

February 7, 2017

SENT VIA EMAIL TO: wmack@plsaengineering.com

Mr. Will Mack
Pasco Laret Suiter & Associate
27127 Calle Arroyo, Suite 1904
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

Dear Mr. Mack:

Subject: Marburn Corp TM Fourth Assessment Letter; Project No. 435483; 24006076; Navajo
Community Plan

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

- A Site Development Permit and Tentative Map for the subdivision of one existing vacant parcel into 24 single family residential lots and five homeowner association lots within environmentally sensitive lands located at the northeast corner of Interstate 8 and College Avenue in the Navajo Community Plan area within Council District 7.

Enclosed is a Cycle 16 Issues Report (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 client's project. In reviewing City staff's comments, I do not identify any major significant issues, and therefore will keep this letter brief.

If any additional requirements should arise during the subsequent review of your project, staff will identify the issue and the reason for the additional requirement. To resolve any outstanding issues, please provide the information requested in the Cycle 13 Issues Report. If you choose not to provide the requested additional information or make the requested revisions, processing may continue. However, the project will be recommended for denial if the remaining issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved and the appropriate findings for approval cannot be made.

- I. **STUDIES/REPORTS REQUIRED:** A revised Storm Water Quality Management Plan and an Addendum Geotechnical Study have been identified as necessary for the project's continued review. Please reference the attached Submittal Requirements Report (Enclosure 2).

- II. PROJECT ACCOUNT STATUS:** Our current accounting system does not provide for real-time information regarding account status and majority of the recent City staff charges have not been posted on the account; however, our latest data indicates you have \$22,018.00 remaining in your deposit account.

During the processing of your project, your application's Financially Responsible Party will continue to receive monthly statements with the break-down of staff charges to your account. The minimum balance required for your application is \$8,000.00, <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/dsdib503.pdf>. To avoid project delays due to insufficient account funds, please ensure that your deposit account maintains the minimum account balance at all times.

For your convenience, deposits can be made anytime online through Open DSD, <http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/opendsd/>, and by entering your project number in the "Project ID" field, <http://opendsd.sandiego.gov/web/approvals/>. Also, any invoices can be paid online by searching for the invoice number, <http://opendsd.sandiego.gov/web/invoices/> or in person at the Cashier, located on the 3rd Floor of the Development Services Center.

- III. TIMELINE:** Upon your review of the attached Cycle 16 Issues Report, you may wish to schedule a meeting with staff and your consultants prior to resubmitting the project. Please contact me if you wish to schedule a meeting with staff. During the meeting, we will also focus on key milestones that must be met in order to facilitate the review of your proposal and to project a potential timeline for a hearing date. Your next review cycle should take approximately 18 days to complete.

- IV. RESUBMITTALS/NEXT STEPS:** Resubmittals are done on a walk-in basis. Please check in on the third floor of the Development Service Center (1222 First Avenue). Please be prepared to provide the following:

A. Plans and Reports: Provide the number of sets of plans and reports as shown on the attached Submittal Requirements Report. The plans should be folded to an approximate 8 ½ x 11 inch size.

B. Cycle Issues Report response letter: Prepare a cover letter specifically describing how you have addressed each of the issues identified in the Cycle 13 Issues Report. Or, you may choose to simply submit the Cycle 13 Issues Reports, identifying within the margins how you have addressed the issues. If the issue is addressed on one or more sheets of the plans or the reports, please reference the plan, sheet number, report or page number as appropriate. If it is not feasible to address a particular issue, please indicate the reason. Include a copy of this Assessment Letter, Cycle 16 Issues Report and your response letter if applicable, with each set of plans.

C. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Fees:

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.

If your project is determined to be Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); a Notice of Exemption (NOE) will be filed with the County Clerk after your project approval and all appeal periods have been exhausted. The County requires a \$50 documentary handling fee to file a CEQA NOE. Prior to scheduling your project for a decision, a check payable to the "San Diego County Clerk" in the amount of \$50 must be forwarded to my attention. Please include your project number on the check. A receipt for this fee and a copy of the NOE will be forwarded to you after the 30-day posting requirement by the County Clerk.

NOTE: New California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document filing fees, effective Jan. 1, 2017, can be accessed via the following link:
<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Conservation/CEQA/Fees>

- V. **COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP:** Staff provides the decision maker with the recommendation from the locally recognized community planning group. It is recommended you contact Matthew Adams, Chair of the Navajo Community Planners, Inc. by email at navajoplanners@cox.net to arrange to present the project to the group and obtain their recommendation. 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.

Information Bulletin 620, "Coordination of Project Management with Community Planning Committees" (available at <http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services>), provides some valuable information about the advisory role 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>.

- VI. **STAFF REVIEW TEAM:** Should you require clarification about specific comments from the staff reviewing team, please contact me or the reviewer directly. The names and telephone numbers of each reviewer can be found on the enclosed Cycle 11 Issues Reports.

In conclusion, please note that information forms and bulletins, project submittal requirements, and the Land Development Code may be accessed on line at <http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services>. Many land use plans for the various communities throughout the City of San Diego are now available on line at <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/profiles/index.shtml>

Page 4
Mr. Will Mack
February 7, 2017

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) 446-5325 or via e-mail at ftirandazi@sandiego.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'F. Tirandazi', with a horizontal line drawn above the first few letters.

Firouzeh Tirandazi
Development Project Manager
Development Services Department

Enclosures:

1. Cycle No. 16 Issues report
2. Submittal Requirements report

cc: File
Matthew Adams, Chairperson, Navajo Community Planners
Reviewing Staff (Assessment letter only)
Seth Litchney, Planning Department



L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 435483 **Title:** Marburn Corp TM
Project Mgr: Tirandazi, Firouzeh (619) 446-5325 ftirandazi@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 16 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/04/2017	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2017
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2017	
Reviewer: Holowach, Courtney (619) 446-5187 Cholowach@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/04/2017	
	Started: 01/05/2017	
Hours of Review: 5.00	Review Due: 01/31/2017	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 01/30/2017	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 02/07/2017	

- . 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 LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 22 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (12 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 89 reviews, 85.4% were on-time, and 44.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Extended Initial Study

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	EAS has determined that further information is needed for Noise, Biology, Geology, Public Utilities (Solid Waste), Public Utilities (Water and Sewer), Hydrology, Planning, Cultural Resources (Paleontology), and Cultural Resources (Archeology). Until the above issues have been addressed, the CEQA determination cannot be made and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. (From Cycle 3)

Noise

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Due to the project's location next to an existing interstate highway there is a potential land use compatibility conflict and significant impact of traffic noise. Please submit a noise study per the City's Acoustical Report Guidelines. Refer to City of San Diego's General Plan - Transportation Element, available on the City website, for the most up to date noise standards. (From Cycle 3)

Biological resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	EAS cannot make a determination on impacts to biological resources until the requested information is received. (From Cycle 3)

Geology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	References: Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Del Cerro Residential Development, College Avenue and Interstate 8, San Diego California prepared by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., July 2015. Civil Plan Set for Del Cerro Residential Tentative Map and Site Development Permit, Northeast Corner of College Avenue & Interstate 8, prepared by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates, July 2015 (From Cycle 3)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	LDR-Geology has reviewed the above referenced report. They are requesting an addendum or update letter. Please see LDR-Geology's comments. EAS will need a copy of this update to review concurrently in the next review cycle. Until this requested information is received the EAS cannot make its CEQA determination. (From Cycle 3)

Palentology

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	The proposed project site is underlain by the Santiago Peak Volcanic and/or Stadium Conglomerate. The Santiago Peak Volcanic is assigned a zero and the Stadium Conglomerate is assigned a high potential for fossil resources. (From Cycle 3)

Summary

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Courtney Holowach at (619) 446-5187. Project Nbr: 435483 / Cycle: 16





L64A-003A

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------|----|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 31 | As mentioned above the CEQA determination cannot be made until all issues have been addressed. Until the requested information has been provided staff is not able to complete the environmental review for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. EAS will coordinate with the other reviewers as the review progresses regarding any additional potential environmental impacts. (From Cycle 3) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 32 | Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes and/or new information. Additionally, the new information may lead to the requirement of new and/or technical studies. A determination as to the appropriate environmental document will be made based on all reviewed and submitted information. (From Cycle 3) |

EAS Review 4/25/16

Continued Extended Initial Stu

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------|----|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 33 | EAS has determined that further information is needed in regards to Geology, Noise and Biological Resources. (From Cycle 11) |
|--------------------------|----|--|

Noise

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 39 | Per the Guideline, "Two scaled maps should be included: one showing the existing conditions in the project area with adjacent land uses, receptors, and noise sources indentified, and the second map showing future conditions (use a time span of no less than 15 years, unless the project's life span is less) with the proposed project and proposed land uses, receptors, and noise sources identified". (From Cycle 11) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 41 | The discussion of future acoustical conditions needs expanding per the City's Guidelines. At a minimum the following information must be given: (From Cycle 11) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 42 | Discussion of the type of noise sources and proximity to potentially impact areas. (From Cycle 11) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 43 | In light of the California Supreme Court decision in California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (CBIA v. BAAQMD) please include a discussion in your report. The acoustician should consider this court case and then provide a discussion as to whether the proposed project will exacerbate current traffic conditions. (From Cycle 11) |

Biological Resources

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 45 | References: Biological Technical Report prepared by Alden Environmental, Inc., (March 9, 2016) (From Cycle 11) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 46 | EAS has reviewed the above reference report and has the following comments: (From Cycle 11) |

Geology

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------|----|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 51 | References: Geotechnical Addendum, Response to Cycle Review Comments, LDR-Geology, Regarding Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Del Cerro Residential Development, College Avenue and Interstate 8, San Diego, California (March 14, 2016) (From Cycle 11) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 52 | EAS is receipt of the above referenced report. EAS defers to LDR-Geology on this issue. Previous LDR-Geology comments have not been addressed. Please refer to LDR-Geology's review for clarification. Until the requested information is received EAS cannot clear Geology issues. (From Cycle 11) |

Paleo

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 56 | According to the City's CEQA Significance Threshold Guidelines grading greater than 1,000 cubic yards and cutting deeper than 10 feet in depth may constitute a significant impact to paleontological resources. According to submitted grading quantities the project will exceed this threshold by grading 18,300 cubic yards and at a depth of 18 feet. As it appears the project exceeds these thresholds, paleontological resource monitoring would be required. (From Cycle 11) |
|-------------------------------------|----|---|

Cultural Resources (Archy)

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 67 | Upon project re-submittal, written acknowledgement by the applicant to implement the specific historical resources (archaeology) mitigation, monitoring and reporting program is required prior to a formal environmental document determination being made. Please provide written acknowledgement on the project plans. (From Cycle 11) |
|-------------------------------------|----|---|

Summary

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





L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 62 As mentioned above the CEQA determination cannot be made until all issues have been addressed. Until the requested information has been provided staff is not able to complete the environmental review for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. EAS will coordinate with the other reviewers as the review progresses regarding any additional potential environmental impacts. (From Cycle 11)

EAS Review Nov. 2016

Extended Initial Study

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 68 EAS has determined that further information is needed in regards to Noise, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources (Archy), and Land Use. (From Cycle 13)

Noise

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 69 References: Acoustical Analysis, Del Cerro Residential, San Diego, California, Davy & Associates, Inc., October 21, 2016) (From Cycle 13)
- 70 EAS is in receipt of the above referenced report. EAS has the following comments: (From Cycle 13)
- 71 The introduction references the project description of 24 single family homes. However, in paragraph 5 of the introduction multiple unit residential buildings are referenced. Please revise to be consistent with the project description. (From Cycle 13)
- 72 Please revise the following per The City of San Diego's Acoustical Report Guidelines: (From Cycle 13)
- 73 Per the Guideline, "Two scaled maps should be included: one showing the existing conditions in the project area with adjacent land uses, receptors, and noise sources indentified, and the second map showing future conditions (use a time span of no less than 15 years, unless the project's life span is less) with the proposed project and proposed land uses, receptors, and noise sources identified". (From Cycle 13)
- 74 Figure 2: Does Figure 2 reflect the most recent site plan? EAS understands that the project has gone through design revisions. Please ensure that all figures reflect most recent revisions. (From Cycle 13)
- 75 The discussion of future acoustical conditions needs expanding per the City's Guidelines. At a minimum the following information must be given: (From Cycle 13)
- 76 Discussion of the type of noise sources and proximity to potentially impact areas. (From Cycle 13)
- 77 EAS defers to Planning and Long-Range Planning on issues of land use compatibility. EAS will coordinate with Planning and Long-Range Planning staff to determine if the proposed development would conflict with any adopted land use plans and if any changes in the project design would mitigate potential impacts to a level below significance. (From Cycle 13)
- 78 Per previous comments, based upon the California Supreme Court decision in California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District (CBIA v. BAAQMD), when a proposed project risks exacerbating existing environmental conditions that already exist, an agency must analyze the potential impact of such hazards on future residents or users. Therefore, please include a discussion in your report as to whether the proposed project will exacerbate current traffic conditions. (From Cycle 13)
- 79 On pg. 7 please revise mitigation language. Mitigation cannot be "if". (From Cycle 13)
- 80 On pg. 8 please remove 3.3. Recommendation 3.3 is mitigation not a construction recommendation. Mitigation cannot be a recommendation. (From Cycle 13)
- 81 Please clearly indicate exactly what mitigation is being proposed. (From Cycle 13)

Biological Resources

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 82 References: Biological Technical Report prepared by Alden Environmental, Inc., (May 11, 2016) (From Cycle 13)
- 83 EAS has reviewed the above reference report and has the following comments: (From Cycle 13)
- 85 Please revise report to reflect most recent project description. Proposed project is for 24 single family home, not 26 single family homes. (From Cycle 13)
- 86 Please revise Figure 3 to reflect most recent project description/design. Please ensure that impacts are updated to reflect current project design. (From Cycle 13)

Hydrology

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 89 EAS defers to LDR-Engineering on issues of water quality and hydrology. (From Cycle 13)

Geology

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	84	References: Geotechnical Addendum, Infiltration Testing for Proposed Storm Water BMP Basins, Proposed Del Cerro Single-Family Residential Development, City of San Diego, prepared by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., dated May 31, 2016 (their project no. 1411-02-B-6). Civil Plan Set for: Del Cerro Residential Tentative Map and Site Development Permit, Northeast Corner of College Avenue & Interstate 8, prepared by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates, revision 3 dated October 26, 2016. (From Cycle 13)
<input type="checkbox"/>	88	EAS is receipt of the above referenced report. EAS defers to LDR-Geology on this issue. Previous LDR-Geology comments have not been addressed. Please refer to LDR-Geology's review for clarification. Until the requested information is received EAS cannot clear Geology issues. (From Cycle 13)

Land Use

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	93	EAS defers to LDR-Planning and LDR-Long-Range Planning on General Plan, community plan, and Land Development Code issues. Per the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, an inconsistency with a land use plan is not in and of itself a significant impact; the inconsistency would have to result in a secondary physical impact. EAS will coordinate with LDR-Planning and LDR-Long-Range Planning review staff. (From Cycle 13)

Paleo

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	90	According to the City's CEQA Significance Threshold Guidelines grading greater than 1,000 cubic yards and cutting deeper than 10 feet in depth may constitute a significant impact to paleontological resources. According to submitted grading quantities the project will exceed this threshold by grading 18,300 cubic yards and at a depth of 18 feet. (From Cycle 13)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	91	Since the submitted grading quantities exceed the City's CEQA Significance Thresholds this project will require paleontological monitoring during construction activities. (From Cycle 13)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	92	With a future submittal, the applicant must acknowledge that they agree to and understand the monitoring requirement. This will be included in any environmental document prepared for the project. (From Cycle 13)

Visual Quality

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	101	Per LDR-Planning review, the proposed project includes retaining walls. A significant impact is identified for projects that include crib, retaining or noise walls greater than six feet in height and 50 feet in length with minimal landscape screening or berming where the walls would be visible to the public. Please provide an Elevation Plan of the proposed noise and retaining walls and include a depiction of any landscape that would screen the walls. (From Cycle 13)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	102	EAS will coordinate with Planning staff to determine if the proposed development would create a significant visual quality impact and if any changes in the project design would mitigate potential impacts to a level below significance. (From Cycle 13)

Environmental Determination

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	98	Other reviewing disciplines have requested additional information. An environmental determination cannot be made until all issues in this review are addressed and all other reviewing disciplines have cleared their issues. (From Cycle 13)
<input type="checkbox"/>	99	Until this information is provided, EAS staff is not able to complete the environmental review for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. EAS will coordinate with the other reviewers as the review progresses regarding any additional potential environmental impacts. (From Cycle 13)
<input type="checkbox"/>	100	Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes and/or new information. Additionally, the new information may lead to the requirement of new and/or additional technical studies. Because this review has identified potentially significant impacts, the project cannot be exempt from CEQA. At a minimum, a Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. (From Cycle 13)

EAS Review January 2017

Noise

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

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Courtney Holowach at (619) 446-5187. Project Nbr: 435483 / Cycle: 16





L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

103 References: Acoustical Analysis, Del Cerro Residential, San Diego, California, Davy & Associates, Inc., December 16, 2016)

Previous EAS comments have been addressed and the above reference report is acceptable.

Noise impact mitigation will be included in any environmental document prepared for the project. (New Issue)

Biological Resources

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

104 References: Biological Technical Report prepared by Alden Environmental, Inc., (December 12, 2016)

Per previous comments the report has been revised to reflect correct project description.

Per previous review comments Figure 3 now reflects correct project description/design.

Biological impact mitigation will be included in any environmental document prepared for the project. (New Issue)

Water Quality and Hydrology

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

105 EAS defers to LDR-Engineering on issues of water quality and hydrology. (New Issue)

Geology

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 106 References: Geotechnical Addendum, Response to Cycle 13 Review Comments, LDR-Geology, Del Cerro Residential Development, College Avenue and Interstate 8, City of San Diego, California, prepared by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., dated December 21, 2016 (their project no. 1411-02-B-7). (New Issue)
- 107 Civil Plan Set for: Del Cerro Residential Tentative Map and Site Development Permit, Northeast Corner of College Avenue & Interstate 8, prepared by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates, revision 4 dated December 27, 2016. (New Issue)
- 108 EAS defers to LDR-Geology on this issue. Previous LDR-Geology comments have not been addressed. Please refer to LDR-Geology's review for clarification. Until the requested information is received EAS cannot clear Geology issues and cannot make its environmental determination. (New Issue)

Paleo

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

109 Per previous review comments, the applicant has acknowledged that they agree to and understand the monitoring requirement. This will be included in any environmental document prepared for the project. No further comment is necessary. (New Issue)

Archy

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

110 Per previous review comments, the applicant has acknowledged that they agree to and understand the monitoring requirement. This will be included in any environmental document prepared for the project. No further comment is necessary. (New Issue)

Visual Quality

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

111 An Elevation Plan of the proposed noise and retaining walls and include a depiction of any landscape that would screen the walls has been provided. The applicant has not adequately addressed visual quality impacts. (New Issue)

Environmental Determination

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 112 Other reviewing disciplines have requested additional information. An environmental determination cannot be made until all issues in this review are addressed and all other reviewing disciplines have cleared their issues. (New Issue)
- 113 Until this information is provided, EAS staff is not able to complete the environmental review for the project and the environmental processing timeline will be held in abeyance. EAS will coordinate with the other reviewers as the review progresses regarding any additional potential environmental impacts. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	114	Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes and/or new information. Additionally, the new information may lead to the requirement of new and/or additional technical studies. Because this review has identified potentially significant impacts, the project cannot be exempt from CEQA. At a minimum, a Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 16 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/04/2017	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2017
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2017	
Reviewer: Palenske, Allison (619) 446-5197 Apalenske@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/12/2017	
	Started: 01/25/2017	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 01/26/2017	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 01/26/2017	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 02/07/2017	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/31/2017 from 01/31/2017 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 LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 10 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (6 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 50 reviews, 94.0% were on-time, and 53.2% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review Cycle 6 01/14/16

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Project Scope - An SDP and TM for a 26 single family residential subdivision located on a current vacant lot within the RS-1-7 Zone of the Navajo Community. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	Improvements - Show all proposed and existing improvements clearly on the landscape concept plan for staff to review clearances. (From Cycle 6)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Additional comments and/or issues may arise once other discipline reviews are complete. (From Cycle 6)

2nd Review Cycle 11 04/20/16

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Previous Issue 10 Cycle 11 - Improvements need to clearly show the sewer laterals as well as the water lines. Please revise. (From Cycle 11)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Improvement Conflicts (sht. 2 of 4) - There appears to be several trees in conflict with the proposed water lines. Please ensure minimum distances are met to all improvements. (From Cycle 11)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	College Ave. Trees - There is not enough clearance between the proposed Pinus canariensis and/or the Olea europaea and the sound wall along College Ave. Trees must have a minimum root zone of 40 sq. ft. with no dimension less than 5 feet per SDMC. Please revise. (From Cycle 11)

3rd Review Cycle 13 11/21/16

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Previous Issue 17 and 18 - Tree Separation Distances - There appears to still be an issue with the proposed sewer laterals and the proposed trees. A minimum of 10' from the sewer lateral must be met. Please ensure all proposed improvements meet the minimum distances required from the trees. (From Cycle 13)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Previous Issue 19 - Please review The City of San Diego Street Tree Selection Guide for appropriate species in parkways that are 4 feet in width. Staff will support either of the two species currently listed with a letter from a Certified Arborist that states the 4 foot area would be appropriate for either of the proposed species. (From Cycle 13)

4th Review Cycle 1/26/2017

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Landscaping' review, please call Allison Palenske at (619) 446-5197. Project Nbr: 435483 / Cycle: 16





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	College Ave. Trees, Planting Area Width (Third request, Previous Issues No. 19, 22): A planting area width of 4ft is not suitable for the proposed street tree species (Pinus canariensis, Olea europaea). As suggested in previous review cycles, a smaller species (as per The City of San Diego Street Tree Selection Guide) will be more suited for these conditions. Staff suggests the using the following species (found elsewhere in the plant palette) for areas along College Ave with a 4ft planting area width- Pyrus calleryana, Tabebuia impetiginosa. (ctd. below) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Additional options suitable for 4ft wide parkway can be found in the Street Tree Selection Guide at the following link- https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/street-div/pdf/treeguide.pdf (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Trees/Utilities Conflict (Previous Issues No. 18, 21): Staff acknowledges trees have been moved further away from sidewalk in order to provide separation distance between utility lines shown on plans. However, it is unclear how lines will connect to the structures, and if this path may pose conflicts. Staff recommends adjusting utility lines to allow street trees to be placed within 10ft of curb with the appropriate separation distance from utilities. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	Fence/Wall Legend Linetypes: The lineweights/linetypes shown on Landscape Shts. 3 and 4 for fences/walls do not appear to match the lineweights/linetypes used for plans. Please revise for consistency/clarity. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	Disturbed Area Adjacent to City Open Space: Please show limit of disturbance and area of revegetation with temporary irrigation. Revegetation shall conform to SDMC §142.0411. Landscape defers to Park and Rec regarding plant species to be used for revegetation. Please see Park and Rec review for further discussion. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Please contact reviewer at apalenske@sandiego.gov or (619)446-5197 with questions or for further discussion. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 16 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/04/2017	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2017
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2017	
Reviewer: Huynh, Khanh (619) 446-5299 KHuynh@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/06/2017	
	Started: 01/25/2017	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 01/26/2017	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 01/27/2017	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 02/07/2017	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/31/2017 from 01/31/2017 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 LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 4 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (2 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 72 reviews, 95.8% were on-time, and 47.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

3rd Review

SDP issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	44	The area (sf) for BMP # 2 shown on the Biofiltration Basin BMPs Table on the DMA/HMP Exhibit is inconsistent with the Preliminary Grading Plan, sheet C 2.0. The DMA/HMP Exhibit shown as 4,209 sf, and the Preliminary Grading Plan shown as 4,868 sf. Revise the plans/exhibit accordingly. (From Cycle 13)

Drainage Report

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	45	The report is acceptable. (From Cycle 13)

SWQMP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	46	Engineering Review defers to Geology for a determination of Categorization of Infiltration Feasibility Condition based on their findings of the studies, calculations, maps, data sources, etc, presented in the applicant's submittal of Form I-8 of the SWQMP. (From Cycle 13)
<input type="checkbox"/>	47	Only if Geology determines the project is a No Infiltration Condition will the treatment control BMPs be acceptable. Otherwise the BMP will have to be redesigned to the BMP Fact Sheets of the identified Infiltration Condition. (From Cycle 13)

4th Review

SWQMP

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	As submitted, the worksheet B.5-1 shown the infiltration rate is 0.00 in/hr. This is incorrect, per the Geotechnical report, the tested infiltration rate is 0.10 and 0.39 inches/hour, and the designed infiltration rate is 0.05 and 0.19 inches/hour with a safety factor of 2.0. Therefore, revise all the BMPs worksheet B.5-1 to show the correct infiltration rate and recalculate the numbers. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	49	Project proposed partial infiltration. Therefore, revise the Bioretention Basin detail to show no liner at the bottom of the basin. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services Department
1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 16 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/04/2017	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2017
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Transportation Dev	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2017	
Reviewer: Elhamad, Ismail (619) 446-5494 ielhamad@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/05/2017	
	Started: 01/26/2017	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 01/26/2017	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 01/26/2017	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 02/07/2017	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/31/2017 from 01/31/2017 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: New Document Required.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Transportation Dev on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 7 outstanding review issues with LDR-Transportation Dev (5 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Transportation Dev performed 46 reviews, 93.5% were on-time, and 50.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

24006076 SDP/TM 2nd rev 4/19/1

Access Analysis

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	We have reviewed the draft traffic access analysis for Del Cerro Residential project prepared by LOS Engineering, Inc. dated February 3, 2016. The traffic access analysis is acceptable and adequate for release. (From Cycle 11)

24006076 SDP/TM 3rd rev 11/21/1

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	Provide a parking calculation table on the site plan to include number of residential units, parking rare of 2 spaces/unit, minimum parking spaces required, total parking spaces provided inside the two-car garages for residents and total number of parking spaces provided for visitors. (From Cycle 13)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	Plans should show a van accessible space in the visitors parking area. (From Cycle 13)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Plans should call out the width of the main driveway entrance on College Avenue. A maximum driveway width of 25 feet is allowed. This driveway cross section should also be shown on the Sections and Details Plan (Sheet C4.0 of 23) (From Cycle 13)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	The Landscape Plan should show the sight distance of 440 feet with a note " No obstructions higher than 36 inches shall be located within this area" (From Cycle 13)

24006076 SDP/TM 4th rev 1/26/1

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	The site plan should show the driveway width (curb cut) of 25 feet and 3 feet flare on each side. (2nd request) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Plans should show the diemnsions of the guest parking spaces and the van accessible space. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	Plans should show the accessible route from the van accessible space to all residential units. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	The landscape plan should show the 440 feet corner sight distance with a note " No obstruction higher than 36 inches shall be located within this area". (2nd request) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Revise the Parking Calculation on the Site Plan (Sheet C1.0) to say "Total Garages and Guest Parking Spaces: 51). Currently says Total Guest Parking: 51. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services Department
1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 16 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 01/04/2017	Deemed Complete on 01/04/2017
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 01/04/2017	
Reviewer: Washburn, Jacobe (619) 446-5075 jwashburn@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 01/04/2017	
	Started: 01/25/2017	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 01/26/2017	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 01/26/2017	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 02/07/2017	

- . The review due date was changed to 01/31/2017 from 01/31/2017 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 LDR-Geology on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 5 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (2 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Geology performed 90 reviews, 80.0% were on-time, and 68.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

435483-3 (12/10/2015)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The geotechnical consultant must indicate if the site is suitable for the proposed development as designed or provide recommendations to mitigate the geologic hazards to an acceptable level. (From Cycle 3)

435483-11 (4/19/2016)

References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Geotechnical Addendum, Response to Cycle Review Comments, LDR-Geology, Regarding Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Del Cerro Residential Development, College Avenue and Interstate 8, San Diego, California, prepared by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., dated March 14, 2016 (their project no. 1411-02-B-5). (From Cycle 11)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Del Cerro Residential Development, College Avenue and Interstate 8, San Diego, California, prepared by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., dated July 20, 2015 (their project no. 1411-02-B-4). (From Cycle 11)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Development Plan Set for: Del Cerro Residential Tentative Map and Site Development Permit, Northeast Corner of College Avenue & Interstate 8, prepared by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates, dated July 20, 2015, revision 2 dated March 24, 2016. (From Cycle 11)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	The previous review comments that have not been cleared remain applicable. (From Cycle 11)

435483-13 (11/23/2016)

References

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





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Geotechnical Addendum, Infiltration Testing for Proposed Storm Water BMP Basins, Proposed Del Cerro Single-Family Residential Development, City of San Diego, prepared by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., dated May 31, 2016 (their project no. 1411-02-B-6). Civil Plan Set for: Del Cerro Residential Tentative Map and Site Development Permit, Northeast Corner of College Avenue & Interstate 8, prepared by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates, revision 3 dated October 26, 2016. (From Cycle 13)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	The previous review comments that have not been cleared remain applicable. (From Cycle 13)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	Submit an addendum geotechnical report or update letter and an updated C.4-1 Worksheet that specifically addresses the following comments: (From Cycle 13)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	The project's geotechnical consultant must provide summarized responses for the Criteria on Worksheet C.4-1. (From Cycle 13)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	The project's geotechnical consultant has indicated No in their response to Criterion 5; however, a review of the percolation test data indicate results which are considered partial infiltration. (From Cycle 13)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	The project's geotechnical consultant must address the specific geologic or geotechnical hazard associated with any amount of storm water infiltration that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level for each proposed storm water BMP. The analyses and supporting documentation should be submitted for review. Note that a geotechnical condition created by the proposed grading may not be considered a valid geotechnical hazard. (From Cycle 13)

435483-16 (1/26/2017)

References

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Geotechnical Addendum, Response to Cycle 13 Review Comments, LDR-Geology, Del Cerro Residential Development, College Avenue and Interstate 8, City of San Diego, California, prepared by Advanced Geotechnical Solutions, Inc., dated December 21, 2016 (their project no. 1411-02-B-7). Civil Plan Set for: Del Cerro Residential Tentative Map and Site Development Permit, Northeast Corner of College Avenue & Interstate 8, prepared by Pasco Laret Suiter & Associates, revision 4 dated December 27, 2016. (New Issue)

Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	The project's geotechnical has indicated that development of the subject site is considered feasible from a geotechnical standpoint. However, as previously requested for the purposes of environmental review, the geotechnical consultant must indicate if the site is suitable for the proposed development as designed or provide recommendations to mitigate the geologic hazards to an acceptable level. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 16 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Submitted:** 01/04/2017 Deemed Complete on 01/04/2017
Reviewing Discipline: Park & Rec **Cycle Distributed:** 01/04/2017
Reviewer: Hooker, Craig **Assigned:** 01/04/2017
(619) 446-5041 **Started:** 01/25/2017
Chooker@sandiego.gov **Review Due:** 01/26/2017
Hours of Review: 4.00 **Completed:** 01/26/2017 **COMPLETED ON TIME**
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Closed:** 02/07/2017

- . The review due date was changed to 01/31/2017 from 01/31/2017 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 Park & Rec on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 10 outstanding review issues with Park & Rec (7 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Park & Rec performed 29 reviews, 86.2% were on-time, and 65.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Park and Rec Review 4-27-16

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Sheet 1 Landscape Concept Plan: Add restoration planting and limit of disturbance line on plans to show restoration of areas. The height of the retaining wall (11') right on the property line will create a disturbance to City ofnd openspace of a least 5' out from the base of the wall. 25 month revetation with temporary irrigation will be required. (From Cycle 11)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Sheet C1.0- Provide a 12' Maintenance access from the public ROW to The City of San Diego owned parcel for access for Brush Management and routine maintenance. Access could occur through Lot D. (From Cycle 11)

Park and Rec Review 7-17-16

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	Sheet C2.0: The location of access is unacceptable. a 6' retaining wall seperates the open space parcel from any vehicle access to the parcel. (From Cycle 13)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Show limit of disturbance and restoration plan for adjacent City owned open space on the Landscape Concept Plan sheet 1 of 4. (From Cycle 13)

Park and Rec Review 1-25-17

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Previous Issue 4 and 7: No limit of disturbance or revegetation has been shown on the plans for disturance of the adjacent open space lot. These disturbances occur at proposed lots 18 and 19. Provide revegetation and temporary irrigation note consistent with the landscape regulations for both these areas and any other construction that may affect the openspace lot.. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	A easement is shown on the map for Lot D but this easement must be extended to provide access from the public street. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Landscape Concept Plan Note Sht 1&2. Revise note to Read: Disturbed areas delineated on sheet XX will be revegetated consistent with the LDC Landscape Regulations 142.0411 Revegetation and Erosion Control including hydroseed and temporary irrigation to the satisfaction of the Parks and Recreation Openspace Division. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Landscape Concept Plan Sheet 1 of 4- Plant Legend. Add a Coastal Sage Hydroseed Mix for revegetation of disturbed areas on City owned open space adjacent to lots 19 and 18. A acceptable list of plant species for use on openspace land has been forwarded to the project manager for inclusion with this cycle issues report. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Landscape Concept Plan Sheet 1 of 4- Plant Legend. Add a non-irrigated Hydroseed Mix to the legend including species under 12" in height for revegetation of HOA lot D. This mis must be non-invasive and preferably native. An acceptable list of plant species for use adjacent to openspace land has been forwarded to the project manager for inclusion with this cycle issues report. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Fence and Wall Plan: The linetypes used on the Landscape Concept Plan do not correlate with the Fence and Wall Legend on Sheet 3 of 4. Correct. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Show a steel gate at the entrance to the Openspace lot. This gate can be tubular steel and will need a locking mechanism for City Openspace use. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'Park & Rec' review, please call Craig Hooker at (619) 446-5041. Project Nbr: 435483 / Cycle: 16





Submittal Requirements

2/7/17 3:31 pm

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services Department
1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Page 1 of 1

L64A-001

Project Information

Project Nbr: 435483 **Title:** Marburn Corp TM
Project Mgr: Tirandazi, Firouzeh (619)446-5325 ftirandazi@sandiego.gov



Review Cycle Information

Review Cycle: 17 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

Opened: 02/07/2017 3:19 pm

Submitted:

Due:

Closed:

Required Documents:

<u>Package Type</u>	<u>Pkg Qty</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Qty Needed</u>
Development Plans	7	Tentative Map	7
Geotechnical Reports	3	Geotechnical Investigation Report Addendum	3
Development Plans	7	Site Development Plans	7
Storm Water Quality Management Plan	3	Storm Water Quality Management Plan	3

