

## 4.10 VISUAL RESOURCES, LIGHT AND GLARE

---

Section 4.10 provides a detailed description of the existing visual resources of the Amorco Marine Oil Terminal (Amorco Terminal) Lease Consideration Project (Project) study area, regional visual character, views of the Project area from important vantage points, and the changes of these views that would occur with the continued use of the Amorco Terminal for an additional 30-year period. It also discusses impacts on visual resources from continued use of the Amorco Terminal, accidental spill releases, and identifies mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

### 4.10.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### 4.10.1.1 Regional Character of Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay

Carquinez Strait forms a visually distinct, yet relatively narrow channel that connects San Pablo Bay to Suisun Bay. The approximately 6-mile strait lies between two major bridges: the Carquinez Bridge, from Crockett to Vallejo; and the Benicia-Martinez Bridge, from Benicia to Martinez. Both bridges are visually distinct features in a landscape characterized by gently rolling terrain. To the east, Suisun Bay widens until it reaches the city of Pittsburg, where the shoreline narrows again before the waters enter from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. The landscape in the area is a combination of gently rolling hills and flat expanses of land. The Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay are characterized by a visual mix of industrial uses, small towns, and open areas of undeveloped land.

The 1,294-acre Carquinez Strait Regional Shoreline includes several parcels of land along the southern shoreline of the Strait. The area is characterized by coastal scrub and grasslands, bay laurels, and oak woodlands. The shoreline's bluffs rise approximately 750 feet to summits and ridges of the rolling terrain.

Characteristic views of the Strait and Suisun Bay show tugboats pushing barges, directing ships, or moving from job to job in the area. Oil tankers are a common site in the area, with four active terminals located between Crockett and Avon.

Regional, county, and city policies address aesthetic issues in the area. These policies include the general plans (GPs) of both Contra Costa and Solano counties, and of the cities of Martinez and Benicia. While there are no designated State Scenic Highways in the Project vicinity, the city of Benicia has identified Interstate 680 (I-680) north of the bridge as a scenic route.

The Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) *San Francisco Bay Plan* (amended 2006) contains policies on visual quality and visual access to the waterfront. The BCDC also provides design review of new projects that may affect the appearance of the San Francisco Bay.

1 **4.10.1.2 Visual Character of the Amorco Terminal and Adjacent Area**

2 The Amorco Terminal is located on the Carquinez Strait, approximately 0.25 mile west of  
3 the Benicia-Martinez Bridge. I-680 is east and northeast of the Project site. The area is  
4 characterized primarily by industry, as well as open space and marshland. Heading south  
5 on I-680, the Amorco Terminal is clearly visible from portions of the bridge; however, the  
6 adjacent Shell Refinery and marine terminal are also clearly visible. The Amorco  
7 Terminal, Tank Farm, and marshland are in motorists' foreground views while exiting the  
8 bridge in Martinez. Middleground views consist primarily of industrial uses, and gently  
9 rolling hills are in the background.

10 From the Amorco Terminal to either side between I-680 to the east and the Shell Martinez  
11 Marine Terminal to the west, the visual setting is characterized by views of the marsh and  
12 shoreline. The marshland includes wetland grasses and low-level shrubs, providing a  
13 visual "softscape." Focal points that can be defined as the predominant "hardscape"  
14 landscape features along the shoreline include the Benicia-Martinez Bridge, the Amorco  
15 Terminal, and the Shell Martinez Marine Terminal.

16 The Amorco Terminal is approximately 0.85 mile from Marina Vista Road, and is  
17 separated from the road by the associated Amorco Tank Farm and by railroad tracks  
18 adjacent to Marina Vista Road. A berm between the railroad tracks and the Amorco  
19 Terminal blocks views of the facility from Marina Vista Road in both directions. No  
20 residential receptors are located in the area within views of the Amorco Terminal. Only  
21 water users and travelers across the Benicia-Martinez Bridge have views of the Amorco  
22 Terminal.

23 The northern shore of the Carquinez Strait consists primarily of industrial uses, including  
24 the Valero Benicia Refinery; thus, public views from the north of the Amorco Terminal are  
25 also limited.

26 Other environmentally sensitive areas in the vicinity of the Amorco Terminal are identified  
27 in Section 4.2, Biological Resources, and Section 4.8, Land Use and Recreation.

28 Exterior lighting is provided along the approach trestle and at the wharf to allow for night  
29 operations and provide safety for employees.

30 **4.10.1.3 Visual Character of the San Francisco Bay Area**

31 The San Francisco and San Pablo Bays' shoreline contains a range of visual stimulation  
32 consisting mainly of urbanized and industrial areas, with occasional rural and open space  
33 areas, coastal wetlands, and salt evaporation ponds. The landform throughout most of  
34 the area is hilly terrain. Where there is no development, the open area is generally  
35 covered with low vegetation.

1 The greatest area of urbanization is within the central and south-central portions of San  
2 Francisco Bay. From San Francisco south to Palo Alto, urban development is prevalent  
3 on the western shoreline. On the eastern shoreline, urban development is continuous  
4 from San Leandro to Pinole Point, but from there eastward is fairly undeveloped.

5 San Francisco and San Pablo Bays contain about 90 percent of California's remaining  
6 coastal wetlands. Major preserves and shoreline parks include Suisun Bay Marsh, with  
7 numerous duck hunting preserves; San Pablo Bay National Wildlife Refuge off of Tubbs  
8 Island, which is accessible by boat; and Point Pinole Regional Shoreline. China Camp  
9 State Park, along the southwest shore of San Pablo Bay, preserves a historic Chinese  
10 shrimp fishing village. Coyote Hills Regional Park and San Francisco Bay National Wildlife  
11 Refuge protect important wetland acreage in the South Bay for wintering waterfowl. Many  
12 other small parks, piers, and recreational marinas also provide access to the shoreline.

13 The southern portion of the San Francisco Bay Area (Bay Area) contains several large  
14 areas of salt evaporation ponds. One is located north of the San Francisco Bay National  
15 Wildlife Refuge on the eastern shoreline, and another across the San Francisco Bay on  
16 the western shoreline. Several others are also along the far southern end.

17 Within the Bay Area, there are numerous ports, harbors, marine terminals, and naval  
18 terminals. A description of these facilities is presented in Section 2.0, Project Description.  
19 Marine vessel traffic is a common sight throughout the Bay Area.

#### 20 **4.10.1.4 Outer Coast**

21 Outside of the Golden Gate, one of the more pristine areas is the Farallon Islands, located  
22 27 nautical miles west of Point Bonita in Marin County. The islands rise from the edge of  
23 the continental shelf forming jagged, rocky outcroppings, and remain the most important  
24 seabird nesting site on the coast. The Gulf of Farallones and Monterey Bay are marine  
25 sanctuaries located off the coast and contain protected resources.

26 A large portion of the northern California coast remains representative of the shoreline of  
27 years past. Little development has occurred and areas along the northern California coast  
28 remain unspoiled. From the Golden Gate north, the shoreline consists of dramatic  
29 coastline features, including rolling hilly coastal landforms dropping to sandy beaches;  
30 jagged rock outcroppings forming hazards to marine vessels in the nearshore; cliffs that  
31 drop to the sea; and large, flat beach areas with dunes. Small shoreline communities and  
32 picturesque harbor areas also dot the shoreline in some areas. A large number of rivers  
33 and creeks cut the coastline, adding visual interest. Established preserve areas are also  
34 along the coastline. Vegetation is diverse, ranging from salt marsh vegetation to Douglas  
35 fir and redwood forests.

36 The southern California coastline from Santa Barbara south ranges from undeveloped  
37 stretches (southern Orange County/northern San Diego County) to intense development

1 (San Diego, Orange, and Los Angeles counties), to less intense development, but still  
2 much urbanization, toward Santa Barbara.

### 3 **4.10.2 REGULATORY SETTING**

4 Federal and State laws that may be relevant to the Project are identified in Table 4-1.  
5 Local laws, regulations, and policies are discussed below.

#### 6 **4.10.2.1 Regional Regulations**

7 The following San Francisco Bay Plan (amended 2006) Appearance, Design, and Scenic  
8 Views policy may be applicable to the Project.

9 Policy 4: Structures and facilities that do not take advantage-of or visually complement  
10 the Bay should be located and designed so as not to impact visually on the Bay and  
11 shoreline. In particular, parking areas should be located away from the shoreline.  
12 However, some small parking areas for fishing access and Bay viewing may be allowed  
13 in exposed locations.

#### 14 **4.10.2.2 Local Regulations**

##### 15 ***Contra Costa County***

16 The County of Contra Costa GP is a comprehensive, long-range planning document  
17 stating the County's development and preservation goals and policies. Based on  
18 consultation with the County, the Contra Costa County GP would not be applicable to the  
19 Proposed Project (extension of the existing lease agreement) because it is in an  
20 incorporated area of the city of Martinez and the County does not have policies or  
21 regulations directly applicable to marine terminals or oil spills (Contra Costa County  
22 2002).

##### 23 ***City of Martinez***

24 The following city of Martinez GP (1973) policies may be applicable to the Project.

##### 25 Land Use Element

26 Policy 21.51: Expansion of the petroleum refining and related industries must proceed in  
27 an orderly fashion and be consistent with protection of the community's air, water, scenic  
28 and fiscal resources.

1 Open Space Element

2 Policy 22.50: All other waterways and their banks should be protected from encroachment  
3 and degradation and restored or enhanced visually through appropriate landscaping  
4 where deemed necessary. Integration of these into park or trail systems and other  
5 common open spaces should be required as a condition for development of adjoining  
6 lands.

7 Central Martinez Specific Area Plan

8 Policy 30.722: The highest priority should be assigned to conservation, park and  
9 recreational uses at the waterfront. Contemplated uses should include: an expanded and  
10 improved boat marina, fishing pier(s), water-oriented commercial/recreational  
11 establishments, scenic routes, hiking and bicycling pathways, and areas for both active  
12 and passive recreational pursuits.

13 Policy 30.724: Existing industrial and non-water-related commercial activities should be  
14 concentrated, attractively maintained and screened from view. Ultimately, incompatible  
15 waterfront uses should be relocated to other suitable locations.

16 **4.10.3 IMPACT ANALYSIS**

17 **4.10.3.1 Significance Criteria**

18 Visual impacts are considered adverse and significant if one or a combination of the  
19 following apply:

- 20
- Cause adverse impacts on a scenic vista or scenic highway
  - Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day  
21 or nighttime views in the area (including views from land and water)
  - Routine operations and maintenance visually contrast with or degrade the  
22 character of the viewshed (from adjacent roadways, waterways, or other public or  
23 private spaces), or otherwise change the expectations of viewers, resulting in a  
24 negative impression of the viewshed
- 25  
26

27 **4.10.3.2 Assessment Methodology**

28 Because of the time factor involved in oil dispersion, visual impacts from spills are  
29 considered to be significant and unavoidable impacts if first-response efforts would not  
30 contain or cleanup the spill, resulting in residual impacts that would be visible to the  
31 general public on shoreline or water areas. If a spill occurs that would be contained and  
32 cleaned up during the first response, that impact to visual resources would be considered  
33 less than significant with mitigation.

1 **4.10.3.3 Impacts Analysis and Mitigation Measures**

2 The following subsections describe the Project's potential impacts on aesthetic and visual  
3 resources; where impacts are determined to be significant, feasible mitigation measures  
4 (MMs) are described that would reduce or avoid the impact.

5 **Proposed Project**

6 **Impact Visual Resources (VR)-1: Cause adverse impacts on a scenic vista or scenic**  
7 **highway. (Less than significant.)**

8 A scenic vista is generally considered a view of an area that has remarkable scenery or  
9 a resource that is indigenous to the area. A scenic resource may also represent a  
10 landmark or area that has been noted for its outstanding scenic qualities and is thereby  
11 protected by State or local plans because of those qualities. As described in Section  
12 3.1.3.1, the Project area is urban in nature and lacks any outstanding scenic qualities.

13 While there are no designated State Scenic Highways in the Project vicinity, the City of  
14 Benicia has identified I-680 north of the Benicia-Martinez Bridge as a scenic route, and  
15 the BCDC *San Francisco Bay Plan* (amended 2006) designates the bridge itself as a  
16 scenic drive. The Amorco Terminal can be seen clearly from the bridge, particularly when  
17 driving southbound and approaching the southern end of the bridge. However, the  
18 Amorco Terminal is an existing facility on land zoned Heavy Industrial, and no visual  
19 changes to the Project area are planned as a result of the new 30-year lease. Therefore,  
20 the proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts on a scenic vista or  
21 scenic highway.

22 **Mitigation Measure:** No mitigation required.

23 **Impact VR-2: Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would**  
24 **adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area (including views from land or**  
25 **water). (Less than significant.)**

26 Exterior lighting is provided along the approach trestle and at the wharf to allow for night  
27 operations and provide safety for employees. These lights point toward the  
28 loading/unloading activity. During operation of the Amorco Terminal, existing lighting  
29 would continue to be used at existing locations and levels, and no new lighting would be  
30 installed. As there are no sensitive receptors in the area, there would be no impacts  
31 caused by lighting or glare from the Terminal.

32 Tanker movements throughout the Carquinez Strait are part of an established pattern of  
33 activity in the area. These vessel movements are an acceptable visual action. The docked  
34 ships would generate light while at the dock from unloading operations, which would be  
35 at any time of day or night. The low-level lighting from ships is typically distant from

1 receptors and does not result in light and glare impacts to nearby land uses; therefore,  
2 light and glare impacts from ships would be less than significant.

3 **Mitigation Measure:** No mitigation required.

4 **Impact VR-3: Create visual effects from routine operations over the 30-year lease**  
5 **period. (Less than significant.)**

6 Project operations involve tanker activity at the existing Amorco Terminal and vessel  
7 transit through established shipping lanes in Carquinez Strait, and San Pablo and San  
8 Francisco Bays. The Amorco Terminal has been in place since 1923, and the Project site  
9 is industrial in character. No visual changes from existing operations would occur over  
10 the lease period. The berthing of ships at the wharf can be seen from I-680, consistent  
11 with existing conditions; however, ship berthing cannot be seen from Marina Vista Road,  
12 as views are obstructed by the railroad berm and Tank Farm, and the wharf is distant.  
13 Viewers from boats have more direct views of the vessels. The level of shipment activity  
14 and throughput is not expected to change substantially during the proposed 30-year lease  
15 agreement period. The annual ship and barge traffic is approximately 60 to 90 vessels  
16 (anticipated maximum). Due to the Amorco Terminal capacity, only one vessel at a time  
17 would continue to be berthed at the wharf. From the water, ships berthed at the Amorco  
18 Terminal would appear as a use consistent with the existing operations. Therefore,  
19 Project operations would not significantly change the visual character of the area, and  
20 impacts are considered adverse, but less than significant.

21 Vessels currently transit near the Amorco Terminal in the shipping lane. Therefore,  
22 continued transit operations would result in adverse, but less-than-significant impacts to  
23 the visual environment.

24 Vessels transiting to the Amorco Terminal in the San Francisco Bay transit lanes and  
25 along the outer coast would continue to blend in with other accepted tankering operations.  
26 No new visual elements would be added and public sensitivity toward views would not  
27 change. Impacts are adverse, but less than significant.

28 **Mitigation Measure:** No mitigation required.

29 **Impact VR-4: Create visual effects from accidental releases of oil at or near the**  
30 **Amorco Terminal. (Significant and unavoidable.)**

31 This analysis considers the occurrence of accidental spills separate from routine  
32 operations. In general, the potential impacts resulting from such an occurrence would  
33 tend to degrade the visual quality of the water and shoreline. The degree of impact is  
34 influenced by factors not limited to location, spill size, type of material spilled, prevailing  
35 wind and current conditions, the vulnerability and sensitivity of the shoreline, and  
36 effectiveness of early containment and cleanup efforts.

1 The greatest risk of a spill is from small accidents at the Amorco Terminal during normal  
2 operations. While there is less risk of spill during tankering, the size of a spill that could  
3 result is much greater, as discussed in Section 4.1, Operational Safety/Risk of Accidents.  
4 The following discusses the visual impacts expected to occur in the event of a spill.

5 Generally, small leaks and spills (50 to 100 barrels) would be easily contained with  
6 contingency measures employed at the Amorco Terminal. However, the Amorco Terminal  
7 is located in an area of rapidly moving current. Thus, if a spill is not detected immediately,  
8 or if a moderate- or large-sized spill at or near the Amorco Terminal occurred at a rate  
9 unable to be quickly contained due to the rapid current, then the spill could spread over  
10 a large area. Oil spill modeling results indicate that probabilities of exceeding the levels  
11 of concern range from 75 to 100 percent along the shoreline east and west of the  
12 Carquinez Bridge in both summer and winter, with higher probabilities of exceedance  
13 extending into San Pablo Bay and Suisun Bay for the winter scenario. See Appendix C  
14 for the oil spill modeling results and Section 4.1, Operational Safety/Risk of Accidents, for  
15 a detailed discussion of the results.

16 Visually, oiling conditions could range from light oiling, which appears as a surface sheen,  
17 to heavy oiling, including floating lumps of tar. Light product spills generally volatilize  
18 relatively rapidly, and little remains within 24 to 48 hours after a spill. Heavy crude oil may  
19 disappear over a period of several days, with remaining heavy fractions lasting from  
20 several weeks to several months floating at or near the surface in the form of mousse,  
21 tarballs, or mats. Therefore, the presence of oil on the water would change the color and,  
22 in heavier oiling, textural appearance of the water surface. Oil on shoreline surfaces or  
23 nearshore marsh areas would cover these surfaces with a brownish-blackish, goeoy  
24 substance.

25 Such oiling would result in a negative impression of the viewshed. The public, becoming  
26 aware of a spill, may react negatively to its visual effects. Sensitivity heightens and  
27 awareness of the negative change in the environment increases. Without rapid  
28 containment by immediate booming and cleanup, the visual effects of even a small spill  
29 of 50 barrels can leave residual impacts, and they can be significant.

30 Tesoro Refining and Marketing Company, LLC (Tesoro) has contracted with Bay Area  
31 Ship Services to assist with initial oil spill response services, including the immediate  
32 execution of approximately 600 feet of harbor boom in approximately 30 minutes. In  
33 addition, Tesoro contracts with Marine Spill Response Corporation to serve as the primary  
34 Oil Spill Response Organization contractor in its Oil Spill Response Plan for offshore,  
35 onshore, and shallow-water response services. Refer to Section 2.6.4 for a more detailed  
36 description of the Amorco Terminal oil spill response capabilities and equipment.

37 The impact of a spill on a sensitive area could last for a long period of time, depending on  
38 the level of physical impact and cleanup ability. In events where light oiling would disperse

1 rapidly, significant adverse impacts are expected. In events where medium to heavy oiling  
2 occurs over a widespread area, and where first-response containment and cleanup efforts  
3 are not effective, leaving residual effects of oiling, significant adverse impacts would be  
4 expected. The physical effort involved in cleanup itself, including the equipment used,  
5 would contribute to a negative impression of the environment and the visual impact. It is  
6 impossible to predict with any certainty the potential consequences of spills; therefore,  
7 visual impacts can be considered to be adverse and significant, depending on the  
8 effectiveness of first-response containment and cleanup.

9 Mitigation measures OS-1a, OS-1b, OS-1c, OS-4a, and OS-4b, presented in Section 4.1,  
10 Operational Safety/Risk of Accidents, provide improved oil spill containment measures.  
11 With implementation of these measures, the risk to shoreline and recreational resources  
12 can be reduced to less than significant for small spills; however, impacts would remain  
13 significant for large spills.

14 **Mitigation Measure:** No additional mitigation measures available.

15 **Impact VR-5: Create visual effects from oil spills from vessels in transit. (Significant**  
16 **and unavoidable.)**

17 Vessels transiting the shipping lanes also pose a risk of spills from accidents. A moderate  
18 to large spill has the potential to spread within a large area, with floating oil and oil  
19 contacting sensitive shoreline resources given the right wind and current conditions, and  
20 the size and origin of the spill. While spills would be significant, spills from vessels enroute  
21 to the Amorco Terminal would be the responsibility of the ship's operators/owners and  
22 not Tesoro, as Tesoro does not own any vessels. Response capability is analyzed in  
23 Section 4.1, Operational Safety/Risk of Accidents.

24 Spills along the outer coast could result in significant adverse impacts, where spills would  
25 be visible in the nearshore zone or at the shoreline. Spills would change the color and  
26 texture of water and shoreline conditions. The level of public sensitivity and expectations  
27 of views along the outer coast are more varied than within San Francisco Bay. Along  
28 many portions of the outer coast, public usage is low. In such areas, the public perception  
29 and expectations of viewers would not change as much as in areas the public frequents.  
30 In high-use areas such as coastal park and beach areas, ecological preserve areas,  
31 communities and harbors, and other areas where a higher number of viewers would be  
32 present, visual sensitivity would be high where cleanup efforts and residual effects were  
33 occurring.

34 It is impossible to predict with any certainty the potential consequences of spills; therefore,  
35 visual impacts can be considered to be adverse and significant, depending on the  
36 effectiveness of first-response containment and cleanup. Response capability for spills  
37 from any ships in transit would defer to the Marine Spill Response Corporation, as

1 described in Sections 2.0, Project Description, and 4.1, Operational Safety/Risk of  
2 Accidents.

3 Mitigation measures OS-1a, OS-1b, OS-1c, OS-4a, and OS-4b, presented in Section 4.1,  
4 Operational Safety/Risk of Accidents, provide improved oil spill containment measures.  
5 With implementation of these measures, the risk to shoreline and recreational resources  
6 can be reduced to less than significant for small spills; however, impacts would remain  
7 significant for large spills.

8 **Mitigation Measure:** No additional mitigation measures available.

9 **Alternative 1: No Project**

10 **Impact VR-6: Effects on visual resources with no new Amorco Terminal lease.**  
11 **(Beneficial.)**

12 The No Project Alternative involves lease denial and cessation of Amorco Terminal  
13 operations. The Amorco Terminal would eventually be decommissioned or converted to  
14 another use, which would be subject to separate California Environmental Quality Act  
15 (CEQA) review. If the Project were to be dismantled, it is likely that heavy equipment,  
16 including a barge or crane, would be used temporarily. While the removal effort would  
17 cause adverse effects due to the heavy equipment, impacts would be short-term and less  
18 than significant. With the removal of the Amorco Terminal from the shoreline, a slight  
19 long-term beneficial change in visual conditions in the immediate area may occur.

20 After decommissioning, the No Project Alternative assumes the number of tankers  
21 servicing the area would remain essentially the same due to regional demands, and that  
22 without the Amorco Terminal, incoming tankers would instead go to the Avon Terminal.  
23 Therefore, the risks associated with the transport of oil would not be removed from the  
24 region, but simply shifted to a nearby facility, approximately 2.5 miles away. The localized  
25 risk of a spill (i.e., risks associated with the specific location and access route to the  
26 Amorco Terminal) impacting visual resources would shift. Impacts at the Amorco Terminal  
27 would not occur, as the Amorco Terminal would not be in use. With no potential for spills  
28 in the immediate area, a slight beneficial impact may occur. However, an incremental  
29 increase in risk associated with increases in vessel activity at the Avon Terminal would  
30 result. At the Avon facility, there would be the potential for oil spill impacts similar to the  
31 proposed Project.

1 The No Project Alternative assumes that other facilities in the area, such as the Avon  
2 Terminal, would have the capability to make up for the loss of the Amorco Terminal.  
3 However, if other facilities do not have this capability, they may be required to expand.  
4 While this document does not examine the potential impacts of a facility expansion  
5 because the possibility of such an action is too speculative at this time, expansion of  
6 existing facilities would not likely result in significant adverse visual impacts. Any such  
7 expansion activities likely would trigger environmental review at the time of a proposal to  
8 expand any of the facilities in the area.

9 **Mitigation Measure:** No mitigation required.

#### 10 **Alternative 2: Restricted Lease Taking Amorco Out of Service for Oil Transport**

11 **Impact VR-7: Effects on visual resources by taking Amorco Terminal out of service**  
12 **for oil transport. (Less than significant.)**

13 The Amorco Terminal is an existing facility on land zoned Heavy Industrial, and no visual  
14 changes to the Project area are anticipated as a result of a restricted lease. Should this  
15 alternative be selected, mitigation measures would be determined during a separate  
16 environmental review under CEQA.

17 **Mitigation Measure:** No mitigation required.

#### 18 **Cumulative Impact Analysis**

19 Oil spills from multiple sources that would overlap in time (either the spill occurrence or  
20 the cleanup operation) are unlikely; however, such incidents would result in significant,  
21 adverse visual impacts. A spill can begin as a localized incident, but can have the potential  
22 to spread over a very large area. If more than one spill were to occur within a short  
23 timeframe within the Carquinez Strait, Suisun Bay, San Pablo Bay, or along the outer  
24 coast and first-response cleanup efforts were unsuccessful, impacts to visual resources  
25 would be significant and unavoidable.

#### 26 **4.10.4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

27 Table 4.10-1 includes a summary of anticipated impacts to visual resources and  
28 associated mitigation measures.

1 **Table 4.10-1: Summary of Visual Resources Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)
<b><i>Proposed Project</i></b>	
VR-1: Cause adverse impacts on a scenic vista or scenic highway	No mitigation required.
VR-2: Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area (including views from land or water)	No mitigation required.
VR-3: Create visual effects from routine operations over the 30-year lease period	No mitigation required.
VR-4: Create visual effects from accidental releases of oil at or near the Amorco Terminal	No additional mitigation measures available. (Refer to MMs OS-1a, OS-1b, OS-1c, OS-4a, and OS-4b.)
VR-5: Create visual effects from oil spills from vessels in transit	No additional mitigation measures available. (Refer to MMs OS-1a, OS-1b, OS-1c, OS-4a, and OS-4b.)
<b><i>Alternative 1: No Project</i></b>	
VR-6: Effects on visual resources with no new Amorco Terminal lease	No mitigation required.
<b><i>Alternative 2: Restricted Lease Taking Amorco Out of Service for Oil Transport</i></b>	
VR-7: Effects on visual resources by taking Amorco Terminal out of service for oil transport	No mitigation required.