



Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 261310 **Title:** Jean Drive Storm Drain
Project Mgr: Deisher, Helene (619) 446-5223 hdeisher@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 13 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/03/2013	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2013
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2013	
Reviewer: Majas, Polonia (619) 446-5394 pmajas@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 02/28/2013	
	Started: 03/04/2013	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 03/11/2013	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 03/04/2013	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/07/2013	

- . The review due date was changed to 03/11/2013 from 01/31/2013 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (2 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 99 reviews, 66.7% were on-time, and 53.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Informational Items

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	The property is located within the OR-1-1 zone of the Mid-City:Kensington-Talmadge Community Plan, the Campus Parking Impact Overlay Zone, the Central Urbanized Planned District. The project site is located within Environmentally Sensitive Lands (Steep Hillides and Sensitive Biological Resources) and is located within the Multiple Habitat Planning Area - Subarea 114. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Scope of Work - Project proposes to remove an existing storm drain and to install a new storm drain at a new location. (From Cycle 12)

Required Permits

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	The proposed project will require a Site Development Permit (SDP) for impacts to Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL), processed in accordance with Process Three (Hearing Officer as decision-maker, appealable to Planning Commission) per Section 143.0110(b). In accordance with Section 143.0111(d), outside the Coastal Overlay Zone, City linear utility projects are exempt from the development area regulations for Steep Hillides and Sensitive Biological Resources, including development within the MHPA. (From Cycle 12)

ESL Exemption

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Revegetation Plan dated May, 31, 2012 indicates that the proposed "location of the new pipe corresponds to the original approved location for this storm drain; the failed storm drain was not constructed pursuant to the approved plans." Per SDMC Section 143.0110(c)(5), city public works projects for which plans, specifications, or funding have been approved by the City Council or the City Manager before July 1, 1991 are exempt from a Site Development Permit. If applicable, applicant may provide documentation demonstrating that the project meets the SDMC exemption criteria noted above. (From Cycle 12)

Community Plan

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

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Polonia Majas at (619) 446-5394. Project Nbr: 261310 / Cycle: 13





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 7 The proposed project is located within designated Open Space in the Kensington-Talmadge Community Plan Map (Figure 9) of the Mid-City Community Plan. The Public Facilities and Services Element recognizes that existing utility services (including drainage facilities) will require improvements to address recurrent roadway flooding problems (p. 119). The project is consistent with this policy. (From Cycle 12)

MHPA - Subarea 114

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 8 LDR-Planning review staff will confer

Planning staff will confer verify the existence of ESL on the premises upon conference with Environmental staff on any ESL impacts (From Cycle 12)
- 9 Planning staff will verify the existence of ESL on the premises upon conference with Environmental staff on any ESL impacts.

Please note that if wetlands are impacted as part of the propsoed project, the Site Development Permit (SDP) will be elevated to a Process Four (Planning Commision as decision-maker, appealable to City Council) per SDMC Section 143.0141(b). (From Cycle 12)

Pending Comments

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 10 Provide a completely dimensioned site plan.
 1. Include the exterior dimensions of both sites.
 2. Include the dimensions of the disturbed areas to allow staff to verify the disturbed area calculations shown on sheet 1.
 3. It appears that the project is encroaching in to an adjacent private site. Please clarify.

(From Cycle 12)
- 11 Please provide the following information on plans.
 1. Quantify the total of impact and include the percentage of impacts for the entire sites.
 2. Quantify the area of grading proposed.
 2. Plans show the relocation of an existing private shed? Please clarify and provide details regarding this shed. It appears that this shed is being relocated on city owned property?

(From Cycle 12)
- 12 On plans and within the project summary of the "Revegetation Plan" provide an explanation describing the staging area for the project. Provide information clarifying that the staging area will not impact additional ESL's during or after construction. (From Cycle 12)
- 13 On plans include the legal description of the sites. (From Cycle 12)

02nd Review

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 14 Per LDR-Environmental review no wetland impacts on site due to the absence of wetlands within the project site. (New Issue)
- 15 Prior to the next resubmittal, please contact me directly to discuss pending comments. (New Issue)





Review Information

Cycle Type: 13 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/03/2013	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2013
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2013	
Reviewer: Szymanski, Jeffrey (619) 446-5324 jszymanski@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/10/2013	
	Started: 02/05/2013	
Hours of Review: 3.00	Review Due: 01/31/2013	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 02/05/2013	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 03/07/2013	

- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 72 reviews, 52.8% were on-time, and 42.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Extended Initial Study

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Entitlements Division has reviewed the referenced project and has determined that additional information is required for Biological Resources and Land Use. Until the above issues have been addressed, the CEQA determination can not be made and the environmental processing time line will be held in abeyance. (From Cycle 1)

Land Use

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Please see comments from MSCP staff. Compliance with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines would be required. The BTR should include a discussion regarding this compliance. (From Cycle 1)

EAS Review 8/15/2012

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	EAS has reviewed the submitted BTR (Helix, May 2012) and has the following comments: Please include the Project Tracking Number (PTS # 261310) on the front cover of the report. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Table 3 of the BTR should include the required mitigation ratios as listed in Table 3 of the City's Biological Guidelines. The table should include the total mitigation acreage that will be required. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Based upon my calculations the required mitigation should be .386 acres. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	The BTR has identified .19 acres of temporary impacts. The BTR needs to justify this acreage as temporary. The City views temporary impacts as those where the vegetation that is impacted would reestablish on its own without any revegetation efforts. Temporary impacts are usually associated with trimming or impacts where the root system is not being disturbed. If the temporary impacts can not be justified then the .19 should be considered permanent. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	On page 17 of the BTR bird surveys are being listed as mitigation in order to comply with MBTA. However, there needs to be a clear nexus between an impact and the requirement to require mitigation. For the bird surveys to be defined as mitigation then the BTR must identify that an impact would occur. The basis for this determination could be based upon birds identified in the area, the nature and scope of the project, and the surrounding vegetation. If a definitive impact is not identified then the bird surveys should be removed from the mitigation section of the report. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	The revegetation plan (Helix, May 2012) was also reviewed. Because the revegetation is being used as CEQA mitigation the revegetation plan must be consistent with Attachment III of the City's Biological Guidelines, which includes a 5 year monitoring plan. (From Cycle 12)

Hydrology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Please see comments from Engineering staff as revisions are required to the drainage study. (From Cycle 12)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Please see comments from Geology staff as revisions are required to the geotechnical study. (From Cycle 12)

CEQA Determination

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

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Jeffrey Szymanski at (619) 446-5324. Project Nbr: 261310 / Cycle: 13





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	EAS has reviewed the project resubmittal and can provide the following comments: All items requested per the Extended Initial Study have been submitted, reviewed and approved. As such, the Initial Study had been completed and a CEQA determination can be made. Therefore, at the close of this review cycle and after review of other discipline issues a Mitigated Negative Declaration can be prepared. The MND will include mitigation measures for Land Use (MHPA) and Biology. (New Issue)





Review Information

Cycle Type: 13 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Submitted:** 01/03/2013 Deemed Complete on 01/04/2013
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review **Cycle Distributed:** 01/04/2013
Reviewer: Canning, Jack **Assigned:** 01/07/2013
(619) 446-5425 **Started:** 01/16/2013
jccanning@sandiego.gov **Review Due:** 01/28/2013
Hours of Review: 3.00 **Completed:** 01/18/2013 **COMPLETED ON TIME**
Next Review Method: Conditions **Closed:** 03/07/2013

- . The review due date was changed to 03/11/2013 from 01/31/2013 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (2 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 57 reviews, 93.0% were on-time, and 39.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Engineering 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The Engineering Review Section has reviewed the subject development and have the following comments that need to be addressed prior to a Public Hearing. Upon resubmittal, we will complete our review of the Site Development Permit Plans. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Based on the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards Section 2.3, the project is exempt from requirements for Permanent Best Management Practices because the project has been determined to be a repair project. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The project is not a Standard Development Project because based on the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards Section 2.3, the project is exempt from requirements for Permanent Best Management Practices because the project has been determined to be a repair project. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Revise the Improvement Plans using the current 2012 Standard Drawings for Public Works Construction. Examples of required changes are Sidewalk G-7 is now SDG-155; Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk G-2 is now SDG-151; 6" Curb G-6 is now SDG-154; Type A Curb Inlet D-1 is now SDD-115; there is not a Concrete Energy Dissipater D-41 anymore. Use D-42 and any of the other new Standards that apply to your project; the Rip-Rap Energy Dissipater is now SDD-104. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Additional comments may be recommended pending further review or any redesign of this project. These comments are not exclusive. Should you have any questions or comments, please call Jack Canning at 619 446-5425. (From Cycle 12)

Drainage & Hydrology Study

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	All projects within the City of San Diego must use the City of San Diego Drainage Design manual for design and calculations to attain reasonable standardization of drainage design throughout the City. Therefore remove all references to the San Diego County Hydrology Manual. Revise all calculations and conclusions which adhere to the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Revise the Project Description Section 1.0. Add the original approved Improvement Plan Drawing number. Add a discussion that the existing alignment was not constructed per the approved plan and that the proposed alignment corresponds to the original approved location. (From Cycle 12)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Jack Canning at (619) 446-5425. Project Nbr: 261310 / Cycle: 13





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Revise the Analysis & Conclusions Section 3.0. Add a discussion that the existing alignment was not constructed per the approved Improvement Plan and that the proposed alignment corresponds to the original approved location. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Analysis & Conclusions Section 3.0 states a hydraulic energy dissipater is proposed. Add a discussion stating, per the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual, at the storm water discharge location a suitable energy dissipater will be installed to reduce the discharge to non-erodible velocities. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	Revise the Analysis & Conclusions Section 3.0 Add a discussion stating, per the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual, the existing storm drain alignment has been revised such that the storm drain outlet now extends to the nearest well-defined natural drainage channel which can adequately convey the discharge. (From Cycle 12)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	The Engineering Review Section accepts the Drainage & Hydrology Study dated October 1, 2012 because the analysis, calculations and conclusions were made using methodology presented in the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual. (New Issue)

Revegetation Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Revise Project Summary and Location Section IIA. Section states the failed storm drain was a 24 inch diameter, which is not correct. The correct failed existing storm drain diameter is 18". Revise to match all project documents. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Revise Project Summary and Location Section IIA. Section states an energy dissipater structure will be installed. Add a discussion stating, per the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual, at the storm water discharge location a suitable energy dissipater will be installed to reduce the discharge to non-erodible velocities. (From Cycle 12)

Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	No Engineering Review Section Conditions are required for this project. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 13 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/03/2013	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2013
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-MSCP	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2013	
Reviewer: Forburger, Kristen (619) 236-6583 kforburger@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/08/2013	
	Started: 01/28/2013	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 01/28/2013	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 02/22/2013	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 03/07/2013	

- . The review due date was changed to 03/11/2013 from 01/31/2013 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for Plan-MSCP on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 8 outstanding review issues with Plan-MSCP (7 of which are new issues).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.
- . Last month Plan-MSCP performed 10 reviews, .0% were on-time, and 70.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

MSCP Review 11-28-11

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Drainage should be directed away from the MHPA, or if not possible, must not drain directly into the MHPA, Instead runoff should flow into sedimentation basins, grassy swales or mechanical trapping devices prior to draining into the MHPA. Please provide details on how the storm water outlet will be designed. (From Cycle 1)

MSCP Review 8/10/12

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	MSCP reviewed "Biological Resources Letter Report for the Jean Street Storm Drain Replacement Project," prepared by Helix Environmental (May 21, 2012) with the first project submittal. It has been determined that revisions to this report are required. Please address the following comments in a revised Biological Resources Letter Report (BRLR) and incorporate any further comments provided by EAS. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Page 12 of 20, MSCP Guidelines that apply are stated; Please include how the project would implement these directives. Please demonstrate compliance with the existing language and add discussion of Section 1.5.2 Restoration since mitigation is proposed as on-site restoration inside the MHPA. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Impacts to Tier I habitat would result with project implementation; therefore, mitigation with restoration of Tier I habitat is proposed. Please disclose mitigation ratios that apply and state that the project would comply with the Biology Guidelines Table 3 "Upland Mitigation Ratios" footnote 1 as the project would restore impacted Tier I habitat per the Guidelines for Conducting Biological Surveys Attachment B. Since on site restoration is proposed for mitigating a Tier I impact within the MHPA, the BTR and Restoration Plan shall be revised to implement a 5-year standard. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Need 5-year restoration plan per Bio guidelines Page 22. mitigaion inside MHPA (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Please state in BTR that a restoration plan would include the translocation of 150 individuals of Quercus demosa to mitigate for impacts to approximately 145 individuals. The translocation effort would be subject to a 5-year success criteria. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	MSCP Subarea Plan requires that all drainage shall be treatment before released into the MHPA. How is the storm drain outfall being treated? Please include a discussion of drainage treatment in the BTR (From Cycle 12)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	The project site lies partially within the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the City's MSCP. Please provide a map of the MHPA boundary on the project plans at the same scale as the project or a maximum scale of 1":200' (From Cycle 12)

MSCP Review 2/20/13

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	MSCP has reviewed "Biological Resources Letter Report for the Jean Street Storm Drain Replacement Project PTS 261310," prepared by Helix Environmental (December 12, 2012) with the first project submittal. Minor revision are required. Please address the following comments in a revised BRLR. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	The mitigaion proposal has been revised to obtain Tier I credits rather than restore habitat on-site. MSCP concurs with the submittal of the Revegetation Plan for a 25-month reveg effort. Please reference implementation of this plan throughtout the report where revegetation is discussed. For example, Page 13 of 23, under "Restoration" The Revetation report should be referenced as it addresses site preparation, planting specifications, maintenance ect. Implementation of the reveg plan is required due to the effort beinig located within the MHPA. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'Plan-MSCP' review, please call Kristen Forburger at (619) 236-6583. Project Nbr: 261310 / Cycle: 13





L64A-003A

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Page 19 of 23 under "Sensitive Plants" Include a discussion that 150 Quercus dumosa are included within the plant palette of the reveg plan. Reference the reveg plan in this section. Please include summer-holly to the plant palette. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Page 20 of 23. Conclusion. Reference the implementation of revegetation in addition to the City's Landscape guidelines for erosion control. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Please include a Biological Monitoring Program within the Mitigation section. The Program should state a qualified biologist would attend the precon meeting, stake and flag limits of grading, the biologist shall identify appropriate locations on the project plans where trench spoils would be stockpiled. Where construction areas drain into adjacent sensitive habitat area, silt fencing shall be installed along the construction limits and checked by the biologist prior to grading. The biologist shall monitor construction within and adjacent to the MHPA to ensure consistency with the MSCP. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Address comment 13 and provide the MHPA line on the plans. The resubmitted plans show Open Space Easement areas. The MHPA and Open Space Easements could constitute different boundary lines. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Please reference the Revegetation Plan on the Landscape Construcion drawings, sheet L-4. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 13 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/03/2013	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2013
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2013	
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296 pathomas@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/07/2013	
	Started: 01/07/2013	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 01/28/2013	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 01/28/2013	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/07/2013	

- . The review due date was changed to 03/11/2013 from 01/31/2013 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Geology on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 49 reviews, 69.4% were on-time, and 75.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review/Cycle 12 Informatio

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within geologic hazard zone 53 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 53 is characterized by level or sloping terrain with unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk. (From Cycle 12)

1st Review/Cycle 12 References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Jean Drive Storm Drain Improvements, San Diego, California, prepared by Harris & Associates, undated. Draft Geotechnical Investigation, Jean Drive Storm Drain Replacement, San Diego, California, prepared by Southern California Soil & Testing, Inc., dated February 15, 2012 (their project no. 1211009, report no. 1). (From Cycle 12)

1st Review/Cycle 12 Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The geotechnical report submitted for review is in "Draft" form. Please submit the finalized geotechnical investigation report. The geotechnical report must be prepared in accordance with the City's "Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports." (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Provide a geologic/ geotechnical map specific to the proposed construction. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	The geotechnical consultant must indicate if the referenced plans are in accordance with their recommendations. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	The geotechnical consultant must comment whether or not the proposed project as recommended will measurably destabilize neighboring properties or induce the settlement of adjacent structures. (From Cycle 12)

2nd Review/Cycle 13 References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Jean Drive Storm Drain Improvements, San Diego, California, prepared by Harris & Associates, undated. Geotechnical Investigation, Jean Drive Storm Drain Replacement, San Diego, California, prepared by Southern California Soil & Testing, Inc., dated September 13, 2012 (their project no. 1211008, report no. 1). (New Issue)

2nd Review/Cycle 13 Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	The referenced geotechnical documents have been reviewed. Based on that review, the geotechnical consultant has adequately addressed the soil and geologic conditions potentially affecting the proposed project for the purposes of environmental review. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 13 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/03/2013	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2013
Reviewing Discipline: Park & Rec	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2013	
Reviewer: Harkness, Jeff (619) 533-6595 Jharkness@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/07/2013	
	Started: 01/08/2013	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Review Due: 01/28/2013	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Completed: 01/17/2013	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 03/07/2013	

- . The review due date was changed to 03/11/2013 from 01/31/2013 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for Park & Rec on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Park & Rec (1 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Park & Rec performed 21 reviews, 66.7% were on-time, and 78.9% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review 8-16-12

Construction Drawings

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	L-1 - add a note that states all temporary irrigation shall be removed upon approval of the project. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	L-4 Maintenance Requirements - revise the last sentence within #4 to read: "Contractor must possess a valid state pesticide/herbicide license (Qualified Applicators Certification) at all times. Any pesticide recommendation shall be issued by a State Qualified Pesticide Advisor." (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	L-4 - add a note that states "All revegetation within Zone 2 Brush Management shall not be in excess of 24" in height for over 50% of the site, upon Park & Recreation Dept acceptance of the revegetation project" (From Cycle 12)

Revegetation Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	Page 8 Maintenance Activities - add #6 Brush Management All revegetation within Brush Management Zone 2 shall be maintained per the Municipal Code Brush Management requirements. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Page 10 Maintenance Monitoring - The document needs to state that Park & Recreation, Open Space Division staff must be at the 120 establishment period inspections, and invited to the monthly and quarterly inspections in Year 1 and Year 2. Please contact Paul Kilburg, Park & Recreation Deptl, Senior Planner (619) 685-1327. (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Page 11 Final Report - Ensure that the Park & Recreation Dept, Open Space Division receives a copy of the Final Report (From Cycle 12)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Page 11 Final Report - The document needs to state that the Park & Recreation Dept, Open Space Division must accept the revegetation project prior to deeming the project complete. (From Cycle 12)

Draft Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	All improvements built per these drawings are the asset of and shall be maintained by Storm Water Division of the Transportation and Storm Water Department. (New Issue)

