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1. Introduction

Pursuant to California Public Resources Code §21082.1, the City of San Clemente (City) has independently reviewed and analyzed information contained in this Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) prior to its distribution. Conclusions and discussions contained herein reflect the independent judgment of the City as to those issues known at the time of publication.

1.1 Purpose of the SEIR

This EIR has been prepared as a Supplemental EIR (SEIR) on behalf of the City to evaluate the environmental consequences, the mitigation measures, and the project alternatives associated with the proposed Outlets at San Clemente Sign Program Amendment (Project) which was previously analyzed in the Marblehead Coastal EIR (SCH No. 95091037) and subsequent addenda. The proposed Project requires the following discretionary actions:

- Certification of the Supplemental EIR
- Approval of Amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 05-176 for a Master Sign Program for freeway-oriented signs
- Approval of Sign Exception Permit 15-428

It is intended that this SEIR be considered in the decision-making process for this Project, along with other information presented at public proceedings on the Project. Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15200, this SEIR will serve the following purposes of review:

1. Sharing expertise
2. Disclosing agency analyses
3. Checking for accuracy
4. Detecting omissions
5. Discovering public concerns
6. Soliciting counter proposals

1.2 Statutory Authority

This SEIR has been prepared in accordance with the CEQA statutes, as amended (Public Resources Code §21000, et seq.). As noted, a sign program for the Outlets at San Clemente project was analyzed in the Marblehead Coastal EIR (SCH No. 95091037) and subsequent addenda. However, changes to a proposed project or its surrounding circumstances subsequent to the certification of an initial EIR necessitate the preparation of a supplement to an EIR, commonly known as a Supplemental EIR (SEIR) (California Public Resources Code.
§21166; CEQA Guidelines §15162, §15163). This allows agencies to prepare an SEIR to modify projects in response to changed circumstances and new information without requiring that the environmental review process begin anew.

CEQA Guidelines §15162 requires preparation of a subsequent EIR if:

- Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR . . .
- Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR . . .
- New information of substantial importance has occurred which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the EIR was certified . . .

As noted in CEQA Guidelines §15163, a supplement to an EIR may be prepared rather than a subsequent EIR if:

1) Any of the conditions described in Section 15162 would require the preparation of a subsequent EIR, and
2) Only minor additions or changes would be necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation.

Because none of the §15162 conditions have occurred requiring preparation of a Subsequent EIR, the City has determined that a Supplemental EIR should be prepared to augment the previously certified EIR. Further, per §15163, the supplement to the EIR need contain only the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised, and may be recirculated without recirculating the previous draft or final EIR.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15146, the degree of specificity required in an EIR must correspond to the actions sought to be covered by the EIR. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15050, the City is the Lead Agency for this SEIR.

The SEIR identifies and discusses every significant impact, mitigation measure, and project alternative with relationship to this project, using best efforts to forecast, while incorporating requests by the public and responsible agencies for consideration of specific mitigation measures and/or alternatives.

The mitigation measures included in this SEIR are designed to avoid or reduce the environmental impacts described herein. Mitigation measures are structured in accordance with §15370 of the CEQA Guidelines. This section refers to effects on the physical environment, as opposed to other types of effects (e.g., economic and social effects) that may arise as a result of this Project or that may be of interest to the public and decision makers generally. Accordingly, the mitigation measures have been structured to meet the following criteria:

- Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action
- Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation
- Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment
• Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action
• Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments

1.3 CEQA Process

CEQA requires agencies to prepare EIRs and other environmental documentation “as early as feasible in the planning process to enable environmental considerations to influence project program and design and yet late enough to provide meaningful information for environmental assessment” (CEQA Guidelines §15004(b)). The first step in the CEQA process is the preparation of an Initial Study (IS). However, if the lead agency can determine that an EIR will clearly be required for the project, an initial study is not required (CEQA Guidelines §15063(a)).

The City has prepared this Supplemental EIR to address the issue of environmental analysis of the sign program as required by the 2008 Court decision. Approval of the SEIR is intended to allow the City to process a Sign Exemption Permit for the sign program as proposed since certification of the original Marblehead EIR.

An Initial Study Checklist was prepared specifically for the purpose of identifying which environmental topics would be analyzed in the SEIR. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS) were prepared and distributed for review on March 28, 2017 and are provided as Appendix A herein. Time limits mandated by state law required a 30-day review period; therefore, the review period ended on April 26, 2017. The purpose of the NOP was to provide public information and to elicit responses on matters to be studied in the SEIR. The NOP was filed with the Orange County Clerk-Recorder, posted on the City’s website, and sent via U.S. mail to approximately 12 public agencies and interested parties.

A Public Scoping Meeting was held on April 13, 2017 in the City of San Clemente to allow local residents and interested persons an opportunity to review the proposed Project and provide input on issues to be addressed in the SEIR. At that meeting, the process for commenting on the SEIR was described and attendees were notified that a public meeting would be held by the City to consider the SEIR. The Scoping Meeting was attended by approximately 50 individuals. Comments were solicited from the meeting attendees. A summary of the main comments provided during the Public Scoping Meeting is included in Table 1-1, along with a notation of where the issue is addressed in the DEIR.
Table 1-1  Scoping Meeting Comment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Where Comment is Addressed in DEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need daytime and nighttime project simulations including Icon Tower.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern related to hours of sign illumination.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern related to sign colors and lighting.</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide lighting plan.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding the type of lighting technique that will be used.</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern related to hotel signs lighting remaining on 24-hours.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to include scaled signs showing the maximum size that will be</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permitted by the City.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled elevations need to be provided.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans need to show an accurate picture.</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic currently backs up northbound on Pico. Will the project add</td>
<td>Section 5 – Transportation and Traffic, Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more traffic and cause more accidents?</td>
<td>Section 5 – Transportation and Traffic, Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic impacts on drivers trying to read 36 signs while driving on</td>
<td>Section 5 – Transportation and Traffic, Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the freeway.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Transportation and Traffic, Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project will create a situation where it is dangerous for cars</td>
<td>Section 5 – Transportation and Traffic, Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trying to exit the freeway.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Transportation and Traffic, Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval and sizes of temporary signs.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Land Use and Planning, Section 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative including a northbound and southbound tower with no</td>
<td>Section 6 – Project Alternatives, Section 6.3 (or 6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building signs.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction quality and compatibility with ambiance.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The signs will be a new source of light pollution.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents do not want a Citadel by the sea.</td>
<td>Not a CEQA issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The signs need to be of good quality to attract the right people.</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices should be sent out to all Home Owners Association in the</td>
<td>Section 1 – CEQA Process, Section 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area.</td>
<td>Section 1 – CEQA Process, Section 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noticing should be provided to all area residents.</td>
<td>Section 1 – CEQA Process, Section 1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City received 75 comment letters, including Caltrans, Native American Heritage Commission, California Office of Planning and Research, South Coast Air Quality Management District, and 71 individuals during the NOP 30-day review period. A summary of the main comments is included in Table 1-2, along with a notation of where the issue is addressed in the DEIR. A copy of each letter is provided as Appendix B.
### Table 1-2 NOP Review Period Comment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Where Comment is Addressed in DEIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting impact on wildlife.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Biological Resources, Section 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting impact on night sky.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern regarding signs operation beyond outlet hours.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 10 – Inventory of Unavoidable Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver distractions caused by signs.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Transportation and Traffic, Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential negative impacts on property value.</td>
<td>Not an environmental issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner views will be impacted by the project.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project infringes on property owner’s rights.</td>
<td>Not an environmental issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes sign pollution.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Land Use, Section 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project aesthetically conflicts with the Spanish Village by the Sea</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological and physiological impacts of signs.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in home value.</td>
<td>Not an environmental issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tower signs are not compatible with the community.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that neon signs will replace temporary signs.</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for signage to draw business.</td>
<td>Not an environmental issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for one sign at the exit.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Transportation and Traffic, Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs will cheapen the aesthetic area.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting will be intrusive to residents.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlet plans showed thick landscape but never delivered.</td>
<td>The analysis in this EIR focuses on project impacts based on existing on-site conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement for the outlet is unnecessary.</td>
<td>Not an environmental issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The additional allowable colors are not appropriate.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 6 – Alternatives, Section 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 10 – Inventory of Unavoidable Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The signs would diminish the style of the town.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize to a few signs to alert motorists.</td>
<td>Section 6 – Alternatives, Section 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include story poles for the hotel.</td>
<td>The hotel was previously analyzed and approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include RSCCA in noticing.</td>
<td>Section 1 – CEQA Process, Section 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include Broadmoor in noticing.</td>
<td>Section 1 – CEQA Process, Section 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include all area HOAs in noticing.</td>
<td>Section 1 – CEQA Process, Section 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for accurate renditions of signs.</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide lighting levels.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix C – Operational Photometric Assessment – Plaza San Clemente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix D – Operational Photometric Assessment – Plaza San Clemente Hotel Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide noise comparison with other outlets.</td>
<td>As discussed in the initial study, noise impacts from a fully functional regional commercial center were analyzed in the Marblehead EIR (1998 and 2004 Addendum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Where Comment is Addressed in DEIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about increase in traffic congestion.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Transportation and Traffic, Section 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighted signs will taint the night sky and stars.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 45-foot sign does not keep in character with the city.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest that the City consider signage that is of uniform font and</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>color without the use of logos.</td>
<td>Section 6 – Alternatives, Section 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 10 – Inventory of Unavoidable Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much lighting already there.</td>
<td>The analysis in this EIR focuses on project impacts based on existing on-site conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lights from signs will shine directly into homes.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs will increase commercialism.</td>
<td>Not an environmental issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of City’s role in the CEQA process.</td>
<td>Section 1 – CEQA Process, Section 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project not compatible with historic culture and architecture.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage was not included as a part of the original plans.</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway-oriented signs, including temporary banners, are not permitted by the City Code.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Land Use and Planning, Section 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The signs conflict with the City’s policy to reduce and eliminate</td>
<td>Section 5 – Land Use and Planning, Section 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freeway-oriented signs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs are not compatible with project architecture.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The signs conflict with current City regulations and codes.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Land Use and Planning, Section 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed signs are advertisement.</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage colors limited to bronze.</td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painted on temporary signs are not banners.</td>
<td>Section 6 – Alternatives, Section 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 10 – Inventory of Unavoidable Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project is not comparable to the outlets at Carlsbad,</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camarillo, or the desert.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that San Clemente will become the “Spanish Vegas by the Sea.”</td>
<td>Section 4 – Project Description, Section 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 5 – Aesthetics, Section 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The addition of signs will not increase profit.</td>
<td>Not an environmental issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlets are outdated.</td>
<td>Not an environmental issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs are outdated.</td>
<td>Not an environmental issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This SEIR will be distributed to affected agencies, surrounding cities, and interested parties for a 45-day review and comment period in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15087. Upon completion of the 45-day public review period, written responses will be prepared to all comments received on the SEIR during the public review period. These comments and responses, along with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, will constitute the Final SEIR for the Project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, written responses to comments from public agencies will be made available to those agencies at least 10 days prior to the public hearing with the City Council, at which time certification of the Final SEIR would be considered.
It should be noted that the environmental impacts of a project may not always be mitigated to a less than significant level. When this occurs, impacts are considered significant unavoidable impacts. If a public agency approves a project that has significant unavoidable impacts, the Lead Agency shall state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project based on the Final SEIR and any other information in the public record for the project. This is termed a “Statement of Overriding Considerations” in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15093, and is used to explain the specific reasons the benefits of the proposed Project make its significant unavoidable impacts acceptable. The Statement of Overriding Considerations, if necessary, is prepared after the Final SEIR has been completed, but before action to approve the project has been taken.

1.4 Incorporation by Reference

Certain documents are to be incorporated by reference into this SEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15150. Where a document is incorporated by reference, its pertinent sections will be briefly summarized and referenced in the relevant sections in this SEIR. The following documents are among those incorporated by reference herein:

- City of San Clemente General Plan
- City of San Clemente Zoning Code
- Marblehead Coastal EIR (SCH No. 95091037)
- Marblehead Coastal EIR Addenda Nos. 1 thru 5
- Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan
- Marblehead Coastal Development Agreement
- Marblehead Coastal Design Guidelines

Copies of all documents incorporated by reference are available for public review at the City of San Clemente, Planning Division, 910 Calle Negocio, 1st Floor, San Clemente, California.

1.5 Issues to be Resolved

CEQA Guidelines §§15123(b)(2) and (3) require that the EIR summary identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, issues raised by agencies and the public, and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts.

Issues to be resolved that are known or have been called to the attention of the City during the NOP process are noted below. Because each issue to be resolved could involve some degree of controversy, the distinction between the area of controversy and an issue to be resolved is not critical. Issues raised during the Public Scoping Meeting and the NOP comment period are:

- Lighting impact on area residences
- Safety concerns for freeway traffic
- Number of signs is greater than originally proposed
- Signs visible from freeway result in visual clutter due to their size, number and color
It is recognized that other issues may be raised during the review and hearing process that were not and could not have been known at the time of the publication of this SEIR. These will be addressed to the extent required by law in the preparation of the Final SEIR and in the deliberation process.

1.6 Disagreement among Experts

This SEIR and the record of proceedings contain substantial evidence to support all of the conclusions presented herein. That is not to say that there will not be disagreements with these conclusions. The CEQA Guidelines and, more particularly, case law clearly provide the standards for treating disagreement among experts. Where evidence and opinions of experts conflict on an issue concerning the environment, and the agency knows of these controversies in advance, the SEIR must acknowledge the controversies, summarize the conflicting opinions of the experts, and include sufficient information to allow the public and decision-makers to take intelligent account of the environmental consequences of their action.

It is also possible that evidence will be presented during the SEIR review that might create disagreement. This evidence is considered by the decision-makers during the public hearing process. In rendering a decision on a project where there is disagreement among experts, the decision-makers are not obligated to select the most conservative or environmentally protective option. They may give more weight to one expert than another, and resolve a dispute among experts through the exercise of their collective good faith judgment. In their proceedings, they must consider the comments received and address objections, but need not follow said comments or objections so long as they state the basis for their decision and that decision is supported by substantial evidence.

1.7 Thresholds of Significance

The state does not require that local agencies adopt their own thresholds of significance. In this regard, the City relies on the state’s CEQA Environmental Checklist. In addition, in some areas, the City relies on its General Plan, codes, and ordinances as thresholds of significance.

1.8 Project Alternatives

Section 6, Alternatives Analysis of this Draft EIR presents alternatives that have been designed to alleviate identified environmental impacts. These alternatives consist of the No Project Alternative, the Reduced Size Alternative, the Reduced Size/Reduced Number Alternative, the Project Identification Alternative, Icon Tower Alternative, and the Hours of Operation Alternative. Each alternative has been measured against the stated objectives of
the proposed Project, and in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15126.6, range of
alternatives must be able to attain most of the basic objectives of the project.

The alternatives focus on approaches capable of eliminating significant environmental
impacts associated with the proposed Project including, but not limited to, aesthetics,
biological resources, land use, and traffic, or reducing the impacts to a level of insignificance.
Consistent with CEQA Guidelines §15126.6, an EIR need only address those alternatives that
are actually capable of reducing or eliminating one or more significant physical
environmental effect brought on by the project, as proposed. A comprehensive analysis of
Project alternatives, including the identification of the environmentally superior alternative,
is provided in Section 6, Alternatives Analysis.

1.9 Availability of Draft EIR, Technical Appendices, and Administrative Record

The SEIR, Technical Appendices, and the Administrative Record for the proposed Project are
available at the City of San Clemente, Planning Division, 910 Calle Negocio, 1st Floor, San
Clemente, California.

This SEIR may be viewed on the City’s website at:


A reference copy CD is available for review at the San Clemente Public Library, 242 Avenida
Del Mar, San Clemente, California.
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2. Executive Summary

2.1 Project Location

The proposed Project, known as the Outlets at San Clemente Sign Program, is located at 101 West Avenida Vista Hermosa, San Clemente, California as shown on Exhibit 2-1 – Regional Map and Exhibit 2-2 – Vicinity Map. The Interstate 5 (I-5) Freeway is adjacent to the Project site on the east. The Faire Harbour Condominiums and Highland Light residential communities are located east of the I-5 Freeway. An industrial center is located to the south, and the residential community of Sea Summit, including Shore Cliffs Middle School, is located to the north and west. The Sea Summit residential community is still under development as of this writing.

The City of San Clemente is located at the southern tip of Orange County, approximately halfway between the cities of Los Angeles and San Diego, with a population of approximately 67,000.

2.2 Project Description

The proposed Project consists of:

- Modification of a previously approved Master Sign Program per Marblehead Coastal EIR SCH No. 95091037 and Addenda 1 through 5
- Addition of 23 halo-illuminated wall-mounted signs and 2 project identification signs on the exterior walls of an existing outlet center
- Addition of 4 halo-illuminated tenant signs and 2 project identification signs to a proposed Icon Tower
- Addition of 3 primary and 2 secondary halo-illuminated hotel signs to an approved but unbuilt hotel
- Approval of an Amendment to a Discretionary Sign Permit for the Master Sign Program that would allow addition of freeway-oriented signs

A detailed description of the Sign Exception Permit process is provided in Section 3 (beginning on page 19). A detailed description of the Project is provided in Section 4 (beginning on page 33).
2.3 Discretionary Actions

This SEIR is intended to provide complete and adequate CEQA coverage for all actions and approvals associated with ultimate development of the proposed Project, including but not limited to:

- Certification of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report
- Approval of Amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 05-176 for a Master Sign Program for Freeway-Oriented Signs
- Approval of Sign Exception Permit 15-428 to allow freeway-oriented signs, signs in excess of the City Sign Ordinance standard of 64 square feet in area, and sign areas in excess of the City Sign Ordinance standard of 1 square foot per 1 lineal foot of building frontage

2.4 Summary of Environmental Impacts

Sections 5 through 10 of the SEIR include environmental analysis and information related to the proposed Project. Section 5, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, provides a detailed analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed Project related to aesthetics, biological resources, land use and planning, and transportation and traffic. Section 6 provides an analysis of alternatives to the Project as it is currently proposed. Section 7 and Section 8 describe the potential for the proposed Project to result in cumulative impacts and growth-inducing impacts, respectively. Section 9 provides a complete list of mitigation measures proposed for the Project under this SEIR. Section 10 summarizes the potentially significant adverse impacts of the proposed Project that cannot be avoided or mitigated to a level of “less than significant.”

The environmental analyses in this SEIR are focused on the environmental topics that could be significantly adversely affected by the proposed Project. Information below briefly discusses the environmental topics addressed herein.

Aesthetics

The Project site is located adjacent to the I-5 Freeway across from an established residential community. The proposed signs would be in direct view of the residences across the freeway, as well as vehicles traveling north and south on the I-5 Freeway.

Light is currently generated within the Project site and adjacent areas by street lights, vehicle headlights, and residential and commercial lighting. Glare results from sunlight reflecting off surfaces such as windows, paving, buildings, and windshields.

The Project could result in a significant impact on or degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Signage was considered in the Marblehead FEIR, which included development of the Project site, and this SEIR modifies the number and types of signs proposed and approved in the FEIR. Signage materials will be non-reflective and will not produce glare affecting vehicles on the adjacent I-5 Freeway, adjacent residences, or commercial development.
Biological Resources

The majority of the Project site consists of a mostly built outlet center and already approved but yet to be built development on previously graded portions of the site. The site is surrounded by residential and urban development on all sides except for a remnant canyon located adjacent to the northern portion of the site.

The proposed Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species or on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. The Project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. There will be no conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, and the Project will not conflict with the provisions of the Orange County Southern Subregion Habitat Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The adjacent canyon would not be exposed to a substantial increase or change in artificial night lighting, and no species within the canyon will be impacted.

Land Use and Planning

The Project site is designated as Regional Commercial in the City of San Clemente General Plan and MHC SP-RC 1 in the Marblehead Specific Plan, which provides regulatory guidance for the development of the Marblehead community of which the Project site is a part. The Regional Commercial General Plan land use designation includes general retail commercial, factory outlet stores, restaurants, offices, financial institutions, lodging, and similar regionalserving uses. The Project is within the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan area subject to the Marblehead Coastal Development Agreement and zoning code regulations in place at the time the Marblehead Coastal Development Agreement was approved. The Project is consistent with General Plan and Specific Plan land use designations. The proposed Project includes additional freeway-oriented and freeway-visible signs (signs not necessarily oriented toward the freeway but are still visible from the freeway) that were not analyzed as part of the Marblehead EIR and, therefore, consistency with the Specific Plan and Development Agreement is analyzed herein.

Transportation and Traffic

The Sign Impact Analysis provided information regarding the impact on freeway traffic of providing and not providing the proposed wall-mounted signage along the building frontages. Included in the Analysis are evaluations based on Caltrans criteria for freeway signs, wayfinding impacts related to safety issues for distracted or lost drivers, and a freeway egress evaluation.
## 2.5 Matrix of Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Level of Significance after Incorporation of Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Potential impacts will occur due to signage lighting remaining on for 1 hour past the hours of operation for individual tenants.</td>
<td>MM AE-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits for proposed outlet center tenant and Project identification signage, the Project Applicant shall submit plans to the Planning Division demonstrating that all proposed sign lighting is set to a timer. Sign lighting shall be turned off at the time of closure of each individual tenant consistent with the Project use permit.</td>
<td>1. Impacts related to sign lighting remaining illuminated for 1 hour after individual tenant closing will be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measure MM AE-1 which limits signage lighting to operational hours. 2. Impacts related to the color exceptions remain significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of color exceptions on signs is inconsistent with the established Spanish Architectural style specified in the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td>No mitigation measures are required or proposed.</td>
<td>No impacts will occur to biological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Project will not adversely affect or have a significant impact, either directly or indirectly, on biological resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning</strong></td>
<td>No mitigation measures are required.</td>
<td>No impacts will occur related to Land Use &amp; Planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Project does not include a change to the land use or zoning designations and is consistent with the City’s General Plan, the Marblehead Specific Plan and the Marblehead Development Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation and Traffic</strong></td>
<td>No mitigation measures are required.</td>
<td>No impacts will occur related to Transportation and Traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation measures were provided in the Marblehead EIR related to impacts on traffic. No additional or more severe impacts will occur due to implementation of the Project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.6 Impacts Found Not To Be Significant

Section §15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify those impacts found not to be significant in the Initial Study/NOP and EIR process. Those impacts must be identified and accompanied by a brief explanation of why the impacts were found to be insignificant. The following impacts were found to be insignificant after completion of the NOP process and are not further analyzed in the SEIR.

#### Table 2-1 Impacts Found Not To Be Significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Basis for Dismissal from EIR Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Forestry Resources</td>
<td>The Project site is within an existing developed area and is surrounded by residential, commercial, and industrial uses. No agricultural or forestry resources exist on or in the immediate vicinity of the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The proposed Project relates to the addition of signage not analyzed in the Marblehead EIR. Air quality impacts related to the entire Marblehead development, including greenhouse gas emissions, were analyzed in the previously certified EIR. The proposed signage will not result in any new or additional air quality impacts beyond those analyzed in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>The Project site is either developed or disturbed, and no cultural resources were discovered during development. The proposed Project does not involve additional grading, and ground disturbance will be limited to ground preparation for the installation of an icon tower for project and tenant identification. The Marblehead EIR considered cultural resources, and no new impacts will occur with Project implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
<td>The Project does not propose any development or construction involving grading and is not located in an area in close proximity to earthquake faults. The site is not subject to liquefaction, landslides, mudslides, or geotechnical conditions resulting in significant impacts. Geology and soils analysis was provided in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals and no new impacts will occur with implementation of the modified sign program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Greenhouse gas emissions were analyzed within the Air Quality analysis in the Marblehead EIR and subsequent Addenda for the originally proposed 750,000-square-foot commercial development. The proposed sign program will not result in any greenhouse gas emissions impacts that were not previously analyzed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>The proposed sign program will not result in new or additional impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials beyond those previously analyzed in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals. No hazardous materials will be used to construct and install the signs, and the signs will improve wayfinding for motorists, which will minimize dangerous driving conditions due to confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>The sign program will have no impact on the previously analyzed hydrology and water quality conditions. Overall development impacts have been addressed in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals, and no further analysis is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>The Project site does not support any mineral resources as determined in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>There will be no noise impacts due to implementation of the signage program beyond what was analyzed in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals. No additional analysis is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>The signage program does not include housing and will not impact population. No additional analysis is required beyond what was provided in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>There will be no impact to public services related to installation of the proposed signage. No additional analysis is required beyond that already provided in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>There will be no impact related to recreation with the installation of additional signage. No additional analysis is required beyond that already provided in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Outlets at San Clemente
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue</th>
<th>Basis for Dismissal from EIR Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>There will be no impact related to tribal cultural resources with the installation of signage and the construction of the Icon Tower. The Project site is not considered a tribal cultural resource, as defined in California Public Resources Code section §21074, listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code §5020.1(k), or a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
<td>The proposed sign program will not result in impacts to utilities or service systems beyond the need for minimum additional electricity usage for sign lighting. No impacts beyond those analyzed in the Marblehead EIR, its addenda, and related approvals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Project History and Background

The City of San Clemente is located at the southern tip of Orange County bordering San Diego County. The Project site is approximately midway in the City, overlooking the Pacific Ocean, and is part of the larger Marblehead community, which will include residential, commercial, recreation, and open space uses. As noted in the Marblehead EIR (1998), a regional shopping center was planned as the first development phase (Phase 1) with residential development occurring as market demands were created consistent with the City's annual housing allocation program (Phase 2). The entire Marblehead development incorporates the bluffs above the Pacific Ocean and the more hilly inland terrain to the northeast. The site is bisected by a number of drainages originating in the northeast portion of the property. The regional commercial center is located along the northeastern portion of the site.

The Marblehead EIR evaluated a fully operational, 750,000-square-foot regional commercial center. Analysis included air quality and traffic impacts, among others. Over time, the scope of the Project decreased in size for the residential and commercial components. The EIR also evaluated a freeway sign program that consisted of, among other things, three freeway-oriented monuments. Since the original EIR was approved, subsequent Addenda have been prepared modifying the Project components originally analyzed. The environmental approval history is as follows:

Original EIR (1998)
- 116.7 acres of residential uses (436 dwelling units)
- 60.4 acres of regional-serving commercial (750,000 square feet)
- 1.0 acre of Coastal Commercial (60,000 square feet)
- 9.4 acres of public open space
- 49.5 acres of private open space
- 13.6 acres of circulation facilities
- 3 double-sided freestanding freeway signage monuments (250 square feet per side)
- 3 freeway-oriented wall signs (150 to 200 square feet each)

Addendum No. 1 (1998)
- Analyzed the impacts associated with implementation of 20 acres of multiple-family residential development (i.e., 300 dwelling units)
- Identified 40.4 acres of regional commercial land uses at a 0.35 FAR (i.e., 615,000 square feet)

Addendum No. 2 (2000)
- Reduction of 10 lots from 434 residential lots to 424 residential lots
- Reduction of 1.1 acres of commercial center net acreage from 60.4 acres to 59.3 acres
- Reduction of 54 commercial parking spaces from 3,718 to 3,664
Reduction of the average lot size by 119 square feet from 7,136 square feet to 7,017 square feet

Addendum No. 3 (2003)
- Reduction of project to 313 residential lots
- Reduction of commercial center net acreage to 51.6 acres

Addendum No. 4 (2003)
- Refinement of the parks and trails facilities, detailing the proposed parks and trails amenities packages
- Updated traffic modeling was performed in 2003

Addendum No. 5 (2003)
- Reduction of 33,709 square feet of commercial uses (to 641,534 square feet)
- Minor alignment adjustments to enhance traffic efficiency and pedestrian mobility

As identified in Addendum No. 5, the built-out regional commercial center will encompass approximately 640,000 square feet, a reduction of approximately 110,000 square feet from what was originally analyzed in the Marblehead EIR. To date, a portion of the outlet center opened in late 2015, and a second phase has been approved but has not yet been constructed.

Subsequent to the adoption of Addendum No. 5, the City Council adopted Resolution 04-61 amending Marblehead Coastal Commercial Plaza Site Plan Permit 99-16 reducing the amount of development from 700,140 square feet to 642,584 square feet of commercial uses including a 125-room hotel, a conference center, a theatre, restaurants, and outlet retail uses. The Amendment to Site Plan Permit 99-16 Marblehead Coastal, Commercial Plaza Plans submittal dated June 2, 2004, identifies, among other elements, signs on the backs of the outlet center buildings and an Icon Tower at the southeast corner of the Project site, consistent with the current application. Pages of the Amendment to Site Plan Permit 99-16 Marblehead Coastal, Commercial Plaza submittal have been included as Exhibit 3-1 through Exhibit 3-4 for reference. Those exhibits depict tenant identification signage on the building elevations facing the freeway. Exhibit 3-1 depicts the proposed freeway-oriented signage. Exhibit 3-2 depicts the interior signage, and Exhibit 3-3 shows additional interior signage and the parking garage signage. Exhibit 3-4 shows an aerial view of proposed landscaping under Site Plan Permit 99-16.

The Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan was adopted August 5, 1998. An Amendment was adopted on August 21, 2007. The Specific Plan provides guidelines and regulations for land use, circulation, resource preservation, and development processing. The Specific Plan is a regulatory plan constituting the zoning for the property. The Specific Plan provides for development consisting of 640,000 square feet of retail uses with an outlet component at a maximum floor area ratio of 0.35. The signage program is intended to meet the goals of the Marblehead Specific Plan, the Marblehead Coastal Development Agreement, and the Marblehead Coastal Design Guidelines to provide adequate and appropriate signage for a fully operational center.
Exhibit 3-1  – Amendment to Site Plan Permit 99-16 Marblehead Coastal, Commercial Plaza
For Reference Only
Exhibit 3-3  Amendment to Site Plan Permit 99-16 Marblehead Coastal, Commercial Plaza
For Reference Only

Exhibit 3-4  Amendment to Site Plan Permit 99-16 Marblehead Coastal, Commercial Plaza
A Sign Exception Permit (SEP 06-402) was subsequently approved by the City Council calling for the placement of various interior signs and 32 freeway signs at The Outlets at San Clemente. Representative Project ID signs, freeway-oriented Tenant ID signs, and hotel signs from the SEP 06-402 are included as Exhibit 3-5 through Exhibit 3-8 – Master Sign Program for SEP 06-402. On May 18, 2007, a legal challenge to the approval of the freeway sign program was filed in the Superior Court of Orange County for noncompliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The ruling noted that the original Final Environmental Impact Report anticipated that a master sign program would be prepared and that any future sign proposal would require environmental review. The sign plan proposed for SEP 06-402 included 32 signs including signs on the Icon Tower, which the court determined was a substantial change requiring additional environmental review. The Judge issued a ruling on May 22, 2008 ordering the City to void the portion of SEP 06-402 approving the freeway signs. The City rescinded its decision to approve the freeway-oriented signage portion of Sign Exception Permit 06-402 on September 2, 2008 (Resolution 08-78).

Current Application and Design Review Subcommittee Comment

An application for SEP 15-428, Amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 05-176, was submitted by the applicant in November 2015. The requests made by the application were reviewed by the City Design Review Subcommittee (DRSC) on August 4, 2016. The DRSC Staff Report is included herein as Appendix F. At the meeting, the DRSC conducted an initial evaluation on the sign plans submitted to the DRSC and made preliminary recommendations on how the Project can best comply with policies and design guidelines that relate to visual impact, architectural design, compatibility, and aesthetics. The comments and requests of the DRSC included the following:

1. The quality and aesthetics of the proposed signs should match the architecture and attractive quality of the building.
2. Freeway signs need to be in harmony with the quality Spanish design of the center and the Spanish Village by the Sea image of the City.
3. The color palette should be reduced to bronze and black, with a range of metallic colors consistent with the Spanish Colonial Revival architecture of the building.
4. Submit color samples to clarify what the actual colors for the signs are.
5. Sign numbers 3, 21 and 22 of the plan submitted to the DRSC should be eliminated because the conflict with architectural features.
6. Sign program should prohibit the allowance of freeway-oriented banners in the future.
7. Sign numbers 11, 12, 16 and 23 of the plan submitted to DRSC need appropriately scaled for the wall space they are located.
Exhibit 3-5 — Master Sign Program for SEP 06-402
Exhibit 3-6 – Master Sign Program for SEP 06-402
Exhibit 3-7 – Master Sign Program for SEP 06-402
Exhibit 3-8  – Master Sign Program for SEP 06-402
In response to DRSC comments, the applicant revised the sign plan and provided clarifications, including the following:

1. The proposed signs will comprise thinly fabricated letters that will appear as a traditional wrought-iron letters to create authentic heavy sun shadowing onto the building’s finish. Concealed indirect halo lighting will cast light from inside the letters onto the walls for a subtle lighting effect.

2. The Carlsbad Premium Outlets has external individual tenant signage facing the frontage streets, and when the project was built it had periodic freeway visibility that has been obscured from view over the course of time and development progress. In addition, Carlsbad Premium Outlets was built next to pre-existing commercial/visitor serving development such as Car Country, a hotel, a destination restaurant (Anderson's), a Chevron gas station, and the famous flower fields. Carlsbad Premium Outlets is not a standalone project; therefore, is not comparable to the Outlets at San Clemente, which has no pre-existing traffic generators to rely on.

3. Spanish and Mexican villages often employ vibrant colorful signage and painted sign details. In response to DRSC comments, the applicant is not proposing true authentic signage but instead is offering a softer, more restrained signage.

4. The applicant would like to maintain the already reduced color palette that includes a range of blacks, bronzes, and other metallic as well as up to four feature colors. A sample board was prepared and submitted to the City Planning Department for reference.

5. In response to DRSC comments and public sentiments, sign number 3 was permanently removed from the location identified on the plan submitted to the DRSC. An alternate position for sign number 3 is provided on the updated plans. For the purposes of tracking the number of signs on the plans, the number 3 sign position was shifted to the right and the signs were re-enumerated.

6. The applicant agrees with the DRSC that Temporary Freeway Oriented Signage Banners would be unnecessary once the freeway sign program has been approved and put into effect, as there would be no need for tenants to utilize temporary signage.

7. Façade features at the location of signs 12 and 16 (on the plan submitted to the DRSC) were designed specifically for signage; therefore, the applicant disagreed with the comment that these signs are not appropriately scaled in these locations.

In response to DRSC comments, the proposed sign plans include Project ID signs reduced by 33% from the plans that were submitted to DRSC. The reduction in the size of Project ID signs to 200 square feet more closely represents the current project identity and is scaled appropriately for the architecture.
During the Outlets at San Clemente construction process multiple utility conflicts were identified at the location of the Icon Tower that was a part of the previous architectural design package. The conflicts have been resolved, and the proposed sign plans were updated to include a reduced scope tower element. The Icon Tower is an essential feature of the historical context of the Master Sign Program architectural theme of “Spanish Ranchero” providing a sense of history through the use of wall fragments, piers, and the feeling of a lookout tower.

Temporary Signage

Concurrent with the planning application for SEP 15-428, amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 05-176, the applicant submitted an application for a Temporary Banner Sign Permit. Temporary Banner Signs are regulated by the City’s Municipal Code Section 17.84.030 (H). The City approved the application for temporary banner signs, which allows a maximum size of 64 square feet for signs that must be flush-mounted to the building. The “signs” installed under the Temporary Banner Sign Permit were affixed onto the building façade rather than using actual banners. At the time of this report’s publication, multiple temporary permits have been issued to tenants of the Outlets at San Clemente on separate occasions. This report acknowledges the presence of 18 temporary signs affixed to buildings at the Project site. However, temporary signs are not the subject of this analysis, and information related to applications and issuance of temporary signs should be obtained directly from City staff.
4. Project Description

4.1 Project Location

The proposed Project site, known as the Outlets at San Clemente, is located at 101 West Avenida Vista Hermosa in San Clemente. The Project site is surrounded by the I-5 Freeway to the east, Avenida Vista Hermosa to the north, Avenida Pico to the south, and the Pacific Ocean to the west, within intervening development along the coastline. The residential portion of the Marblehead development, once completed, will lie between the Outlets and El Camino Real, the road paralleling the coast to the west.

The surrounding area is developed with residential, industrial, and commercial uses. The Faire Harbour Condominiums and Highland Light residential communities are located east of the I-5 Freeway. An industrial center is south of the Project. The residential community of Sea Summit (under development), including Shore Cliffs Middle School, is to the north and west.

4.2 Existing Conditions

The larger development area, known as the Marblehead Coastal Property in the Marblehead EIR, consists of 248 acres of land with several significant features including coastal canyons and bluffs. The site was vacant and in a natural condition prior to approval of the EIR for development of a regional commercial center, visitor-serving commercial, and residential uses.

A portion of the outlets center is located within the Coastal Zone. The proposed signage is located outside the Coastal Zone.

The topography of the site consists of bluffs above the Pacific Ocean and more hilly terrain inland. The northeast portion of the site is bisected by drainages originating in the northeast portion of the property. The Prima Deshecha Cañada and Segunda Deshecha Cañada drainages originate in the foothills of the Santa Ana Mountains and run adjacent to the property's southeastern border. Elevations at the site range from approximately 38 feet above mean sea level (MSL) to 142 feet above MSL where the outlet center and parking lot are located.

The Project site is within Subarea 4 of the Orange County Southern Subregion Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). The adjacent canyon located in the northwestern portion of the Marblehead site is designated as Supplemental Open Space in the HCP. However, the outlet center and the proposed hotel are located outside any reserve or lands protected under the HCP.

The Project site is surrounded by the I-5 Freeway to the east with the Faire Harbour Condominiums, Highland Light, and Marblehead Inland residential communities (MHI - Residential) located east of the I-5 Freeway, an industrial center to the south, and the residential community of Sea Summit (MHC Residential), including Shore Cliffs Middle School, to the north and west. At this time, the Sea Summit residential community is still under development. Table 4-1 below depicts the existing land uses surrounding the Project site.
Table 4-1  Surrounding Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Sea Summit residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Industrial center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>I-5 Freeway, Faire Harbour Condominiums, and Highland Light residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Marblehead residential project/Pacific Ocean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project site currently consists of an existing outlet center (Phase 1), the approved but unbuilt Phase 2 of the outlet center, and an approved but unbuilt hotel. The approved but unbuilt hotel is included in the analysis herein in terms of proposed signage. The hotel will be located on a parcel immediately north and across a small canyon from the outlet center. Site photographs and a key map are included herein as Exhibit 5-7 through Exhibit 5-51.

Phase 1 has been completed, and the several buildings that are currently in operation are affixed with temporary tenant and project identification signs. Uses include the outlet stores, fast food restaurants, and more formal restaurants. The temporary signs are not lighted. However, the temporary signs are not considered the baseline condition for analysis of the Project signage proposed herein.

The outlet center is described herein as typically operating from 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Retail stores may have varied operational hours and special seasonal hours of operation. A movie theatre is included on the site but is not currently built. Existing lighting includes architectural lighting, parking lot lighting, and landscape lighting. Parking lots are located on the north, south, and west perimeter of the outlet buildings, which are clustered on the east portion of the site.

The Marblehead EIR and subsequent addenda have refined and reduced the scope of uses from the original EIR, and the size of the outlet regional shopping center has been reduced from 750,000 square feet to 641,000 square feet. Approval for additional signage through a Sign Exception Permit (SEP 06-402) was issued by the City in February 2007. The SEP 06-402 approval included interior signs and 32 freeway-oriented signs at the Outlets at San Clemente. On May 18, 2007, a legal challenge to the approval for the proposed freeway sign program was entered against the City in the Superior Court of Orange County for noncompliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The judge issued a ruling on May 22, 2008, ordering the City to void the portion of SEP 06-402 approving the freeway signs and to consider the proposed Project in light of the Court’s May 22, 2008 order.

Interior signage approved by SEP 06-402 was not challenged or included in the judge’s decision, and internal tenant ID signs were installed onto Phase 1 of the outlet center in adherence with the Master Sign Program approved by the City Council on May 22, 2007. The analysis included in this SEIR is in response to the Court’s mandate for additional environmental analysis of proposed freeway-oriented signage in order to process a Sign Exemption Permit for the placement of freeway-oriented signage.
4.3 Project Description

The regional commercial component of the Marblehead site comprises a total area of approximately 69.4 acres (750,000 square feet) per the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan and Tentative Tract Map dated January 1998. The Marblehead EIR analyzed a fully operational regional commercial center and a hotel. The analysis also included an evaluation of freeway-oriented signage. The Project analyzed herein modifies the sign program to include additional freeway-oriented and freeway visible signs (which may not necessarily be oriented toward the freeway but are still at least partially visible from the freeway) from what was analyzed previously. The Project will include a total of 36 signs as described below for Phase 1 (existing outlet center) and Phase 2, the approved but unbuilt component of the outlet center, which includes a hotel.

1. Access

The Project site is located between the Avenida Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico exits from the I-5 Freeway. The site can also be accessed from El Camino Real (Coast Highway) off Avenida Pico.

2. Sign Program Description

Proposed signage consists of 36 signs including 23 tenant identification wall signs and 2 project identification signs on an exterior wall of the existing outlet center, 4 tenant signs and 2 project identification signs on an Icon Tower, and 3 primary and 2 secondary signs for the approved but unbuilt hotel component. The signs are proposed to be for the purpose of wayfinding and tenant identification, and will be freeway visible, oriented or directed toward motorists traveling along the freeway. A detailed plan showing individual sign location details with example tenant identities, method for sign area calculation, and sign fabrication detail is included below.

Sign content would be limited to nationally trademarked logos and names and would not include tag lines. It is anticipated that tenants and merchants at the outlet center will occasionally change, and therefore, so will the signage. Each sign location will have the potential to be constructed at the maximum height, width, and area allowed by the application. However, the exact dimensions of each sign will vary by brand name or the logo used while remaining within the confines of the set maximums for height, width, and area. The maximum allowable sign area will be limited to those proposed by the sign program and plans submitted by the applicant to the City as a part of the request for SEP15-428, included as Exhibit 4-1 and Exhibit 4-2 – Sign Plans.

Proposed tenant signs range in size from approximately 31.5 square feet to a maximum of 130.5 square feet. Project identification signs will be a maximum of 200 square feet and are positioned on alternate faces of the building and the Icon Tower to capture the attention of outlet center visitors and vehicles traveling in the vicinity. Hotel signage is proposed to be 64 square feet for primary signage and 30 square feet for secondary signage. Exhibit 4-3 – Overall Site Plan details the location of each proposed sign. Tenant signage criteria as set forth by the Marblehead Master Sign Program are shown Exhibit 4-4 – MSP 3.0 Tenant Signage Criteria.
Exhibit 4-1 — Sign Plans
Exhibit 4-2 – Sign Plans
Exhibit 4-3 – Overall Site Plan
Exhibit 4-4  MSP 3.0 Tenant Signage Criteria
The outlet signs are intended to include halo lighting that will shut off 1 hour after the close of business hours for each individual tenant or merchant. Tower signs will shut off at 10:00 p.m., restaurant and theatre signs will remain on past 10:00 p.m., and hotel signs are anticipated to remain illuminated 24 hours. The signs are proposed to be constructed of metal channeling letters, and are further described as follows.

Sign Construction

Sign construction and mounting methods are included as Exhibit 4-5 – Reverse Channel Halo Fabrication and in the sign program on Exhibit 4-4 – MSP 3.0 Tenant Signage Criteria. The signs will adhere to the Type 1 signs depicted on Criteria Sheet MSP 3.0, using reverse channeling lettering in the following options.

Reverse Channeling Letters

Individual channel letters (halo effect) with shallow 3½” returns, to be pin mounted 2” from face of stucco façade. Letters would be dimensional metal channels with opaque face and returns. Letters would have Lexan® backing for UL listing.

Optional Stencil Cut Logo Emblem

Stencil-cut opaque panel with minimum 4” returns, to be pinned off face of stucco. Neon halo illumination provided at all panel cut-outs and panel perimeter. Neon color would be white 6500 degrees K or registered corporate color only. Pinned off wall 2”. The maximum allowable size of the emblem is 20% of sign area in use unless symbol is a primary brand icon.

The cut-out of negative letters would be flushed out or pushed through with routed acrylic. Acceptable letter colors are white peened finish, colored vinyl overlay. Color selection would be dependent on contrast with background sign panel. Panel required to have Lexan® backing for UL listing. Neon tubing would follow perimeter of emblem or outline of logo.

Sign Color and Content

The proposed color palette for the signs include a black, navy blue, brown, grey copper and bronze, with an option for up to four additional colors such as green, grey, red and white at the discretion of the owner in consultation with the Community Development Director. Tenant signs would be limited to nationally recognized trademark logos and names for the purpose of tenant identification. Taglines and slogans would not be permitted. Banners will be prohibited from all freeway-oriented facades. Exhibit 4-6 – Materials Board depicts the materials and colors to be used for sign construction.
Exhibit 4-5  – Reverse Channel Halo Fabrication
COLOR EXCEPTIONS

These 4 Color Exceptions are an example of the possible colors based on current tenants and their individual branding requirements. These Color Exceptions are subject to change.

Allowable Sign Colors

Exhibit 4-6  – Materials Board
Sign Lighting

The sign lighting is proposed to be a white with a color temperature of 6500 degrees Kelvin. Lighting and mounting techniques are demonstrated on Criteria Sheet MSP – 30. Hours of illumination would vary among merchants, restaurants, and the theatre. Each individual wall-mounted tenant sign would be turned off 1 hour after the close of its respective tenant. The wall-mounted Project Identity Signs would be turned off 1 hour after the close of the last tenant.

Retail tenant signs would be the first to turn off, while the restaurant and theatre signage would remain on longer, as these establishments typically remain open much later. Holiday hours for the center are longer and later than off-holiday hours; therefore, the signage for the outlet center would remain illuminated the latest during these times of year. The Project signs on the Icon Tower would be turned off at 10:00 p.m. The Hotel signs would remain on 24 hours a day.

Tenant ID Signs

Tenant ID signs are intended to identify the individual retail tenant and will be posted on the building façade. The signs will be halo illuminated. Sign locations will not necessarily correspond to tenant locations. The following Table 4-2 provides information that is further described in the text below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Number</th>
<th>Sign Area</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Width Linear Foot</th>
<th>Maximum Sign Height Linear Foot</th>
<th>Height Above Ground</th>
<th>@ 13 Lumens per SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>127.5 SF</td>
<td>41'5&quot;</td>
<td>5' 0&quot;</td>
<td>24'0&quot;</td>
<td>1697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>88.5 SF</td>
<td>28' 9&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>24'0&quot;</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>76.5 SF</td>
<td>26' 3&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>24'0&quot;</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>90 SF</td>
<td>30' 6&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>22'0&quot;</td>
<td>1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90 SF</td>
<td>25' 0&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>22'0&quot;</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>79.5 SF</td>
<td>16' 10&quot;</td>
<td>5' 9&quot;</td>
<td>25'0&quot;</td>
<td>1033.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>79.5 SF</td>
<td>16' 10&quot;</td>
<td>5' 9&quot;</td>
<td>25'0&quot;</td>
<td>1033.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>36 SF</td>
<td>16' 9&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>28'0&quot;</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>67.5 SF</td>
<td>25' 3&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>25'0&quot;</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80.25 SF</td>
<td>27' 0&quot;</td>
<td>5' 4&quot;</td>
<td>20'0&quot;</td>
<td>1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>116.25 SF</td>
<td>38' 9&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>20'0&quot;</td>
<td>1511.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>54 SF</td>
<td>25' 0&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>26'0&quot;</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.5 SF</td>
<td>33' 0&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>26'0&quot;</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>120 SF</td>
<td>19' 0&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>22'0&quot;</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>73.5 SF</td>
<td>29' 5&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>24'0&quot;</td>
<td>1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>58.5 SF</td>
<td>27' 3&quot;</td>
<td>5' 9&quot;</td>
<td>30'0&quot;</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>124.5 SF</td>
<td>41' 6&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>20'0&quot;</td>
<td>1618.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>74.25 SF</td>
<td>29' 9&quot;</td>
<td>7' 6&quot;</td>
<td>30'0&quot;</td>
<td>1009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>90 SF</td>
<td>36' 0&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>20'0&quot;</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>63 SF</td>
<td>29' 3&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>22'0&quot;</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.5 SF</td>
<td>14' 6&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>25'0&quot;</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.5 SF</td>
<td>14' 6&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>25'0&quot;</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>105 SF</td>
<td>35' 0&quot;</td>
<td>7' 0&quot;</td>
<td>20'0&quot;</td>
<td>1365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>64 SF*</td>
<td>14' 3&quot;</td>
<td>4' 6&quot;</td>
<td>17'0&quot;</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>64 SF*</td>
<td>14' 3&quot;</td>
<td>4' 6&quot;</td>
<td>22'0&quot;</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>64 SF*</td>
<td>14' 3&quot;</td>
<td>4' 6&quot;</td>
<td>17'0&quot;</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>64 SF*</td>
<td>14' 3&quot;</td>
<td>4' 6&quot;</td>
<td>22'0&quot;</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tenant ID signs to be installed on the Icon Tower
1. Sign 1 is a 127.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the easternmost building (Building 22) of the existing center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 34 feet above ground facing easterly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, this sign will be primarily viewed from the northbound I-5 Freeway looking west and from the church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will be viewed secondarily from the residences across the I-5 Freeway, traffic on the I-5 Freeway, and area surface roads to the east and southeast of the Project site.

2. Sign 2 is an 88.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the easternmost building (Building 22) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 32 feet above the ground facing easterly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from the northbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway, I-5 Freeway traffic, and area surface roads to the east and southeast of the Project site.

3. Sign 3 is a 76.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the easternmost building (Building 22) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 32 feet above ground facing easterly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway, I-5 Freeway traffic, and area surface roads to the east and southeast of the Project site.
4. Sign 4 is a 90-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the easternmost building (Building 22) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 22 feet above ground facing easterly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway, I-5 Freeway traffic, and area surface roads to the east and southeast of the Project site.

5. Sign 5 is a 90-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the easternmost building (Building 22) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 32 feet above ground facing easterly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway, I-5 Freeway traffic, and area surface roads to the east and southeast of the Project site.

6. Sign 6 is a 79.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the easternmost building (Building 22) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 25 feet above ground facing easterly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway, I-5 Freeway traffic, and area surface roads to the east and southeast of the Project site.
7. Sign 7 is a 79.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the easternmost building (Building 22) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 25 feet above ground facing easterly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, the sign's primary viewing points will be from northbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway, I-5 Freeway traffic, and area surface roads to the east and southeast of the Project site.

8. Sign 8 is a 36-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the easternmost building (Building 22) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 28 feet above ground facing easterly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, the sign's primary viewing points will be from northbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway, I-5 Freeway traffic, and area surface roads to the east and southeast of the Project site.

9. Sign 9 is a 67.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the easternmost building (Building 22) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 25 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign's primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.
10. Sign 10 is an 80.25-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the northeastern-most building (Building 19) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 20 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

11. Sign 11 is a 116.25-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the northeastern-most building (Building 19) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 20 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

12. Sign 12 is a 54-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the northeastern-most building of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 26 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.
13. Sign 13 is a 100.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the northeastern-most building (Building 19) of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 20 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

14. Sign 14 is a 120-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the northeastern-most building of the existing outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 22 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

15. Sign 15 is a 73.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on northeasterly facing wall of Building 17A, which is located northerly of Building 19. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 24 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.
16. Sign 16 is a 58.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the northerly facing wall of Building 17A, which is located northerly of Building 19. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 30 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

17. Sign 17 is a 124.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on Building 17B immediately north of Building 17A, and the northernmost commercial tenant building in the outlets. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 20 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

18. Sign 18 is a 74.25-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on Building 17B immediately north of Building 17A, and the northernmost commercial tenant building in the outlets. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 30 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.
19. Sign 19 is a 90-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on Building 17B immediately north of Building 17A, and the northernmost commercial tenant building in the outlets. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 20 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

20. Sign 20 is a 63-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on Building 17B immediately north of Building 17A, and the northernmost commercial tenant building in the outlets. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 22 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

21. Sign 21 is a 31.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on Building 17B immediately north of Building 17A, and the northernmost commercial tenant building in the outlets. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 25 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.
22. Sign 22 is a 31.5-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on Building 17B immediately north of Building 17A, and the northernmost commercial tenant building in the outlets. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 25 feet above ground facing northerly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Hermosa. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

23. Sign 23 is a 105-square-foot Tenant ID sign located Building 17B immediately north of Building 17A, and the northernmost commercial tenant building in the outlets. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 20 feet above ground facing northerly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Hermosa. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

24. Sign 24 is a 64-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the east face of the Icon Tower. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 17 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway and areas across the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from the northbound I-5 Freeway and traffic traveling west on Avenida Pico. The sign will also be viewed from surface roads and residences across the I-5 Freeway to the east and southeast of the Project site and area.

25. Sign 25 is a 64-square-foot Tenant ID sign located immediately above Sign 24 on the east face of the Icon Tower. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 22 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from the northbound I-5 Freeway and traffic traveling west on Avenida Pico. The sign will also be viewed from surface roads and residences across the I-5 Freeway to the east and southeast of the Project site and area.
26. Sign 26 is a 64-square-foot Tenant ID sign located on the southerly face of the Icon Tower. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 17 feet above ground facing southeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign's primary viewing points will be from northbound traffic on the I-5 Freeway. The signs will have secondary views from surface roads and residences located southeasterly of the I-5 Freeway.

27. Sign 27 is a 64-square-foot Tenant ID sign located immediately above sign 26 on the southerly face of the Icon Tower. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 22 feet above ground facing southeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign's primary viewing points will be from northbound traffic on the I-5 Freeway. The signs will have secondary views from surface roads and residences located southeasterly of the I-5 Freeway.

Outlet ID Signs

Outlet ID Signs are intended to identify the site as “The Outlets at San Clemente” and will be posted on the freeway-facing façade of the main buildings (Buildings 17A and 17B) and two sides of the Icon Tower. Table 4-3 provides detailed information that is further described in the text below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Area</th>
<th>Sign Width Linear Feet</th>
<th>Sign Length Linear Feet</th>
<th>Height Above Ground</th>
<th>@ 13 Lumens per SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 200 SF</td>
<td>19' 11&quot;</td>
<td>8' 0&quot;</td>
<td>30' 0&quot;</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 200 SF</td>
<td>19' 11&quot;</td>
<td>8' 0&quot;</td>
<td>20' 0&quot;</td>
<td>2600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 100 SF</td>
<td>14' 3&quot;</td>
<td>6' 10</td>
<td>25' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 100 SF</td>
<td>14' 3&quot;</td>
<td>6' 10</td>
<td>25' 0&quot;</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Sign 1 is a 200-square-foot Project ID sign located on the east face of the architectural connection between Buildings 17A and 17B. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 30 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign's primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

2. Sign 2 is a 200-square-foot Project ID sign located on the approved but unbuilt Phase 2 of the outlet center. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 20 feet above ground facing northerly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Hermosa. Once constructed, the sign's primary viewing points will be from southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

3. Sign 3 is a 100-square-foot Project ID sign located on the proposed Icon Tower. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 25 feet above ground facing northeasterly
toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences and church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north and area surface roads to the east and northeast of the Project site.

4. Sign 4 is a 100-square-foot Project ID sign located on the proposed Icon Tower. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 25 feet above ground facing easterly toward the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Pico. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the church across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway, I-5 Freeway traffic, and area surface roads to the east and southeast of the Project site.

**Hotel ID Signs**

The approved but unbuilt hotel signage will include building signs that will face the I-5 Freeway and Avenida Hermosa. The signs will identify the as yet unnamed hotel. Table 4-4 provides detailed information which is further described in the text below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Area</th>
<th>Linear Foot</th>
<th>Height Above Ground</th>
<th>@ 13 Lumens per SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 64 SF</td>
<td>20’ 0”</td>
<td>30’ 0”</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 30 SF</td>
<td>10’ 0”</td>
<td>25’ 0”</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 30 SF</td>
<td>10’ 0”</td>
<td>16’ 0”</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 64 SF</td>
<td>20’ 0”</td>
<td>30’ 0”</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) 64 SF</td>
<td>20’ 0”</td>
<td>30’ 0”</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Sign 1 is a 64-square-foot primary Hotel ID sign located on the approved but unbuilt hotel. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 30 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences located directly across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

2. Sign 2 is a 30-square-foot secondary Hotel ID sign located on the approved but unbuilt hotel. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 25 feet above ground facing northeasterly toward the I-5 Freeway. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing points will be from northbound and southbound I-5 Freeway traffic looking west and from the residences located directly across the I-5 Freeway. This sign will have secondary views from the residences across the I-5 Freeway to the north of the Project site and area surface roads to the north and east of the Project site.

3. Sign 3 is a 64-square-foot secondary Hotel ID sign located on the approved but unbuilt hotel. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 16 feet above ground facing northwesterly toward Avenida Hermosa. Once constructed, the sign’s primary viewing
point will be from the hotel parking lot. This sign will have secondary views from Avenida Hermosa and I-5 Freeway traffic traveling southbound.

4. Sign 4 is a 64-square-foot primary Hotel ID sign located on the approved but unbuilt hotel. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 30 feet above ground facing northwesterly toward Avenida Hermosa. Once constructed, the sign's primary viewing point will be from the hotel parking lot and Avenida Vista Hermosa. This sign will have secondary views from I-5 Freeway traffic traveling southbound.

5. Sign 5 is a 64-square-foot primary Hotel ID sign located on the approved but unbuilt hotel. This sign is proposed to be placed at a height of 30 feet above ground facing southeasterly toward the outlet center. Once constructed, the sign's primary viewing point will be from the outlet center parking lot. This sign will have secondary views from I-5 Freeway traffic traveling northbound.

In addition to certification of the SEIR, additional approvals for the proposed sign program include Sign Exception Permit 15-428 and Amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 05-176. A Sign Exception Permit (15-428) is required to allow signs above the maximum 64-square-foot regulation. The Discretionary Sign Permit (05-176) regulates the Project's sign program; therefore, is required to be amended to allow the sign program to include the proposed signs.

4.4 Energy Conservation

Appendix F, Energy Conservation in the CEQA Guidelines requires that EIRs include a discussion of the potential energy aspects of a proposed Project. Particular emphasis is to be placed on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. The means of achieving this goal include:

- Decreasing overall per capita energy consumption
- Decreasing reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, natural gas and oil, and
- Increasing reliance on renewable energy sources.

Project approval includes an Amendment to the Sign Program analyzed in the original Marblehead EIR. The Amendment will increase the number of signs as described above from 3 to 32. The Project consists of the addition of signage to the previously analyzed sign program for the regional commercial portion of the Marblehead development. The majority of the signs will be halo illuminated and wall mounted, incorporating the most energy-efficient LED lighting. Lighting will be extinguished 1 hour after the close of the retail operations.

Signage will also be installed on a freestanding Icon Tower. As with all other freeway-oriented signage, these sign letters and logos will have indirect lighting only. The low-level lighting will result in minimal energy consumption overall through the use of light-emitting diode (LED) fixtures. Therefore, the Project will not result in a significant increase in energy use. The halo-illuminated, wall-mounted signs will not result in significant environmental
impacts as further analyzed herein in Section 5.1, Aesthetics (beginning on page 59) and are consistent with the goals of CEQA Guidelines Appendix F related to energy consumption.

### 4.5 Discretionary Approvals

This Supplemental EIR is intended to provide complete and adequate CEQA coverage for all actions and approvals associated with ultimate development of the proposed Project. The following approvals are required for Project implementation.

- Certification of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report
- Approval of Amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 05-176 for Master Sign Program for freeway oriented signs
- Approval of Sign Exception Permit 15-428 to allow freeway-oriented signs, signs in excess of the City Sign Ordinance standard of 64 square feet in area, and sign areas in excess of the City Sign Ordinance standard of 1 square foot per 1 lineal foot of building frontage

### 4.6 Project Objectives

CEQA Guidelines §15124 requires an EIR to include a statement of objectives sought by the proposed Project. This disclosure assists in developing the range of Project alternatives to be analyzed in the EIR, as well as providing a rationale for the adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations, if one must be adopted, because of one or more significant unavoidable Project-related impacts. Identified below are objectives related to the proposed Project.

- Comply with the Court-mandated environmental review of proposed signage
- Provide adequate signage for Project identification
- Ensure that signage is consistent with California Department of Transportation criteria related to the I-5 Freeway
- Provide a wayfinding means to ensure safe egress from the I-5 Freeway and adequate path-finding information for vehicular access to the Project
- Provide consistency with the Development Agreement in terms of compliance with appropriate sign ordinances and regulations while identifying exceptions through approval of a sign program
4.7 Intended Uses of the SEIR

1. Agencies that are expected to use the SEIR in their decision making:
   • City of San Clemente as Lead Agency

2. Permits or other approvals that may be required to implement the project:
   • California Department of Transportation review for consistency with signage criteria

3. Subsequent use of the SEIR

This Supplemental EIR is intended to update the Marblehead EIR to incorporate the proposed changes to the sign program. CEQA does not require all the environmental topics included in the CEQA Guidelines Initial Study Checklist be included in a Supplemental EIR. The topics need not be addressed if there is no demonstration, based on substantial evidence, that any of the following conditions exist:

(1) The Applicant's proposed changes to the sign program involve “new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects”;

(2) Substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken will require major revisions of the previous Marblehead EIR due to the involvement of new significant, environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous Marblehead EIR was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
   (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous Marblehead EIR;
   (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous Marblehead EIR;
   (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
   (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Marblehead EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The analysis in the SEIR is limited to the proposed signs and their environmental impacts, if any. The previously certified EIR for the Marblehead Coastal Development and the subsequent Addenda evaluated the whole of the Project-specific impacts. Those CEQA documents are the final and conclusive documents underlying the Project’s approvals. The 2007 legal challenge to the proposed freeway signage approvals in SEP 06-402 resulted in the Court ordering the City to rescind the freeway-oriented signage portion of the Sign Exception Permit 06-402 and requiring additional CEQA analysis of the proposed freeway signage.
Due to the limited scope of the Project, this SEIR focuses on impacts relevant to the proposed signage and includes analysis of Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Land Use, and Transportation and Traffic. This SEIR analyzes whether the Project results in any new or more significant effects not discussed in the previous Marblehead EIR, or whether new mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially reduce significant effects on the environment have been considered and rejected. This SEIR may be relied upon for all approval and permit actions related to development of the proposed Project.
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5. **Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures**

5.1 **Aesthetics**

This section describes the existing aesthetics setting and the potential effects from the proposed Project implementation on the Project site and its surrounding area. Aesthetics refers to visual considerations, including scenic resources, scenic vistas, changes in visual character, and lighting or glare. Aesthetics analysis is a process to assess logically visible changes and any anticipated viewer response to that change. The analysis herein is based on visual simulations, a Photometric Assessment prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering, dated February 15, 2017 (Appendix C), and a Visual Impact Analysis prepared by KTUA, dated September 2017 (Appendix G).

The Visual Impact Analysis divided the area surrounding the Project into visual assessment units to evaluate the aesthetic impacts that the proposed Project would have on different viewer groups. Each viewer group is expected to have a common perception or sensitivity based on the visual quality and character of their associated visual assessment unit since visual impacts are relative to the visual environment in which they are found. The visual quality and visual character of each visual assessment unit were evaluated to determine the proposed Project’s visual impact on the visual experience and common perception.

The Visual Impact Analysis categorized the Project site and surrounding areas according to 18 visual assessment units. The visual quality (vividness, memorability, intactness) and visual character (harmony, visual interest, consistency of materials, textures, colors and scale) of each assessment unit were evaluated to determine the proposed Project’s impact based on contrast to setting. Each of the 18 visual assessment units are analyzed using a scale of 0 through 4, where 0 represents “none” and 4 represents “high,” to determine the magnitude of impact the proposed Project would have on each viewer group with respect to visibility of Project signage and number of viewers. The distance of views from the assessment unit to the Project are also presented, and are found on Table 5-1.

The described visual assessment units are typically defined by the limits of a particular viewshed with perceivable boundaries. These boundaries are generally created by landforms, with edges defined by vegetation, buildings, and fencing. The visual assessment units are used to represent the context of where viewer groups may be found, while also assessing visual quality and character from the visually prominent elements of the proposed Project, as shown on Exhibit 5-1 – Visual Assessment Units.

Photos A through Q are included to provide a visual representation of identifying characteristics for each of the referenced visual assessment units, as shown on Exhibit 5-2 through Exhibit 5-4. The identifying characteristics include uses such as public facility, commercial, urban corridor, light industrial, residential, open space, school, hotel, and the outlet center.
5.1.1 Existing Conditions

The City of San Clemente is bisected by the I-5 Freeway and is generally characterized by tall hills and ridgelines to the east, with bluffs and mesas to the west. Ocean views are prominent from near and distant locations within the City. The I-5 Freeway corridor is generally characterized by residential uses east of the freeway and commercial and industrial development concentrated west of the freeway near Avenida Pico. Existing signage is visible in close proximity to the Project site denoting said commercial developments.

The Project site is developed with a portion of a 641,000-square-foot regional commercial center, including an approved but unbuilt Phase 2 of the outlet center and an approved, unbuilt hotel. The outlet buildings on the Project site have a Spanish style architecture. Also visible on and near the Project site are graded slopes, parking lots, and I-5 Freeway northbound and southbound travel lanes. The regional commercial center is located within the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan, which encompasses a large area within the western portion of the City and includes single-family and multi-family housing and open space. Existing sources of light and glare include the outlet parking lot lighting, building lighting, landscape lighting, freeway lighting, lighting from car headlights and park lighting.

5.1.2 Regulatory Setting

City of San Clemente

The City of San Clemente has several regulatory documents which provide guidance related to aesthetics. First, the City's General Plan identifies scenic corridors and scenic vistas, which are detailed in the Initial Study (Appendix A). Next, the City's Zoning Ordinance Section 17.04.020(e) identifies that the purpose and intent of the zoning code is to “Preserve the traditional scale and seaside orientation of the City and provide for reasonable preservation of public views.” Neither the General Plan nor the Zoning Ordinance provide protection of private views, as further detailed herein.

1. Sign Ordinance

The City's Sign Ordinance stated purpose is to protect the City's historical and residential essence, while ensuring individual expression and attractive community character. The City established specific objectives to ensure economic viability and its overall attractiveness, which include:

- To promote a high quality business environment by assuring that signs are complementary to the City's goals for historic preservation and quality urban design;
- To ensure that signs are carefully designed, aesthetically pleasing, appropriately maintained, and professional in appearance;
- To reduce possible traffic and safety hazards through reduced sign clutter, the elimination of unauthorized signs in the public right-of-way, and minimizing visual competition among signs;
- To minimize the visual and lighting impacts of business signs on adjacent residential neighborhoods.
### Table 5-1 Visual Assessment Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visual Assessment Unit</th>
<th>Visibility of Project Signage</th>
<th>Distance to Views of Project Signage</th>
<th>Number of Viewers²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Outlets at San Clemente</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Foreground</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Open / Under Construction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Single Family Residential</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Foreground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Single Family Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Foreground to Middleground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Middle School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Foreground to Middleground</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Open Space / Canyon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foreground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Public Facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Light Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Middle to Background</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Freeway Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Community Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Major Urban Corridor (Avenida Vista Hermosa)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Major Urban Corridor (Avenida Pico)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Multi-family Residential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Open / Undeveloped Space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Multi-family Residential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Church / Place of Worship</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Single Family Residential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 I-5 freeway</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Foreground</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Foreground: Less than 1/8 mile; Middleground: 1/8 to 1/2 mile; Background: Greater than 1/2 mile
²Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.1, Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Signage, September 2017
Exhibit 5-1 – Visual Assessment Units

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Signage and Project Identification Tower
Exhibit 5-2 – Visual Assessment Unit Photos
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Related to the general design standards, Section 17.84 of the Municipal Code establishes that signs must be constructed of permanent materials such as metal or other compatible, durable, and waterproof material. Sign scale and colors must be compatible with the style of buildings and must be oriented to minimize light or glare upon adjacent residential properties and public rights of way.

In addition to the City’s Sign Ordinance, the City has a set of design guidelines intended to “preserve and strengthen San Clemente’s unique atmosphere and historic identity.” These guidelines are used by the City to evaluate proposed development Projects subject to discretionary design review.

2. **Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan**

The purpose of the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan Development Standards and Guidelines is to ensure that development within the Marblehead Coastal Plan area will be consistent with the City’s General Plan goals, Urban Design Program, and Master Landscape Plan for Scenic Corridors. This Specific Plan provides the following design objectives:

- Preserve and strengthen San Clemente’s unique character as the “Spanish Village by the Sea.”
- Define a consistent approach to site planning, architecture, streetscape, lighting, landscaping, and other design elements to achieve visual harmony within Marblehead Coastal.
- Recognize the unique character, constraints, and opportunities of the Marblehead Coastal area.

3. **Marblehead Coastal Development Standards and Guidelines**

The proposed signage is subject to the following guidelines and standards:

**Site Design Guidelines** (only those that apply have been listed below)

E. Project Identification Signs - Projects should be identified by low monument signage to provide neighborhood identification. Such signs should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with residential buildings, walls, and other structures, and shall conform to the City’s Sign Ordinance.

**Commercial Development**

D. Signs - Commercial centers should be identified by a sign program with monument signage and wall signs for individual tenants. Such signs may include logos, and should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with project buildings, walls, and other structures. Due to the size and proportions of the buildings, appropriate scaled signage may require maximum sign area allowances greater than currently specified in the City’s Sign Ordinance. A specific Sign Plan accounting for all such allowances shall be provided for consideration at the time of site plan review.

Freestanding signage shall be integrated with the overall architectural and landscape design for the commercial center. Multiple locations for the freestanding signage shall be permitted and appropriately located with respect to multiple frontages and entries into the center.
Architectural Guidelines

Section 305 II-D-5 - Signs should be integrated into the architectural design of the building in a manner consistent with the intent of the City's Sign Ordinance, as well as the architectural elements, scale, and massing of the project.

5.1.3 Thresholds of Significance

The City thresholds of significance for the evaluation of Project impacts in the area of Aesthetics are based upon suggested criteria from the CEQA Environmental Checklist in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. CEQA protection of views generally pertains to public views and not private views. In this instance, the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance identify a “reasonable preservation of public views” but do not provide any specific protection of private views. The Project would result in a significant impact if it would:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

5.1.4 Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation

1. Short-Term Impacts

Short-term impacts to aesthetics are those associated with the Project during Project construction phases. The installation of signs on the existing buildings of Phase 1, the future buildings of Phase 2 and the hotel, and the Icon Tower will have dominant views from the residences and the church located across the I-5 Freeway, as well as traffic traveling both directions on the I-5 Freeway. Installation timing will be staggered, as it is anticipated that the signs for Phase 1 and the Icon Tower would be completed upon Project approval, while the signs for Phase 2 and the hotel would be completed independently of one another in the future once those buildings have been constructed.

The proposed signs would be installed on the outer walls of the outlet center, on an archway connecting Building 17A and 17B and the hotel, or on a Project sign monument, referred to as the Icon Tower. The activities for installation of signs to the outlet center and the hotel buildings include drilling anchor holes into the walls, fastening power feeds, mounting a watertight sign backing, and mounting the sign face. Installation activities require minimal construction equipment such as a snorkel or scissor lift. The duration for wall installation activities of Phase 1 is anticipated to occur over the span of a few days, as each sign takes a two-technician team 4 to 8 hours to install, and multiple technician teams will work simultaneously to ensure the signs are installed quickly. The duration of Phase 2 installation is anticipated to be similar to Phase 1; however, due to the small quantity of hotel signs, the duration of the hotel sign installation is anticipated to be much shorter than installation on the outlet center.
The Icon Tower is proposed to be located at the southeast corner of the subject property immediately beyond the existing parking lot. Construction activities for the Icon Tower would include minor site preparation work and construction of the Icon Tower. The equipment used and construction duration would be similar to that of the wall signs.

2. **Long-Term Impacts**

Long-term impacts to aesthetics are those associated with the Project upon completion of all Project construction phases and are generally related to operational impacts. The outlet center is described herein as typically operating from 10:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. However, individual tenant hours may vary, with stores closing as early as 8:00 p.m. or later during seasonal special hours of operation. Signs will automatically shut off 1 hour after the close of individual tenants, and the Icon Tower will be shut off at 10:00 p.m. However, the movie theatre and a select number of restaurants will remain open after 10:00 p.m., as will their signage. The hotel and hotel signage will operate 24-hours a day.

The visual impacts of a Project include both the objective visual resource change created by the Project and the subjective viewer response to that change. Distance from the Project, frequency of view, length of view, viewer activity, viewer perception, and viewing conditions contribute to the assessment of a visual impact. The physical limits and changes of the views and the quantity of the viewers are objective. Viewer perception is subjective.

The perception of different viewer groups to the visual environment and its elements varies based on viewer activity and awareness. Activities such as commuting in heavy traffic can distract an observer from many aspects of the visual environment. Conversely, pleasure driving or relaxing in a scenic environment can encourage an observer to look at the view more closely and at greater length, thereby increasing the observer’s attention to detail. Sensitivity is also determined by how much the viewer has at stake in the viewshed. Typically, people who own property in an area are more sensitive to change than those just passing through an area. As such, views from residential neighborhoods are included in the visual impact assessment for disclosure purposes. However, views from private areas – including views from residences, backyards, or other private areas such as private streets – are not considered within the impact assessment, because the City’s regulatory documents do not provide protection of private views and because CEQA does not consider private views in determining an aesthetic impact.

**Viewshed Analysis**

The Visual Impact Analysis provided a theoretical viewshed showing that the proposed signs are potentially visible mostly from both the northbound and southbound lanes of I-5, as well as areas to the north, south, and east of the Project site. The approximate distances from the Project site to the selected 51 area viewpoint locations are shown on Exhibit 5-5 – Signage Viewshed – Regional.

To quantify impacts experienced by neighboring communities, the proposed Project was assigned a point system by the Visual Impact Analysis. In the point system, each sign represents three points and there are 36 signs proposed for a total of 108 possible points. The area viewshed and assigned visual points are depicted on Exhibit 5-6 – Signage Viewshed – Local.
Exhibit 5-5  – Signage Viewshed – Regional

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage, September 2017
Exhibit 5-6 – Signage Viewshed – Local

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage, September 2017
From most points within the highlighted viewshed area, vegetation, structures, and topography between the viewer and the Project site block views of the site. Points with the greatest potential to view the site have been selected as Candidate Key Views, and are discussed and analyzed for potential changes due to Project development, in the Visual Character section below.

The roads and viewpoints shown on the viewshed map include private roads, as well as property inaccessible by the general public, which are considered as private views. It is possible for a local city to implement its own thresholds of significance for determining significant visual impacts. However, San Clemente has not developed these local standards. While this analysis is only required to consider public views based on the CEQA guidelines and the City’s General Plan, private views have been included in the analysis to provide a more thorough depiction of potential aesthetics impacts and changes to the visual setting.

The proposed Project will be viewed by several types of viewer groups. An individual might belong to more than one viewer group in the course of a day. However, the sensitivity and exposure of each group varies due to the amount of time a view is available to a viewer (duration of view) and the viewer’s awareness at the time the view is available. A viewer’s exposure can be estimated by the size of the viewer group, the proximity of the viewer in relation to the proposed location, and the duration of views available of the Project site. Viewer sensitivity to changes in the visual environment can be estimated through a combination of their level of activity (allowing them to focus on the views), their awareness (which can limit their focus), their engagement in local interests, and the value they place on local views.

The viewer groups present in the Project area are defined as the following:

1. Freeway Drivers: Those drivers traveling on I-5.
2. Local Area Drivers: Drivers on Avenida Vista Hermosa, Avenida Pico, and Calle de Los Molinos.
3. Local Area Workers/Customer: Those working/visiting at nearby commercial establishments and light industrial employment centers.
4. Adjacent Residents: Those living to the north and west of the Project site.
5. Distant Residents: Those living to the east of the Project site, across I-5.

Lighting can also have a significant effect on views. Clouds and fog can change viewing conditions by increasing or decreasing contrast. Atmospheric conditions in Orange County tend to be hazy a large percentage of the time. A combination of fog, mist, haze, and smog combine to decrease visibility to less than 2 to 3 miles. Often, details of visual features are not discernible when more than 3 miles away. A 2-mile buffer has been marked on the Project viewshed map. Based on typical viewing conditions in this area, objects more than 2 miles away generally will not be considered visually prominent.

Viewing duration for northbound I-5 would be less than 1 minute, considering average speeds of the freeway. Due to limited visibility from the southbound I-5 direction, the
duration is expected to be less than 30 seconds. Workers and customers of local businesses, are likely to see the Project while traveling anywhere from a few seconds to a few minutes. Residential views of the Project site could be as long as the sunlight hours in a day. Nighttime views of lighting/signage for churchgoers, depending on if there is an outside event, are likely to be visible for 1 to 15 minutes in duration, given other activities and directions of view are available.

The analysis provided considers view impacts to several types of viewers. The greatest visual impacts of the proposed Project will be observed by the residences and the church located across the I-5 Freeway, which have direct views of the Project site. However, the City has not adopted thresholds of significance for protecting private views, and CEQA guidelines only consider public views.

Following is a summary of potential aesthetics resources impacts associated with development of the proposed Project.

**Visual Character**

The Visual Impact Analysis provided candidate key views as a representation of locations that have been identified to represent the best location for typical views for each viewer group. Key views were selected based on locations that most clearly display the visual contrasts of the Project and are representative of primary viewer groups that would potentially be affected by the Project.

The primary factors that were taken into account for the selection of Candidate Key Views include Project elements visible at the location, the dominant viewer group, number of viewers, sensitivity of viewer to change, visibility rating, distance from viewer to Project site, and signage. A tabular inventory and summary of the primary factors used for selecting candidate key views for simulation, including an impact scale of 0 through 4, where 0 represents “none” and 4 represents “high,” is shown below on Table 5-2 below.

**Candidate Key Views**

For the purpose of this analysis, all views listed on Table 5-2 are considered key views. A key view that is classified as a candidate key view is one that may display visual changes and has the potential to show or not show a significant impact. Those candidate key views were narrowed to the final recommendations for visual simulations.
### Table 5-2 Candidate Key View Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and tower</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visibility Level 3</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Built Outlets</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be moderately visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and tower</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visibility Level 4</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Built Outlets</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be highly visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I-5 SB / Avenida Vista Hermosa</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and tower</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visibility Level 4</td>
<td>Middleground</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Berm obscures some of the proposed signage. So only partially visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Calle de Industrias</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and tower</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visibility Level 2</td>
<td>Middleground to Background</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Calle Frontera</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Local Driver / Residents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 2</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets and Phase 2</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be partially visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>St. Andrews by the Sea</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Church attendees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Visibility Level 2</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be partially visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
### Table 3.4: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middleground Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be visible</td>
<td>No, too far north of outlet stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middleground Hotel</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be visible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I-5 SB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Middleground Hotel and Phase 2 Outlets</td>
<td>Bern obscures some of the proposed signage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Calle Frontera</td>
<td>Proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background Hotel</td>
<td>Proposed hotel signage would be highly visible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Avenida Vista Hermosa</td>
<td>Proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employee / Resident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middleground Hotel</td>
<td>Proposed hotel signage would be visible</td>
<td>No, limited viewers and views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Avenida Vista Hermosa</td>
<td>Proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Foreground Hotel</td>
<td>Proposed hotel signage would be visible</td>
<td>No, limited viewers and views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Avenida Vista Hermosa</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background Hotel</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be partially visible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pacific Coast Church</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Church attendees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Proposed hotel signage would be visible</td>
<td>No, limited public views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marblehead Inland</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and planned outlets</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
<td>No, limited public views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Calle Miguel</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and proposed hotel</td>
<td>Local Driver / Resident</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I-5 NB</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings and proposed hotel</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets, Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
<td>No, limited public views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Freeway SB 1/2 mile from hotel</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Freeway Driver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Avenida Presidio more than 1 mile</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2815 Corte Esmeralda</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
### Table 3.4: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2410 Calle Aquamarina</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2246 Calle Opalo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2402 Via Mero</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>703 Corte Topacio</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2333 Via Aguila to the NW</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2312 Calle Almirante</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2304 Calle Almirante</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2401 Camino Bacanera</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
### Table 3.4: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2318 Avenida Manejada</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage is not visible, No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2340 Avenida Manejada</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage is not visible, No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2148 Via Teca</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage is not visible, No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2211 Via Garillan</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage is not visible, No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2233 Avenida Platanar</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage is not visible, No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2207 Avenida Platanar</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage is not visible, No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35a</td>
<td>2129 Avenida Oliva slightly less than 1/4 mile</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage is not visible, No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35b</td>
<td>2129 Avenida Oliva 1/4 mile</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage is not visible, No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0–4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
### Table 3.4: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Level</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2011 Via Aquilla</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2003 Via Mango</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2005 Paseo Laro</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2178 Calle Ola Verde 3/8 mile to hotel</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2141 Calle Ola Verde slightly more than 1/8 mile</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41a</td>
<td>2165 Avenida Espada more than 1/2 mile to hotel</td>
<td>Portions of the proposed buildings and hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 3</td>
<td>Background Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>The proposed signage would be visible</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41b</td>
<td>2165 Avenida Espada 1/4 mile to outlet</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background None</td>
<td>The proposed signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
### Table 3.4: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2035 Via Mantaraya 3/8 mile</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 1 3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The proposed signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Via Teca and Ave Faceta</td>
<td>Portions of the existing buildings</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 1 3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
<td>No, limited public views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2111 Avenida Oliva</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2179 Via Aguila</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2182 Via Teca</td>
<td>Proposed hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 1 3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
<td>No, limited public views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2245 Avenida Oliva 3/8 mile from outlet</td>
<td>Portions of existing and proposed buildings</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 1 3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>651 Via Faison</td>
<td>Proposed hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 1 3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Marblehead Entrance on Ave Faceta</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
<td>No, project is not visible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None

Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
## Table 3.4: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key View #</th>
<th>Photo Taken From</th>
<th>Visible Project Elements</th>
<th>Dominant Viewer Group</th>
<th>Quantity of Viewers</th>
<th>Sensitivity of Viewer to Change</th>
<th>Visibility Rating</th>
<th>Distance from Viewer to Project Site</th>
<th>Signage</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Recommended for Simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>Avenida Faceta and Via Teca</td>
<td>Portions of existing buildings and hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50b</td>
<td>Avenida Faceta and Via Teca</td>
<td>Portions of existing and proposed buildings and hotel</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visibility Level 1</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Built Outlets, Phase 2 Outlets and Hotel</td>
<td>Signage barely visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Avenida Faceta and Via Agua</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Visibility Level 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Signage is not visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Table 3.4; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017*

Scale of 0-4, where 4 = High, 1 = Low, 0 = None
Exhibit 5-7 – Candidate Key View Locations Aerial shows 51 Key Views that were reviewed for visual analysis, the 9 views that are included in the 3D Model Overlay, and the 10 views that are included in the visual simulations. The exhibit is color coded by views that are Key Views (green), have a 3D Model Overlay (orange), and Simulated Key View (red). In addition, the exhibit provides a color-coded depiction of sign visibility, depicting the surrounding locations from which the signs will be visible; the darker the color, the greater number of visible signs. Locations with the highest number of visible signs will be from the back yards of residences located easterly across the I-5 Freeway. In addition, a high concentration of signs will be visible from the neighborhood located southeast of the Project site, east of the I-5 Freeway and south of San Clemente High School, primarily along Avenida La Cuesta. There is substantial fluctuation between the quantity of visible signage from both residential neighborhoods. The fluctuation is due to existing topography and the presence of residential dwelling units that block views.

Following Exhibit 5-7 is a series of key view photographs. The key view photographs are provided on Exhibit 5-8 through Exhibit 5-51. Each exhibit contains a photograph from the locations identified on Exhibit 5-7. Many of the key views are provided with a corresponding 3D Model Overlay under the photo. The 3D model overlay was used in assessing the rough approximation of the proposed project to identify appropriate view locations for the more detailed View Simulations. As such, the 3D model overlays are not intended as photo realistic simulations of a specific view, and readers may notice minor project components that do not appear in precise locations. The 10 View Simulations that are included as Exhibit 5-52 through Exhibit 5-61 do provide a precise simulation of the proposed project.

Each key view – or key view with 3D model overlay – includes a notation indicating which visual features may be visible from that location. Each visual feature visible from a key view location is represented with an orange box. When the outlets site is not visible, the “none” box is selected. Even when the “none” box is selected, Project elements may appear within the 3D simulation model overlay to help orient the reader. For example, in certain instances, signs are physically blocked by topographic features such as a berm, or are located behind a bridge or a road. In those cases, signs or buildings may be superimposed onto the 3D simulation to illustrate that the sign(s) are accounted for, but not visible from that vantage point. See key views 3-5 and 18.
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Exhibit 5-7 – Candidate Key View Locations Aerial

Source: Figure 3.5; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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Exhibit 5-8 – Candidate Key View 1 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-9 – Candidate Key View 2 Photographs
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Candidate Key View Photograph 3: View en Interstate 5 southbound looking southwest

Exhibit 5-10 – Candidate Key View 3 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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Exhibit 5-11 – Candidate Key View 4 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 5: View from Calle Frontera looking southwest

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- [ ] signs
- [ ] tower
- [ ] existing stores
- [ ] future stores
- [ ] future hotel
- [ ] none

Candidate Key View Photograph 5: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-12 – Candidate Key View 5 Photographs
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Exhibit 5-13 – Candidate Key View 6 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- Signs
- Trees
- Existing slopes
- Future slopes
- Future hotel
- Stone
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Exhibit 5-14 – Candidate Key View 7 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 8: View on Interstate 5 northbound looking west toward the hotel site

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements with orange:
- Signs
- Tower
- Existing stores
- Future stores
- Future hotel
- None

Candidate Key View Photograph 8: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-15 – Candidate Key View 8 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-16 – Candidate Key View 9 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 10: View from Colle Fromero looking southwest toward the hotel site.

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Candidate Key View Photograph 10: View seen in 3D model.
Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-17 – Candidate Key View 10 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 11: View from Avenida Vista Hermosa looking north toward the hotel site.

Candidate Key View Photograph 11: View seen in 3D model

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-18 – Candidate Key View 11 Photographs
**Candidate Key View Photograph 12**: View from Avenida Venta Hermosa looking south toward the hotel site.

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

**Candidate Key View Photograph 12**: View seen in 3D model.

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

**Exhibit 5-19 – Candidate Key View 12 Photographs**
Candidate Key View Photograph 13: View from Avenida Vista Hermosa looking south toward the hotel site.

Exhibit 5-20 – Candidate Key View 13 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 14: View from Pacific Coast Church looking south

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-21 – Candidate Key View 14 Photographs
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Exhibit 5-22 – Candidate Key View 15 Photographs
5.1 – Aesthetics

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- pier

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-23  – Candidate Key View 16 Photographs
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Exhibit 5-24 – Candidate Key View 17 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Candidate Key View Photograph 18: View on Interstate 5 southbound

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- signs
- tower
- existing trees
- future stores
- future hotel
- home

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-25 – Candidate Key View 18 Photographs
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Exhibit 5-26 – Candidate Key View 19 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

**Candidate Key View Photograph 21: 2410 Calle Amapasana**

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

**Candidate Key View Photograph 22: 2246 Calle Opalo**

Exhibit 5-27 – Candidate Key Views 21 and 22 Photographs
For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with options):
- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 23: 2402 Via Mero

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with options):
- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 24: 701 Carte Tegano

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-28 – Candidate Key Views 23 and 24 Photographs
For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (in orange):
- signs
- tower
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Candidate Key View Photograph 25: 2133 Via Aguilla to the northwest

Candidate Key View Photograph 26: 2122 Calle Almendare

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-29 – Candidate Key Views 25 and 26 Photographs
5.1 – Aesthetics

Exhibit 5-30 – Candidate Key Views 27 and 28 Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-31 – Candidate Key Views 29a and 29b Photographs
Exhibit 5-32 – Candidate Key Views 30 and 31 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange): signs, tower, existing stores, future stores, future hotel, none

Candidate Key View Photograph 32: Via Guatlan

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Candidate Key View Photograph 33: 2237 Avenida Pecanor

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange): signs, tower, existing stores, future stores, future hotel, none

Exhibit 5-33 – Candidate Key Views 32 and 33 Photographs
Exhibit 5-34 – Candidate Key Views 34 and as Photographs
Exhibit 5-35  – Candidate Key Views 35c and 36 Photographs
Exhibit 5-36 – Candidate Key Views 37 and 38 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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Exhibit 5-37 – Candidate Key View 39 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Exhibit 5-38 – Candidate Key View 40 Photographs
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Exhibit 5-39 – Candidate Key View 41a Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
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**Candidate Key View Photograph 42: View seen in 3D model**

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

**Exhibit 5-41 – Candidate Key View 42 Photographs**
Candidate Key View Photograph 43: Via Ieca & Avenida Fuerte

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):
- signs
- towers
- existing stores
- future stores
- future hotel
- none

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-42 – Candidate Key View 43 Photographs
5.1 – Aesthetics

For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- Signs
- Tower
- Existing stairs
- Future stairs
- Future hotel
- Plane

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-43  – Candidate Key View 44 Photographs
5.1 – Aesthetics

Exhibit 5-44 – Candidate Key View 45 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-45 – Candidate Key View 46 Photographs
For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- [ ] signs
- [ ] tower
- [ ] existing signs
- [ ] future stores
- [ ] future hotel
- [ ] none

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-46 – Candidate Key View 47 Photographs
Candidate Key View Photograph 48: View on Cefale-Fronte looking southwest toward the Hotel site

Exhibit 5-47 – Candidate Key View 48 Photographs

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Exhibit 5-48 – Candidate Key View 49 Photographs
For this key view, the viewer can see the following proposed project elements (with orange):

- Ledges
- Tower
- Existing stores
- Future stores
- Future hotel
- more

Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-49 – Candidate Key View 50a Photographs
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Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-50 – Candidate Key View 50b Photographs
Source: Figure 3.6; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
This page intentionally blank
Visual Simulations

Of the 54 candidate key views presented in the Visual Impact Analysis, Project signage is not visible from 35 of the locations. As detailed in Table 5-1 (page 61), 10 candidate views were chosen for simulation (Views 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, and 41a) because these represent vantage points with the greatest visibility. More specifically, the views were chosen for additional analysis and simulation based on 1) Medium to large number of viewers; 2) Proximity of the viewer to the Project; 3) Public views having a higher priority than private views; and 4) Visibility of the Project elements. Key Views 2 and 3 were chosen because of their proximity to the Project, while Key Views 8, 9, and 13 were chosen because of their large number of public viewers. Key Views 6 and 10 were selected because the signage can be seen in more detail. Key Views 16, 41a, and 41b were added based on key views that were more distant or where in the Marblehead housing development areas that were evaluated in the past. Key View 17 was added to evaluate the first point to the south on I-5 that northbound viewers can see the Project. The following are descriptions of the locations of Exhibit 5-52 through Exhibit 5-61.

Visual Assessment View 2

View 2 (Exhibit 5-52) shows the existing view and simulated view of the proposed Project as seen from the northbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway just north of Avenida Pico looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 400 feet from the Project site. As depicted in the simulated view, northbound traffic at this location on the I-5 Freeway will have a direct view of the proposed Icon Tower located on top of the berm and an obscured view of the proposed hotel. The outlet center buildings are viewed in the background, set back from the berm and Icon Tower by the parking lot. In addition to the slight increase in elevation, the buildings are set back from the freeway by approximately 180 feet. The building tenant ID signage would be somewhat recognizable, and the building Project ID signs would provide adequate recognition to vehicle passengers on the freeway. The Icon Tower signage would be fully recognizable from this vantage. The hotel Project ID signs would be unrecognizable from this vantage.
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Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017

Exhibit 5-52 – Candidate Key View 2 Visual Simulation
Visual Assessment View 3

View 3 (Exhibit 5-53) shows the existing view and simulated view of the proposed Project as seen from the southbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway lateral to the northern corner of Phase 1 of the outlet center looking southwesterly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 120 feet from the Project site. As depicted in the simulated view, southbound traffic at this location on the I-5 Freeway have direct view of the berm and a slightly obscured view of the outlet center buildings sitting on top of the berm with the Icon Tower viewable in the background. In addition to the berm resulting in a slight increase in elevation, the buildings are set back from the freeway by approximately 75 feet due to the parking lot located between the berm and outlet buildings. The building tenant ID and Project ID signs would be fully recognizable from this vantage. The Icon Tower tenant ID and Project ID signs would be recognizable in the background. The hotel location is not in view from this vantage, as it is past the hotel site.
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Exhibit 5-53 — Candidate Key View 3 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 6

View 6 (Exhibit 5-54) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from Saint Andrews Church located along Calle Frontera near Avenida Pico looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 1,000 feet from the Project site and at a slightly higher elevation looking down toward the Project site. As depicted in the simulated view, this location has a partly obscured view of the outlet center buildings and Icon Tower, and very minimal to no view of the hotel. The tenant ID and Project ID signs on the buildings and the Icon Tower would be noticeable at this location; however, the existing outlet center is part of the current viewshed and recognition of individual lettering on building signs will vary from observer to observer due to the distance. The hotel Project ID signs would not be recognizable from this location.
Exhibit 5-54  – Candidate Key View 6 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 8

View 8 (Exhibit 5-55) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the northbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway midway between Avenida Pico and Avenida Vista Hermosa looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 500 feet from the Project site, which is approximately 300 feet closer to the hotel than view 7. As depicted on the simulated view, northbound traffic at this location on the I-5 Freeway has a direct view of the future hotel. There is very little grade differential at this location and the buildings are set back from the edge of the property by approximately 80 feet due to the parking lot located between the berm and hotel buildings. The tenant ID and Project ID signs on the buildings and Icon Tower are not visible from this vantage. Hotel ID signs would be recognizable from this vantage.
Exhibit 5-55  – Candidate Key View 8 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
**Visual Assessment View 9**

**View 9** (Exhibit 5-56) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the southbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway just past Avenida Vista Hermosa looking southwesterly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 400 feet from the Project site. As depicted on the simulated view, southbound traffic at this location on the I-5 Freeway has a direct view of the future hotel. The outlet center and the Icon Tower are mostly obscured by the grade differential produced by the berm and the angle of this vantage. Hotel ID signs would be recognizable from this vantage.
Exhibit 5-56  – Candidate Key View 9 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
**Visual Assessment View 10**

**View 10** (Exhibit 5-57) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the vacant lot located across the I-5 Freeway on Calle Frontera looking southwesterly toward the Project site. This location is approximately 600 feet from the Project site. As depicted on the simulated view, pedestrians and vehicles traveling along Calle Frontera have a direct view of the future hotel, including clearly recognizable hotel signage. The outlet center and the Icon Tower are not shown in this simulation but would also be visible from this vantage point. Tenant ID and Project ID signs would be visible and recognizable.
Exhibit 5-57  – Candidate Key View 10 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 13

View 13 (Exhibit 5-58) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from westbound Avenida Vista Hermosa looking southerly, across the I-5 Freeway, toward the Project site. This location is approximately 400 feet from the Project site and approximately 650 feet to the future hotel building. This vantage is relatively direct with a few bushes or trees potentially obscuring views. The outlet center and Icon Tower cannot be seen at this angle. Hotel ID signs would be slightly recognizable from this vantage.
Exhibit 5-58  – Candidate Key View 13 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 16

**View 16** (Exhibit 5-59) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from Calle Miguel looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately a mile away from the Project site. This vantage is from a relatively high elevation that provides immediate views of houses and landscaping with the I-5 Freeway and the outlet center in the distance and the Marblehead development area in the far distance. Depending on weather conditions, the outlet center tenant ID and Project ID signs and the hotel Project ID signs would be only slightly discernable and would not be recognizable from this vantage.
Exhibit 5-59  – Candidate Key View 16 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 17

View 17 (Exhibit 5-60) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the northbound travel lane of the I-5 Freeway just north of Avenida Pico off-ramp looking northwesterly toward the Project site. This location is approximately a half mile from the Project site. The immediate views from this vantage are of the northbound and southbound traffic of the I-5 Freeway with the outlet center located at a slightly higher elevation in the northwest distance. The Icon Tower signs would be discernable from this vantage; however, the outlet center tenant ID and Project ID and hotel Project ID signs would not be recognizable.
Exhibit 5-60  – Candidate Key View 17 Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
Visual Assessment View 41a

View 41a (Exhibit 5-61) shows the existing view and simulated view that includes the proposed Project as seen from the inland Marblehead housing community area looking westerly toward the Project site. This location is approximately a half mile from the Project site. The immediate view from this vantage include landscape and houses with the future phase 2 of the outlet center, future hotel and Marblehead coastal community in the distance and the Pacific Ocean in the far distance. The outlet center tenant ID and Project ID signs would not be discernable from this vantage and the hotel ID signs would be only slightly discernable.
Exhibit 5-61  – Candidate Key View 41a Visual Simulation

Source: Figure 4.1; Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage; September 2017
View Simulations Conclusion

As detailed in the Visual Impact Analysis, while the signage is proposed to be placed in visible locations, the signage is consistent with a commercial development in terms of overall size, form, and lighting, and is not dominant in the viewing scene. Visibility of signage is generally from the I-5 Freeway and from farther east along Calle Frontera (east of the Faire Harbour Condominiums). The proposed signage is generally limited to 100 square feet, where 5 of the 27 tenant signs would exceed 100 square feet ranging from 100.5 to 127.5 square feet. In addition, two of the four of the Project ID signs would exceed 100 square feet. According to the Visual Impact Assessment, legibility of 100-square-foot signs is limited to approximately one-quarter mile. In total, 7 of the 36 proposed signs would exceed 100 square feet. The five tenant signs that exceed 100 square feet may be marginally more visible, with two of the Project ID signs, which are 200 square feet, also visible.

The proposed Project Icon Tower is scaled to the surrounding buildings and relates to the forms of the adjacent outlet buildings. The signage materials proposed for the Icon Tower will be consistent with rest of the Project signage and will not contrast with its setting.

The wall signs are proposed to be placed in a consistent manner with locations between wall towers, rooflines, and protruding wall spaces. While there would be a variation in fonts and colors, the overall company names and logos are balanced with each other and with the scale of the walls on which they are placed. The proposed signs are balanced and scaled for the size of the building, and are placed in consistent locations. If the signage were of varying scales, styles, materials, and lighting sources, and were randomly placed in different locations on the buildings, a potential visual quality impact could occur. However, the balance in scale, design, and number of signs are compatible and consistent, resulting in a uniform visual perspective.

Light and Glare

Light and Glare from Sign Materials

The proposed sign materials are matte-finished with no mirrored glass panes, highly polished metal materials or other highly reflective surfaces. As such, signs are not anticipated to produce daytime glare. Exhibit 4-6 (page 42) depicts the colors and materials to be used for the signs.

Photometric Assessment

A Photometric Assessment was prepared for the Project for the purpose of investigating on-site and surrounding off-site impacts produced by the installation signage on the subject site. The Photometric Assessment is included as Appendix C. A computer model was used to compare lighting levels using a measurement in foot-candles at 5-feet above the ground between the existing condition and the Project buildout condition at 376 distinct plot locations on the Project site.
The Photometric study analyzed the potential increase in lighting levels that would result from the implementation of the proposed Project. Based on computer model output, the photometric report concluded that the Project would generate an increase of on-site levels immediately adjacent to the proposed outlet and hotel signage ranging from one to three foot-candles. Lighting of the Icon Tower will result in an increase in illumination levels in the immediate vicinity of the tower by approximately 10 foot-candles. However, off-site lighting levels due to the proposed Icon Tower will only increase by one foot-candle along a small part of the I-5 Freeway and to the proposed hotel and outlet signage are predicted to have zero off-site lighting impacts, as shown on Exhibit 5-62 below.

The adjacent properties would have no discernable incremental increases in lighting due to the proposed signage. The proposed Project will not result in off-site spillage (glare) to adjoining properties or public rights-of-way.

**Sign Lighting**

The sign lighting will be done by backlighting, with the metal box letters and logos held away from the wall. An internal lighting system will cast light back onto the wall where the raised letters or logo will block this portion of the light from shining off-site. The void created by this technique is enough to provide recognition of the lettering and logo forms. This approach is subtle and will control light spillover because lighting is beamed directly at the building behind the sign. There will be no light pollution that will negatively affect sensitive receptors because the amount of light produced is minimal. As discussed above, the proposed Project will not generate a discernable increase in the amount of off-site lighting. The proposed reverse channel halo lighting is detailed on Exhibit 5-63 below.

**Tower Lighting**

The tower will be lighted with down-lighting and up-lighting. Spillover for up-lighting and down-lighting is controlled by light cut-off functions included as an integral part of the light fixture. This reduces spillover lighting and helps to keep the light from negatively affecting a driver passing by on the freeway and to avoid unnecessary light spillover.
FIGURE 5b: Predicted Project (36 Project Signs) Illumination Levels, 100-Ft Increments (ISE 1/17)

Exhibit 5-62  – Photometric Plan
Exhibit 5-63 – Sign Lighting Example
General Night Lighting

The outlets center is developed with surface parking lots which include light standards for parking lot safety, landscape lighting and building lighting. A comparison of outlet center daytime views with and without signage is included as Exhibit 5-64 – Daytime View Comparison. The pictures on the left-hand side of the exhibit represent original views as they currently exist. The pictures on the right-hand side of the exhibit represent the existing views with added sign simulations.

A comparison of outlet center nighttime views with and without signage is included as Exhibit 5-65 – Nighttime View Comparison. The comparison between the existing nighttime views and Project nighttime views depict proposed signage as having a minimal amount of backlighting for the purpose of creating a visual depth that will allow the signs to be legible to people on-site, in the vicinity, and traveling on the I-5 Freeway.

The proposed signs will be most visible from the Faire Harbour Condominiums located to the east across the I-5 Freeway because of the close proximity to the outlet site. While the sign lighting will be visible during the nighttime hours, the sign lighting will not result in a new source of light and glare because the outlet site is already extensively lit. The photometric plan demonstrates that there will be no spill generated from the sign lighting onto off-site locations, especially those across the I-5 Freeway. The prominence of lit signs will diminish with the attenuation provided by distance.

In addition to the nighttime view comparisons provided above, visual simulations were prepared from Key View locations 8, 9, 10 and 13 because those vantage points present the most direct views of the proposed signage. Night lighting as viewed from these four nearby locations including the I-5 Freeway northbound immediately adjacent to the Project site looking east toward the hotel site, I-5 Freeway southbound immediately adjacent to the Project site looking east toward the Project site, the empty lot along Calle Frontera located across the I-5 Freeway looking east toward the hotel site, and from a location along Avenida Vista Hermosa and Calle Frontera looking east toward the Project site are shown on Exhibit 5-66 through Exhibit 5-69.

As shown on the nighttime lighting visual simulation exhibits, the proposed signs will not substantially contribute to nighttime light or glare beyond the existing conditions because the proposed Project would not discernably increase the amount of existing night lighting from adjacent sources such as the I-5 Freeway and other public view locations.
Exhibit 5-64 – Daytime View Comparison
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Exhibit 5-65  – Nighttime View Comparison
Exhibit 5-66  – Nighttime Views – Candidate Key View 8
Exhibit 5-67  – Nighttime Views – Candidate Key View 9
Exhibit 5-68 – Nighttime Views – Candidate Key View 10

Note: Details of site grading or architectural plans or 3D models do not exist for the hotel. This visualization assumes as best as can be expected given the available materials.
Exhibit 5-69 – Nighttime Views – Candidate Key View 13
3. **City of San Clemente Sign Ordinance**

The City of San Clemente Sign Regulations Ordinance (Title 17, Chapter 17.84 – Sign Regulations) has established specific objectives in its sign regulation ordinance to enhance the City’s economic base and promote an aesthetically pleasing environment. Project compliance with these objectives are described in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.84.010.A.4 – To promote a high-quality business environment by assuring signs are complementary to the City’s goals for historic preservation and quality urban design</td>
<td>The proposed metal channel lettered signs are complementary in quality and design to the Spanish Village theme. The sizes of the signs are proportional to the building sizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.84.010.A.5 – To ensure that signs are carefully designed, aesthetically pleasing, appropriately maintained, and professional in appearance</td>
<td>The proposed signs are designed to have metal channel lettering with a matte finish to provide an appearance that is aesthetically pleasing and professional. Signage does not include mirrored glass panes or polished metal materials, and would be placed in locations appropriate for signage such as between wall towers, rooflines, and protruding wall spaces. The proposed Project is considered consistent with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.84.010.A.7 – To reduce possible traffic and safety hazards through reduced sign clutter, the elimination of unauthorized signs in the public right of way, and minimizing visual competition among signs</td>
<td>The proposed signs include variations in font and color consistent with the individual tenants that they are representing. They are not arranged in a cluttered manner, and they comply with the City’s requirement for signage to not exceed more than 75% of the building façade width. The proposed tenant ID signs will represent nationally branded companies that will be readily recognizable for the viewer. The proposed signs are designed to minimize distractions to the overall visual environment and attention of the drivers in the vicinity, especially on the northbound or southbound I-5 Freeway. Potential traffic impacts are analyzed in Section 5.4, Transportation and Traffic of this report. The proposed Project is considered consistent with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.84.010.A.8 – To minimize the visual and lighting impacts of business signs on adjacent residential neighborhoods</td>
<td>The proposed signs will be seen from adjacent residential neighborhoods; however, the signs have been designed to complement the existing and future buildings. The materials used for the proposed signage would not include mirrored glass panes, polished metals or other reflective surfaces capable of producing daytime glare. At night, the signs will be back lit to emphasize the shape of the raised lettering or logos by creating a lighting contrast between letters or logo and the background wall where the letters or logo also act to block direct light from view. This type of lighting controls light spillover and is a subtle way to illuminate signs. The proposed Project is considered consistent with this requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 17.84 of the zoning code establishes that signs must be constructed of permanent materials such as metal or other compatible, durable, and waterproof material. The proposed Project is consistent with this requirement, as signage proposed by the Project would be made of metal.

Sign scale and colors have to be compatible with the style of buildings and must be oriented to minimize light or glare upon adjacent residential properties and public rights of way. Due to building location and orientation, a majority of the proposed signs will directly face adjacent residences. The signs have been designed to be compatible in size and style with the buildings where they will be located. The maximum size of each
sign varies based on location and architectural compatibility. The proposed Project is considered consistent with this requirement.

Based on the City's zoning code, the maximum sign area permitted is 1 square foot of sign area for every 1 lineal foot of building, not exceeding 75% of the business façade width, and the maximum size is 64 square feet. Though some of the proposed signs are larger than specified by the applicable sign ordinance, they occupy substantially less than 75% of the business façade width and are otherwise harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with Project buildings, walls, and other structures.

While the proposed Project is seeking signage larger than allowed by the City's Sign Code, larger scale signage has been contemplated for the Regional Commercial Center as far back as the adoption of the 1998 Specific Plan for Marblehead Coastal Development, as noted in Section 3-4 II of the Specific Plan, "Due to the size and proportions of the buildings, appropriate scaled signage may require maximum sign area greater than specific in the City’s Sign Ordinance." Based on this analysis, oversized signage could be found consistent with the intent of contemplated signage for the Outlet Center.

The Sign Regulation Ordinance objectives were established to enhance the City's economic base and promote an aesthetically pleasing environment. The proposed Project upholds these objectives by providing signage for the Outlets at San Clemente, a regional commercial center that relies on promotional identification for patronage. The metal channel lettering, pinned off the wall with halo illumination, is consistent with the high-quality architectural standards.

The Visual Impact Analysis includes photos and simulations of the Project area taken from various vantage points, including private residential areas and public areas. An analysis of views is provided in Section 5.1.4 of this report. The primary viewers of the proposed signage would be northbound and southbound traffic traveling on the I-5 Freeway. More residences are located east and northeast of the I-5 Freeway. The photometric studies and maps, included as Appendices C and D, depict lighting levels associated with the proposed Project as having minimal impacts on the surrounding residential community (as further detailed in Section 5.2, Biological Resources). This is due, in part, to the type of lighting proposed for the signs which is minimal, but in larger part to existing building, landscape, and parking lot lighting.

Although, the Project will not create a substantial new lighting source or potentially degrade public views, the Project proposes to keep lighting on for 1 hour after the close of individual tenants. While nighttime sign lighting is allowed, there is no demonstrable need to retain night lighting for 1 hour past the close of individual tenants, and related to the Project identification signs, for 1 hour past the close of the outlet center. Lighting of signs beyond the hours of individual tenant and center closure will result in a significant impact.
4. **Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan**

The Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan provides the following design objectives with responses as to how the proposed Project will affect or conform to these standards are included in Table 5-4 below.

### Table 5-4  Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan Consistency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Section 301 11.A – Preserve and strengthen San Clemente’s unique character as the “Spanish Village by The Sea.”</td>
<td>The Project Icon Tower is designed with a Spanish Village theme consistent with outlet center building architecture. The proposed signage materials would be of a metallic matte finish, consistent with the building’s architecture. In addition to the allowable bronze and metallic finishes, the Project includes up to four color exemptions that would be independently decided in the future by the owner and approved by City staff. The colors would be associated with nationally trademarked brands and logos for the purpose of tenant identification, as depicted on Exhibit 4-6 – Materials Board (page 42). Project signs, as shown in the photo simulations, become a dominant visual feature, minimizing the Spanish Village architectural theme. While it is acknowledged that other areas of the City contain large, colored signs, this Project has been evaluated on the basis that the City’s adopted Village by The Sea character which promotes a robust Spanish architecture and building detail, including non-obtrusive, wrought-iron bracket signs with hand crafted appearances. The proposed color exceptions are considered inconsistent with the City’s Village by the Sea theme. The resultant conflict with this architectural standard is considered a significant impact requiring a Statement of Overriding Considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Section 301 11.C – Define a consistent approach to site planning, architecture, streetscape, lighting, landscaping and other design elements to achieve visual harmony within Marblehead Coastal.</td>
<td>The proposed signage has been designed with the intent to provide outlet center and hotel identification. The locations of the proposed signs are compatible with the building architecture. For example, signage will utilize spaces within the articulated façade and between the roofline and other building features. The metal channel lettering and logos will be backlit by a halo lighting method creating a subtle contrast between the signs and walls for nighttime recognition of tenants and project identification. The lighting, however subtle, is proposed to be illuminated beyond the hours of the outlet center’s operation. The function of lighted signage is to provide wayfinding and identification, and lighting beyond hours of operation does not serve the objectives of the lighted signage. Hotel signage will not be illuminated beyond hours of operation, as the hotel maintains 24-hour operations, requiring visible daytime, as well as nighttime, signage. The proposed hours of operation for the outlet center to keep signage lighting on for one hour past the closing of each individual tenant contradicts the Specific Plan’s objective for lighting in harmony with Marblehead Coastal. Sign lighting gives the impression that the lighted tenants are open. Therefore, keeping lights on past the closure of each individual tenant would be a source of confusion and would not result in visual harmony with the rest of Marblehead Coastal. This is considered a significant impact and requires mitigation as detailed below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Section 301 11.E – Recognize the unique character, constraints, and opportunities of the Marblehead Coastal area.</td>
<td>The unique character of the site is its canyons, landforms, and Spanish Village architectural theme. The proposed signage does not affect any of the unique characteristics of the Marblehead Coastal area. The Icon Tower is considered consistent with the primary architectural theme. The Project is considered to be consistent with this guideline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan objectives were established to preserve and strengthen San Clemente’s unique character as the “Spanish Village by The Sea,” define a consistent approach to planning in visual harmony with the Marblehead Coastal development, and recognize uniqueness of the coastal area. The proposed Project upholds these objectives by proposing high-quality metal signage that will be pinned off the walls with subtle backlighting in visual harmony with the existing buildings. However, the four color exceptions provide unlimited flexibility in selecting colored signage and may result in the selection of colors which are inconsistent with the Spanish Village by the Sea architectural style required by the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. The Materials Board specifies metallic and neutral colors. The allowance of four color exceptions will draw unnecessary attention to the four signs and will clash with the rest of the color palette, potentially degrading the visual character of the site and the otherwise high-quality requirements for sign design and construction. The proposed sign color exceptions are considered to be a significant impact requiring a Statement of Overriding Considerations because unknown colors will clash with the Spanish Village by the Sea architectural style.

Based on analysis of the Visual Impact Analysis and photometric study, the lighting proposed will not create a substantial new lighting source or potentially degrade public views. The Project proposes to keep lighting on for 1 hour after the outlet center closes. The necessity for signage, and signage to be lighted at night, is consistent with the Specific Plan on the basis that it is providing wayfinding and identification. However, maintaining lit signage after the close of business is not essential for the objectives of signage, as the merchants, restaurants, and retailers would not be open for business at the time. Therefore, the Project component, including lighting signs for 1 hour past closing of the outlet center, is not consistent with the Specific Plan and is considered to be a significant impact.

5. Marblehead Coastal Design Guidelines and Standards

The proposed signage is also subject to the following guidelines and standards as identified in the Site Design Guidelines section of the Specific Plan, as described in Table 5-5 - Marblehead Coastal Design Guidelines and Standards Consistency Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guideline/Standard</th>
<th>Consistency Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3. Section 303 1.E – Project Identification</td>
<td>The Project Icon Tower is considered to be in scale with the outlet center’s primary architecture and includes elements that tie into the architecture of the primary buildings. The tower contains materials and color consistent with the primary buildings. The signs proposed on the walls, although larger than some business signs found on the customer-viewed side of the center, are in keeping with the larger scale of the existing buildings, which range in height from 28 to 40 feet with architectural features ranging from 35 to 50 feet in height. The primary Freeway viewpoints of the outlet center and hotel buildings are set at a minimum distance of 150 feet with a grade differential contributing to muted building size. The primary residential views are setback a minimum distance of 450 feet. Both views are part of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs: Projects should be identified by low monument signage to provide neighborhood identification. Such signs should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with residential buildings, walls, and other structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-5 Marblehead Coastal Design Guidelines and Standards Consistency Analysis
The proposed metallic matte finish for the signs is consistent with the building’s architecture, which incorporates the white walls, red roof, and wrought iron theme of a Spanish Village by The Sea. In addition to the allowable bronze and metallic finishes for signage, the Project includes up to four color exemptions that would be independently decided in the future by the owner and approved by City staff. The colors would be associated with nationally trademarked brands and logos for the purpose of tenant identification. The potential color schemes would not be in harmony with the City’s Village by The Sea theme. The Village by The Sea character promotes a robust Spanish architecture and building detail, including non-obtrusive, wrought-iron bracket signs with hand crafted appearances. The proposed color exceptions would contradict the Project identification sign guideline.

Chapter 3. Section 303 11.D – Commercial Development Signs: Commercial centers should be identified by a sign program with monument signage and wall signs for individual tenants. Such signs may include logos, and should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with Project buildings, walls and other structures. Due to the size and proportions of the buildings, appropriately scaled signage may require maximum sign area allowances greater than currently specified in the City’s Sign Ordinance. A specific Sign Plan accounting for all such allowances shall be provided for consideration at the time of site plan review.

Chapter 3. Section 303 11.O – Freestanding Signage: Freestanding signs shall be integrated with the overall architectural and landscape design for the commercial center.

Chapter 3. Section 303 1.D.5 – Architectural Guidelines: According to the architectural guidelines found under Section 305 II-D-5 of the Specific Plan, signs should be integrated into the architectural design of the building in a manner consistent with the intent of the City’s Sign Ordinance, as well as the architectural elements, scale, and massing of the Project.

The Marblehead Coastal Development Standards and Guidelines are included as a part of the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. Standards and Guidelines for Project identification signs, commercial development signs, freestanding signs, and architecture should be harmonious in scale, form, materials, and colors with Project.
buildings, walls and other structures. Although the size and scale of the signs are larger than most commercial signs in the area, the signs are consistent with the larger scale of the regional commercial center and hotel buildings, which is a large development with architectural features up to 50 feet in height. The size and scale of the proposed signs are appropriate.

The metal channel lettering, pinned off the wall with halo illumination is consistent with the building's architecture, which incorporates the white walls, red roof, and wrought iron theme of a Spanish Village by The Sea. However, the color exceptions reserved for owner’s discretion would not be limited to particular tenants and would thereby allow for colors inconsistent with the Marblehead Coastal Development Standards and Guidelines. The Project component including color exceptions for colors that are beyond those compatible with the City's adopted Spanish Village by The Sea theme is inconsistent with the Marblehead Coastal Development Standards and Guidelines. This is considered a significant impact requiring a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

5.1.5 Mitigation Measures

The Project proposes outlet tenant sign lighting will be turned off 1 hour past the closure of individual tenants, and Project identification sign lighting will be turned off 1 hour after the closure of the last tenant, which will give the impression that businesses are open after they are closed. Sign illumination beyond the hours of individual tenant and overall outlet operation is unnecessary and considered a significant impact, because it is inconsistent with the objectives of the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. Because the function of sign lighting is to provide wayfinding and identification after dark, lighting beyond the hours of operation will not serve to fulfill either of those functions. The following mitigation measure is proposed:

| MM AE-1 | Prior to the issuance of building permits for proposed outlet center tenant and Project identification signage, the Project Applicant shall submit plans to the Planning Division demonstrating that all proposed sign lighting is set to a timer. Sign lighting shall be turned off at the time of closure of each individual tenant consistent with the Project use permit. |

5.1.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation

The potentially significant impact resulting from the signs remaining lit for one hour after the close of individual tenants and the overall outlet center can be mitigated to a level of less than significant with the implementation of MM AE-1.

The proposed color exceptions cannot be mitigated and remain a significant impact as further detailed below.

As analyzed herein, and per Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines:

1. The proposed Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
Scenic Vistas

The closest scenic vista to the Project is located at the Knob Hill viewing point on the Rancho San Clemente Hiking Trail approximately 1 mile northeast of the Project site along the ridgeline near Calle Del Cerro and Avenida Pico. The dominant south and west views from Knob Hill are of coastal bluffs and the Pacific Ocean, with the possibility of viewing Catalina and San Clemente Islands on clear days. The dominant north and east views are of local and regional mountains. View of the Project site from Knob Hill is blocked by a hillside. Even if the view were not blocked by a hillside, the distance from the scenic vista to the Project site would make viewing the proposed signs unlikely.

Visual Corridor

The Project site has direct views from the northbound and southbound lanes of I-5 Freeway; however, the I-5 Freeway is not a designated scenic highway, and views in this area are largely of existing commercial and industrial buildings and residences. There are limited views to the Pacific Ocean in the background. The closest visual corridor is located southbound along Avenida Vista Hermosa at the I-5 Interchange, approximately one-half mile northwest of the Project site. The existing outlet center can be seen very minimally on the far left-hand side from a vehicle traveling southbound on Avenida Vista Hermosa. The northbound side of the highway includes a sidewalk for pedestrian travel. Beyond that, there is very little pedestrian access in this area of Avenida Vista Hermosa. Visual impacts due to the placement of signs on the existing outlet center buildings, on the approved but unbuilt Phase 2 of the outlet center, or on the approved but unbuilt hotel would not create a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista. Project-related aesthetics impacts to vehicles or pedestrians traveling along Avenida Vista Hermosa would be less than significant because the dominant view of the coastal bluffs and the Pacific Ocean would not be altered.

There are two major visual corridors within the Project vicinity, which include Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico. The visual corridor from Vista Hermosa is directed southwesterly toward the ocean, whereas the outlet center is located to the south of Vista Hermosa. To the extent that existing and approved but unbuilt structures are located within the periphery of the view corridor from Vista Hermosa, and signage will not block any views. Sign lighting that will occur at night may be visible from the Vista Hermosa. However, the center is currently lit with a variety of parking lot and building lights, and additional lighting from signage will not impact nighttime views from the visual corridor, because that view is not oriented at the Project site.

The visual corridor along Avenida Pico is also oriented toward the ocean and is located westerly of the outlet center, near El Camino Real. There will be no view impacts from the Avenida Pico view corridor, because the view is to the ocean, which is in the opposite direction of the outlet center and the proposed signage will not be oriented in that direction. The proposed signage would be placed on an existing outlet center, the approved but unbuilt Phase 2 of the outlet center, or
the approved but unbuilt hotel and signage would not block or interfere with views from visual corridors. The Project site is not visible from the view corridor located on Avenida Pico northeasterly of the I-5 Freeway, because a large hillside landform blocks the view.

2. The Project site is developed with a retail outlet center and accessory uses, including such things as a parking structure and surface parking lots, light standards, and trash enclosures, and will not result in substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway because there are no scenic resources within the approved development area and the I-5 Freeway, located easterly of the Project site, is not classified as a state scenic highway. All proposed signs will be located on previously approved buildings within the Project area.

3. The addition of Project signage will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings as the site is approved for retail/commercial use. The outlet center and hotel were analyzed in the Marblehead Coastal DEIR, which considered the addition of typical retail/commercial center development. The signs proposed by the Project were analyzed in a Visual Impact Analysis and the View Simulations did not present evidence of significant impact with respect to the design, balance, scale, and number of signs primarily because the visual prominence of the signs is reduced with distance and there are no public views within one-quarter mile of the Project site which would be negatively impacted by the placement of signage on existing and previously approved, unbuilt structures.

However, the Project proposes four color exceptions to the metal and dark color palette depicted on Exhibit 4-6 – Materials Board (page 42). The color exceptions, while limited to “nationally recognized brand logos” would provide a sharp contrast to the metallic and dark which currently exist on the monument signage, and those proposed for the majority of the tenant, Project identification and hotel signs. Spanish style architecture is characterized by curves and arches, smooth stucco exterior walls, terracotta roof tiles, towers, ornamental iron work and courtyards. While Spanish style architecture may include colorful decorative elements such as painted tile signs are not considered an architectural element per se.

As such, the color exceptions proposed as part of the sign program are inconsistent with the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan, which requires Spanish style architecture. This impact cannot be feasibly mitigated and is considered a significant impact requiring a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

4. The proposed sign lighting will be reverse channel halo fabrication, which will result in minimal lighting compared to other types of lighting available for wall mounted signs because the light source reflects off the wall upon which the sign is mounted. The result is that the sign appears to be surrounded by a halo of light rather than having an entire face of a sign or even individual letters directly illuminated.
While the Project signs will be visible at night when illuminated, the photometric analysis demonstrates that the sign lighting will not result in a substantial increase in ambient lighting levels. When combined with night lighting for the existing and approved but unbuilt Project components, the sign lighting will result in a nominal increase in night lighting.

The Project component including lighting signs for 1-hour past closing of individual tenants and 1 hour past the close of the outlet center is inconsistent with the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan and the Sign Ordinance, because the additional night lighting is not required for wayfinding, will create confusion as to whether businesses are open, and will result in lighting visible from nearby residences when said lighting is unnecessary. With the implementation of MM AE-1, this impact will be mitigated to less than significant.

5.1.7 Cumulative Impacts

CEQA Guidelines §15355 defines cumulative impacts as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” Cumulative impacts are the direct and indirect effects of a proposed Project that, when considered alone, would not be deemed a substantial impact, but when considered in addition to the impacts of related projects in the area, would be considered potentially significant. “Related projects” refers to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects, which would have similar impacts to the Proposed Project.

Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan contemplated development for the Marblehead coastal area, including the Project site. The proposed signs primarily face east and northeast toward the I-5 Freeway and residences located to the east and northeast of the I-5 Freeway. The regional commercial center is unique to the area, and no other freeway-oriented signs currently exist or are proposed in the Project vicinity, located along the I-5 Freeway between Avenida Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico. As analyzed in this report and depicted in the photometric study, the lighting that the proposed signs will contribute will be negligible as compared to the existing landscape and parking lot lighting. The Project will not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

5.1.8 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

1. Short-Term

   No short-term impacts are anticipated to occur.

2. Long-Term

   The long-term unavoidable adverse Project impacts are associated with the operation of lighted signage and color exceptions retained for use at the discretion of the owner. The purpose of illuminated signs is to extend the signs’ primary function of wayfinding and Project identity into the evening and night. However, once the tenants have closed, the lighted signs no longer serve their primary function and contribute to light pollution as an
unnecessary light source, albeit at a minimum. The operation of illuminated signage past the outlet center’s hours of operation is not consistent with various components of the City’s General Plan, the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan, and Design Standards and Guidelines, as detailed in Section 5.1.4 of this report, and will be mitigated to a less than significant level with the implementation of MM AE-1.

The four-color exceptions reserved for use at owner’s discretion would not be limited and allows for the use of colors that would be considered inconsistent with the established Spanish Colonial Revival architecture. The Sign Design Guidelines specify the appropriate design of signage pin mounted letters with metal finish consistent with the architectural character of the building. The Project color exception component of the Project is not compatible with the City’s adopted Spanish Village by The Sea theme. This impact cannot be feasibly mitigated and is considered a long-term unavoidable adverse impact.
5.2 Biological Resources

This section analyzes the potential biological resources impacts associated with the proposed Project. Information in this section is based on the Biological Resources Impact Analysis Report (Biological Report) prepared by Merkel & Associates, Inc. dated February 7, 2017 (Appendix H) and the Operational Photometric Assessment (Photometric Assessment) prepared by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc. dated January 17, 2017 (Appendix C). The Photometric Assessment analysis was included in more detail in Section 5.1, Aesthetics (beginning on page 59) herein.

The scope of the Biological Report includes existing conditions of the approximately 60.4-acre Project site, all methods employed regarding general and focused biological surveys, documentation of botanical and wildlife resources, and an analysis of impacts to biological resources. Methods of the study include a review of relevant literature and data pertaining to the Project area, review of aerial photography, and field surveys. Photographs of the Project study area were taken to record the biological resources present, and data collected was digitized into current GIS Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) software platforms. The Biological Report is consistent with accepted scientific and technical standards and survey guidelines requirements of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS), the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), the California Native Plant Society (CNPS), and other applicable agencies and organizations.

The Biological Report also identifies and evaluates impacts to biological resources associated with the proposed Project in the context of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), applicable state and federal regulations, and the Orange County Southern Subregion Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP).

The Photometric Assessment examined three scenarios for the analysis:

- Baseline Conditions - the condition at the Project site absent the proposed 36 illuminated freeway-oriented signs
- Project Condition - the effect of the 36 illuminated signs alone
- Cumulative Condition - the combination of the baseline and Project conditions acting together

Discussion of lighting in this section is limited to potential impacts to biological resources due to the addition of 36 illuminated freeway-oriented signs.

5.2.1 Existing Conditions

An isolated remnant canyon is located partially within the study area directly adjacent to the northern parking lot of the outlet center and to the south of the hotel portion of the site. The canyon was previously impacted and revegetated with native habitat as evidenced by an irrigation system running throughout the slopes of the canyon area. The Project is located in Subarea 4 of the Orange County Southern Subregion HCP, but the Project site specifically is located outside any reserve or lands protected under the HCP. The adjacent canyon located in...
the northwestern portion of the study area is designated as Supplemental Open Space in the HCP. No USFWS-designated critical habitat for any listed species is located within the Project area.

The Project site has night lighting consistent with a developed outlet center, restaurants, and a parking lot. Existing signage lighting is generally internal to the outlet center with no freeway-oriented lighted signage under the existing condition. Additional lighting will result from construction of the approved but as yet unbuilt hotel. A complete analysis of lighting impacts generally is included in Section 5.1, Aesthetics (beginning on page 59) herein.

5.2.2 Regulatory Setting

The proposed Project is subject to state and federal regulations associated with a number of regulatory programs. These programs often overlap and were developed to protect natural resources, including: state- and federally listed plants and animals; aquatic resources including rivers and creeks, ephemeral streambeds, wetlands, and areas of riparian habitat; other special-status species that are not listed as threatened or endangered by the state or federal governments; and other special-status vegetation communities.

1. State of California Endangered Species Act

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) defines endangered species as “a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant that is in serious danger of becoming extinct throughout all, or a significant portion, of its range due to one or more causes including loss of habitat, change in habitat, overexploitation, predation, competition, or disease.” The state defines a threatened species as “a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile or plant that, although not presently threatened with extinction, is likely to become an endangered species in the foreseeable future in the absence of the special protection and management efforts required by this chapter. Any animal determined by the commission as rare on or before January 1, 1985 is a threatened species.”

Candidate species are defined as “a native species or subspecies of a bird, mammal, fish, amphibian, reptile, or plant that the commission has formally noticed as being under review by the department for addition to either the list of endangered species or the list of threatened species, or a species for which the commission has published a notice of proposed regulation to add the species to either list.” Candidate species may be afforded temporary protection as though they were already listed as threatened or endangered at the discretion of the Fish and Game Commission. Unlike the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA), CESA does not list invertebrate species.

Article 3, Sections 2080-2085 of the CESA addresses the taking of threatened, endangered or candidate species by stating "No person shall import into this state, export out of this state, or take, possess, purchase or sell within this state any species, or any part or product thereof, that the commission determines to be an endangered species or a threatened species, or attempt any of these acts except as otherwise provided.” Under CESA, “take” is defined as “hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill or attempt to hunt, pursue, catch, capture or kill.” Sections
1901 and 1913 of the California Fish and Game Code provide that notification is required prior to disturbance.

2. **Federal Endangered Species Act**

The Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) of 1973 defines an endangered species as “any species that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.” Under provisions of Section 9(a)(1)(B) of the FESA, it is unlawful to “take” any listed species. “Take” is defined as “... harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct.” USFWS has interpreted the terms “harm” and “harass” to include certain types of habitat modification that result in injury to, or death of species as forms of “take.” When a property owner seeks permission from a federal agency for an action that could affect a federally listed plant and animal species, the property owner and the agency are required to consult with USFWS, which makes determinations about “take” on a case-by-case basis.

3. **Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) makes it illegal for anyone to “take, possess, import, export, transport, sell, purchase, barter or offer for sale, purchase, or barter, any migratory bird, or the parts, nests, or eggs of such a bird except under the terms of a valid permit issued pursuant to Federal regulations.” Applied to development projects, the MBTA prohibits the impact to the active nests of birds protected by the MBTA. The definition for “take” as identified under the MBTA is not synonymous with “take” as defined under the FESA. The MBTA definition lacks a “harm and harassment” clause comparable to the FESA definition. Thus, the MBTA authority does not extend to activities beyond the nests, eggs, feathers, or specific bird parts (i.e., activities or habitat modification in the vicinity of nesting birds that do not result in “take” as defined under the MBTA are not prohibited).

4. **California Fish and Game Code**

The California Fish and Game Code contains sections (3503, 3503.5 and 3513) that are applied to nesting birds. Section 3503 states that “it is unlawful to take, possess or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation made pursuant thereto.” Section 3505.3 more specifically applies to birds of prey and states that it is unlawful to take, possess or destroy any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds-of-prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto.” Section 3513 states: “It is unlawful to take or possess any migratory nongame bird as designated in the MBTA or any part of such migratory nongame bird except as provided by rules and regulations adopted by the Secretary of the Interior under provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.” Similar to the MBTA provisions applied to development projects, the Fish and Game Code sections prohibit the impact to active nests.
5. **California Department of Fish and Wildlife**

Pursuant to Division 2, Chapter 6, Sections 1600-1603 of the California Fish and Game Code, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) regulates all diversions, obstructions, or changes to the natural flow or bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake, which supports fish or wildlife.

CDFW defines a “stream” (including creeks and rivers) as “a body of water that flows at least periodically or intermittently through a bed or channel having banks and supports fish or other aquatic life. This includes watercourses having surface or subsurface flow that supports or has supported riparian vegetation.” CDFW definition of “lake” includes “natural lakes or man-made reservoirs.”

6. **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15380**

CEQA requires evaluation of a project’s impacts on biological resources and provides guidelines and thresholds for use by lead agencies to evaluate the significance of proposed impacts. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15380 provides protection for non-listed species that could potentially meet the criteria for state listing. CDFW recognizes that plants on Lists 1A, 1B or 2 of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants in California may meet the criteria for listing and should be considered under CEQA. CDFW also recommends protection of plants which are regionally important (locally rare species, disjunct populations of more common plants or plants on the CNPS Lists 3 or 4).

5.2.3 **Thresholds of Significance**

Environmental impacts regarding biological resources are assessed using impact significance threshold criteria, which reflect the policy statement contained in CEQA, *California Public Resources Code §21001(c).* Accordingly, the State of California legislature has established it to be the policy of the State of California:

Prevent the elimination of fish or wildlife species due to man’s activities, ensure that fish and wildlife populations do not drop below self-perpetuating levels and preserve for future generations representations of all plant and animal communities...

The thresholds of significance in this SEIR for evaluating Project impacts on biological resources utilized by the City of San Clemente are based on CEQA Appendix G in the CEQA Guidelines. The Project would result in a significant impact if it would:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal
pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

5.2.4 Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation

1. Methodology

Photometric Analysis

A photometric analysis of potential effects of the freeway-facing signs on the biological resources on-site was performed by Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc. (ISE). The ISE LightMap v3.2 computer model was used and was based on technical information for the proposed signage. ISE then included the proposed increase in lighting conditions in foot-candles (FC) based on the difference between the modeled ambient/baseline photometric data and the cumulative photometric data.

General Biological Survey

A general biological survey was conducted by a qualified biologist within the study area, which included a buffer area of approximately 1,000 feet from the proposed freeway-oriented signage, including an area directly across the I-5 Freeway to the northeast. The large buffer area ensured that the surrounding areas where any potential changes to the existing lighting could occur were represented. The off-site area across the I-5 Freeway was surveyed visually with the aid of binoculars from the Project site. The built-out parking lot and shopping center areas were not buffered as extensively, because no potential biological resources occur in these areas.

Existing vegetation types were delineated onto a 1” = 100’ scale color aerial photograph. Vegetation types were classified according to the Holland (1986) code classification system as modified by Oberbauer (2008). A list of detectable flora and fauna species was recorded in a field notebook, with plant identifications either resolved in the field or determined through verification of voucher specimens. Wildlife species were determined through direct observation, aided by binoculars, identification of songs, call notes, and alarm calls, or by detection of signs (e.g., burrows, tracks, scat). Directed searches for sensitive species with a potential to occur on-site were conducted within the study area. A raptor nesting survey was conducted to determine the presence/location of any active nests.

Photographs of the study area were taken to record biological resources present, and data collected from the survey were digitized into current Geographical Information System (GIS) Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) software platforms.
Biological inventories are generally subject to various survey limitations. The biological survey conducted for the Project was performed during summer daylight hours. Therefore, some potential breeding, wintering species or nocturnal species may not have been detected. However, based on the developed and/or disturbed condition of the site, the surveys conducted were sufficient to obtain a thorough review of the biological resources present on the Project site.

2. **Project Night Lighting**

As described above, a photometric analysis was performed to analyze potential impacts from the 36 freeway-oriented signs by determining the baseline night lighting with an increase in the lighting condition due to the proposed signage. Analysis of comparative illumination measures is provided in Table 5-6 below to analyze potential increases in lighting due to the Project night lighting condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outdoor Condition</th>
<th>Average Illumination in Foot-Candles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overcast Day</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusk</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twilight</td>
<td>1.0 - 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full moon</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter moon</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New moon</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcast night</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ambient/baseline night light levels obtained within the outlet center and for surrounding areas range from approximately 162 foot-candles (FC) closest to the outlet center to 107 FC within the northern parking lot. Lower levels between approximately 20 FC and 7 FC were detected within the adjacent canyon north of the outlet center/south of the planned hotel. As noted herein, a complete analysis of lighting and glare impacts is included in Section 5.1, Aesthetics (beginning on page 59). Analysis within this section is limited to potential impacts of lighting on biological resources.

3. **Biological Resources**

Biological resources analysis consists of flora (vegetation) and fauna (animal) species as detected and observed during the biological resources survey conducted on August 15, 2016. Species listed as endangered or threatened under the FESA and the CESA, species designated as California Special Concern species or Fully Protected species by the CDFW or species designated as Covered Species in the Orange County Southern Subregion HCP are considered “sensitive.” Species considered rare by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) or as Special Plants or Animals in the CNDDB may be considered “sensitive” if they meet the CEQA Guidelines §15380 (Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 20) definition for “endangered, rare or threatened species.” Exhibit 5-70 depicts the location of the biological resources identified herein and also shows the results of the lighting analysis.
a. **Botanical Resources – Flora**

The biological survey identified seven vegetation types including conserved and non-conserved vegetation communities as defined by the Orange County Southern Subregion HCP. While the Project site is developed, the surrounding areas within the study area include remnants of native habitat and/or naturalized vegetation. The Biological Report, Appendix 1 (Appendix H herein) includes a complete list of the floral species observed. The following table identifies habitats/vegetation communities which are detailed herein.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation Type</th>
<th>Holland/Oberbauer Code</th>
<th>HCP Habitat Type</th>
<th>Total Area (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern willow scrub</td>
<td>63320</td>
<td>Conserved</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mule fat scrub</td>
<td>63310</td>
<td>Conserved</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diegan coastal sage scrub-revegetated</td>
<td>32500</td>
<td>Conserved</td>
<td>10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus woodland</td>
<td>79100</td>
<td>Non-conserved</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native vegetation</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>Non-conserved</td>
<td>7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed land</td>
<td>11300</td>
<td>Non-conserved</td>
<td>85.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/developed</td>
<td>11100</td>
<td>Non-conserved</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>113.01</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Southern Willow Scrub**

A small patch of southern willow scrub habitat occurs within the bottom of the adjacent canyon along an unnamed drainage. The habitat predominantly consists of arroyo willow, Goodding's black willow, and narrow-leaved willow with inclusions of mule fat. Due to the surrounding urban development and lack of connectivity with other larger areas of riparian habitat and intact habitat structure, the southern willow habitat contains relatively low to moderate habitat values. Anna's hummingbird and California towhee are common bird species observed in this habitat. However, the existing habitat values are low for urban-tolerant birds. Potential mammals include common species such as raccoon, opossum, striped skunk, and coyote. Potential reptiles and amphibians include common species such as gopher snake and Pacific tree frog.
Figure 5-70 – Candidate Key View Simulations
2. **Mule Fat Scrub**

A relatively small patch of mule fat scrub was located adjacent to the southern willow scrub habitat. This habitat is almost entirely mule fat scrub and likely functions as a component of the willow scrub habitat. Similarly, this habitat possesses relatively low values due to the small size, lack of connectivity, and lack of diversity of structure.

3. **Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub-Revegetated**

Diegan coastal sage scrub was previously impacted by surrounding development and planted as part of a revegetation effort. The revegetated area is located on the southeast- and northwest-facing slopes flanking the outlet center parking lots. This relatively open habitat is dominated by California sagebrush with inclusions of coastal California buckwheat and coyote brush. Other species such as laurel sumac, lemonade berry, and white sage also are present, but sparsely distributed.

Due to the isolated configuration, revegetated habitat on manufactured slopes, surrounding urban development, and remaining human disturbance in the form of landscape crews maintaining the sprinkler system and removing weeds, the Diegan coastal sage scrub possesses a low habitat value. However, the predominant native plant species composition provides wildlife habitat. Common and urban-tolerant bird species were observed during the biological survey.

Diegan coastal sage scrub is considered suitable nesting habitat for the federally threatened coastal California gnatcatcher. The gnatcatcher was detected during the recent survey as further discussed below as Sensitive Fauna. Potential additional mammals are the same common species that could occur in the southern willow scrub habitat (coyote and skunk). Potential common reptiles and amphibians present include the San Diego alligator lizard and garden slender salamander.

4. **Eucalyptus Woodland**

The eucalyptus woodland is a small strip of habitat located north of the freeway and adjacent to the residential development. The non-native habitat consists almost entirely of eucalyptus trees that are moderately disturbed due to the proximity to residential development. The non-native species composition may only support common bird species. The survey did not reveal active raptor nests or remnants of nests, and the area is not likely suitable for raptor nesting due to the open canopy in many of the trees.

5. **Non-Native Vegetation**

Non-native vegetation habitat occurs on either side of the freeway in the form of landscaping on manufactured slopes for the purpose of erosion control. The vegetation consists almost entirely of cyclops acacia and freeway ice plant with low wildlife value. The vegetation likely only supports foraging value for common bird and butterfly species.
6. Disturbed and Urban/Developed Lands

Patches of bare ground between the eucalyptus woodland and non-native vegetation east of the I-5 Freeway were mapped as disturbed habitat with little to no wildlife value due to its location. The areas mapped as urban/developed lands include the outlet center and surrounding parking lots, access roads, the already graded portions of the site for future development, the I-5 Freeway, and residential homes to the east of the I-5 Freeway.

b. Zoological Resources – Fauna

A total of eight faunal species were observed and/or detected in the Project study area during the biological survey. The majority consist of species that are common and widespread, typically occurring within an urban setting. However, three sensitive fauna species were detected and/or observed within the adjacent canyon. The Biological Report includes, as Appendix 2, a complete list of fauna species observed during the surveys.

1. Sensitive Fauna

As noted, the sensitive fauna species were observed or detected only in the adjacent canyon in the northern portion of the study area. The species included coastal California gnatcatcher (federally listed threatened, CDFW Species of Special Concern, CNDDB Special Animal, South Orange County Covered Species), yellow warbler (California Species of Special Concern, CNDDB Special Animal), and Nuttall's woodpecker (CNDDB Special Animal).

One coastal California gnatcatcher was heard in the Diegan coastal sage scrub in the adjacent canyon. As noted in the Biological Report, the entire canyon has known records for coastal California gnatcatcher (USFWS 2016). Individual yellow warbler and Nuttall’s woodpecker were either observed and/or heard in the southern willow scrub habitat also within the canyon. Appendix 3 of the Biological Report (Appendix H herein) provides a list of the sensitive wildlife species identified during the surveys or evaluated for the potential to occur on-site based on suitable habitat.

2. Wildlife Corridors

The Biological Report states that wildlife corridors play an important role in maintaining population viability and preserving biological diversity. Fragmented habitats support significantly lower numbers of species and increase the likelihood of extinction for species restricted to small areas. The remnant canyon located in the northern portion of the study area has been previously disturbed and subsequently revegetated. The canyon is isolated and offers no connectivity to large contiguous open habitats. Only the adjacent canyon in the northwestern portion of the study area supports the topography and wildlife habitat that could provide coverage, foraging and breeding opportunities to a variety of common species and a limited number of sensitive bird species.
5.2.5 Impact Analysis

Impacts can be considered either direct or indirect. Direct impacts are those that involve the loss, modification, or disturbance of plant communities, which directly affects the flora and fauna of those habitats. Direct impacts also include the destruction of individual plants or animals, which may also directly affect regional population numbers of a species or result in the physical isolation of populations thereby reducing genetic diversity and population stability. CEQA Guidelines §15358 defines a *direct impact* or primary effect as “effects which are caused by the project and occur at the same time and place” that can produce a temporary or permanent biologically significant “physical change” in the environment.

Indirect (or secondary) impacts are those that are reasonably foreseeable and caused by a project, but occur at a different time or place. Indirect impacts can occur at the urban/wildland interface of projects, to biological resources located downstream from projects and other off-site areas where the effects of the project may be experienced by plants and wildlife. Examples include increases in ambient levels of noise or light, predation by domestic pets, competition with exotic plants and animals, introduction of toxics, including pesticides, and other human disturbances such as hiking, off-road vehicle use, and unauthorized dumping. Indirect effects may be both short-term and long-term. CEQA Guidelines §15358 defines an *indirect impact* or secondary effect as “effects which are caused by the project and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable” that can produce a temporary or permanent biologically significant, “physical change” in the environment.

1. Direct Impacts
   a. Vegetation Community Direct Impacts

   Because the Project does not propose any ground disturbance or habitat impacts, no focused rare plant surveys were conducted. However, based on the field survey, no sensitive flora species have at least a moderate potential to occur largely due to a lack of suitable habitat and/or soils. Because the proposed Project is the installation of signage on existing walls or towers associated with an already built outlet center, and an approved but unbuilt hotel on previously graded portions of the site, no vegetation community impacts will occur with implementation of the proposed Project.

   b. Sensitive Species Direct Impacts

   The Biological Report states that “No sensitive flora species were detected onsite.” The three sensitive fauna species observed or detected only in the adjacent canyon in the northern portion of the study area will not be impacted, because no development or grading will occur in the canyon. No other potential sensitive faunal species are anticipated to have at least a moderate potential to occur within the Project site.

   The installation of lighted signs on existing walls or towers on developed or previously graded portions of the site will occur at least 200 feet from the nearest potentially suitable habitat as determined in the field survey and Biological Report. Therefore, no direct impacts to sensitive species would occur with implementation of the proposed Project.
c. **Jurisdictional Resource Direct Impacts**

The southern willow scrub and mule fat scrub in the adjacent canyon are considered jurisdictional resources. However, they would not be directly impacted by the proposed Project, because no development or disturbance will occur in the canyon. Therefore, no significant direct impacts will occur to jurisdictional resources.

d. **Wildlife Corridor Direct Impacts**

Potential impacts to wildlife corridors are less than significant, because due to the location of the Project within an urban area, there is no viable linkage with other larger areas of native habitats. The adjacent canyon is not expected to provide a regional linkage for maintaining population viability and preserving biological diversity for a wide range of wildlife, including large mammals with large home ranges. Therefore, the canyon does not function as a regional wildlife corridor and no significant direct impacts will occur with Project implementation.

2. **Indirect Impacts**

a. **Night Lighting Impacts**

The canyon in the northwestern portion of the study area, which is outside the Project site, could be impacted by an increase in night lighting within the sensitive habitat area that supports sensitive species. Coastal California gnatcatchers occupy this area. Analysis in the Biological Report focused on the proposed lighting on the northern edge of the outlet center, which faces the adjacent canyon to the north, and along the southern edge of the planned hotel, which faces the adjacent canyon to the south.

Based on the ISE photometric data, the Project site ambient/baseline night light condition in the adjacent canyon ranges from 20.56 FC at the top of slope closest to the parking lot to 6.69 FC along the northern edge of the canyon farthest from the parking lot and outlet stores. Typical natural darkness in undeveloped areas ranges in orders of magnitude dimmer than 0.1 lux (0.009 FC). However, the Project site is in a nearly built-out urban setting where ambient night lighting conditions are typically greater than for an undeveloped area. Existing lighting on the Project site consists of parking lot lighting, security lighting, and architectural lighting. Section 5.1, Aesthetics (beginning on page 59), provides additional information based on the photometric data analysis.

When the ambient/baseline lighting is compared to the cumulative lighting condition in the adjacent canyon, there is little or no difference (e.g., 0.00-0.49 FC) within the canyon, which is currently exposed to a certain level of night lighting. Therefore, the adjacent canyon that supports gnatcatcher habitat would not be exposed to a substantial increase or change in artificial night lighting from the proposed Project.

As detailed in the Operational Photometric Assessment for the Project, which is more fully detailed in Section 5.1, Aesthetics (beginning on page 59), off-site levels under full lighting would average approximately 10 to 20 FC along the frontage of the I-5 Freeway with levels decreasing to between 1.0 to 5.0 FC in adjacent residential and commercial
areas. The analysis concludes that adjacent properties would have no discernable incremental increases in lighting due to the Project.

There are no significance thresholds regarding increases in artificial lighting on sensitive species. However, it is not expected that the minimal proposed increase in lighting within gnatcatcher habitat would substantially reduce the number, restrict the range of, or adversely affect the gnatcatcher. Lighting into sensitive habitat is not expected to result in significant impacts under CEQA. The Project will not increase the lighting currently on the site by significant amounts.

3. CEQA Impacts

As detailed herein, the addition of 36 freeway-oriented signs will not result in significant impacts to biological resources. The proposed Project will not:

   a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS.

   The Project will not include grading, demolition, or construction that would result in a direct impact to biological resources identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status in any applicable plan or regulation. The sign placement will occur on existing buildings, and the Icon Tower will be erected on previously disturbed ground adjacent to the existing buildings. Habitat located in the adjacent canyon will not be disturbed by Project implementation. The canyon is sufficiently distant from the additional lighting produced by the new signs that no impact will occur.

   b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS.

   No grading or construction on land that has not previously been disturbed will occur. No sensitive natural community or riparian habitat exists on the Project site, because the outlet center has been constructed and the unbuilt portions of the outlet center have been graded to prepare for construction of the buildings. Asphalt parking lots on three sides of the existing buildings preclude the presence of any habitat.

   c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means.

   No wetlands exist on the Project site, which has been graded and partially built with the outlet center. The approved Phase 2 of the outlet center and the approved but unbuilt hotel component will not disturb wetlands, because the site has been graded. No grading will occur in the remnant canyon adjacent to the northern parking lot of the outlet center and south of the hotel site.
5.2.6 Mitigation Measures

The proposed Project will not adversely affect or have a significant impact, either directly or indirectly, on biological resources. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required or proposed.

5.2.7 Level of Significance after Mitigation

As identified in the Biological Report, there will be no impacts to any listed special status vegetation communities, special status animals, sensitive flora species, sensitive fauna species, or wildlife corridors.

5.2.8 Cumulative Impacts

CEQA Guidelines §15355 defines cumulative impacts as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other effects."
environmental impacts.” Cumulative impacts are the direct and indirect effects of a proposed Project that, when considered alone, would not be deemed a substantial impact, but when considered in addition to the impacts of related projects in the area, would be considered potentially significant. “Related projects” refers to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects, which would have similar impacts to the Proposed Project.

The Marblehead EIR fully considered cumulative impacts related to the development of the entire Marblehead Coastal project which included residential and commercial components. The surrounding area is either under development or developed and will not contribute to biological resources impacts in the area.

The Orange County Southern Subregion HCP was designed to compensate for the loss of biological resources throughout the region. Therefore, projects that conform to the HCP would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact for biological resources adequately covered by the program. Even though the Project is within Subarea 4 of the Orange County Southern Subregion HCP, because the Project has been analyzed as having no direct or indirect impacts to biological resources, the Project will not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.

5.2.9 **Unavoidable Adverse Impacts**

No impacts to Biological Resources have been identified with implementation of the proposed Project. Therefore, there are no unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the Project as proposed.
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5.3 Land Use and Planning

This section analyzes the potential land use and planning impacts associated with the proposed Project. Information and analysis in this section are based on goals and policies in the City of San Clemente General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, the Marblehead Specific Plan, and the Marblehead Development Agreement. The site is in southern Orange County, within the City of San Clemente as depicted on Exhibit 2-1 (page 12).

5.3.1 Existing Conditions

1. Regional Setting
   
The Project site is located in San Clemente in south Orange County adjacent to the San Diego County boundary. The Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base lies to the east and south within San Diego County. The Project site is just inland of the Pacific Ocean adjacent to the I-5 (San Diego) Freeway at approximately mid-point of the City’s north/south boundaries. The cities of Dana Point and San Juan Capistrano lie to the north of San Clemente.

2. On-Site Land Uses
   
The Project site is part of a larger parcel known as the Marblehead Coastal Development area. The development approved in 1998 included 436 residential dwelling units and a 750,000-square-foot regional-serving commercial center. To date, a portion of the residential component has been developed, and Phase 1 of the retail/commercial component has been developed including the Outlets at San Clemente, consisting of retail stores, fast-food restaurants, and sit down restaurants that are built and operational. The hotel, which is Phase 2 of the retail/commercial component, is approved but unbuilt.

3. Surrounding Land Uses
   
The surrounding uses include residential to the east across the I-5 Freeway (Faire Harbour Condominiums and Highland Light) and north (Sea Summit), industrial to the south, and the Pacific Ocean with a line of existing oceanside residential development to the west (Exhibit 2-2 – Vicinity Map (page 13). The residential component of the Marblehead Coastal Development is between the Project site and the ocean to the west. The I-5 Freeway is immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of the Project site.

5.3.2 Regulatory Setting

1. City of San Clemente General Plan
   
The proposed Project is located within the City of San Clemente and is, therefore, under the regulatory jurisdiction of the City. The San Clemente General Plan (General Plan) includes elements addressing Land Use, Urban Design, Historical Preservation, Economic Development, Mobility/Streets, Beaches/Parks/Recreation, Natural Resources, Safety, Public Services/Facilities, Growth Management, Coastal, and Governance. The current General Plan
was adopted in 2014 and last updated in 2016. The Land Use Element of the General Plan describes objectives, policies, and land use patterns for the City.

The General Plan land use designation for the Project site is Regional Commercial. This designation permits a wide range of uses, including general retail commercial, factory outlet stores, promotional and specialty retail, restaurants, entertainment, professional offices, financial institutions, lodging, and similar regional-serving uses.

2. **City of San Clemente Zoning Ordinance**

   The Zoning Ordinance implements the City’s General Plan by providing regulations regarding permitted land uses, development standards, and the development entitlement process for land within the City boundaries. The Specific Plans approved by the City are incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance by reference. The Project site is zoned Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan - RC-1 within the City’s zoning designations. RC-1 is the designation for Regional Commercial and is consistent with the City’s General Plan designation of Regional Commercial. The Zoning Map is included as Exhibit 5-71.

   At the time the Marblehead development was approved in 1998, the City’s Zoning Code provided for a Sign Exception Permit that would allow modifications to the existing signage regulations. A Zoning Code Amendment in 2016 removed the Sign Exception Permit provision. However, as discussed herein, the Project Development Agreement provides that regulations in effect at the time the Development Agreement is approved are applicable to the development of the Project. Therefore, consistency is analyzed herein based on the Zoning Code regulations in place at the time the Development Agreement was approved.

3. **Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan**

   A Specific Plan is a tool for the systematic implementation of the General Plan. It effectively establishes a link between implementing policies of the General Plan and the individual development proposals in a defined area. A Specific Plan may be as general as setting forth broad policy concepts or as detailed as providing direction to every facet of development from the type, location, and intensity of uses to the design and capacity of infrastructure; from the resources used to finance public improvements to the design guidelines of a subdivision.

   The Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan was prepared in conformance with *California Government Code* §65450, which permits local jurisdictions to prepare specific plans for the systematic implementation of the General Plan. It contains the regulations, conditions, and programs necessary for implementation of the City’s General Plan as applicable to the property. The Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan was adopted by the City on August 5, 1998 and amended on August 21, 2007.
Exhibit 5-71  – Zoning Map
4. Marblehead Coastal Development Agreement

*California Government Code §65864, et seq.* authorizes cities to enter into development agreements with any person having a legal or equitable interest in property for the development of the property. A Development Agreement for the Marblehead Coastal property was entered into on October 2, 1998 between the City of San Clemente and the Project applicant/developer. Section 2.1 of the Development Agreement states that the term of the agreement is twenty years from the Effective Date, unless extended by the parties.

The Development Agreement conveys a vested right to the developer to develop the Marblehead residential and commercial areas in accordance with standards in place at the time of its approval unless otherwise specified within the Development Agreement. Specifically, the Development Agreement states in Section 3 - Development of the Property:

3.1 **General** - other than as expressly set forth in this Agreement, the terms and conditions of development applicable to the Property, including but not limited to the permitted uses of the Property, the density and intensity of use, maximum height and size of proposed buildings, and provisions for reservation and dedication of land for public purposes and provisions for the construction and installation of public improvements shall be those set forth in the Specific Plan and all other ordinances, laws, statutes, rules, regulations and official policies governing development that may apply to the Property from time to time. To the maximum extent permitted by law, in the event of any conflict between the express provisions of this agreement, on the one hand, and the Specific Plan or other ordinances, laws, statutes, rules, regulations or official policies governing development that may apply to the Property from time to time, on the other hand, the provisions of this Agreement shall prevail.

5.3.3 Thresholds of Significance

For purposes of this SEIR, the CEQA thresholds of significance for evaluation of Project impacts related to Land Use and Planning are based on suggested criteria from the California Environmental Quality Act Environmental Checklist found in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. The Project would result in a significant impact if it would:

a) Physically divide an established community
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect
c) Conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

5.3.4 Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation

Implementation of the proposed Project will not alter existing on-site land use designations or development limits. The Project site is designated Regional Commercial in the General Plan and proposes the modification of an existing approved sign program to increase the signage
from 10 to a total of 32 freeway-oriented signs at the Outlets at San Clemente. The outlet center currently has 16 temporary tenant identification signs, which have been permitted on a temporary, time-certain basis.

The original Marblehead EIR evaluated a fully operational, approximately 750,000-square-foot regional commercial center. The approved signage included three freeway-oriented Icon Tower monuments. Although the current Project includes a total of 32 freeway-oriented signs, only one freestanding monument structure is proposed, with the remaining signage wall-mounted on the building location of the specific tenant. No change to land use designations is requested, and the proposed Project signage is consistent with the use permitted by the General Plan, the Specific Plan, and the Development Agreement.

1. **Consistency with the City of San Clemente General Plan**

   **Land Use Element**

   The land use designation of Regional Commercial allows general retail, commercial, factory outlet stores, promotional and specialty retail, restaurants, entertainment, professional offices, financial institutions, lodging, and similar regional-serving uses. The proposed Project does not include any change in land use designations, density, or development standards that would be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the Land Use Element. Policies within the Land Use Element that could apply to the proposed Project include:

   **LU-2.02 - Identification of Commercial Areas.** We require distinctive entry and informational signage, street trees, street furniture, pedestrian-scaled lighting and other improvements to uniquely identify individual commercial districts including: the Downtown Core, North Beach, South El Camino Real, Pico Plaza, Los Molinos, Camino de los Mares, Avenida Pico, Marblehead Coastal, Shorecliffs and “La Pata” commercial district, which includes Talega, Plaza Pacifica and the commercial properties at the intersection of Avenida La Pata and Avenida Vista Hermosa.

   The Outlets at San Clemente, including the approved but unbuilt Phase 2 and hotel, are consistent with Policy 2.02 in that the signage approved in the Marblehead EIR and the signage proposed herein will provide information, direction, and wayfinding to customers/visitors accessing the Project from the I-5 Freeway. The signs will identify the individual shops with wall signage that will be visible from the I-5 Freeway. The Icon Tower will identify major tenants and serve as an identifying anchor showing the location of the retail center from a greater distance than the wall signage. All signage will be scaled appropriately for coverage within the space provided so as to provide uniformity and conformity throughout while uniquely identifying the retail center and hotel as a commercial district. The Project is consistent with this policy.

   **LU-2.03 - Neighborhood Compatibility.** We require that commercial projects abutting residential neighborhoods be designed and operated to protect
residents from the effects of noise, light, odors, vibration, traffic, parking, and other operational impacts.

The nearest residential development with views of the freeway-oriented signage is located across the I-5 Freeway. The Outlets at San Clemente, including the approved but unbuilt Phase 2 and hotel, will provide signage lighting that is compatible with City standards and that will protect adjacent development as well as nearby development from adverse effects. The signage proposed will not emit noise, odors or vibration as they are either typical wall-mounted signs or mounted on the Icon Tower. The signs will enhance wayfinding for local and freeway traffic. The signs will be halo illuminated and the effects of the type of lighting utilized will be minimal and will be extinguished one hour after close of business for the retail shops. A photometric analysis prepared for the Project compared light levels for the existing condition with those projected at Project buildout. The computer model output showed zero foot-candle lighting extending off-site. The proposed back lighting will not result in light spill or glare that will impact adjacent development as detailed in Section 5.1, Aesthetics (beginning on page 59), which further analyzes the impacts of the proposed signage program. The proposed Project is consistent with this policy.

**Mobility/Complete Streets Element**

This Element focuses on moving people by multiple transportation modes through human and motorized means. Because traffic impacts generated by proposed development can impact a City's ability to achieve transportation goals, and a stated goal is to make commercial districts more functional and enjoyable, the following policy is indirectly applicable to the proposed Project.

**M-1.05 - Development project impacts.** We require development projects to analyze potential off-site traffic impacts and related environmental impacts through the CEQA process and to mitigate adverse impacts to less than significant levels.

The original Marblehead EIR evaluated and analyzed traffic impacts related to the development consisting of a residential and retail/commercial component. Since the certification of that EIR, EIR Addendums 1 through 5 have been approved, reducing the development size of the residential and retail components. Mitigation was provided to reduce traffic impacts identified as significant. The proposed Project, which consists of freeway-oriented signage, will not increase traffic either on-site or off-site beyond what was originally anticipated and analyzed for a fully operational retail center and hotel. The freeway-oriented signage will benefit the center and the City by assisting shoppers and hotel guests in locating and accessing their destinations, thereby ensuring the success of the development. The proposed Project will provide signage that will also more safely and effectively direct vehicles to the Project site. Therefore, the Project is consistent with this policy.
Urban Design Element

The focus of this Element is on the physical and design characteristics of human-made urban features that unify San Clemente. The primary goal of the Element is to create and enhance a “high-quality, built environment” for residents, employees, and visitors. Signage is among the design features that are considered to achieve the goal.

**UD-1.09. Signs.** We require quality, balance, consistency and the use of high quality materials in the design of public and private signs, including commercial signs, municipal signs and street and traffic signs. Signs should be compatible with the architectural character of buildings on which they are placed, prevailing streetscape character and surround community character, and should not be visually obtrusive.

Consistency with this policy is achieved in several ways. The freeway-oriented signs include 23 wall-mounted signs and 2 Project identification signs on the exterior walls of the outlet center. Four tenant signs and two Project identification signs will be part of an Icon Tower sign. An additional three primary and two secondary hotel signs will be part of the as yet unbuilt hotel.

The signs, which will be visible to the residences across the I-5 Freeway as well as motorists traveling on the freeway, will be constructed with metal channel letters and pinned off the building walls. White halo lighting will illuminate the letters and will be turned off 1 hour after the close of business. Because the signs will be attached to the buildings, they will be architecturally compatible and will use only nationally recognized trademark logos. The Icon Tower will be architecturally compatible with the buildings in style and color. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with Policy UD-1.09.

2. **Consistency with the San Clemente Zoning Ordinance**

The City's Zoning Ordinance implements the General Plan, providing regulations regarding permitted land uses, development standards, and the development entitlement process. Areas within an approved Specific Plan are incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance by reference. A specific plan can either replace the City's Zoning Ordinance and design guidelines or provide standards that enhance the existing regulations.

On March 15, 2016, the City adopted amendments to its Zoning Ordinance related to freeway-oriented signage. The amendments prohibit freeway-oriented signs and signs larger than 64 square feet in order to “reduce distraction to drivers and increase safety on our local streets and freeways.” The amendments also repealed and removed Section 17.16.260 of the Municipal Code which provided for Sign Exception Permits.

The current Zoning Ordinance is not applicable to the extent it is inconsistent with the Development Agreement or the Specific Plan. The City's current Zoning Ordinance permits a 64-square-foot maximum size per sign and no longer includes a provision for exceeding that maximum through a Sign Exception Permit. The proposed Project signage includes 20 signs which would exceed that 64 square foot standard. In addition, if the Project was subject to
current regulations, the total maximum signage square footage for the outlet center would also exceed that maximum with approximately 2,978 square feet proposed and 2,660 square feet allowed. Based on the action to repeal Section 17.16.260 of the Municipal Code, under current City regulations where no freeway-oriented signage is permitted, the proposed signage plan would not be permitted. Due to the above-described amendment repealing Section 17.16.160 for Sign Exception Permits, there is also no longer a process or mechanism to deviate from the Code restrictions.

However, as noted, the Marblehead Development Agreement requires the City to evaluate the Project based on the zoning in place at the time the Development Agreement was approved. The Zoning Ordinance in effect at that time allowed for wall signs up to 64 square feet with an Administrative Sign permit. Freeway-oriented signs were also allowed up to 64 square feet with an Administrative Sign Permit and a Sign Exception Permit. Sign Exception Permit (SEP) 06.402 included the placement of various interior signs and 32 freeway-oriented signs. Municipal Code Section 17.16.260, which was also in effect at the time the Development Agreement was signed, states that a sign exception permit is required under certain conditions.

The following table depicts the parameters under which a Sign Exception Permit (SEP) was required per Section 17.16.260 of the Municipal Code. The table lists the condition and then identifies why the proposed Project requires a Sign Exemption Permit based on the regulations in place under the Development Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-8 Sign Exception Permit Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 17.16.260 SEP Requirement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any sign that exceeds the maximum standards per Matrix of Sign Types (Section 17.84.030 (c)). Maximum standard: 64 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any sign that exceeds the individual sign area allowed as listed in Section 17.84.020 - General Regulations and Section 17.84.030(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any business or site that exceeds the maximum sign area allowed, as listed in Section 17.84.030 - Specific Regulations by Sign Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any sign that exceeds the permitted sign height of 15’ for pole signs and 10’ for monument signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any business, building or site that exceeds the maximum number of signs permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any freeway-oriented sign, except for change of copy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Any sign exceeding 75 percent of the length of the business façade | No signs will exceed 75% of the length of the building façade. Exhibits 4-5 and 4-6 depict building façade coverage.
As shown in the table, the Project, as proposed, would require a Sign Exception Permit to allow signs that are over the maximum size, over the maximum height and cumulatively are above the total permitted square footage.

The findings required for approval of a Sign Exception Permit are detailed below and include analysis showing consistency of the Project signage as proposed herein.

Findings

1) There are unique or unusual circumstances relating to the size of the site or business, shape of the site or business, location and orientation of the site or business, visibility of the site or business, proximity to street frontage or length of street frontage that do not allow the site or business to achieve the goals and objectives of this chapter for adequate business identification.

The Project’s location adjacent to the I-5 Freeway between two off-ramps results in several unique circumstances. The Project setbacks along the freeway frontage exceed typical setbacks for a retail project, making identification of the Project more difficult for passing motorists. Freeway traffic moves more rapidly than arterial roadway traffic and smaller scale signs are less noticeable as vehicles pass quickly. The Project’s success and ability to achieve its goals and objectives depend on its status as a regional center, attracting regional as well as local shoppers and visitors, rather than solely serving the local community. Due to the size of the Project, larger freeway-oriented signs are appropriate and not inconsistent with the goals of the originally approved Project to achieve a successful regional-serving retail center.

2) The granting of the sign exception permit is not contrary to the intent of the General Plan, Design Guidelines, relative specific plan or Architectural Overlay District in which the sign exception is proposed.

The Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan provides for a regional shopping center that is consistent with the intent of the General Plan. Due to the size and proportions of the buildings, appropriately scaled signage requires allowances to the maximum sign area, which are greater than provided in the City’s Zoning Code. The Sign Exception Permit, which is still applicable under the Development Agreement, provides a mechanism for increasing sign size to accommodate special circumstances similar to the outlet center such as location, scale, type of development and project identification.

3) The granting of a Sign Exception Permit is not considered a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations of other similarly situated properties.

The granting of a Sign Exception Permit does not grant special privileges inconsistent with similarly situated properties. Existing businesses adjacent to the freeway have signage that is visible from the freeway, including signs that exceed the sign code standards. The Project’s proposed signage serves the same purpose as other commercial development to provide identification/direction/wayfinding assistance to motorists accessing the outlet center from the freeway.
4) **The granting of a Sign Exception Permit does not create a traffic or safety hazard.**

An analysis has been prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan that specifically addresses impacts with and without freeway signage. The analysis concludes that not providing signage as proposed may cause significant impacts to traffic safety for southbound motorists attempting to access the outlet center without identifying and wayfinding signage. Therefore, granting a Sign Exception Permit will enhance safety for vehicles exiting the freeway to access the outlet center and not create a traffic or safety hazard.

5) **The granting of a Sign Exception Permit does not adversely impact surrounding properties by increasing light, glare or noise.**

A Sign Exception Permit for the proposed signage will not adversely impact surrounding properties by increasing light, glare, or noise. The proposed wall-mounted signage will be halo-illuminated, and the Icon Tower will be up- and down-lit with directed lighting. Lighting will be controlled by a timer, and wall signs will be turned off 1 hour after store closings. The sign materials will be non-reflective to eliminate glare. No noise will be associated with the signage.

6) **For freeway-oriented signs:**

a) **The location of the site dictates the need for a freeway-oriented sign to allow adequate business identification.**

The outlet center location dictates the need for freeway-oriented signage because, as a regional shopping center, the main access will be from the I-5 Freeway and signs must be visible to motorists traveling on the freeway. In addition, because the setbacks along the freeway are larger than those for retail development along an arterial roadway, there is a need for larger signage to enhance visibility from a greater distance. The signs will act as identification/directional/wayfinding guides and meet the goals for granting a Sign Exception Permit.

b) **The design, scale, materials and location of the freeway-oriented sign provides necessary business identification to motorists on the freeway without creating adverse visual impacts.**

The design, scale, materials, and location of the proposed freeway-oriented signs provide necessary business identification to motorists on the freeway without creating adverse impacts. The freeway-oriented signs have been conditioned in terms of quantity, location, size, and color. This will reduce the potential for distraction to motorists while at the same time providing location and wayfinding, thereby enhancing safety for motorists trying to access the outlet center.
c) The design, scale and materials of the signs harmonize with the architectural design of the building it serves and are complimentary to the City’s image as viewed from the freeway.

The design, scale, and materials of the signs harmonize with the architectural design of the existing buildings. The Marblehead Specific Plan Design Guidelines require that signage “be harmonious in scale, form, materials and colors with project buildings.” In addition, freestanding signage “shall be integrated with the overall architectural and landscape design for the commercial center.” The proposed signs have been conditioned to limit the quantity, location, size and color of the signs which will ensure that they are complimentary to the City’s image.

d) The design and scale of the signs is appropriate to the distance from which the signs are normally viewed from the freeway.

The design and scale of the signs is appropriate to the distance of the signs as viewed from the freeway, because cars will be generally traveling at freeway speeds and need to be alerted of the presence of the outlet center well in advance of the exit for the outlet center. The Project has been conditioned to limit the quantity, location, size, and color of the signs. The size and scale of the signs are compatible with the building mass and architecture and will be the appropriate size for viewing from the freeway.

e) If applicable, the design, scale and location of the building dictates the use of a freestanding, freeway-oriented sign, rather than a building-mounted, freeway-oriented sign.

The design, scale, and location of the building dictates the use of a freestanding freeway-oriented sign that is identified as the Icon Tower. Due to the size of the Project site and scale of the buildings, there is a need for an Icon Tower sign to provide identification/direction/wayfinding for motorists accessing the retail center from the freeway. The Icon Tower will provide Project identification/location from a greater distance than the wall-mounted signage. The proposed signs meet the goal of granting a Sign Exception Permit.

3. Consistency with the Marblehead Specific Plan

The Marblehead Specific Plan (Marblehead SP) is one of seven Specific Plans adopted by the City. The Marblehead SP, on page 1-5 (Section III. Sign Ordinance), notes that the SP “incorporates the Sign Ordinance by reference.” The Sign Ordinance contains regulations pertaining to signs throughout the City. The purpose and objectives of the Marblehead SP include, among others:

- Provide for a variety of land uses within the Specific Plan area capable of generating significant new tax revenues to the City
- Promote regional commercial uses to generate sales tax revenues
Marblehead SP, Chapter 3 - Design Guidelines (commercial development) page 3-4, specifically address signage as follows:

D. **Signs** - Commercial centers should be identified by a sign program with monument signage and wall signs for individual tenants. Such signs may include logos, and should be harmonious in scale, form, materials and colors with project buildings, walls and other structures. Due to the size and proportions of the buildings, appropriate scaled signage may require maximum sign area allowances greater than currently specified in the City's Sign Ordinance. A specific Sign Plan accounting for all such allowances shall be provided for consideration at the time of site plan review.

Freestanding signage shall be integrated with the overall architectural and landscape design for the commercial center. Multiple locations for the freestanding signage shall be permitted and appropriately located with respect to multiple frontages and entries into the center.

Marblehead SP, Chapter 3, page 3-16 states:

5. **Signs** - Signs should be integrated into the architectural design of the building in a manner consistent with the intent of the City's Sign Ordinance, as well as the architectural elements, scale and massing of the project.

Marblehead SP, Chapter 5 - Development Standards, page 5-11 states:

H. **Signs** - Signs shall be permitted in accordance with the City Sign Ordinance, except as modified by a Sign Program for the site.

The Marblehead EIR and Specific Plan envisioned, and received approval based on, at least 10 freeway-oriented signs, including three icon towers. The Sign Exception Permit (SEP 97-19) was permitted under Municipal Code Section 17.16.260 (later repealed). The subsequent legal challenge to the modified Sign Program resulted in the Court requiring vacation of prior approval of the freeway-oriented signage portion of the sign program and environmental analysis of the additional freeway-oriented signage which had not been a part of the original approval.

The currently proposed sign program, while increasing the number of signs, remains consistent with the Marblehead SP Guidelines. In addition, the Marblehead EIR evaluated a fully operational center, with 750,000 square feet of commercial and retail uses, with adequate signage. The current sign program remains consistent with the intent of the analysis in the Marblehead EIR. The Sign Ordinance “incorporated by reference” into the Marblehead SP the regulatory ordinance in terms of consistency because the very nature of a specific plan is to vest the development entitlement with the regulations and codes in effect at the time of approval, unless subsequently amended.

4. **Development Agreement for Marblehead Coastal Property**

A Development Agreement (DA) was entered into on October 2, 1998. The DA was intended to eliminate uncertainty in planning for and securing the orderly development of the Project.
In addition, the DA provided significant public benefits to the City in exchange for the assurance regarding development of the Project under the terms and conditions of the DA.

Specific regulations for development are included in Section 3. Development of the Property, page 9 of the DA. Section 3.1 states: “Other than as expressly set forth in this Agreement the terms and conditions of development applicable to the Property . . . . shall be those set forth in the Specific Plan and all other ordinances, laws, statutes, rules, regulations and official policies governing development that may apply to the Property from time to time.” The section states further: “To the maximum extent permitted by law, in the event of any conflict between the express provisions of this Agreement, on the one hand, and the Specific Plan or other ordinances, laws, statutes, rules, regulations, or official policies governing development that may apply to the Property from time to time, on the other hand, the provisions of this Agreement shall prevail.”

Based on the agreements detailed in the DA as approved, the Project is not subject to the current City Zoning Ordinance to the extent it is inconsistent with the Development Agreement or the Specific Plan. The Marblehead Coastal property, including the outlet center and hotel, remain subject to the approved Specific Plan and the conditions as set forth in the Development Agreement as of the time the Specific Plan and the DA were approved. The Zoning Ordinance in existence at that time is the prevailing regulatory document for the proposed signage as stated in Section 3.1 of the DA. The Sign Exception Permit (SEP 97-16) was approved under and in compliance with the then-current Zoning Ordinance which allowed for such exceptions. The proposed Project represents a modification to SEP 97-16. Further environmental analysis in this SEIR of the freeway-oriented signs is in response to the Court ruling specifically related to the additional freeway-oriented signage now proposed. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with the Marblehead Development Agreement.

5. **Consistency with Regional Planning Programs**

Consistency with Countywide and regional plans affecting planning in the Project area is limited due to the nature of the proposed Project, which involves additional freeway-oriented signage for an already approved and partially built development. Any such plans were previously discussed and analyzed in the Marblehead EIR. However, the Project site is located within Subarea 4 of the Orange County Southern Subregion Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), which encompasses San Clemente and neighboring areas. The General Plan EIR HCP Map does not identify the Project site and surrounding areas a part of the habitat reserve (City of San Clemente, 2014, Figure 5.3-1). A previously disturbed canyon area, located between the outlet center, the approved but unbuilt Phase 2 of the outlet center, and the approved planned hotel, is designated as supplemental open space by the Orange County Southern Subregion Orange County HCP. Implementation of the sign program as proposed will not impact land uses designated within the HCP. Potential Project-related biological impacts to the HCP are analyzed and detailed in Section 5.2, Biological Resources (beginning on page 169 herein).

A detailed consistency analysis with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Community Strategy
(RTP/SCS) is not included. The purpose of the RTP/SCS is to guide regional development and provide a strategic vision for handling the region’s land use, housing, economic development, transportation, environmental sustainability, and overall quality of life. The larger Marblehead development has been fully analyzed, and the proposed additional signage is not inconsistent with the goals and vision of the RTP/SCS. No other regional planning programs are applicable to the proposed Project.

5.3.5 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required. The Project does not include any change to land use or zoning designations and is consistent with the City’s General Plan, the Marblehead Specific Plan, and the Marblehead Development Agreement.

5.3.6 Level of Significance after Mitigation

The proposed Project will not divide an established community. The proposed Project relates to additional freeway-oriented signage for an approved development that is partially built. All public services, including police, fire, and water, were previously analyzed in the Marblehead EIR.

The proposed Project does not conflict with any applicable land use policy or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the Project. The proposed Project is consistent with the San Clemente General Plan designation of Regional Commercial and the Marblehead Specific Plan designation of MHC SP-RC 1 (Specific Plan - Regional Commercial). The proposed Project does not result in environmental impacts to land use and planning and no mitigation is required.

The proposed Project does not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, and further information and analysis is provided in Section 5.2, Biological Resources (beginning on page 169 herein). Therefore, there will be no Project impacts related to Land Use and Planning.

5.3.7 Cumulative Impacts

The proposed Project is consistent with applicable general plan, zoning, and specific plan policies, goals, and regulations. The Marblehead Coastal Development will ultimately be built out with fewer residences and less retail/commercial uses than originally considered or approved. The Marblehead EIR analyzed cumulative impacts for the entire Marblehead development. Cumulative land use impacts are generally individually mitigated on a project-by-project basis. Additional signage beyond what was analyzed in the EIR will not result in cumulative impacts in terms of land use because the Project is consistent with all land use and planning regulations with the approval of a Sign Exception Permit. The Project area is substantially built out with the exception of the hotel and the residential portion of the larger Marblehead project and the Sea Summit residential community to the north and west of the Project site. As these proposed uses are approved and also consistent with local regulations, there will be no cumulative impacts with the additional signage for the proposed Project.
5.3.8 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No unavoidable adverse impacts to Land Use are associated with the proposed Project.


5.4 Transportation and Traffic

This section analyzes the potential Project impacts on freeway traffic due to providing and not providing the proposed wall-mounted signage along the southerly, easterly, and northerly building frontages. The analysis is based on the Sign Impact Analysis letter report prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan (LLG) dated June 28, 2017 (LLG Report) included as Appendix I herein). In addition, an Analysis of Proposed Freeway-Oriented On-Premise Signage was prepared by Charles R. Taylor, Ph.D., of Villanova University (School of Business) dated September 7, 2016 (Villanova Report). The analysis is included herein as Appendix J.

As detailed in Chapter 3, Project History and Background (beginning on page 19), a legal challenge to the City’s approval of Sign Exception Permit SP 06-402 (SEP) was filed with the County of Orange Superior Court in 2007. The basis for the challenge was that the number of signs permitted in the SEP was significantly larger than analyzed in the Marblehead Final EIR. The 2008 Court judgment required that an updated analysis be provided to include the additional freeway-oriented signage for the Project, including for the approved but unbuilt hotel component. The City, in response to the Superior Court judgement, rescinded its previous approvals of the freeway-oriented signs (Resolution 08-78) in September 2008.

Traffic forecasts and impacts for the Project site were previously analyzed in the Marblehead Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) dated 1998 and further updated in the San Clemente Traffic Model - Marblehead Coastal Traffic Forecast Data report dated August 2003. Both reports were prepared by Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. The previously prepared Final EIR traffic analysis assumed development of 720,000 square feet of retail uses in addition to 440 residential units. As noted herein, the development size for the retail component was reduced via Addenda to the Final EIR to approximately 640,000 square feet. The Addendum approved in 2004 noted that, compared to the original 1998 EIR analysis, the amended Project would generate approximately 18,950 fewer daily trips including approximately 359 fewer AM peak hour and 1,204 fewer PM peak hour trips. The reduction is a result of fewer residences and a reduction in the retail square footage. Therefore, impacts related to the previously analyzed traffic conditions are anticipated to be commensurately less than projected. The Final EIR concluded that with implementation of the standard conditions and mitigation measures identified therein, the traffic impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Based on the reduction in square footage for the retail component of the Project, and the previous finding of “less than significant,” this SEIR does not present new analysis related to traffic. Analysis herein is specific to evaluation of traffic impacts due to the wall-mounted and Icon Tower signage for the Outlets at San Clemente and the unbuilt but approved hotel signage as required by the above-described Court judgment.
5.4.1 **Existing Conditions**

The larger Marblehead project analyzed in the Marblehead Final EIR is not fully built out with the residential portion currently under construction. The retail component, of which the Project is a part, currently consists of the Outlets at San Clemente and fast-food as well as sit-down restaurants. The approved hotel feature, also a part of the retail/commercial component, has not yet been built. The existing sign program, as approved in the Final EIR, proposed at least 10 freeway-oriented signs, including 3 freeway-oriented monuments. None of the approved signage is currently in place. The Project site can be accessed off the I-5 Freeway via Avenida Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico.

5.4.2 **Performance Criteria**

The LLG Report analysis included the following three impact components:

1. **Sign impact evaluation of the proposed Project signage based on the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) criteria under Outdoor Advertising Permit Requirements as it relates to I-5 Freeway traffic**

2. **Wayfinding impact evaluation, which considers the safety issues associated with distracted/lost Project customers/visitors (based on National Highway Traffic Safety Administration research)**

3. **I-5 Southbound Freeway egress evaluation based on the weaving condition of the I-5 Freeway between Avenida Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico**

Each component is discussed in greater detail below.

5.4.3 **Thresholds of Significance**

The state encourages local agencies to adopt their own thresholds, but it is not required. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis, the applicable thresholds listed in the CEQA Guidelines will be used in addition to the performance criteria identified above. As noted, a Sign Exception Permit was included in the original approval process for the Marblehead FEIR. Resolution 99-68 detailed the sign consistency with the City’s General Plan, Design Guidelines and Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. The Resolution noted that the location of the site dictates the need for freeway-oriented signs to allow adequate business identification. The Sign Exception Permit was required to modify the City’s approved sign ordinance to allow specific sign standards that were not permitted in the ordinance existing at that time.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines states that the project would have a potential significant impact with respect to transportation and traffic if it would:

a) **Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking not account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit**

b) **Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other**
standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)
e) Result in inadequate emergency access
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

In addition, analysis will include compliance with three areas of performance criteria listed above including:

- Caltrans signage criteria
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration safety issues for wayfinding
- Egress evaluation based on weaving conditions on I-5

### 5.4.4 Project Impacts Prior to Mitigation

The Marblehead EIR evaluated traffic impacts for a regional commercial center of up to 750,000 square feet and 440 residential dwelling units. The analysis concluded that the long term (operational) impacts would result in a potential capacity deficiency at Avenida Pico west of the I-5 Freeway. The location was included in the City's Regional Circulation Financing and Phasing Program (RCFPP) and the improvement identified was the widening from four to six lanes financed in part by development fees for each new development. Mitigation Measures were included in the EIR requiring payment of fair share fees to the RCFPP (MM 4.2-1 and MM 4.2-2). The conclusion in the EIR was that with implementation of standard conditions and mitigation measures included therein, traffic impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. The Project proposed in this SEIR does not involve the addition of traffic or an increase in the severity of impacts previously identified. The following analysis is specific to the addition of Project-related freeway-oriented signage to the previously analyzed retail/commercial component of the larger project included in the Marblehead EIR.

In addition to the Sign Impact Analysis by LLG, an analysis was prepared for the Outlets at San Clemente Freeway-Oriented Signage by Charles R. Taylor, Ph.D., of Villanova University (School of Business), dated September 7, 2016 (Villanova Report). The analysis is included herein as Appendix J. The analysis discussed:

1. Traffic safety regarding properly constructed and placed signs
2. Economic need regarding on-premise signs being critical to the viability of retail business
3. Profitability related to illuminated signage
4. Public opinion polls supporting the importance of signage as beneficial to businesses and consumers
In addition to the CEQA Guidelines thresholds listed above, this section in the SEIR specifically focuses on the traffic safety factor for the proposed freeway-oriented signage along the I-5 Freeway segment between Avenida Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico. The Villanova Report states that:

Years of research clearly indicate that on-premise signs are not a traffic safety hazard. In fact the best research evidence suggests that properly constructed signs of adequate height that are readable can actually enhance traffic safety.

The Report further notes that if signage is readable and conspicuous, dangerous situations can be prevented such as drivers straining to see signs, making quick lane changes across traffic to turn or becoming frustrated because they did not see the sign in time to make the appropriate turn. With specific regard to The Outlets at San Clemente, the author notes that:

...there is no evidence that the signs will constitute a traffic safety hazard provided that the signs have sufficient visibility, which includes being large enough and sufficiently illuminated to be visible and conspicuous to the viewer.

The following information is based on the LLG Report impact analysis under the current condition of no freeway-oriented signage at the Outlets at San Clemente.

1. **Caltrans Sign Impact Evaluation**

Caltrans criteria/requirements are presented in Table 5-9 below. As shown, Caltrans Outdoor Sign Requirements include requirements related to both the display location and the display itself. LLG applied the requirements to the signage for The Outlets at San Clemente as currently proposed for the wall-mounted signage and tower icon/hotel freeway signage. Of the nine Display Location requirements, the Project is consistent with seven, one is pending and one is not applicable.

Six requirements for Display are included in the Table. Of the six, the Project is consistent with two and four are not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outdoor Advertising Permit Requirements</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Display Location:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be outside the right of way of any highway</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be outside of any stream, or drainage channel</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There must be an existing business activity within 1000 feet of proposed display location on either side of the highway</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Location of property where display is to be placed must be zoned industrial or commercial</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must have current property owner consent, in writing, to place the display at desired location</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must have written permission (building permit) from the local government having jurisdiction where the display is to be relocated</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Location may not be adjacent to a landscaped freeway</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Location may not be adjacent to a scenic highway</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If adjacent to a bonus segment of an Interstate freeway, copy, size, and spacing is more restrictive</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outdoor Advertising Permit Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Display must be 500 feet from any other permitted display on the same side of any highway that is a freeway</td>
<td>Nearest freeway-oriented sign is 905' away --</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display must be 300 feet from any other permitted display on the same side of any primary highway that is not a freeway in an unincorporated area</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display must be 100 feet from any other permitted display on the same side of any primary highway that is not a freeway and is within the limits of an incorporated city</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display must be 500 feet from an interchange; intersection at grade or safety roadside rest if the highway is a freeway and the location is outside the limits of an incorporated city and outside the limits of an urban area</td>
<td>Within City Limits</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An electric changeable message center display must meet the above spacing requirements and be 1000 feet from another electronic message center display</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height for the advertising display area is, 25 feet in height and 60 feet in length, not to exceed an overall maximum of 1,200 square feet</td>
<td>200 Square Feet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrans (www.dot.ca.gov)

### 2. Wayfinding Impact Evaluation

The LLG wayfinding impact evaluation was prepared based on the physical characteristics of the Project site, the adjacent freeway, and the surrounding roadway system. This analysis was provided to determine the impact and potential safety implications of providing, or not providing, wall-mounted signage to assist customers in finding the Project site. Analysis includes the likely routes that will be used and consequences that will occur depending on whether customers know exactly where they are going and whether there is wall-mounted signage for the Project. The analysis was aimed specifically at customers and visitors traveling southbound on the I-5 Freeway. The report notes that vehicles traveling northbound on the I-5 Freeway could use either the Avenida Vista Hermosa or the Avenida Pico off-ramp, but at the I-5/Pico interchange they may still face the same lost/distracted safety issues that southbound traffic faces if wall-mounted signage is not installed.

Exhibit 5-72 graphically depicts the assumed path of travel for southbound motorists exiting at Avenida Pico with wall-mounted signage in place. The driver would correctly exit at Avenida Pico turning right, travel west, and turn right on Avenida Vista Hermosa, followed by another right turn into the Project.

Under a no-signage scenario, where the exact destination is not known, southbound travelers exiting on Avenida Pico would likely turn at the first right and incorrectly presume the buildings with no signage are the outlet center. Exhibit 5-73 through Exhibit 5-75 depict the various routes an unfamiliar driver might take if there is no signage to identify the buildings at the outlet center. The analysis considered that these drivers assumed the appropriate exit is Avenida Pico and not the drivers who missed the exit from the freeway for either lack of reaction time or lack of recognition of the buildings due to no signage. The exhibits are taken from the Sign Impact Analysis prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan dated June 28, 2017 and included herein as Appendix I.
Exhibit 5-72  – I-5 Southbound Path of Travel (With Signage)
Exhibit 5-73  – I-5 Southbound Path of Travel (Without Signage, Route Option 1)
Exhibit 5-74  – I-5 Southbound Path of Travel (Without Signage, Route Option 2)
Exhibit 5-75 – I-5 Southbound Path of Travel (With Signage, Route Option 3)
The Project is not clearly visible from Avenida Pico, and drivers could become distracted trying to use GPS or other navigational devices to locate the outlet center, thereby creating potentially unsafe conditions. According to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), operation of a vehicle while using a cell phone or other electronic device is considered “distracted driving.” The LLG Report notes that the NHTSA states that distracted driving “occurs when drivers divert their attention from the driving task to focus on some other activity.” Further, “…distracted driving is a risky behavior that poses a danger to vehicle occupants as well as non-occupants such as pedestrians and bicyclists.”

As a result, it is our finding that, due to the wayfinding function of the proposed wall-mounted signage, providing the proposed wall-mounted Icon Tower and hotel freeway signage will not significantly adversely impact traffic safety on the adjacent I-5 Freeway.

3. Freeway Egress Evaluation

The LLG Report used the Highway Capacity Manual 2010 (HCM 2010) Freeway Weaving Analysis to analyze whether customers/visitors can safely egress southbound I-5 at Avenida Pico under the with signage and without signage scenarios. The segment analyzed is on the I-5 Freeway between Avenida Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico and is based on the assumption that the proposed wall-mounted signage would be visible just prior to the end of the southbound I-5/Avenida Vista Hermosa on-ramp junction with the freeway mainline.

The without wall-mounted signage scenario reflects a condition where the customer/visitor does not decide, at the earliest point, to exit the Avenida Pico off-ramp, and if at all, until being even with the northerly edge of the Project buildings. This is based on the presumption that the sign-less buildings are not apparent as a retail center until adjacent to the driver’s eye/vehicle. The freeway segment between the two exits is depicted on Exhibit 5-76 and is approximately 565 feet in length.

Table 5-10 below depicts the peak hour Level of Service results of the weaving analysis with wall-mounted signage traffic conditions, including Project traffic. The table presents a summary of the AM and PM peak hour traffic conditions for the with signage condition, which is based on the freeway lane geometry. The freeway weaving segment for this scenario operates at an acceptable level of service (LOS) during both AM and PM peak hours compared to the LOS standards defined in the LLG Report. Providing wall-mounted signage and, therefore, advance visibility of the Project site, results in adequate distance to safely exit the I-5 Freeway. The Highway Capacity Software (HCS) 2010 Freeway Weaving Analysis worksheets are included in the LLG Report as Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Freeway Weaving Segment</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>With Wall-Mounted Signage Traffic Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Southbound between</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>7,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Avenida Vista Hermosa and Avenida Pico</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>6,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 5-76  – Weaving Analysis

Source: Sign Impact Analysis by LLG
The *without* wall-mounted signs scenario where the Project is not recognized until after the Avenida Pico on-ramp gore results in the determination that adequate distance/spacing is not provided to safely egress the freeway at Avenida Pico. This is based on the weaving analysis which shows an LOS of D which is approaching the boundary between LOS E or F. The Report states that reducing the weaving distance would result in an unacceptable LOS E or worse. In addition, based on the short distance and time to recognize the sign-less Project buildings as The Outlets at San Clemente, it is likely that many drivers will miss the Avenida Pico off-ramp completely, which creates additional potential safety issues while attempting to find the Project, similar to the lost/distracted driver evaluation.

### 5.4.5 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measures were provided in the Marblehead EIR addressing the identified traffic-related Project impacts. As currently proposed, the additional signage will enhance wayfinding for customers/visitors. No additional or more severe traffic-related impacts will result from implementation of the proposed freeway-oriented signage program, and no mitigation measures are required.

### 5.4.6 Level of Significance After Mitigation

The addition of signage to the existing outlet center and the approved but unbuilt hotel component will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. As analyzed herein, the signage will not affect the amount of traffic or the circulation system other than to enhance wayfinding, thereby potentially improving circulation system conditions.

Similarly, the proposed signage would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including level of service standards, or other standards established by the Orange County Congestion Management Agency. The freeway-oriented signage will comply with and be consistent with Caltrans standards for Outdoor Advertising Permit Requirements as it relates to I-5 Freeway traffic. In addition, development fair share fees required with the original Marblehead EIR will provide funds to implement improvements to the deficiency identified on Avenida Pico and to improve circulation. There will be no additional traffic as a result of the proposed Project’s increase in signage from that analyzed in the original EIR and, therefore, no impacts to the previously analyzed level of service standards will occur.

The Project will not result in any impacts related to the remaining CEQA thresholds including:

- Changes in air traffic patterns, increases in air traffic levels, or changes in location that result in substantial safety risks. The Project is not located near a local or regional airport, and the nature of the proposed signage would not interfere with air traffic.
- Increases in hazards due to design features, sharp curves or dangerous intersections. The Project is limited to provision of signage for the retail outlet center and does not include roadway additions or modifications that would result in hazards.
• Impacting emergency access or resulting in inadequate emergency access. The signage will enhance wayfinding in the event of an emergency. Emergency access to the Project site will remain the same as currently exists.

• Conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. The Project only consists of the addition of wall-mounted and tower-mounted signage to the existing retail outlet center. The Project does not involve plans related to public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

With respect to the impact analysis components of the LLG Report, the Project will be consistent with the Caltrans criteria under Outdoor Advertising Permit Requirements, compliant with safety issues identified in the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration research and provide adequate safety related to the weaving condition of the I-5 Freeway with implementation of the proposed signage program.

The report further notes that “providing wall-mounted and Icon Tower icon/hotel freeway signage will not significantly impact traffic on the adjacent I-5 Freeway.”

As noted herein, subsequent reductions in total Project site for the residential and retail components from the original 1998 analysis result a commensurate reduction in average daily trips. The addition of the proposed signage is not anticipated to result in additional or new impacts related to traffic volumes, because no new or additional traffic-generating uses are proposed, and no mitigation is required.

5.4.7 Cumulative Impacts

The proposed Project signage is specific to the Project site and will not induce additional freeway-oriented signage along the I-5 Freeway. There will be no cumulative impact, because the Project site is in a substantially built-out area with very little opportunity for new development. The original EIR evaluated the potential impacts of a regional commercial center of up to 750,000 square feet. The signage was anticipated for a fully operational center. The increase in the number of signs has been analyzed as a benefit to safety and wayfinding for the Outlets at San Clemente and the approved but unbuilt hotel component.

5.4.8 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

No unavoidable adverse impacts related to transportation and traffic are associated with the proposed Project.
6. Alternatives Analysis

6.1 Introduction

CEQA has long recognized that a rigorous evaluation of Project alternatives is key to ascertaining whether major environmental impacts brought about by a proposed Project can be avoided or significantly lessened. CEQA and its associated case law require that alternatives be evaluated that are capable of feasibly attaining most of the basic Project objectives and offering substantial environmental advantages over the Project proposed. CEQA does not require that an agency speculate unnecessarily or re-evaluate previously analyzed alternatives where no new significant information – i.e., in an earlier CEQA document – shows that such alternatives will now be feasible. Additionally, CEQA does not require that the agency evaluate ostensibly infeasible alternatives, or address alternatives that are independent of the goal of reducing environmental impacts.

Therefore, an adequate alternatives analysis is focused on avoiding or substantially lessening the significant environmental impacts brought on by the Project as proposed taken in the context of previous environmental and policy evaluations. CEQA is not intended to be used as a means of studying alternative dispositions of a project independent of the environmental impacts that attend it. In other words, CEQA does not require the EIR to address alternatives that are unrelated to the reduction of impacts.

The Project site is designated as Regional Commercial in the City of San Clemente General Plan and MHC SP-RC 1 in the Marblehead Specific Plan, which provides regulatory guidance for the development of the Marblehead community of which the Project site is a part. RC1 designates Regional Serving Commercial including general retail commercial, factory outlet stores, restaurants, offices, financial institutions, lodging and similar regional serving uses. The Project is within the Marblehead Specific Plan area subject to the Marblehead Coastal Development Agreement and is consistent with the General Plan and Specific Plan land use designations. The proposed Project includes additional signs that were not analyzed as part of the Marblehead EIR. Analysis herein is based, in part, on the zoning code regulations in effect at the time the Development Agreement was approved.

To allow an appropriate context for evaluating alternatives, CEQA requires that the Lead Agency enumerate the basic Project objectives. This disclosure assists in developing the range of Project alternatives to be investigated in this section, as well as providing a rationale for the adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations, if one is adopted. Listed below are the main goals and objectives
as stated in Section 4.1, Certification of the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

- Approval of Amendment to Discretionary Sign Permit 05-176 for Master Sign Program for freeway oriented signs
- Approval of Sign Exception Permit 15-428 to allow freeway-oriented signs, signs in excess of the City Sign Ordinance standard of 64 square feet in area, and sign areas in excess of the City Sign Ordinance standard of 1 square foot per 1 lineal foot of building frontage

Project Objectives (page 55).

- Comply with the Court-mandated environmental review of proposed signage
- Provide adequate signage for Project identification
- Ensure signage is consistent with California Department of Transportation criteria related to the I-5 Freeway
- Provide a wayfinding means to ensure safe egress from the I-5 Freeway and adequate path-finding information for vehicular access to the Project
- Provide consistency with the Development Agreement in terms of compliance with appropriate sign ordinances and regulations while identifying exceptions through approval of a sign program

Although CEQA calls for the evaluation of alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic purposes of the Project, the central goal of the EIR alternatives analysis is to reduce or eliminate environmental effects of the proposed Project that have been identified in the analytical portions of the EIR (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6), not to evaluate Project alternatives that are not capable of reducing impacts, or that merely are variations on a theme.

It is the intent of this section to describe, or reference the description of, reasonable and feasible alternatives to the proposed Project that could attain most of the basic Project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen any significant effects of the Project. Due to the very limited scope of the Project analyzed herein, Alternatives are analyzed based on the environmental topics discussed in this SEIR. All remaining environmental topics per the CEQA Guidelines checklist have been analyzed and mitigated in the original Marblehead EIR and no additional analysis is required because there is no possibility that the proposed Project will have impacts in those areas.

### 6.2 Feasibility

Section 15126.6(f)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines explains how feasibility is to be considered for alternatives capable of otherwise resolving environmental impacts resulting from the Project as proposed. This section states that among the factors that may be taken into account in determining feasibility are:

- Site suitability
- Economic viability
Alternatives Analysis

6.3 – Alternatives Considered But Not Advanced

CEQA does not require that the discussion of alternatives be exhaustive, or demand evaluation of alternatives that are not realistically possible, given the failure to meet the basic Project objectives and limitation of time, energy, and funds. The SEIR does not consider alternatives that are infeasible, and the alternative discussed in this section was rejected for the following reasons:

- The project alternative is considered infeasible due to failure to carry out the basic goals and objectives of the proposed Project.
- The project alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the Project.

The following Project alternatives were considered but not advanced for future review. The alternative fails to carry out the goals and objectives of the proposed Project.

- **Alternative Sign Locations** – The Project site is consistent with the City’s General Plan and the Marblehead Specific Plan for development of a regional shopping center. Due to the location of the outlet center, directly adjacent to the I-5 Freeway, signage must be placed where it is fully visible to motorists seeking to access the shopping center. Loss of customers due to lack of or inadequate signage does not fulfill the intent of establishing a fully operational and successful regional shopping center. If the signs were placed at ground level or on smaller monuments, they would not be visible to passing motorists on the freeway. The signage locations depicted in the proposed sign plan provide the most effective display of informational and wayfinding devices to accomplish the Project goals. Therefore, the alternative sign location alternative is not considered feasible because there are no alternative locations for signage along the I-5 Freeway that will adequately identify the outlet center and its tenants.

- **Design Review Subcommittee Alternative** – This Alternative would revise the sign program to strictly comply with recommendations presented by the Design Review Committee (DRSC) on August 24, 2016 during their review of the Sign Exception Permit (05-176). The DRSC recommended revisions including a reduced metallic color palette, and elimination or size reduction of signs that were viewed as incompatible with building architecture. Since the DRSC recommendations were made, the Project has been revised and now meets many...
of the recommendations. Therefore, this Alternative is not considered because nearly all of the DRSC comments have substantially been addressed and their suggestions have been implemented in the revised Project designs.

6.4 Alternatives Presentation

The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(f)). With the historical and regulatory context as a backdrop, a review can proceed for alternatives to the Project that minimize impacts brought about by the Project and are not addressed in other CEQA documents. The reader will find five alternatives in this section.

- **No Project Alternative** – This alternative allows decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed Project with the impacts of not approving the proposed Project, which would result in no freeway-oriented signage.

- **Reduced Size/Reduced Number Alternative** – This alternative would analyze a reduced number of signs and would limit sign area to 64 square feet without an SEP to increase size. The maximum allowable size for Project ID would remain at 200 square feet; however, tenant signs would be limited to 64 square feet and the maximum number of signs would be 17, consistent with the 2004 Site Plan approval. Color exceptions would not be permitted by this alternative. The Icon Tower would be limited to Project ID signs only and would have an allowable area of 100 square feet. Hotel signage would remain as proposed.

- **Project Identification Alternative** – This alternative would analyze the sign program with Project identification signs only and without tenant identification signs. Wall mounted outlet center Project ID and Icon Tower Project ID signs would have an allowable area of 200 square feet. No tenant ID signs or color exceptions would be permitted by this alternative. Hotel signage would remain as proposed.

- **No Color Exceptions Alternative** – This Alternative would be similar to the proposed Project. However, all outlet and hotel signage would be only in the metallic and neutral color palette depicted on the materials board (Exhibit 4-6, page 42). No color exceptions would be permitted with this Alternative.

- **DRSC/Applicant Updated Project** – This Alternative addresses the most recent recommendations and comments from the DRSC. The Alternative eliminates signage on the northeast- and southwest-facing elevations of the Icon Tower and reduces the number and sign size of specified tenant ID signs. This Alternative also provides for consistent color of signs on the eastern building elevation and reduces lighting temperature and lumens.

The SEIR itself, as well as the Project Alternatives section, provide sufficient documentary material from which to construct any permutation of alternatives on the Project insofar as environmental impacts are concerned. CEQA Guidelines §15126.6 states “(a) Alternatives to
the proposed Project. An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or to the location of the Project, which would reasonably obtain most of the basic objectives of the Project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Therefore, this analysis is intended to allow decision-makers to identify alternatives based on sufficient analysis for each environmental topic discussed in the SEIR. The table below lists a comparison of the alternatives with the proposed Project.

Table 6-1 below lists a comparison of the alternatives with the proposed Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 - No Project</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2 – Reduced Size/Reduced Number of</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3 - Project ID Signage Only</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4 – No Color Exceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5 – DRSC Applicant Updated Project</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Potential impacts are greater than proposed Project
– Potential impacts are less than proposed Project
● Potential impacts are equal to proposed Project

6.5 Project Alternative 1 - No Project

6.5.1 Description of Alternative

The No Project Alternative assumes that the Project would not be developed as described in this SEIR. A review of the No Project Alternative must be included in every EIR pursuant to state law. Impacts from the proposed Project would not be as stated in the SEIR. The proposed Project is designated as Regional Commercial in the City of San Clemente General Plan. This category permits general retail, commercial, factory outlet stores, promotional and specialty retail, restaurants, entertainment, professional offices, financial institutions, lodging and similar regional serving uses.

The Project site is zoned Specific Plan under the City’s zoning ordinance. The purpose and objectives of the Marblehead Specific Plan include promoting regional commercial uses to generate sales tax revenues and providing for a variety of land uses within the Specific Plan area capable of generating new tax revenues to the City.

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines states:

The “no project” analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis commenced, as well as what would be reasonably expected to
occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that when the project is not a land use or regulatory plan, the “no project” alternative:

... is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others ... this “no project” consequence should be discussed.

The Project site is developed, with the retail outlet component of Phase 1 of the larger Marblehead development area. The approved but unbuilt portion consists of Phase 2 of the retail component and a hotel. The Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan envisioned a fully operational regional shopping center that includes appropriate signage.

The No Project Alternative would result in the site being left in its current condition consisting of a retail outlet center with no freeway-oriented signage. Approved and unbuilt portions of the site would be developed without freeway-oriented signage. Existing monument signage and building signage is not oriented toward the freeway and would remain.

1. Aesthetics

The No Project alternative would result in no freeway-oriented signage for the outlets and the approved but unbuilt hotel. The building facades would be blank, with no Project identification or tenant identification signage. Because there would be no freeway-oriented sign, no new night lighting would be installed. Existing sources of night lighting, including building lighting, parking lot lighting, and landscape lighting, would remain visible. The existing signage at the retail outlets is internal to the site and only minimally visible to visitors approaching or on the site. While the visibility of signs diminishes with distance, from the perspective of the residential neighborhoods nearby, this would likely be perceived as an improved aesthetics condition. However, as viewed from the freeway, it could create the appearance of a vacant project with no signage to identify the use or the occupants. Large buildings with no signage could be viewed as out of character with the surrounding commercial development where identifying signage is visible from a variety of vantage points, including the freeway.

Impacts in the areas of aesthetics are somewhat different compared to the proposed Project, but would still result in impacts to aesthetics. While nearby residents may perceive the absence of freeway-oriented signage as a benefit, views from private areas are not protected by the City’s Zoning Ordinance. In addition, a complete absence of signage may result in the buildings appearing vacant or unfinished, which would present a negative aesthetic condition.
2. **Biological Resources**

The No Project Alternative not would result in impacts to biological resources. Such impacts were fully analyzed in the Marblehead EIR as well as the Biological Report prepared for this EIR. Because neither the Project proposed herein nor the project as previously analyzed would result in impacts to biological resources, the No Project Alternative is equal to the proposed Project.

3. **Land Use**

The proposed Project adds signage to a previously approved development. Land uses will remain consistent, because a portion of the retail outlet center is currently developed and operational. The approved but unbuilt portion of the retail/commercial designated area will ultimately be constructed in accordance with previous approvals. The Marblehead Development Agreement provides that regulations and codes in existence at the time of approval of the Development Agreement will remain the prevailing regulatory documents. The Project, as proposed, is regulated by the Zoning Ordinance in effect in 1998, which permitted Sign Exception Permits to modify sign plans in terms of size, number, and type, and to allow freeway-oriented signage.

The No Project Alternative would deprive the Project applicant of the ability to seek approval of freeway-oriented signage which is allowed by the Zoning Code in place at the time the Development Agreement was approved. Because the Development Agreement allows for freeway-oriented signs, an impact would occur if the Applicant was denied the opportunity to provide signage as proposed. The No Project Alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed Project with respect to land use regulations. In addition, the Alternative does not meet the goal of providing a fully operational, successful regional shopping center that provides wayfinding and tenant identification signage to potential customers and visitors accessing the site from the I-5 Freeway.

4. **Transportation/Traffic**

The Project’s proximity to the I-5 Freeway results in a potential safety factor for motorists who are not familiar with the area or the location of the outlet center. As noted in the Sign Impact Analysis prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan for the proposed Project, providing wall-mounted and tower icon/hotel freeway signage will not significantly impact traffic on the adjacent I-5 Freeway, but not providing signage may cause significant impacts on traffic safety because of potential driver confusion about where to exit the freeway and lack of Project and tenant identification. The Traffic Analysis has shown that the proposed signage will enhance wayfinding and improve circulation system conditions. Because the No Project Alternative could result in more traffic circulation and safety impacts, this Alternative does not meet the goals of the proposed Project.

6.5.2 **Attainment of Project Objectives**

The No Project Alternative is equal to the proposed Project in the areas of Biological Resources. Impacts under Aesthetics would be different but would still result in greater impacts compared to the proposed Project, because the No Project alternative would result in
large buildings with no identification or information and would not be in character with other commercial development which provides signage information. The No Project Alternative would have a greater impact in the area of Land Use and Planning and Transportation/Traffic. The Project is permitted to be developed consistent with the Zoning Code regulations in effect when the Development Agreement was approved. The applicant would be denied the ability to provide freeway-oriented signage under this Alternative. With regard to Traffic, the location of the outlet center adjacent to the I-5 Freeway presents a unique need for appropriate signage for motorists accessing the site from the freeway. Absent adequate signage, drivers could experience confusion about the exact location of the shopping center, including which exit to use, resulting in unsafe vehicular movement while attempting to exit the freeway. Visible signage would also reduce potential wayfinding impacts, which could impede traffic flow and safety for drivers trying to find the outlet center entrances.
6.6 Project Alternative 2 – Reduced Size/Reduced Number of Signs Alternative

6.6.1 Description of Alternative

This Alternative would limit tenant identification signs to 17 signs with a maximum size of 64 square feet. A Sign Exception Permit would not be included in this Alternative to increase the size of tenant identification signs. The sign numbers and size would be consistent with the Site Plan approved by the City in 2004. Colors would be limited to the proposed color palette, including metallic and neutral colors with no color exceptions permitted. The Icon Tower would include Project ID signs only, and no individual tenant names would be included. The allowable area of the icon signage would be 100 square feet, and the two wall-mounted Project identifications signs would be 200 square feet, as with the proposed Project. There would be no change to the hotel signage from what is identified in the proposed Project.

View simulations have been prepared to depict this Alternative from four key view vantage points. The simulations portray the following:

- Portions of existing buildings and the Icon Tower from northbound I-5
- View from Vista Hermosa heading west toward the Project
- Portions of existing buildings and proposed hotel from northbound I-5
- View toward Project from 2165 Avenida Espada more than one-half mile from the Hotel

1. Aesthetics

Tenant identification signs would be limited to 64 square feet, and no Sign Exception Permit would be required for the tenant sign size. The total number of tenant signs would be 17 compared to 27 as proposed. From an aesthetics standpoint, there would be a minimal improvement between this Alternative and the proposed Project. Freeway-facing Project ID signs as viewed by passers-by would be the same with fewer tenant signs. While all signs cannot be seen at the same time from any one location, reducing the number of tenant ID signs may somewhat improve the visual appearance. The Icon Tower would be the same structure under either this Alternative or the proposed Project, with the only difference being the elimination of tenant identification on the tower. There would be no change to the proposed hotel signage under this Alternative, and the visual effect would be the same.

Signs under this Alternative would exhibit the same type of lighting as the proposed Project. Even though distance diminishes the appearance of signs, the view of lighted signs would be marginally reduced with fewer, smaller signs. This Alternative is anticipated to be better perceived by nearby residents, even though the private views are not protected by the City’s Zoning Ordinance, because it could be argued that fewer tenant signs, with a 64-square-foot maximum, would provide an improved aesthetics condition. The removal of the color exceptions would ensure that the signs would not conflict with the Spanish style architecture theme. When compared to the proposed Project, this alternative would result in a reduction of aesthetics impacts to below a level of significance because no color exceptions would be allowed.
Candidate Key View 2 Visual Simulation: Option B - Reduced Size / Reduced Number (with No Color Exceptions) Alternative

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage by LLG; September 27, 2017

Exhibit 6-1 – I-5 NB, Portions of Existing Buildings and Tower – Alternative 2
Candidate Key View 13 Visual Simulation: Option B - Reduced Size / Reduced Number (with No Color Exceptions) Alternative

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage by LLG; September 27, 2017

Exhibit 6-2 – Avenida Vista Hermosa – Alternative 2
Candidate Key View 17 Visual Simulation: Option B - Reduced Size / Reduced Number (with No Color Exceptions) Alternative

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage by LLG; September 27, 2017

Exhibit 6-3  – I-5 NB, Portions of Existing Buildings Proposed Hotel – Alternative 2
Candidate Key View 41a Visual Simulation: Option B- Reduced Size / Reduced Number (with No Color Exceptions) Alternative

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage by LLG; September 27, 2017

Exhibit 6-4  – 2165 Avenida Espada More than One-Half Mile to Hotel – Alternative 2
2. **Biological Resources**

Impacts would be identical to the proposed Project. Neither the proposed Project nor this Alternative would disturb the canyons and drainages where biological resources have been identified. Signs would be lighted with halo illumination under either scenario. Reducing the number and the size of the signs would not result in fewer biological impacts because the ambient light levels reaching the resources would remain substantially the same since the site is basically developed and lighting exists throughout the outlet center. Therefore, this Alternative is the same as the proposed Project with respect to biological resources.

3. **Land Use and Planning**

As noted herein, the Marblehead Development Agreement conveyed a vested right to the developer to develop the outlet center in accordance with standards in place at the time the Development Agreement was approved. This includes freeway-oriented signage and an ability to apply for a Sign Exception Permit. Under this Alternative, the number of tenant signs would be reduced from 27 to 17, and the sign colors would be restricted to the proposed color palette including bronze and neutral colors. No Sign Exception Permit as allowed under the Development Agreement provisions, would be required for tenant identification sign size. The applicable Zoning Ordinance restricts the sign sizes to a maximum of 64 square feet and under this Alternative, tenant sign sizes would be in compliance with that standard. From an objective of allowing signs consistent with the Development Agreement, this Alternative would have similar impacts to the proposed Project, because an SEP would still be required for the freeway-oriented signs and the size of the Project ID signs.

4. **Transportation and Traffic**

As noted herein, impacts to transportation and traffic have been analyzed from a perspective of wayfinding and freeway egress safety for visitors to the outlet center. The reduction in the number of signs, sign scaling, and color palette would not result in a substantially greater or lesser impact. Providing fewer tenant signs would not result in an impact because Project identification and Icon Tower signage would remain as proposed. Therefore, this Alternative is substantially the same as the proposed Project.

6.6.2 **Attainment of Project Objectives**

This Alternative is superior to the proposed Project in the area of Aesthetics. There will be a reduction of 10 tenant identification signs, and size of the tenant identification signs would be limited to 64 square feet. Sign colors would be limited, and no color exceptions would be permitted, which may improve perception of visual appearance. No color exceptions would also result in consistency with the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan Spanish design theme.

This Alternative is equal to the proposed Project in the area of biological resources. The Alternative would not create any impacts to biological resources, because no disturbance or grading would occur in the areas where biological resources have been identified. Because this Alternative recognizes the Marblehead Development Agreement’s vesting of codes and regulations in place at the time the Development Agreement was approved, this alternative is
consistent in providing freeway-facing signage. The elimination of and reduction in size of
tenant ID signs would likely not adversely impact safety or freeway egress, or markedly affect
wayfinding. This Alternative meets most of the objectives outlined herein and is marginally
superior to the proposed Project.
6.7 Project Alternative 3 - Project ID Signs Only

6.7.1 Description of Alternative

Several commenters at the April 13, 2017 Public Scoping Meeting noted that the Project should be limited to Project ID signage (The Outlets at San Clemente), removing the individual tenant signs proposed. This Alternative addresses the potential environmental impacts associated with the elimination of tenant identification signage on the building façade and the Icon Tower. The Alternative assumes two Icon Tower Project ID signs and two building façade Project ID signs for a total of four Project ID signs.

The approved but yet unbuilt hotel would continue to provide signage as described in the proposed Project. Due to the unique nature of the use compared with the retail shops, the signage would be required to identify the location and brand of the hotel. The signage would consist of four 64-square-foot signs and one 30-square-foot sign with freeway-oriented positioning.

View simulations have been prepared to depict this Alternative from four key view vantage points. The simulations portray the following:

- Portions of existing buildings and the Icon Tower from northbound I-5
- View from Vista Hermosa heading west toward the Project
- Portions of existing buildings and proposed hotel from northbound I-5
- View toward Project from 2165 Avenida Espada more than one-half mile from the Hotel

The Icon Tower signage would consist of two 100-square-foot signs, 25 feet above ground level and facing northeasterly and easterly toward the I-5 Freeway. The current Zoning Ordinance does not provide a Sign Exception Permit allowing a variance in the size, number, height, or length of proposed signs. However, the City is required to consider the signs under the Zoning Ordinance in place at the time the Development Agreement was approved. A Sign Exception Permit, allowed under the Zoning Ordinance would be required for the Icon Tower signs to exceed the size regulations and for freeway-oriented signs. The tower signs would be up-lit and down-lit consistent with the proposed Project.

The two wall Project ID signs would be freeway-facing and placed on the building façade. The signs would be halo-illuminated as described in the proposed Project. However, the elimination of tenant identification signage along the building façade would substantially reduce the number of illuminated signs visible from off-site viewing locations.

Aesthetically, the difference between the proposed Project and this Alternative would be the reduction in the number of signs from the 36 signs to 9 total signs (4 Project identification signs and 5 hotel signs). No color exceptions would be permitted as color exceptions only apply to the tenant ID signs.
Candidate Key View 2 Visual Simulation: Option C - Project Identification (no Tenant Signs and no color exceptions) Alternative
Final Report - September 2017

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage by LLG; September 27, 2017

Exhibit 6-5  — I-5 NB, Portions of Existing Buildings and Tower — Alternative 3
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6.7 – Project Alternative 3 - Project ID Signs Only

Candidate Key View 13 Visual Simulation: Option C - Project Identification (no Tenant Signs and no color exceptions) Alternative

Final Report - September 2017

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage by LLG; September 27, 2017

Exhibit 6-6 – Avenida Vista Hermosa – Alternative 3
Candidate Key View 17 Visual Simulation: Option C - Project Identification (no Tenant Signs and no color exceptions) Alternative Final Report - September 2017

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage by LLG; September 27, 2017
Candidate Key View 41a Visual Simulation: Option C- Project Identification (no Tenant Signs and no color exceptions) Alternative Final Report - September 2017

Source: Visual Impact Analysis of Proposed Freeway Signage by LLG; September 27, 2017

Exhibit 6-8  – 2165 Avenida Espada More than One-Half Mile to Hotel – Alternative 3
Hotel signage would be as proposed herein and would be placed on the hotel building. The signs would be halo-illuminated and the impacts would be as described under the proposed Project. All signs would be within the 64-square-foot maximum standard and would not require a Sign Exception Permit for sign size. From an aesthetics standpoint, less night lighting would occur as viewed by residents across and drivers along the I-5 Freeway with the elimination of 23 building façade tenant ID signs and 4 Icon Tower tenant identification signs.

1. **Aesthetics**

The Project ID Signs Only alternative would continue to provide Project identification signage on the Icon Tower and on the building façade consistent with the proposed Project, but would eliminate all tenant ID signage. The proposed Project would result in Aesthetics impacts, because the proposed color exceptions associated with the tenant ID signage would conflict with the Spanish style theme required by the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. This alternative would eliminate this aesthetics impact, because the color exceptions only apply to Tenant ID signs, which are not considered by this alternative. While the City’s Zoning Ordinance does not protect private views and the viewing of signage in and of itself is not considered an environmental impact, the elimination of tenant ID signage would likely be perceived by nearby residents as an aesthetic improvement. The Project ID signs would be lit consistent with the proposed Project, but the reduction of the tenant signs would eliminate a large number of signs (27) that would otherwise be illuminated at night. Again, the proposed night lighting, as mitigated, would not result in an unavoidable adverse impact, but the reduction in the total number of lit signs would likely be perceived as an aesthetics improvement.

It is important to consider whether the outlet buildings would look aesthetically pleasing with large expanses of the building facades absent of signage. This alternative would place one Project ID sign on the existing outlet building and one Project ID sign on the approved but unbuilt building. The signage would likely be adequate to preclude the assumption that the site was vacant, or closed, and would not degrade the visual character of the site or the surrounding area in a way that would result in a significant aesthetics impact.

This Alternative would result in fewer aesthetics impacts compared to the proposed Project because no color exceptions would be included.

2. **Biological Resources**

As analyzed herein, the proposed Project will not result in impacts to biological resources, because there will be no additional ground or habitat disturbance associated with the signage. This Alternative would not result in any ground disturbance or habitat disturbance and, therefore, would be identical to the proposed Project. The nearest biological resources occur in the adjacent drainages and canyons where no development or disturbance will occur. The lighting levels associated with either the proposed Project or this Alternative will not impact biological resources due to the distance between the signage and the location of the nearest habitat or species as identified in the biological resources report. Therefore, impacts with this Alternative would be the same as the proposed Project with respect to biological resources.
3. **Land Use**

The proposed Project is regulated by the Zoning Ordinance that was in place at the time the Development Agreement was approved. The Zoning Ordinance included provision for Sign Exception Permits, which allowed for deviations in the number, size, height, and length of signs. As previously noted, the City’s current Zoning Ordinance no longer includes the Sign Exception Permit and does not allow freeway-oriented signage.

Under the Project ID Signage Only Alternative, two Icon Tower Project ID signs, two building façade Project ID signs, and five hotel building façade signs would be allowed. No tenant ID signs would be included. The oversized Project ID signage on the Icon Tower and retail building would require a Sign Exception Permit; however, the hotel signage is within the 64-square-foot maximum in the Zoning Ordinance in place with approval of the Development Agreement. This Alternative would result in similar impacts to the proposed Project because both the Alternative and the proposed Project would require Sign Exception Permits for sign heights, square footage and to allow freeway-oriented signage.

4. **Transportation and Traffic**

The traffic analysis provided information related to a sign impact evaluation based on Caltrans criteria, a wayfinding impact evaluation, and an I-5 southbound freeway egress evaluation. Project ID signs on the Icon Tower and the building façade would allow drivers on the freeway sufficient visibility and recognition for safe freeway egress and wayfinding to the Project site. The elimination of individual tenant signage on the Icon Tower or building façade will not result in a significant impact from the perspective of Project identification and location from the freeway. Impacts with this Alternative would be generally similar to the proposed Project in terms of visitors’ ability to identify the retail outlets, access the appropriate freeway egress point and locate the center from the freeway.

6.7.2 **Attainment of Project Objectives**

The Project ID Signs Only Alternative is equal to the proposed Project in the area of Biological Resources, because no impacts would occur with either the proposed Project or this Alternative. Impacts to Aesthetics would be less with this Alternative, because no color exceptions would be allowed. Impacts under Land Use and Planning would be substantially the same, because a Sign Exception Permit would still be required for the over-height, over-size signs and to allow freeway-oriented signage. Transportation and Traffic impacts would be substantially the same with this Alternative in terms of safety for vehicles attempting to locate the site because hotel and Project ID signage will still be visible from the freeway.

This Alternative does not meet all the objectives of the proposed Project, which include providing adequate signage for project and tenant identification. Removal of the individual tenant signs from the Icon Tower and building façade will make it more difficult for visitors to identify which major retail stores are in the center before actually arriving at the Project site. However, impacts would be less in the area of Aesthetics, so the Alternative results in somewhat fewer environmental impacts than the proposed Project.
6.8 Project Alternative 4 – No Color Exceptions

6.8.1 Description of Alternative

The No Color Exceptions Alternative would maintain the number and placement of signage as identified in the proposed Project, but would prohibit signs using any colors other than the proposed color palette, including metallic and neutral colors consistent with the Spanish design theme required by the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. No distinctive logo colors for the nationally known brand tenants that consumers have come to recognize would be permitted. The all metallic and neutral color signage would still include halo illumination for all wall-mounted signs and up/down lighting for the Icon Tower. View simulations have not been provided for this Alternative, because it is essentially the proposed Project without colors other than metallic and neutral colors for the sign lettering and logos.

1. Aesthetics

The number and size of signs under this Alternative would remain the same as in the proposed Project; however, the color palette would be restricted to metallic and neutral colored lettering/logos with no option for additional colors. Lighting would remain the same as the proposed Project, and hours of illumination for the signage would be consistent with the proposed Project.

Views from the residences across the freeway would not be significantly different than the proposed Project because the distance between the residences and the signs would result in a more muted visual appearance, but signs would still be lighted at night and visible to the same degree. Elimination of occasional spot colors would not substantially reduce the tenants’ ability to provide national brand recognition through the use of logos, which are intended to be for “nationally recognizable brands.” This alternative would reduce the aesthetic impact that will occur under the proposed Project because the use of color exceptions is inconsistent with the Spanish style theme required by the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. In addition, because only four color exceptions are proposed, the colors may clash with the majority of the signs that will be in metallic and neutral tones, creating an aesthetics effect that is visually unappealing. The No Color Exceptions Alternative would result in fewer aesthetics impacts compared to the proposed Project.

2. Biological Resources

Impacts would be identical to the proposed Project. Neither the proposed Project nor this Alternative would disturb the canyons and drainages where biological resources have been identified. Signs would be lighted with halo illumination under either scenario. Therefore, this Alternative is the same as the proposed Project with respect to biological resources.

3. Land Use and Planning

This Alternative is equal to the proposed Project in terms of consistency with the City's policies and regulations. As noted, the Marblehead Development Agreement conveyed a
vested right to the developer to develop the outlet center in accordance with standards in place at the time the Development Agreement was approved.

Under this Alternative, the number of signs would remain as proposed but the color palette would be restricted to metallic and neutral colors. There would be no conflict with the City’s General Plan, the Zoning Code or the Marblehead Development Agreement with this Alternative. This Alternative would still require a Sign Exception Permit for freeway-oriented signs and impacts would be substantially the same as the proposed Project.

4. **Transportation and Traffic**

Impacts to transportation and traffic have been analyzed from a perspective of wayfinding and freeway egress safety for visitors to the outlet center. The color palette would not result in any impact as the number and sizes of the signs would provide adequate visibility and notice of freeway egress to allow safe wayfinding for drivers. It is presumed that nationally recognized brand logos will be distinguishable to drivers whether they are presented in color or in a metal or neutral scheme. The elimination of the four color exceptions will not diminish project identification or wayfinding. No further impacts would occur as a result of this Alternative and the impacts under transportation and traffic would be identical to the proposed Project.

6.8.2 **Attainment of Project Objectives**

This Alternative is equal to the proposed Project in the areas of biological resources, land use and planning and transportation and traffic. The Alternative would not create any impacts to biological resources because no disturbance or grading would occur in areas where biological resources were identified. There is no conflict with the number, size or location of signs under land use and planning with this Alternative. Limiting color choices for the signage would not impact drivers in terms of safety and wayfinding.

This Alternative is superior to the proposed Project with respect to Aesthetics through the elimination of the four color exceptions for tenant ID signs. The use of four colored logo signs where the majority of the signs are metal and neutral colors will create an aesthetics impact because it is inconsistent with the Spanish style architectural design theme specified in the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan. This aesthetics impact will be most visible for drivers passing the outlet center along the freeway. This Alternative may result in a slight reduction of visual impacts due to the elimination of the four color exceptions from more distant locations as well. However, the colored signs would appear less prominent as viewed from off-site locations east of the Project site across the I-5 Freeway. This Alternative meets the stated Project objectives identified in Section 4.6 above, including to provide adequate signage for project identification, provide wayfinding to ensure safe egress from the I-5 Freeway.
6.9 Project Alternative 5 – DRSC/Applicant Updated Project

6.9.1 Description of Alternative

The DRSC/Applicant Updated Project Alternative would respond to on-going feedback from the Design Review Subcommittee (DRSC) and public comments related to the impacts of the proposed signage on adjacent residential neighborhoods. The DRSC held meetings on August 4, 2016, July 26, 2017 and September 27, 2017, and provided recommendations and comments to the Applicant for additional modifications to the Project, as proposed. The modifications have been incorporated in updated SEP Permit Documents and a revised Sign Example booklet, included herein as noted below. The updated Sign Examples are included herein as Appendix K.

This Alternative proposes the re-orientation of the Icon Tower signs to eliminate the signage on the east-facing elevation directly facing the residential areas across the freeway. Rather, the Icon Tower will provide signage visible to north and southbound drivers on the freeway. Only Project ID signage and one movie theatre identification sign will appear on the Tower. The freeway-facing building façade tenant ID signage will be reduced from 14 signs to 10 with the flexibility to utilize any 10 of the 14 identified locations. All tenant ID signs are proposed to be uniform in color. Tenant ID signs will average 36” in height. Specified signs, identified below, will also have reductions in maximum sign heights and widths.

This Alternative also includes a change in the lighting temperature and light output.

Specifically, the number and size of signs under this Alternative have been modified as follows. Exhibit 6-9 through Exhibit 6-16 depict the signage as proposed in this Alternative.

1. The Sign Area Calculation and Lighting Specifications components of the Sign Example Booklet have been incorporated into the Sign Exception Permit package to provide one stand-alone Sign Program document.
2. The specifications for the LED sign lighting temperature have been reduced from 6500 K (cool white) to 4000 K (pure white), a softer, warmer color in harmony with the plaster surface of the structures.
3. SEP 1.0 has been coordinated to match elevation refinements and Icon Tower reduced signage. The Outlet ID light output has been reduced to 2000 lumens.
4. Tenant Sign Zones SEP 1.1 and 1.2 have been modified as follows:
   • On the East elevation face, reduce the number of tenant signs from 14 to a maximum of 10 tenant signs. Sign may be located in any of the 14 identified tenant sign locations. These signs shall be a uniform color, and the average height of those 10 signs shall be 36” as measured from the tallest element of each sign.
   • The sign area control strings for maximum sign length and maximum sign height have been adjusted for precise centering of signage on the architectural facades as shown in Appendix K herein.
   • Tenant Sign Location 12, maximum sign width, has been reduced from 26’0” to 22’-0”.
• Tenant Sign Location 14, maximum sign height, has been reduced from 7'-0" to 5'-0" to better fit the wall area.

• Tenant Sign Location 15 includes additional restrictions on sign placement to left justify the sign for the asymmetrical façade and requires a 48" minimum margin between top of sign projections and the clay tile edge detail.

• Tenant Sign Location 17 includes a corrected façade to restore the symmetry to the background facade, allowing the sign to be centered.

• Tenant Sign Locations 21 and 22 include reduced maximum sign width to 7'-9" and increased vertical sign allowance to 10'. Additional restrictions have been added on sign placement to left justify the sign for this asymmetrical façade, requiring a 12" minimum margin to the outside corner of the Tower.

• Tenant Sign Location 23 includes a corrected façade to restore the symmetry to the background façade, allowing the sign to be centered.

5. Proposed Hotel Signage SEP 1.3 has been further restricted to provide additional perimeter margins to provide for more neutral wall space, away from architectural features. An 18" perimeter margin is required on all signs with the exception of the North Conference Center Entry which has a 12" perimeter margin requirement.

6. Icon Tower Signage SEP 1.4 has been reduced in scale and quantity and revised positions to better shield the signs from Marblehead Inland. The southeast facing elevation has 1 Project identity as originally proposed. The two tenant ID signs have been removed and replaced with one theatre identification sign. All signs have been removed from the northeast facing elevation. The northwest facing elevation will include one Project identification sign and one theatre identification sign. Both proposed theatre identification signs conform to the existing City standard of 64 square feet maximum sign area. No signs are proposed for the southwest-facing elevation.

The halo-illuminated lighting would remain the same as the proposed Project, but as noted above, the lighting temperature would be reduced to 4000 K, and hours of illumination for the signage would be consistent with the proposed Project. Signs would still be lighted at night for one hour past the close of individual tenants, consistent with the proposed project. Signs would remain visible to a similar degree compared to the proposed project, although the number of signs and the size of some signs would be reduced.
Exhibit 6-9  – Site Plan – Alternative 5
Exhibit 6-10 – Tenant Sign Zones – Alternative 5
Exhibit 6.11 – Tenant Sign Locations – Alternative 5
Exhibit 6-12  – Tenant Sign Zones, Hotel – Alternative 5
Exhibit 6-13 – Icon Tower, Northeast and Southeast Elevations – Alternative 5
Exhibit 6-14 – Icon Tower, Northwest and Southwest Elevations – Alternative 5
Exhibit 6-15 – Tenant Sign Mounting Section – Alternative 5
Exhibit 6-16 – Signage Criteria – Alternative 5
1. **Aesthetics**

The Project Icon Tower would still have signage on two faces as with the proposed Project. However, the signage would be removed from the northeast-facing elevation and placed on the northwest facing elevation. Views from the residences across the freeway would be different than the proposed Project because the Icon Tower signage facing the residences would be eliminated with no signs being placed on the northeast and southwest facing elevations. This alternative would reduce the aesthetic impact that will occur under the proposed Project because the perceived impacts for the residents will be reduced through elimination of the most visible and nearest signage on the Icon Tower. In addition, the Icon Tower would identify only the Project and the movie theatre.

This Alternative would include a proposed uniform color for the building facade signage, which will likely be viewed as an aesthetic improvement, and specified tenant identification signs would be reduced in width and height. However, the color exception permitted under the proposed Project would remain with this alternative for south-facing tenant ID signs and, therefore, would be similarly inconsistent with the Specific Plan Spanish theme concept and would remain a significant unavoidable impact.

As noted, the reduction in the lighting temperature and lumens is an aesthetic improvement compared to the proposed Project. The DRSC/Applicant Updated Project Alternative would result in fewer perceived aesthetics impacts to residents across the I-5 Freeway compared to the proposed Project and is, therefore, marginally superior to the proposed Project in the area of aesthetics.

2. **Biological Resources**

Impacts would be identical to the proposed Project. Neither the proposed Project nor this Alternative would disturb the canyons and drainages where biological resources have been identified. Signs would be lighted with halo illumination under either scenario. Therefore, this Alternative is the same as the proposed Project with respect to biological resources.

3. **Land Use and Planning**

This Alternative is equal to the proposed Project in terms of consistency with the City’s policies and regulations. As noted, the Marblehead Development Agreement conveyed a vested right to the developer to develop the outlet center in accordance with standards in place at the time the Development Agreement was approved.

Under this Alternative, the number of tenant signs would be reduced and the sign size would be reduced as detailed above. There would be no conflict with the City’s General Plan, the Zoning Code, or the Marblehead Development Agreement with this Alternative. This Alternative would include color exceptions similar to the proposed Project for south-facing tenant signage, which is inconsistent with the City’s Spanish design theme. In addition, this Alternative would still require a Sign Exception Permit for freeway-oriented signs, and impacts would be substantially the same as the proposed Project.
4. Transportation and Traffic

Impacts to transportation and traffic have been analyzed from a perspective of wayfinding and freeway egress safety for visitors to the outlet center. This Alternative would not result in any impact, because the re-orientation of Icon Tower signs on two sides would still provide adequate visibility and notice of freeway egress to allow safe wayfinding for drivers on the I-5 Freeway, because the Icon Tower signage would be visible and would face both northbound and southbound drivers. The signage facing across the freeway towards the residences would be eliminated under this Alternative. In addition, signs on the Icon Tower would be limited under this Alternative to the retail center identification and the movie theatre. Building wall-mounted signage will be modified somewhat as described above, but the Project ID signage is unchanged. The modifications identified in this Alternative would still provide adequate wayfinding for vehicles accessing the Outlet Center from the freeway. No additional impacts would occur as a result of this Alternative, and the impacts under transportation and traffic would be similar to the proposed Project.

6.9.2 Attainment of Project Objectives

This Alternative is generally equal to the proposed Project in the areas of biological resources, land use and planning, and transportation and traffic. The Alternative would not create any impacts to biological resources, because no disturbance or grading would occur in areas where biological resources were identified. There is no conflict with the number, size, or location of signs under land use and planning with this Alternative. The elimination of signage on the residence-facing side of the Icon Tower would not impact drivers in terms of safety and wayfinding, because signage would be re-oriented to provide Project ID and one anchor tenant name on the tower sides facing the northbound and southbound freeway drivers.

This Alternative is superior to the proposed Project with respect to aesthetics based on the reduction of the number of tenant ID signs on the eastern façade from 14 to 10, and the reduced size of signs as detailed above. Reduced lighting temperatures and lumens will reduce lighting levels, and the uniform colors for the freeway-facing signage on the east building façade would further enhance the aesthetics views. The modifications identified in this Alternative would result in signage that is less prominent as viewed from off-site locations east of the Project site across the I-5 Freeway. However, the signage generally will still be highly visible from the adjacent residences east of the freeway. In addition, the color exceptions on the south elevation will be inconsistent with the City's Spanish design theme and would still be considered a significant unavoidable impact. This Alternative meets the stated Project objectives identified in Section 4.6 (beginning on page 55 above), including to provide adequate signage for project identification, provide wayfinding to ensure safe egress from the I-5 Freeway.
6.10 **Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Per CEQA Guidelines §15126.6, a range of reasonable alternatives has been considered in this SEIR. The Alternatives were intended to reduce the significant impact of the proposed Project and to address concerns presented at the Scoping Meeting and in Notice of Preparation comment letters. CEQA does not require that an alternative meet all project objectives, rather, CEQA §15126.6(f) specifies that alternatives should “feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project.” As detailed above, the No Project Alternative does not meet most of the project objectives because it would not provide Project Identification Signage, Assist in Wayfinding and Safe Egress from the Freeway, and it would not allow signage consistent with the approvals vested in the Development Agreement. The No Project Alternative results in greater impacts in the areas of aesthetics, Land Use and Planning and Traffic. Alternative 3 – Project ID Signage Only does not meet the objective of allowing for signs consistent with the Development Agreement.

The remaining Project alternatives presented herein, including Alternative 2 – Reduced Size/Reduced Number, Alternative 4 – No Color Exceptions, and Alternative 5 – DRSC/Applicant Updated Project, would reduce Project impacts in the area of aesthetics, compared to the proposed Project. However, a significant impact would still result because of the color exceptions for the signs on the south elevation. In addition, these alternatives would not result in new or greater impacts in the areas of biology, land use and planning, or transportation and traffic as compared to the proposed Project. While these three Project alternatives would each reduce Project impacts in the area of Aesthetics, the alternatives were analyzed to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision making.

Alternatives 2 and 4 may both be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative because both alternatives would result in the same reduction of impacts in the area of Aesthetics (elimination of color exceptions). These alternatives may be perceived differently by members of the public, residents living within one-quarter mile of the site where the signs will be most visible, and residents living at greater distances. This is because the visual appearance of the signs is diminished with distance, and also because certain viewer groups may be more sensitive to the visual appearance of signs, and the number of signs, even if they are not considered to be significant environmental impacts.

For purposes of this analysis, Alternative 2 – Reduced Size/Reduced Number, would reduce the significant impact in the area of aesthetics and may be perceived to result in an improvement compared to the proposed Project, because it lessens the perceived aesthetics impacts such as sign clutter and night lighting. This Alternative would allow 17 tenant ID signs rather than 27 and would permit a maximum size of 64 square feet for tenant ID signs. Therefore, Alternative 2 is considered to be the superior alternative, because it would result in a reduction of significant impacts in the area of aesthetics (no color exceptions) compared to the proposed Project and would also result in an overall reduction in sign number and size, which may be perceived as a beneficial outcome.
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7. Summary of Cumulative Impacts

CEQA requires the consideration of cumulative impacts. Defined, these impacts are “two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines §15355). Where the Project will create an impact to the existing residential developments, such impacts are noted in Section 5 of the SEIR. In addition to assessment of impacts on the environment, including the existing built environment, this section analyzes whether the Project will result in incremental effects that, when combined with other past, present and probable future projects, are cumulatively considerable.

The proposed Project is signage for a regional shopping center, the Outlets at San Clemente, located in the City of San Clemente and which is part of the larger Marblehead Coastal development. The City is nearly built out along the I-5 Freeway corridor where the Project site is surrounded by residential development to the north, east, and west and industrial uses to the south.

The SEIR analyzed adjacent development projects, some of which are approved but unbuilt, in terms of impacts to those developments due to the proposed Project. The Sea Summit residential community, which includes Shore Cliffs Middle School, is located to the north and west of the Project and is still under development. The City’s General Plan, Land Use Chapter notes that most of the City’s expansion areas are built out and growth will primarily occur on vacant infill parcels or through redevelopment. The Outlets at San Clemente is part of the retail/commercial component of the Marblehead Coastal development and will ultimately be built out with a hotel, a movie theatre, restaurants, and additional stores. The residential component will ultimately consist of 313 residential lots.

Section 5 of the SEIR contains analysis of cumulative impacts for each topical environmental section. Specifically, the existing built environment was used to accurately describe the existing setting without the proposed Project and was contemplated to determine whether the proposed Project, when combined with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would result in cumulatively considerable impacts Cumulative impact conclusions are based on two key criteria:

1. Level of project-specific impact. When an analysis concludes a project’s impacts are individually minor but “cumulatively considerable,” the project may have a significant impact on the environment.

2. Consideration of non-existing conditions and other cumulative projects. If there is a serious existing problem such that any additional amount of impact, when compared to the pre-existing conditions, would be significant, any additional amount of project impact would contribute to a cumulative impact.
The table below identifies each environmental topic and discusses cumulative impacts related to each.

Table 7-1  Cumulative Impacts Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Issue/Topic</th>
<th>Project Specific Impact</th>
<th>Conclusion Regarding Cumulative Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>New sources of light will be introduced to the site. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to reduce aesthetics impacts to less than significant.</td>
<td>The view simulations depict the proposed Project. Views of the site will be similar to other commercial development within the vicinity. No scenic views will be impacted. Cumulative impacts occur when Project impacts are considered with other projects that could exacerbate the visual condition. There are no comparable new or approved projects in the vicinity that would make a cumulative contribution to the views from adjacent residences or the freeway. Therefore, the Project will not result in a cumulative impact to aesthetics within the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>The Project site is within Subarea 4 of the Southern Orange County Habitat Conservation Program. The Project site is substantially disturbed by existing buildings and graded for unbuilt portions of the development. Identified biological resources are limited to the adjacent drainages/canyons where no grading or ground disturbance will occur. The lighted signage which is proposed in this SEIR will occur at least 200 feet from the nearest potentially suitable habitat.</td>
<td>The Project has been analyzed as having no direct or indirect impacts to biological resources either on-site or in the adjacent canyons and drainages. Therefore, the Project will not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable related to biological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>The proposed Project is consistent with the City’s General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, the Marblehead Specific Plan and the Marblehead Development Agreement (DA). The proposed Project relates to an increase in the number of signs previously approved by the sign program. The DA provides that the Zoning Ordinance in existence at the time the DA was approved is the prevailing regulatory document. The amendment to the original sign program is permitted with a Sign Exception Permit (Section 17.16.260 of the Municipal Code in effect under the Development Agreement).</td>
<td>The proposed Project is consistent with applicable policies and regulations as identified in the City’s General Plan, Marblehead DA and Specific Plan. Development of a regional shopping center such as The Outlets at San Clemente was envisioned by the General Plan. The Marblehead Coastal Development will ultimately be built with fewer residences and less retail/commercial square footage. Therefore, as analyzed in the Marblehead EIR, potential cumulative impacts will be reduced overall. An increase in the proposed Project signage will not result in cumulative impacts in the area of land use and will be consistent with applicable goals, policies and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Addenda to the original Marblehead EIR have reduced the project size from 720,000 square feet of retail/commercial to approximately 641,000 square feet. Reduction of residential units has further lessened traffic impacts as analyzed in the EIR. Analysis in this SEIR is specific to traffic impacts related to additional freeway-oriented signage. Evaluation focused on wayfinding and freeway egress. Analysis determined that providing wall-</td>
<td>The proposed signage is specific to The Outlets at San Clemente and will not induce additional freeway-oriented signage in the vicinity. The Project will not induce additional signage as the surrounding area is generally built out with little opportunity for additional development requiring freeway signage. Therefore, the Project will not result in cumulative impacts affecting traffic in the vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Issue/Topic</td>
<td>Project Specific Impact</td>
<td>Conclusion Regarding Cumulative Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mounted signage and icon/tower signage will not significantly impact traffic on the adjacent I-5 Freeway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Growth-Inducing Impacts

CEQA requires the consideration of growth-inducing impacts resulting from new development. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(d), such impacts are ways in which the proposed Project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included are projects that would remove obstacles to growth. In addition, growth-inducing impacts could be realized if the project would encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.

Potential growth-inducing impacts have been discussed throughout this SEIR, but are brought to focus in this section. The proposed Project is within the City of San Clemente which is substantially built-out and has little potential for future large scale development. There is little opportunity for large scale development in the areas immediately adjacent to not only the Project site, but within the City generally. Not only the nature of the proposed Project, but the lack of developable land in the vicinity, restrict the possibility that the Project will result in growth-inducing impacts.

The City's General Plan envisioned the development of a fully operational regional shopping center which would include project signage. There is nothing related to the provision of the proposed signage that will foster population growth or the need for infrastructure and other development improvements generally for the Marblehead Coastal development will not be extended into adjacent areas outside of the Project boundaries. Growth inducing impacts related to the entire Marblehead Coastal development were fully analyzed in the original EIR and the project proposed herein is limited to the signage associated with the outlet center.

There is no anticipated population growth due to the Project which will result in growth-inducing impacts. The General Plan and Specific Plan original approval was for substantially more commercial square footage than will be constructed for the outlet center. The requirement for signage was anticipated with the development of the regional center. The proposed Project is limited to the increase in signage from that which was originally proposed and approved and will not result in additional growth-inducing impacts.
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9. Inventory of Mitigation Measures

MM AE-1 Prior to the issuance of building permits for proposed outlet center tenant and Project identification signage, the Project Applicant shall submit plans to the Planning Division demonstrating that all proposed sign lighting is set to a timer. Sign lighting shall be turned off at the time of closure of each individual tenant consistent with the Project use permit.
10. Inventory of Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

10.1 Aesthetics

Impacts related to the use of up to four color exceptions for nationally recognized brand logos are inconsistent with the Spanish style architecture specified in the Marblehead Coastal Specific Plan and result in an unavoidable, adverse impact.
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11. Organizations Affiliated with the Project

The City of San Clemente is the Lead Agency for the proposed Project. Contact persons for the project are:

**City of San Clemente**

Community Development Department, Planning Division  
910 Calle Negocio, Suite 100  
San Clemente, CA 92673  
(949) 361-6186  
Amy Vazquez, Contract Planner  
(949) 361-6182

**Environmental Consultant**

CAA Planning, Inc.  
65 Enterprise, Suite 130  
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656  
(949) 581-2888  
Shawna L. Schaffner, CEO  
Kathleen Crum, Senior Planner  
Pua Whitford, Assistant Planner

**Project Applicant**

Villa San Clemente  
225 Avenida Vista del Oceano  
San Clemente, CA 92672  
(949) 498-2678

**Other Organizations Affiliated with the Project**

Aesthetics  
KTU+A  
3916 Normal Street  
San Diego, CA 92103  
Michael Singleton, Principal Planner

Investigative Science and Engineering, Inc.  
P. O. Box 488  
Ramona, CA 92065  
(760) 787-0016
Multimedia LED
4225 Prado Road, Suite 108
Corona, CA 92880
(951) 280-7500
Alex Birner, President

Studio Progetti
328 East Padre Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
(805) 563-4460

Biological Resources
Merkel & Associates, Inc.
5434 Ruffin Road
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 560-5465
Keith W. Merkel

Transportation/Traffic
Linscott, Law & Greenspan
2 Executive Circle, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 825-6175
Keil D. Maberry, Principal