



L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 412254 **Title:** Tivyan SDP
Project Mgr: Tirandazi, Firouzeh (619) 446-5325 ftirandazi@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 08/06/2015	Deemed Complete on 08/07/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Landscaping	Cycle Distributed: 08/07/2015	
Reviewer: Lien, Terre (619) 446-5327 tlien@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 08/13/2015	
	Started: 09/16/2015	
Hours of Review: 6.00	Review Due: 08/28/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 09/18/2015	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 10/20/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/23/2015 from 09/02/2015 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 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Landscaping on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 18 outstanding review issues with LDR-Landscaping (9 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Landscaping performed 37 reviews, 59.5% were on-time, and 35.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | General Scope - Project includes single-dwelling unit development on an undeveloped lot in a City-wide RS-1-8 residential zone adjacent to the the Rancho Encantada Specific Planning area. Project is subject to a Site Development Permit due to the presence of Steep Hillside and Sensitive Biological Resources. |
|--------------------------|---|---|

(From Cycle 5)

Development Plans

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Development Summary, Brush Management (sht. 1) - Once Brush Management zones have been finalized, please update listed acreage designated as Brush Management Zone Two and Open Space. See below for further discussion.

(From Cycle 5) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 3 | Consistency of Plans, Grading and Brush Management (sht. 2 thru 5, 8, 9, 11) - Slope configurations and depictions of brush management zones are inconsistent between the Civil sheets and Landscape sheets. Please resolve, incorporating adjustments per below.

(From Cycle 5) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 4 | Brush Management Zones (sht. 2 thru 5, 8, 9, 11) - Brush Management is to be measured perpendicular from the face of the structure extending out towards the native/naturalized vegetation. Zone Two reduction measures should be implemented where appropriate to minimize biological impacts, maximize on-site mitigation opportunities, and reduce on-going maintenance responsibilities. Staff strongly recommends that all manufactured slopes draining down to the pad be permanently irrigated and included in Zone One. (From Cycle 5) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 | [cont. from above]
Slopes draining away from the pad should be treated as an expanded Zone One or at least provide the minimum 35-ft Zone One with a balance of Zone Two towards the tow of slope. See attached mark-ups for your reference/use based upon slope configurations shown on the Civil sheets.

(From Cycle 5) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 | Covenant of Easement, Open Space (sht. 2,) - Once Brush Management zones have been finalized, please adjust Open Space depictions to include both the Zone Two Brush Management (non-mitigation) acreage and designated Open Space (mitigation) acreage.

(From Cycle 5) |





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Off-site Brush Management vs. Alternative Compliance (sht. 2 thru 5, 8, 9, 11) - Property to the west of the subject parcel is identified on the Landscape plan as "Developed." However, Google Maps, Bing Maps, and the submitted Bio Report indicate that the property is undeveloped. Either provide evidence that the adjacent property is, in fact, developed or provide for brush management to the west of the proposed residential structure. Since the full defensible space cannot be provided to the west, (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	[cont. from above] ...an off-site easement with the adjacent property owner would be required to provide the balance of brush management on the adjacent property. (See attached City template, DS-50, for establishing a Brush Management Easement.) Alternative to this would be to provide additional fire-rating of the residential structure over and above standard CBC 7A requirements to include the following upgraded opening protection: Dual-glazed, dual-tempered panes... (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	[cont. from above] ...along southwest and northwest faces, inclusive of a 10-ft perpendicular return along adjacent wall faces, as shown on the attached mark-ups. (From Cycle 5)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Alternative Compliance, Opening Protection (sht. 6, 8) - If pursuing the Alternative Compliance option described above, please identify windows/doors to receive the upgraded protection and include the following note: "Alternative Compliance for Brush Management: Identified openings to be upgraded to dual-glazed, dual-tempered panes in lieu of full brush management zones, typ." Include a brief discussion of the Alternative Compliance measures in the Landscape Design Statement. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	Landscape Plans, Title Sheet (sht. 8) - Remove extraneous information that is irrelevant to the project at hand, including references to the Ridgecrest Subdivision and HOA maintenance over Parcel 1 of PM 17619. Under Re-vegetation Program Note 5, replace the words "the restoration" with "coverage," since restoration has a specific connotation related to mitigation for impacts. Omit the "Additional Notes" 1 thru 7, which are irrelevant to the project or redundant to notes provided elsewhere on the plans. Update sheet listing per below. Retitle sheet to "Cover Sheet / Revegetation Notes." (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Irrigation (sht. 9, 10) - At the entitlement stage, irrigation should be addressed with a conceptual note only to establish the type(s) of systems to be provided. This has been adequately addressed under Re-vegetation Program Note 2 on the Cover sheet. Omit the Irrigation Plan and Construction Details. (From Cycle 5)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Site Context (sht. 11) - On the Planting Plan / Brush Management Plan, please identify the "Native Undisturbed Plant Material" as "Southern Mixed Chaparral" consistent with the Bio Report. Identify the MHPA south of the subject parcel. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	Slope Hydroseed Mix (sht. 11) - Retitle "Slope Restoration Hydroseed Mix" to read "Zone One Slope Revegetation Hydroseed Mix," since restoration has a specific connotation related to mitigation for impacts. Note that revegetation within Zone Two must be an exclusively native palette per section 142.0412(h)(5). Provide a Zone Two mix accordingly or provide permanent irrigation to all manufactured slope areas and incorporate Zone Two reduction as appropriate. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Zone One Treatment (sht. 8, 11) - Design Statement on Landscape Cover sheet states: "The Landscape Design intent was carefully generated as a result of design sensitivities for a contextual/aesthetically pleasing environment." However, the Planting Plan merely reflects a sodded lawn for pad areas and above mentioned hydroseed mix. Plans should conceptually anticipate how the owner may wish to use the Zone One areas adjacent to the residential structure. Plan should anticipate location for trees to both "...create an environment suitable and inviting for residents..." (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	[cont. from above] ...and "...resemble contextually the surrounding neighborhood and the nearby natural environment." Demonstrate that trees located in Zone One shall meet clearance requirements set forth under 142.0412(g)(4), which calls for trees to be located away from structures to a minimum distance of 10 feet as measured from the structures to the drip line of the tree at maturity. By way of example, a tree with a 30-ft mature canopy spread would need to be located a minimum of 25 feet from the structure. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Planting Notes (sht. 12) - Planting notes provided on sheet 12 are relevant to construction, not entitlement. Please omit from the development plan package. (From Cycle 5)





L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 18 Brush Management Notes (sht. 13, 14) - Omit Code sections 142.0412(k) through (o), which are irrelevant to the project at hand. Reference Policy No. FPB B-08-1 as the source for notes on sheet 14. Omit sections VI. D and all of section VII. (Section VIIA is obsolete and addressed in discussion of Alternative Compliance above. Section VIIB is irrelevant.)

(From Cycle 5)

Bio Report

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 19 Brush Management, Acreages and Figures - Please update acreages and figures in the Bio Report once brush management zones and extents of the covenant of easement are finalized.

(From Cycle 5)

- 20 Project Reference (pg 1) - Please update PTS # to reflect this entitlement, i.e. PTS # 412254.

(From Cycle 5)

- 21 Summary, Zone Two Brush Management (pg. 1) - Zone Two Brush Management is not considered an impact. Revise 3rd sentence of second paragraph to read: "BMZ 2 would occur within an additional 0.86 acre of Southern Mixed Chaparral, but BMZ 2 is considered "impact neutral" and does not require mitigation."

(From Cycle 5)

- 22 Project Description, BMZ 2 (pg. 4) - Revise second bullet under BMZ 2 description to read: "Must be thinned and pruned on a seasonal basis consistent with the Brush Management Regulations and Standards to reduce the fuel-load..."

(From Cycle 5)

- 23 Direct Impacts, Vegetation (pg. 12) - Revise beginning of third sentence of paragraph to read: "BMZ 2 maintenance activities (0.86 acre) are considered impact neutral..." Omit last two sentences of the paragraph since the width of Zone One and Zone Two shall not exceed 100 feet per section 142.0412(c). (Note that fuel-load maintenance along the entry drive is permitted and required by Fire Code, but it is not considered Zone Two Brush Management, which is based on the residential structure.)

(From Cycle 5)

- 24 MHPA Adjacency Guidelines, Brush Management, Guideline (pg. 18) - Referenced text from the Subarea Plan is outdated. Please revise to read as follows:

Guideline:* "New development located adjacent to and topographically above the MHPA (e.g., along canyon edges) must be set back from slope edges to incorporate Zone One brush management areas on the pad and outside of the MHPA. Zone Two may be located in the MHPA upon granting of an easement to the City (or other acceptable agency) except where narrow wildlife corridors require it to be located outside of the MHPA. (From Cycle 5)

- 25 [cont. from above]

Brush management zones will not be greater in size than is currently required by the City's regulations. Initial thinning of woody vegetation shall not exceed 50 percent coverage of the existing vegetation prior to implementation of Brush Management activities. Additional thinning and pruning shall be done consistent with City standards to obtain minimum vertical and horizontal clearances and shall avoid/minimize impacts to covered species to the maximum extent possible. (From Cycle 5)

- 26 [cont. from above]

For all new development, regardless of the ownership, brush management in the Zone Two area will be the responsibility of a homeowners association or other private party. For existing and approved projects, the brush management zones, standards and locations, and clearing techniques will not change from those required under existing regulations."

*Revised to be consistent with the Land Development Code as amended by O-20261 N.S., effective 7-19-13.

(From Cycle 5)

- 27 MHPA Adjacency Guidelines, Brush Management, Compliance (pg. 18) - Revise first part of fourth sentence to remove references to Zone Two being greater than the minimum required.

(From Cycle 5)

2nd Review

Development Plans

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Most issues from previous submittal have been satisfactorily addressed. See below for further direction on unresolved issues and discussion of new issues generated by current iteration of the plans and documents. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	Brush Management Zones (sht. 1, 9) - A fruit orchard is shown extending downslope from the proposed residential structure out to Beeler Canyon Road, the width of which will be greater than 100-ft. Therefore, no formalized brush management will be required in that direction. Adjust brush management exhibits accordingly. (See marked up excerpt from the plans for your reference/use.) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	Alternative Compliance (sht. 1, 6, 9) - [Previous Issue No. 10] Provide documentation of alternative compliance measures on the architectural plans as previously directed. Extend the fire-rating to include east face of master bath and north face of master bedroom. (See marked-up excerpt of the plans for your reference/use.) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	Site Context (sht. 9) - [Previous Issues 7 & 13] Identify adjacent parcel to the west as "Undeveloped." Show and identify MHPA to the south. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	Zone One Planting Legend - (sht. 9) - For clarification, please identify the Modified Zone 1 as irrigated. Correct call-out after the diagonal hatch pattern to read "Modified Zone 2" and correct sheet references for thinning/pruning notes. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	Tree Legend (sht. 9) - Please use consistent identifiers/symbols between the Legend and Plan. (New Issue)

Bio Report

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	Brush Management Zones (Pg. 16, Fig 3) - See Issue No. 29 above. Update Bio Report for consistency. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Brush Management Zone 2, Pruning (pg. 1) - Correct second to last sentence in second paragraph under Summary to read: "...but BMZ 2 is considered "impact neutral" and does not require mitigation as long as only thinning and pruning of native vegetation occurs." (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	MHPA Adjaacency Guidelines, Brush Management (pg. 19) - Under the Compliance subsection, revise 6th sentence to read: "Further, regular brush management activity in BMZ 2 shall not exceed that required by the Code and Standards and shall be restricted to only occur outside of the bird-breeding season..." (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 08/06/2015	Deemed Complete on 08/07/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 08/07/2015	
Reviewer: Stanco Jr, Joseph (619) 446-5373 Jstanco@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 08/10/2015	
	Started: 10/15/2015	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Review Due: 08/28/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 10/16/2015	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 10/20/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/23/2015 from 09/02/2015 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 3rd 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 3 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (3 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 70 reviews, 31.4% were on-time, and 52.6% 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"/>	1	The property is located within the RS-1-8 zone, the Brush Management Zone. The property is subject to the Progress Guide and General Plan policies. The Progress Guide and General Plan Generalized Land Use map, identifies the for Residential Use. The intent is to permit development consistent with the applied zone. The property contains Environmentally Sensitive Lands in the form of Steep Hillides and Sensitive Biological Resources as defined by SDMC Section 113.0103. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	The proposed scope of work is to construct an approximately 2,879 s.f. one story single family dwelling unit and an approximately 841 s.f. two car garage and other private improvements on a 2.795 acre vacant lot. (From Cycle 5)

Site Development Permit

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	The property contains Steep Hillides and Sensitive Biological Resources. Development of a site containing Environmentally Sensitive Lands requires a Site Development Permit [SDMC Section 143.0110(b), Table 143-01A]. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	A Site Development Permit shall be processed in accordance with Process Three (Hearing Officer as the Decision Maker appealable to Planning Commission) [SDMC Section 126.0502(a)(2)]. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	A Site Development Permit may be approved or conditionally approved only if the decision maker makes all of the applicable findings as specified in SDMC Section 126.0504(a) and (i). (From Cycle 5)

Open Space Easement Area

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	The Brush Management Zone 2 (BMZ2) may be considered impact neutral if included within the open space conservation easement. Provide plans identifying the total acres for the Brush Management Zone 2 and a separate calculations for the open space conservation easement. Revise plans to include the delineation of the BMZ within the open space easement. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	continued If the BMZ2 is not include within the open space easement the development would need to be relocate outside of any steep hillside areas. (From Cycle 5)

Steep Hillides

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	The allowable development area includes all portions of the premises without steep hillides. Steep hillides shall be preserved in their natural state, except that development is permitted in steep hillides if necessary to achieve a maximum development area of 25 percent of the premises (SDMC Section 143.0142(a)(2). (From Cycle 5)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Joseph Stanco Jr at (619) 446-5373. Project Nbr: 412254 / Cycle: 10





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	continued

The BMZ2 area encroaching into steep hillsides is required to be included within open space conservation easement. This will ensure the preservation of steep hillsides and any potential impacts. Otherwise, the BMZ2 is required to be pulled back from any encroachments into steep hillsides. (From Cycle 5)

Sensitive Biological Resources

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	In accordance with SDMC Section 143.0141(a)(1), all development occurring in sensitive biological resources is subject to a site-specific impact analysis conducted by a qualified Biologist, in accordance with the Biology Guidelines in the Land Development Manual. The impact analysis shall evaluate impacts to sensitive biological resources and CEQA sensitive species. The analysis shall determine the corresponding mitigation, where appropriate, and the requirements for protection and management. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	In accordance with SDMC Section 143.0141(a)(3), sensitive biological resources that are outside of the allowable development area on a premises, or are acquired as off-site mitigation as a condition of permit issuance, are to be left in a natural state and used only for those passive activities allowed as a condition of permit approval. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Additional comments may be generated once revised Biological Report is submitted for review. (From Cycle 5)

Structure Height

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Provide both the plumb line height and the over all structure height from the existing or proposed grade whichever is lower as specified in SDMC Section 113.0270. Plans provide for review do illustrate the specific grade elevation that was used to demonstrate the height. (From Cycle 5)

General Pending Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Provide a site plan drawn to scale with include the exterior dimensions of the proposed structures. Provide the front, side and rear setbacks. Include all private development such as fences, sidewalks, concrete paths and/or other landscaping features. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	Within the development summary include a Site Development Permit for both Steep Hillsides and Sensitive Biological Resources. Also, include a development table and include the applicable development regulations for the RS-1-8 zone (SDMC Section 131.0431(b), Table 131-04D). Include two columns containing the required and proposed development information.

	Example	Required	Proposed
	Side Yard Setback	10 ft.	30 ft. (From Cycle 5)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	Provide plans that are drawn to scale and that contains consistent information such as the exact location of the BMZ's, open space easements, driveways and location of the development. Revise plans and verify that the plans are scaled correctly. The scale and dimensions annotated on plans are inconsistent including but not limited to the BMZ's noted on Sheet 2. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	Sheet 2

The exterior property line dimensions contain two different dimensions. Revise plans to include the recorded property line dimensions. (From Cycle 5)

2ND REVIEW - OCT 2015

Open Space/BMZ

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Please address the outstanding Brush Management issues from Landscape staff so that Planning staff can determine the final Covenant of Easement (Open Space) boundary and total acreage. (New Issue)

Development Table

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Please provide the actual proposed front, side, and rear setbacks for the proposed residence on the development table provided on sheet 1. The proposed setbacks should be measured from the point of the structure closest to the adjacent property line. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

 **Draft Conditions**

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall execute and record a Covenant of Easement which ensures preservation of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands that are outside the allowable development area on the premises as shown on Exhibit "A" for Sensitive Biological Resources and Steep Hill-sides in accordance with SDMC section 143.0152. The Covenant of Easement shall include a legal description and an illustration of the premises showing the development area and the Environmentally Sensitive Lands as shown on Exhibit "A." (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 08/06/2015	Deemed Complete on 08/07/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 08/07/2015	
Reviewer: Dresser, Morgan (619) 446-5404 Mdresser@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 08/10/2015	
	Started: 09/09/2015	
Hours of Review: 6.00	Review Due: 09/02/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 10/19/2015	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 10/20/2015	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 3rd complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 12 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (10 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 79 reviews, 54.4% were on-time, and 48.6% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Cycle 5-5/14/2015

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Site Development Permit to construct a 2,879 square foot single-story residence with a detached 872 square foot detached two car garage. The 2.82 acre vacant parcel is located at 11275 Beeler Canyon Road, Council District 5. The site is covered in Southern Mixed Chaparral vegetation and a drainage in the southwest corner. To the north of the site is Beeler Canyon Road, Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) is located along the southern property line off site, directly to the south and to the west and east is vacant land with Southern Mixed Chaparral. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	According to the Biology Report submitted by Tierra Data, Biology Resources Letter Report for the Tivyvan Residence Design Review Project (City PTS#: 379328), San Diego, California the project site is currently vacant and supports Southern Mixed Chaparral vegetation no sensitive animals were observed. Please update the PTS # to reflect the current project PTS # 412254. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	The site is described as mostly natural with few non-native plants with no sensitive plants detected. Some sensitive plant species that have been detected within one mile of the site include Del Mar Manzanita, San Diego barrel cactus, and San Diego goldenstar. This project does include impacting approximately 0.87 acres of the Southern Mixed Chaparral, which would be considered a significant impact and would require mitigation. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	On page 10, paragraph 2 under sensitive plants states that "No sensitive plants were detected, though conditions were poor for detecting sensitive annuals or herbaceous species." Please explain what is meant by this. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	A small number of wildlife species were observed, however no sensitive animals were detected. Anna's hummingbird, hermit thrush, and western scrub jay were detected and American crows and an unidentified warbler flew over the site. There was of small mammal use on site including active burrows, and Lepidoid and Mule deer scat. Some sensitive animals that have been detected within one mile of the site include the coastal California gnatcatcher, costal cactus wren, and the southern California rufous-crowned sparrow (the only one that has potential to appear on site). (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	The site is located within the Recommended Quino Survey Area for the federally-listed as endangered quino checkerspot butterfly per the 2014 USFWS protocol. Quino checkerspot surveys in 2001 were negative, even though conditions were ideal for the species. There were no quino checkerspot butterflies observed during the site visit and the larval host, plant dot-seed plantain and nectar sources such as owl's clover were not observed as well due to the time of the year. Please explain why the survey was not conducted during the time of year this host plant would be observed. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	EAS defers to LDR Engineering Review on hydrology and/or drainage issues. Should Engineering review staff determine that a technical study is required on the project, please provide a copy of those studies to EAS with the next submittal. Staff will coordinate with LDR Engineering Review to asses potential impacts and determine what if any mitigation is necessary. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Short-term noise impacts would be associated with onsite grading and construction activities of the project. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area, but would no longer occur once construction is completed. Sensitive receptors (e.g. residential uses) may occur in the immediate area, and may be temporarily affected by construction noise. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	-- CONT... -- Construction activities, however, would be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City's Municipal Code (Section 59.5.0404, Construction Noise) which are intended to reduce potential adverse effects resulting from construction noise. With compliance to the City's construction noise requirements, project construction noise levels would be reduced to less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. (From Cycle 5)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Morgan Dresser at (619) 446-5404. Project Nbr: 412254 / Cycle: 10





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"/>	10	-- CONT... -- For the long-term, existing noise levels would not be impacted due to the nature of the proposed residential use. Typical noise levels associated with residential uses are anticipated. Therefore, no significant noise-producing traffic or operations would occur. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, La Jolla, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975) the project site is located on Stadium Conglomerate, which is considered to have a high sensitivity level for paleontological resources. The City Significance Determination Thresholds state that monitoring is required when a depth of 10 feet and 1,000 cubic yards of excavation would be exceeded when a project is located on a formation that has a high sensitivity rating. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	-- CONT... -- The project proposes grading approximately 375 cubic yards and to a depth of approximately 4.8 feet over approximately 28,492 square feet. Therefore, no impact is identified for this issue area. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	The City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study Maps (1995 Edition) have designated the geology at the project location as being within the City of San Diego Geologic Hazard Categories 53. Hazard Category 53 is categorized as level or sloping terrain, unfavorable geologic structure with low to moderate risk. Per the City of San Diego Information Bulletin 515 (Geotechnical Study Requirements) for a Site Development Permit for Environmentally Sensitive Lands, a Geotechnical Report is required. (From Cycle 5)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	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 5)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	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. A determination as to the appropriate environmental document will be made based on all reviewed and submitted information. (From Cycle 5)

Cycle 10-10/19/2015

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES- EAS has reviewed the August 3, 2015 Biological Resources Letter Report for the Tivyan Residence Design Review Project (City PTS #: 412254), San Diego California prepared by Tierra Data. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Overall the project will impact a total of 1.07 acres if Southern Mixed Chaparral on site and .01 acres of developed land off site. This project has the potential to violate the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game (CFG) Code if clearing occurs during the bird breeding season, February 1-September 15. Impacts will be mitigated at a ratio greater than the required 1:1 ratio on site with recordation of a Covenant of Easement (COE) over the proposed 1.73 acre open space, with 1.35 acres counting towards mitigation and .38 acres in Brush Management Zone 2 (BMZ 2). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	By avoiding clearing and brush management during the bird breeding season (February 1-September 15) and having a biological monitor on site to monitor clearing, grading, and brush management during construction, the proposed project will ensure compliance with the MBTA and all pertinent sections of the CFG Code. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Please add information regarding management in perpetuity for the proposed Covenant of Easement. Please see the City of San Diego's Land Development Code Biology Guidelines, Section II, Identification of the Mitigation Program: Management Element. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	HYDROLOGY/DRAINAGE- EAS defers to LDR-Engineering Review on hydrology and/or drainage issues. At this time revisions to the Water Quality Technical Report (WQTR) and Drainage Report are being requested, please see LDR-Engineering staff comments for further information. Staff will coordinate with LDR-Engineering Review to asses potential impacts and determine what if any mitigation is necessary. Please provide a copy of those studies to EAS with the next submittal. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS EAS has received the Report of Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Residential Building Site, 11275 Beeler Canyon Road, San Diego, California prepared by Allied Earth Technology for Mr. Roman Tivyan on June 24, 2014. This report referenced the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed 3-Lot Development, 2.8 Acre Parcel, Beeler Canyon Road, County of San Diego prepared by Vinje & Middleton Engineering, Inc. on June 27, 2005. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	EAS defers to LDR-Geology on any geological issues. Please see LDR-Geology staff comments for further information. At this time, LDR-Geology is requesting additional information. Please provide any additional information to EAS as well. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Morgan Dresser at (619) 446-5404. Project Nbr: 412254 / Cycle: 10





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	LAND USE- EAS defers to LDR-Planning Review on Land Development Code and community plan issues; please refer to LDR-Planning Review comments for additional information and/or clarification. Per the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, an inconsistency with a land use plan is not in of itself a significant impact; the inconsistency would have to result in a secondary physical impact. EAS will coordinate with the LDR-Planning to assess the potential impact and determine what, if any, mitigation is required. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION- 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. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	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. A determination as to the appropriate environmental document will be made based on all reviewed and submitted information. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 08/06/2015	Deemed Complete on 08/07/2015
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 08/07/2015	
Reviewer: Huynh, Khanh (619) 446-5299 KHuynh@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 08/10/2015	
	Started: 08/28/2015	
Hours of Review: 6.00	Review Due: 09/23/2015	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 09/22/2015	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 10/20/2015	

- . The review due date was changed to 09/23/2015 from 09/02/2015 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 3rd 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 21 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (20 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 60 reviews, 78.3% were on-time, and 47.3% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

1st Review issues

<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 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	The applicant did not complete the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist correctly. The correct response to Part B, Item No.7 is YES, this project is within, directly adjacent to, or discharging directly into a Water Quality Sensitive Area. This has been determined using the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards Appendix C and PTS Stormwater Environmentally Sensitive Areas Map Layer. Submit a revised checklist on the next submittal. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	This project is subject to the regulations contained in the revised City's Storm Water Standards dated January 20, 2012. To comply with the updated regulations, the project will be required to add to a WQTR, a determination if the proposed project is subject to hydromodification criteria among other requirements. If applicable, hydromodification management facilities shall be required to mitigate project-related increases to discharge rates and durations. The specific process is outlined in the Hydromodification Management Requirements Section 4.5 of the Storm Water Standards. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	All drainage calculations shall be based if the Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) are required. Project must be designed so that runoff rates and durations are controlled to maintain or reduce pre-project downstream erosion conditions and protect stream habitat. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	Based on the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, this project is a Priority Project and requires BMPs. The applicant shall submit a Water Quality Technical Report consistent with the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards. Required elements of a WQTR are provided in Appendix F on this manual. Details supporting all decisions made in accordance with Chapter 4 requirements shall be documented in the WQTR. (continued below) (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	The design of any LID or treatment control BMP which allows for infiltration of runoff should be accompanied by a Geotechnical Investigation of the surrounding soils. A Geological Investigation Report should be attached to the Water Quality Technical Report and prepared in conformance with the City of San Diego Technical Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	The revised Storm Water Standards are available online at: http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/news/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Revise the Tittle Sheet, to show Legal Description and Owners' information correctly. The city's system showed the Legal Description as "Parcel 3". The plans showed as "Parcel 2". The city's system shown the owners are "Tivyan Roman and Sayavanh Nikki". The plans shown as "Roman Tivyan". Revise the plans accordingly. (From Cycle 5)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Khanh Huynh at (619) 446-5299. Project Nbr: 412254 / Cycle: 10





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"/>	9	Revise the Site Plan. Show and call out the proposed Treatment Control BMP's and HMP controls that will be called out in the required WQTR. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	SDMC section 143.0142(f) states: Any increase in runoff resulting from the development of the site shall be directed away from any steep hillside areas and either into an existing or newly improved public storm drain system or onto a street developed with a gutter system or public right-of-way designated to carry surface drainage run-off. (From Cycle 5)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Submit a Preliminary Drainage Study which addresses the existing and proposed storm water run-off and discharge locations for the project site study shall address how the storm water increase is discharge onto Beeler Canyon Road. Add a discussion regarding the required culvert in the Beeler Canyon Road's right-of-way. Discuss it shall be constructed to current City Standard, including 18 inches RCP, inlet, and outlet type. Add a discussion regarding the existing and proposed drainage on Beeler Canyon Road and the existing/proposed drainage device. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	Project proposed discharge concentrated storm water on the existing hillside which is unacceptable. Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. Add a note that states: This project will not discharge any increase in storm water run-off onto the existing hillside areas or adjacent properties. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Revise the Site Plan. The storm drain outlets shall extend to the nearest well-defined natural drainage channel or public street which can adequately convey the discharge. Add a note that states: At the storm drain discharge location, a suitable energy dissipater is to be installed to reduce the discharge to non-erodible velocities. Add a note that states: No additional run-off is proposed for the discharge location. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. Remove/relocate the proposed energy dissipater. Plans showed the storm water will discharge into the adjacent lot which is unacceptable. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	On the Site Plan & Grading Plan, sheet 2. Plans showed the amount of maximum fill depth/cut as 4.8 feet. Is it for within building footprint or outside building footprint? If it's for within the building footprint, then revise the table to add the amount of maximum cut/fill depth for outside the building footprint. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Revise the site and grading plans to identify the source, date and MSL datum of the topography. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Provide Bench Mark information per the City of San Diego Vertical Control Book. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement for the ongoing permanent BMP maintenance, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall incorporate any construction Best Management Practices necessary to comply with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1 (Grading Regulations) of the San Diego Municipal Code, into the construction plans or specifications. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	Revise the Site Plan, sheet 2. Add a note that states: Prior to the issuance of any construction permit the Owner/Permittee shall submit a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). The WPCP shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in Appendix E of the City's Storm Water Standards. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	Additional comments may be recommended pending further review of any redesign of this project. These comments are not exclusive. Should you have any questions or comments, please call Khanh Huynh at 619 446-5299. (From Cycle 5)

2nd Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Revise the Site Plan and Grading Plan, sheet 2. Revise the Storm Water Storage Area Detail E as follow: (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Add an overflow system on the detail. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Show the 36" depth of the storage, measured from the top of the storage to where the low flow orifice. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	Add a depth dimension for the storage area for irrigation. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	On sheet 2 of the Site Plan and Grading Plan, project proposed GEOTEXTILE which is infiltration. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	

The design of any LID or treatment control BMP which allows for infiltration of runoff should be accompanied by a Geotechnical Investigation of the surrounding soils. The Geotechnical Investigation report that was received did not discuss the infiltration. Revise the report to add discussion on the conclusion that the Geologist support infiltration.

(New Issue)

📁 Drainage Report issues

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

28 Revise the Drainage Report to add a discussion regarding the required culvert in the Beeler Canyon Road's right-of-way.

(New Issue)

29 Revise the Drainage Study Appendix C, Hydraulic Calculations. Add calculations for the underground detention system, including the overflow system calculations. (New Issue)

30 Revise Section 3 & 4 to include all calculation for all the hydrology nodes. (New Issue)

31 Revise the Proposed Condition Hydrology Map to show Q values for all the hydrology nodes. (New Issue)

32 Add a discussion in the Summary and Conclusions Section which discusses how the project mitigated the increases in the storm water run-off.

(New Issue)

📁 WQTR issues

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

33 Revise the report, section 4.3.2 Hydromodification Management Control BMP, page 13. Add a discussion to explain what IMPs are proposed. (New Issue)

34 Revise the report, section 4.3.2 Hydromodification Management Control BMP, page 13. Add a discussion regarding the San Diego BMP Sizing Calculator which includes site specific sizing factor parameters of Rain Gauge Basin, Hydrologic Soil Group, Average Slope and Stream Susceptibility and verifies footprint sizes for flow control basins. (New Issue)

35 Revise the BMP Sizing Spreadsheet V1.03 to show the proposed BMP sizing for the Bioretention, vault, minimum and proposed vault depth.

(New Issue)

36 Add a discussion in the Summary and Conclusions Section which discusses how the project mitigated the increases in the storm water run-off. (New Issue)

37 The drawdown time is not sufficient. Revise the design to meet current City Standards of drawdown less than 96 hours. (New Issue)

38 Submit drawdown calculation to prove compliance. (New Issue)

39 Add project number on the report. (New Issue)

📁 Information

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

40 Based on the scope of work, this project is now, and it will be priority development project when the new MS4 permit which become effective at the end of the year. (continue below)

The San Diego Water Board adopted Order No. R9-2013-0001, NPDES No. CAS0109266, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) Draining the Watersheds within the San Diego Region. (continue below) (New Issue)

41 This project will be required to adhere to the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards in effect at the time of approval of ministerial permit. The new Storm Water Development Regulations will become effective later this year on December 24, 2015 and this project will be subject to those regulations unless this project has prior lawful approval as defined in the permit. A discretionary approval is not an approval of full design rather an acceptance of conceptual design and thus does not qualify for prior lawful approval under the permit definition.

(New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 10 Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Submitted:** 08/06/2015 Deemed Complete on 08/07/2015
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-MSCP **Cycle Distributed:** 08/07/2015
Reviewer: Smit-Kicklighter, Holly **Assigned:** 08/14/2015
(619) 236-6621 **Started:** 08/24/2015
hsmmit@sandiego.gov **Review Due:** 08/28/2015
Hours of Review: 6.00 **Completed:** 08/31/2015 **COMPLETED LATE**
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline) **Closed:** 10/20/2015

- . The review due date was changed to 09/23/2015 from 09/02/2015 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 3rd complete submittal for Plan-MSCP on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 6 outstanding review issues with Plan-MSCP (7 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Plan-MSCP performed 20 reviews, 35.0% were on-time, and 50.0% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

MSCP 1st Review May 2015

BTR Specific Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	MSCP requests that the following specific comments on the Biology Letter Report for the Tivyan Residence (Tierra Data, February 18, 2015) be addressed: SUMMARY - Specify the BMZ2 impacts are only neutral if only thinning of native vegetation occurs. Any grading and replanting of BMZ2 would require mitigation. Please also note, BMZ2 areas of any kind are un-usable for mitigation requirements. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	METHODS - Clarify this paragraph to indicate that the late season/fall survey limited the potential for observing spring annuals and migratory bird species. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	PAGE 7 Special Conditions for Covered Species and Page 13 -Sensitive Plants and Animals discussions: Please note that all narrow endemic plant species are also MSCP Covered Species, however additional faunal species are also MSCP covered. Appendix A of the MSCP Subarea Plan includes "Conditions of Coverage" that must be discussed for high/moderate potential species per the BTR. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	PAGE 10- City records indicate that MSCP covered Southern CA rufous crowned sparrow was previously documented on-site in 2005 by RM Beauchamp. Please note this in the report. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	IMPACT SECTION - The text on page 12 (and Figure 3) indicates correctly that BMZ1 is considered a developed impact area; and the goes on to talk about how strict application of BMZ2 is not applied and that BMZ2 would be extended to small pockets of habitat at the front of the lot; however in Table 2, area is listed as 0.67 acres of BMZ1 instead of BMZ2. Please correct Table 2- Column 9 to be BMZ2. Otherwise the mitigation numbers would be incorrect as impacts would be 1.55 ac with a required mitigation acreage of 1.55 at the required 1:1 mitigation ratio. CONT (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	This would leave the proposed mitigation of 1.09 ac short by 0.46 ac. MITIGATION SECTION - MSCP requests that the BTR list verbatim or reference all applicable standard City Biological Mitigation Measures to protect biological resources and adjacent MHPA pursuant to the 2012 City of San Diego "Biology Guidelines, and the MSCP Subarea Plan. The specific measures can be sent via email by either the MSCP or EAS planner. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	At a minimum, mitigation measures recommended should include MHPA Land Use Adjacency measures and Bio monitoring during construction (includes general nesting bird measures). Mitigation Measure 1 - Please remove the mention that extra mitigation is provided. CONCLUSION - revise this section as needed per above comments (I.e. will MHPA LUAG be assured via mitigation measures or permit conditions?) (From Cycle 5)

SITE PLAN Specific Comments

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





L64A-003A

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 9 MSCP recommends the following corrections/changes be made: Sheet 1 - SDP for ESL Steep Slopes reference should include SDP for biological resources as well.

Sheet 8 - Specify that revegetation is for BMZ1 only. Landscaping sheet list should be made consistent with actual sheet numbers (i.e Landscape Sheets 1-7 are actually Sheets 8-14 of the plan set).
- (From Cycle 5)
- 10 Sheet 11 - This sheet references a native grass and wildlife hydroseed mix for BMZ1. Please note that Gazania splendens is a non-native African species that has been known to invade adjacent native habitat. Please substitute with a native bush daisy such as Encelia californica or Bahiopsis (Viguiera) lanciniata.

(From Cycle 5)

MSCP 2nd Rev Aug 2015

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 17 MSCP has reviewed the August 3, 2015, Bio Letter Report by Tierra Data and the 14 sheet Site Plan set (Version 7, Cycle 10) as has the following comments: (New Issue)

Biology LtrRpt Aug 2015

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 11 Per landscape comments, all brush management zones must be corrected and determined on-site. This means that the biological impact assessment may need to be updated to include any new areas of Zone 1 as an impact. Please also note any graded and revegetated areas of Zone 2 are also considered to be mitigable impacts and not mitigation credit is given for revegetation in Zone 2.

Please mention that BMZ2 compliance with City regulations allows only "thinning" of existing species (2nd REQUEST). (New Issue)
- 12 Restated from comment 8 - Currently only the impact section discusses MHPA Land Use Adjacency guidelines and project compliance. The compliance element must also be reflected as mitigation in the mitigation section. MSCP Staff forwarded the City's standard MMRP's for this which should be used in the mitigation section (as project features are not enforceable). SECOND REQUEST (New Issue)
- 13 Specify on the impact map where entire impact footprint is (i.e. use a solid red outline for all impacts - include the area of the cable fence). Note that cable fence can only be placed at rear of Zone 1 as Zone 2 cannot be fenced off to allow for wildlife use of the area. Update this map as necessary to include all direction from the Landscape Section on the BMZ's including potential alternative compliance and request for off-site BM, etc. Please explain why BMZ2 would be required along the roadway on the northside. (New Issue)
- 14 Correct references of Stonegate to Stonebridge. (New Issue)

Site Plans

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 15 Sheet 2 - Limits of grading - Please rename to limits of work/development - BMZ1 must be included in this envelope as must any graded BMZ2 areas and the rip rap areas near the driveway, etc. Mitigation for all native habitat within the development footprint must be clearly outlined in the Biology Report. (New Issue)
- 16 Sheet 8 shows grading and revegetation of an area shown as BMZ2. Please note that grading constitutes a mitigable impact area and must be discussed as such in the Biological Letter Report. (New Issue)

