Project No. G1815-11-01
September 29, 2016

Danube Properties Incorporated
2055 Third Avenue, Suite 200
San Diego, California 92101

Attention: Mr. Don Clauson

Subject: RESPONSE TO CITY COMMENTS
STRAUSS FIFTH AVENUE APARTMENTS
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

References:
1. *Geotechnical Investigation, Strauss Fifth Avenue Apartments, San Diego, California,* prepared by Geocon Incorporated, dated May 8, 2015 (Project No. G1815-11-01).
2. *Storm Water Management Recommendations, Strauss Fifth Avenue Apartments, San Diego, California,* prepared by Geocon Incorporated, dated June 6, 2016, revised September 2, 2016 (Project No. G1815-11-01).
3. *Review Comments for Strauss 5th Ave. Apartments SDP, San Diego, California*, prepared by the City of San Diego, dated September 28, 2016 (Project No. 451832).

Dear Mr. Clauson:

We prepared this letter to address the referenced review comments provided by the City of San Diego LDR-Geology regarding development of the subject site. The city's comments are listed herein with the Geocon response immediately following.

Comment 12: *The boring log for Sample P3-2 indicates blow counts of 50 for 4 inches and the laboratory initial dry density indicates 86.3 (pcf). Clarify if the results of the consolidation testing could be attributed to sample disturbance. The geotechnical consultant must indicate if in their professional opinion these results are representative of the sedimentary bedrock of the San Diego Formation onsite.*

Response: Based on visual observations of the test samples we obtained and discussions with our laboratory manager at the time of the testing, we evaluated the consolidation tests were not performed on disturbed samples. Therefore, we opine the results are adequate for use in design and are representative of the San Diego Formation on the property.

Comment 13: *Based on ASTM D5333 the consolidation test results are considered to have a slight potential for hydro consolidation. Clarify if differential settlement due to hydro consolidation is considered to be a significant effect on the proposed development. Clarify if the effect can be mitigated to an acceptable level (e.g. foundation design).*

Response: Based on our experience and discussions with the project structural engineer, it is not desirable to allow differential settlements of these magnitudes below planned structures. The differential settlement cannot be reasonably mitigated using the foundation system typical for the planned structure. In addition, installing other foundation types (i.e. deep foundations) is not a reasonable solution for this project.

Comment 14: *The geotechnical consultant indicates side liners are a potential measure to mitigate the effects of storm water infiltration. Clarify the applicability of implementing side liners into the design of the proposed permanent storm water BMP's.*

Response: The side liners would be required for the planters or biofiltration basins that would be installed on the property. The side liners would allow the planters to be located adjacent to the city right-of-ways if properly designed and installed. The storm water management devices for this project should be properly lined to prevent infiltration into the underlying soil based on the discussion and laboratory test results presented in the referenced letter dated September 2, 2016.

Comment 15: *Based on the responses to the review cycle issues, revise Worksheet C.4-1 as necessary.*

Response: The C.4-1 form presented in the referenced letter dated September 2, 2016 remains applicable to the design and construction of the subject project. Therefore, we did not provide an updated form.

If you have any questions regarding this response, or if we may be of further service, please contact the undersigned at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

GEOCON INCORPORATED

Shawn Foy Weedon
GE 2714

JH:SFW:dmc

(e-mail) Addressee