



Cycle Issues DRAFT

4/14/11 3:27 pm

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

Page 1 of 23

L64A-003B

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Project Information

Project Nbr: **233958**

Title: BALBOA PARK PLAZA DE PANAMA



Project Mgr: Sokolowski, Michelle

(619) 446-5278

msokolowski@sandiego.gov

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

Submitted: 03/15/2011 Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011

Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review

Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011

Reviewer: Geiler, Gary

Assigned: 03/21/2011

(619) 446-5366

Started: 04/13/2011

Hours of Review: 3.00

Review Due: 04/13/2011

Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)

Completed: 04/14/2011

Closed:

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 7 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

Planning

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The proposed project requires an amendment to the Balboa Park Master Plan and the Central Mesa Precise Plan, and a Site Development Permit for development on a premises containing environmentally sensitive lands and historical resources. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The site is unzoned, City owned property located within Balboa Park Master Plan and Central Mesa Precise Plan. The premises contains sensitive biological resources and steep hillsides and designated historic resources. (New Issue)

Plan Revisions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Grading Plan (Sheet 2)-Project Tabulation is conceptual. Revise to show amount of site to be graded, amount of site with 25% slopes or greater, and amount of site with natural steep hillsides (per Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Slope Analysis (Sheet 6)-Identify on the graphic and include a tabulation of those areas that are natural steep hillsides and disturbed areas. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Parking Garage Sections (Sheet 15,16)-Revise the Sheet Titles to reflect the drawings. Sheet 15 Parking garage sections are street/site sections. Sheet 16 contains parking garage sections. All sections shall be fully dimensioned with pre-existing and finished grades, spot elevations, etc. (See Submittal Manual for required information on Section Plans). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Bridge Concepts Alternative (Sheet 17)-Individual elevations of each bridge shall be provided in order to determine height. (See Submittal Manual for required information on Elevation Plans). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Parking Structure (Sheet 22)-Identify spot elevations at the all high points, including the informational center, guardrails, etc. (See Submittal Manual for required information on Elevation and Section Plans). (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Shearer-Nguyen, Liz (619) 446-5369	Assigned: 03/15/2011	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Started: 04/14/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/18/2011	
	Completed: 04/14/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with LDR-Environmental (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

1st Review 4/11

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Entitlements Section has reviewed the above-referenced project and determined that the project as proposed, and as discussed with the consultants and applicant, requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). A Public Notice for the preparation of an EIR and Scoping Meeting was distributed for a 30-day public review period beginning on March 23, 2011. The public scoping meeting has been scheduled for Thursday, April 14, 2011. Any comments submitted during the public comment period will be incorporated into the EIR. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	The currently identified issue areas that need to be addressed are: Land Use, Transportation/Circulation/Parking, Historical Resources, Air Quality/Odor, Biological Resources, Energy, Geologic Conditions, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Health Safety/Hazardous Materials, Hydrology, Noise, Paleontological Resources, Public Services and Facilities, Public Utilities, Visual Effects/Neighborhood Character/Landform Alteration, Water Quality, and Cumulative Effects. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please be aware that the environmental review may change in response to any project changes and/or new information. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Ocen, Julius (619) 446-5295	Assigned: 03/15/2011	
Hours of Review: 10.10	Started: 04/11/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/14/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 8 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

1st Review Issues

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	(1 of 2) The project is subject to Priority Permanent Storm Water BMP requirements. Therefore, the applicant shall submit a Water Quality Technical Report consistent with the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards Appendix F. The report shall include, but not be limited to how Low Impact Development (LID) and Source Control BMPs have been incorporated to the project, selection and calculations regarding the numeric sizing treatment standards, BMP maintenance schedules and maintenance costs and the party responsible for future maintenance and associated costs. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	(2 of 2) The report will also need to address water quality, by describing the type of pollutants which will be generated post-construction, the pollutants to be captured and treated by the proposed BMP's and the quality of the resultant discharge. If substantial impacts are anticipated, list the measures which must be taken to mitigate such impacts. This project must determine Hydromodification Management Requirements HMP per section 4 of the storm water standards. The Storm Water Standards are available online at http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/stormwater.shtml (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	ADD NOTE TO PLANS FOR ALL PROJECTS WITH PERMANENT BMP REQUIREMENTS: Prior to the issuance of any construction permit, the Owner/Permittee shall enter into a Maintenance Agreement for the ongoing permanent BMP maintenance. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	ADD NOTE TO PLANS FOR ALL PROJECTS WITH CONSTRUCTION: 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. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	The conceptual grading plan need to have a completed grading data table with cut/fill import/export quantities, slope gradient, drainage patterns, and the collection/discharge points for all site/roof drains. Please provide this information accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Submit a preliminary drainage study and address the adequacy of the down stream system(s) and demonstrate that no adverse impacts will occur to downstream systems/properties as a result of the**increased runoff from this proposed development. If impacts are anticipated, what measures must be taken to mitigate such impacts. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	The proposed bypass bridge needs to be designed using the the standard commercial local street per the city's street design manual with a parkway width of 20 feet, 8% maximum grade and a minimum curve radius of 290 feet. Please revise plans accordingly. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Please provide street cross section BB shown on sheet 1. Additionally provide all street names on the plans. (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Julius Ocen at (619) 446-5295. Project Nbr: 233958 / Cycle: 3





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: Fire-Plans Officer	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Carter, Ron (619) 446-5449	Assigned: 03/18/2011	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Started: 04/11/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/12/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 6 outstanding review issues with Fire-Plans Officer (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

Fire Dept issues (1st review)

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Show location of all existing hydrants, within 600', on site plan. (UFC903.2) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Provide fire access roadways in accordance with FHPS Policy A-08-1 (UFC 902.1) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Provide turn radius for fire apparatus in accordance with FHPS Policy A-08-1 (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Post indicator valves, fire department connections, and alarm bell are to be located on the address/access side of the structure. UFC 1001.4 - provide as a note on the site plan. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Call Ron Carter at 619-446-5449 for an appointment to discuss these requirements. Email to schedule appt acceptable (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Provide a Fire Access plan to show existing hydrants and Fire Access Roadways (New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Sokolowski, Michelle (619) 446-5278	Assigned: 03/25/2011	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Started: 04/13/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/13/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (all of which are new).

Balboa Park Committee

Balboa Park Committee

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Please contact the Bruce Martinez, staff for the Balboa Park Committee to make arrangements to present your project for review and recommendation. This group is officially recognized by the City as a representative of Balboa Park, and an advisor to the City in actions that would affect this area. The Development Services Department has notified Mr. Martinez of your request and has sent a copy of your project plans and documents. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	You can contact Bruce Martinez at (619) 235-1124 or via email at bmartinez@sanidiego.gov . (New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: Park & Rec	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Harkness, Jeff (619) 533-6595	Assigned: 03/22/2011	
Hours of Review: 1.50	Started: 04/13/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/14/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 48 outstanding review issues with Park & Rec (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

Review 4-14-11

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	General - The City of San Diego Real Estate Assets Department should review the plans to assure there are no conflicts with existing leaseholds. - Former Balboa Park Horticulturalist Kathy Puplava has provided comments regarding potential impacts to existing trees within the project area. Please consider these comments and revise the design as feasible to minimize impacts to sensitive species. - See redline plans for clarification on comments for sheets 1 through 22. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Sheet 1 - Development Summary, 1, D: There is only one national historic landmark district, not two. - Development Summary, 7: Add public restrooms and park maintenance facilities to the existing uses. - Legend: The legend lists proposed overhead electric line. There are no overhead electric lines in this area, and none should be added. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Sheet 2 - Indicate how traffic will physically be stopped from proceeding east on El Prado at the bypass road. - Where the bypass road intersects with El Prado, the east radius appears to be larger than necessary? Traffic will not be turning right off the bypass road at this intersection. - Where the bypass road intersects with El Prado, there is a pinch point on the west side where the sidewalk appears too narrow. - Curb ramps and detectable warning tiles are not shown on the plans. These are needed to determine the accessible path of travel. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	Sheet 2 con't. - Staff has a concern regarding pedestrian/bicycle/vehicle conflict at the intersection of the bypass road and El Prado. Vehicles turning onto and off of the bypass road will conflict with pedestrians and cyclists continuing east and west along El Prado. - One maintenance shed is being removed and access to another is severely hampered. Also, storage in the existing restroom building is being removed. The plans should specifically address how the loss of these maintenance facilities will be mitigated and where replacement facilities will be located. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	Sheet 2 con't. - Dumpsters and dumpster enclosures are not included in the plans. The plans need to locate / relocated the appropriate number of trash facilities. - Provide a "staff only" parking space by the existing maintenance facility. - Parking aisle width is not listed on the middle aisle. Minimum width is 24 feet per code. - The aisle width on the southern aisle is listed as 21.5 feet. Minimum aisle width is 24 feet per code. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Sheet 2 con't. -Traffic in the southern aisle is labeled as one-way. This will be confusing, and consideration should be given to designing this two-way. Concern is that people will drive both ways regardless of arrows. - On the south row of parking there is one space that is not accessible and has no special label. Please indicate its use. - All accessible parking spaces should have the International Symbol of Access (ISA) shown on the plans. Include wheel stops and signage. (New Issue)





<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	Sheet 2 con't. - There is a drop-off zone and a loading zone in the Alcazar Lot. What is the difference between the two, and why are both needed? Consolidation of these two elements would simplify circulation. - Access to the Archery Range appears to have been eliminated and the Archery Range layout will be impacted. How will this be mitigated? - The public restrooms have been eliminated. Staff understands there are public restrooms in the House of Charm adjacent to the Alcazar garden that were closed for an unknown reason. Investigate re-opening of these restrooms. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Sheet 2 con't. - Access to the existing wood bridge and stairs at Palm Canyon does not appear to be accurate. Please confirm access and modify plans as appropriate, including the stairs down into Palm Canyon. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9	Sheet 2 con't. - There is an existing Kauri Pine (Agathis australis) at the southeast corner of the House of Charm. This tree is extremely rare and valuable, and needs to be protected in place. The proposed retaining wall along the west side of the Esplanade will have a severe impact on this tree. The walkway should be re-aligned to further south on the Esplanade or to the west end of the House of Charm arcade (where the existing walkway enters). (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	10	Sheet 2 con't. - There is an existing door on the south side of the House of Charm that currently has walkway access. This door appears to have no access on the current plans. - A retaining wall is shown in the vicinity of a large Ficus tree on the east side of the Alcazar Lot. This wall will have an impact on the tree's root system. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	11	Sheet 2 con't. -The existing historic stairs and at the southeast corner of the Alcazar Lot appear to be impacted. More accurately indicate the stairs and preserve them. Provide access to the stairs. - The existing historic stairs and bridge abutment on the south side of Palm Canyon appear to be impacted by grading and road re-alignment. Please preserve the historic stairs and bridge abutment. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	12	Sheet 2 con't. - Grading at the southwest corner of the Alcazar Lot may impact existing historic footings from the Alcazar Garden arbor. Please confirm and make appropriate modifications to the plans to mitigate the issue. - A large portion of the retaining walls along the Esplanade appear to be unnecessary and may not be an appropriate addition to the National Historic Landmark District. Retaining walls and free-standing walls should be minimized. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	13	Sheet 2 con't. - The intersection of Pan American Road and Pan American Road West should be re-configured to make it clear the general public does not have access. Traffic bollards or other means should be used to keep traffic from turning from the new bypass road onto Pan American Road West. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	14	Sheet 2 con't. - Provide a plan that shows accessible paths of travel. The arrows shown on this plan are not the typical symbol used, and the path of travel appears incomplete. Path of travel must be provided to all nearby institutions (Museum of Man, Old Globe, Museum of Art, House of Charm, House of Hospitality, Timken Museum, etc.). - The route of the park tram must be accommodated to the West Mesa. How will this be accomplished? Will there be a tram stop in the Alcazar Lot? (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	15	Sheet 2 con't. - Where will bus drop-off occur? This currently happens along the east side of the Esplanade. - Where will limousine drop-off occur for weddings and other special events? This currently occurs at several locations in the Plaza de Panama. - Staff has a concern that too many functions are proposed to be accommodated in a very small space (Alcazar Lot). Current functions are much more spread out in the Plaza de Panama, Esplanade and Alcazar Lot. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	16	Sheet 2 con't. - The Alcazar Lot will generate much more noise than it does currently. This will make the Alcazar Garden a much less desirable location for weddings and similar events, which it currently hosts. What is the mitigation for this? - It takes a large crew and effort to plant Alcazar Garden 4 times per year. It takes 6-10 trucks to deliver the flower flats and the soil amendments, and a large crew to plant the garden. This type of maintenance activity needs be considered in the planning of the Alcazar Lot. (New Issue)





<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	Sheet 3 - There is an existing Kauri Pine (<i>Agathis australis</i>) at the southeast corner of the House of Charm. This tree is extremely rare and valuable, and needs to be protected in place. The proposed retaining wall along the west side of the Esplanade will have a severe impact on this tree. The walkway should be re-aligned to further south on the Esplanade or to the west end of the House of Charm arcade (where the existing walkway enters).
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Sheet 3 con't. - The wall along the east side of the Esplanade should be deleted. It is not a historic wall, and blocks access to the new viewing platform by the Japanese Friendship Garden. - This plan does not show any new walkways as indicated on other plans. - Staff supports keeping the existing fountain in the center of the Plaza de Panama.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Sheet 3 con't. - Two Park and Recreation maintenance facilities are impacted by this plan. The relocation and design of the facilities must be addressed. - The drainage along the bypass road east of the parking structure does not appear to be at the low point of the road.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Sheet 3 con't. - The proposed tram turn-around does not appear to address parkwide tram circulation needs. Also, the turn-around unnecessarily impacts existing accessible and standard parking spaces, usable turf and Palm trees. The tram turn-around can be accommodated within the existing footprint of the Palisades parking lot without the need for re-alignment of the Palisades lot entrance. - Grading along Presidents Way should be minimized to preserve existing mature Podocarpus trees. Grading shown appears to be unnecessary.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Sheet 3 con't. Stairs shown at the southwest corner of the parking structure will be an attractive nuisance; skateboarders and bikes will congregate there. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Sheet 8 - Existing conditions noted in the keynotes are not adequately labeled on the plans. - The existing historic stairs to the former bridge location need to be shown accurately and preserved. They appear to be impacted according to this plan. - Benches are shown on the keynotes but not on the plans. Consider benches for the valet drop-off/pick-up and for the drop-off areas. The proposed seat walls do not meet ADA requirements for benches.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Sheet 8 con't. - Curb ramps and detectable warning tiles are not shown on the plans. Any pedestrian areas that are flush with adjacent vehicular paving will require a continuous three foot wide strip of detectable warning tiles. - Identify all accessible parking spaces with the ISA. Include wheel stops and signage. - The parking space at the southwestern corner of the lot is not accessible. Is there a special designation for this space? - Retaining walls shown on the grading plans are not shown on this plan. - Paving on this plan does not appear to match the grading plan.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	Sheet 8 con't. - Protect the existing Ficus trees adjacent to the Alcazar lot, especially the tree between the Alcazar Garden and the lot. - Show the existing wall between the Alcazar Garden and the lot, and indicate its disposition. - Identify a "staff only" space adjacent to the existing maintenance facility. Maintenance needs must be addressed on the plans. - Native/naturalized vegetation along Palm canyon is not appropriate. Select appropriate plantings for this area.
		(New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	Sheet 8 con't. - The slopes at the bridge abutments are too steep to install as non-irrigated. Provide irrigated re-vegetation compatible with the Archery Range area. - All trees are deciduous and native or naturalized. Please provide more variety, including evergreen trees, as appropriate for the area being planted. The trees do not need to be native or naturalized in this area.
		(New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	Sheet 8 con't. - The plant legend is too general to provide comment on. - Keynote 3.3: Please define "pedestrian light." - Trees should be kept clear of any light standards. - Steel bollards (3.4) are too difficult to see. These are not adequate pedestrian protection for visually impaired and detectable warning tiles are required along the entire edge where pedestrian paving is flush with auto paving. - The wood seat cap (2.2) will be difficult to maintain and will be carved up with graffiti. Seat walls do not meet ADA requirements. - Please define what a "specialty curb" is (2.6) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	27	Sheet 9 - Staff prefers to keep the existing plantings at the base of all buildings, including the arcades along El Prado and buildings surrounding the Plaza de Panama. - Paving along the outside edges of the arcades is discouraged. People will tend to cut through the planters to get to the walkways, creating a maintenance problem. - Locate benches along the edge of walkways within the walkway paving. Placing benches within lawn areas will create mowing and edging problems and the benches will not be ADA compliant. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	28	Sheet 9 con't. - Show the Friends of Balboa Park information kiosk currently located adjacent to the Timken Museum. - Lights are shown too close to trees. Trees will block the light and make maintenance difficult. - The proposed stair configuration at the Museum of Art is not historically accurate. Also, the Museum of Art leasehold is defined by the current stair configuration. Please keep the existing stair configuration. - Please indicate the proposed tram route on the plans. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	29	Sheet 10 - Staff supports an option that keeps existing foundation plantings at the base of existing buildings, without walkways adjacent to the arcades. - Staff does not support movable planters. - Staff does not support vertical water jets. - Staff supports keeping the existing fountain in its current location. - Staff supports permanent reflecting pools on either side of the existing fountain. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	30	Sheet 11 - Do not plant any trees other than Palms in Palm Canyon (delete deciduous native/naturalized trees). - Delete the low wall on the east side of the Esplanade. This wall blocks access to the Japanese friendship Garden and viewing area. Delete the low wall/retaining wall on the west side of the Esplanade to the largest extent possible. Use grading to take up the slope as much as possible. - Delete narrow strips of turf. They are difficult to maintain. Use appropriate shrubs and groundcovers instead. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	31	Sheet 11 con't. - Locate benches along the edge of walkways within the walkway paving. Placing benches within lawn areas will create mowing and edging problems and the benches will not be ADA compliant. - The change in the design of the center island precludes access with a mower. Please provide mower access. - Re-align the walkway from the Alcazar Lot to the Esplanade to avoid impacting the Kauri Pine. - The walkway should be routed further south or into the west end of the arcade at the House of Charm. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	32	Sheet 11 con't. - It appears the curb line of the roadway is too close to the fountain at the north end of the Organ Pavilion. Provide adequate clearance. The curb line does not appear to match the grading plans or existing alignment. - The existing paving and planting inside the Organ Pavilion is shown incorrectly. - Show the existing Palm Canyon walk and stairs to below differently from proposed walkway extensions. - Cross sections of retaining walls should include safety railings for maintenance staff. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	33	Sheet 11 con't. - Native/naturalized plantings in this area are not appropriate. Plantings should match surrounding landscape. - The symbols for existing shrubs to remain and proposed shrubs are identical. Please differentiate. - Reduce the amount of hedge planting. Hedging is high maintenance. - Trees along the Esplanade should be centered in the space. Turf maintenance will be more difficult with the trees so close to the paving edge. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	34	Sheet 11 con't. - The area to the east of this plan sheet (along Pan American Road West) is missing. - Will there be a connection from the Palm Canyon boardwalk to the Organ Pavilion? (New Issue)





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	35	Sheet 12 - The rooftop garden design needs to incorporate maintenance vehicle access. Maintenance vehicles need to access lighting, restrooms, information center, elevators, etc. This same access should also be provided for event related vehicle access. - The restrooms are very far from the Organ Pavilion (+/- 400 feet). This is much further than the existing restrooms. The Organ Pavilion is a major venue in the park and needs convenient restroom facilities. Consideration should be given to the relocation of restroom facilities to serve the Pavilion. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	36	Sheet 12 con't. - The use of hedges appears excessive and will require high maintenance. Please reduce the amount of hedging required. Do not plant hedges between paving and turf; the hedges will not survive the foot traffic. - The Children's Garden is located very close to the edge of the parking structure and the stairwell. Safety should be considered in siting this feature. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	37	Sheet 12 con't. - The use of native/naturalized plant materials in these areas may not be appropriate. The Australian Garden is located southeast of this area (Gold Gulch) and similar planting should be used east of the new bypass road. Native/naturalized plants in the space between the bypass road and parking structure may not be appropriate in the middle of a high maintenance urban park. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	38	Sheet 13 - The walkway leading from the intersection of Presidents Way and the new bypass road to the rooftop park appears to be too steep to meet ADA requirements. - Stairs shown at the southwest corner of the parking structure appear to be an attractive nuisance; skateboarders and bikes will likely congregate there. - The openings for the Palm trees planted inside the parking structure are not shown. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	39	Sheet 13 con't. - Retain the existing Podocarpus trees along Presidents Way to the greatest extent possible. Minimize grading in this area. - Provide screen planting for the air shaft at the south end of the parking structure. - The maintenance shed shown at the lower right is impacted by grading. - The terraced stairs (2.13) are acceptable provided the surrounding paving is stabilized decomposed granite. If the paving changes, these terraced stairs will be attractive to skateboarders and should be deleted. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	40	Sheet 14 - Do not show tree planting outside the area of work. - The tram turn-around should be shifted to the south and contained within the footprint of the existing palisades lot. The tram stop should be designed to accommodate a park-wide tram system. This design eliminates palm trees and usable turf as well as usable parking spaces. Presidents Way should not be re-aligned. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	41	Sheet 15 - It is not clear on the plan sheets where cross-sections are cut; not all section locations are called out. - Cross-section A shows a low wall that is not shown on the plans. Is this the existing wall or a new wall? Cross-section A also shows what appears to be a very narrow drive aisle. The minimum width for a drive aisle is 24 feet. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	42	Sheet 15 con't. - Cross-section B incorrectly labels Palm Canyon as native chaparral. It also incorrectly identifies the Japanese Friendship Garden as native chaparral. This cross-section does not accurately show walls proposed on the grading plans. - Cross-section D shows a deep drop from landscaping to the road bed below. A guard rail needs to be included in this section for worker safety. The same comment applies to cross-section D. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	43	Sheet 16 - Cross-section E incorrectly labels Presidents Way as Pan American Road. Grading on the south end of the parking structure is not accurately shown. Identify the clearance between the bypass road and the bottom of the pedestrian overpass. - Cross-section F shows palm trees planted on Level 3 but the garage plans show planters on Level 1. The planting plans show "terraced stairs", which appear to be raised planters. These are not shown on the cross-sections. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	44	Sheet 16 con't. - Cross-section G shows stairs at the west end of the structure. These stairs may be attractive to skateboarders. Delete the stairs and replace them with terraced planters or vegetated mounding. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	45	Sheet 17 - A large bridge abutment is shown adjacent to the Alcazar Lot. Consider modifying the design to minimize the size of the bridge abutment. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	46	Sheet 18 - The label for valet storage appears to be free-floating. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	47	Sheet 20 - The six spaces in the northwest corner need to be reserved for staff only, including the civic organist and others. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	Sheet 22 - The terms "ground level" and "first level" are used interchangeably. Keep the terminology consistent. - The first level plan shows planters for palm trees while the other levels appear to have cut-outs for the trees to grow through. This is not what is shown on these cross-sections. If the trees will not be planted in the ground, it seems of little benefit to plant them one level down with the risk of people climbing down or falling down the tree holes. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Facilities Financing	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Galvez III, Oscar (619) 533-3685	Assigned: 03/16/2011	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Started: 03/25/2011	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 03/28/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Plan-Facilities Financing (all of which are new).

Impact Fees

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	Facilities Financing has no outstanding issues. Additional review will be required only in the event major revisions in the scope of the project result in a new assessment of Development Impact and Housing Trust Fund fees. Contact: Oscar Galvez III, Facilities Financing Project Manager, 619-533-3679. (New Issue)





Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: PUD-Water & Sewer Dev	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Keshavarzi, Mahmood (619) 533-4692	Assigned: 03/16/2011	
Hours of Review: 8.00	Started: 04/11/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/13/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with PUD-Water & Sewer Dev (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

Informational Items

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	All water services to the site, including domestic, irrigation and fire, will require private, above ground back flow prevention devices (BFPDs). BFPDs are typically located on private property, in line with the service and immediately adjacent to the right-of-way. The Public Utilities Department will not permit the required BFPDs to be located below grade or within the structure. (New Issue) [Recommended]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	Water and sewer capacity charges will be due at the time of building permit issuance. Capacity charges, as well as service and meter size, are determined by the Water Meter Data Card which is completed during the building plan review process. Any questions regarding water and sewer capacity fees should be addressed to Information and Application Services (619-446-5000). (New Issue) [Recommended]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Prior to connecting to any existing sewer lateral, the lateral shall be inspected using a closed-circuit television (CCTV) by a California Licensed Plumbing Contractor to verify the lateral is in good working condition and free of all debris. Utilization of existing sewer laterals is at the sole risk and responsibility of the Owner/Permittee to ensure the laterals are functional and connected to a public sewer facility. (New Issue) [Recommended]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	No trees or shrubs exceeding three feet in height at maturity shall be installed within ten feet of any water and sewer facilities. (New Issue) [Recommended]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	All proposed public water and sewer facilities, including services and meters, must be designed and constructed in accordance with established criteria in the most current edition of the City of San Diego Water and Sewer Facility Design Guidelines and City regulations, standards and practices pertaining thereto. (New Issue) [Recommended]

1st Review Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	6	Revise Sheets 2 - 4 per items below: 1. Call out the existing and proposed public water and sewer mains with size and reference drawing number. Show all existing appurtenances. 2. Show and call out the existing sewer and water laterals and identify to remain or abandon. 3. Show and call out the proposed water service(s) (domestic, fire, irrigation) and sewer lateral(s). 4. Is the proposed 16" water main public or private? if public move it to Pan American Road. Continued below: (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	7	5. Add the following note; "No trees or shrubs exceeding three feet in height at maturity shall be installed within ten feet of any water and sewer facilities". (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	8	Upon review of the revised plans addressing the above comments, the Water and Sewer Review Section will provide additional comments, if any, and draft permit conditions. If you have any questions regarding the Water and Sewer Review Section comments, please contact Moe Keshavarzi at (619) 533-4692. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

4/14/11 3:27 pm

Page 14 of 23

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

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: Caltrans	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Sokolowski, Michelle (619) 446-5278	Assigned: 03/25/2011	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Started: 03/30/2011	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 03/30/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

Caltrans Comments

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

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	Caltrans has received and reviewed the Balboa Park Plaza de Panama (PTS 233958) Parking Structure and Circulation brief and site plans. Caltrans has no comments at this time. If you have any questions, please contact me.
-------------------------------------	---	---

Christian Bushong
Caltrans, District 11 Planning Department Development Review Branch 4050 Taylor Street, MS 240 San Diego, CA 92110

christian.bushong@dot.ca.gov
(619) 688-6494
(New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: Environmental Services Dept	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Sokolowski, Michelle (619) 446-5278	Assigned: 03/18/2011	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Started: 04/13/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/13/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Environmental Services Dept (all of which are new).

Waste Management Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	A Waste Management Plan is required. Comments will be provided after this plan is provided and reviewed. Environmental Services prefers that documents be provided to them electronically to cut down on their waste. Please include an e-copy (CD) of this plan with your resubmittal. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Also, detailed construction plans, are not required for this discipline; just a site plan that shows the location of the project and an aerial view of the proposed work included in the Waste Management Plan. Please clearly mark this package of your resubmittal specifically for the Environmental Services Dept. so they receive the correct plan package. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Questions should be directed to Lisa Wood at lwood@sandiego.gov; (858) 573-1236 or to Eric Turner at eturner@sandiego.gov; (858) 627-3302. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Historic	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Stanco, Kelley (619) 236-6545	Assigned: 03/17/2011	
Hours of Review: 10.00	Started: 04/13/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/13/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 20 outstanding review issues with Plan-Historic (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

Plan-Historic Review 4/13/2011

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The project site is located within the Balboa Park National Register Landmark Historic District (also designated as HRB Site #1). All work on the property requires a building permit and must be reviewed by Plan-Historic staff for compliance with the City's Historic Resources Regulations (SDMC Ch14, Art 3 Div 2) and the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. (Info Only; No Response or Action Required) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Projects which do not comply with the above Standards and criteria will require a Site Development Permit (Process 4) in accordance with SDMC 143.0210(e)(2). The Site Development Permit requires findings to be made in support of the deviation. These findings can be found in SDMC Section 126.0504(i). (Info Only; No Response or Action Required) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	The U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards can be viewed at the following website: http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/standards/rehabilitation.htm http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/download/standards_guidelines.pdf (pages 68-122) (For Reference Only; No Response or Action Required) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	The project application proposes the following scope of work: 1. Construct a bypass bridge and road connecting to the Cabrillo Bridge and leading to a new underground parking garage just south of the Organ Pavilion. 2. Construct a new 785-car underground parking structure just south of the Organ Pavilion with a roof-top garden that includes lawn, formal gardens, an elevator, restrooms, and retail structures. 3. Construct new retaining walls to facilitate construction of the bypass road and underground parking structure. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5	4. Expand and improve the Alcazar Garden parking lot for ADA accessible and valet parking. 5. Remove existing paving and install new pedestrian oriented improvements at the Plaza de California, Plaza de Panama and adjacent Esplanade. 6. Construct a new pedestrian walkway along Palm canyon, tying into the existing pedestrian bridge. 7. Develop and provide improvements for a new tram system. 8. Misc landscaping and street furniture enhancements. (New Issue)

Prior Reviews/Conceptual Proj

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





L64A-003B

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 6
The proposed project has been presented in concept at a number of public forms, including Historical Resources Board (HRB) Hearings. The Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) was invited to review the project and provide comment, but declined to provide specific comments. While review by OHP and the National Park Service (NPS) is not required, both agencies will have an opportunity to provide comment during public review. (Info Only; No Response or Action Required) (New Issue)

Project Proposal & Impacts

Issue
Cleared? Num Issue Text

- 7
Plan-Historic staff has reviewed the project proposal for consistency with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards) and has found that the project will result in substantial alterations to the Historic Landmark District that will have an adverse impact on the resource. Therefore, a Site Development Permit will be required for the proposed project, consistent with SDMC Section 143.0210(e)(2). (New Issue)
- 8
The comments below elaborate on the project elements that have singularly and cumulatively resulted in the adverse impact to the resource. These comments are preliminary, and the project is subject to additional review and analysis by Plan-Historic staff as more information is provided and/or the project evolves. Additional documentation and exhibits may be required for a more detailed analysis. (Info Only; No Response or Action Required) (New Issue)
- 9
The construction of the bypass bridge results in an intrusion into the district that adversely impacts the setting and feeling of the historic district and alters historic spatial relationships. (New Issue)
- 10
The construction of the bypass road is a significant new element extending through a large portion of the district that also adversely impacts the setting and feeling. The construction of the road necessitates substantial land form alterations through extensive grading and use of retaining walls. These alterations significantly alter the character of the district and introduce highly contemporary grading and infrastructure improvements that disrupt the historic feel. (New Issue)
- 11
The construction of the underground parking garage will adversely impact the historic setting of the Speckels Organ Pavilion, one of the few remaining structures dating to the original 1915/1916 Exposition. The finished grade at the top of the parking garage will be roughly level with grade around the Organ Pavilion, and will connect across over the bypass road to the Pavilion. (continue...) (New Issue)
- 12
(...continue) This is a significant change from the current spatial relationships and setting around the Pavilion, which is set higher than the current parking area. In addition, the wooded backdrop behind the Pavilion will be removed and the new rooftop gardens and open space will be visible beyond. (New Issue)
- 13
The improvements on top of the parking garage include a formal garden, an open lawn area, stairwells, an elevator shaft, restrooms, and misc retail space. The formal garden proposed will introduce elements found in other areas of the park not present at this area historically. The formal garden should be removed and changed to a less formal garden or open space. In addition, while a restroom facility can be supported, misc commercial structures are not appropriate. (New Issue)
- 14
Removal of the parking from the Plaza de Panama and restoring the pedestrian oriented use has the potential to positively impact the district and could be determined to be consistent with the Standards. Of the four design concepts shown, the "Historic Plaza" option is the most consistent with the Standards and should be pursued. However, some of the improvements shown as part of that option are not consistent. Specifically, these elements include alteration of the stairs and landing in front of the Museum of Art and the use of decorative paving (please see issue #15 for more detail). (New Issue)
- 15
The extensive use of enhanced and decorative paving is not consistent with the Standards. Staff has two issues in this regard. First, the sheer amount of new paving introduced. Staff is concerned that this will result in a loss of historic character and feeling. New paving should be limited unless it is restoring non-historic paving to a historic appearance. The second issue is the many different types of paving proposed and the appropriateness of the paving. Overall, proposed paving must be simplified. (continued...) (New Issue)
- 16
(...continued) Enhanced paving for pedestrian circulation is a contemporary philosophy not consistent with the period of significance of the district. Paving varieties must be kept to a minimum, must be simplified, and must be consistent with the historic character and period of significance for the district. Specific paving materials, style, color, pattern, etc will have to be identified as part of this application. (New Issue)
- 17
Other pedestrian enhancements, including extensive lighting and steel bollards, are also not appropriate or consistent with the Standards. These improvements must be scaled back and consistent with the historic character of the district. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	Extensive grading is proposed throughout the project boundary. This grading results in significant alteration to land forms and changes in spatial relationships in different areas of the district. The applicant will need to demonstrate whether or not there is historic precedent for these relationships; i.e. whether or not these changes reflect a prior condition. Staff is especially concerned about the relationship between the Organ Pavilion and the area to the south; as well as the area between the proposed parking garage and the International Cottages. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	Retaining walls are used extensively throughout the project to accommodate the new access road. These walls are an intrusion into the district, and as noted in issue #10, are a contemporary element that significantly impact the historic feel and setting. Additional information in the form of elevations and renderings are required to better understand the visual impacts of these walls throughout the district. In addition, the need for some of the walls must be addressed, in particular the wall on the east side of the Esplanade. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	Alternative project designs that address the adverse impacts identified should be developed as part of the environmental review process. Staff will review alternatives, as well as additional information provided by the applicant and revisions to the project scope and will provide additional comment during future review cycles. Should you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact the Development Project Manager to set up a meeting. (New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

4/14/11 3:27 pm

Page 19 of 23

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Map Check	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Hall, Dan (619) 446-5169	Assigned: 03/15/2011	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Started: 04/12/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/12/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with LDR-Map Check (all of which are new).

First Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	If possible supply a current Prelim Title Report (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Add the Legal Description, Assessor Parcel Numbers and any existing recorded easement within the project area. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Geology	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Thomas, Patrick (619) 446-5296	Assigned: 03/16/2011	
Hours of Review: 2.00	Started: 03/16/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/12/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: New Document Required.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with LDR-Geology (all of which are new).
- . The reviewer has not signed off 1 job.

1st Review/Cycle 3 Information

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | The project site is located within geologic hazard zones 51 and 52 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps. Zone 51 is characterized by level mesas underlain by terrace deposits and bedrock, nominal risk. Zone 52 is characterized by other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain with favorable geologic structure, low risk. (New Issue) |
|--------------------------|---|--|

1st Review/Cycle 3 Reference

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 | Grading Plan, Balboa Park, Plaza De Panama Circulation and Parking Structure Project, Plaza De Panama, Balboa Park, San Diego, California, prepared by Rick Engineering Company, dated March 15, 2011. (New Issue) |
|--------------------------|---|--|

1st Review/Cycle 3 Issues

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 | A geotechnical report that addresses the project currently proposed (PTS No. 233958) must be submitted for review. The geotechnical report must be prepared in accordance with the City's "Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports." (New Issue) |
|--------------------------|---|--|





Cycle Issues DRAFT

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Development Services

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA 92101-4154

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: REA-Asset Marketing	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Sokolowski, Michelle (619) 446-5278	Assigned: 03/25/2011	
Hours of Review: 1.50	Started: 04/13/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/14/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 4 outstanding review issues with REA-Asset Marketing (all of which are new).

Real Estate Assets Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	The absence of vehicles or vehicle drop-off in the Plaza will require an alternative solution to avoid impacting access to the institutions for the elderly and the disabled. Please make sure to address this in your processing. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	2	Lack of vehicle access could have financial impacts to the institutions by limiting or restricting special events and weddings at the Museums and the House of Hospitality. Please make sure to address this in your processing. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Staff suggests that the impacted institutions be given the ability to apply for a Right of Entry Permit from the Park and Recreation Department for vehicle access on the Plaza de Panama for special events at the impacted institutions. Please make sure to address this in your processing. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	It appears that the project will encroach on the steps to the Museum of Art which is within the Museum of Arts leasehold and may require that the lease be amended. Please address this issue. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	For questions, please contact Patti D. Phillips, Supervising Property Agent, City of San Diego Real Estate Assets Department, (619) 236-6766 Fax: (619) 236-6706 pphillips@sandiego.gov (New Issue)





Cycle Issues DRAFT

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

L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: SDG&E	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Sokolowski, Michelle (619) 446-5278	Assigned: 03/25/2011	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Started: 04/13/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/13/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with SDG&E (all of which are new).

SDG&E Comments

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	1	This project has been sent to SDG&E for their review and comment. As of this date, no comments have been received. We will let you know when comments have been received. (New Issue)





L64A-003B

Review Information

Cycle Type: 3 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 03/15/2011	Deemed Complete on 03/15/2011
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Airport	Cycle Distributed: 03/15/2011	
Reviewer: Galloway, Tait (619) 533-4550	Assigned: 03/16/2011	
Hours of Review: 0.50	Started: 03/18/2011	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Review Due: 04/13/2011	
	Completed: 04/06/2011	
	Closed:	

- . The review due date was changed to 04/18/2011 from 04/18/2011 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: First Review Issues.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with Plan-Airport (all of which are new).

ALUCP 1st Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	AIRPORT INFLUENCE AREA: The proposed below grade parking structure and circulation road project is located in the Airport Influence Area (AIA) for the San Diego International Airport (SDIA) as depicted in the adopted 2004 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	NOISE: The proposed project is within the 60 to 65 decibel (dB) 1990 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) as depicted in the adopted 2004 ALUCP. Parking structures are a compatible use for aircraft noise in the 60-65 dB CNEL. (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	AIRSPACE: The height of the proposed parking structure and road does not exceed the existing grade; therefore, notification to the FAA is not required. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION: The proposed project is required to be submitted the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, for a constancy determination with the ALUCP for SDIA. (New Issue)

