in 2016 and is no longer a historic property for purposes of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Construction of the new bridge was completed in 2022.

10. Seventh Street Bridge

The Seventh Street Bridge, spanning the Los Angeles River from approximately Myers Street on the east to Santa Fe Avenue on the west, was determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in 1986 at the local level of significance. The Seventh Street Bridge was listed as a City of Los Angeles HCM on January 30, 2008. Contributing elements include assimilation of the pre-existing 1910 bridge; decorative spindle railing; concrete pylons with molded inset paneling, each supporting a centered bronze mast and two symmetrically placed bronze luminaires with acorn finials; and secondary light fixtures with double luminaires attached to a concrete mast atop a base with multiple inset panels.

11. Olympic Boulevard Bridge (Ninth Street Bridge)

The Olympic Boulevard (Ninth Street) Bridge, spanning the Los Angeles River from Rio Vista Avenue on the east to Enterprise Street on the west, was determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP in 1986 at the local level of significance. The Olympic Boulevard Bridge was listed as a City of Los Angeles HCM on January 30, 2008. Contributing elements include Beaux-Arts (Classical) detailed ornamental pylons with triglyphs, metopes, and dentil molding, topped with a bracketed molded base on which is a centered, finial-capped mast from which symmetrically extend four torch-like bronze luminaries, each underscored at their armatures with floral bracketing and bud-like drop finials; a turn spindle railing with a periodic circle motif within which is diagonally inset a semi-abstract bud-like double motif, akin to nearby spindles but possessing a mantling quality; and molded railing with small, periodic piers.

12. Washington Boulevard Bridge

The Washington Boulevard Bridge was previously determined NRHP eligible in 1986 at the local level of significance. A relatively short bridge, spanning only the Los Angeles River channel itself, the Washington Boulevard Bridge is a five-span T-girder bridge with City Beautiful Beaux-Arts design elements. Designed by City bridge engineer Merrill Butler, it is listed as a City of Los Angeles HCM.

Viewers

There are a variety of land uses throughout the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit and, therefore, a variety of viewers and viewer groups. The primary viewer groups in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit include industrial/commercial employees and visitors to businesses throughout the downtown Los Angeles industrial corridor as well as residents that live close by. Industrial viewers' visual preference is generally utilitarian, unless they want to enhance the public presentation and views of their facility. Industrial viewers are primarily workers, with few transitory visitors. Commercial viewers' visual preferences vary, depending on the business, and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers.

Other viewer groups include motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists who use the local roadways and thoroughfares that are parallel or are otherwise adjacent to the existing railway and proposed alignment. Where workers are often permanent, visitors, customers, motorists, commuters, and others are transitory. Table 3.16-3 describes the viewer groups and their sensitivity for the KVPs, which are identified on Figure 3.16-2.

Table 3.16-3 Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: Key Viewpoints' Viewer Groups, Viewer Preferences, and Visual Resources

KVP	Location and Direction of View	Viewer Group	Viewer Sensitivity	Viewer Preferences	Visual Resources
1	View from E Cesar Chavez Ave (facing southeast)	Travelers: motorists/pedestrians using E Cesar Chavez Ave Industrial/commercial viewers: employees throughout the downtown Los Angeles industrial corridor	Industrial/ commercial viewers: low Travelers: moderate-low	Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers. Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers.	Tree-lined street
2	View from Mozaic at Union Station Apartments (facing southeast)	Residential viewers: Mozaic at Union Station Apartments Industrial/commercial viewers: employees throughout the downtown Los Angeles industrial corridor	Residential viewers: moderate Industrial/ commercial viewers: low	Residential viewers' visual preference is generally toward strong visual character because these viewers, on average, spend a majority of their lives in and around their homes. Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers. Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers.	Los Angeles Union Station
3	View from 1st St at the Los Angeles River (facing southwest)	Industrial/commercial viewers: employees throughout the downtown Los Angeles industrial corridor Travelers: motorists/pedestrians using 1st St Bridge	Industrial/ commercial viewers: low Travelers: low	Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers. However, pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile viewers have a higher sensitivity at historic bridges. Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers.	Los Angeles River

KVP	Location and Direction of View	Viewer Group	Viewer Sensitivity	Viewer Preferences	Visual Resources
4	View from north of 4th St at the Los Angeles River (facing south)	Industrial/commercial viewers: employees throughout the downtown Los Angeles industrial corridor Travelers: motorists/pedestrians using 4th St Bridge	Industrial/ commercial viewers: low Travelers: low	Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers. However, pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile viewers have a higher sensitivity at historic bridges. Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers.	Los Angeles River and 7th St bridge

KVP = key viewpoint

Visual Quality

As mentioned previously, the section of the Los Angeles River within the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit is a concrete-lined flood control channel with little vegetation or wildlife habitat; therefore, the natural harmony of this landscape unit is low. The landscape unit is typified by land used for manufacturing, warehousing, rail yards, and other commercial and industrial uses as well as some mixed-use parcels with residences. The available views toward the downtown Los Angeles skyline and other visual resources, as well as the position of the rail corridor and utility towers close to the Los Angeles River/flood control channel, provide some cultural order and project coherence. Overall, visual quality ranges from low to moderate-low.

Four KVPs were identified to represent typical views from common types of viewing areas, depicting the range of visual character found in this landscape unit.

For KVPs in this landscape unit, Table 3.16-4 provides a qualitative rating of the natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence and an overall assessment of the existing visual quality at the KVP. Viewer groups and viewer preference are taken into account when determining existing visual quality.

Table 3.16-4 Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: Existing Visual Quality

Key Viewpoint	Natural Harmony	Cultural Order	Project Coherence	Existing Visual Quality
Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit	**Moderate-low**	**Moderate-low**	**Moderate-low**	**Moderate-low**
1	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
2	Low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low
3	Low	Low	Moderate-low	Low
4	Low	Low	Moderate-low	Low

3.16.5.2 Gateway Cities Landscape Unit

Overall Setting

The Gateway Cities Landscape Unit captures KVPs and viewer groups throughout the area. These KVPs are represented by photographs of existing conditions in Section 3.16.6.3. This landscape unit includes residential, recreational, and commercial views to the proposed alignment throughout the communities of Vernon, Commerce, Montebello, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, and Buena Park. Land uses within this landscape unit vary, but generally include single-family and relatively low-density multifamily residential neighborhoods, mobile-home communities, parks, trails, schoolyards, commercial businesses, and light industrial/manufacturing uses. These land uses typify the visual character throughout the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit. Visual resources include natural elements, such as the topography or the rolling hills of the Los Angeles Basin, street trees, vegetation, and other landscaped elements, as well as built structures that have historic/cultural merit, are architecturally important, or are otherwise publicly valued.

Existing Visual Resources and Visual Character

Visual resources in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit are mapped on Figure 3.16-3, then briefly discussed in the following natural, cultural, and project visual resources sections. Notable visual resources in this landscape unit include several river and bicycle trails and cultural landmarks, including historic train stations and properties. For more detailed maps and information on visual resources, please refer to the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Aesthetics and Visual Quality Technical Report* (Authority 2025a).



Source: ESRI 2024

Figure 3.16-3 Visual Resources and Key Viewpoints in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit

Natural Visual Resources

13. Rio Hondo and Bicycle Path/River Trail

The Rio Hondo Bicycle Path/River Trail is a 16-mile Class I bike path running along the banks of the Rio Hondo, a tributary to the Los Angeles River. The Rio Hondo begins in Irwindale and flows into the Los Angeles River in South Gate. As discussed in further detail in Chapter 4, Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Evaluations, of the Draft EIR/EIS, the southern segment of the Rio Hondo channel is presumed eligible for listing in the NRHP. Contributing elements include a concrete channel base, concrete-lined embankments, and grouted stone embankments. Most of the river is lined with concrete, but in the RSA, its bottom is sandy. Although usually dry, it carries substantial amounts of water during heavy rains. The bicycle path and river trail run from the Peck Road Water Conservation Park north to Imperial Highway in the city of Downey to the south.

14. San Gabriel River and Bicycle Path/River Trail

The San Gabriel River flows 43 miles through Los Angeles and Orange Counties. Today, most of the San Gabriel River is channelized, with the section below Whittier Narrows Dam lined by concrete and impounded in places by debris and flood control dams. The San Gabriel River Trail is a 28-mile-long bike path that runs along the San Gabriel River through El Dorado Regional Park and onto street bike trails near the Alamitos Bay Marina in Los Angeles County. The southern end is in Seal Beach. The northern segment begins near the Whittier Narrows Recreation Area.

15. Coyote Creek and Bikeway and Planned Bikeway Extension

Coyote Creek is a principal tributary of the San Gabriel River in northwest Orange County, southeast Los Angeles County, and southwest Riverside County. The Coyote Creek North Fork Bikeway (Existing) is a Class I bike path in Los Angeles County that runs adjacent to the Coyote Creek flood control channel for approximately 9.5 miles. The bike path is under jurisdiction of the California Department of Transportation. The path begins in Santa Fe Springs on the north fork of Coyote Creek and extends south into Long Beach where it joins the San Gabriel River bicycle path at the trail bridge, just south of Willow Street/Katella Avenue.

Cultural Visual Resources

16. Federated Metals Corporation, Vernon

This property is a substantially sized industrial parcel with two connected buildings that each possess Moderne-styled design elements. The Federated Metals Corporation property is not NRHP eligible; however, this building is an exceptionally intact example of a 1930s-era Moderne-style industrial building and is therefore still considered an important cultural visual resource for the purposes of this aesthetic analysis.

17. Bandini Park, Commerce

Bandini Park, one of four neighborhood parks in the city of Commerce, offers outdoor activities such as organized sports (e.g., basketball, flag football, soccer, softball, volleyball) as well as picnic shelters, playgrounds, and a children's wading pool, which is open during the summer. Bandini Park has a meeting room, kitchen facility, preschool room, arts and crafts/ceramics room, and television viewing room.

18. Zimmerman Park, Norwalk

This park on Shoemaker Avenue, immediately west of the LOSSAN Corridor, provides several sports fields and hosts Little League baseball.

19. Neff Park, La Mirada

Neff Park covers 10 acres and includes three historic buildings, a gazebo, basketball court, tennis court, horseshoe pits, a playground, and picnic areas. The historic buildings include the Neff Home, George House, and Neff Barn. Neff Barn, which displays an extensive collection of historic memorabilia, is used for group meetings, summer and holiday day camps, and special events. The gazebo can be reserved for special ceremonies. The sport facilities are open play.

20. Windermere Park, La Mirada

Windermere Park covers 5 acres and includes a community room, a soccer field, a playground, and picnic areas. This community room at the park is used for Tiny Tots, the Positive Alternatives and Recreation for Kids (P.A.R.K.) Program, meetings, and classes. This playground also offers both younger and older children's play equipment.

21. Shrimpton Manufacturing and Supply Company

The Shrimpton Manufacturing and Supply Company is an irregular plan industrial building having Late-Moderne design elements on its primary, street-facing north and west elevations. It is eligible for the NRHP and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) at the local level of significance for architecture. The property's period of significance is 1948, the year of its construction. Its character-defining features include metal-frame ribbon windows set in deep bezels, glass block, and a prominent, bezel-framed entry parapet itself having Roman brick cladding, gold anodized doorframes, and travertine veneer. It also includes the landscape in front of the office portion of the industrial building.

22. Western Waxed Paper Company

An exceptionally large complex featuring combined warehouse and office portions, the 1948 Western Waxed Paper Company building is a significant example of a Late Moderne styled post-World War II industrial property. It is eligible for the NRHP and CRHR at the local level of significance for architecture. The property's period of significance is its build year, 1948. The property's street-facing elevations read as an asymmetrical but highly composed total design, of one- and two-story elements, of protruding and receding massing, itself of varying geometries—some set back from a frontal, lawn-covered landscape having mature tree specimens. Character-defining features include a two-story bezel-boxed massing with cutaway square openings; asymmetrically composed front elevation with bezeled balconet counter-balanced by inset, steel-frame, fixed, full-height window glazing and stacked Roman brickwork; architecturally integrated Roman brick planters; a low-rise, extended isosceles cantilever framing a pedestrian walkway and connected to a carport; and long, set-back massing having a continuous grid of fixed aluminum windows.

23. Boulder Dam–Los Angeles 287.5-Kilovolt Transmission Line

The Boulder Dam–Los Angeles 287.5-kilovolt Transmission Line transmits electricity from its generation point at the Boulder (now Hoover) Dam in southern Nevada to the Century Receiving Station in the Watts neighborhood of Los Angeles. It is listed under the NRHP/CRHR, its area of significance is engineering, and its period of significance is 1937 to 1953. It is important for its associations to the Boulder Dam, Los Angeles development during the pre-World War II era, and unique engineering and structural characteristics in the context of point-to-point power transmission. Only a small segment of this historic property is present within the landscape unit, near the east bank of the Rio Hondo in Pico Rivera. Character-defining features include the steel lattice towers, single and double corridors, associated stations, and power cables. However, no towers are included within the landscape unit boundary.

Project Visual Resources

24. Redondo Junction

The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Redondo Junction Yard District was formerly determined to be NRHP eligible because it is one of the last operating train junctions in the western United States to feature a roundhouse, watchman's tower, and offices that housed both the master train mechanic and locomotive supervisor. Redondo Junction also houses Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway steam locomotive No. 3751, an oil-burning locomotive that was built in May 1927 by the Baldwin Locomotive Works in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. A movable resource, steam locomotive No. 3751 is stored in a shed at Redondo Junction. The resource was listed on the NRHP in 2000. Redondo Junction currently houses Amtrak maintenance facilities.

25. Commerce Train Station

The Commerce Metrolink Station (also known as the Montebello/Commerce station) opened in 1997. It is a modest station in an industrialized area and adjacent to a large train yard. It is on 26th Street, just west of Interstate 5.

26. Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Train Station

The Metrolink station that serves Norwalk and Santa Fe Springs is on Imperial Highway at the LOSSAN Corridor. It is a relatively new and still-expanding station, with landscaping, station furniture, and a soaring pedestrian bridge spanning four railroad tracks as a focal point.

27. Buena Park Train Station

The Buena Park Metrolink Station, which has been open since late 2007, is at Lakeknoll Drive and Dale Street in a transit-oriented development area adjacent to a townhouse development operated by California State University, Fullerton. The focal point of the station is a 70-foot-tall clock tower.

Viewers

Primary viewer groups in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit include residents in areas that neighbor the existing railway and proposed alignment, employees and patrons of nearby businesses, and motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists who use local roadways and thoroughfares that traverse or are parallel or otherwise adjacent to the existing railway and proposed alignment. Residential viewers tend to be sensitive to change unless they participate in defining the change. Commercial viewers' visual preferences vary, depending on the angle, location, and preferences of the individual and the nature of the business; their preferences may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers. Workers are often permanent, while visitors, customers, motorists, and pedestrians are transitory. Recreational viewers typically focus on their recreational activity, are typically unsupportive of visual changes that would negatively affect the recreational setting and are typically supportive of visual improvements that enhance their recreational experience.

Table 3.16-5 describes the viewer groups and sensitivity of viewers in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit for the KVPs, which are provided on Figure 3.16-3.

Table 3.16-5 Gateway Cities Landscape Unit: Key Viewpoints' Viewer Groups, Viewer Preferences, and Visual Resources

KVP	Location and Direction of View	Viewer Group	Viewer Sensitivity	Viewer Preferences	Visual Resources
5	View from Downey Rd and E 26th St (facing northwest)	Industrial/commercial viewers: employees near existing railway Travelers: motorists/pedestrians along E 26th St near Downey Rd	Industrial/ commercial viewers: low Motorists/ pedestrians: low	Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers. Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers.	Existing railroad tracks; overhead power transmission lines
6	View from 6185 Bandini Blvd (facing north)	Industrial/commercial viewers: employees near existing railway Travelers: motorists/pedestrians along Bandini Blvd	Travelers: low Industrial/ commercial viewers: low	Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers. Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers.	Industrial uses and overhead power transmission lines; industrial uses
7	View from Sycamore St and Supply Ave (facing southwest)	Industrial/commercial viewers: employees near existing railway Travelers: motorists/pedestrians along Sycamore St	Industrial/ commercial viewers: low Travelers: low	Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers. Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers.	Industrial warehouse; existing railroad tracks and overhead power transmission lines
8	View from S 4th St and Sycamore St (facing southeast)	Residents along Sycamore St and adjacent local roadways	Residential viewers: moderate-high Travelers: moderate-low	Residential viewers' visual preference is generally toward strong visual character because these viewers, on average, spend a majority of their lives in and around their homes. Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Residential neighborhood; tree-lined streets; overhead telephone lines; concrete block wall
9	View from Rio Hondo Bike Path near Maynard Rd (facing northeast)	Recreationists and bicyclists using the Rio Hondo Bike Path	Recreational users: moderate	Recreational viewers typically focus on their recreational activity, are typically unsupportive of visual changes that would negatively affect the recreational setting and are typically supportive of visual improvements that enhance their recreational experience.	Field; culvert; bermed overcrossing; industrial and power transmission lines in background

KVP	Location and Direction of View	Viewer Group	Viewer Sensitivity	Viewer Preferences	Visual Resources
10	View from San Gabriel River Bike Path south of Slauson Ave (facing northeast)	Recreationists and bicyclists using the San Gabriel River Bike Path	Recreational users: moderate	Recreational viewers typically focus on their recreational activity, are typically unsupportive of visual changes that would negatively affect the recreational setting and are typically supportive of visual improvements that enhance their recreational experience.	San Gabriel River floodplain; concrete bridge overcrossing; power transmission lines; boxcars and small industrial structures
11	View from Metropolitan State Hospital/Bloomfield Ave (facing east)	Travelers: motorists on Bloomfield Ave; recreationists using the facilities at Metropolitan State Hospital	Travelers: low Recreational users: moderate-low	Recreational viewers typically focus on their recreational activity, are typically unsupportive of visual changes that would negatively affect the recreational setting and are typically supportive of visual improvements that enhance their recreational experience. Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Industrial uses and parking area
12	View from Norwalk/ Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station Parking Lot (facing east)	Travelers: commuters, transit riders, and others in proximity of Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station	Travelers: moderate	Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Metrolink station parking lot and station beyond
13	View from John Zimmerman Park (facing north/ northwest)	Recreationists at Zimmerman Park	Recreational users: moderate-high	Recreational viewers typically focus on their recreational activity, are typically unsupportive of visual changes that would negatively affect the recreational setting and are typically supportive of visual improvements that enhance their recreational experience.	Playing fields edged with trees; and field lighting; industrial beyond
14	View from Tulare Ave and Fullerton Ave (facing northwest)	Residents along Tulare St and adjacent local roadways throughout the immediate vicinity	Residential viewers: moderate- high Motorists/ pedestrians: moderate	Residential viewers' visual preference is generally toward strong visual character because these viewers, on average, spend a majority of their lives in and around their homes. Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Residential; fencing; railroad beyond

KVP = key viewpoint

Visual Quality

As mentioned previously, land uses that typify this landscape unit vary but generally include single-family and relatively low-density multifamily residential neighborhoods, mobile-home communities, parks, trails, schoolyards, commercial businesses, and light industrial/ manufacturing uses. Therefore, depending on the angle, location, preferences, and sensitivity of a viewer, visual quality varies throughout this project section. The views include natural elements, such as the topography or rolling hills of the Los Angeles Basin, street trees, vegetation, and other landscape elements, as well as built structures that have historic/cultural merit, are architecturally important, or are otherwise publicly valued. These natural and built elements provide scenic relief to viewers. Natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence vary throughout this landscape unit, based on the vantage point, although overall visual quality generally ranges from low to moderate.

In this landscape unit, ten KVPs were identified to represent typical views from common types of viewing areas, depicting the range of visual character and visual quality. Photographs of the KVPs are included in Section 3.16.6.3.

In Table 3.16-6 the existing natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence are rated to determine the existing overall visual quality of KVPs 5 through 14 in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit.

Table 3.16-6 Gateway Cities Landscape Unit: Existing Visual Quality

Key Viewpoint	Natural Harmony	Cultural Order	Project Coherence	Overall Visual Quality
Gateway Cities Landscape Unit	**Moderate-low**	**Moderate-low**	**Moderate-low**	**Moderate-low**
5	Low	Low	Low	Low
6	Low	Low	Low	Low
7	Low	Low	Low	Low
8	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low
9	Moderate-low	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate-low
10	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low
11	Low	Low	Moderate	Moderate-low
12	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
13	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
14	Low	Low	Low	Low

3.16.5.3 Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit

Overall Setting

The Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit captures KVPs and viewer groups throughout the area. These KVPs are presented alongside their visual simulations in Section 3.16.6.3. The landscape unit encompasses the cities of Fullerton and Anaheim and includes a variety of land uses similar to those of the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit. Most land uses within the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit are commercial and residential. Therefore, these land uses typify the visual character throughout the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit. Visual resources include street trees, vegetation, and other landscape elements, as well as built structures that have historic/cultural merit, are architecturally significant, or are otherwise publicly valued.

Existing Visual Resources

Visual resources in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit are mapped on Figure 3.16-4, then briefly discussed in the following natural, cultural, and project visual resources sections. Notable visual resources in this landscape unit include the Santa Ana River Trail, the identified historic property, and various cultural landmarks. For more detailed maps and information on visual resources, please refer to the *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Aesthetics and Visual Quality Technical Report* (Authority 2025a).

Natural Visual Resources

28. Santa Ana River and Trail

The Santa Ana River begins in the San Bernardino National Forest in San Bernardino County and empties into the Pacific Ocean on the border of Newport Beach and Huntington Beach. In the viewshed, it forms the boundary between the city of Orange and the city of Anaheim. Although frequently dry, it can carry large amounts of water during heavy rainfall. Water released from Prado Dam upstream of the RSA is often ponded in settling basins in the portion of the river that crosses through the RSA, forming maze-shaped ponds that are used to recharge groundwater, which is at relatively shallow depths under the river.

The Santa Ana River Trail is a recreational bicycle trail that runs along the Santa Ana River for approximately 30 miles between Prado Dam and the ocean. In the RSA, this path is paved with asphalt and grade-separated from cross traffic. It passes under the existing LOSSAN Corridor.

Cultural Visual Resources

29. Val-Vita Food Products Company Headquarters, Fullerton

The former Val-Vita headquarters property is a single-story office building that was designed in the Streamline Moderne style. The subject property appears to be NRHP eligible at the state level under Criterion C as a significant and highly intact example of Streamline Moderne design. Additionally, the subject building has historic significance relative to NRHP Criterion B for its association with the industrialist and noted art collector Norton Simon, who would go on to establish Hunt Foods and Industries, Inc.

30. Hunt Foods and Industries Office and Library, Fullerton

Completed in 1962, the six-story Hunt Foods and Industries office building and the nearby Hunt branch of the Fullerton library are present at either end of a long and continuous landscaped campus that has an Asiatic-inspired landscape theme and dark-stained aggregate walkways, many of which are slightly elevated. The administrative building served as the headquarters for Hunt Foods & Industries. The property is eligible for the NRHP and CRHR under Criteria B/2 and C/3 at the local level of significance. Contributing elements include architecture and landscape architecture. The City of Fullerton identified this office building as a “Potential/Possible Significant Property.”

31. Fullerton Pooch Park, Fullerton

The 2-acre park includes separate areas for small and large dogs, a wood chip area, and benches.

32. Adlena Park, Fullerton


The 3-acre park includes a softball field, basketball courts, a children’s play area, a spray pool, picnic tables, a lighted baseball field, and barbecues.

33. Janet Evans Swim Complex and Independence Park, Fullerton

Independence Park is home to the Janet Evans Swim Complex and includes a gymnasium, a skate park, picnic tables, and a playground. The swim complex includes two outdoor pools and locker room facilities. Activities include swimming lessons and organized sports. The park, which hosts a farmer’s market on Wednesdays, is on the ocean side of the LOSSAN Corridor, between the LOSSAN Corridor and Valencia Drive, east of Euclid Street.

34. Ford Park, Fullerton

The 3-acre park includes a children’s play area, picnic tables, a baseball field, and barbecues.



Source: ESRI 2024

Figure 3.16-4 Visual Resources and Key Viewpoints in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit

35. Amerige Park, Fullerton
Amerige Park contains a large sports facility, Duane Winters Field, and was once the spring training grounds for several Pacific Coast League baseball teams. The park includes a large, lighted baseball field with bleachers, soccer fields, tennis courts, horseshoe courts, and picnic facilities. The park is on the inland side of the LOSSAN Corridor where it crosses Highland Avenue.

36. Richman Park, Fullerton
The 2-acre park includes a children's play area, a picnic pavilion, and a soccer field.

37. Fullerton Mutual Orange Association Packing House
Originally built in 1925 by the Santa Fe Land Improvement Company, with additions in 1952, the Fullerton Mutual Orange Association Packing House has direct associations with Fullerton's once-substantial citrus industry, rendering the building NRHP eligible. Served by a Santa Fe rail siding and across from the NRHP-listed Elephant Packing House, the Fullerton Mutual Orange Association Packing House is one of four remaining packing houses in the RSA.

38. Elephant Packing House, Fullerton
Designed in the Mission Revival Style, Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) built the 1924 Elephant Packing House to serve the nearby rail right-of-way. The property is one of the last citrus packing houses in Fullerton, which was once a center for the citrus industry. It was listed in the NRHP in 1983.

39. Fullerton Odd Fellows Temple
Completed in 1927, the Fullerton Odd Fellows Temple is a three-story brick commercial building with highly distinctive glazed pale-pink and blue terra cotta tile across its façade. The Fullerton Odd Fellows Temple was listed in the NRHP in 2002.

40. Pacific Electric Railway Depot, Fullerton
Built in 1918, the Pacific Electric Railway Depot is a single-story, rectangular Mission Revival building, with its broad side perpendicular to Commonwealth Avenue. The station not only serviced passengers but also citrus shipments; hence, a loading dock was included. The Fullerton Pacific Electric Railway Depot was determined NRHP eligible in September 1979. The station was deemed significant at the local level for its associations to architecture, transportation, commerce, and community development. The City of Fullerton lists the property as a Historic Landmark.

41. Fullerton Post Office
Completed in 1938, the Fullerton Post Office, a New Deal/Public Works Administration project, was designed by noted local architect Harry K. Vaughn, whose other local buildings include the Fullerton Junior College campus and the Fullerton Public Library—today, the Fullerton Museum. The Fullerton Post Office was listed in the NRHP in 2012.

42. Fullerton Train Station and Redevelopment Area
The Fullerton Train Station comprises two historic depots, the Fullerton Union Pacific Depot, built in 1923, and the Santa Fe Railway Passenger and Freight Depot, built in 1930. The Fullerton Union Pacific Depot is a Mission Revival depot that is prototypical for UPRR depots of the interwar era. It was listed in the NRHP in 1983. The Fullerton Santa Fe Railway Passenger and Freight Depot is built of cast concrete in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. It was listed in the NRHP in 1992.

A restaurant occupies the UPRR depot, and the Santa Fe depot is used as an Amtrak ticket office, passenger waiting area, and café. The area surrounding the station is known as the Central Fullerton Redevelopment Area. This area includes high-density apartment complexes, retail space, and outdoor eating areas.

43. Lemon Park, Fullerton
The 5-acre park includes meeting rooms, a kitchenette, tables and chairs, and a patio.

44. Historic Palm District, Anaheim
Consisting of 516 properties, the Historic Palm District has 181 contributing structures, primarily single-family residences of various revival styles. The Historic Palm District was adopted by the Anaheim City Council in October 2006.

45. Union Pacific Railroad Depot, Anaheim
The 1923 Anaheim UPRR Depot is a one-story, Spanish Revival-themed train depot with stucco cladding, symmetrically placed arcades, and a centered arched entry that has been topped with an espadaña parapet. The subject property was relocated to its present location in the 1990s when a substantial grade separation at Lincoln Avenue was built. The subject property was evaluated in 1978 and determined NRHP eligible at that time. The building's relocation necessitates re-evaluation of the property relative to NRHP criteria.

46. Citrus Park, Anaheim
This small linear park on the ocean side of the LOSSAN Corridor is between the corridor and Atchison Street and between Lincoln Avenue and Broadway. The park includes a gazebo, basketball courts, a volleyball court, a children's play area, and barbeque facilities.

47. Anaheim Colony Historic District
Anaheim Colony is a historic district in Anaheim. The original "Mother Colony" was bounded by North, South, East, and West Streets, and the present historic district is bordered by Harbor Boulevard, Sycamore Street, the BNSF Railway (BNSF) rail corridor, and Santa Ana Street.

48. The Kroeger-Melrose Historic District, Anaheim
The Kroeger-Melrose Historic District contains 67 parcels on five streets south of Lincoln Avenue, Anaheim's primary commercial street. Located within the boundary of Anaheim's original city limits, most of the houses were built between 1900 and 1915. The Kroeger-Melrose Historic District strongly expresses the character of an early twentieth-century middle-class neighborhood. The Kroeger-Melrose Historic District was listed in the NRHP in 1985.

49. Magnolia Park, Anaheim
The 1-acre park includes a children's play area, a group picnic shelter, benches, and a walking path.

50. Angel Stadium of Anaheim and the Big A
Angel Stadium is home to the Los Angeles Angels of Anaheim. The stadium is on the ocean side of the LOSSAN Corridor, across the tracks from the Honda Center. Angel Stadium opened in 1966; it underwent renovations from 1979 to 1980 and in 1996. The stadium has a seating capacity of approximately 45,050. Angel Stadium is open on the northeast side, facing the LOSSAN Corridor, providing views into the stadium.

Outside the stadium are the well-known "giant hats" (labeled hat size 649½) at the main entrance (not visible from the LOSSAN Corridor side) and the Big A, a 230-foot-tall sign in the shape of the Angels' logo, with a halo that lights up after an Angels win. The Big A is visible from the LOSSAN Corridor.

There is a permanent fireworks display area on the northeastern side of the stadium. Displays are generated for Friday night home games and on other occasions.

51. Honda Center
The Honda Center is an entertainment and sports venue, best known as the home of the National Hockey League's Anaheim Ducks. It is on the inland side of the LOSSAN Corridor, near Anaheim Regional Transportation Intermodal Center (ARTIC). The building, designed by HOK Architects, was opened in 1991. It seats up to 18,325 for stage events (17,174 for hockey). The facility has a 95-foot-tall marquee on the side facing State Route 57 and a slightly smaller marquee facing Katella Avenue.

52. Brea Creek Bastanchury Corridor (Planned)
The planned path includes a dedicated path for bicycling, walking, and running uses. The planned path will be located along Brea Creek in Fullerton and Buena Park and will also traverse other nearby communities (Placentia, Brea, and unincorporated portions of Orange County).

53. Pacific Drive Elementary School
Pacific Drive Elementary School has a children's play area and basketball courts. The resource is publicly owned.

54. Union Pacific Trail Phase II (Planned)
The planned Union Pacific Trail Phase II would be located along the UPRR-owned rail corridor in Fullerton. The approximately 8.8-mile-long path would connect to the existing Union Pacific Trail to the east and would feature walking, bicycling, and running.

55. Union Pacific Park
Union Pacific Park is located along the rail line and features barbecues, a basketball court, picnic tables, and a children's playground. This park is currently closed and undergoing a renovation project.

56. St. Mary's Catholic Church
Built in 1970, St. Mary's Catholic Church is a Late Modern-style church building designed by architect J. George Szeptycki, who designed numerous post-World War II churches in Southern California. The property is eligible for the NRHP and CRHR for its high artistic value and as an excellent example of Szeptycki's Late Modern work. Its area of significance is architecture, with a 1970 period of significance. The building's character-defining features include its rectangular-plan, predominantly flat roof; shed-roofed front component; asymmetrical curved north (primary) elevation rising in height from east to west; blonde face brick veneers interrupted by vertically oriented stained-glass windows at the north, east, and west elevations; curved northwest corner with canopy-sheltered primary entrance; brick paved patio and short flight of steps with metal railings accessing to the primary entrance; metal sculpture of St. Mary at the west elevation; and the building's adjacent, tall steeple with a stylized cross affixed to the north side near the top. The property boundary is the church footprint, surrounding planters, and steeple.

57. Amerige Brothers' Real Estate Office
Located in Fullerton's Amerige Park, the Amerige Brothers' Real Estate Office building is a small Vernacular wood-frame building built circa 1887 in Anaheim and relocated to Fullerton that served as a portable real estate office. The office is eligible for the NRHP and CRHR at the local level of significance for the founding of Fullerton and the Southern California Real Estate Boom of 1886 to 1888. The period of significance is 1887 to 1889. The property is also listed as City of Fullerton Landmark HL-4. The subject property was the first building in the Townsite of Fullerton and provided for the Amerige Brothers to sell Townsite lots, which led to the creation of Fullerton. The building is significant for its role in the founding of Fullerton and as a rare example of a surviving building directly associated with real estate promotions and transactions that took place as part of the Southern California land boom of 1886 to 1888. The property's character-defining features include the building's rectangular plan; wood tongue-in-groove siding; a front gabled roof covered in wood shingles and featuring a shaped parapet at the primary (north) elevation; symmetrical primary elevation with a central doorway secured by a partially glazed wood door flanked by wood windows; panels of vertical wood siding accent areas above the primary entry door and beneath the windows; large one-over-one, double-hung wood windows with simple wood surrounds and projecting subsills; and a shed-roofed canopy with turned wood supports and a shaped fascia at the primary elevation.

58. Fullerton Ice Company
Built in 1910, the Fullerton Ice Company is an exposed brick building that is believed to be the fourth oldest brick building in Fullerton. The property is NRHP and CRHR eligible at the local level of significance for its associations with the early-twentieth-century refrigeration industry. Its area of significance is industry. The period of significance is 1910, the year of its construction, to 1958, the year that the Santa Ana freeway (Interstate 5) was completed through northern Orange County, fostering a new suburbanization that hastened the demise of the local citrus industry that this building primarily served. Later known as the Crystal Ice House, the business played a crucial local role in providing ice for traveling perishables leaving Fullerton before the advent of new refrigeration technologies after World War II. Character-defining features include the simply designed building with its flat roof, original wood-frame windows, and inset decorative brickwork near the parapet roof with brick dentil molding. An inset loading dock is also present.

59. Fullerton Historic Landmark

The landscape unit contains several buildings that are part of the Fullerton Historic Landmark, including 229 W Santa Fe Avenue (1922, 1928–1929), 227 W Santa Fe Avenue (1928), 125 W Santa Fe Avenue (1922), 119 W Santa Fe Avenue (1921), 118 E Commonwealth Avenue (1927), and 343 E Santa Fe Avenue (1928). The buildings are representative of vernacular commercial architecture in the 1920s.

Project Visual Resources

60. Fullerton Airport

Fullerton Airport is on the ocean side of the LOSSAN Corridor. Its origins trace back to 1913, when barnstormers used a vacant site as a makeshift landing strip. The airport encompasses 86 acres between Artesia Boulevard (including where it fronts the LOSSAN Corridor) and between Commonwealth Avenue and Dale Street and Pritchard Avenue. It can accommodate 600 planes.

Viewers

Primary viewer groups in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit include residents in areas that neighbor the existing railway and proposed alignment, employees and patrons of similarly located businesses, and motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists who use local roadways and thoroughfares that traverse or are parallel or otherwise adjacent to the existing railway and proposed alignment. Table 3.16-7 describes the viewer groups for the KVPs, which are provided on Figure 3.16-4.

Table 3.16-7 Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit: Key Viewpoints' Viewer Groups, Viewer Preferences, and Visual Resources

KVP	Location and Direction of View	Viewer Group	Viewer Sensitivity	Viewer Preferences	Visual Resources
15	View from Raymer Ave at Gilbert St (facing west)	Industrial viewers: employees in industrial corridor along Raymer Ave Travelers on Raymer Ave	Industrial/ commercial users: low Motorists/ pedestrians: moderate-low	Motorists and pedestrians are considered transitory and temporary viewers. Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers.	Rail corridor; vegetation
16	View from Fullerton Metrolink Station (facing northeast)	Travelers: commuters, transit riders, and others near Fullerton Station	Motorists/ transit riders: moderate	Motorists and transit riders are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Railroad tracks and station
17	View from Fullerton Metrolink Station (facing east)	Travelers: commuters, transit riders, and others near Fullerton Station	Motorists/ transit riders: moderate	Motorists and transit riders are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Railroad tracks and station
18	View from Fullerton Metrolink Station (facing west-northwest)	Travelers: commuters, transit riders, and others near Fullerton Station	Motorists/ transit riders: moderate	Motorists and transit riders are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Railroad tracks and station
19	View from E Walnut Ave (facing east)	Travelers: motorists, commuters, cyclists, and pedestrians traveling along E Walnut Ave Commercial viewers: employees along E Walnut Ave	Motorists/ pedestrians: moderate Commercial viewers: moderate-low	Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers. Motorists and transit riders are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Railroad tracks, roadway undercrossing; rail overcrossing; roadside vegetation

KVP	Location and Direction of View	Viewer Group	Viewer Sensitivity	Viewer Preferences	Visual Resources
20	View from State College Blvd and E Katella Ave (facing east)	Travelers: motorists, commuters, cyclists, and pedestrians traveling along State College Blvd Commercial viewers: employees along State College Blvd	Motorists/ pedestrians: moderate Commercial viewers: moderate-low	Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers. Motorists and transit riders are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Roadway undercrossing; rail overcrossing; commercial; vegetated berm
21	View from S State College Blvd (facing northeast)	Travelers: motorists, commuters, cyclists, and pedestrians traveling along State College Blvd Residents along S State College Blvd Commercial viewers: employees along State College Blvd	Motorists/ pedestrians: moderate-low Commercial viewers: low Residential viewers: moderate-high	Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers. Motorists and transit riders are considered transitory and temporary viewers. Residential viewers' visual preference is generally toward strong visual character because these viewers, on average, spend a majority of their lives in and around their homes.	Roadway; at-grade rail crossing; industrial uses; billboards
22	View from Angel Stadium of Anaheim parking lot north (facing north)	Commercial viewers: employees at Angel Stadium of Anaheim and throughout immediate vicinity Travelers: motorists, commuters, and transit riders	Motorists/ pedestrians: moderate Commercial viewers: moderate-low	Industrial/commercial viewers' visual preferences vary depending on the business and may be more aligned with retail, institutional, or industrial viewers' visual preferences than those of residential viewers. Motorists and transit riders are considered transitory and temporary viewers.	Parking area; rail corridor and office buildings beyond; palm trees and other vegetation

KVP = key viewpoint

Visual Quality

Land uses that typify this landscape unit vary, including single-family and relatively low-density multifamily residential neighborhoods, parks, trails, commercial businesses, and light industrial/manufacturing uses. Therefore, depending on the angle, location, preferences, and sensitivity of a viewer, visual quality varies throughout this project section. Views to/from the aforementioned visual resources include natural elements as well as built structures that have historic/cultural merit, are architecturally significant, or are otherwise publicly valued. These natural and built elements provide scenic relief to viewers. Natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence vary, based on the vantage point. Overall visual quality generally ranges from low to moderate-high.

Eight KVPs were identified to represent typical views from common types of viewing areas, depicting the range of visual character and visual quality found in a landscape unit. KVPs, along with their visual simulations, are depicted in Section 3.16.6.3.

In Table 3.16-8, the existing natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence are rated to determine the existing overall visual quality of KVPs 15 through 22 that represent the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit.

Table 3.16-8 Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit: Existing Visual Quality

Key Viewpoint	Natural Harmony	Cultural Order	Project Coherence	Overall Visual Quality
Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit	**Moderate-low**	**Moderate-low**	**Moderate-low**	**Moderate-low**
15	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate	Moderate-low
16	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
17	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
18	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
19	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate
20	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
21	Low	Low	Moderate-low	Low
22	Moderate-low	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate-low

3.16.6 Environmental Consequences

3.16.6.1 Overview

This section discusses the potential impacts on aesthetics and visual quality from construction and operation of the project alternatives and station options. It includes a discussion of impacts on visual quality including scenic vistas, scenic highways, and light and glare. Each topic area addresses potential impacts from the No Project Alternative and the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Impacts from the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives are presented in terms of the temporary and permanent changes to the visual character, viewer sensitivity, and impact on visual quality.

Construction and operation of the project would introduce new visual elements into the areas adjacent to or within viewing range of the rail corridor and proposed trackway. The most substantial permanent new visual elements would be associated with station site placement and maintenance facilities, grade separations, communication towers, and other infrastructure

necessary to accommodate the HSR system such as elevated structures where bulk and mass cannot be reduced.

Increased nighttime lighting generated at the HSR stations, maintenance facilities, and traction power substations (TPSS) would also be visible to nearby viewers. Trains operating at night would contribute a regular and repeating source of light, and nighttime maintenance activities along the alignment would introduce lighting in fixed locations or emanating from slow-moving maintenance vehicles.

During construction, the Authority and its contractors would screen construction equipment, restrict fugitive dust emissions, and implement site restoration and revegetation plans. Open space land used for temporary staging would be restored. The project would comply with the Authority's aesthetic guidelines and the design of project infrastructure such as elevated structures to balance the desire for a consistent, project-wide aesthetic with the relevant local context. Through the Authority's aesthetics review process, the Authority would consult with local jurisdictions to involve the community, solicit input on local aesthetic preferences, and incorporate this feedback into the final design.

The *Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section Aesthetics and Visual Quality Technical Report* (Authority 2025a) explains the overall change in the visual quality rating of each project alternative for each landscape unit. The intensity of the change to aesthetics and visual quality would vary with context, such as where the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would be visible to viewers, and the affected viewer sensitivity to the visual change.

The project design includes several features (IAMFs) to minimize visual changes and impacts during construction and operation with minimal disruption from HSR construction and operation. For instance, the contractor will document in a technical memorandum how the Authority's aesthetic guidelines have been employed to minimize visual impacts (**AVQ-IAMF#1**), and document that the Authority's aesthetic review process has been followed to guide the development of nonstation area structures (**AVQ-IAMF#2**). The project features also reduce fugitive dust (**AQ-IAMF#1**) with a fugitive dust control plan during construction.

The IAMFs differ from mitigation measures in that they are part of the project and are a binding commitment by the Authority. In contrast, mitigation measures may be available to further reduce, compensate for, or offset project impacts that the analysis identifies under NEPA or concludes are significant under CEQA.

The impacts of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives are described and organized by landscape unit, as follows.

Construction Impacts

- Impact AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction
- Impact AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction

Operational Impacts

- Impact AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation
- Impact AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation

3.16.6.2 No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, recent development trends are anticipated to continue, leading to ongoing viewer, visual resources, and visual quality impacts. Planned residential, industrial, commercial, and transportation projects would introduce new development in the RSA, resulting in direct and indirect impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality. These projects would also increase sources of evening light and glare, which could degrade nighttime views. In some locations, views toward open spaces, such as the Rio Hondo, the San Gabriel and Santa Ana River Trails, and the San Gabriel Mountains, may be reduced or blocked by new structures. In addition to new greenfield development on undeveloped or agricultural lands, redevelopment

activities may result in the alteration of historic structures that add visual interest and contribute a unique character to the urban fabric.

The affected jurisdictions in the region would evaluate the aesthetic impacts of planned developments in the course of environmental review and require that projects incorporate visual measures to mitigate impacts. Developmental change under the No Project Alternative could result in indirect impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality.

Under the No Project Alternative, construction and operational impacts from noise, fugitive dust, and visual change would not occur. However, impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality through view- and surface-disturbing activity could persist through recent development trends. These trends are anticipated to continue and could potentially affect aesthetics and visual quality in the RSA. For example, the widening of transportation corridors would not necessarily degrade the visual quality of the area, but the indirect effects from increased development (to the extent permitted by local agencies) alongside these corridors, along with increasing billboard-type signage through the area, could result in the incremental degradation of views of the existing landscape. The extent of this alteration would vary depending on specific location. Collectively, these changes could substantially degrade visual quality from moderate to moderate-low or low in areas of generally moderate visual quality but with high-sensitivity viewers. Planned development and transportation projects that would occur under the No Project Alternative in the project section would likely include various forms of mitigation to reduce impacts on aesthetics and visual quality. These development activities include demolition, new construction, ground disturbance and compaction in construction and staging areas, accelerated erosion or increased flooding associated with changes in drainage patterns, and development of new borrow sites, and could lead to impacts on aesthetics and visual quality.

3.16.6.3 Project Impacts

Construction and operation of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would result in temporary and permanent impacts on aesthetics and visual quality.

Construction of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would involve demolition of existing structures; clearing and grubbing; reduction of permeable surface area; handling, storing, hauling, excavating, and placing fill; possible pile driving; construction of aerial structures, bridges, and road and parking lot modifications; utility upgrades and relocations; construction of light maintenance facilities (LMF) and potentially other ancillary facilities; and installation of power poles, HSR electrical systems, and railbeds.

Operation of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would include the operation of trains, inspection and maintenance along the track at LMFs, and railroad right-of-way, as well as on the structures, fencing, power system, train control, electric interconnection facilities, and communications. Construction and operations and maintenance are more fully described in Chapter 2, Alternatives.

The following sections describe each construction and operational impact for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives and three landscape units.

Construction Impacts

Impact AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Visual quality impacts associated with project construction would occur during the 1- to 8-year construction period and would be particularly noticeable to recreationists and residents. The most intensive phases of project construction, which would have the greatest potential to result in temporary impacts on aesthetics and visual quality, are expected in the first 5 years. The presence of construction materials, equipment, and on-site workers would alter the existing visual environment for the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units.

Construction activities could cause substantial visual intrusions in a given area for the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units. Earthwork, rail bed or column and guideway construction, associated truck hauling, and other major material and equipment movement and storage could cause substantial visual intrusions in a given area, because these activities would be highly visible. Soil movement, such as grading or excavation, could involve the release of dust, which could affect visibility.

Construction staging areas would introduce discordant visual changes to their immediate surroundings within the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units. Construction of HSR stations would require the establishment of a staging area and other construction activities, which would be temporary. Similarly, construction of maintenance and storage facilities would also require the establishment of a staging area and other construction activities, which would be temporary. Staging areas will be managed in accordance with the contractor's plan to minimize any potential adverse effects on adjacent sensitive uses. The contractor's plan will be prepared in compliance with applicable city, state, and federal regulations and standards. For example, project construction staging areas could be enclosed and screened.

Concrete batch plants, used to produce concrete for project construction, would be located within the project section right-of-way during construction. Given their extended use, they could create noticeable visual impacts near sensitive receptors such as residents and recreationists. Construction activities may also involve the use of temporary structures (e.g., trailers, fencing, parking). However, because there are no designated scenic vistas (including protected views) or scenic highways within the RSA or visible from the RSA, construction activities would not affect a scenic vista or highway.

In the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit, visual quality impacts affecting viewers and visual character would result from construction activities and built features of the project, including the LMF at 26th Street, tracks (including on aerial structures), electrification of tracks and TPSS, landform changes, grade separations (overcrossings and undercrossings), security features (barriers, signage, and signal lights), radio towers (up to 100 feet tall), lighting, and landscaping and revegetation that would primarily be visible from bridges over the project alignment, the Los Angeles River and Bicycle Path and Planned Extension, Redondo Junction, local roadways and sidewalks, and adjacent commercial, industrial, and a limited number of residential buildings with view corridors toward the project alignment. Within the RSA, Olvera Street, Los Angeles Plaza Park, and LAUS would not have views of construction because of the presence of the intervening built environment and mature landscaping. Similarly, construction activities would likely be undetectable in views of the downtown Los Angeles skyline because of distance and the intervening built environment and mature landscaping. Construction activity and equipment, including dump trucks, haul trucks, and cranes, could be partially visible from the upper stories of the Southern California Gas Company Administration Building (where lower-level views are blocked by the Southern California Gas Company Complex) and from portions of the Southern California Gas Company Complex with views of the project alignment between intervening warehouses. Construction staging areas would also be visible to passing travelers, visitors, and business employees.

For the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit, visual quality impacts affecting viewers and the overall visual character would result from construction activities and the introduction of permanent built features. These impacts would stem from modifications to the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station, relocation of the Commerce and Buena Park Metrolink Stations, and construction of the 26th Street LMF. Additional aspects contributing to impacts include installation of new and relocated tracks, track electrification (both at grade and on aerial structures), and development of supporting infrastructure (such as a TPSS, a paralleling station in Commerce, and a switching station in Santa Fe Springs). Other contributing aspects include landform alterations, grade separations (overcrossings and undercrossings), roadway relocations and closures, and the addition of security features like barriers, signage, and signal lights. Visual impacts would also result from the installation of radio towers up to 100 feet tall, lighting systems, landscaping, and revegetation.

These visual changes would primarily be visible from bridges crossing the project alignment; local roadways, sidewalks, and nearby commercial, industrial, and residential buildings with views toward the project alignment; and the following visual resources:

- 13. Rio Hondo and Bicycle Path/River Trail
- 14. San Gabriel River and Bicycle Path/River Trail
- 15. Coyote Creek North Fork Bikeway (Existing) and Coyote Creek Main Branch Bikeway Extension (Planned)
- 18. Zimmerman Park
- 21. Shrimpton Manufacturing and Supply Company
- 22. Western Waxed Paper Company
- 23. Boulder Dam–Los Angeles 287.5-Kilovolt Transmission Line
- 24. Redondo Junction
- 25. Commerce Train Station
- 26. Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Train Station
- 27. Buena Park Train Station

Construction of the 26th Street LMF would require removal of the Federated Metals Corporation property. In addition, Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would require installation of project elements along the existing railroad bridge over the Rio Hondo channel. This would require aerial and at-grade construction adjacent to the historic property. Project construction would also require a temporary encroachment onto the historic boundary. Bandini Park, Neff Park, and Windermere Park would not have views of construction because of the presence of the intervening built environment, soundwalls, and mature landscaping. Construction equipment, including dump trucks, haul trucks, and cranes, would be visible to viewers of the construction site. Construction staging areas would also be visible to passing travelers, visitors, and business employees.

With respect to the Federated Metals Corporation property, the property is an important cultural visual resource for the purposes of this aesthetic analysis. However, the Federated Metals Corporation property is not NRHP eligible and, therefore, does not qualify as a historic resource. Although the removal of this property would introduce a visual change in the area, it would not result in a substantial alteration to the overall visual environment. This is because the proposed 26th Street LMF would be built adjacent to the existing railroad yard on the west bank of the Los Angeles River, where current BNSF storage tracks and other rail infrastructure dominate the visual landscape. Given the proximity of the 26th Street LMF to existing rail infrastructure, the scale and size of the LMF would be consistent with the surrounding visual landscape and would not substantially alter or degrade existing views. As such, removal of the Federated Metals Corporation property would not result in a substantial change to the overall visual character of the area.

Although the project elements and new crossing would be visible in the Rio Hondo channel, these structures are consistent with the types of transportation infrastructure that have historically been visible from the river channel. As such, the new visual elements would not change the character of the historic property's use or result in changes to the physical setting in a manner that would substantially impair the protected features, activities, or attributes of the Rio Hondo channel. In addition, although construction activities would result in new visual elements on the Hunt Foods and Industries property, they would not cause physical destruction of, damage to, or alteration of this historic property.

For the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit, visual quality impacts affecting both viewers and overall visual character would result from project-related construction activities and permanent

features. These impacts would stem from modifications at the Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station that would primarily be visible from bridges crossing the project alignment; local roadways, sidewalks, and nearby commercial, industrial, and residential buildings with views toward the project alignment; and the following visual resources:

- 28. Santa Ana River and Trail
- 29. Val-Vita Food Products Company Headquarters
- 30. Hunt Foods and Industries Office and Library
- 31. Fullerton Pooch Park
- 33. Janet Evans Swim Complex and Independence Park
- 35. Amerige Park
- 37. Fullerton Mutual Orange Association Packing House
- 38. Elephant Packing House
- 39. Fullerton Odd Fellows Temple
- 40. Pacific Electric Railway Depot, Fullerton
- 41. Fullerton Post Office
- 44. Historic Palm District, Anaheim
- 45. Union Pacific Railroad Depot, Anaheim
- 46. Citrus Park, Anaheim
- 47. Anaheim Colony Historic District
- 48. Kroeger-Melrose Historic District, Anaheim
- 50. Angel Stadium of Anaheim and the Big A
- 51. Honda Center
- 52. Brea Creek Bastanchury Corridor (Planned)
- 53. Pacific Drive Elementary School
- 54. Union Pacific Trail Phase II (Planned)
- 55. Union Pacific Park
- 57. Amerige Brothers' Real Estate Office
- 58. Fullerton Ice Company
- 59. Fullerton Historic Landmark
- 60. Fullerton Airport

The Fullerton Train Station and Redevelopment Area would be modified to accommodate the project. Additionally, minor utility relocation is proposed on the Hunt Foods and Industries property. Adlena Park, Ford Park, Richman Park, St. Mary's Catholic Church, Lemon Park, and Magnolia Park would not have views of construction because of the presence of the intervening built environment, soundwalls, and mature landscaping.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A will incorporate aesthetic guidelines for the HSR infrastructure in the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units that include approaches to integrating structures within a community and reducing the intrusiveness of large, elevated structures, minimizing impacts on views (**AVQ-IAMF#1**). Refer to *Aesthetic Options for Non-Station Structures* (Authority 2017b). Prior to construction, the contractor will document that the Authority's aesthetic review process has been followed (**AVQ-IAMF#2**). In addition, soil movement during construction, such as grading, excavation, and import or export by truck, could cause the release of dust, which could impair visibility. **AQ-IAMF#1** will be incorporated to avoid substantial visibility effects from dust. **AQ-IAMF#1** requires the contractor to prepare a fugitive dust control plan that identifies measures such as covering all materials transported on public roads, watering exposed graded surfaces, and stabilizing all disturbed graded areas. **BIO-IAMF#11** will also be incorporated to ensure that site managers conduct regular site inspections to ensure that staging areas are clean and orderly, to the extent practicable, and that construction debris is removed from public rights-of-way and adjacent properties/roadway.

Once construction is complete, construction equipment would be removed, and construction staging areas and temporary structures would be dismantled. However, the areas disturbed by

construction would require remediation to prevent substantial changes to views, visual character, and visual quality and the diminishment of natural harmony, cultural order, and project coherence. Therefore, **AVQ-MM#1, Minimize Visual Disruption from Construction Activities**, includes remediation requirements for areas disturbed during project construction.

Additionally, construction activities and the addition of built security features (intrusion-protection railings,[2] signage, lighting, and signal lights) to the four historic bridges would conflict with the visual character of these historic bridges and substantially affect the scenic values of the bridges as important visual resources. These built security features would be permanent construction effects, because they would remain after the construction period. The affected bridges in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit are as follows: First Street Bridge, Fourth Street Bridge, Seventh Street Bridge, and Olympic Boulevard Bridge. **AVQ-MM#1** will partially reduce visual impacts on the historic bridges; however, even with mitigation, visual impacts in these four historic bridge locations would remain.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Because Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would not include the LMF at 26th Street, the alternative would not require the removal of the Federated Metals Corporation property. Nevertheless, there would be a change to the visual landscape from construction of the 15th Street LMF adjacent to existing rail infrastructure. Construction of the 15th Street LMF would require that existing big-box warehouses be removed.

Although Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would result in fewer localized impacts at 26th Street, because it avoids the removal of the Federated Metals Corporation property and associated construction activity at that location, both alternatives would result in similar visual impacts from construction of an LMF.

Construction under this alternative would require similar construction equipment, affect similar viewers, and affect visual character within the RSA similar to that described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Overall, visual quality impacts for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B during construction would be similar to those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A within the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units. Impacts would be reduced by incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1**, **AVQ-IAMF#2**, and **AQ-IAMF#1**. **AVQ-MM#1** will further reduce effects on viewers, visual character, and visual quality in the landscape units during construction.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit, an HSR platform and tracks would be elevated, alongside the modified Metrolink tracks, but the impacts would be the same as those occurring under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would occur in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. The same types of construction activities and equipment would be used, including dump trucks, haul trucks, and cranes. Viewers of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option construction site would be the same as those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Construction staging areas would also be visible to primary viewer groups, including nearby residents, employees and visitors to businesses, motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other travelers on local roadways. Generally, industrial and

[2] Protective railings are required on highway, roadway, freight, and pedestrian structures that cross over the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Providing a solid barrier on these structures where they cross over the electrified components of the system is critical for the safe operation of the train and the protection of both passengers and rail employees. Solid barriers on these overcrossings are required to extend to the edge of the rail right-of-way or 30 feet from the centerline of the outermost track, whichever is greater, at a minimum height of 8 feet.

commercial workers have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and, therefore, lower sensitivity because the nature of their work typically limits both the duration and relevance of views of the surrounding landscape. Travelers, given the nature of their activities, also have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and are considered to have a lower sensitivity because they experience the environment only briefly and in passing. However, residents would have a higher awareness of visual changes in the environment and are also considered to have a higher sensitivity because of their consistent, long-term exposure to the landscape, making changes in visual quality substantially more noticeable. The exposure of most of these viewer groups is shorter in duration, except in residential areas where the duration is longer. Overall, given viewers' familiarity with the existing LOSSAN Corridor, viewer sensitivity throughout the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit would be predominantly low to moderate-low, except where recreational and residential viewers are present, and in that case viewer sensitivity would be moderate to moderate-high. Visual quality impacts that affect viewers and visual character would result from construction activities and built features. As described for the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit, effects of the station option on viewers, visual character, and visual quality will be reduced through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1**, **AVQ-IAMF#2**, and **AQ-IAMF#1**. **AVQ-MM#1** will further address the effects on viewers, visual character, and visual quality for this HSR station option during construction.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit, HSR station platform and facilities would be built along with the modifications required at the existing Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak station, but the impacts would be the same as those occurring under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. The Fullerton HSR Station Option would introduce additional elements at the site compared to Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, including HSR station buildings, a facility power station, roadway modifications, and a parking structure, and the construction area under the Fullerton HSR Station Option would be larger than that for Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. However, construction of both the Fullerton HSR Station Option and Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would require similar equipment, including dump trucks, haul trucks, and cranes. Viewers of the Fullerton HSR Station Option construction site would be the same as those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Construction staging areas would also be visible to primary viewer groups, including nearby residents, employees and visitors to businesses, motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other travelers on local roadways. Generally, industrial and commercial workers have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and, therefore, lower sensitivity because the nature of their work typically limits both the duration and relevance of views of the surrounding landscape. Travelers, given the nature of their activities, also have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and are considered to have a lower sensitivity because they experience the environment only briefly and in passing. However, residents would have a higher awareness of visual changes in the environment and are also considered to have a higher sensitivity because of their consistent, long-term exposure to the landscape, making changes in visual quality substantially more noticeable. Exposure of most of these viewer groups is shorter in duration, except in residential areas where the duration is longer. Overall, given viewers' familiarity with the existing LOSSAN Corridor, viewer sensitivity throughout the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit would be predominantly moderate-low to moderate, except where residential viewers are present, and in that case viewer sensitivity would be moderate-high. Visual quality impacts during construction would be similar to those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in all of the landscape units. Effects of the station option will be reduced through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1**, **AVQ-IAMF#2**, and **AQ-IAMF#1** to substantially avoid or reduce impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality. **AVQ-MM#1** will further address the effects on viewers, visual character, and visual quality for this HSR station option during construction.

CEQA Conclusion

In many parts of the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit, the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would be visually compatible with the natural and cultural environment. Temporary

degradation of visual quality in these locations would not occur. However, the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives would introduce built security features that would modify four historic bridges, causing a visual change for viewers with high sensitivity. Adherence to **AVQ-IAMF#1**, **AVQ-IAMF#2**, and **AQ-IAMF#1** will minimize degradation of visual quality during construction, but the impacts would remain significant in the vicinity of the four historic bridges in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit. **BIO-IAMF#11** will also be incorporated to ensure that site managers conduct regular site inspections to ensure that staging areas are clean and orderly, to the extent practicable, and that construction debris is removed from public rights-of-way and adjacent properties/roadway. **AVQ-MM#1** will reduce construction impacts on the visual quality of the historic bridges in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit; however, the addition of built security features (intrusion-protection railings,[3] signage, lighting, and signal lights) to the four historic bridges would conflict with the visual character of these historic bridges and substantially affect the scenic values of the bridges as important visual resources. These built security features would be permanent construction effects, because they would remain after the construction period. Therefore, even with mitigation, construction in the vicinity of the four historic bridges would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on visual quality in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit.

Within the Gateway Cities and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units, the project section is in an urbanized area. The Authority is a state agency and is therefore not required to comply with local land use and zoning regulations; however, it has endeavored to design and build the HSR project so that it is consistent with land use and zoning regulations. Incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1**, **AVQ-IAMF#2**, **AQ-IAMF#1**, and **BIO-IAMF#11** in the project's design would reduce anticipated visual quality impacts related to disruption of existing communities during project construction. Even with application of these IAMFs, impacts would remain significant. However, with implementation of **AVQ-MM#1**, impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality associated with project construction and temporary impacts on visual quality in the Gateway Cities and Fullerton/ Anaheim Landscape Units would be less than significant.

As previously noted, there are no designated scenic vistas (including protected views) or scenic highways within the RSA or visible from the RSA. Construction activities would thus not affect any scenic vista or highway. Therefore, there would be no impact under CEQA on scenic vistas or scenic highways, including scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

Impact AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Nighttime project construction activities would temporarily alter the existing visual environment for the time period of construction, approximately 1 to 8 years. This would include nighttime construction activities associated with the 26th Street LMF. Visual quality impacts affecting viewers and visual character, would result from construction lighting features in the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units.

Introduction of light and glare from construction activities would lead to substantial, but temporary, aesthetic degradation of the four historic bridges within the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: First Street Bridge, Fourth Street Bridge, Seventh Street Bridge, and Olympic Boulevard Bridge. Construction-related light and glare would conflict and contrast with the visual character of these bridges and would substantially affect their scenic values.

[3] Protective railings are required on highway, roadway, freight, and pedestrian structures that cross over the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Providing a solid barrier on these structures where they cross over the electrified components of the system is critical for the safe operation of the train and the protection of both passengers and rail employees. Solid barriers on these overcrossings are required to extend to the edge of the rail right-of-way or 30 feet from the centerline of the outermost track, whichever is greater, at a minimum height of 8 feet.

Construction activities and built features require nighttime lighting that would disturb viewers, visual character, and visual quality. Effects of Shared Passenger Alternative A will be partially reduced in these locations through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** to substantially avoid or minimize light and glare impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality. Even with application of these IAMFs, intrusive nighttime lighting necessary for construction would occur and potential impacts would remain. Implementation of **AVQ-MM#2, Minimize Light Disturbance During Construction**, which requires that the contractor prepare a technical memorandum verifying how the contractor will shield nighttime construction lighting and direct it downward in such a manner to minimize the light that falls outside the construction site boundaries, will reduce potentially invasive sources of light and glare associated with construction.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would introduce light and glare that could result in visual disturbance that affects viewers, visual character, and visual quality, because of construction of lighting features in the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units. These effects would be similar to those of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with two exceptions. At Olympic Boulevard Bridge, impacts would be slightly more intense because of the larger area of disturbance associated with construction of the 15th Street LMF. At 26th Street, impacts would be slightly reduced without construction of the 26th Street LMF.

Although Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would still include construction activities at 26th Street, the absence of the 26th Street LMF would reduce the extent of construction activities at this location. As a result, nighttime lighting requirements at 26th Street under Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would be slightly reduced because of the smaller construction footprint and construction activities requiring nighttime lighting.

As such, both alternatives would result in similar visual impacts from the increase in nighttime lighting during construction. Although overall visual impacts are comparable in all landscape units, Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would reduce visual impacts at 26th Street because of the reduction of nighttime lighting during project construction at this location.

Construction activities and built features require nighttime lighting that would disturb viewers, visual character, and visual quality. Effects of Shared Passenger Track Alternative B will be partially reduced in these locations through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** to substantially avoid or minimize light and glare impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality. Implementation of **AVQ-MM#2** would further reduce potentially invasive sources of light and glare associated with construction.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit, an HSR platform and tracks would be elevated alongside the modified Metrolink tracks, but the impacts would be the same as those occurring under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives with the station area. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would occur in the same area that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. The existing Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station is considered a project visual resource, and residential land uses are nearby, which have the potential to be affected by nighttime construction activities. Construction activities and built features require nighttime lighting that would disturb viewers, visual character, and visual quality in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit. Effects of Shared Passenger Track Alternative B will be partially reduced in these locations through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** to substantially avoid or minimize light and glare impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality. During project construction, intrusive nighttime lighting necessary for construction would occur. Implementation of **AVQ-MM#2** will reduce potentially invasive sources of light and glare associated with construction.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, the HSR station platform and facilities would be built along with the modifications required at the existing Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak station but the impacts would be similar to those occurring under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. Construction of the HSR platform, facilities, and parking would happen in a larger area than would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives and would be closer to some cultural visual resources. As depicted on Figure 3.16-4, the Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station is near several cultural visual resources that have the potential to be affected by nighttime construction activities, including, but not limited to, Amerige Park, Fullerton Mutual Orange Association Packing, Elephant Packing House, Pacific Electric Railway Depot, and the Fullerton Train Station and Redevelopment Area. In addition, there are residential land uses nearby, which have the potential to be affected by nighttime construction activities. Construction activities and built features require nighttime lighting that would disturb viewers, visual character, and visual quality in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit. Effects of the HSR station option will be partially alleviated in these locations through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** to substantially avoid or minimize light and glare impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality. Implementation of **AVQ-MM#2** will reduce potentially invasive sources of light and glare associated with construction.

CEQA Conclusion

The impact on viewers, visual character, and visual quality under CEQA from temporary light and glare during project construction would be potentially significant before mitigation. Although adherence to **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** will lessen nighttime lighting impacts, residual impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality during construction of the project could occur. Project construction would introduce substantial new sources of light and glare over a long period of time, which would adversely affect nighttime views. Implementation of **AVQ-MM#2** will reduce potentially invasive sources of light and glare associated with nighttime construction. This mitigation requires that the contractor shield nighttime construction lighting, minimize light spill outside the construction site boundaries, and document its compliance in a technical memorandum. With implementation of **AVQ-MM#2**, impacts from temporary light and glare during construction would be less than significant.

Operational Impacts

Impact AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

There are no designated scenic vistas (including protected views) or scenic highways within the RSA or visible from the RSA, and operation of the project would not affect a scenic vista or highway for any of the landscape units in the project section.

Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit

Four KVPs have been identified to represent typical views and viewers from common types of viewing areas, depicting the range of existing visual character and visual quality found in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit. Photographs of the existing conditions at these KVPs and simulations of the conditions under the project are depicted on Figure 3.16-5 through Figure 3.16-12.



Figure 3.16-5 Key Viewpoint 1: Existing View from E Cesar Chavez Avenue (Facing Southeast)



Figure 3.16-6 Key Viewpoint 1: Visual Simulation from E Cesar Chavez Avenue (Facing Southeast)



Figure 3.16-7 Key Viewpoint 2: Existing View from Mozaic at Union Station Apartments (Facing Southeast)



Figure 3.16-8 Key Viewpoint 2: Visual Simulation from Mozaic at Union Station Apartments (Facing Southeast)



Figure 3.16-9 Key Viewpoint 3: Existing View from First Street at the Los Angeles River (Facing Southwest)



Figure 3.16-10 Key Viewpoint 3: Visual Simulation from First Street at the Los Angeles River (Facing Southwest)



Figure 3.16-11 Key Viewpoint 4: Existing View from north of Fourth Street at the Los Angeles River (Facing South)



Figure 3.16-12 Key Viewpoint 4: Visual Simulation from north of Fourth Street at the Los Angeles River (Facing South)

Visual Changes

Visual changes in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit would include an LMF at 26th Street, tracks (including on aerial structures), electrification of tracks and TPSS, landform changes, grade separations (overcrossings and undercrossings), security features (barriers, signage, and signal lights), radio towers (up to 100 feet tall), lighting, and landscaping and revegetation.

Viewer Sensitivity

The primary viewer groups in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit include employees and visitors to businesses throughout the downtown Los Angeles industrial corridor. Other viewer groups include motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other travelers on local roadways. Generally, industrial and commercial workers have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and, therefore, lower sensitivity because the nature of their work typically limits both the duration and importance of their views of the surrounding landscape. Travelers, given the nature of their activities, also have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and are also considered to have a lower sensitivity because they experience the environment only in passing and do not rely on sustained views. Overall, given the viewers' familiarity with the existing LOSSAN Corridor, viewer sensitivity throughout the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit would be low to moderate-low. The exception to this would be the higher sensitivity of pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile viewers at the historic bridges.

Visual Character and Visual Quality

Project train and maintenance facility operational activities would alter the existing visual environment. These alterations would include increased activity along the rail corridor, new and expanded stations with greater transit and commuter activity, and signal lights. Effects of the project will be partially alleviated through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** to substantially avoid or minimize impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality.

An evaluation was made of operational impacts from the four KVPs in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit. During operation of the project, changes to the visual quality in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit would occur. As depicted on Figure 3.16-5, the existing view is dominated by the channelized roadway corridor that is enclosed by the tall roadside trees and tall office buildings. The bridge acts to obscure views of features beyond the structure. The overhead contact system (OCS) is present over the rail line in the existing view. During operation, the bridge and safety fencing would look the same as existing conditions, as depicted on Figure 3.16-6. The proposed OCS would be more prominent in the view but would not be dominant or substantially detract from quality of views.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-7, the existing elevated tracks at LAUS act to partially obscure views of the lower levels of the buildings east of the rail line. In addition, stopped trains further contribute to the obstruction of views of the lower levels of the buildings. During operation, the proposed retaining wall and shade structure would obstruct slightly more of the adjacent buildings, but views would remain consistent and in keeping with existing conditions and would not substantially detract from the quality of views, as depicted on Figure 3.16-8.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-9, the existing rail line and fencing appear old, and there are seven tracks. The concrete-lined river, lattice steel transmission lines, adjacent industrial development and associated storage yards, and tall light posts dominate existing views. During operation, there would be fewer tracks, which would reduce visual clutter associated with the rail corridor, as depicted on Figure 3.16-10. The new fencing and ballast rock would slightly improve the quality of views by replacing old and worn features that are degrading with new materials. The proposed OCS would not detract from views because of the existing number of visual intrusions associated with utilities already present in the view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-11, the existing rail line and fencing appear old, and there are several tracks, similar to the view of KVP 3. Like KVP 3, the concrete-lined river, adjacent industrial development and associated storage yards, and tall light posts dominate views, and the new Sixth Street Bridge is a focal point in this view because of its unique design. During operation, there would be fewer tracks, which would reduce visual clutter associated with the rail corridor, as depicted on Figure 3.16-12. The new fencing and ballast rock would slightly improve the quality of views by replacing old and worn features that are degrading with new materials. The proposed OCS would not detract from views because of the existing number of visual intrusions associated with utilities already present in the view.

As discussed in Section 3.17, Cultural Resources, the project has the potential to significantly affect culturally and historically significant resources in the RSA through operational changes caused by the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. **CUL-MM#12, Design Review for Intrusion-Protection Barriers**, seeks to reduce the effect by consulting with interested parties to achieve a barrier design that meets safety goals while introducing the minimum physical and visual effects on the historic property. Views of passing trains and infrastructure will be minimized with implementation of **AVQ-MM#3, Incorporate Design Aesthetic Preferences into Final Design and Construction of Nonstation Structures,** which requires the contractor to work with the Authority and local jurisdictions to incorporate Authority-approved aesthetic preferences into final design and construction, which would partially alleviate aesthetic degradation of the existing character or quality of the four affected bridges and their surroundings by providing the opportunity for design input from the jurisdiction; **AVQ-MM#5, Replant Unused Portions of Land Acquired for the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section**, which requires planting of vegetation in land acquired for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A (e.g., shifting roadways) that is not used for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A or related supporting infrastructure, or other higher or better use; **AVQ-MM#6, Screen Traction Power Distribution Stations and Radio Communication Towers**, which will screen from public view the TPSSs (at approximately 30-mile intervals along the HSR guideway), including radio towers where required, through the use of landscaping or solid walls/fences; and **AVQ-MM#7, Incorporate Design Criteria for Elevated Guideways and Station Elements that Can Adapt to Local Context**, which requires incorporation of design criteria for elevated guideways and station elements that can adapt to local context. These mitigation measures will limit the effects of the main visual changes anticipated in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit (train movements, train lighting, activities at the LMF, security lighting, and signal lights) by blocking the changes from view and ensuring that the changes have been considered in the design criteria.

As presented in Table 3.16-9, the visual quality effects of the project at the KVPs in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit would be neutral because of the moderate-low to low visual quality change and moderate to low viewer sensitivity to change. Similarly, it would not reduce visual quality at the KVPs selected for analysis, particularly because the project would be introduced into an existing rail corridor and would generally be compatible with the visual setting. The overall visual quality effect would be compatible and neutral in this landscape unit.

Substantial aesthetic degradation resulting from discordant operational view elements would occur from operational activities (train movement and maintenance facility operations) and the moving security features such as signal lights, which are inconsistent with the historic bridges, on the four historic bridges in this landscape unit: First Street Bridge, Fourth Street Bridge, Seventh Street Bridge, and Olympic Boulevard Bridge. Operations-related visual quality impacts affecting viewers and visual character would also result in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit at locations other than those of the historic bridges.

The 26th Street LMF is proposed adjacent to the existing railroad yard on the west bank of the Los Angeles River where the current BNSF storage tracks are located. Because of the project LMF location adjacent to an existing rail yard, the scale and size of the proposed LMF would not substantially alter or degrade existing views.

The presence of the train cars themselves would be limited in both frequency and duration. Therefore, although train cars would be temporarily visible—because of the intervening development, such as sound or retention walls, which often obstruct sightlines to the rail corridor, and because of the established presence of other train cars on the existing railway—train operations are not expected to contribute to significant visual quality impacts.

The changes in visual quality at the KVPs in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit are summarized in Table 3.16-9. The effect on visual quality for all KVPs in the Downtown Landscape Unit is neutral.

Table 3.16-9 Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: Summary of Visual Effects

KVP	Visual Quality Rating: Existing	Visual Quality Rating: Proposed	Overall Visual Change	Viewer Sensitivity to Change	Effect on Visual Quality
1	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Neutral
2	Moderate-low	Low	Moderate-low	Moderate	Neutral
3	Low	Low	Low	Low	Neutral
4	Low	Low	Low	Low	Neutral

KVP = key viewpoint

Gateway Cities Landscape Unit

Ten KVPs are designated to represent typical views from common types of viewing areas, depicting the range of visual character and visual quality found in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit. Photographic comparisons by KVP of existing conditions and simulated conditions are depicted in this section (Figure 3.16-13 through Figure 3.16-32).



Figure 3.16-13 Key Viewpoint 5: Existing View from Downey Road and E 26th Street (Facing Northwest)



Figure 3.16-14 Key Viewpoint 5: Visual Simulation from Downey Road and E 26th Street (Facing Northwest)



Figure 3.16-15 Key Viewpoint 6: Existing View from 6185 Bandini Boulevard (Facing North)



Figure 3.16-16 Key Viewpoint 6: Visual Simulation from 6185 Bandini Boulevard (Facing North)



Figure 3.16-17 Key Viewpoint 7: Existing View from Sycamore Street and Supply Avenue (Facing Southwest)



Figure 3.16-18 Key Viewpoint 7: Visual Simulation from Sycamore Street and Supply Avenue (Facing Southwest)



Figure 3.16-19 Key Viewpoint 8: Existing View from S Fourth Street and Sycamore Street (Facing Southeast)



Figure 3.16-20 Key Viewpoint 8: Visual Simulation from S Fourth Street and Sycamore Street (Facing Southeast)



Figure 3.16-21 Key Viewpoint 9: Existing View of the Rio Hondo Trail Near Maynard Road (Facing Northeast)



Figure 3.16-22 Key Viewpoint 9: Visual Simulation of the Rio Hondo Trail Near Maynard Road (Facing Northeast)



Figure 3.16-23 Key Viewpoint 10: Existing View of the San Gabriel River Bike Path and San Gabriel River Trail South of Slauson Avenue (Facing Northeast)



Figure 3.16-24 Key Viewpoint 10: Visual Simulation of the San Gabriel River Bike Path and San Gabriel River Trail South of Slauson Avenue (Facing Northeast)



Figure 3.16-25 Key Viewpoint 11: Existing View from Metropolitan State Hospital/ Bloomfield Avenue (Facing East)



Figure 3.16-26 Key Viewpoint 11: Visual Simulation from Metropolitan State Hospital/ Bloomfield Avenue (Facing East)



Figure 3.16-27 Key Viewpoint 12: Existing View from Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station Parking Lot (Facing East)



Figure 3.16-28 Key Viewpoint 12: Visual Simulation from Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station Parking Lot (Facing East)



Figure 3.16-29 Key Viewpoint 13: Existing View Facing Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station from John Zimmerman Park (Facing North/Northwest)



Figure 3.16-30 Key Viewpoint 13: Visual Simulation Facing Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station from John Zimmerman Park (Facing North/Northwest)



Figure 3.16-31 Key Viewpoint 14: Existing View from Tulare Avenue and Fullerton Avenue (Facing Northwest)



Figure 3.16-32 Key Viewpoint 14: Visual Simulation from Tulare Avenue and Fullerton Avenue (Facing Northwest)

Visual Changes

Visual changes in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit would include modifications to the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs Metrolink Station; relocation of the Commerce and Buena Park Metrolink Stations; new and relocated tracks; electrification of tracks (at grade and on aerial structures); a TPSS; a paralleling station in Commerce; a switching station in Santa Fe Springs;

landform changes; grade separations (overcrossing and undercrossings) and roadway relocations and closures; security features (barriers, signage, and signal lights); radio towers (up to 100 feet tall); lighting; and landscaping and revegetation.

Improvements related to the proposed TPSS and associated electrical interconnections bringing in power to the project site from utility providers would cause minimal change to the visual character of the project site. The TPSS along Washington Boulevard in Los Angeles would be in a dense industrial area. Along E Washington Boulevard from Soto Street to 1,000 feet east of Downey Road, Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would replace existing power lines with steel tubular poles along the west side of Washington Boulevard in an industrial area in existing roadways and public utility facilities. Approximately 35 poles would be required to connect the TPSS to the power source on De La Torre Way and Fifteenth Street. In addition, the boundaries of the existing substation north of Emery Street would be expanded in the event that future expansion or rearrangement is needed. Furthermore, Emery Street would become a cul-de-sac at Spence Street and De La Torre Way. Because of the heavily industrialized landscape of the area, the utility improvements would not result in a substantial change in visual quality.

Viewer Sensitivity

Primary viewer groups in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit include residents/recreationists in areas that neighbor the existing railway and proposed alignment, employees and patrons of similarly located businesses, and motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other travelers that use local roadways and thoroughfares that traverse or are parallel or otherwise adjacent to the existing railway and proposed alignment. Generally, the impact on visual quality for lower-sensitivity groups, such as commuters and haulers, would most likely be neutral. More sensitive viewers, such as residents, might have an adverse reaction to visual changes. Overall, given the viewers' familiarity with the existing LOSSAN Corridor and existing Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs, Commerce, and Buena Park Metrolink Stations, viewer sensitivity throughout the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit would be predominantly low to moderate-low, except where recreational and residential viewers are present and viewer sensitivity would be moderate to moderate-high.

Visual Character and Visual Quality

As depicted on Figure 3.16-13, the existing rail line and surrounding landscape appear visually degraded because of the dominance of pavement, wooden utility poles, lattice steel transmission towers, lattice steel train signal structure, and adjacent industrial development. During operation, the concrete barrier and fencing would slightly reduce visual clutter by obscuring views of the tracks, but the OCS would slightly increase visual clutter by adding an additional utility feature into view, as depicted on Figure 3.16-14. However, the proposed OCS would not result in a notable change in the quality of views because of the existing number of visual intrusions associated with utilities already present in the view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-15, the existing rail line is not visible in views, and pavement, tubular steel utility poles, lattice steel transmission towers, security fencing, and adjacent industrial development dominate the landscape. Views of the mountains in the background are present, but they are not a focal point because of the tall utility infrastructure that draws the viewer's attention. During operation, the viaduct would introduce a new, elevated transportation structure into the view, as depicted on Figure 3.16-16. However, the structure and proposed OCS would retain views of the mountains. Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would not greatly degrade the quality of views, given the industrial nature of this view and the existing number of visual intrusions associated with utilities and development present in the view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-17, the landscape is dominated by pavement, the tracks, security fencing with graffiti, and adjacent industrial development that appear disjointed because of the separation that the tracks create. During operation, the relocated Commerce Metrolink Station would introduce a new transportation facility into the view, as depicted on Figure 3.16-18. Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would not greatly degrade the quality of views given the industrial

nature of this view but would act to better unify the view by creating a more organized and programmed space.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-19, the landscape is dominated by residential development, a soundwall, and landscaping associated with the residence and soundwall for a view that appears relatively intact. The tall wooden utility pole and wires detract from the existing view. During operation, the rail line soundwall would blend well with the existing soundwall, as depicted on Figure 3.16-20. The proposed OCS would slightly increase visual clutter by adding an additional utility feature into view, but would not greatly alter the quality of the view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-21, the landscape is dominated by open space, several mature trees, rail berm, and a bike tunnel under the rail line for a view that appears relatively intact. Lattice steel transmission towers and wires can be seen beyond the berm and detract slightly from the existing view. During operation, the security fencing along the rail line would not greatly alter views, as depicted on Figure 3.16-22. The proposed OCS would slightly increase visual clutter by adding an additional utility feature into view but would not greatly alter the quality of the view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-23, the landscape is dominated by the grassy riverbed, the roadway and rail viaduct structures, rail berm, river levees, lattice steel transmission towers and wires, lattice steel train signal structure, and a band of mature trees in the distance. During operation, the upgraded rail bridge decking and security fencing along the rail line would not be very noticeable in views, as depicted on Figure 3.16-24. The proposed OCS would slightly increase visual clutter by adding an additional utility feature into view, but would not greatly alter the quality of the view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-25, the existing rail line is not visible in views, and pavement, the flagpole, the security wall and gate, and industrial development dominate the landscape. During operation, the viaduct would introduce a new, elevated transportation structure into the view, as depicted on Figure 3.16-26. However, the structure and proposed OCS would not greatly degrade the quality of views, given the industrial nature of this view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-27, the existing station, parking lot, and landscaping dominate views. During operation, the station improvements would introduce a new, elevated platform with new track, other associated facilities, and additional landscaping into the view, as depicted on Figure 3.16-28. However, the proposed improvements would be seen as a visual expansion of existing rail facilities. In addition, proposed landscaping would ensure the scale of the facility does not dominate views. Therefore, the improvements would not degrade the quality of this view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-29, the existing ball field, park, and landscaping dominate views, although the rail line is visible beyond the park. The ball field lighting draws attention in this view. During operation, the station improvements would introduce a new, elevated platform with new track, and other associated facilities, as depicted on Figure 3.16-30. The proposed improvements would become a focal point in the view, although the station would not be as tall as the ball field lighting. Therefore, the proposed station would not overly dominate the view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-31, the landscape is dominated by residential development, privacy fencing, lattice steel train signal structure, and landscaping. Wooden utility poles and wires along the roadway and rail line detract from the existing view. During operation, the proposed OCS would slightly increase visual clutter by adding an additional utility feature into view, as depicted on Figure 3.16-32, but would not greatly affect the quality of the view.

The changes in visual quality at the KVPs in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit are summarized in Table 3.16-10.

Table 3.16-10 Gateway Cities Landscape Unit: Summary of Visual Effects

KVP	Visual Quality Rating: Existing	Visual Quality Rating: Proposed	Overall Visual Change	Viewer Sensitivity to Change	Effect on Visual Quality
5	Low	Low	Low	Low	Neutral

KVP	Visual Quality Rating: Existing	Visual Quality Rating: Proposed	Overall Visual Change	Viewer Sensitivity to Change	Effect on Visual Quality
6	Low	Low	Low	Low	Neutral
7	Low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Low	Beneficial
8	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Low	Moderate	Neutral
9	Moderate-low	Low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Neutral
10	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Low	Moderate-low	Neutral
11	Moderate-low	Low	Moderate-low	Low	Neutral
12	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-high	Neutral
13	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-high	Neutral
14	Low	Low	Low	Moderate	Neutral

KVP = key viewpoint

As presented in Table 3.16-10, the visual quality effects at the KVPs in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit would be neutral or beneficial because of the moderate to low visual quality change and the moderate to low viewer sensitivity to change except for KVP 12 and KVP 13, where sensitivity is moderate-high, but the effect on visual quality would be neutral. Similarly, it would not reduce visual quality at KVPs selected for analysis, because the project would be introduced into an existing rail corridor and would generally be compatible with the visual setting. The overall visual quality effect would be compatible and neutral in this landscape unit.

Project operational activities in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit would alter the existing visual environment for the life of the system. Incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** in the project's design would reduce visual quality impacts related to project operational activities. However, even with the project's adherence to these measures, operation of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would have adverse visual quality impacts on viewers and visual character. With implementation of the following mitigation, views of passing trains and infrastructure will be minimized in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit, similar to that described for the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: **AVQ-MM#3**, which requires incorporation of design aesthetic preferences into final design and construction of nonstation structures; **AVQ-MM#4, Provide Vegetation Screening Along At-Grade and Elevated Guideways Adjacent to Residential Areas**, which requires vegetation screening at grade and elevated guideways adjacent to residential areas; **AVQ-MM#5**, which requires replanting of unused portions of land acquired for the project; **AVQ-MM#6**, which requires screening of TPSSs and radio communication towers; and **AVQ-MM#7**, which requires incorporation of design criteria for elevated guideways and station elements that can adapt to local context. These mitigation measures will reduce the effects of the main visual changes anticipated in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit (train movements, train lighting, activities at the LMF, security lighting, and signal lights) by blocking the changes from view and ensuring that the changes have been considered in the design criteria.

In addition, Shared Passenger Track Alternative A would permanently incorporate a portion of the Rio Hondo channel into the project footprint. The project elements and new crossing would be visible in the channel; however, these structures are consistent with the types of transportation infrastructure that have historically been visible from the river channel. As such, the new visual elements would not change the character of the historic property's use or result in changes to the physical setting in a manner that would substantially impair the protected features, activities, or attributes of the Rio Hondo channel.

Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit

Five KVPs are designated to represent typical views from common types of viewing areas, depicting the range of visual character and visual quality found in the Fullerton/Anaheim

Landscape Unit. Additionally, three KVPs (KVPs 16–18) do not provide typical views from common viewing areas but rather provide aerial views of existing and simulated conditions to depict how the project would fit into the larger context of the project site and urban environment. Photographic comparisons by KVP of existing conditions and simulated conditions are depicted in this section (Figure 3.16-33 through Figure 3.16-48).



Figure 3.16-33 Key Viewpoint 15: Existing View from Raymer Avenue at Gilbert Street (Facing West)



Figure 3.16-34 Key Viewpoint 15: Visual Simulation from Raymer Avenue at Gilbert Street (Facing West)



Figure 3.16-35 Key Viewpoint 16: Existing View of Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station (from the Southwest Facing Northeast)



Figure 3.16-36 Key Viewpoint 16: Visual Simulation of Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station (No High-Speed Rail Station Option) (from the Southwest Facing Northeast)




Figure 3.16-37 Key Viewpoint 17: Existing View of Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station (from the West Facing East)




Figure 3.16-38 Key Viewpoint 17: Visual Simulation of Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station (No High-Speed Rail Station Option) (from the West Facing East)



Figure 3.16-39 Key Viewpoint 18: Existing View of Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station (from the East-Southeast Facing West-Northwest)



Figure 3.16-40 Key Viewpoint 18: Visual Simulation of Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station (No High-Speed Rail Station Option) (from the East-Southeast Facing West-Northwest)



Figure 3.16-41 Key Viewpoint 19: Existing View of the Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station from E Walnut Avenue (Facing East)



Figure 3.16-42 Key Viewpoint 19: Visual Simulation of the Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station from E Walnut Avenue (No High-Speed Rail Station Option) (Facing East)



Figure 3.16-43 Key Viewpoint 20: Existing View from State College Boulevard and E Katella Avenue (Facing East)



Figure 3.16-44 Key Viewpoint 20: Visual Simulation from State College Boulevard and E Katella Avenue (Facing East)



Figure 3.16-45 Key Viewpoint 21: Existing View from S State College Boulevard (Facing Northeast)



Figure 3.16-46 Key Viewpoint 21: Visual Simulation from S State College Boulevard (Facing Northeast)



Figure 3.16-47 Key Viewpoint 22: Existing View from Angel Stadium Parking Lot North (Facing North)



Figure 3.16-48 Key Viewpoint 22: Visual Simulation from Angel Stadium Parking Lot North (Facing North)

Visual Changes

Visual changes in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit would include station improvements at Fullerton Station and ARTIC (with new parking structures at each station), electrification of tracks, addition of storage tracks with a 2-acre servicing facility, a paralleling station in Fullerton, a TPSS in Anaheim, landform changes, grade separations (overcrossing and undercrossings) and roadway rerouting and closures, security features (barriers, signage, and signal lights), radio towers (up to 100 feet tall), lighting, and landscaping and revegetation.

Viewer Sensitivity

Primary viewer groups in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit include residents in areas that neighbor the existing railway and proposed alignment, employees and patrons of similarly located businesses, and motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists who use local roadways and thoroughfares that traverse or are parallel or otherwise adjacent to the existing railway and proposed alignment. Overall, given the viewers' familiarity with the existing LOSSAN Corridor, viewer sensitivity throughout the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit would be predominantly moderate-low to moderate, except where residential viewers are present and viewer sensitivity would be moderate-high.

Visual Character and Visual Quality

As depicted on Figure 3.16-33, KVP 15, the landscape is dominated by the rail line, bridge railings, and mature trees along the rail corridor. During operation, the proposed station platform, fencing, and OCS would slightly increase the dominance of the rail line in the view, as depicted on Figure 3.16-34, but would not greatly affect the quality of the view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-35, Figure 3.16-37, and Figure 3.16-39, the rail line segments land uses on either side of the corridor. Industrial, commercial, and park uses immediately border the corridor in the station area, with residential and commercial uses in the blocks farther away. Mature trees and shrubs are located along the rail corridor at the Highland Avenue undercrossing at Walnut Avenue and Amerige Park. During operation, the proposed station platforms, fencing, OCS, and realignment of Walnut Avenue would require that the vegetation at the Highland Avenue undercrossing at Walnut Avenue be removed to accommodate the retaining wall needed for the rail line and station platforms, as depicted on Figure 3.16-36, Figure 3.16-38, and Figure 3.16-40. In addition, several industrial buildings would need to be removed to accommodate the new station facilities and parking structure. As depicted on Figure 3.16-40, the existing pedestrian bridge over the rail line connecting the Amtrak station to the Metrolink parking lot and the existing station platform with associated vegetation and shade structures would be removed. These changes would slightly increase the dominance of the rail line in the view, but would not greatly affect the quality of the view because the changes would be in keeping with the existing visual landscape.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-41, existing views are dominated by roadway and sidewalk pavement, the existing rail line, streetlights, roadside landscaping, features associated with the rail safety crossing, and a commercial development in the distance. During operation, the concrete barrier and fencing and the OCS would slightly increase visual clutter by adding an additional feature into view, as depicted on Figure 3.16-42. However, the proposed OCS would not result in a notable change in the quality of views because of the existing number of visual intrusions associated with utilities already present in the view.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-43, the existing viaduct structure acts to mostly obscure views of the commercial development beyond, and views are dominated by the viaduct structure, associated fencing, and roadside landscaping. During operation, the proposed OCS would be visible but would not dominate views because they would be of a height that is similar to the adjacent streetlights, as depicted on Figure 3.16-44. The modified bridge deck and proposed fencing would be in keeping with existing views. The project would not greatly detract from the quality of views.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-45, roadway and sidewalk pavement, industrial buildings, billboards, a transmission corridor, streetlights, traffic lights, and features associated with the rail safety crossing dominate existing views. The view is visually cluttered. During operation, the proposed viaduct structure, OCS, and roadway underpass would become a focal point in the view, as depicted on Figure 3.16-46. The proposed viaduct structure would obscure views of the visually cluttered landscape beyond and would not substantially detract from the quality of views.

As depicted on Figure 3.16-47, the existing rail line is not very noticeable unless a train is traveling by on the tracks, because existing vegetation partially obscures views of the rail line. As a result, mature trees and the tall office building beyond the tracks dominate existing views. During operation, the proposed OCS would be visible but would not dominate views because it would be shorter than the adjacent trees, as depicted on Figure 3.16-48. The safety barrier and proposed fencing would be in keeping with existing views. The trees and the tall office building would remain the focal points of this view, and the project would not substantially detract from the quality of views.

Improvements related to the proposed TPSS and associated electrical interconnections bringing in power to the project site from utility providers would cause minimal change to the visual character of the project site. The proposed TPSS site, near the intersection of Lewis Street and Cerritos Avenue, is in an area composed of office complexes and mixed commercial/light manufacturing facilities. This area is surrounded by transmission towers with warehouses adjacent to the site. It is assumed that this substation would be the source of power for the TPSS approximately 0.2 mile northeast of the substation. Because the general area has underground power distribution, it is assumed that the two 115-kilovolt circuits would be routed to the TPSS site underground.

The changes in visual quality at the KVPs in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit are summarized in Table 3.16-11.

Table 3.16-11 Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit: Summary of Visual Effects

KVP	Visual Quality Rating: Existing	Visual Quality Rating: Proposed	Overall Visual Change	Viewer Sensitivity to Change	Effect on Visual Quality
15	Moderate-low	Low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Neutral
16	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate-low	Neutral
17	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate-low	Neutral
18	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Neutral
19	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Neutral
20	Moderate	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Neutral
21	Low	Low	Low	Moderate-low	Neutral
22	Moderate-low	Moderate-low	Low	Moderate-low	Neutral

KVP = key viewpoint

As presented in Table 3.16-11, the visual quality effects of the project at the KVPs in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit would be neutral because of the moderate to low visual quality change and the moderate-low viewer sensitivity to change. Similarly, it would not reduce visual quality at the KVPs selected for analysis, particularly because the project would be introduced into an existing rail corridor and would generally be compatible with the visual setting. The overall visual quality effect would be compatible and neutral in this landscape unit.

In addition, at the Hunt Foods and Industries Office and Library in Fullerton, trees and tree branches adjacent to but outside the historic property boundary near the railroad right-of-way would be removed and trimmed as part of project operations to ensure that foliage does not

encroach on OCS elements during operations. However, the setting beyond the property boundary is not a character-defining feature of the historic property. Because no trees or landscape elements that contribute to the historic property would be altered as part of the project, the removal or trimming of trees beyond it would not affect its setting or views to or from it.

Project operations in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit would substantially alter the existing visual environment for the life of the system. **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** would reduce anticipated visual quality impacts related to project operations. However, even with adherence to these measures, visual quality impacts on viewers and visual character would occur during operation of Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. With implementation of the following mitigation, views of passing trains and infrastructure will be minimized in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit, similar to that described for the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: **AVQ-MM#3** requires the contractor to work with the Authority and local jurisdictions to incorporate Authority-approved aesthetic preferences into final design and construction. **AVQ-MM#4** requires vegetation screening at grade and at elevated guideways adjacent to residential areas. These mitigation measures will reduce the effects of the main visual changes anticipated in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit (train movements, train lighting, activities at the LMF, security lighting, and signal lights) by blocking the changes from view and ensuring that the changes have been considered in the design criteria.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Impacts for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would be similar to those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, with the exception of the 15th Street LMF. The 15th Street LMF is proposed next to the existing Redondo Junction Roadhouse, on the west bank of the Los Angeles River, where the current maintenance already occurs. The 15th Street LMF would convert the existing industrial uses and big-box warehouses to the LMF but would be seen as a visual expansion of the existing rail facilities. Because it would be next to an existing rail yard in an area that is very industrialized, the scale and size of the proposed LMF would not substantially alter or degrade existing views.

The presence of the train cars would be limited in both frequency and duration. Train cars would be temporarily visible, but intervening industrial development would obstruct sightlines to the rail corridor. In addition, there is an established presence of other train cars on the existing railway. Therefore, train operations at the LMF are not expected to contribute to significant visual quality impacts.

Adherence to **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** will partially reduce impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality associated with operation of the project's LMF. The presence and operation of the train cars are not expected to contribute to significant visual quality impacts with implementation of **AVQ-MM#3** and **AVQ-MM#5** (described further in the Shared Passenger Track Alternative A analysis regarding the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit). **AVQ-MM#3** requires incorporation of design aesthetic preferences into final design and construction of nonstation structures. **AVQ-MM#5** requires replanting of unused portions of land acquired for the project.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With the inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be the same as those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. This HSR station option includes an elevated HSR platform alongside the modified Metrolink tracks. Other HSR facilities such as a larger station building and more parking areas would be included where the existing Metrolink station parking lot and adjacent warehouse facilities and shipping container storage yard are located. However, these additional HSR station elements would be in the same areas that would be modified under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. The change in views would be minimal. Primary viewer groups include nearby residents, employees and visitors to businesses, motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other travelers on local roadways. Generally, industrial and commercial workers have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and, therefore, lower sensitivity because the

nature of their work typically limits both the duration and importance of their views of the surrounding landscape. Travelers, given the nature of their activities, also have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and are also considered to have a lower sensitivity because they experience the environment only in passing and do not rely on sustained views. However, residents would have a higher awareness of visual changes in the environment and are also considered to have a higher sensitivity because their homes provide consistent, long-term exposure to the surrounding landscape, making changes in visual quality more noticeable and personally important. Exposure of most of these viewer groups is shorter in duration, except in residential areas where the duration is longer. Overall, given viewers' familiarity with the existing LOSSAN Corridor, viewer sensitivity throughout the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit would be predominantly low to moderate-low, except where recreational and residential viewers are present, and in that case, viewer sensitivity would be moderate to moderate-high. Viewers would see the new station and trains approaching and leaving the station.

Adherence to **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** will reduce impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality associated with operation of the project's facilities and activities. The presence and operation of HSR train cars within the station area in the Gateway Cities Landscape Unit are not expected to contribute to significant visual quality impacts with implementation of **AVQ--MM#4**, **AVQ-MM#5**, and **AVQ-MM#7** (described further in the Shared Passenger Track Alternative A analysis regarding the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit). **AVQ--MM#4** requires vegetation screening at grade and at elevated guideways adjacent to residential areas. **AVQ-MM#5** requires replanting of unused portions of land acquired for the project. **AVQ-MM#7** requires incorporation of design criteria for elevated guideways and station elements that can adapt to local context.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Operation of the Fullerton HSR Station Option would appear to be a visual expansion of the existing Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station. In addition to the modifications occurring under the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, several HSR station facilities and elements would be added. A HSR platform would be added west of the new Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak platform, which would be supported by new retaining walls on both sides of the HSR/Metrolink tracks to account for grade differences and would be connected via ramps and paths to the Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak platform. The proposed HSR parking would appear much like other parking facilities in the area, such as at Fullerton Community Center across from the station site. Existing conditions are depicted on Figure 3.16-49, Figure 3.16-51, Figure 3.16-53, and Figure 3.16-55. As depicted on Figure 3.16-50, Figure 3.16-52, and Figure 3.16-54, the changes would be very similar to those described for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives. However, the HSR platform would also be visible. Mature trees and shrubs line the rail corridor at the Highland Avenue undercrossing at Walnut Avenue and Amerige Park. During operation, the proposed station platforms, fencing, OCS, and realignment of Walnut Avenue would require that the vegetation at the Highland Avenue undercrossing at Walnut Avenue be removed to accommodate the retaining wall needed for the rail line and station platforms, as depicted on Figure 3.16-52, Figure 3.16-54, and Figure 3.16-56. In addition, several industrial buildings would need to be removed to accommodate the new HSR station facilities and parking structure. As depicted on Figure 3.16-52, the existing pedestrian bridge over the rail line connecting the Amtrak station to the Metrolink parking lot and the existing station platform with associated vegetation and shade structures would be removed. These changes would slightly increase the dominance of the rail line in the view, but would not substantially affect the quality of the view because the changes would be in keeping with the existing visual landscape.



Figure 3.16-49 Key Viewpoint 16: Existing View of Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station (from the Southwest Facing Northeast)



Figure 3.16-50 Key Viewpoint 16: Visual Simulation of Fullerton High-Speed Rail Station Option and Metrolink/Amtrak Station (from the Southwest Facing Northeast)




Figure 3.16-51 Key Viewpoint 17: Existing View of Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station (from the West Facing East)



Figure 3.16-52 Key Viewpoint 17: Visual Simulation of Fullerton High-Speed Rail Station Option and Metrolink/Amtrak Station (from the West Facing East)



Figure 3.16-53 Key Viewpoint 18: Existing View of Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station (from the East-Southeast Facing West-Northwest)



Figure 3.16-54 Key Viewpoint 18: Visual Simulation of Fullerton High-Speed Rail Station Option and Metrolink/Amtrak Station (from the East-Southeast Facing West-Northwest)



Figure 3.16-55 Key Viewpoint 19: Existing View of the Fullerton Metrolink/Amtrak Station from E Walnut Avenue (Facing East)



Figure 3.16-56 Key Viewpoint 19: Visual Simulation of the Fullerton High-Speed Rail Station Option from E Walnut Avenue (Facing East)

Primary viewer groups include nearby residents, employees and visitors to businesses, motorists, commuters, haulers, transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other travelers on local roadways. Generally, industrial and commercial workers have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and, therefore, lower sensitivity. Travelers, given the nature of their activities, also have a lower awareness of visual changes in the environment and are also considered to have a lower sensitivity. However, residents would have a higher awareness of visual changes in the environment and are also considered to have a higher sensitivity because their homes provide consistent, long-term exposure to the surrounding landscape, making changes in visual quality more noticeable and personally important. Exposure of most of these viewer groups is shorter in duration, except in residential areas where the duration is longer. Overall, given viewers' familiarity with the existing LOSSAN Corridor, viewer sensitivity throughout the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit would be predominantly moderate-low to moderate, except where residential viewers are present and, in that case, viewer sensitivity would be moderate-high. Viewers would see the new station and trains approaching and leaving the station.

Adherence to **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** will reduce impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality associated with construction of the HSR station option's facilities and activities. The presence and operation of the train cars within the station area in the Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit are not expected to contribute to significant visual quality impacts with implementation of **AVQ-MM#4**, **AVQ-MM#5**, and **AVQ-MM#7** (described further in the Shared Passenger Track Alternative A analysis regarding the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit). **AVQ-MM#4** requires vegetation screening at grade and at elevated guideways adjacent to residential areas. **AVQ-MM#5** requires replanting of unused portions of land acquired for the project. **AVQ-MM#7** requires incorporation of design criteria for elevated guideways and station elements that can adapt to local context.

CEQA Conclusion

The impact under CEQA from degradation of visual quality during project operation would be significant for the Downtown Los Angeles, Gateway Cities, and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units. Visual quality impacts affecting viewers and visual character would result from operational activities. The project section lies in an urbanized area, and the Authority has endeavored to design and build the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives consistent with land use and zoning regulations. Adherence to **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** will also lessen degradation of visual quality during operation, but residual impacts would occur. **CUL-MM#12** will reduce operational visual impacts by consulting with interested parties to achieve a barrier design that meets safety goals while introducing the minimum physical and visual impacts on historic bridges in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit. **AVQ-MM#4** will reduce operational visual impacts along the alignment, and **AVQ-MM#3** through **AVQ-MM#7** will reduce operational visual impacts on the historic bridges, but only partially. Accordingly, even with mitigation, operation of necessary security features on four historic bridges, including signal lighting, would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on the visual quality of the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit.

The impact under CEQA from degradation of visual quality during project operation would be less than significant with implementation of **AVQ-MM#3** through **AVQ-MM#7** for the Gateway Cities and Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Units.

As previously noted, there are no designated scenic vistas (including protected views) or scenic highways within the RSA or visible from the RSA, so operation would not affect a scenic vista or highway. Therefore, there would be no impact under CEQA on scenic vistas or scenic highways, including scenic resources in a state scenic highway.

Impact AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation

Shared Passenger Track Alternative A

Introduction of light and glare from security and signal lighting could affect the visual quality of the historic bridges and other operational activities and built features. During operation, signal lights would flash intermittently as trains proceed through the corridor, providing brief additional daytime and nighttime illumination. In addition, train lights would provide an additional transient source of illumination. The 26th Street LMF would require nighttime security lighting. It is anticipated that

maintenance facility lighting would be appropriately shielded to avoid light spilling onto adjacent land uses.

Nighttime lighting disturbances affecting viewers, visual character, and visual quality would result from signal and train lighting along the corridor in all landscape units from operational activities and built features, including at the historic bridges in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit. Effects of the project will be alleviated through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** to substantially avoid or alleviate impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality (described in Section 3.16.4.2, Impact Avoidance and Minimization Features). Security lighting would be designed to be nonintrusive, and signal lighting would occur intermittently as trains pass through the corridor. Train lighting would also be intermittent and of brief duration. Therefore, there would not be an effect on views or uses as a result of increased light and glare during operation.

Shared Passenger Track Alternative B

Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would result in light and glare from security and signal lighting that would affect all four historic bridges in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit. In addition, the 15th Street LMF would require nighttime security lighting, similar to the 26th Street LMF. As such, impacts for Shared Passenger Track Alternative B would be similar to those described for Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, because the 15th Street LMF would require similar nighttime security lighting as the 26th Street LMF under Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. It is anticipated that maintenance facility lighting would be appropriately shielded to avoid light spill onto adjacent land uses.

Effects of Shared Passenger Track Alternative B to viewers, visual character, and visual quality will be alleviated through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2**. Security lighting would be designed to be nonintrusive, and signal lighting would occur intermittently as trains pass in and out of the LMF. Train lighting would also be intermittent and of brief duration. Therefore, there would not be an effect on views or uses as a result of increased light and glare during operation.

High-Speed Rail Station Options

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs

With inclusion of the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Introduction of light and glare from security and signal lighting could affect the visual quality at the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option and areas surrounding the station. Existing security and signal lighting are present in the area because of operations of the existing Metrolink platform; however, the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would increase the frequency of light and glare from these sources. During operation, signal lights would flash intermittently as trains arrive and leave the station, providing brief additional daytime and nighttime illumination. Furthermore, train lights would provide an additional transient source of illumination. Although the existing Metrolink/Amtrak station includes nighttime security lighting at the station and parking areas, the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would require additional nighttime security lighting at its facilities. It is anticipated that station lighting would be appropriately shielded to avoid light spilling onto adjacent land uses. Effects of the station option on viewers, visual character, and visual quality will be alleviated through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2**). Security lighting would be designed to be nonintrusive, and signal lighting would occur intermittently as trains pass in and out of the station. Train lighting would also be intermittent and of brief duration. Therefore, there would not be an effect on views or uses as a result of increased light and glare during operation.

High-Speed Rail Station Option: Fullerton

With inclusion of the Fullerton HSR Station Option, impacts would be similar to those of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. Introduction of light and glare from security and signal lighting could affect the visual quality at Fullerton HSR Station Option and areas surrounding the station. Existing security and signal lighting are present in the area because of operations of the existing Metrolink platform; however, the Fullerton HSR Station

Option would increase the frequency of light and glare from these sources. During operation, signal lights would flash intermittently as trains arrive and leave the station, providing brief additional daytime and nighttime illumination. Furthermore, train lights would provide an additional transient source of illumination. Although the existing Metrolink/Amtrak station includes nighttime security lighting at the station and along roadways, the Fullerton HSR Station Option would require additional nighttime security lighting at its facilities. It is anticipated that station lighting would be appropriately shielded to avoid light spilling onto adjacent land uses. Effects of the station option on viewers, visual character, and visual quality will be alleviated through incorporation of **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2**. Security lighting would be designed to be nonintrusive, and signal lighting would occur intermittently as trains pass in and out of the station. Train lighting would also be intermittent and of brief duration. Therefore, there would not be an effect on views or uses as a result of increased light and glare during operation.

CEQA Conclusion

The impact under CEQA related to nighttime lighting during project operation would be less than significant. **AVQ-IAMF#1** and **AVQ-IAMF#2** are included as a part of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives during operation to effectively minimize nighttime lighting impacts. As noted above, light and glare during train operations would be intermittent and of brief duration. Security lighting on bridges and at maintenance facilities would be shielded to avoid light spilling onto adjacent land uses. Therefore, CEQA does not require mitigation.

3.16.7 Mitigation Measures

In addition to **CUL-MM#12**, described in Section 3.17, the Authority has identified the following aesthetics and visual quality mitigation measures for impacts under NEPA and significant impacts under CEQA that cannot be adequately avoided or minimized by IAMFs.

3.16.7.1 AVQ-MM#1: Minimize Visual Disruption from Construction Activities

Prior to construction (any ground-disturbing activity), the contractor shall prepare a technical memorandum identifying how the project will reduce construction-related visual/aesthetic disruption and will include the following activities:

- Minimize preconstruction clearing to that necessary for construction.
- Limit the removal of buildings to those that will conflict with project components.
- When possible, preserve existing vegetation, particularly vegetation along the edge of construction areas that may help screen views.
- After construction, regrade areas disturbed by construction, staging, and storage to original contours and revegetate with plant material similar in numbers and types to that which was removed, based on local jurisdictional requirements. If no local jurisdictional requirements exist, replace removed vegetation at a 1:1 replacement ratio for shrubs and small trees, and a 2:1 replacement ratio for mature trees. For example, if the contractor removes 10 mature trees in an area, replant 20 younger trees that within 5 to 15 years (depending on the growth rates of the trees) will be of a height and spread to provide visual screening similar to the visual screening provided by the trees that were removed for construction. Replaced shrubs shall be a minimum of 5 gallons and replaced trees shall be a minimum 24-inch box and minimum 8 feet in height.
- To the extent feasible, do not locate construction staging sites within the immediate foreground distance (0 to 500 feet) of existing residential neighborhoods, recreational areas, or other land uses that include high-sensitivity viewers. Where such siting is unavoidable, screen staging sites from viewers using appropriate solid screening materials such as temporary fencing and walls. Paint over or remove graffiti or visual defacement of temporary fencing and walls within 5 business days of it occurring.

The technical memorandum will be submitted to the Authority for review and approval.

3.16.7.2 AVQ-MM#2: Minimize Light Disturbance During Construction

Prior to construction (any ground-disturbing activity requiring nighttime construction), the contractor shall prepare a technical memorandum verifying how nighttime construction lighting will be shielded and directed downward to minimize the light that falls outside the construction site boundaries. The technical memorandum will be submitted to the Authority for review and approval.

3.16.7.3 AVQ-MM#3: Incorporate Design Aesthetic Preferences into Final Design and Construction of Nonstation Structures

Prior to construction (any ground-disturbing activity), the contractor shall work with the Authority and local jurisdictions to incorporate the Authority-approved aesthetic preferences for nonstation structures into final design and construction. Refer to *Aesthetic Options for Non-Station Structures* (Authority 2017b). A technical memorandum will be submitted to the Authority to document compliance.

3.16.7.4 AVQ-MM#4: Provide Vegetation Screening Along At-Grade and Elevated Guideways Adjacent to Residential Areas

Prior to operation and maintenance of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, the contractor will plant trees (minimum 24-inch box and 8 feet in height) along the edges of the HSR rights-of-way in locations adjacent to residential areas to visually screen the elevated guideway and the residential area. The species of trees to be installed will be selected based on their mature size and shape, growth rate, hardiness, and drought tolerance. No species on the Invasive Species Council of California's list will be planted. Upon maturity, the crowns of trees used would be tall enough to partially, or fully, screen views of the elevated guideway from adjacent at-grade areas. Upon maturity, trees would allow ground-level views under the crowns (with pruning if necessary) and would not interfere with the 15-foot clearance requirement for the guideway. The trees will be maintained. Irrigation systems will be installed in the tree planting areas.

The contractor shall prepare a technical memorandum within 90 days of completing a construction section or segment documenting the species of trees that were incorporated into the edges of the HSR right-of-way adjacent to residential uses. The technical memorandum will be submitted to the Authority to document compliance.

3.16.7.5 AVQ-MM#5: Replant Unused Portions of Land Acquired for the Los Angeles to Anaheim Project Section

Prior to operation and maintenance of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives, the contractor will plant vegetation in land acquired for the project (e.g., shifting roadways) that are not used for the HSR or related supporting infrastructure, or other higher or better use. Plantings will allow adequate space between the vegetation and the HSR alignment and catenary lines. Street trees and other visually important vegetation removed in these areas during construction will be replaced with similar vegetation that, on maturity, will be similar in size and character to the removed vegetation. Replaced shrubs shall be a minimum of 5 gallons, and trees shall be a minimum 24-inch box and 8 feet in height. The contractor will provide for continuous maintenance with appropriate irrigation systems. The contractor will install the irrigation system in the planting areas. No species listed on the Invasive Species Council of California's list of invasive species will be planted.

3.16.7.6 AVQ-MM#6: Screen Traction Power Distribution Stations and Radio Communication Towers

Within 90 days of completing TPSS or radio tower construction, the contractor will screen from public view the TPSS (at approximately 30-mile intervals along the HSR guideway), including radio towers where required, through the use of landscaping or solid walls/fences. This will consist of context-appropriate landscaping of a type and scale that does not draw attention to the station or feature. Plant species will be selected based on their mature size and shape, growth rate, hardiness, and drought tolerance. Planted shrubs shall be a minimum of 5 gallons and trees

shall be a minimum 24-inch box and 8 feet in height. No species on the Invasive Species Council of California's list will be planted. The landscaping will be continuously maintained and appropriate irrigation systems will be installed within the landscaped areas. Walls will be built of cinder-block, or similar material, and will be painted a neutral color to blend in with the surrounding context. If a chain-link or cyclone fence is used, it will include slats in the fencing.

Graffiti or visual defacement or damage of fencing and walls will be painted over or repaired within a reasonable period as agreed between the Authority and local jurisdiction. None of the mitigation measure options is expected to result in secondary effects. The mitigation measures are typical of visual treatments applied on linear transportation facilities; they have been defined to be specific in range and implementable according to context and designed in coordination with local jurisdictions.

The contractor shall prepare a technical memorandum documenting how the requirements in this measure were implemented. The technical memorandum will be submitted to the Authority to document compliance.

3.16.7.7 AVQ-MM#7: Incorporate Design Criteria for Elevated Guideways and Station Elements that Can Adapt to Local Context

Prior to construction (any ground-disturbing activity), the contractor will prepare a technical memorandum describing how the contractor partnering with the Authority coordinated with local jurisdictions during final design on the design of elevated guideways and stations so that they were designed appropriately to fit in with the visual context of the areas near them. This will include the following activities:

- **For stations:** During the station design process, establish or follow a consultation process with the local jurisdiction to identify and integrate local design features into the station design through a collaborative, context-sensitive approach. The process will include activities to solicit community input in their respective station areas. This effort will be coordinated with the station area planning process that will be undertaken by those cities under their station area planning grants.
- **For elevated guideways in cities or unincorporated communities:** During the elevated guideway design process, establish a process with the city or county with jurisdiction over the land along the elevated guideway to advance the final design through a collaborative, context-sensitive approach. Participants in the consultation process will meet on a regular basis to develop a consensus on the urban design elements that are to be incorporated into the final guideway designs. The process will include activities to solicit community input in the affected neighborhoods.

Actions taken to help achieve integration with the local design context during the context-sensitive process will include the following:

- Design HSR stations and associated structures such as elevators, escalators, and walkways to be attractive architectural elements or features that add visual interest to the streetscapes near them.
- Design HSR station parking structures and adjacent areas to integrate visually into the areas where they will be located. Where the city has adopted applicable downtown design guidelines, the parking structures and adjacent areas will be designed to be compatible with the policies and principles of those guidelines.
- For the elevated guideways and columns, incorporate architectural elements, such as graceful curved or tapered sculptural forms and decorative surfaces, to provide visual interest. Include decorative texture treatments on large-scale concrete surfaces such as parapets and other portions of elevated guideways. Include a variety of textures, shadow lines, and other surface articulation to add visual and thematic interest. Where the guideway is approaching a station, the design of guideway columns and parapets will be closely coordinated with station and platform architecture to promote unity and coherence.

- Consistent with the principles of crime prevention through environmental design, integrate trees and landscaping into the station streetscape and plaza plans where possible to soften and buffer the appearance of guideways, columns, and elevated stations.
- For the stations, structures, and related open spaces, incorporate design features that provide interest and reflect the local design context. These features could include landscaping, lighting, and public art.

The designs in cities and unincorporated communities will reflect the results of the context-sensitive design process. During the context-sensitive design process, the project's obligations and constraints related to planning, mitigation, engineering, performance, funding, and operational requirements will be taken into consideration.

The technical memorandum will be submitted to the Authority to document compliance.

3.16.7.8 Impact of Mitigation

There would be no secondary impacts from mitigation.

3.16.7.9 Early Action Projects

Table 3.16-12 lists the mitigation measures relevant to aesthetics required for the early action projects.

Table 3.16-12 Mitigation Measures Required for Early Action Projects

Early Action Project	Impacts	Mitigation Measures
Pioneer Boulevard Grade Separation	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impacts: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust and, potentially, nighttime construction lighting) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#4 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#6 AVQ-MM#7
Norwalk Boulevard and Los Nietos Road Grade Separation	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impact: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust and, potentially, nighttime construction lighting) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#6 AVQ-MM#7
Cerritos Avenue Grade Separation	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impact: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust and, potentially, nighttime construction lighting) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#6 AVQ-MM#7

Early Action Project	Impacts	Mitigation Measures
State College Boulevard Grade Separation	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impact: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust and, potentially, nighttime construction lighting) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#7
Commerce Yard Modifications (including the Commerce Flyover)	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impact: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#7
Commerce Metrolink Station Relocation	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impact: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust and, potentially, nighttime construction lighting) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#7
Buena Park Metrolink Station Relocation	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impact: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust and, potentially, nighttime construction lighting) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#4 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#7
Metrolink Fullerton Interlocker Project	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impact: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust and, potentially, nighttime construction lighting) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#4 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#7

Early Action Project	Impacts	Mitigation Measures
BNSF Railway Storage and Intermodal Facilities Modifications in Hobart Yard (Vernon and Commerce)	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impact: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust and, potentially, nighttime construction lighting) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#7
BNSF Railway Storage and Intermodal Facilities Modifications in Commerce Yard (Commerce and Bell)	AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation ▪ Significant Impact: impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality from construction activities (including the release of dust and, potentially, nighttime construction lighting) and built features, disruption from nighttime lighting	AVQ-MM#1 AVQ-MM#2 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#7

3.16.8 NEPA Impacts Summary

This section summarizes the impacts of the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives and compares them to the anticipated impacts of the No Project Alternative.

3.16.8.1 No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, recent development trends in the project section are anticipated to continue, leading to ongoing viewer, visual resources, and visual quality impacts. Planned residential, industrial, commercial, and transportation projects would build new developments in the RSA and result in associated direct and indirect impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality. These would also increase sources of evening light and glare, which could degrade nighttime views. In some locations, views toward open spaces, such as Rio Hondo, the San Gabriel and Santa Ana River Trails, and the San Gabriel Mountains, may be reduced or blocked by new structures. In addition to new greenfield development on undeveloped or agricultural lands, redevelopment activities may result in the alteration of historic structures that add visual interest and contribute a unique character to the urban fabric.

The affected jurisdictions in the region would evaluate the aesthetic impacts of planned developments in the course of environmental review and require that projects incorporate visual measures to mitigate impacts. Developmental change under the No Project Alternative could result in indirect impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality.

3.16.8.2 Shared Passenger Track Alternatives

- **Impact AVQ-1:** During project construction, visual effects from construction would occur in urban areas. Implementation of **AVQ-MM#1** will reduce visual quality impacts associated with construction.
- **Impact AVQ-2:** During project construction, intrusive nighttime lighting necessary for construction would occur resulting in effects. Implementation of **AVQ-MM#2** will reduce potentially invasive sources of light and glare associated with construction by requiring the contractor to prepare a technical memorandum verifying how nighttime construction lighting would be shielded and directed downward to minimize the light that falls outside the

construction site boundaries. The technical memorandum will be submitted to the Authority for review and approval, thereby ensuring that nighttime light and glare would be addressed.

- **Impact AVQ-3:** Through implementation of applicable mitigation measures, construction and operation of HSR infrastructure, including grade-separation features, would not degrade the overall visual quality for the life of the system (e.g., through the removal of scenic views or visual resources throughout the proposed alignment area[s]) within the RSA. Similarly, it would not reduce visual quality at the KVPs selected for analysis, particularly because the project would be introduced into an existing rail corridor and would generally be compatible with the visual setting. The project would include design standards to integrate structures in local communities and reduce the intrusiveness of large built elements. Other mitigation measures will reduce effects on viewers, visual character, and visual quality. **AVQ-MM#3** and **AVQ-MM#7** require the contractor to work with local jurisdictions to design structures that fit the local context.

  As part of **AVQ-MM#4**, the contractor, prior to the commencement of HSR operations, will provide landscape screening to obscure HSR infrastructure from viewers. The screening will reduce potential effects during operations for the life of the system. **AVQ-MM#5** and **AVQ-MM#6** would also be implemented to reduce visual effects. **CUL-MM#12** will reduce effects related to construction of security features on the historic bridges in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit. The effects would remain for the life of the historic bridges.

- **Impact AVQ-4:** Light and glare during train operations would be intermittent and of brief duration. Security lighting on bridges and at maintenance facilities would be shielded to avoid light spilling onto adjacent land uses. Effects of the project would also be addressed through project features that substantially avoid or alleviate impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality.

Table 3.16-13 presents a comparison of the potential impacts of the project alternatives, including pre- and post-mitigation conclusions for the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives and the two HSR station options.

Table 3.16-13 Comparison of Project Alternative Impacts on Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Impacts	Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option		NEPA Conclusion Before Mitigation	Mitigation	NEPA Conclusion Post Mitigation			
			Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton			Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option: Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option: Fullerton
Impact AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction	Even with incorporation of project features to minimize the visual effects of construction and implementation of mitigation established by this Draft EIR/EIS, construction would affect the visual character of the four historic bridges in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit and have substantial adverse effects on the scenic values of the bridges as important visual resources. Effects on the visual quality at locations in all of the landscape units, other than those in the immediate vicinities of the four historic bridges, would not be substantial.	Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. The alternative would not require removal of Federated Metals Corporation. However, there would still be a change to the visual landscape from construction of the 15th St LMF.	Same as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area.	Same as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area.	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit, Gateway Cities Landscape Unit, and Fullerton/ Anaheim Landscape Unit: Adverse effect	AVQ-MM#1	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: Adverse effect Gateway Cities Landscape Unit and Fullerton/ Anaheim Landscape Unit: No adverse effect	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: Adverse effect Gateway Cities Landscape Unit and Fullerton/ Anaheim Landscape Unit: No adverse effect	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: N/A Gateway Cities Landscape Unit: No adverse effect Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit: N/A	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: N/A Gateway Cities Landscape Unit: N/A Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit: No adverse effect
Impact AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction	Lighting for construction sites in the landscape units would create a new source of substantial light for up to 5 years, resulting in effects and reducing visual quality for the duration of construction. Effects of the project would be addressed through project features to minimize the visual effects of nighttime construction lighting and implementation of mitigation established by this Draft EIR/EIS.	Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. Adverse effects at the Olympic Boulevard Bridge would be slightly more intense than those associated with Shared Passenger Track Alternative A, because of the larger construction area associated with the 15th St LMF.	Same as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area.	Similar impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives in the station area. The Fullerton HSR Station Option is in closer proximity to cultural visual resources that have the potential to be affected by nighttime construction activities that would be slightly more intense with inclusion of the HSR station option. There are also residential land uses nearby.	Adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	AVQ-MM#2	No adverse effect	No adverse effect	No adverse effect	No adverse effect
Impact AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation	Visual quality effects include increased activity along the rail corridor, new and expanded stations with greater transit and commuter activity, and signal lights. Even with incorporation of project features to minimize operational visual effects and implementation of mitigation established by this Draft EIR/EIS, the project would result in substantial aesthetic degradation effects on four historic bridges in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit because of discordant operational view elements and moving security features, such as signal lights.	Similar to Shared Passenger Track Alternative A. The 15th St LMF is proposed next to the existing Redondo Junction Roadhouse, where current maintenance already occurs. The 15th St LMF would convert the existing industrial uses and big-box warehouses to the LMF, but would be seen as a visual expansion of the existing rail facilities.	Same as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area.	Similar impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Changes required as part of the HSR station option would slightly increase the visual dominance of the rail line, but would not greatly affect the quality of the view because the changes would be in keeping with the existing visual landscape.	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit, Gateway Cities Landscape Unit, and Fullerton/ Anaheim Landscape Unit: Adverse effect	AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#4 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#6 AVQ-MM#7 CUL-MM#12	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: Adverse effect Gateway Cities Landscape Unit and Fullerton/ Anaheim Landscape Unit: No adverse effect	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: Adverse effect Gateway Cities Landscape Unit and Fullerton/ Anaheim Landscape Unit: No adverse effect	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: N/A Gateway Cities Landscape Unit: No adverse effect Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit: N/A	Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit: N/A Gateway Cities Landscape Unit: N/A Fullerton/Anaheim Landscape Unit: No adverse effect

Impacts	Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option		NEPA Conclusion Before Mitigation	Mitigation	NEPA Conclusion Post Mitigation			
			Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton			Shared Passenger Track Alternative A	Shared Passenger Track Alternative B	With Inclusion of HSR Station Option	
									Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs	Fullerton
Impact AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation	Light and glare during train operations would be intermittent and of brief duration. Security lighting on bridges and at maintenance facilities would be shielded to avoid light spilling onto adjacent land uses. Effects of the project would also be addressed through project features that substantially avoid or alleviate impacts on viewers, visual character, and visual quality.	Same as Shared Passenger Track Alternative A.	Similar impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Existing security and signal lighting are present in the area because of operations of the existing Metrolink/Amtrak platform; however, the Norwalk/Santa Fe Springs HSR Station Option would increase the frequency of light and glare from these sources. The HSR station option would require additional nighttime security lighting at its facilities.	Similar impacts as the Shared Passenger Track Alternatives within the station area. Existing security and signal lighting are present in the area because of operations of the existing Metrolink platform; however, the Fullerton HSR Station Option would increase the frequency of light and glare from these sources. The Fullerton HSR Station Option would require additional nighttime security lighting at its facilities.	No adverse effect (all alternatives and HSR station options)	No mitigation needed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

EIR/EIS = environmental impact report/environmental impact statement; HSR = high-speed rail; LMF = light maintenance facility; N/A = not applicable; NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act

3.16.9 CEQA Significance Conclusions

As described in Section 3.16.4.5, Method for Determining Significance Under CEQA, the impacts of project actions under CEQA are evaluated against thresholds to determine whether a project action would result in no impact, a less-than-significant impact, or a significant impact. Table 3.16-14 contains a summary of the CEQA determination of significance for all construction and operational impacts for the project.

Table 3.16-14 CEQA Significance Conclusions for Aesthetics and Visual Quality

Impact	Impact Description and CEQA Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Source of Impact
Construction				
Impact AVQ-1: Visual Quality During Construction	Significant for all alternatives: Construction activities and equipment would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of multiple sites and their surroundings where there are highly sensitive viewers.	AVQ-MM#1	Significant and unavoidable for Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit Less than significant for Gateway Cities Landscape Unit and Fullerton/ Anaheim Landscape Unit	All alternatives and options
Impact AVQ-2: Nighttime Lighting During Construction	Significant for all alternatives: Lighting for construction would create a new source of substantial light that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area for the time period of construction, approximately 1 to 8 years.	AVQ-MM#2	Less than significant for all landscape units	All alternatives and options
Operation				
Impact AVQ-3: Visual Quality During Operation	Significant for all alternatives: Visual quality impacts affecting viewers and visual character would result from operational activities. Visual quality impacts include increased activity along the rail corridor, new and expanded stations with greater transit and commuter activity, and signal lights. In addition, operation of necessary security features on four historic bridges, including signal lighting, would result in impacts on visual quality in the Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit.	CUL-MM#12 AVQ-MM#3 AVQ-MM#4 AVQ-MM#5 AVQ-MM#6 AVQ-MM#7	Significant and unavoidable for Downtown Los Angeles Landscape Unit Less than significant for Gateway Cities Landscape Unit and Fullerton/ Anaheim Landscape Unit	All alternatives and options

Impact	Impact Description and CEQA Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Source of Impact
Impact AVQ-4: Nighttime Lighting During Operation	Less than significant for all alternatives: Light and glare during train operations would be intermittent and of brief duration. Security lighting on bridges and at maintenance facilities would be shielded to avoid light spilling onto adjacent land uses.	No mitigation measures are required	Not applicable	All alternatives and options

CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act