



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

November 18, 2015

VIA E-MAIL: jguise@sandiego.gov

Jason Guise, Project Manager
Right-of-Way Division, Engineering and Capital Projects Department
525 B Street, Suite 750 MS 908A
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Guise:

Subject: HIGHLAND AND MONROE STORM DRAIN REPLACEMENT PROJECT,
Assessment Letter; Project No. 442502; WBS# B-12096.02.01

The Development Services Department has completed the **first review** of the project referenced above, and described as:

- For the replacement of three segments of storm drains for a total of 841 linear feet at the following locations: Highland Avenue, 45th Street and Monroe Avenue, and North Talmadge Drive within the Kensington-Talmadge Community Plan. The project is located within the OR-1-1, RS-1-1, and RS-1-7 Zones.

Enclosed is Cycle Issues Report No. 5 (Enclosure 1) which contains review comments from staff representing various disciplines. The purpose of this assessment letter is to summarize the significant project issues and identify a course of action for the processing of your project.

If any additional requirements should arise during the subsequent review of your project, we will identify the issue and the reason for the additional requirement. To resolve any outstanding issues, please provide the information that is requested in the Cycle Issues Report. If you choose not to provide the requested additional information or make the requested revisions, processing may continue. However, the project may be recommended for denial if the remaining issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved and the appropriate findings for approval cannot be made.

As your Development Project Manager, I will coordinate all correspondence, emails, phone calls, and meetings directly with the applicants assigned "Point of Contact." The addressee on this letter has been designated as the Point of Contact for your project. Please notify me if you should decide to change your Point of Contact while I am managing this project.

I. REQUIRED APPROVALS/FINDINGS - Your project as currently proposed requires the processing of:

Required approvals: A Site Development Permit for work within Environmentally Sensitive Lands containing sensitive biological resources (Process CIP-Two). The decision to approve, conditionally approve, or deny the project will be made by a staff level review.

Required Findings: In order to recommend approval of your project, certain findings must be substantiated in the record. During the first review of the project the applicable findings will be identified and draft applicant findings will be requested. Enclosure 2 contains the required findings.

II. SIGNIFICANT PROJECT ISSUES: The significant project issues are summarized below. Resolution of these issues could affect your project. Additional explanation is provided in the Cycle Issues Report.

KEY ISSUES:

- **LDR-Planning** – Work within premises containing Environmentally Sensitive Land (Sensitive Biological Resources) without deviations require a Site Development Permit.
- **LDR-Engineering** – The project requires a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) that must be prepared in accordance with Appendix G of Storm Water Standard Manual; Please note drainage study and hydraulic analysis is required to insure adequacy of proposed RCP pipes and drainage system; and refer to the list of corrections required to be added in the plans.
- **LDR-Environmental** – The minimum CEQA documents that would be required for the project is a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). Mitigations and monitoring are required for archaeological, paleontological, and biological resources/land use adjacency to a less than significant level. However, a final determination cannot be made until all project issues of all reviewing disciplines are adequately addressed.
- **LDR-Geology** – Submit an addendum geotechnical report or update letter that addresses the cycle issues.
- **Planning-MSCP** – The project will require a biological monitoring during construction.

III. STUDIES/REPORTS REQUIRED: A number of documents have been identified as necessary to the project's review. Reference the attached Submittal Requirements Report (Enclosure 3).

- IV. PROJECT ACCOUNT STATUS:** When submitting your project please reaffirm the SAP or WBS number. Please contact me immediately if there are any changes to these numbers.
- V. TIMELINE:** Upon your review of the attached Cycle Issues Report, you may wish to schedule a meeting with staff and your consultants prior to resubmitting the project. Please telephone me if you wish to schedule a meeting with staff.

Your next review cycle should take approximately 20 days to complete.

If you wish to continue processing this project, please note that delays in resubmitting projects and/or responding to City staff's inquiries negatively impact this Department's ability to effectively manage workload, which can lead to both higher processing costs and longer timelines for your project.

- VI. RESUBMITTALS/NEXT STEPS:** When you are ready to resubmit, please call me directly to confirm the submittal requirements have not changed for the next review cycle. Once we review the submittal requirements, you may me for a Public Project resubmittal at 619-446-5443 or via e-mail at pkann@sandiego.gov for an appointment.

San Diego County Clerk Fee: The San Diego County Clerk now requires \$50.00 to post the required public notice informing the public that a draft environmental document has been prepared. A check made out to the San Diego County Clerk for this amount will be required prior to the distribution of the draft environmental document for public review.

D. CEQA Filing Fees: A California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Notice of Determination (NOD) must be filed within five working days after the project's approval and all appeal periods have been exhausted. Filing the NOD would start a 30-day statute of limitations on legal court challenges to the approval under CEQA. The NOD must be accompanied by a California Department of Fish and Wildlife Fee (CDFW) filing fee or a CDFW "No Effect" form, and a San Diego County document handling fee.

Prior to the project's decision, the following must be forwarded to me to be filed with the CEQA NOD:

- A check, payable to the "San Diego County Clerk" in the amount of \$2,260.00 (\$2,210.00 CDFW fee + \$50 handling fee) if a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for your project; Please include your project number on the check.

A receipt for the fee and a copy of the NOD will be forwarded to you after the 30-day posting requirement by the County Clerk.

E. Records Fee: A Records Fee, to cover the cost of imaging and archiving your complete project record electronically, will be billed to your projects account (see Information Bulletin 503).

VII. COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP: Staff provides the decision maker with the recommendation from your locally recognized community planning group. If you have not already done so, please contact David Moty, Chairperson of the Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group, at kentalpc@yahoo.com to schedule your project for a recommendation from the group. If you have already obtained a recommendation from the community planning group, in your resubmittal, if applicable, please indicate how your project incorporates any input suggested to you by the community planning group.

Council Policy 600-24 provides standard operating procedures and responsibilities of recognized Community Planning Committees and is available at <http://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/officialdocs/index.shtml>

VIII. STAFF REVIEW TEAM: Should you require clarification about specific comments from the staff reviewing team, please contact me, or feel free to contact the reviewer directly. The names and telephone numbers of each reviewer can be found on the enclosed Cycle Issues Report.

In conclusion, please re-submit your project for a Site Development Permit (Process CIP-Two) to the Development Services Department. Please see the **Public Projects - Submittal Requirements for Development Permit/Approvals**. The submittal requirements are located on citynet at: <http://citynet/dsd/index.shtml>

Additional information and links to bulletins and guidelines can be found at: <http://citynet/dsd/publicprojects.shtml>

For modifications to the project scope, submittal requirements or questions regarding any of the above, please contact me prior to resubmittal. I may be reached by telephone at (619) 446-5443 or via e-mail at pkann@sandiego.gov

Sincerely,



Peter Kann
Development Project Manager

Page 5
Jason Guise, Project Manager
November 18, 2015

Enclosures:

1. Cycle No. 5 Issues Report
2. Required Findings
3. Submittal Requirements Report

cc: File
David Moty, Chair of the Kensington-Talmadge Planning Group
Reviewing Staff (Assessment letter only)



L64A-003B

Project InformationProject Nbr: **442502**

Title: Highland - Monroe Storm Drain

Project Mgr: Kann, Peter

(619) 446-5443

PKann@sandiego.gov

**Review Information****Cycle Type:** 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)**Submitted:** 09/24/2015 Deemed Complete on 09/24/2015**Reviewing Discipline:** LDR-Planning Review**Cycle Distributed:** 09/24/2015**Reviewer:** Kann, Peter**Assigned:** 09/28/2015

(619) 446-5443

Started: 11/17/2015

PKann@sandiego.gov

Review Due: 10/22/2015**Hours of Review:** 1.00**Completed:** 11/17/2015**Next Review Method:** Submitted (Multi-Discipline)**Closed:**

- . The review due date was changed to 10/27/2015 from 10/27/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).

Permit Requirements

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project is located outside the Coastal Overlay Zone. A Coastal Development Permit is not required. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	A Site Development Permit is required because the project is located on a premise that contains Environmentally Sensitive Lands for sensitive biological resources. The project will have direct impacts to .0004 acre of Chamise Chapparral (Tier II sensitive biological resources). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Applications for Capital Improvement Projects requiring a Site Development Permit requires a Process CIP-Two decision made by a staff level review.

Any deviations from the Environmentally Sensitive Lands will require a Process CIP-Five Decision. (New Issue)



. The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.

. The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.

. Your project still has 10 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The project's Geotechnical Investigation (GEOCON, Inc. March 30, 2015) indicates there is undisturbed native soil (Alluvium) at the base of the canyons that would be disturbed by the proposed project. Since native surficial soils have the potential to contain sensitive archaeological resources this disturbance could have significant impact on archaeological resources. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Unless a cultural resources report is submitted that demonstrates the project would have a less than significant impact on archaeological resources, monitoring by qualified archaeological and native american monitors will be required during the proposed project's ground disturbance of areas containing Alluvium to reduce potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level. (New Issue)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The project site is underlain by the Linda Vista and San Diego geological deposit/formation/rock unit as indicated by the submitted geotechnical investigation and City of San Diego/California Division of Mines and Geology La Jolla Quadrangle geologic map. The City of San Diego CEQA Significance Thresholds Paleontological Monitoring Determination Matrix indicates that the Linda Vista Formation is moderately sensitive, and the San Diego Formation is highly sensitive, for the discovery of paleontological resources. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The thresholds state that monitoring is required when when grading near a fossil recovery site in the same geologic formation as the project site indicated on the Kennedy Maps. There is a fossil recovery site within one-quarter mile of the project site in the Linda Vista Formation. Therefore, a qualified paleontological monitor will be required to be present during ground disturbance of areas where Linda Vista Formation is present. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The thresholds state that monitoring may be required for shallow grading when unweathered geologic formations are present at the surface. Since the geotechnical investigation indicates there is exposed San Diego formation at the surface for portions of the project alignment, a qualified paleontological monitor will be required to be present during ground disturbance of areas where San Diego Formation is present. (New Issue)

		<u>Issue</u>
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	The project's Biological Survey Letter Report (Dudek, 7/20/15) recommends that the General Avian, Raptor, and California Gnatcatcher avoidance measures be employed during project construction to reduce potential indirect and direct impacts to these avian species to a less than significant level. In addition, the Plan - MSCPP review discipline recommends that the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (LUAG) be adhered to during project implementation. The avian avoidance and LUAG will be incorporated into the CEQA document as mitigation measures for the project. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	The copy of the Biological Survey Letter Report that was distributed to LDR - Environmental review did not include Figures 3a, 4a, or 4b . Please provide color copies of these figures with the next review cycle submittal. (New Issue)

	<u>Issue</u>	
Cleared?	Num	Issue Text



L64A-003B

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8 | The LDR - Geology review discipline has requested the submittal of an addendum geotechnical report or update letter. Please provide a copy of this document to LDR - Environmental review with the next review cycle submittal. LDR - Environmental review cannot adequately assess the environmental impacts that may result from the geologic conditions affecting the project site until LDR - Geology review accepts the project's geotechnical investigation as adequate for the purpose of environmental review. (New Issue) |
|--------------------------|---|--|

Hydrology/Water Quality

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9 | The LDR - Engineering review discipline has requested the submittal of a Drainage Study. Please provide a copy of this document to LDR - Environmental Review with the next review cycle submittal. LDR - Environmental review cannot adequately assess the environmental impacts related to hydrology/water quality until LDR - Engineering review accepts the project's drainage study as adequate and complete. (New Issue) |
|--------------------------|---|--|

CEQA Determination

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- | | | |
|--------------------------|----|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10 | Since mitigation and monitoring will be required to reduce the proposed project's potentially significant impacts to archaeological, paleontological, and biological resources/land use adjacency to a less than significant level, as described in the previous Project Issue Groups, the minimum CEQA document that would be required is a mitigated negative declaration (MND). However, a final determination with respect to the requirements of CEQA cannot be made until the project issues of all reviewing disciplines are adequately addressed. Therefore, the MND determination is preliminary. (New Issue) |
|--------------------------|----|--|





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 09/24/2015	Deemed Complete on 09/24/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 09/24/2015	
Reviewer: Florezabihi, Hoss (619) 446-5348 florezabih@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 09/24/2015	
	Started: 10/22/2015	
Hours of Review: 5.00	Review Due: 10/22/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 10/22/2015	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 10/27/2015 from 10/27/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 14 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).

1st Review Comments

Issue		
Cleared?	Num	Issue Text
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This is a CIP project and therefore CIP engineer(s) will ensure compliance with all regulations/ requirements including Storm Water requirements. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Please note These projects require a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) that must be prepared in accordance with Appendix G of Storm Water Standard Manual. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Access Easements - Physical access shall be provided to all storm drain easements . Should special access to storm drain be required because of grade differential , a minimum access easement of 15' shall be established . A min. access road shall be provided in the access easement , 12' wide with a max. grade of 15% . (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	For pipes 24" or larger , enlarge easement on one side of clean out to 20'. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Please callout & show limits of easements per last two comments on your Site plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Please call out/show B-sheet # for proposed easement . (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Please propose water tight joints for all slopes greater than 20%. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Please call out replacement of curb/gutter and sidewalk in all affected areas. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Please note Drainage study & hydraulic analysis is required to insure adequacy of proposed RCP pipes & drainage system. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Please note Concrete Energy Dissipater per D-42 is required @ Highland Ave. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Please note special design rip rap is required for velocity over 18 f/s on Highland Ave. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Please add new cross gutter per SDG-157 and curb ramps to the Legend on Cover sheet . (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Please note trench proposal on 45th street is subject to Street Preservation Fee based on street overlay date of 8/15/2003. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Please note trench proposal on Monroe Ave. is subject to Street Preservation Fee based on street overlay date of 8/15/2004.
		(New Issue)





L64A-003B

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Review Information

Cycle Type: 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 09/24/2015	Deemed Complete on 09/24/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 09/24/2015	
Reviewer: Quinn, Jim	Assigned: 09/24/2015	
(619) 446-5334	Started: 09/24/2015	
jpquinn@sandiego.gov	Review Due: 10/22/2015	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Completed: 10/22/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 10/27/2015 from 10/27/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: New Document Required.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 9 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (all of which are new).

442502-5 (10/22/2015)

Information

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
-----------------	------------------	-------------------

<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Geologic Hazard Category:
--------------------------	---	---------------------------

Based on the City's Seismic Safety Study maps, the subject site is located within geologic hazard category 52, which is characterized as having a low risk of geologic hazards.

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	2	References:
--------------------------	---	-------------

Limited Geotechnical Investigation, Highland and Monroe Storm Drain Replacement, Contract No. H104861, Task No. 11G29, San Diego, California, prepared by Geocon Inc., dated March 30, 2015 (their project no. G1200-52-15)

Highland & Monroe Storm Drain Replacement, 30% Design, prepared by City of San Diego, Public Works, dated July 17, 2015

(New Issue)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
-----------------	------------------	-------------------

<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Submit an addendum geotechnical report or update letter that addresses the following:
--------------------------	---	---

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Circumscribe the limits of anticipated remedial grading on the geologic maps.
--------------------------	---	---

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Provide geologic/geotechnical cross sections along the storm drain alignments that shows existing and proposed grades, remedial grading, distribution of fill, and geologic units.
--------------------------	---	--

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Describe the gradient, condition, and performance of the existing slopes. Indicate if remedial grading or other measures are necessary to rehabilitate the existing slopes.
--------------------------	---	---

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Indicate if subdrains are recommended for this project.
--------------------------	---	---

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Indicate if the proposed construction will destabilize or result in settlement of adjacent property or the right of way.
--------------------------	---	--

(New Issue)

<input type="checkbox"/>	9	The engineer of work should clearly show the limits of grading on the preliminary plans. The limits of grading should encompass the area of remedial grading anticipated by the project's geotechnical consultant. (New Issue)
--------------------------	---	--





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 5 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 09/24/2015	Deemed Complete on 09/24/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-MSCP	Cycle Distributed: 09/24/2015	
Reviewer: Forburger, Kristen	Assigned: 09/30/2015	
(619) 236-6583	Started: 10/22/2015	
kforburger@sandiego.gov	Review Due: 10/22/2015	
Hours of Review: 3.00	Completed: 10/22/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 10/27/2015 from 10/27/2015 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.

MSCP review 10/22/15

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	MSCP has reviewed "Biological Survey Letter Report for Highland and Monroe Avenues Storm Drain Replacement" prepared by DUDEK (July 20, 2015). The report determined that significant direct impacts to sensitive habitat and the MHPA would result with project implementation. Indirect impacts to avian and the MHPA have the potential to result. Therefore, Biological Monitoring during Construciton including General Avian and the MHPA LUAG's mitigation monitoring and reporting programs should be implemented as determined by EAS with the environmental determination for the project. (New Issue)



Submittal Requirements



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

11/18/15 11:49 am

Page 1 of 1

L64A-001

Project Information

Project Nbr: **442502**

Title: Highland - Monroe Storm Drain

Project Mgr: Kann, Peter

(619)446-5443

PKann@sandiego.gov



Review Cycle Information

Review Cycle: 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

Opened: 11/18/2015 10:06 am

Submitted:

Due:

Closed:

Required Documents:

Package Type

Pkg Qty Document Type

Qty Needed

Development Plans

5 Applicant Response to Issues

5

Development Plans

5 Site Development Plans

5

Biology Study/Report

2 Biology Study/Report

2

Geotechnical Reports

3 Geotechnical Investigation Report

3



126.0504 Findings for Site Development Permit Approval

A Site Development Permit may be approved or conditionally approved only if the decision maker makes all of the *findings* in Section 126.0504(a) and the supplemental *findings* in Section 126.0504(b) through (o) that are applicable to the proposed *development* as specified in this section.

(a) Findings for all Site Development Permits

- (1) The proposed *development* will not adversely affect the applicable *land use plan*;
- (2) The proposed *development* will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare; and
- (3) The proposed *development* will comply with the regulations of the Land Development Code including any allowable deviations pursuant to the Land Development Code.

(b) Supplemental Findings--Environmentally Sensitive Lands

A Site Development Permit required in accordance with Section 143.0110 because of potential impacts to *environmentally sensitive lands* may be approved or conditionally approved only if the decision maker makes the following supplemental *findings* in addition to the *findings* in Section 126.0504(a):

- (1) The site is physically suitable for the design and siting of the proposed *development* and the *development* will result in minimum disturbance to *environmentally sensitive lands*;
- (2) The proposed *development* will minimize the alteration of natural land forms and will not result in undue risk from geologic and erosional forces, *flood* hazards, or fire hazards;
- (3) The proposed *development* will be sited and designed to prevent adverse impacts
- (4) The proposed *development* will be consistent with the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan;
- (5) The proposed *development* will not contribute to the erosion of public beaches or adversely impact local shoreline sand supply; and
- (6) The nature and extent of mitigation required as a condition of the permit is reasonably related to, and calculated to alleviate, negative impacts created by the proposed *development*.