

# **Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP)**

**Check if electing for offsite alternative compliance**

**Engineer of Work:**

---

Provide Wet Signature and Stamp Above Line

**Prepared For:**

**Prepared By:**

---

**Date:**

---

Approved by: City of San Diego

Date



## Table of Contents

- Acronyms
- Certification Page
- Submittal Record
- Project Vicinity Map
- FORM DS-560: Storm Water Applicability Checklist
- FORM I-1: Applicability of Permanent, Post-Construction Storm Water BMP Requirements
- HMP Exemption Exhibit (for all hydromodification management exempt projects)
- FORM I-3B: Site Information Checklist for PDPs
- FORM I-4B: Source Control BMP Checklist for PDPs
- FORM I-5B: Site Design BMP Checklist PDPs
- FORM I-6: Summary of PDP Structural BMPs
- Attachment 1: Backup for PDP Pollutant Control BMPs
  - Attachment 1a: DMA Exhibit
  - Attachment 1b: Tabular Summary of DMAs (Worksheet B-1 from Appendix B) and Design Capture Volume Calculations
  - Attachment 1c: FORM I-7 : Worksheet B.3-1 Harvest and Use Feasibility Screening
  - Attachment 1d: Infiltration Feasibility Information(One or more of the following):
    - FORM I-8A: Worksheet C.4-1 Categorization of Infiltration Feasibility Condition based on Geotechnical Conditions
    - Form I-8B: Worksheet C.4-2 Categorization of Infiltration Feasibility Condition based on Groundwater and Water Balance Conditions
    - Infiltration Feasibility Condition Letter
    - Worksheet C.4-3: Infiltration and Groundwater Protection for Full Infiltration BMPs
    - FORM I-9: Worksheet D.5-1 Factor of Safety and Design Infiltration Rate
  - Attachment 1e: Pollutant Control BMP Design Worksheets / Calculations
- Attachment 2: Backup for PDP Hydromodification Control Measures
  - Attachment 2a: Hydromodification Management Exhibit
  - Attachment 2b: Management of Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas
  - Attachment 2c: Geomorphic Assessment of Receiving Channels
  - Attachment 2d: Flow Control Facility Design

**Project Name:**

- Attachment 3: Structural BMP Maintenance Plan
  - Maintenance Agreement (Form DS-3247) (when applicable)
- Attachment 4: Copy of Plan Sheets Showing Permanent Storm Water BMPs
- Attachment 5: Project's Drainage Report
- Attachment 6: Project's Geotechnical and Groundwater Investigation Report

Project Name:

## Acronyms

APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
ASBS	Area of Special Biological Significance
BMP	Best Management Practice
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CGP	Construction General Permit
DCV	Design Capture Volume
DMA	Drainage Management Areas
ESA	Environmentally Sensitive Area
GLU	Geomorphic Landscape Unit
GW	Ground Water
HMP	Hydromodification Management Plan
HSG	Hydrologic Soil Group
HU	Harvest and Use
INF	Infiltration
LID	Low Impact Development
LUP	Linear Underground/Overhead Projects
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
N/A	Not Applicable
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
PDP	Priority Development Project
PE	Professional Engineer
POC	Pollutant of Concern
SC	Source Control
SD	Site Design
SDRWQCB	San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
SIC	Standard Industrial Classification
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollutant Protection Plan
SWQMP	Storm Water Quality Management Plan
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
WMAA	Watershed Management Area Analysis
WPCP	Water Pollution Control Program
WQIP	Water Quality Improvement Plan

Project Name:

## Certification Page

### Project Name: Permit Application

I hereby declare that I am the Engineer in Responsible Charge of design of storm water BMPs for this project, and that I have exercised responsible charge over the design of the project as defined in Section 6703 of the Business and Professions Code, and that the design is consistent with the requirements of the Storm Water Standards, which is based on the requirements of SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001 as amended by R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100 (MS4 Permit).

I have read and understand that the City Engineer has adopted minimum requirements for managing urban runoff, including storm water, from land development activities, as described in the Storm Water Standards. I certify that this PDP SWQMP has been completed to the best of my ability and accurately reflects the project being proposed and the applicable source control and site design BMPs proposed to minimize the potentially negative impacts of this project's land development activities on water quality. I understand and acknowledge that the plan check review of this PDP SWQMP by the City Engineer is confined to a review and does not relieve me, as the Engineer in Responsible Charge of design of storm water BMPs for this project, of my responsibilities for project design.

---

Engineer of Work's Signature

---

PE#

---

Expiration Date

---

Print Name

---

Company

---

Date

Engineer's Stamp

Project Name:

## Submittal Record


Use this Table to keep a record of submittals of this PDP SWQMP. Each time the PDP SWQMP is re-submitted, provide the date and status of the project. In last column indicate changes that have been made or indicate if response to plancheck comments is included. When applicable, insert response to plancheck comments.

Submittal Number	Date	Project Status	Changes
1		<b>Preliminary Design/Planning/CEQA</b> <b>Final Design</b>	<b>Initial Submittal</b>
2		<b>Preliminary Design/Planning/CEQA</b> <b>Final Design</b>	
3		<b>Preliminary Design/Planning/CEQA</b> <b>Final Design</b>	
4		<b>Preliminary Design/Planning/CEQA</b> <b>Final Design</b>	

Project Name: "the Nest"

## Project Vicinity Map

Project Name: "the Nestt"  
Permit Application PTS



Project Name:

## **City of San Diego Form DS-560 Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist**

Attach DS-560 form.



City of San Diego  
Development Services  
1222 First Ave., MS-302  
San Diego, CA 92101  
(619) 446-5000

# Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist

FORM  
**DS-560**  
November 2018

Project Address: **4033-39 lamont Street, San Diego, CA 92109**

Project Number:

## SECTION 1. Construction Storm Water BMP Requirements:

All construction sites are required to implement construction BMPs in accordance with the performance standards in the [Storm Water Standards Manual](#). Some sites are additionally required to obtain coverage under the State Construction General Permit (CGP)<sup>1</sup>, which is administered by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board.

**For all projects complete PART A: If project is required to submit a SWPPP or WPCP, continue to PART B.**

### PART A: Determine Construction Phase Storm Water Requirements.

1. Is the project subject to California's statewide General NPDES permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities, also known as the State Construction General Permit (CGP)? (Typically projects with land disturbance greater than or equal to 1 acre.)

☐ Yes; SWPPP required, skip questions 2-4    ☒ No; next question

2. Does the project propose construction or demolition activity, including but not limited to, clearing, grading, grubbing, excavation, or any other activity resulting in ground disturbance and/or contact with storm water?

☒ Yes; WPCP required, skip questions 3-4    ☐ No; next question

3. Does the project propose routine maintenance to maintain original line and grade, hydraulic capacity, or original purpose of the facility? (Projects such as pipeline/utility replacement)

☐ Yes; WPCP required, skip question 4    ☐ No; next question

4. Does the project only include the following Permit types listed below?

- Electrical Permit, Fire Alarm Permit, Fire Sprinkler Permit, Plumbing Permit, Sign Permit, Mechanical Permit, Spa Permit.
- Individual Right of Way Permits that exclusively include only ONE of the following activities: water service, sewer lateral, or utility service.
- Right of Way Permits with a project footprint less than 150 linear feet that exclusively include only ONE of the following activities: curb ramp, sidewalk and driveway apron replacement, pot holing, curb and gutter replacement, and retaining wall encroachments.

☐ Yes; no document required

Check one of the boxes below, and continue to PART B:

☐ If you checked "Yes" for question 1,  
**a SWPPP is REQUIRED. Continue to PART B**

☒ If you checked "No" for question 1, and checked "Yes" for question 2 or 3,  
**a WPCP is REQUIRED.** If the project proposes less than 5,000 square feet of ground disturbance AND has less than a 5-foot elevation change over the entire project area, a Minor WPCP may be required instead. **Continue to PART B.**

☐ If you checked "No" for all questions 1-3, and checked "Yes" for question 4  
**PART B does not apply and no document is required. Continue to Section 2.**

1. More information on the City's construction BMP requirements as well as CGP requirements can be found at:  
[www.sandiego.gov/stormwater/regulations/index.shtml](http://www.sandiego.gov/stormwater/regulations/index.shtml)

**PART B: Determine Construction Site Priority**

This prioritization must be completed within this form, noted on the plans, and included in the SWPPP or WPCP. The city reserves the right to adjust the priority of projects both before and after construction. Construction projects are assigned an inspection frequency based on if the project has a "high threat to water quality." The City has aligned the local definition of "high threat to water quality" to the risk determination approach of the State Construction General Permit (CGP). The CGP determines risk level based on project specific sediment risk and receiving water risk. Additional inspection is required for projects within the Areas of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) watershed. **NOTE:** The construction priority does **NOT** change construction BMP requirements that apply to projects; rather, it determines the frequency of inspections that will be conducted by city staff.

**Complete PART B and continued to Section 2**

1. ☐ **ASBS**  
a. Projects located in the ASBS watershed.
2. ☐ **High Priority**  
a. Projects that qualify as Risk Level 2 or Risk Level 3 per the Construction General Permit (CGP) and not located in the ASBS watershed.  
b. Projects that qualify as LUP Type 2 or LUP Type 3 per the CGP and not located in the ASBS watershed.
3. ☐ **Medium Priority**  
a. Projects that are not located in an ASBS watershed or designated as a High priority site.  
b. Projects that qualify as Risk Level 1 or LUP Type 1 per the CGP and not located in an ASBS watershed.  
c. WPCP projects (>5,000sf of ground disturbance) located within the Los Penasquitos watershed management area.
4. ☒ **Low Priority**  
a. Projects not subject to a Medium or High site priority designation and are not located in an ASBS watershed.

**SECTION 2. Permanent Storm Water BMP Requirements.**

Additional information for determining the requirements is found in the [Storm Water Standards Manual](#).

**PART C: Determine if Not Subject to Permanent Storm Water Requirements.**

Projects that are considered maintenance, or otherwise not categorized as "new development projects" or "redevelopment projects" according to the [Storm Water Standards Manual](#) are not subject to Permanent Storm Water BMPs.

**If "yes" is checked for any number in Part C, proceed to Part F and check "Not Subject to Permanent Storm Water BMP Requirements".**

**If "no" is checked for all of the numbers in Part C continue to Part D.**

1. Does the project only include interior remodels and/or is the project entirely within an existing enclosed structure and does not have the potential to contact storm water? ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Does the project only include the construction of overhead or underground utilities without creating new impervious surfaces? ☐ Yes ☒ No
3. Does the project fall under routine maintenance? Examples include, but are not limited to: roof or exterior structure surface replacement, resurfacing or reconfiguring surface parking lots or existing roadways without expanding the impervious footprint, and routine replacement of damaged pavement (grinding, overlay, and pothole repair). ☐ Yes ☒ No

**PART D: PDP Exempt Requirements.**

PDP Exempt projects are required to implement site design and source control BMPs.

If "yes" was checked for any questions in Part D, continue to Part F and check the box labeled "PDP Exempt."

If "no" was checked for all questions in Part D, continue to Part E.

**1. Does the project ONLY include new or retrofit sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or trails that:**

- Are designed and constructed to direct storm water runoff to adjacent vegetated areas, or other non-erodible permeable areas? Or;
- Are designed and constructed to be hydraulically disconnected from paved streets and roads? Or;
- Are designed and constructed with permeable pavements or surfaces in accordance with the Green Streets guidance in the City's Storm Water Standards manual?

☐ Yes; PDP exempt requirements apply

☒ No; next question

**2. Does the project ONLY include retrofitting or redeveloping existing paved alleys, streets or roads designed and constructed in accordance with the Green Streets guidance in the [City's Storm Water Standards Manual](#)?**

☐ Yes; PDP exempt requirements apply

☒ No; project not exempt.

**PART E: Determine if Project is a Priority Development Project (PDP).**

Projects that match one of the definitions below are subject to additional requirements including preparation of a Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP).

If "yes" is checked for any number in PART E, continue to PART F and check the box labeled "Priority Development Project".

If "no" is checked for every number in PART E, continue to PART F and check the box labeled "Standard Development Project".

**1. New Development that creates 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surfaces collectively over the project site.** This includes commercial, industrial, residential, mixed-use, and public development projects on public or private land.

☒ Yes ☐ No

**2. Redevelopment project that creates and/or replaces 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surfaces on an existing site of 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surfaces.** This includes commercial, industrial, residential, mixed-use, and public development projects on public or private land.

☐ Yes ☒ No

**3. New development or redevelopment of a restaurant.** Facilities that sell prepared foods and drinks for consumption, including stationary lunch counters and refreshment stands selling prepared foods and drinks for immediate consumption (SIC 5812), and where the land development creates and/or replace 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface.

☐ Yes ☒ No

**4. New development or redevelopment on a hillside.** The project creates and/or replaces 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface (collectively over the project site) and where the development will grade on any natural slope that is twenty-five percent or greater.

☐ Yes ☒ No

**5. New development or redevelopment of a parking lot that creates and/or replaces 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface (collectively over the project site).**

☐ Yes ☒ No

**6. New development or redevelopment of streets, roads, highways, freeways, and driveways.** The project creates and/or replaces 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface (collectively over the project site).

☐ Yes ☒ No

7. **New development or redevelopment discharging directly to an Environmentally Sensitive Area.** The project creates and/or replaces 2,500 square feet of impervious surface (collectively over project site), and discharges directly to an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA). "Discharging directly to" includes flow that is conveyed overland a distance of 200 feet or less from the project to the ESA, or conveyed in a pipe or open channel any distance as an isolated flow from the project to the ESA (i.e. not commingled with flows from adjacent lands). ☐ Yes ☒ No
8. **New development or redevelopment projects of a retail gasoline outlet (RGO) that create and/or replaces 5,000 square feet of impervious surface.** The development project meets the following criteria: (a) 5,000 square feet or more or (b) has a projected Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of 100 or more vehicles per day. ☐ Yes ☒ No
9. **New development or redevelopment projects of an automotive repair shops that creates and/or replaces 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surfaces.** Development projects categorized in any one of Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes 5013, 5014, 5541, 7532-7534, or 7536-7539. ☐ Yes ☒ No
10. **Other Pollutant Generating Project.** The project is not covered in the categories above, results in the disturbance of one or more acres of land and is expected to generate pollutants post construction, such as fertilizers and pesticides. This does not include projects creating less than 5,000 sf of impervious surface and where added landscaping does not require regular use of pesticides and fertilizers, such as slope stabilization using native plants. Calculation of the square footage of impervious surface need not include linear pathways that are for infrequent vehicle use, such as emergency maintenance access or bicycle pedestrian use, if they are built with pervious surfaces or if they sheet flow to surrounding pervious surfaces. ☐ Yes ☒ No

**PART F: Select the appropriate category based on the outcomes of PART C through PART E.**

1. The project is **NOT SUBJECT TO PERMANENT STORM WATER REQUIREMENTS.** ☐
2. The project is a **STANDARD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.** Site design and source control BMP requirements apply. See the [Storm Water Standards Manual](#) for guidance. ☐
3. The project is **PDP EXEMPT.** Site design and source control BMP requirements apply. See the [Storm Water Standards Manual](#) for guidance. ☐
4. The project is a **PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.** Site design, source control, and structural pollutant control BMP requirements apply. See the [Storm Water Standards Manual](#) for guidance on determining if project requires a hydromodification plan management ☒

Joy D. Christensen

Assistant Engineer

Name of Owner or Agent (Please Print)

Title

Signature

09/11/2020

Date

Project Name:

Applicability of Permanent, Post-Construction Storm Water BMP Requirements		Form I-1
<b>Project Identification</b>		
Project Name:		
Permit Application Number:		Date:
<b>Determination of Requirements</b>		
<p>The purpose of this form is to identify permanent, post-construction requirements that apply to the project. This form serves as a short <u>summary</u> of applicable requirements, in some cases referencing separate forms that will serve as the backup for the determination of requirements.</p> <p>Answer each step below, starting with <b>Step 1</b> and progressing through each step until reaching "Stop". Refer to the manual sections and/or separate forms referenced in each step below.</p>		
Step	Answer	Progression
<b>Step 1:</b> Is the project a "development project"? See Section 1.3 of the manual (Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) for guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Go to <b>Step 2</b> .
	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>Stop.</b> Permanent BMP requirements do not apply. No SWQMP will be required. Provide discussion below.
Discussion / justification if the project is <u>not</u> a "development project" (e.g., the project includes <i>only</i> interior remodels within an existing building):		
<b>Step 2:</b> Is the project a Standard Project, PDP, or PDP Exempt? To answer this item, see Section 1.4 of the manual in its entirety for guidance AND complete Form DS-560, Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist.	<input type="checkbox"/> Standard Project	<b>Stop.</b> Standard Project requirements apply
	<input type="checkbox"/> PDP	PDP requirements apply, including PDP SWQMP. Go to <b>Step 3</b> .
	PDP Exempt	<b>Stop.</b> Standard Project requirements apply. Provide discussion and list any additional requirements below.
Discussion / justification, and additional requirements for exceptions to PDP definitions, if applicable:		

Project Name:

Form I-1 Page 2 of 2		
Step	Answer	Progression
<b>Step 3.</b> Is the project subject to earlier PDP requirements due to a prior lawful approval? See Section 1.10 of the manual (Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) for guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Consult the City Engineer to determine requirements. Provide discussion and identify requirements below. Go to <b>Step 4.</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> No	BMP Design Manual PDP requirements apply. Go to <b>Step 4.</b>
Discussion / justification of prior lawful approval, and identify requirements ( <u>not required if prior lawful approval does not apply</u> ):		
<b>Step 4.</b> Do hydromodification control requirements apply? See Section 1.6 of the manual (Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) for guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	PDP structural BMPs required for pollutant control (Chapter 5) and hydromodification control (Chapter 6). Go to <b>Step 5.</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>Stop.</b> PDP structural BMPs required for pollutant control (Chapter 5) only. Provide brief discussion of exemption to hydromodification control below.
Discussion / justification if hydromodification control requirements do <u>not</u> apply:		
<b>Step 5.</b> Does protection of critical coarse sediment yield areas apply? See Section 6.2 of the manual (Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) for guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	Management measures required for protection of critical coarse sediment yield areas (Chapter 6.2). <b>Stop.</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Management measures not required for protection of critical coarse sediment yield areas. Provide brief discussion below. <b>Stop.</b>
Discussion / justification if protection of critical coarse sediment yield areas does <u>not</u> apply:		


Project Name:

## HMP Exemption Exhibit

Attach a HMP Exemption Exhibit that shows direct storm water runoff discharge from the project site to HMP exempt area. Include project area, applicable underground storm drain line and/or concrete lined channels, outfall information and exempt waterbody.  
Reference applicable drawing number(s).

**Exhibit must be provided on 11"x17" or larger paper.**

# Hydromodification Exemption Exhibit





FLOOD HAZARD INFORMATION

SEE FIS REPORT FOR DETAILED LEGEND AND INDEX MAP FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT  
THE INFORMATION DEPICTED ON THIS MAP AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION ARE ALSO AVAILABLE IN DIGITAL FORMAT AT [HTTPS://MSC.FEMA.GOV](https://msc.fema.gov)

SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS		Without Base Flood Elevation (BFE) Zone A,V, A99
		With BFE or Depth Zone AE, AO, AH, VE, AR
OTHER AREAS OF FLOOD HAZARD		Regulatory Floodway
		0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard, Areas of 1% annual chance flood with average depth less than one foot or with drainage areas of less than one square mile Zone X
		Future Conditions 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard Zone X
		Area with Reduced Flood Risk due to Levee See Notes. Zone X
OTHER AREAS		Area with Flood Risk due to Levee Zone D
		Area of Minimal Flood Hazard Zone X
GENERAL STRUCTURES		Area of Undetermined Flood Hazard Zone D
		Channel, Culvert, or Storm Sewer
OTHER FEATURES		Levee, Dike, or Floodwall
		Cross Sections with 1% Annual Chance Water Surface Elevation
		Coastal Transect
		Coastal Transect Baseline
		Profile Baseline
		Hydrographic Feature
		Base Flood Elevation Line (BFE)
		Limit of Study
		Jurisdiction Boundary

NOTES TO USERS

For information and questions about this Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), available products associated with this FIRM, including historic versions, the current map date for each FIRM panel, how to order products, or the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) in general, please call the FEMA Map Information eXchange at 1-877-FEMA-MAP (1-877-336-2627) or visit the FEMA Flood Map Service Center website at <https://msc.fema.gov>. Available products may include previously issued Letters of Map Change, a Flood Insurance Study Report, and/or digital versions of this map. Many of these products can be ordered or obtained directly from the website.

Communities annexing land on adjacent FIRM panels must obtain a current copy of the adjacent panel as well as the current FIRM Index. These may be ordered directly from the Flood Map Service Center at the number listed above.


For community and countywide map dates refer to the Flood Insurance Study report for this jurisdiction.

To determine if flood insurance is available in this community, contact your Insurance agent or call the National Flood Insurance Program at 1-800-638-6620.


Base map information shown on this FIRM was derived from digital orthophotography collected by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Farm Service Agency. Department of Agriculture imagery was flown in 2016 and was produced with a 1-meter ground sample distance.

Coastal Base Flood Elevations shown on the map apply only to landward of 0.0' North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD 88). Coastal flood elevations are also provided in the Coastal Transect Parameters table in the FIS Report for this jurisdiction. Elevations shown in the Coastal Transect Parameters table should be used for construction and/or floodplain management purposes when they are higher than the elevations shown on the FIRM.

SCALE



PANEL LOCATOR



National Flood Insurance Program

**NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM**  
FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP

**SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**  
and Incorporated Areas

PANEL 1611 OF 2375

Panel Contains:  
COMMUNITY SAN DIEGO, CITY OF  
NUMBER 060295  
PANEL 1611  
SUFFIX H

VERSION NUMBER 2.3.3.3  
MAP NUMBER 06073C1611H  
MAP REVISED DECEMBER 20, 2019

B.M. N.E.B.P. CROWN POINT DR. AND MORRELL ST. ELEV. 21.657 M.S.L. ADD .09 TO PLANS GRADE TO GET TRUE M.S.L.


WORK TO BE DONE

IMPROVEMENT	STD. DWGS.	LEGEND
STORM DRAIN D-3,		=====
CURB INLET/APRON		=====
TYPE B-1 D-16-D-4, D-5, D-6, D-37, D-9		=====
STORM DRAIN		=====
CLEANOUT TYPE A-4, D-4, D-11, D-9		=====
GRAVITY TYPE HEADWALL D-1 D-9		=====
PIPE COLLAR D-14		=====
ROCK SLOPE PROTECTION		=====
PEDESTRIAN RAMP FOR THE HANDICAPPED (G-60-T (REV. 4-18-76))		=====

**SPECIFICATIONS**  
STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DOCUMENT NO. 727731 FILED 1-14-69  
**REFERENCE DRAWINGS**  
STANDARD DRAWINGS OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DOCUMENT NO. 735691 FILED 4-26-71  
WATER 3744 W  
SEWER 1816-D  
**SURVEY NOTES:**  
CHIEF: HATCH  
INDEX: 228-1698  
W.O. NO. 117354  
DATE:

PROFILE of STORM DRAIN

SCALE:  
HOR. 1" = 20'  
VERT. 1" = 3'



BEFORE EXCAVATING, VERIFY LOCATION OF UNDERGROUND UTILITIES - CONTACT  
CANE & ELECTRIC CO. 235-6320  
TELEPHONE CO. & 236-0585  
FIRE ALARM 236-0585  
WATER & SEWER 236-0585  
COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION 236-1505  
BUILDINGS AND IRRIGATION 236-1500

CITY CONTRACT		NO. 117354	
MORRELL STREET DRAIN			
CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA		DATE 8-7-76	
DESIGNED BY M.G.		CHECKED BY M.G.	
APPROVED BY M.G.		DATE 8-7-76	
DESCRIPTION		APPROVED, DATE, FILMS	
ORIGINAL		SERIAL NUMBER	
REVISION		REVISION	
DATE STARTED		DATE COMPLETED	
INSPECTOR		16763	

Project Name:

Site Information Checklist For PDPs		Form I-3B
Project Summary Information		
Project Name		
Project Address		
Assessor's Parcel Number(s) (APN(s))		
Permit Application Number		
Project Watershed	Select One: <input type="checkbox"/> San Dieguito River <input type="checkbox"/> Penasquitos <input type="checkbox"/> Mission Bay <input type="checkbox"/> San Diego River <input type="checkbox"/> San Diego Bay <input type="checkbox"/> Tijuana River	
Hydrologic subarea name with Numeric Identifier up to two decimal places (9XX.XX)		
Project Area (total area of Assessor's Parcel(s) associated with the project or total area of the right-of-way)	_____ Acres (_____ Square Feet)	
Area to be disturbed by the project (Project Footprint)	_____ Acres (_____ Square Feet)	
Project Proposed Impervious Area (subset of Project Footprint)	_____ Acres (_____ Square Feet)	
Project Proposed Pervious Area (subset of Project Footprint)	_____ Acres (_____ Square Feet)	
Note: Proposed Impervious Area + Proposed Pervious Area = Area to be Disturbed by the Project. This may be less than the Project Area.		
The proposed increase or decrease in impervious area in the proposed condition as compared to the pre-project condition	_____ %	

Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 2 of 11
Description of Existing Site Condition and Drainage Patterns
<p>Current Status of the Site (select all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Existing development</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Previously graded but not built out</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural or other non-impervious use</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Vacant, undeveloped/natural</li></ul> <p>Description / Additional Information:</p>
<p>Existing Land Cover Includes (select all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Vegetative Cover</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Non-Vegetated Pervious Areas</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Impervious Areas</li></ul> <p>Description / Additional Information:</p>
<p>Underlying Soil belongs to Hydrologic Soil Group (select all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> NRCS Type A</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> NRCS Type B</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> NRCS Type C</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> NRCS Type D</li></ul>
<p>Approximate Depth to Groundwater:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Depth &lt; 5 feet</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> 5 feet &lt; Groundwater Depth &lt; 10 feet</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> 10 feet &lt; Groundwater Depth &lt; 20 feet</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Depth &gt; 20 feet</li></ul>
<p>Existing Natural Hydrologic Features (select all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Watercourses</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Seeps</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Springs</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Wetlands</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> None</li></ul> <p>Description / Additional Information:</p>

Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 3 of 11	
Description of Existing Site Topography and Drainage	
<p>How is storm water runoff conveyed from the site? At a minimum, this description should answer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Whether existing drainage conveyance is natural or urban;</li><li>2. If runoff from offsite is conveyed through the site? If yes, quantification of all offsite drainage areas, design flows, and locations where offsite flows enter the project site and summarize how such flows are conveyed through the site;</li><li>3. Provide details regarding existing project site drainage conveyance network, including storm drains, concrete channels, swales, detention facilities, storm water treatment facilities, and natural and constructed channels;</li><li>4. Identify all discharge locations from the existing project along with a summary of the conveyance system size and capacity for each of the discharge locations. Provide summary of the pre-project drainage areas and design flows to each of the existing runoff discharge locations.</li></ol>	
Descriptions/Additional Information	
<div></div>	



Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 4 of 11
Description of Proposed Site Development and Drainage Patterns
Project Description / Proposed Land Use and/or Activities:
List/describe proposed impervious features of the project (e.g., buildings, roadways, parking lots, courtyards, athletic courts, other impervious features):
List/describe proposed pervious features of the project (e.g., landscape areas):
Does the project include grading and changes to site topography? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Description / Additional Information:

Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 5 of 11

Does the project include changes to site drainage (e.g., installation of new storm water conveyance systems)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

If yes, provide details regarding the proposed project site drainage conveyance network, including storm drains, concrete channels, swales, detention facilities, storm water treatment facilities, natural and constructed channels, and the method for conveying offsite flows through or around the proposed project site. Identify all discharge locations from the proposed project site along with a summary of the conveyance system size and capacity for each of the discharge locations. Provide a summary of pre and post-project drainage areas and design flows to each of the runoff discharge locations. Reference the drainage study for detailed calculations.

Description / Additional Information:

Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 6 of 11

Identify whether any of the following features, activities, and/or pollutant source areas will be present (select all that apply):

- ☐ Onsite storm drain inlets
- ☐ Interior floor drains and elevator shaft sump pumps
- ☐ Interior parking garages
- ☐ Need for future indoor & structural pest control
- ☐ Landscape/outdoor pesticide use
- ☐ Pools, spas, ponds, decorative fountains, and other water features
- ☐ Food service
- ☐ Refuse areas
- ☐ Industrial processes
- ☐ Outdoor storage of equipment or materials
- ☐ Vehicle and equipment cleaning
- ☐ Vehicle/equipment repair and maintenance
- ☐ Fuel dispensing areas
- ☐ Loading docks
- ☐ Fire sprinkler test water
- ☐ Miscellaneous drain or wash water
- ☐ Plazas, sidewalks, and parking lots

Description/Additional Information:

Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 7 of 11
Identification and Narrative of Receiving Water
Narrative describing flow path from discharge location(s), through urban storm conveyance system, to receiving creeks, rivers, and lagoons and ultimate discharge location to Pacific Ocean (or bay, lagoon, lake or reservoir, as applicable)
Provide a summary of all beneficial uses of receiving waters downstream of the project discharge locations
Identify all ASBS (areas of special biological significance) receiving waters downstream of the project discharge locations
Provide distance from project outfall location to impaired or sensitive receiving waters
Summarize information regarding the proximity of the permanent, post-construction storm water BMPs to the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area and environmentally sensitive lands

Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 8 of 11			
Identification of Receiving Water Pollutants of Concern			
List any 303(d) impaired water bodies within the path of storm water from the project site to the Pacific Ocean (or bay, lagoon, lake or reservoir, as applicable), identify the pollutant(s)/stressors causing impairment, and identify any TMDLs and/or Highest Priority Pollutants from the WQIP for the impaired water bodies:			
303(d) Impaired Water Body (Refer to Appendix K)	Pollutant(s)/Stressor(s) (Refer to Appendix K)	TMDLs/WQIP Highest Priority Pollutant (Refer to Table 1-4 in Chapter 1)	
Identification of Project Site Pollutants*			
<p>*Identification of project site pollutants is only required if flow-thru treatment BMPs are implemented onsite in lieu of retention or biofiltration BMPs (note the project must also participate in an alternative compliance program unless prior lawful approval to meet earlier PDP requirements is demonstrated)</p> <p>Identify pollutants anticipated from the project site based on all proposed use(s) of the site (see Appendix B.6):</p>			
Pollutant	Not Applicable to the Project Site	Anticipated from the Project Site	Also a Receiving Water Pollutant of Concern
Sediment			
Nutrients			
Heavy Metals			
Organic Compounds			
Trash & Debris			
Oxygen Demanding Substances			
Oil & Grease			
Bacteria & Viruses			
Pesticides			

Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 9 of 11	
<b>Hydromodification Management Requirements</b>	
Do hydromodification management requirements apply (see Section 1.6)?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, hydromodification management flow control structural BMPs required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	No, the project will discharge runoff directly to existing underground storm drains discharging directly to water storage reservoirs, lakes, enclosed embayments, or the Pacific Ocean.
<input type="checkbox"/>	No, the project will discharge runoff directly to conveyance channels whose bed and bank are concrete-lined all the way from the point of discharge to water storage reservoirs, lakes, enclosed embayments, or the Pacific Ocean.
<input type="checkbox"/>	No, the project will discharge runoff directly to an area identified as appropriate for an exemption by the WMAA for the watershed in which the project resides.
Description / Additional Information (to be provided if a 'No' answer has been selected above):	
Note: If “No” answer has been selected the SWQMP must include an exhibit that shows the storm water conveyance system from the project site to an exempt water body. The exhibit should include details about the conveyance system and the outfall to the exempt water body.	
<b>Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas*</b>	
<b>*This Section only required if hydromodification management requirements apply</b>	
Based on Section 6.2 and Appendix H does CCSYA exist on the project footprint or in the upstream area draining through the project footprint?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
Discussion / Additional Information:	

Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 10 of 11
<b>Flow Control for Post-Project Runoff*</b> <b>*This Section only required if hydromodification management requirements apply</b>
List and describe point(s) of compliance (POCs) for flow control for hydromodification management (see Section 6.3.1). For each POC, provide a POC identification name or number correlating to the project's HMP Exhibit and a receiving channel identification name or number correlating to the project's HMP Exhibit.
Has a geomorphic assessment been performed for the receiving channel(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> No, the low flow threshold is $0.1Q_2$ (default low flow threshold) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the result is the low flow threshold is $0.1Q_2$ <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the result is the low flow threshold is $0.3Q_2$ <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the result is the low flow threshold is $0.5Q_2$ If a geomorphic assessment has been performed, provide title, date, and preparer:
Discussion / Additional Information: (optional)

Project Name:

Form I-3B Page 11 of 11
Other Site Requirements and Constraints
<p>When applicable, list other site requirements or constraints that will influence storm water management design, such as zoning requirements including setbacks and open space, or local codes governing minimum street width, sidewalk construction, allowable pavement types, and drainage requirements.</p>
Optional Additional Information or Continuation of Previous Sections As Needed
<p>This space provided for additional information or continuation of information from previous sections as needed.</p>

Project Name:

Source Control BMP Checklist for PDPs		Form I-4B	
<b>Source Control BMPs</b>			
All development projects must implement source control BMPs where applicable and feasible. See Chapter 4 and Appendix E of the BMP Design Manual (Part 1 of the Storm Water Standards) for information to implement source control BMPs shown in this checklist.			
Answer each category below pursuant to the following.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Yes" means the project will implement the source control BMP as described in Chapter 4 and/or Appendix E of the BMP Design Manual. Discussion / justification is not required.</li> <li>• "No" means the BMP is applicable to the project but it is not feasible to implement. Discussion / justification must be provided.</li> <li>• "N/A" means the BMP is not applicable at the project site because the project does not include the feature that is addressed by the BMP (e.g., the project has no outdoor materials storage areas). Discussion / justification may be provided.</li> </ul>			
Source Control Requirement		Applied?	
4.2.1 Prevention of Illicit Discharges into the MS4	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.2.1 not implemented:			
4.2.2 Storm Drain Stenciling or Signage	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.2.2 not implemented:			
4.2.3 Protect Outdoor Materials Storage Areas from Rainfall, Run-On, Runoff, and Wind Dispersal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.2.3 not implemented:			
4.2.4 Protect Materials Stored in Outdoor Work Areas from Rainfall, Run-On, Runoff, and Wind Dispersal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.2.4 not implemented:			
4.2.5 Protect Trash Storage Areas from Rainfall, Run-On, Runoff, and Wind Dispersal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.2.5 not implemented:			

Project Name:

Form I-4B Page 2 of 2			
Source Control Requirement	Applied?		
4.2.6 Additional BMPs Based on Potential Sources of Runoff Pollutants (must answer for each source listed below)			
On-site storm drain inlets	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Interior floor drains and elevator shaft sump pumps	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Interior parking garages	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Need for future indoor & structural pest control	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Landscape/Outdoor Pesticide Use	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Pools, spas, ponds, decorative fountains, and other water features	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Food service	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Refuse areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Industrial processes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Outdoor storage of equipment or materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Vehicle/Equipment Repair and Maintenance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Fuel Dispensing Areas	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Loading Docks	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Fire Sprinkler Test Water	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Miscellaneous Drain or Wash Water	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Plazas, sidewalks, and parking lots	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
SC-6A: Large Trash Generating Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
SC-6B: Animal Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
SC-6C: Plant Nurseries and Garden Centers	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
SC-6D: Automotive Facilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.2.6 not implemented. Clearly identify which sources of runoff pollutants are discussed. Justification must be provided for <u>all</u> "No" answers shown above.			

Project Name:

Site Design BMP Checklist for PDPs		Form I-5B	
<b>Site Design BMPs</b>			
<p>All development projects must implement site design BMPs where applicable and feasible. See Chapter 4 and Appendix E of the BMP Design Manual (Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) for information to implement site design BMPs shown in this checklist.</p> <p>Answer each category below pursuant to the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Yes" means the project will implement the site design BMP as described in Chapter 4 and/or Appendix E of the BMP Design Manual. Discussion / justification is not required.</li> <li>• "No" means the BMP is applicable to the project but it is not feasible to implement. Discussion / justification must be provided.</li> <li>• "N/A" means the BMP is not applicable at the project site because the project does not include the feature that is addressed by the BMP (e.g., the project site has no existing natural areas to conserve). Discussion / justification may be provided.</li> </ul> <p>A site map with implemented site design BMPs must be included at the end of this checklist.</p>			
Site Design Requirement		Applied?	
4.3.1 Maintain Natural Drainage Pathways and Hydrologic Features		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.3.1 not implemented:			
1-1 Are existing natural drainage pathways and hydrologic features mapped on the site map?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
1-2 Are trees implemented? If yes, are they shown on the site map?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
1-3 Implemented trees meet the design criteria in 4.3.1 Fact Sheet (e.g. soil volume, maximum credit, etc.)?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
1-4 Is tree credit volume calculated using Appendix B.2.2.1 and SD-1 Fact Sheet in Appendix E?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
4.3.2 Have natural areas, soils and vegetation been conserved?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.3.2 not implemented:			

Project Name:

Form I-5B Page 2 of 4			
Site Design Requirement	Applied?		
4.3.3 Minimize Impervious Area	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.3.3 not implemented:			
4.3.4 Minimize Soil Compaction	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.3.4 not implemented:			
4.3.5 Impervious Area Dispersion	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.3.5 not implemented:			
5-1 Is the pervious area receiving runoff from impervious area identified on the site map?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
5-2 Does the pervious area satisfy the design criteria in 4.3.5 Fact Sheet in Appendix E (e.g. maximum slope, minimum length, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
5-3 Is impervious area dispersion credit volume calculated using Appendix B.2.1.1 and 4.3.5 Fact Sheet in Appendix E?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Project Name:


Form I-5B Page 3 of 4			
Site Design Requirement	Applied?		
4.3.6 Runoff Collection	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.3.6 not implemented:			
6a-1 Are green roofs implemented in accordance with design criteria in 4.3.6A Fact Sheet? If yes, are they shown on the site map?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
6a-2 Is the green roof credit volume calculated using Appendix B.2.1.2 and 4.3.6A Fact Sheet in Appendix E?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
6b-1 Are permeable pavements implemented in accordance with design criteria in 4.3.6B Fact Sheet? If yes, are they shown on the site map?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
6b-2 Is the permeable pavement credit volume calculated using Appendix B.2.1.3 and 4.3.6B Fact Sheet in Appendix E?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
4.3.7 Landscaping with Native or Drought Tolerant Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.3.7 not implemented:			
4.3.8 Harvest and Use Precipitation	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Discussion / justification if 4.3.8 not implemented:			
8-1 Are rain barrels implemented in accordance with design criteria in 4.3.8 Fact Sheet? If yes, are they shown on the site map?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
8-2 Is the rain barrel credit volume calculated using Appendix B.2.2.2 and 4.3.8 Fact Sheet in Appendix E?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A

Project Name:

Form I-5B Page 4 of 4
Insert Site Map with all site design BMPs identified:
<div></div>



LEGEND



LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

LOTS 13-17 IN BLOCK 1 OF VENICE PARK, IN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO MAP THEREOF NO. 991, FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY MAY 24, 1906.


APHN: 424-431-27-00

BENCHMARK


CITY OF SAN DIEGO BENCHMARK BRASS PLUG LOCATED AT THE NORTHEASTERLY CORNER OF LAMONT STREET AND PACIFIC BEACH DRIVE. ELEVATION 40.81' MEAN SEA LEVEL (N.G.V.D. 1929).

NOTES


1. THE SOURCE OF THE TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHOWN HEREON IS PHOTOGRAMMETRIC SURVEY CHRISTENSEN ENGINEERING & SURVEYING, DATED APRIL 02, 2020.
2. THE USE OF PROPOSED LOT IS FOR MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL.
3. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS SERVED BY SANITARY SEWER LATERALS AND WATER SERVICES CONNECTED TO CITY OF SAN DIEGO MAINS.
4. 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.
5. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT, THE OWNER/PERMITTEE SHALL INCORPORATE ANY CONSTRUCTION BMP'S NECESSARY TO COMPLY WITH CHAPTER 14, ARTICLE 2, DIVISION 1 (GRADING REGULATIONS) OF THE SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL CODE, INTO THE CONSTRUCTION PLANS OR SPECIFICATIONS.
6. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT THE OWNER/PERMITTEE SHALL SUBMIT A WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLAN (WPCC). THE WPCC SHALL BE PREPARED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES IN PART 2 CONSTRUCTION BMP STANDARDS CHAPTER 4 OF THE CITY'S STORM WATER STANDARDS.
7. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY CONSTRUCTION PERMIT, THE APPLICANT SHALL SUBMIT A TECHNICAL REPORT THAT WILL BE SUBJECT TO FINAL REVIEW BY THE CITY ENGINEER, BASED ON THE STORM WATER STANDARDS IN EFFECT AT THE TIME OF THE CONSTRUCTION PERMIT ISSUANCE.
8. ONSITE EASEMENTS EXIST, AS SHOWN.
9. AN ENCROACHMENT MAINTENANCE AND REMOVAL AGREEMENT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR PRIVATE CURB OUTLET (D-25), LANDSCAPING, IRRIGATION AND WALKWAYS WITHIN THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY.
10. SITE IMPERVIOUS SURFACE RUNOFF WILL BE DIRECTED TO TWO FILTERRA FILTRATION UNITS FOR TREATMENT AND TO LANDSCAPING WITH AND WITHOUT AMENDED SOIL, BEFORE LEAVING SITE. SEE SHEET C-2.
11. FOR LANDSCAPE AND HARDSCAPE, SEE LANDSCAPE PLAN.
12. ALL PROPOSED PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS SHALL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH CURRENT CITY STANDARDS AT THE TIME OF THEIR CONSTRUCTION.
13. HISTORIC SIDEWALK SCORING, IF ANY, SHALL BE MAINTAINED AND ANY CONTRACTOR DATE STAMPS SHALL BE PRESERVED.



TYPICAL SECTION ALLEY  
NOT TO SCALE



TYPICAL SECTION LAMONT STREET  
NOT TO SCALE



PRELIMINARY

JANUARY 15, 2021

ANTONY K. CHRISTENSEN, RCE 54021

Date



Prepared By:

CHRISTENSEN ENGINEERING & SURVEYING  
7886 SILVERTON AVENUE, SUITE "J"  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92126  
PHONE (858)271-9901 FAX (858)271-8912

Project Address:

4033 LAMONT STREET  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92109

Project Name:

THE NEST

Sheet Title:

PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN  
DETAILS AND NOTES

Revision 5:

Revision 4:

Revision 3:

Revision 2:

Revision 1: 01-15-21 ADDRESS CITY COMMENTS

Original Date: SEPTEMBER 07, 2020


Sheet 4 of 24 Sheets

DEP#

C-1



CHRISTENSEN ENGINEERING & SURVEYING  
CIVIL ENGINEERS LAND SURVEYORS PLANNERS  
7886 SILVERTON AVENUE, SUITE "J", SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92126  
TELEPHONE: (858) 271-9901 FAX: (858) 271-8912




CONSTRUCTION NOTES

- 1 PROPOSED PUB 1" IRRIGATION SERVICE WITH WATER METER BOX
- 2 PROPOSED PUB 2" WATER SERVICE WITH WATER METER BOX
- 3 EXISTING WATER SERVICE TO BE KILLED AT THE MAIN
- 4 PROPOSED PUB 4" FIRE SERVICE
- 5 PROPOSED PVT CURB OUTLET Q100 = 0.69 CFS, V100 = 2.6 FPS
- 6 PROPOSED PVT A-4 CLEANOUT WITH PUMP TO CURB OUTLET
- 7 PROPOSED PVT FIRE SERVICE BACKFLOW PREVENTER
- 8 PROPOSED PVT WATER SERVICE BACKFLOW PREVENTER
- 9 PROPOSED PVT IRRIGATION SERVICE BACKFLOW PREVENTER
- 10 WATER METER BOX (TYPICAL)
- 11 PROPOSED PVT 4' X 4' RAISED FILTERRA BIOFILTRATION UNIT (4,201 SF SF OF BUILDING TREATED) IMP-S
- 12 PROPOSED PVT 4' X 6' RAISED FILTERRA BIOFILTRATION UNIT (6,251 SF SF OF BUILDING TREATED) IMP-N
- 13 PROPOSED PVC DRAIN (TYPICAL)
- 14 PROPOSED PUB 6" SEWER LATERAL (TYPICAL)
- 15 EXISTING SEWER LATERAL TO BE ABANDONED AT THE PROPERTY LINE
- 16 PROPOSED PVT 12" AMENDED SOIL AREA (558 SF). TO RETAIN RUNOFF FROM ENTRY AREAS (509 SF) (TYPICAL)
- 17 PROPOSED LANDSCAPE AREA (TYPICAL) SEE LANDSCAPE PLAN
- 18 REMOVE EXISTING CURB AND DRIVEWAY, REPLACE WITH 6" CURB GUTTER AND SIDEWALK TO CURRENT CITY OF SAN DIEGO STANDARD. PUBLIC
- 19 VISIBILITY TRIANGLE AREA (NOTHING GREATER THAN 36" IN HEIGHT ALLOWED IN THIS AREA. (TYPICAL)
- 20 AREA DRAIN (TYPICAL)
- 21 AREA OF EXISTING CONCRETE IN R/W TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH LANDSCAPING
- 22 AREA OF TRANSFORMER AND ENTRY TO GARAGE (281 SF) RUNOFF TO FLOW TO LANDSCAPED AREA (422 SF).
- 23 PLANTER RUNOFF DISCHARGES AT BOTTOM OF PLANTER WALL AS SHOWN
- 24 IMPROVEMENTS EASTERLY OF PROJECT SITE ENCROACH INTO ALLEY R/W AS SHOWN
- 25 PROPOSED PUB 1" COMMERCIAL SPACE WATER SERVICE
- 26 PROPOSED 2.5' ALLEY DEDICATION
- 27 PROPOSED REMOVE AND REPLACE ALLEY PAVEMENT ALONG PROJECT FRONTAGE, PER CURRENT CITY STANDARD

GRADING DATA

AREA OF SITE - 13,989 S.F. (0.3211 AC) [13,669 SF/0.3138 AC AFTER ALLEY DEDICATION]  
AREA OF SITE TO BE GRADED - 13,669 SF  
PERCENT OF SITE TO BE GRADED - 100%  
AMOUNT OF SITE WITH 25% SLOPES OR GREATER: AREA - 0 SF, PERCENT OF TOTAL SITE - 0%  
AMOUNT OF SITE WITH SLOPES THAT ARE SUBJECT TO ESL REGS. (LDC SEC. 143.0110): 0%  
AMOUNT OF CUT - 40 C.Y.  
AMOUNT OF FILL - 370 C.Y.  
AMOUNT OF IMPORT - 330 C.Y.  
(VOLUMES ASSUME 5" SLAB AND 4" SAND)  
MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF FILL SLOPE - NONE  
MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF CUT SLOPE - NONE  
MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF VERTICAL CUT: 1 FEET  
MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF VERTICAL FILL: 4 FEET  
  
RETAINING WALL: NONE  
  
EXISTING IMPERVIOUS AREA = 8,115 SF, 0.1863 AC (58.0%)  
PROPOSED IMPERVIOUS AREA = 11,429 SF, 0.2624 AC (83.6%)

**CE & S** CHRISTENSEN ENGINEERING & SURVEYING  
CIVIL ENGINEERS LAND SURVEYORS PLANNERS  
7888 SILVERTON AVENUE, SUITE "J", SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92126  
TELEPHONE: (858) 271-9901 FAX: (858) 271-8912



PRELIMINARY  
ANTHONY K. CHRISTENSEN, RCE 54021  
JANUARY 15, 2021  
Date



Prepared By:  
CHRISTENSEN ENGINEERING & SURVEYING  
7888 SILVERTON AVENUE, SUITE "J"  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92126  
PHONE (858)271-9901 FAX (858)271-8912

Project Address:  
4033 LAMONT STREET  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92109

Project Name:  
THE NEST

Sheet Title:

Revision 5:  
Revision 4:  
Revision 3:  
Revision 2:  
Revision 1: 01-15-21 ADDRESS CITY COMMENTS

Original Date: SEPTEMBER 07, 2020

Sheet 5 of 24 Sheets

DEP#

PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN

Project Name:

Summary of PDP Structural BMPs	Form I-6
<b>PDP Structural BMPs</b>	
<p>All PDPs must implement structural BMPs for storm water pollutant control (see Chapter 5 of the BMP Design Manual, Part 1 of Storm Water Standards). Selection of PDP structural BMPs for storm water pollutant control must be based on the selection process described in Chapter 5. PDPs subject to hydromodification management requirements must also implement structural BMPs for flow control for hydromodification management (see Chapter 6 of the BMP Design Manual). Both storm water pollutant control and flow control for hydromodification management can be achieved within the same structural BMP(s).</p> <p>PDP structural BMPs must be verified by the City at the completion of construction. This includes requiring the project owner or project owner's representative to certify construction of the structural BMPs (complete Form DS-563). PDP structural BMPs must be maintained into perpetuity (see Chapter 7 of the BMP Design Manual).</p> <p>Use this form to provide narrative description of the general strategy for structural BMP implementation at the project site in the box below. Then complete the PDP structural BMP summary information sheet (page 3 of this form) for each structural BMP within the project (copy the BMP summary information page as many times as needed to provide summary information for each individual structural BMP).</p> <p>Describe the general strategy for structural BMP implementation at the site. This information must describe how the steps for selecting and designing storm water pollutant control BMPs presented in Section 5.1 of the BMP Design Manual were followed, and the results (type of BMPs selected). For projects requiring hydromodification flow control BMPs, indicate whether pollutant control and flow control BMPs are integrated or separate.</p> <p>(Continue on page 2 as necessary.)</p>	

Project Name:

Form I-6 Page 2 of

(Continued from page 1)

Project Name:

Form I-6 Page    of    (Copy as many as needed)	
Structural BMP Summary Information	
Structural BMP ID No.	
Construction Plan Sheet No.	
Type of Structural BMP: <input type="checkbox"/> Retention by harvest and use (e.g. HU-1, cistern) <input type="checkbox"/> Retention by infiltration basin (INF-1) <input type="checkbox"/> Retention by bioretention (INF-2) <input type="checkbox"/> Retention by permeable pavement (INF-3) <input type="checkbox"/> Partial retention by biofiltration with partial retention (PR-1) <input type="checkbox"/> Biofiltration (BF-1) <input type="checkbox"/> Flow-thru treatment control with prior lawful approval to meet earlier PDP requirements (provide BMP type/description in discussion section below) <input type="checkbox"/> Flow-thru treatment control included as pre-treatment/forebay for an onsite retention or biofiltration BMP (provide BMP type/description and indicate which onsite retention or biofiltration BMP it serves in discussion section below) <input type="checkbox"/> Flow-thru treatment control with alternative compliance (provide BMP type/description in discussion section below) <input type="checkbox"/> Detention pond or vault for hydromodification management <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe in discussion section below)	
Purpose: <input type="checkbox"/> Pollutant control only <input type="checkbox"/> Hydromodification control only <input type="checkbox"/> Combined pollutant control and hydromodification control <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-treatment/forebay for another structural BMP <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe in discussion section below)	
Who will certify construction of this BMP? Provide name and contact information for the party responsible to sign BMP verification form DS-563	
Who will be the final owner of this BMP?	
Who will maintain this BMP into perpetuity?	
What is the funding mechanism for maintenance?	

Project Name:

Form I-6 Page      of      (Copy as many as needed)
Structural BMP ID No.
Construction Plan Sheet No.
Discussion (as needed; must include worksheets showing BMP sizing calculations in the SWQMPs):

Form I-6 Page 5 of 6 (Copy as many as needed)	
Structural BMP Summary Information	
Structural BMP ID No. IMP-S	
Construction Plan Sheet No. C-1 & C-2	
<p>Type of Structural BMP:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Retention by harvest and use (e.g. HU-1, cistern)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Retention by infiltration basin (INF-1)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Retention by bioretention (INF-2)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Retention by permeable pavement (INF-3)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partial retention by biofiltration with partial retention (PR-1)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Biofiltration (BF-1)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Flow-thru treatment control with prior lawful approval to meet earlier PDP requirements (provide BMP type/description in discussion section below)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Flow-thru treatment control included as pre-treatment/forebay for an onsite retention or biofiltration BMP (provide BMP type/description and indicate which onsite retention or biofiltration BMP it serves in discussion section below)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Flow-thru treatment control with alternative compliance (provide BMP type/description in discussion section below)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Detention pond or vault for hydromodification management</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (describe in discussion section below)</p>	
<p>Purpose:</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pollutant control only</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hydromodification control only</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Combined pollutant control and hydromodification control</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pre-treatment/forebay for another structural BMP</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe in discussion section below)</p>	
Who will certify construction of this BMP? Provide name and contact information for the party responsible to sign BMP verification form DS-563	Antony Christensen, RCE 54021 7888 Silverton Ave, Ste J San Diego, CA 92126 - 858-271-9901
Who will be the final owner of this BMP?	the Nest
Who will maintain this BMP into perpetuity?	Owner
What is the funding mechanism for maintenance?	Private maintenance agreement fees

Form I-6 Page 6 of 6 (Copy as many as needed)

Structural BMP ID No. IMP-S

Construction Plan Sheet No. C-1 & C-2

Discussion (as needed; must include worksheets showing BMP sizing calculations in the SWQMPs):

Water Quality Volume

For Flow Through WQV (runoff to be treated by a Filterra unit)

$$Q = (0.2 \text{ in}) * C * A * 1.5$$

$$Q = CIA$$

This runoff coefficient is a weighted average using 0.9 for impermeable surfaces and 0.1 for permeable surfaces. The area conveying runoff to the treatment facilities is as follows:

4,201 sf (0.0964 ac) total area

0 sf (0.0 ac) permeable area

4,201 sf (0.0964 ac) impermeable area

$$C = ((0.0 * 0.1) + (0.0964 * 0.9)) / 0.0964 = 0.9$$

Southerly Filterra Unit

$$A = 4,201 \text{ sf} = 0.0964 \text{ ac}$$

$$I = 0.2 \text{ in/hr}$$

C=0.9 for runoff treatment

$$Q = CIA(1.5)$$

$$Q = 0.9 * 0.2 * 0.0964 * 1.5$$

$$Q = 0.0260 \text{ cfs}$$

4' x 4' Filterra is capable of treating 0.0370 cfs and so is adequate

$$Q_{100} = (0.70) (3.9) (0.0964)$$

$$Q_{100} = 0.26 \text{ cfs}$$

Filterra unit with 6" bypass is adequate (capable of conveying 0.6 cfs).

Project Name:

# **Attachment 1**

## **Backup For PDP Pollutant Control BMPs**

This is the cover sheet for Attachment 1.

Project Name:

Indicate which Items are Included:

Attachment Sequence	Contents	Checklist
<b>Attachment 1a</b>	DMA Exhibit (Required) See DMA Exhibit Checklist.	<input type="checkbox"/> Included
<b>Attachment 1b</b>	Tabular Summary of DMAs Showing DMA ID matching DMA Exhibit, DMA Area, and DMA Type (Required)*  *Provide table in this Attachment OR on DMA Exhibit in Attachment 1a	<input type="checkbox"/> Included on DMA Exhibit in Attachment 1a  <input type="checkbox"/> Included as Attachment 1b, separate from DMA Exhibit
<b>Attachment 1c</b>	Form I-7, Harvest and Use Feasibility Screening Checklist (Required unless the entire project will use infiltration BMPs)  Refer to Appendix B.3-1 of the BMP Design Manual to complete Form I-7.	<input type="checkbox"/> Included  <input type="checkbox"/> Not included because the entire project will use infiltration BMPs
<b>Attachment 1d</b>	Infiltration Feasibility Information. Contents of Attachment 1d depend on the infiltration condition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Infiltration Condition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Infiltration Feasibility Condition Letter (<i>Note: must be stamped and signed by licensed geotechnical engineer</i>)</li> <li>○ Form I-8A (optional)</li> <li>○ Form I-8B (optional)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Partial Infiltration Condition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Infiltration Feasibility Condition Letter (<i>Note: must be stamped and signed by licensed geotechnical engineer</i>)</li> <li>○ Form I-8A</li> <li>○ Form I-8B</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Full Infiltration Condition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Form I-8A</li> <li>○ Form I-8B</li> <li>○ Worksheet C.4-3</li> <li>○ Form I-9</li> </ul> </li> </ul> Refer to Appendices C and D of the BMP Design Manual for guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Included  <input type="checkbox"/> Not included because the entire project will use harvest and use BMPs
<b>Attachment 1e</b>	Pollutant Control BMP Design Worksheets / Calculations (Required)  Refer to Appendices B and E of the BMP Design Manual for structural pollutant control BMP design guidelines and site design credit calculations	<input type="checkbox"/> Included

Project Name:

**Use this checklist to ensure the required information has been included on the DMA Exhibit:**

The DMA Exhibit must identify:

- ☐ Underlying hydrologic soil group
- ☐ Approximate depth to groundwater
- ☐ Existing natural hydrologic features (watercourses, seeps, springs, wetlands)
- ☐ Critical coarse sediment yield areas to be protected
- ☐ Existing topography and impervious areas
- ☐ Existing and proposed site drainage network and connections to drainage offsite
- ☐ Proposed grading
- ☐ Proposed impervious features
- ☐ Proposed design features and surface treatments used to minimize imperviousness
- ☐ Drainage management area (DMA) boundaries, DMA ID numbers, and DMA areas (square footage or acreage), and DMA type (i.e., drains to BMP, self-retaining, or self-mitigating)
- ☐ Potential pollutant source areas and corresponding required source controls (see Chapter 4, Appendix E.1, and Form I-3B)
- ☐ Structural BMPs (identify location, type of BMP, size/detail, and include cross-section)

DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AREA EXHIBIT

EXHIBIT CHECKLIST:

HYDROLOGIC SOIL GROUP: "D" (UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION SERVICES  
WEB SOIL SURVEY)

APPROXIMATE DEPTH TO GROUNDWATER: GREATER THAN 10'

EXISTING NATURAL HYDROLOGIC RESOURCES: NO WATERCOURSES, SEEP,  
SPRINGS OR WETLANDS EXIST  
IN THE PROJECT AREA

CRITICAL COARSE SEDIMENT YIELD AREAS: POTENTIAL CCSYAs (CCSYAs)  
DO NOT OCCUR ONSITE OR UPSTREAM

EXISTING TOPOGRAPHY AND IMPERVIOUS AREAS: TOPOGRAPHY IS SHOWN  
COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT  
CAR WASH EXISTS ONSITE

EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE DRAINAGE  
NETWORK AND CONNECTIONS TO DRAINAGE OFFSITE: CURRENTLY DRAINAGE FLOWS SOUTHEASTERLY TO THE  
ADJACENT ALLEY. FOLLOWING CONSTRUCTION SOME  
RUNOFF WILL CONTINUE TO FLOW TO THE ALLEY WITH  
THE MAJORITY FLOWING, AFTER TREATMENT, TO LAMONT  
STREET

PROPOSED GRADING: IS SHOWN ON DMA MAP

PROPOSED IMPERVIOUS FEATURES: IMPERVIOUS ROOFS AND DECKS AND SOME HARDSCAPE

PROPOSED DESIGN FEATURES AND SURFACE TREATMENTS  
USED TO MINIMIZE IMPERVIOUSNESS: ARE SHOWN AND LANDSCAPING IS USED  
TO MINIMIZE IMPERVIOUSNESS.

DMA MANAGEMENT AREA BOUNDARIES, NUMBERS, AREAS AND TYPES: SHOWN

POTENTIAL POLLUTANT SOURCE AREAS AND SOURCE CONTROLS:

EXISTING ONSITE STORM DRAIN INLET: NONE  
INDOOR DRAINS, GARAGES AND PESTICIDE USE: GARAGE IS SHOWN  
NO STORM WATER RUNOFF IS COLLECTED IN GARAGE DRAINS.  
LANDSCAPE/OUTSIDE PESTICIDE USE: NOT ANTICIPATED TO BE USED  
POOLS, SPAS, PONDS: ARE NOT EMPLOYED  
FOOD SERVICE: NOT EMPLOYED  
REFUSE AREAS: COVERED REFUSE AREA WILL BE WITHIN GARAGE  
INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES: DO NOT OCCUR  
OUTDOOR STORAGE OF EQUIPMENT OR MATERIALS: DOES NOT EXIST  
VEHICLE CLEANING: DOES NOT EXIST  
VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT REPAIR: DOES NOT EXIST  
FUEL DISPENSING AREAS: DO NOT EXIST  
LOADING DOCKS: DO NOT EXIST  
FIRE SPRINKLER TEST WATER: WILL BE CONVEYED TO SEWER  
MISCELLANEOUS DRAIN OR WASH WATER: DOES NOT EXIST  
PLAZAS, SIDEWALKS AND PARKING LOTS: DO NOT OCCUR

STRUCTURAL BMP SHOWN AS TO LOCATION, TYPE, SIZE AND DETAIL  
ARE SHOWN (FILTERRA UNITS)

HYDROMODIFICATION REQUIREMENTS: IS EXEMPT. RUNOFF FLOWS VIA  
HARDENED CONVEYANCE TO AN EXEMPT WATER BODY (MISSION BAY)



NOTE:

RUNOFF FROM AREAS DRAINING TO IMP-N & S IS CONVEYED TO A CLEANOUT WITH PUMP  
AND THEN TO A CURB OUTLET AND RELEASED TO LAMONT STREET.


COLOR, HATCHED AREAS SHOWN HEREON REPRESENT THE AREAS OF THE BUILDINGS THAT  
DRAIN TO THE REFERENCED IMPs. AT THE FRONT (DMA FE) 521 SF OF ENTRY AREA FLOWS TO  
THE LANDSCAPED AREA (523 SF) WITH 12' OF AMENDED SOIL AT THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY  
(DMA RE) 330 SF OF IMPERVIOUS DRIVEWAY AND TRANSFORMER RUNOFF FLOWS TO 389 SF OF  
LANDSCAPE AREA, ALL AS SHOWN HEREON.

LEGEND:

TYPICAL DMA - COLOR OF HATCHING REPRESENTS DMA LIMIT - SEE EXHIBIT



SCALE: 1" = 10'  
CONTOUR INTERVAL: 1'



Prepared By:

CHRISTENSEN ENGINEERING & SURVEYING  
7888 SILVERTON AVENUE, SUITE "J"  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92126  
PHONE (858) 271-9901 FAX (858) 271-8912

Project Address:

4033 LAMONT STREET  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92109

Project Name:

THE NEST

Sheet Title:

DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT  
AREA EXHIBIT

Revision 5:

Revision 4:

Revision 3:

Revision 2:

Revision 1: 01-15-21 REVISED DESIGN  
ADDRESS CITY COMMENTS

Original Date: SEPTEMBER 07, 2020

Sheet of Sheets

DEP#

C-DMA

IMP-N  
STRUCTURAL BMP  
TREATING AREA DMA-FIN  
4' X 6' FILTERRA UNIT

DMA-FIN  
6,251 SF OF BUILDING RUNOFF  
FLOWS TO IMP-N  
4' X 4' FILTERRA UNIT  
C=0.9  
(GREEN HATCH)

DMA-D2  
58 SF OF ENTRY  
(RED HATCH)  
DI MINIMIS

DMA-D  
129 SF OF ENTRY  
(YELLOW HATCH)  
DI MINIMIS

DMA-FE  
509 SF OF ENTRIES  
(RED HATCH)  
FLOWS TO 558 SF LANDSCAPE  
12" AMENDED SOIL AREA  
(CYAN HATCH)  
IMPERVIOUS AREA DISPERSION  
SEE WORKSHEET B.5-7

DMA-RE  
281 SF OF DRIVEWAY  
(YELLOW HATCH)  
FLOWS TO 422 SF LANDSCAPE  
AREA (ORANGE HATCH)  
IMPERVIOUS AREA DISPERSION  
SEE WORKSHEET B.5-6

DMA-SM  
1,260 SF LANDSCAPE AREA  
SELF-MITIGATING  
(BLUE HATCH)  
(TYPICAL)

DMA-FIS  
4,201 SF OF BUILDING RUNOFF  
FLOWS TO IMP-S  
4' X 4' FILTERRA UNIT  
C=0.9  
(MAGENTA HATCH)

IMP-S  
STRUCTURAL BMP  
TREATING AREA DMA-FIS  
4' X 4' FILTERRA UNIT

UNAUTHORIZED CHANGES & USES

CAUTION: The Engineer preparing these plans will not be responsible for,  
or liable for, unauthorized change to or uses of these plans. All changes  
to the plans must be in writing and must be approved by the preparer of  
these plans.

**CE & S** **CHRISTENSEN ENGINEERING & SURVEYING**  
CIVIL ENGINEERS LAND SURVEYORS PLANNERS  
7888 SILVERTON AVENUE, SUITE "J", SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92126  
TELEPHONE: (858) 271-9901 EMAIL: ceands@aol.com

JANUARY 15, 2021

ANTONY K. CHRISTENSEN, RCE 54021

Date



Project Name:

Tabular Summary of DMAs							Worksheet B-1		
DMA Unique Identifier	Area (acres)	Impervious Area (acres)	% Imp	HSG	Area Weighted Runoff Coefficient	DCV (cubic feet)	Treated By (BMP ID)	Pollutant Control Type	Drains to (POC ID)
Summary of DMA Information (Must match project description and SWQMP Narrative)									
No. of DMAs	Total DMA Area (acres)	Total Impervious Area (acres)	% Imp		Area Weighted Runoff Coefficient	Total DCV (cubic feet)	Total Area Treated (acres)		No. of POCs

**Where:** DMA = Drainage Management Area; Imp = Imperviousness; HSG = Hydrologic Soil Group; DCV= Design Capture Volume; BMP = Best Management Practice; POC = Point of Compliance; ID = identifier; No. = Number

# The Nest IMP-S

Design Capture Volume		Worksheet B.2-1		
1	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile 24-hr storm depth from Figure B.1-1	d=	0.52	inches
2	Area tributary to BMP (s)	A=	0.0964	acres
3	Area weighted runoff factor (estimate using Appendix B.1.1 and B.2.1)	C=	0.90	unitless
4	Trees Credit Volume  Note: In the SWQMP list the number of trees, size of each tree, amount of soil volume installed for each tree, contributing area to each tree and the inlet opening dimension for each tree.	TCV=	0	cubic-feet
5	Rain barrels Credit Volume  Note: In the SWQMP list the number of rain barrels, size of each rain barrel and the use of the captured storm water runoff.	RCV=	0	cubic-feet
6	Calculate DCV = $(3630 \times C \times d \times A) - TCV - RCV$	DCV=	164	cubic-feet

The City of San Diego | Storm Water Standards  
Worksheet B.2-1 | January 2018 Edition



$$C = ((0.0964 \times 0.9) + (0 \times 0.1)) / 0.0964 = 0.90$$


# The Nest IMP-N


Design Capture Volume		Worksheet B.2-1		
1	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile 24-hr storm depth from Figure B.1-1	d=	0.52	inches
2	Area tributary to BMP (s)	A=	0.1435	acres
3	Area weighted runoff factor (estimate using Appendix B.1.1 and B.2.1)	C=	0.90	unitless
4	Trees Credit Volume  Note: In the SWQMP list the number of trees, size of each tree, amount of soil volume installed for each tree, contributing area to each tree and the inlet opening dimension for each tree.	TCV=	0	cubic-feet
5	Rain barrels Credit Volume  Note: In the SWQMP list the number of rain barrels, size of each rain barrel and the use of the captured storm water runoff.	RCV=	0	cubic-feet
6	Calculate DCV = $(3630 \times C \times d \times A) - TCV - RCV$	DCV=	244	cubic-feet


The City of San Diego | Storm Water Standards  
Worksheet B.2-1 | January 2018 Edition




$$C = ((0.1453 \times 0.9) + (0 \times 0.1)) / 0.1453 = 0.90$$

		Project Name		THE NEST	
		BMP ID		IMP-N	
Sizing Method for Volume Retention Criteria				Worksheet B.5-2	
1	Area draining to the BMP			6251	sq. ft.
2	Adjusted runoff factor for drainage area (Refer to Appendix B.1 and B.2)			0.9	
3	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile 24-hour rainfall depth			0.52	inches
4	Design capture volume [Line 1 x Line 2 x (Line 3/12)]			244	cu. ft.
Volume Retention Requirement					
5	Measured infiltration rate in the DMA  Note:  When mapped hydrologic soil groups are used enter 0.10 for NRCS Type D soils and for NRCS Type C soils enter 0.30  When in no infiltration condition and the actual measured infiltration rate is unknown enter 0.0 if there are geotechnical and/or groundwater hazards identified in Appendix C or enter 0.05			0	in/hr.
6	Factor of safety			2	
7	Reliable infiltration rate, for biofiltration BMP sizing [Line 5 / Line 6]			0	in/hr.
8	Average annual volume reduction target (Figure B.5-2) When Line 7 > 0.01 in/hr. = Minimum (40, 166.9 x Line 7 +6.62)  When Line 7 ≤ 0.01 in/hr. = 3.5%			3.5	%
9	Fraction of DCV to be retained (Figure B.5-3)  When Line 8 > 8% = $0.0000013 \times \text{Line } 8^3 - 0.000057 \times \text{Line } 8^2 + 0.0086 \times \text{Line } 8 - 0.014$  When Line 8 ≤ 8% = 0.023			0.023	
10	Target volume retention [Line 9 x Line 4]			6	cu. ft.

		Project Name		THE NEST	
		BMP ID		IMP-S	
Sizing Method for Volume Retention Criteria				Worksheet B.5-2	
1	Area draining to the BMP			4201	sq. ft.
2	Adjusted runoff factor for drainage area (Refer to Appendix B.1 and B.2)			0.9	
3	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile 24-hour rainfall depth			0.52	inches
4	Design capture volume [Line 1 x Line 2 x (Line 3/12)]			164	cu. ft.
Volume Retention Requirement					
5	Measured infiltration rate in the DMA  Note:  When mapped hydrologic soil groups are used enter 0.10 for NRCS Type D soils and for NRCS Type C soils enter 0.30  When in no infiltration condition and the actual measured infiltration rate is unknown enter 0.0 if there are geotechnical and/or groundwater hazards identified in Appendix C or enter 0.05			0	in/hr.
6	Factor of safety			2	
7	Reliable infiltration rate, for biofiltration BMP sizing [Line 5 / Line 6]			0	in/hr.
8	Average annual volume reduction target (Figure B.5-2) When Line 7 > 0.01 in/hr. = Minimum (40, 166.9 x Line 7 +6.62)  When Line 7 ≤ 0.01 in/hr. = 3.5%			3.5	%
9	Fraction of DCV to be retained (Figure B.5-3)  When Line 8 > 8% = $0.0000013 \times \text{Line } 8^3 - 0.000057 \times \text{Line } 8^2 + 0.0086 \times \text{Line } 8 - 0.014$  When Line 8 ≤ 8% = 0.023			0.023	
10	Target volume retention [Line 9 x Line 4]			4	cu. ft.

		Project Name					THE NEST	
		BMP ID					IMP-N & IMP-S	
Volume Retention for No Infiltration Condition						Worksheet B.5-6		
1	Area draining to the biofiltration BMP					10452	sq. ft.	
2	Adjusted runoff factor for drainage area (Refer to Appendix B.1 and B.2)					0.9		
3	Effective impervious area draining to the BMP [Line 1 x Line 2]					9407	sq. ft.	
4	Required area for Evapotranspiration [Line 3 x 0.03]					282	sq. ft.	
5	Biofiltration BMP Footprint					40	sq. ft.	
Landscape Area (must be identified on DS-3247)								
		Identification	1	2	3	4	5	
6	Landscape area that meet the requirements in SD-B and SD-F Fact Sheet (sq. ft.)		422					
7	Impervious area draining to the landscape area (sq. ft.)		281					
8	Impervious to Pervious Area ratio [Line 7/Line 6]		0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
9	Effective Credit Area If (Line 8 > 1.5, Line 6, Line 7/1.5]		187	0	0	0	0	
10	Sum of Landscape area [sum of Line 9 Id's 1 to 5]					187	sq. ft.	
11	Provided footprint for evapotranspiration [Line 5 + Line 10]					227	sq. ft.	
Volume Retention Performance Standard								
12	Is Line 11 ≥ Line 4?		No, Proceed to Line 13					
13	Fraction of the performance standard met through the BMP footprint and/or landscaping [Line 11/Line 4]					0.8		
14	Target Volume Retention [Line 10 from Worksheet B.5.2]					10	cu. ft.	
15	Volume retention required from other site design BMPs [(1-Line 13) x Line 14]					2	cu. ft.	
Site Design BMP								
	Identification	Site Design Type				Credit		
16	1	12 " AMENDED SOIL				9	cu. ft.	
	2						cu. ft.	
	3						cu. ft.	
	4						cu. ft.	
	5						cu. ft.	
	Sum of volume retention benefits from other site design BMPs (e.g. trees; rain barrels etc.). [sum of Line 16 Credits for Id's 1 to 5] Provide documentation of how the site design credit is calculated in the PDP SWQMP.					9	cu. ft.	
17	Is Line 16 ≥ Line 15?		Volume Retention Performance Standard is Met					

		Project Name		THE NEST	
		BMP ID		FE	
Volume Retention From Amended Soils				Worksheet B.5-7	
1	Impervious area draining to the pervious area			509	sq. ft.
2	Pervious area (must meet the requirements in SD-B and SD-F Fact Sheets)			558	sq. ft.
3	Dispersion Ratio [Line 1/Line 2] Note: This worksheet is not applicable when Line 3 > 50 or Line 3 < 0.25			0.91	
4	Adjusted runoff factor $[(\text{Line } 1 * 0.9 + \text{Line } 2 * 0.1) / (\text{Line } 1 + \text{Line } 2)]$			0.48	
5	85th percentile 24-hour rainfall depth			0.52	inches
6	Design capture volume $[(\text{Line } 1 + \text{Line } 2) * \text{Line } 4 * (\text{Line } 5/12)]$			22	cu. ft.
7	Amendment Depth (Choose from 3", 6", 9", 12", 15" and 18")			12	inches
8	Storage $[(\text{porosity} - \text{field capacity}) + 0.5 * (\text{field capacity} - \text{wilting point})]$			0.25	in./in.
9	Pervious Storage $[\text{Line } 2 * (\text{Line } 7/12) * \text{Line } 8]$			140	cu. ft.
10	Fraction of DCV $[\text{Line } 9 / \text{Line } 6]$			6.36	
11	Measured Infiltration Rate  When mapped hydrologic soil groups are used enter 0.10 for NRCS Type D soils and for NRCS Type C soils enter 0.30  When in no infiltration condition and the actual measured infiltration rate is unknown enter 0.0 if there are geotechnical and/or groundwater hazards identified in Appendix C or enter 0.05			0	in/hr.
12	Factor of Safety			2	
13	Reliable Infiltration Rate $[\text{Line } 11/\text{Line } 12]$			0	in/hr.
14	Dispersion Credit (Based on Figures B.5.6 to B.5.11; Line 10 and Line 13)			0.415	
15	Volume retention due to amendment $[\text{Line } 1 * (\text{Line } 5/12) * \text{Line } 14]$			9	cu. ft.

Harvest and Use Feasibility Checklist		Worksheet B.3-1 : Form I-7
<p>1. Is there a demand for harvested water (check all that apply) at the project site that is reliably present during the wet season?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Toilet and urinal flushing</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Landscape irrigation</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>		
<p>2. If there is a demand; estimate the anticipated average wet season demand over a period of 36 hours. Guidance for planning level demand calculations for toilet/urinal flushing and landscape irrigation is provided in Section B.3.2.</p> <p>[Provide a summary of calculations here]</p>		
<p>3. Calculate the DCV using worksheet B-2.1.</p> <p>DCV = _____ (cubic feet)</p> <p>[Provide a summary of calculations here]</p>		
<p>3a. Is the 36-hour demand greater than or equal to the DCV?</p> <p>Yes    /    No    ⇒</p> <p>↓</p>	<p>3b. Is the 36-hour demand greater than 0.25DCV but less than the full DCV?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes    /    No    ⇒</p> <p>↓</p>	<p>3c. Is the 36-hour demand less than 0.25DCV?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>↓</p>
<p>Harvest and use appears to be feasible. Conduct more detailed evaluation and sizing calculations to confirm that DCV can be used at an adequate rate to meet drawdown criteria.</p>	<p>Harvest and use may be feasible. Conduct more detailed evaluation and sizing calculations to determine feasibility. Harvest and use may only be able to be used for a portion of the site, or (optionally) the storage may need to be upsized to meet long term capture targets while draining in longer than 36 hours.</p>	<p>Harvest and use is considered to be infeasible.</p>
<p>Is harvest and use feasible based on further evaluation?</p> <p>Yes, refer to Appendix E to select and size harvest and use BMPs.</p> <p>No, select alternate BMPs.</p>		



Mr. Tim Golba  
Golba Architecture Inc.  
1940 Garnet Avenue, Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92109

September 22, 2020  
File No. 20-056

Subject: **Infiltration Feasibility Condition Letter**  
NEST at Crown Point Shores  
4033 Lamont Street  
San Diego, California

References: 1) "Geotechnical Investigation, NEST at Crown Point Shores, 4033 Lamont Street, San Diego, California," by TerraPacific Consultants, Inc., dated September 22, 2020.  
2) "Storm Water Standards," City of San Diego, dated October 2018.  
3) "Preliminary Grading Plan, 4033 Lamont Street, San Diego, CA," by Christensen Engineering and Survey, dated September 7, 2020.

Dear Mr. Golba:

The following updated letter provides our opinions regarding site infiltration for the proposed development at the subject project. For simplicity, we are addressing each bullet item as indicated in Section C.1.1, in the October 2018 edition of the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards BMP Design Manual.

- A preliminary geotechnical investigation was conducted by our firm during the initial design phase of the project; this investigation report is referenced above.
- The geotechnical investigation revealed site topography is gently generally flat, with an approximate elevation of 30' msl. Site stratigraphy consists of poorly consolidated undocumented fill soil mantling the site. Native paralic deposits underlie the fill soils. Based on the site-specific exploration, which included numerous borings, existing undocumented fill soils in excess of 6 feet in thickness, were encountered. Localized areas of existing undocumented fill soils of in excess of 6-foot thickness are also expected to underlie the site.
- The site is currently developed with residential structures and other appurtenances; undocumented fill soils from initial site development blanket the site.
- The current design footprint is consistent with the initial concept design due to the limited lot size and dimensions. The proposed development will consist of multi-family structures over an on-grade parking garage, which will utilize the entire lot. Retaining walls near the property lines will accommodate the proposed grade changes.



- Due to the limited lot size and proposed improvement footprint, which utilizes the entire lot, partial or full infiltration is not feasible, as adequate setbacks cannot be established.
- The physical impairment associated with the limited lot size and proposed improvement footprint prevents full/partial infiltration.
- The existing site configuration consists of undocumented fill soils blanketing the site. Undocumented fill soils with depths in excess of 6 feet were encountered during our site-specific investigation, including in numerous borings. These soils are not considered suitable for support of the proposed improvements (structures and appurtenances). Proposed cut areas near property lines will require retaining walls to accommodate the grade changes. As is always the case, infiltration can induce soil settlement and volume change that would adversely impact the proposed improvements which utilize the entire lot footprint.
- The site design BMP requirements appear to be adequately addressed in the overall design by the project civil engineer. The referenced Grading Plan, attached within this letter, was utilized as a base map for the Geotechnical Plan, Figure 2.
- Based on our referenced site-specific geotechnical investigation, infiltration is not considered feasible from a geotechnical standpoint, due to the negative impacts on proposed improvements (structures and appurtenances) that would result from infiltration and associated soil volume changes.
- The Geotechnical Plan, Figure 2, and Preliminary Grading Plan, depict the site design and are provided in the attachment within this letter.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Respectfully submitted,  
**TerraPacific Consultants, Inc.**

Cristopher C. O'Hern, CEG 2397  
Senior Engineering Geologist



Octavio Brambila, PE 70633  
Project Engineer



Compact (high rate) Biofiltration BMP Checklist		Form I-10
<p>Compact (high rate) biofiltration BMPs have a media filtration rate greater than 5 in/hr. and a media surface area smaller than 3% of contributing area times adjusted runoff factor. Compact biofiltration BMPs are typically proprietary BMPs that may qualify as biofiltration.</p> <p>A compact biofiltration BMP may satisfy the pollutant control requirements for a DMA onsite in some cases. This depends on the characteristics of the DMA <b>and</b> the performance certification/data of the BMP. If the pollutant control requirements for a DMA are met onsite, then the DMA is not required to participate in an offsite storm water alternative compliance program to meet its pollutant control obligations.</p> <p>An applicant using a compact biofiltration BMP to meet the pollutant control requirements onsite must complete Section 1 of this form and include it in the PDP SWQMP. A separate form must be completed for each DMA. In instances where the City Engineer does not agree with the applicant's determination, Section 2 of this form will be completed by the City and returned to the applicant.</p>		
<b>Section 1: Biofiltration Criteria Checklist (Appendix F)</b>		
<p>Refer to Part 1 of the Storm Water Standards to complete this section. When separate forms/worksheets are referenced below, the applicant must also complete these separate forms/worksheets (as applicable) and include in the PDP SWQMP. The criteria numbers below correspond to the criteria numbers in Appendix F.</p>		
Criteria	Answer	Progression
<p><b>Criteria 1 and 3:</b></p> <p>What is the infiltration condition of the DMA?</p> <p>Refer to Section 5.4.2 and Appendix C of the BMP Design Manual (Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) for guidance.</p> <p>Applicant must complete and include the following in the PDP SWQMP submittal to support the feasibility determination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infiltration Feasibility Condition Letter; or</li> <li>• Worksheet C.4-1: Form I-8A and Worksheet C.4-2: Form I-8B.</li> </ul> <p>Applicant must complete and include all applicable sizing worksheets in the SWQMP submittal</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Full Infiltration Condition</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Partial Infiltration Condition</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> No Infiltration Condition</p>	<p><b>Stop.</b> Compact biofiltration BMP is not allowed.</p> <p>Compact biofiltration BMP is only allowed, if the target volume retention is met onsite (Refer to Table B.5-1 in Appendix B.5). Use Worksheet B.5-2 in Appendix B.5 to estimate the target volume retention (Note: retention in this context means reduction).</p> <p>If the required volume reduction is achieved <b>proceed to Criteria 2.</b></p> <p>If the required volume reduction is not achieved, compact biofiltration BMP is not allowed. <b>Stop.</b></p> <p>Compact biofiltration BMP is allowed if volume retention criteria in Table B.5-1 in Appendix B.5 for the no infiltration condition is met. Compliance with this criterion must be documented in the PDP SWQMP.</p> <p>If the criteria in Table B.5-1 is met <b>proceed to Criteria 2.</b></p> <p>If the criteria in Table B.5-1 is not met, compact biofiltration BMP is not allowed. <b>Stop.</b></p>

Compact (high rate) Biofiltration BMP Checklist		Form I-10
<p><b>Provide basis for Criteria 1 and 3:</b></p> <p><u>Feasibility Analysis:</u></p> <p>Summarize findings and include either infiltration feasibility condition letter or Worksheet C.4-1: Form I-8A and Worksheet C.4-2: Form I-8B in the PDP SWQMP submittal.</p> <p><u>If Partial Infiltration Condition:</u></p> <p>Provide documentation that target volume retention is met (include Worksheet B.5-2 in the PDP SWQMP submittal). Worksheet B.5-7 in Appendix B.5 can be used to estimate volume retention benefits from landscape areas.</p> <p><u>If No Infiltration Condition:</u></p> <p>Provide documentation that the volume retention performance standard is met (include Worksheet B.5-2 in the PDP SWQMP submittal) in the PDP SWQMP submittal. Worksheet B.5-6 in Appendix B.5 can be used to document that the performance standard is met.</p> <p>Please see Worksheet B.5-6 for IMP-N &amp; IMP-S. The 12" amended soil area within DMA-FE satisfies the volume retention requirement calculated using Worksheets B.5-2 for for each of the two IMPs (IMP-N &amp; IMP-S).</p> <p>All three worksheets provided</p>		
Criteria	Answer	Progression
<p><b>Criteria 2:</b></p> <p>Is the compact biofiltration BMP sized to meet the performance standard from the MS4 Permit?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix B.5 and Appendix F.2 of the BMP Design Manual (Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) for guidance.</p>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Meets Flow based Criteria	<p>Use guidance from <b>Appendix F.2.2</b> to size the compact biofiltration BMP to meet the flow based criteria. Include the calculations in the PDP SWQMP.</p> <p>Use parameters for sizing consistent with manufacturer guidelines and conditions of its third party certifications (i.e. a BMP certified at a loading rate of 1 gpm/sq. ft. cannot be designed using a loading rate of 1.5 gpm/sq. ft.)</p> <p><b>Proceed to Criteria 4.</b></p>
	<input type="radio"/> Meets Volume based Criteria	<p>Provide documentation that the compact biofiltration BMP has a total static (i.e. non-routed) storage volume, including pore-spaces and pre-filter detention volume (Refer to Appendix B.5 for a schematic) of at least 0.75 times the portion of the DCV not reliably retained onsite.</p> <p><b>Proceed to Criteria 4.</b></p>
	<input type="radio"/> Does not Meet either criteria	<p><b>Stop.</b> Compact biofiltration BMP is not allowed.</p>

Compact (high rate) Biofiltration BMP Checklist		Form I-10
<p><b>Provide basis for Criteria 2:</b></p> <p>Provide documentation that the BMP meets the numeric criteria and is designed consistent with the manufacturer guidelines and conditions of its third-party certification (i.e., loading rate, etc., as applicable).</p> <p>See TAPE attached certification for Filterra unit</p>		
Criteria	Answer	Progression
<p><b>Criteria 4:</b></p> <p>Does the compact biofiltration BMP meet the pollutant treatment performance standard for the projects most significant pollutants of concern?</p> <p>Refer to Appendix B.6 and Appendix F.1 of the BMP Design Manual (Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) for guidance.</p>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes, meets the TAPE certification.	<p>Provide documentation that the compact BMP has an appropriate TAPE certification for the projects most significant pollutants of concern.</p> <p><b>Proceed to Criteria 5.</b></p>
	<input type="radio"/> Yes, through other third-party documentation	<p>Acceptance of third-party documentation is at the discretion of the City Engineer. The City engineer will consider, (a) the data submitted; (b) representativeness of the data submitted; and (c) consistency of the BMP performance claims with pollutant control objectives in Table F.1-2 and Table F.1-1 while making this determination. If a compact biofiltration BMP is not accepted, a written explanation/ reason will be provided in Section 2.</p> <p><b>Proceed to Criteria 5.</b></p>
	<input type="radio"/> No	<p><b>Stop.</b> Compact biofiltration BMP is not allowed.</p>
<p><b>Provide basis for Criteria 4:</b></p> <p>Provide documentation that identifies the projects most significant pollutants of concern and TAPE certification or other third party documentation that shows that the compact biofiltration BMP meets the pollutant treatment performance standard for the projects most significant pollutants of concern.</p> <p>See TAPE attached certification for Filterra unit</p>		

Compact (high rate) Biofiltration BMP Checklist		Form I-10
Criteria	Answer	Progression
<b>Criteria 5:</b> Is the compact biofiltration BMP designed to promote appropriate biological activity to support and maintain treatment process? Refer to Appendix F of the BMP Design Manual (Part 1 of Storm Water Standards) for guidance.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	Provide documentation that the compact biofiltration BMP support appropriate biological activity. Refer to Appendix F for guidance. <b>Proceed to Criteria 6.</b>
	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>Stop.</b> Compact biofiltration BMP is not allowed.
<b>Provide basis for Criteria 5:</b>  Provide documentation that appropriate biological activity is supported by the compact biofiltration BMP to maintain treatment process. See TAPE attached certification for Filterra unit as well as Filterra description		
Criteria	Answer	Progression
<b>Criteria 6:</b> Is the compact biofiltration BMP designed with a hydraulic loading rate to prevent erosion, scour and channeling within the BMP?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes	Provide documentation that the compact biofiltration BMP is used in a manner consistent with manufacturer guidelines and conditions of its third-party certification. <b>Proceed to Criteria 7.</b>
	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>Stop.</b> Compact biofiltration BMP is not allowed.
<b>Provide basis for Criteria 6:</b>  Provide documentation that the BMP meets the numeric criteria and is designed consistent with the manufacturer guidelines and conditions of its third-party certification (i.e., maximum tributary area, maximum inflow velocities, etc., as applicable). See Form I-6 for IMP-RF		

Compact (high rate) Biofiltration BMP Checklist		Form I-10
Criteria	Answer	Progression
<b>Criteria 7:</b> Is the compact biofiltration BMP maintenance plan consistent with manufacturer guidelines and conditions of its third-party certification (i.e., maintenance activities, frequencies)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes, and the compact BMP is privately owned, operated and not in the public right of way.	Submit a maintenance agreement that will also include a statement that the BMP will be maintained in accordance with manufacturer guidelines and conditions of third-party certification.  <b>Stop.</b> The compact biofiltration BMP meets the required criteria.
	<input type="radio"/> Yes, and the BMP is either owned or operated by the City or in the public right of way.	Approval is at the discretion of the City Engineer. The city engineer will consider maintenance requirements, cost of maintenance activities, relevant previous local experience with operation and maintenance of the BMP type, ability to continue to operate the system in event that the vending company is no longer operating as a business or other relevant factors while making the determination.  <b>Stop.</b> Consult the City Engineer for a determination.
	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>Stop.</b> Compact biofiltration BMP is not allowed.
<b>Provide basis for Criteria 7:</b>  Include copy of manufacturer guidelines and conditions of third-party certification in the maintenance agreement. PDP SWQMP must include a statement that the compact BMP will be maintained in accordance with manufacturer guidelines and conditions of third-party certification. See TAPE attached certification for Filterra unit. The maintenance of the Filterra Unit will be in accordance with the manufacturer Operation and Maintenance Manual (attached).		





September 2019

## GENERAL USE LEVEL DESIGNATION FOR BASIC (TSS), ENHANCED, PHOSPHORUS & OIL TREATMENT

For

**CONTECH Engineered Solutions Filtterra®**

### **Ecology's Decision:**

Based on Contech's submissions, including the Final Technical Evaluation Reports, dated August 2019, March 2014, December 2009, and additional information provided to Ecology dated October 9, 2009, Ecology hereby issues the following use level designations:

1. A General Use Level Designation for Basic, Enhanced, Phosphorus, and Oil Treatment for the Filtterra® system constructed with a minimum media thickness of 21 inches (1.75 feet), at the following water quality design hydraulic loading rates:

Treatment	Infiltration Rate (in/hr) for use in Sizing
Basic	175
Phosphorus	100
Oil	50
Enhanced	175

2. The Filtterra is not appropriate for oil spill-control purposes.
3. Ecology approves Filtterra systems for treatment at the hydraulic loading rates listed above, to achieve the maximum water quality design flow rate. Calculate the water quality design flow rates using the following procedures:

- Western Washington: for treatment installed upstream of detention or retention, the water quality design flow rate is the peak 15-minute flow rate as calculated using the latest version of the Western Washington Hydrology Model or other Ecology-approved continuous runoff model.
- Eastern Washington: For treatment installed upstream of detention or retention, the water quality design flow rate is the peak 15-minute flow rate as calculated using one of the three flow rate based methods described in Chapter 2.2.5 of the Stormwater Management Manual for Eastern Washington (SWMMEW) or local manual.
- Entire State: For treatment installed downstream of detention, the water quality design flow rate is the full 2-year release rate of the detention facility.

4. This General Use Level Designation has no expiration date, but Ecology may revoke or amend the designation, and is subject to the conditions specified below.

**Ecology's Conditions of Use:**

Filtterra systems shall comply with these conditions shall comply with the following conditions:

1. Design, assemble, install, operate, and maintain the Filtterra systems in accordance with applicable Contech Filtterra manuals and this Ecology Decision.
2. The minimum size filter surface-area for use in Washington is determined by using the design water quality flow rate (as determined in this Ecology Decision, Item 3, above) and the Infiltration Rate from the table above (use the lowest applicable Infiltration Rate depending on the level of treatment required). Calculate the required area by dividing the water quality design flow rate (cu-ft/sec) by the Infiltration Rate (converted to ft/sec) to obtain required surface area (sq-ft) of the Filtterra unit.
3. Each site plan must undergo Contech Filtterra review before Ecology can approve the unit for site installation. This will ensure that design parameters including site grading and slope are appropriate for use of a Filtterra unit.
4. Filtterra media shall conform to the specifications submitted to and approved by Ecology and shall be sourced from Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC with no substitutions.
5. Maintenance includes removing trash, degraded mulch, and accumulated debris from the filter surface and replacing the mulch layer. Use inspections to determine the site-specific maintenance schedules and requirements. Follow maintenance procedures given in the most recent version of the Filtterra Operation and Maintenance Manual.
6. Maintenance: The required maintenance interval for stormwater treatment devices is often dependent upon the degree of pollutant loading from a particular drainage basin. Therefore, Ecology does not endorse or recommend a "one size fits all" maintenance cycle for a particular model/size of manufactured treatment device.
  - Contech designs Filtterra systems for a target maintenance interval of 6 months in the Pacific Northwest. Maintenance includes removing and replacing the mulch layer above the media along with accumulated sediment, trash, and captured organic materials therein, evaluating plant health, and pruning the plant if deemed necessary.
  - Conduct maintenance following manufacturer's guidelines.
7. Filtterra systems come in standard sizes.
8. Install the Filtterra in such a manner that flows exceeding the maximum Filtterra operating rate are conveyed around the Filtterra mulch and media and will not resuspend captured sediment.
9. Discharges from the Filtterra units shall not cause or contribute to water quality standards violations in receiving waters.

## **Approved Alternate Configurations**

### **Filtterra Internal Bypass - Pipe (FTIB-P)**

1. The Filtterra® Internal Bypass – Pipe allows for piped-in flow from area drains, grated inlets, trench drains, and/or roof drains. Design capture flows and peak flows enter the structure through an internal slotted pipe. Filtterra® inverted the slotted pipe to allow design flows to drop through to a series of splash plates that then disperse the design flows over the top surface of the Filtterra® planter area. Higher flows continue to bypass the slotted pipe and convey out the structure.
2. To select a FTIB-P unit, the designer must determine the size of the standard unit using the sizing guidance described above.

### **Filtterra Internal Bypass – Curb (FTIB-C)**

1. The Filtterra® Internal Bypass –Curb model (FTIB-C) incorporates a curb inlet, biofiltration treatment chamber, and internal high flow bypass in one single structure. Filtterra® designed the FTIB-C model for use in a “Sag” or “Sump” condition and will accept flows from both directions along a gutter line. An internal flume tray weir component directs treatment flows entering the unit through the curb inlet to the biofiltration treatment chamber. Flows in excess of the water quality treatment flow rise above the flume tray weir and discharge through a standpipe orifice; providing bypass of untreated peak flows. Americast manufactures the FTIB-C model in a variety of sizes and configurations and you may use the unit on a continuous grade when a single structure providing both treatment and high flow bypass is preferred. The FTIB-C model can also incorporate a separate junction box chamber to allow larger diameter discharge pipe connections to the structure.
2. To select a FTIB-C unit, the designer must determine the size of the standard unit using the sizing guidance described above.

### **Filtterra® Shallow**

1. The Filtterra Shallow provides additional flexibility for design engineers and designers in situations where various elevation constraints prevent application of a standard Filtterra configuration. Engineers can design this system up to six inches shallower than any of the previous Filtterra unit configurations noted above.
2. Ecology requires that the Filtterra Shallow provide a media contact time equivalent to that of the standard unit. This means that with a smaller depth of media, the surface area must increase.
3. To select a Filtterra Shallow System unit, the designer must first identify the size of the standard unit using the modeling guidance described above.
4. Once the size of the standard Filtterra unit is established using the sizing technique described above, use information from the following table to select the appropriate size Filtterra Shallow System unit.

### Shallow Unit Basic, Enhanced, and Oil Treatment Sizing

Standard Depth	Equivalent Shallow Depth
4x4	4x6 or 6x4
4x6 or 6x4	6x6
4x8 or 8x4	6x8 or 8x6
6x6	6x10 or 10x6
6x8 or 8x6	6x12 or 12x6
6x10 or 10x6	13x7

**Notes:**

1. Shallow Depth Boxes are less than the standard depth of 3.5 feet but no less than 3.0 feet deep (TC to INV).

**Applicant:** Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC.

**Applicant's Address:** 11815 NE Glenn Widing Drive  
Portland, OR 97220

**Application Documents:**

- State of Washington Department of Ecology Application for Conditional Use Designation, Americast (September 2006)
- Quality Assurance Project Plan Filterra® Bioretention Filtration System Performance Monitoring, Americast (April 2008)
- Quality Assurance Project Plan Addendum Filterra® Bioretention Filtration System Performance Monitoring, Americast (June 2008)
- Draft Technical Evaluation Report Filterra® Bioretention Filtration System Performance Monitoring, Americast (August 2009)
- Final Technical Evaluation Report Filterra® Bioretention Filtration System Performance Monitoring, Americast (December 2009)
- Technical Evaluation Report Appendices Filterra® Bioretention Filtration System Performance Monitoring, Americast, (August 2009)
- Memorandum to Department of Ecology Dated October 9, 2009 from Americast, Inc. and Herrera Environmental Consultants
- Quality Assurance Project Plan Filterra® Bioretention System Phosphorus treatment and Supplemental Basic and Enhanced Treatment Performance Monitoring, Americast (November 2011)
- Filterra® letter August 24, 2012 regarding sizing for the Filterra® Shallow System.
- University of Virginia Engineering Department Memo by Joanna Crowe Curran, Ph. D dated March 16, 2013 concerning capacity analysis of Filterra® internal weir inlet tray.
- Terraphase Engineering letter to Jodi Mills, P.E. dated April 2, 2013 regarding Terraflume Hydraulic Test, Filterra® Bioretention System and attachments.
- Technical Evaluation Report, Filterra® System Phosphorus Treatment and Supplemental Basic Treatment Performance Monitoring. March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2014.
- State of Washington Department of Ecology Application for Conditional Use Level Designation, Contech Engineered Solutions (May 2015)

- Quality Assurance Project Plan Filterra® Bioretention System, Contech Engineered Solutions (May 2015)
- Filterra Bioretention System Armco Avenue General Use Level Designation Technical Evaluation Report, Contech Engineered Solutions (August 2019)

### **Applicant's Use Level Request:**

General Level Use Designation for Basic (175 in/hr), Enhanced (175 in/hr), Phosphorus (100 in/hr), and Oil Treatment (50 in/hr).

### **Applicant's Performance Claims:**

Field-testing and laboratory testing show that the Filterra® unit is promising as a stormwater treatment best management practice and can meet Ecology's performance goals for basic, enhanced, phosphorus, and oil treatment.

### **Findings of Fact:**

#### Field Testing 2015-2019

1. Contech completed field testing of a 4 ft. x 4 ft. Filterra® unit at one site in Hillsboro, Oregon from September 2015 to July 2019. Throughout the monitoring period a total of 24 individual storm events were sampled, of which 23 qualified for TAPE sampling criteria.
2. Contech encountered several unanticipated events and challenges that prevented them from collecting continuous flow and rainfall data. An analysis of the flow data from the sampled events, including both the qualifying and non-qualifying events, demonstrated the system treated over 99 % of the influent flows. Peak flows during these events ranged from 25 % to 250 % of the design flow rate of 29 gallons per minute.
3. Of the 23 TAPE qualified sample events, 13 met requirements for TSS analysis. Influent concentrations ranged from 20.8 mg/L to 83 mg/L, with a mean concentration of 46.3 mg/L. The UCL95 mean effluent concentration was 15.9 mg/L, meeting the 20 mg/L performance goal for Basic Treatment.
4. All 23 TAPE qualified sample events met requirements for dissolved zinc analysis. Influent concentrations range from 0.0384 mg/L to 0.2680 mg/L, with a mean concentration of 0.0807 mg/L. The LCL 95 mean percent removal was 62.9 %, meeting the 60 % performance goal for Enhanced Treatment.
5. Thirteen of the 23 TAPE qualified sample events met requirements for dissolved copper analysis. Influent concentrations ranged from 0.00543 mg/L to 0.01660 mg/L, with a mean concentration of 0.0103 mg/L. The LCL 95 mean percent removal was 41.2 %, meeting the 30 % performance goal for Enhanced Treatment.
6. Total zinc concentrations were analyzed for all 24 sample events. Influent EMCs for total zinc ranged from 0.048 mg/L to 5.290 mg/L with a median of 0.162 mg/L. Corresponding effluent EMCs for total zinc ranged from 0.015 mg/L to 0.067 mg/L with a median of

0.029 mg/L. Total event loadings for the study for total zinc were 316.85 g at the influent and 12.92 g at the effluent sampling location, resulting in a summation of loads removal efficiency of 95.9 %.

7. Total copper concentrations were analyzed for all 24 sample events. Influent EMCs for total copper ranged from 0.003 mg/L to 35.600 mg/L with a median value of 0.043 mg/L. Corresponding effluent EMCs for total copper ranged from 0.002 mg/L to 0.015 mg/L with a median of 0.004 mg/L. Total event loadings for total copper for the study were 1,810.06 g at the influent and 1.90 g at the effluent sampling location, resulting in a summation of loads removal efficiency of 99.9 %.

### Field Testing 2013

1. Filterra completed field-testing of a 6.5 ft x 4 ft. unit at one site in Bellingham, Washington. Continuous flow and rainfall data collected from January 1, 2013 through July 23, 2013 indicated that 59 storm events occurred. Water quality data was obtained from 22 storm events. Not all the sampled storms produced information that met TAPE criteria for storm and/or water quality data.
2. The system treated 98.9 % of the total 8-month runoff volume during the testing period. Consequently, the system achieved the goal of treating 91 % of the volume from the site. Stormwater runoff bypassed Filterra treatment during four of the 59 storm events.
3. Of the 22 sampled events, 18 qualified for TSS analysis (influent TSS concentrations ranged from 25 to 138 mg/L). The data were segregated into sample pairs with influent concentration greater than and less than 100 mg/L. The UCL95 mean effluent concentration for the data with influent less than 100 mg/L was 5.2 mg/L, below the 20-mg/L threshold. Although the TAPE guidelines do not require an evaluation of TSS removal efficiency for influent concentrations below 100 mg/L, the mean TSS removal for these samples was 90.1 %. Average removal of influent TSS concentrations greater than 100 mg/L (three events) was 85 %. In addition, the system consistently exhibited TSS removal greater than 80 % at flow rates equivalent to a 100 in/hr infiltration rate and was observed at 150 in/hr.
4. Ten of the 22 sampled events qualified for TP analysis. Americast augmented the dataset using two sample pairs from previous monitoring at the site. Influent TP concentrations ranged from 0.11 to 0.52 mg/L. The mean TP removal for these twelve events was 72.6 %. The LCL95 mean percent removal was 66.0, well above the TAPE requirement of 50 %. Treatment above 50 % was evident at 100 in/hr infiltration rate and as high as 150 in/hr. Consequently, the Filterra test system met the TAPE Phosphorus Treatment goal at 100 in/hr. Influent ortho-P concentrations ranged from 0.005 to 0.012 mg/L; effluent ortho-P concentrations ranged from 0.005 to 0.013 mg/L. The reporting limit/resolution for the ortho-P test method is 0.01 mg/L, therefore the influent and effluent ortho-P concentrations were both at and near non-detect concentrations.

### Field Testing 2008-2009

1. Filtterra completed field-testing at two sites at the Port of Tacoma. Continuous flow and rainfall data collected during the 2008-2009 monitoring period indicated that 89 storm events occurred. The monitoring obtained water quality data from 27 storm events. Not all the sampled storms produced information that met TAPE criteria for storm and/or water quality data.
2. During the testing at the Port of Tacoma, 98.96 to 99.89 % of the annual influent runoff volume passed through the POT1 and POT2 test systems respectively. Stormwater runoff bypassed the POT1 test system during nine storm events and bypassed the POT2 test system during one storm event. Bypass volumes ranged from 0.13 % to 15.3% of the influent storm volume. Both test systems achieved the 91 % water quality treatment-goal over the 1-year monitoring period.
3. Consultants observed infiltration rates as high as 133 in/hr during the various storms. Filtterra did not provide any paired data that identified percent removal of TSS, metals, oil, or phosphorus at an instantaneous observed flow rate.
4. The maximum storm average hydraulic loading rate associated with water quality data is <40 in/hr, with the majority of flow rates < 25 in/hr. The average instantaneous hydraulic loading rate ranged from 8.6 to 53 in/hr.
5. The field data showed a removal rate greater than 80 % for TSS with an influent concentration greater than 20 mg/L at an average instantaneous hydraulic loading rate up to 53 in/hr (average influent concentration of 28.8 mg/L, average effluent concentration of 4.3 mg/L).
6. The field data showed a removal rate generally greater than 54 % for dissolved zinc at an average instantaneous hydraulic loading rate up to 60 in/hr and an average influent concentration of 0.266 mg/L (average effluent concentration of 0.115 mg/L).
7. The field data showed a removal rate generally greater than 40 % for dissolved copper at an average instantaneous hydraulic loading rate up to 35 in/hr and an average influent concentration of 0.0070 mg/L (average effluent concentration of 0.0036 mg/L).
8. The field data showed an average removal rate of 93 % for total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) at an average instantaneous hydraulic loading rate up to 53 in/hr and an average influent concentration of 52 mg/L (average effluent concentration of 2.3 mg/L). The data also shows achievement of less than 15 mg/L TPH for grab samples. Filtterra provided limited visible sheen data due to access limitations at the outlet monitoring location.
9. The field data showed low percentage removals of total phosphorus at all storm flows at an average influent concentration of 0.189 mg/L (average effluent concentration of 0.171 mg/L). We may relate the relatively poor treatment performance of the Filtterra system at this location to influent characteristics for total phosphorus that are unique to the Port of Tacoma site. It appears that the Filtterra system will not meet the 50 % removal performance goal when the majority of phosphorus in the runoff is expected to be in the dissolved form.

### Laboratory Testing

1. Filterra performed laboratory testing on a scaled down version of the Filterra unit. The lab data showed an average removal from 83-91 % for TSS with influents ranging from 21 to 320 mg/L, 82-84 % for total copper with influents ranging from 0.94 to 2.3 mg/L, and 50-61 % for orthophosphate with influents ranging from 2.46 to 14.37 mg/L.
2. Filterra conducted permeability tests on the soil media.
3. Lab scale testing using Sil-Co-Sil 106 showed removals ranging from 70.1 % to 95.5 % with a median removal of 90.7 %, for influent concentrations ranging from 8.3 to 260 mg/L. Filterra ran these laboratory tests at an infiltration rate of 50 in/hr.
4. Supplemental lab testing conducted in September 2009 using Sil-Co-Sil 106 showed an average removal of 90.6 %. These laboratory tests were run at infiltration rates ranging from 25 to 150 in/hr for influent concentrations ranging from 41.6 to 252.5 mg/L. Regression analysis results indicate that the Filterra system's TSS removal performance is independent of influent concentration in the concentration range evaluated at hydraulic loading rates of up to 150 in/hr.

### **Contact Information:**

Applicant: Jeremiah Lehman  
Contech Engineered Solutions, LLC.  
11815 Glenn Widing Dr  
Portland, OR 97220  
(503) 258-3136  
[jlehman@conteches.com](mailto:jlehman@conteches.com)


Applicant's Website: <http://www.conteches.com>

Ecology web link: <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/stormwater/newtech/index.html>


Ecology: Douglas C. Howie, P.E.  
Department of Ecology  
Water Quality Program  
(360) 407-6444  
[douglas.howie@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:douglas.howie@ecy.wa.gov)

Date	Revision
December 2009	GULD for Basic, Enhanced, and Oil granted, CULD for Phosphorus
September 2011	Extended CULD for Phosphorus Treatment
September 2012	Revised design storm discussion, added Shallow System.
January 2013	Revised format to match Ecology standards, changed Filterra contact information
February 2013	Added FTIB-P system
March 2013	Added FTIB-C system
April 2013	Modified requirements for identifying appropriate size of unit

June 2013	Modified description of FTIB-C alternate configuration
March 2014	GULD awarded for Phosphorus Treatment. GULD updated for a higher flow-rate for Basic Treatment.
June 2014	Revised sizing calculation methods
March 2015	Revised Contact Information
June 2015	CULD for Basic and Enhanced at 100 in/hr infiltration rate
September 2019	GULD for Basic and Enhanced at 175 in/hr infiltration rate



## PLAN VIEW




## SECTION A-A


FTIBP-6" BYPASS INLET/OUTLET PIPE CONFIGURATION						
APPROXIMATE MAXIMUM BYPASS = 0.6 CFS						
DESIGNATION	AVAILABILITY	MEDIA BAY SIZE	VAULT SIZE (L x W)	INLET/ OUTLET PIPE DIA.	UNDER-DRAIN PIPE DIA. (PERF.)	TREE GRATE QTY. & SIZE
FTIBP0404-6	ALL	4 x 4	4 x 4	6" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP0604-6	N/A CA	6 x 4	6 x 4	6" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP0606-6	ALL	6 x 6	6 x 6	6" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP06504-6	CA ONLY	6.5 x 4	6.5 x 4	6" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP078045-6	MID-ATL ONLY	7.83 x 4.5	7.83 x 4.5	6" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP0804-6	N/A MID-ATL	8 x 4	8 x 4	6" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP0806-6	ALL	8 x 6	8 x 6	6" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 4' x 4'
FTIBP1006-6	ALL	10 x 6	10 x 6	6" SDR 35	6" SDR 35	(1) 4' x 4'
FTIBP1206-6	ALL	12 x 6	12 x 6	6" SDR 35	6" SDR 35	(2) 4' x 4'
FTIBP1307-6	ALL	13 x 7	13 x 7	6" SDR 35	6" SDR 35	(2) 4' x 4'

N/A = NOT AVAILABLE  
MAXIMUM TOP TO INVERT OUT = 5'-5"  
\*\* MAXIMUM TOP TO INVERT IN = 2'-6"

\* INTERNAL PIPING MAY VARY DEPENDING UPON INFLUENT LOCATION.



## PLAN VIEW




**SECTION A-A**

FTIBP-8" BYPASS INLET/OUTLET PIPE CONFIGURATION						
APPROXIMATE MAXIMUM BYPASS = 1.2 CFS						
DESIGNATION	AVAILABILITY	MEDIA BAY SIZE	VAULT SIZE (L x W)	INLET/ OUTLET PIPE DIA.	UNDER- DRAIN PIPE DIA. (PERF.)	TREE GRATE QTY. & SIZE
FTIBP0604-8	N/A CA	6 x 4	6 x 4	8" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP0606-8	ALL	6 x 6	6 x 6	8" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP06504-8	CA ONLY	6.5 x 4	6.5 x 4	8" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP078045-8	MID-ATL ONLY	7.83 x 4.5	7.83 x 4.5	8" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP0804-8	N/A MID-ATL	8 x 4	8 x 4	8" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP0806-8	ALL	8 x 6	8 x 6	8" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 4' x 4'
FTIBP1006-8	ALL	10 x 6	10 x 6	8" SDR 35	6" SDR 35	(1) 4' x 4'
FTIBP1206-8	ALL	12 x 6	12 x 6	8" SDR 35	6" SDR 35	(2) 4' x 4'
FTIBP1307-8	ALL	13 x 7	13 x 7	8" SDR 35	6" SDR 35	(2) 4' x 4'


N/A = NOT AVAILABLE  
MAXIMUM TOP TO INVERT OUT = 5'-5"  
\*\* MAXIMUM TOP TO INVERT IN = 2'-6"



THIS PRODUCT MAY BE PROTECTED BY ONE OR MORE OF THE FOLLOWING U.S. PATENTS: 6,277,274; 6,569,321; 7,625,485; 7,425,261; 7,833,412. RELATED FOREIGN PATENTS



### PLAN VIEW



## SECTION A-A

FTIBP-10" BYPASS INLET/OUTLET PIPE CONFIGURATION						
APPROXIMATE MAXIMUM BYPASS = 2.2 CFS						
DESIGNATION	AVAILABILITY	MEDIA BAY SIZE	VAULT SIZE (L x W)	INLET/ OUTLET PIPE DIA.	UNDER-DRAIN PIPE DIA. (PERF.)	TREE GRATE QTY. & SIZE
FTIBP0606-10	ALL	6 x 6	6 x 6	10" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 3' x 3'
FTIBP0806-10	ALL	8 x 6	8 x 6	10" SDR 35	4" SDR 35	(1) 4' x 4'
FTIBP1006-10	ALL	10 x 6	10 x 6	10" SDR 35	6" SDR 35	(1) 4' x 4'
FTIBP1206-10	ALL	12 x 6	12 x 6	10" SDR 35	6" SDR 35	(2) 4' x 4'
FTIBP1307-10	ALL	13 x 7	13 x 7	10" SDR 35	6" SDR 35	(2) 4' x 4'

N/A = NOT AVAILABLE  
MAXIMUM TOP TO INVERT OUT = 5'-5"  
\*\* MAXIMUM TOP TO INVERT IN = 2'-6"

The design and information shown on this drawing is provided as a service to the project owner, engineer and contractor by Contech Engineered Solutions LLC or one of its affiliated companies ("Contech"). Neither this drawing, nor any part thereof, may be used, reproduced or modified in any manner without the prior written consent of Contech. Failure to comply is done at the user's own risk and Contech expressly disclaims any liability or responsibility for such use. If discrepancies between the supplied information upon which the drawing is based and actual field conditions are encountered as site work progresses, these discrepancies must be reported to Contech immediately for re-evaluation of the design. Contech accepts no liability for designs based on missing, incomplete or inaccurate information supplied by others.

**CONTECH<sup>®</sup>**  
ENGINEERED SOLUTIONS LLC  
[www.ContechES.com](http://www.ContechES.com)

9025 Centre Pointe Dr., Suite 400, West Chester, OH 45069  
800-338-1122      513-645-7000      513-645-7993 FAX

### FILTERRA INTERNAL BYPASS PIPE (FTIBP) CONFIGURATION DETAIL



## Filterra Sizing Spreadsheet

### San Diego Region

### Uniform Intensity Approach

### Storm Intensity = 0.20 in/hr

Filterra Infiltration Rate = 100 (in/hr)  
 Filterra Flow per Square Foot = 0.00231 (ft<sup>3</sup>/sec/ft<sup>2</sup>)

Filterra Flow Rate, Q = 0.00231 ft<sup>3</sup>/sec x Filterra Surface Area

Rational Method, Q = C x I x A

San Diego Multiplier, M = 1.5

OR  
 Site Flowrate, Q = (C x DI x DA x M x 43560) / (12 x 3600)  
 DA = (12 x 3600 x Q) / (C x 43560 x DI x M)

where

Q = Flow (ft<sup>3</sup>/sec)  
 DA = Drainage Area (acres)  
 DI = Design Intensity (in/hr)  
 C = Runoff coefficient (dimensionless)  
 M = Multiplier (dimensionless)

			DI 0.2	C 0.95	C 0.85	C 0.50
Available Filterra Box Sizes			Filterra Flow Rate, Q (ft <sup>3</sup> /sec)	100% Imperv. DA (acres)	Commercial max DA (acres)	Residential max DA (acres)
L (ft)	W (ft)	Filterra Surface Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )				
4	4	16	0.0370	0.129	0.144	0.245
6	4	24	0.0556	0.193	0.216	0.367
6.5	4	26	0.0602	0.209	0.234	0.398
8	4	32	0.0741	0.258	0.288	0.490
10	4	40	0.0926	0.322	0.360	0.612
12	4	48	0.1111	0.387	0.432	0.735
6	6	36	0.0833	0.290	0.324	0.551
8	6	48	0.1111	0.387	0.432	0.735
10	6	60	0.1389	0.483	0.540	0.918
12	6	72	0.1667	0.580	0.648	1.102
13	7	91	0.2106	0.733	0.819	1.393
12	8	96	0.2222	0.773	0.864	1.469
14	8	112	0.2593	0.902	1.008	1.714
16	8	128	0.2963	1.031	1.152	1.959
18	8	144	0.3333	1.160	1.296	2.204
20	8	160	0.3704	1.289	1.440	2.449
22	8	176	0.4074	1.418	1.584	2.694

Project Name:

# **Attachment 2**

## **Backup for PDP Hydromodification Control Measures**

This is the cover sheet for Attachment 2.

☐ Mark this box if this attachment is empty because the project is exempt from PDP hydromodification management requirements.

Project Name:

Indicate which Items are Included:

Attachment Sequence	Contents	Checklist
<b>Attachment 2a</b>	Hydromodification Management Exhibit (Required)	<input type="checkbox"/> Included See Hydromodification Management Exhibit Checklist.
<b>Attachment 2b</b>	<p>Management of Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas (WMAA Exhibit is required, additional analyses are optional)</p> <p>See Section 6.2 of the BMP Design Manual.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Exhibit showing project drainage boundaries marked on WMAA Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Area Map (Required)</p> <p>Optional analyses for Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Area Determination</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.2.1 Verification of Geomorphic Landscape Units Onsite</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.2.2 Downstream Systems Sensitivity to Coarse Sediment</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 6.2.3 Optional Additional Analysis of Potential Critical Coarse Sediment Yield Areas Onsite</p>
<b>Attachment 2c</b>	<p>Geomorphic Assessment of Receiving Channels (Optional)</p> <p>See Section 6.3.4 of the BMP Design Manual.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Performed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Included</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Submitted as separate stand-alone document</p>
<b>Attachment 2d</b>	<p>Flow Control Facility Design and Structural BMP Drawdown Calculations (Required)</p> <p>Overflow Design Summary for each structural BMP</p> <p>See Chapter 6 and Appendix G of the BMP Design Manual</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Included</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Submitted as separate stand-alone document</p>

Project Name:

**Use this checklist to ensure the required information has been included on the Hydromodification Management Exhibit:**

The Hydromodification Management Exhibit must identify:

- ☐ Underlying hydrologic soil group
- ☐ Approximate depth to groundwater
- ☐ Existing natural hydrologic features (watercourses, seeps, springs, wetlands)
- ☐ Critical coarse sediment yield areas to be protected OR provide a separate map showing that the project site is outside of any critical coarse sediment yield areas
- ☐ Existing topography
- ☐ Existing and proposed site drainage network and connections to drainage offsite
- ☐ Proposed grading
- ☐ Proposed impervious features
- ☐ Proposed design features and surface treatments used to minimize imperviousness
- ☐ Point(s) of Compliance (POC) for Hydromodification Management  
Existing and proposed drainage boundary and drainage area to each POC (when necessary, create separate exhibits for pre-development and post-project conditions)
- ☐ Structural BMPs for hydromodification management (identify location, type of BMP, and size/detail).

Project Name:

# **Attachment 3 Structural BMP Maintenance Information**

This is the cover sheet for Attachment 3.

**Project Name:**

**Indicate which Items are Included:**

Attachment Sequence	Contents	Checklist
<b>Attachment 3</b>	Maintenance Agreement (Form DS-3247) (when applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Included <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

Project Name:

**Use this checklist to ensure the required information has been included in the Structural BMP Maintenance Information Attachment:**

**Attachment 3:** For private entity operation and maintenance, Attachment 3 must include a Storm Water Management and Discharge Control Maintenance Agreement (Form DS-3247). The following information must be included in the exhibits attached to the maintenance agreement:

- ☐ Vicinity map
- ☐ Site design BMPs for which DCV reduction is claimed for meeting the pollutant control obligations.
- ☐ BMP and HMP location and dimensions
- ☐ BMP and HMP specifications/cross section/model
- ☐ Maintenance recommendations and frequency
- ☐ LID features such as (permeable paver and LS location, dim, SF).

Project Name:

# **Attachment 4**

## **Copy of Plan Sheets Showing Permanent Storm Water BMPs**

This is the cover sheet for Attachment 4.

Project Name:

**Use this checklist to ensure the required information has been included on the plans:**

The plans must identify:

- ☐ Structural BMP(s) with ID numbers matching Form I-6 Summary of PDP Structural BMPs
- ☐ The grading and drainage design shown on the plans must be consistent with the delineation of DMAs shown on the DMA exhibit
- ☐ Details and specifications for construction of structural BMP(s)
- ☐ Signage indicating the location and boundary of structural BMP(s) as required by the City Engineer
- ☐ How to access the structural BMP(s) to inspect and perform maintenance
- ☐ Features that are provided to facilitate inspection (e.g., observation ports, cleanouts, silt posts, or other features that allow the inspector to view necessary components of the structural BMP and compare to maintenance thresholds)
- ☐ Manufacturer and part number for proprietary parts of structural BMP(s) when applicable
- ☐ Maintenance thresholds specific to the structural BMP(s), with a location-specific frame of reference (e.g., level of accumulated materials that triggers removal of the materials, to be identified based on viewing marks on silt posts or measured with a survey rod with respect to a fixed benchmark within the BMP)
- ☐ Recommended equipment to perform maintenance
- ☐ When applicable, necessary special training or certification requirements for inspection and maintenance personnel such as confined space entry or hazardous waste management
- ☐ Include landscaping plan sheets showing vegetation requirements for vegetated structural BMP(s)
- ☐ All BMPs must be fully dimensioned on the plans
- ☐ When proprietary BMPs are used, site specific cross section with outflow, inflow and model number shall be provided. Broucher photocopies are not allowed.

Project Name:

## **Attachment 5**

# **Drainage Report**

Attach project's drainage report. Refer to Drainage Design Manual to determine the reporting requirements.

# **Drainage Study “the Nest”**

Lots 13-17, Block 1 Map No. 991

4033 Lamont Street  
San Diego, California 92109

Prepared for:  
Tom Paull  
1940 Garnet Avenue, Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92109

Prepared by:  
**Christensen Engineering & Surveying**  
7888 Silverton Avenue, Suite “J”  
San Diego, CA 92126  
(858) 271-9901

January 15, 2021

PTS No. 676545

# Introduction

This project involves the demolition of all existing improvements on the property located at 4033 Lamont Street (multi-family residential) and the construction of 18 residential apartment units with parking garage, utilities, treatment BMPs and landscaping.

The attached drainage area maps are from a topographic survey by Christensen Engineering & Surveying, dated April 02, 2020. As shown on the pre-construction drainage area map, drainage from the site is by surface flow and is urban in character. Prior to construction site runoff flows southeasterly onto the unnamed alley (0.88 cfs for the 100-yr storm). No offsite run-on flows through the project site. The project prior to development is multi-residential with no drainage conveyance system nor runoff treatment.

Following construction, total site runoff remains the same. Runoff to Lamont Street increases by 0.78 cfs and to the alley decreases by the same volume. The ultimate collection of runoff into the public storm drain system remains the same (at the NW curb inlet at Fortuna Avenue and Morrell Street). The site has 8,115 sf of imperviousness existing and a proposed 11,429 of imperviousness, following development, a change from 58.0% to 83.6% area of imperviousness.

Impervious area runoff will be treated by two raised standard Filterra units due to the site being hydromodification exempt and being classified a non-infiltration site. The site is required to treat 1.5 times the flow based runoff (weight adjusted runoff coefficient) times 0.2 in/hr times the area flowing to the Filterra units). After treatment, runoff is conveyed to a curb outlet in Lamont Street. The required retention element of the project is achieved through flow from 521 sf of the entry surface runoff flowing over 523 sf of landscaping in 12" amended soil along the westerly boundary of the project, discharging to Lamont Street by sheet flow. The project discharges runoff to a hardened conveyance system that discharges to an exempt water body (Mission Bay). Runoff flows onto Lamont then flows southerly to Fortuna Avenue and then easterly to a curb inlet at the northwesterly corner of Fortuna Avenue and Morrell Street. From the curb inlet the runoff flows southerly in a 24" RCP to a curb inlet at the southerly intersection of Fortuna Avenue and Morrell Street, then southerly in a 30" RCP to Crown Point Drive where it turns southwesterly continuing approximately 210' to a cleanout and then turns southeasterly to discharge through an outlet to

Mission Bay that is lower than the 100-yr BFE of 8'. It discharges from a 30" pipe at an elevation of 2.50' NGVD29 which equates to 4.59' NAVD88.

Section 404 of CWA regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. Section 404 is regulated by the Army Corps of Engineers. Section 401 of CWA requires that the State provide certification that any activity authorized under Section 404 is in compliance with effluent limits, the state's water quality standards, and any other appropriate requirements of state law. Section 401 is administered by the State Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project does not require a Federal CWA Section 404 permit nor Section 401 Certification because it does not cause dredging or filling in waters of the United States and is in compliance with the State Water Quality Standards. See separate SWQMP.

The Rational Method was used to calculate the anticipated flow for the 100-year storm return frequency event using the method outlined in the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual.

### ***DECLARATION OF RESPONSIBLE CHARGE***

I hereby declare that I am the engineer of work for this Project, that I have exercised responsible charge over the design of the project as defined in Section 6703 of the business and professions code, and that the design is consistent with current standards. I understand that the check of project drawings and specifications by the City of San Diego is confined to review only and does not relieve me, as engineer of work, of my responsibilities for project design

---

Antony K. Christensen  
RCE 54021 Exp. 12-31-21  
JN A2020-52

01-15-21  
Date

# ***Calculations***

## **1. Intensity Calculation**

From the City of San Diego Drainage Design Manual, Figure A-4  
Tc = Time of concentration

$$T_c = (1.8 (1.1 - C) D^{1/2}) / S^{1/3}$$

Since the difference in elevation is 3' (31.3'-28.3') and the distance traveled is 155', S=1.9%. C = 0.70 (portion of site exposed to rainfall is multi-residential).

$$T_c = 7.4 \text{ minutes.}$$

From Figure A-1

$$I_{100} = 3.9 \text{ inches}$$

## **2. Coefficient Determination**

Pre-Construction:

From Table A-1 for Multi-Family residential:

$$C = 0.70$$

Post-Construction:

From Table A-1 for Multi-Family residential:

$$C = 0.70$$

### 3. *Volume calculations*

$$Q = CIA$$

#### **Areas of Drainage**

##### **Pre-Construction**

Area draining easterly to alley PC = 0.3211 Ac

##### **Post-Construction**

Area of building and planters  
draining to cleanout and pumped  
to curb outlet BP= 0.2532 Ac

Area at rear draining to alley  
by sheet flow RP= 0.0300 Ac

Area at front draining to  
Lamont St by sheet flow FP = 0.0307 Ac

Area at alley dedication  
flowing on alley AD= 0.0072 Ac

##### **Pre-Construction**

$$Q_{100PC} = (0.70) (3.9) (0.3211)$$

$$Q_{100PC} = 0.88 \text{ cfs}$$

##### **Post-Construction**

$$Q_{100BP} = (0.70) (3.9) (0.2532)$$

$$Q_{100RP} = (0.70) (3.9) (0.0300)$$

$$Q_{100FP} = (0.70) (3.9) (0.0307)$$

$$Q_{100AD} = (0.70) (3.9) (0.0072)$$

$$Q_{100BP} = 0.69 \text{ cfs}$$

$$Q_{100RP} = 0.08 \text{ cfs}$$

$$Q_{100FP} = 0.09 \text{ cfs}$$

$$Q_{100AD} = 0.02 \text{ cfs}$$

$$Q_{TOTAL} = 0.88 \text{ cfs}$$

#### **4. Discussion**

Due to no change in use the total calculated runoff is expected to be unchanged (0.88 cfs leaving the site). Runoff to the alley will decrease by 0.78 cfs and increase to Lamont Street by the same volume. The ultimate collection of runoff into the public storm drain system remains the same (at the NW curb inlet at Fortuna Avenue and Morrell Street).

Runoff from area BP is conveyed to a cleanout equipped with a pump to convey it to the curb outlet that outlets to Lamont Street. The pump will be sized at the time of ministerial permit processing.

The volume of runoff conveyed to the curb outlet is 0.69 cfs and its velocity is will be 2.7 fps. See attached printout.

#### **5. Water Quality Treatment**

The site is categorized as non-infiltration and hydromodification exempt so qualifies for treatment with a proprietary biofiltration unit. The following depicts the calculations:

Northerly Filterra Unit

$$A = 6,251 \text{ sf} = 0.1435 \text{ ac}$$

$$I = 0.2 \text{ in/hr}$$

$$C = 0.9 \text{ for runoff treatment}$$

$$Q = CIA(1.5)$$

$$Q = 0.9 * 0.2 * 0.1435 * 1.5$$

$$Q = 0.0387 \text{ cfs}$$

4' x 6' Filterra is capable of treating 0.0556 cfs and so is adequate

$$Q_{100} = (0.70) (3.9) (0.1435)$$

$$Q_{100} = 0.39 \text{ cfs}$$

Filterra unit with 6" bypass is adequate (capable of conveying 0.6 cfs).

#### Southerly Filterra Unit

$$A=4,201 \text{ sf} = 0.0964 \text{ ac}$$

$$I = 0.2 \text{ in/hr}$$

$$C=0.9 \text{ for runoff treatment}$$

$$Q = CIA(1.5)$$

$$Q = 0.9 * 0.2 * 0.0964 * 1.5$$

$$Q = 0.0260 \text{ cfs}$$

4' x 4' Filterra is capable of treating 0.0370 cfs and so is adequate

$$Q_{100} = (0.70) (3.9) (0.0964)$$

$$Q_{100} = 0.26 \text{ cfs}$$

Filterra unit with 6" bypass is adequate (capable of conveying 0.6 cfs).

# APPENDIX

## APPENDIX A: RATIONAL METHOD AND MODIFIED RATIONAL METHOD

**Table A-1. Runoff Coefficients for Rational Method**

Land Use	Runoff Coefficient (C)
	Soil Type <sup>(1)</sup>
<b>Residential:</b>	
Single Family	0.55
Multi-Units	0.70
Mobile Homes	0.65
Rural (lots greater than 1/2 acre)	0.45
<b>Commercial <sup>(2)</sup></b>	
80% Impervious	0.85
<b>Industrial <sup>(2)</sup></b>	
90% Impervious	0.95

**Note:**

<sup>(1)</sup> Type D soil to be used for all areas.

<sup>(2)</sup> Where actual conditions deviate significantly from the tabulated imperviousness values of 80% or 90%, the values given for coefficient C, may be revised by multiplying 80% or 90% by the ratio of actual imperviousness to the tabulated imperviousness. However, in case shall the final coefficient be less than 0.50. For example: Consider commercial property on D soil.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Actual imperviousness} &= 50\% \\
 \text{Tabulated imperviousness} &= 80\% \\
 \text{Revised C} &= (50/80) \times 0.85 = 0.53
 \end{aligned}$$

The values in Table A-1 are typical for urban areas. However, if the basin contains rural or agricultural land use, parks, golf courses, or other types of nonurban land use that are expected to be permanent, the appropriate value should be selected based upon the soil and cover and approved by the City.

### A.1.3. Rainfall Intensity

The rainfall intensity (I) is the rainfall in inches per hour (in/hr.) for a duration equal to the  $T_c$  for a selected storm frequency. Once a particular storm frequency has been selected for design and a  $T_c$  calculated for the drainage area, the rainfall intensity can be determined from the Intensity-Duration-Frequency Design Chart (Figure A-1).

## APPENDIX A: RATIONAL METHOD AND MODIFIED RATIONAL METHOD




Figure A-1. Intensity-Duration-Frequency Design Chart




Figure A-4. Rational Formula - Overland Time of Flow Nomograph

**Note:** Use formula for watercourse distances in excess of 100 feet.

Type of conveyance is a: Curb Outlet  
Depth of channel equals .25 Feet  
Bottom Width Equals 3  
Side slope equals .01  
Slope of conveyance equals 1.5 %  
Roughness equals .013  
Flow quantity equals .6931499 CFS  
Area equals .2610757 Square Feet  
Velocity equals 2.642912 FPS  
Depth of flow equals .087 Feet

- 25 STORM DRAIN D-3, GURB INLET APRON TYPE B-1 D-16-D-4, D-5, D-6, D-7, D-9
- STORM DRAIN CLEANOUT TYPE A-4, D-4, D-1, D-9
- GRANITY TYPE HEADWALL D-4 D-9
- PIPE COLLAR D-14
- ROCK SLOPE PROTECTION
- PEDESTRIAN RAMP FOR THE HANDICAPPED 6-60-T (REV. 4-8-76)

SPECIFICATIONS

STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DOCUMENT NO. 727731 FILED 4-14-69  
SPECIAL SPECIFICATION NO. 4103

REFERENCE DRAWINGS

STANDARD DRAWINGS OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DOCUMENT NO. 735691 FILED 4-26-71

WATER 3744 W

SEWER 1816-D


SURVEY NOTES:

CHIEF: HATCH

INDEX: 228-1698

W.O. NO. 117354


DATE:



# **DRAINAGE AREA MAPS**

# **PRE-DEVELOPMENT DRAINAGE AREA MAP**

# PRE-CONSTRUCTION DRAINAGE AREA MAP



AREA PC (RED)  
0.3211 AC  
FLOWS TO ALLEY  
BY SHEET FLOW

# **POST-DEVELOPMENT DRAINAGE AREA MAP**



Project Name:

# **Attachment 6**

## **Geotechnical and Groundwater Investigation Report**

Attach project's geotechnical and groundwater investigation report. Refer to Appendix C.4 to determine the reporting requirements.



## **GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION**

NEST at Crown Point Shores  
4033 Lamont Street  
San Diego, California

*prepared for:*

Mr. Tom Paull  
c/o Tim Golba, Golba Architecture, Inc.  
1940 Garnet Avenue, Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92109

*by:*

TerraPacific Consultants, Inc.  
4010 Morena Boulevard, Suite 108  
San Diego, CA 92117

September 22, 2020  
File No. 20-056



Mr. Tom Paull  
c/o Tim Golba, Golba Architecture, Inc.  
1940 Garnet Avenue, Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92109

September 22, 2020  
File No. 20-056

Subject: **Geotechnical Investigation**  
Proposed Multifamily Development – NEST at Crown Point Shores  
4033 Lamont Street  
San Diego, California


Dear Mr. Paull:

In accordance with our proposal, TerraPacific Consultants, Inc. (TCI) has prepared the following report presenting our findings and recommendations from a geotechnical investigation at the subject property. The purpose of the investigation was to evaluate the subsurface conditions at the site and provide recommendations and design parameters for the proposed construction. The following report contains a summary of our findings and recommendations.

We greatly appreciate the opportunity to be of service. If you should have any questions or comments regarding this report or our findings, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,  
**TerraPacific Consultants, Inc.**

  
Christopher C. O'Hern, CEG 2397  
Senior Engineering Geologist



  
Octavio Brambila, PE 70633  
Project Engineer



CCO/OB:gg

Distribution: (3) – Mr. Tim Golba, Golba Architecture, Inc.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	General .....	1
1.2	Scope of Services.....	1
2.0	PROJECT BACKGROUND.....	2
2.1	Site Description and Development History .....	2
2.2	Proposed Development.....	2
3.0	SITE INVESTIGATION.....	2
3.1	Site Reconnaissance .....	2
3.2	Subsurface Exploration.....	2
3.3	Laboratory Testing .....	3
4.0	SITE GEOLOGY.....	3
4.1	Geologic Setting.....	3
4.2	Site Stratigraphy .....	4
4.3	Groundwater .....	4
5.0	SEISMICITY.....	5
5.1	Regional Seismicity.....	5
5.2	Probabilistic Ground Acceleration .....	5
5.3	Hazard Assessment.....	6
6.0	CONCLUSIONS.....	7
7.0	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	7
7.1	Site Preparation and Grading .....	8
7.1.1	Clearing/Grubbing.....	8
7.1.2	Site Grading.....	8
7.1.3	Fill Materials and Compaction Requirements .....	8
7.2	Temporary Excavations .....	8
7.3	Foundation Recommendations.....	9
7.4	Soil Design Criteria.....	9
7.5	Retaining Walls.....	10
7.6	Earthquake Design Parameters.....	11
7.7	Foundation and Retaining Wall Design Guidelines.....	11
7.8	Trench Backfill .....	13
7.9	Pavement.....	13
7.10	Site Drainage.....	14
7.11	Storm Water Infiltration / Percolation BMPs .....	15
7.12	Plan Review and Geotechnical Observation.....	15
8.0	CLOSURE.....	15
8.1	Limits of Investigation.....	15

## APPENDICES

Appendix A: Figures

Appendix B: References

Appendix C: Subsurface Excavation Logs

Appendix D: Laboratory Test Results

Appendix E: Summary of Active Faults

Appendix F: Infiltration Feasibility Condition Letter

Appendix G: Standard Grading Guidelines



## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 General**

The following report presents the findings of a geotechnical investigation performed at 4033 Lamont Street in San Diego, California. The location of the property is presented on the Site Location Plan (Figure 1 in Appendix A). The purpose of the investigation was to evaluate the subsurface conditions at the site in order to provide recommendations and soil design parameters for the proposed construction.

### **1.2 Scope of Services**

The scope of the investigation consisted of field reconnaissance, subsurface exploration, laboratory testing, and engineering and geologic analysis of the obtained data. The following tasks were performed during the investigation and production of this report:

- Site reconnaissance and review of published geologic, seismologic, and geotechnical reports and maps pertinent to the project. A list of references is provided in Appendix B;
- Logging/sampling of three small-diameter borings at the subject property. The Geotechnical Plan (Figure 2 in Appendix A) presents the approximate subsurface exploration locations. The excavation logs are presented in Appendix C;
- Collection of representative soil samples from selected depths within the excavations, which were transported to our laboratory for testing and analysis;
- Laboratory testing of samples collected from the test excavations. The testing included in-situ moisture and density, maximum dry density, direct shear, hydro-response, expansion index, and sulfate and chloride concentration. The laboratory data is presented in Appendix D;
- Engineering and geologic analysis of data acquired from the investigation, which provided the basis for our conclusions and recommendations; and
- Preparation of this report presenting our findings and recommendations.



## **2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND**

### **2.1 Site Description and Development History**

The subject property is located on the east side of Lamont Street in San Diego, California. The legal description of the property is APN 424-431-27, Lots 13-17, Block 1, Map 991 City of San Diego. The trapezoidal-shaped lot is bordered by similarly developed residential properties to the north and south, an alleyway to the east, and Lamont Street to the west. The site is essentially flat with an approximate elevation of 30 feet above mean sea level (MSL). The lot is currently improved with a single-family structure, companion unit, below-ground pool, and associated appurtenances.

### **2.2 Proposed Development**

Based on our review of the concept plans, it is our understanding that the existing improvements on-site are to be razed, and a new three-story, multi-family structure(s), with street level garage and associated appurtenances, are planned.

## **3.0 SITE INVESTIGATION**

The site investigation was conducted on June 5, 2020, and consisted of visual reconnaissance and subsurface exploration. The purpose of the investigation was to gain an understanding of the site configuration and subsurface conditions in the vicinity of the proposed construction.

### **3.1 Site Reconnaissance**

Our site reconnaissance consisted of walking the site to determine if any indications of adverse geologic conditions were present. No outward signs of distress indicating adverse geologic conditions were noted.

### **3.2 Subsurface Exploration**

The subsurface exploration consisted of three small-diameter borings excavated with a truck-mounted rig. The borings, B-1 through B-3, extended to depths ranging from 11.5 to 15.0 feet below ground surface (bgs). The approximate excavation locations are presented on the Geotechnical Plan (Figure 2 in Appendix A). The borings were logged and sampled by licensed professionals from our office.



In general, the subsurface exploration revealed that generally, the site is mantled by undocumented fill soil to approximate 6-foot depths, which is underlain by native marine terrace deposits identified as Old Paralic Deposits, Unit 6. Groundwater was not encountered within the depths of our excavations. Descriptions of each material are detailed in Section 4.2 Site Stratigraphy, and the subsurface excavation logs are provided in Appendix C.

### **3.3 Laboratory Testing**

Soil samples collected during the field exploration were transported to our laboratory for testing. The purpose of the testing was to characterize the soil types and evaluate the engineering properties of the soil. The laboratory testing included in-situ moisture and density, expansion index, maximum dry density, direct shear, hydro-response, and sulfate and chloride concentrations. Each of the laboratory tests was performed in accordance with ASTM specifications or other accepted testing procedures. The results of the laboratory tests are presented in Appendix D.

## **4.0 SITE GEOLOGY**

### **4.1 Geologic Setting**

The site is located within the coastal portion of the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province of California. This province, which extends 900 miles from Southern California to the southern tip of Baja California, is characterized by northwest-trending structural blocks. The coastal portion of the province in San Diego County is typically comprised of upper Cretaceous-aged to Tertiary-aged (1.8 million to 65 million years) marine and non-marine sedimentary bedrock units that have been deposited within a northwest-trending basin known as the San Diego Embayment (Norris & Webb, 1976). Recent geologic uplift along the San Diego coastal margin, combined with sea-level changes, have created marine terraces and associated deposits consisting of near-shore marine, beach estuarine, and lagoonal facies. These deposits range from early to mid-Quaternary-aged (45,000 to 1.5 million years) and are designated in geologic literature as Paralic Deposits.

According to geologic literature from the California Geological Survey (CGS), the site is underlain by Quaternary-aged surficial deposits designated as Old Paralic Deposits, Unit 6. The literature describes the paralic deposits as “poorly sorted, moderately permeable, reddish-brown, inter-fingered strandline, beach, estuarine and colluvial deposits composed of siltstone, sandstone and conglomerate” (Kennedy and Tan, 2008).



Based on the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study Map, the site is located within a Zone 52 – “other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure, low risk.” The site is located on the Geologic Map (Figure 3 in Appendix A) and the Seismic Safety Study Map (Figure 4 in Appendix A).

## **4.2 Site Stratigraphy**

The subsurface descriptions presented below are interpreted from the conditions exposed during the field investigation and/or inferred from local geologic literature. In addition to the following descriptions, detailed exploration logs are presented in Appendix C.

Fill Soil (Af) - Fill soil is earth material that has been placed using mechanical means, such as bulldozers or other large earthmovers. Typically, the fill soil has been removed from topographically high locations and placed in low-lying areas to create level building pads. When properly compacted, fill soil can be used to support structures. However, it is typically more compressible than natural formational soils.

Undocumented fill soils were encountered in each of ground surface borings to approximate 6-foot depths below ground surface (bgs). The fill soils were relatively consistent and generally described as red to yellow-brown, loose to medium dense, dry to moist, clayey sand.

Old Paralic Deposits, Unit 6 (Qop6) – Marine terrace deposits designated Quaternary-aged Old Paralic Deposits, Unit 6, were encountered in each of the borings underlying the fill material. These deposits are associated with the Nestor marine terrace and are approximately 120,000 years old. The material encountered during our exploration was generally described as a medium red-brown to medium yellow-brown, silty sandstone that was slightly moist, dense to very dense, and friable zones.

## **4.3 Groundwater**

Groundwater was not encountered within the depths of our excavations, which extended to depths of 15.0 feet bgs. It should be noted perched groundwater zones could develop during periods of heavy or prolonged rainfall, and/or with changes in site improvements on the subject or adjacent lots, and/or changes in irrigation patterns on the subject or adjacent lots.



## **5.0 SEISMICITY**

### **5.1 Regional Seismicity**

Generally, the seismicity within California can be attributed to the regional tectonic movement taking place along the San Andreas Fault Zone, which includes the San Andreas Fault, and most parallel and sub-parallel faulting within the state. A majority of Southern California, which includes the subject site, is considered seismically active. Seismic hazards can be attributed to potential ground shaking from earthquake events along nearby faults or more distant faulting.

According to regional geologic literature, the closest known active faults are located within the Rose Canyon Fault Zone. The Rose Canyon fault zone consists of a complex zone of several en echelon strike slip, oblique, reverse, and normal faults, which extend onshore in this area from San Diego Bay north to La Jolla Bay. Several other potentially active and pre-Quaternary faults also occur within the regional vicinity. Currently, the geologic literature presents varying opinions regarding the seismicity of these faults. As such, the following Seismic Analysis only considers the effects of nearby faults currently considered active.

### **5.2 Probabilistic Ground Acceleration**

A deterministic seismic hazard analysis was performed for the site using the computer program EQFault (Blake, 2000). The analysis considers the maximum movement magnitude earthquake for active faults within the specified search radius to provide a maximum expected earthquake event for the known tectonic structure. For this site, we specified a search radius of 62.4 miles (100 km) and the attenuation equation of Campbell & Bozorgnia (1997 Rev.) for alluvium. The results of the analysis for the faults most likely to affect the site are presented in Appendix E, Summary of Active Faults.

In addition to the deterministic analysis, a simplified probabilistic seismic hazard analysis was performed for the site. The California Geological Survey has a webpage that allows a user to calculate the ground motion at a site with either a 2 percent or 10 percent probability of exceedance in a 50-year period. The results of the output indicated the site had respective calculated peak ground accelerations of 0.56g and 0.26g.

The values provided above are for comparing the potential for seismic shaking due to fault activity most likely to affect the site. Other factors should be considered when completing seismic design, such as duration of shaking, period of the structure, design category, etc. The design structural engineer should consider the information provided herein and evaluate the structure(s) in accordance with the California Building Code and guidelines of the City of San Diego. The earthquake design parameters based on the 2019 CBC applicable to the site are provided in Section 7.6.



### 5.3 Hazard Assessment

Faulting/Fault Rupture Hazard - An “active” fault, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, is a fault that has had surface rupture within Holocene time (the past 11,000 years). A “potentially active” fault is defined as any fault that showed evidence of surface displacement during Quaternary time (last approximate 1.6 million years), but not since Holocene time.

According to the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study 2008 and the Quaternary Fault Map from the USGS Earthquake Hazards Program, the subject parcel is located approximately 1.3 miles southwest of an “active” portion of the Rose Canyon Fault Zone (Rose Canyon Fault). Several other unnamed faults are mapped nearby. These faults are considered to be older than Quaternary-aged and are classified on the City map as “potentially active, inactive, presumed inactive or activity unknown.” The site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo fault zone, and according to geologic literature, is not intersected by any faults. The site is depicted on the Seismic Safety Study Map (Figure 4 in Appendix A.)

Seismically Induced Settlement - Within the depths of our exploration, the soils encountered consisted of relatively dense formational soils at shallow depths. Based on the anticipated earthquake effect and the stratigraphy of the site, seismically induced settlement is expected to be minor and within tolerable limits. Structures designed and constructed in accordance with applicable building codes are expected to perform well with respect to settlement associated with predictable seismic events.

Liquefaction - Liquefaction involves the substantial loss of shear strength in saturated soil, usually taking place within a saturated medium, exhibiting a uniform fine-grained characteristic, loose consistency, and low confining pressure when subjected to impact by seismic or dynamic loading. Based on the shallow depth to dense formational soil, the site is considered to have a negligible risk for liquefaction.

Lurching and Shallow Ground Rupture - Rupturing of the ground is not likely due to the absence of known active fault traces within the project limits. Due to the generally active seismicity of Southern California, however, the possibility for ground lurching or rupture cannot be completely ruled out. In this light, “flexible” design for on-site utility lines and connections should be considered.

Landsliding - Given the shallow topographic relief of the site and surrounding area, the possibility for landsliding is believed to be negligible. Furthermore, the San Diego Seismic Safety Study does not depict any known landslides in the vicinity of the site.



Tsunamis or Seiches – Tsunamis are great sea waves produced by seismic events. Given the site elevation of approximately 30 feet msl, it is not likely that a tsunami could impact the site. Historically, the magnitudes of tsunamis to impact the San Diego coastline have been fairly small, typically less than 1 meter in height. Recent studies into the possibility of offshore seismic events triggering tsunamis via fault movement or undersea landslides, has experts of the opinion that Southern California is not free from tsunami risks (Krier, 2005). However, predicting the level of risk is difficult, due to the lack of knowledge about the offshore fault system.

In our opinion, there is no practical approach for mitigating the potential impact to the site from a tsunami. This is an inherent risk for those living within the beach area. All residents in coastal areas should have an evacuation plan in place for a strong seismic event (i.e., typically 20 seconds or more of sturdy ground shaking) or when an official tsunami warning is issued.

## **6.0 CONCLUSIONS**

Based on our geotechnical investigation results, it is our opinion that the proposed development is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint, provided the recommendations presented in the following sections are adopted and incorporated into the project plans and specifications.

The following sections provide recommendations for the proposed site development. The civil and/or structural engineer should use this information during the planning and design of the proposed construction. Once the plans and details have been prepared, they should be forwarded to this office for review and comment.

The key aspect of the site, which will need to be considered during the design, is the presence of undocumented fill soil and/or weathered parallic deposits within the upper approximate 6 feet of the site. As a means to provide a uniform engineered fill pad for the site, it is recommended that all undocumented fill be removed, and the removals extend to a minimum depth of 2 feet below the deepest foundation. It is anticipated these depths will be on the order of 6 feet below existing grade. As is always the case, localized areas of deeper removals may be required.

## **7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following sections provide our recommendations for site preparation, design, and construction of the proposed foundation systems. Once the plans and details have been prepared, they should be forwarded to this office for review and comment.



## **7.1 Site Preparation and Grading**

### **7.1.1 Clearing/Grubbing**

In order to prepare the site for the new construction, it is assumed that all of the existing improvements will be demolished and removed from the site. However, if unsuitable materials (e.g., construction debris, plant material, etc.) are encountered during the grading phase, they should be removed and properly disposed of off-site.

### **7.1.2 Site Grading**

Site grading should be conducted to remove the undocumented fill soils and provide a uniform fill mat extending 2 feet below foundation bottom for all structures. As previously mentioned, removals on the order of 6 feet below grade are anticipated. Localized areas of deeper removals may be required.

The removals should extend a minimum of 5 feet beyond the structural footprint, and may be reduced due to property line constraints. Once the removal bottoms into competent parallel deposit soils have been established, the bottoms should be scarified a minimum of 6 inches, moisture-conditioned, and compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction.

### **7.1.3 Fill Materials and Compaction Requirements**

The on-site soil, less any organic debris, may be used for fill, provided that it is placed in thin lifts (not exceeding 8 inches in loose thickness). All soil should be properly moisture conditioned and mechanically compacted to a minimum of 90 percent of the laboratory maximum dry density, per ASTM D-1557, and at or slightly above optimum moisture condition. The removal bottoms, fill placement, and compaction should be observed and tested by the geotechnical consultant. Standard guidelines for grading are provided in Appendix G.

## **7.2 Temporary Excavations**

Foundation excavations, utility trenches, or other temporary vertical cuts may be conducted in fill or formational soils to a maximum height of 4 feet. Any temporary cuts beyond the above height restraint could experience sloughing or caving and, therefore, should either be shored or laid-back. Laid-back slopes should have a maximum inclination of 1:1 (horizontal:vertical) and not exceed a vertical height of 10 feet without further input from the geotechnical consultant. In addition, no excavation should undercut a 1:1 projection below the foundation for any existing improvements, i.e., existing building foundations both on and off-site. Regional safety measures should be enforced, and all excavations should be conducted in strict accordance with OSHA guidelines.



In the event that deeper excavations are required, or excavations encroach into a 1:1 projection from an existing structure, shoring will likely be required. For temporary excavations that will be shored, but not braced with tiebacks or struts, we recommend using a triangular pressure distribution for calculating earth pressures. Cantilevered shoring design may be based on an equivalent fluid pressure of 37 pcf for shoring of fill and native materials. Shoring design should also include any groundwater pressures that may be encountered in the excavation and any additional surcharge loads resulting from loads placed above the excavation and within a 1:1 plane extending upward from the base of the excavation. For design of soldier piles, an allowable passive pressure of 350 psf per foot of embedment may be used.

Excavation spoils should not be stockpiled adjacent to excavations, as they can surcharge the soils and trigger failure. In addition, proper erosion protection, including runoff diversion, is recommended to reduce the possibility of erosion of slopes during grading and building construction. Ultimately, it is the contractor's responsibility to maintain safe working conditions for persons on-site and verify compliance with the project's BMPs.

### **7.3 Foundation Recommendations**

The following sections provide the soil parameters and general guidelines for foundation design and construction. It is anticipated that conventional continuous and spread footings will support all new construction. As mentioned previously, the new foundations should be supported on competent engineered fill in accordance with Section 7.1. If additional parameters are desired, they can be provided on request.

The foundation design parameters and guidelines provided below are considered to be "minimums" in keeping with the current standard-of-practice. They do not preclude more restrictive criteria that may be required by the governing agency or structural engineer. The architect or structural engineer should evaluate the foundation configurations and reinforcement requirements for structural loading, concrete shrinkage, and temperature stress.

### **7.4 Soil Design Criteria**

The following separate soil design criteria are provided for design and construction of the conventional foundations for building structures. The parameters provided assume foundation embedment in competent engineered fill material with an expansion index classification as low.



### Conventional Foundations

Allowable bearing capacity for square or continuous footings.....2,000 psf

Minimum embedment in competent engineered fill .....24 inches

Minimum width for continuous footings.....18 inches

Minimum width for square footings ..... 3.0 feet

Note: The bearing capacity value may be increased by one-third for transient loads such as wind and seismic. In addition, the value provided may be increased by 500 psf for each additional foot of width or depth beyond the minimums provided. The increased bearing capacity should not exceed 4,000 psf.

Coefficient of friction against sliding .....0.35

Passive resistance .....250 psf/ft up to a maximum of 2,000 psf

## **7.5     Retaining Walls**

### Lateral Loading and Resistance Parameters

For retaining walls, the bearing capacity and foundation dimensions provided for Section 7.4 may be followed. Additional design parameters for lateral loading and resistance are provided below:

Active earth pressure for level backfill (non-restrained walls) ..... 38 psf/ft

At-rest earth pressure for level backfill (restrained walls) ..... 58 psf/ft

Note: The active and at-rest pressures are provided assuming granular soil is used for backfill. Backfill and subdrain recommendations are provided in the following sections.

Passive resistance in competent fill ..... 300 psf/ft

Coefficient of friction against sliding .....0.35

Note: The passive resistance and friction coefficient may be used in combination if there is a fixed structure, such as a floor slab at the toe of the retaining wall. If the two values are used in combination, the passive resistance value should be reduced by one third.



## Earthquake Loads

Seismic loading for retaining walls with level backfill should be approximated by applying a 16 psf/ft in an inverse triangle shape, where the lateral force at the bottom of the wall is equal to zero, and the lateral force at the top of the retaining wall is equal to 16 psf times the height of the wall. The resultant seismic load should be applied from the bottom of the wall a distance of 0.6 times the overall height of the wall.

The seismic loads would be in addition to the normal earth pressure loads applied to the retaining walls, which are provided above. The structural engineer should evaluate the overall height of the wall and apply the appropriate retaining wall loading parameters to be used for analysis and design.

### **7.6 Earthquake Design Parameters**

Earthquake resistant design parameters may be determined from the California Building Code (2019 Edition). Based on our investigation and characterization of the site, the following design parameters may be adopted:

Site coordinates .....	Latitude: 32.7943, Longitude: -117.2330
Site classification .....	D
Site coefficient $F_a$ .....	1.200
Site coefficient $F_v$ .....	xx
Spectral response acceleration at short periods $S_s$ .....	1.366
Spectral response acceleration at 1-second period $S_1$ .....	0.474
Maximum spectral response accelerations at short periods $S_{ms}$ .....	1.640
Maximum spectral response accelerations at 1-second period $S_{m1}$ .....	xx
Design spectral response accelerations at short periods $S_d$ .....	1.093
Design spectral response accelerations at 1-second period $S_{d1}$ .....	xx

### **7.7 Foundation and Retaining Wall Design Guidelines**

The following guidelines are provided for assistance in the design of the various foundation elements and are based on the anticipated low expansion potential of the bearing soils. As is always the case, where more restrictive, the structural and/or architectural design criteria should take precedent.



Foundations - Continuous exterior and interior footings for the buildings should be a minimum of 24 inches deep. Reinforcement should consist of a minimum of four No. 5 rebar, two placed at the top, and two at the bottom of the footing. All footing embedments should be verified by the soil engineer.

Slabs-on-Grade - Interior and exterior slabs-on-grade should be a minimum of 5 inches thick (net) and reinforced with No. 4 rebar placed at a maximum spacing of 16 inches on center, both ways. The steel reinforcement should be placed at the midpoint or slightly above the midpoint in the slab section. For exterior slabs, control joints should be installed at a maximum spacing of 10 feet in each direction. Prior to the construction of slabs, the subgrade should be moistened to approximately 12 inches in depth at least 24 hours before placing the concrete.

All interior floor slabs should be underlain by 2 inches of clean sand, followed by a minimum 15-mil PVC vapor retarder (Stego Wrap or similar). The vapor retarder should be further underlain by a 4-inch thick layer of gravel or crushed rock. Also, the vapor retarder should be properly lapped and sealed around all plumbing penetrations.

Retaining Walls - Retaining walls should be provided with a gravel subdrain system. The drain system should start with a minimum 4-inch diameter perforated PVC Schedule 40 or ABS pipe, which is placed at the heel of the wall footing and below the adjacent slab level. The pipe should be sloped at least 1 percent to a suitable outlet, such as an approved site drainage system or off-site storm drain. The pipe should be surrounded by a gravel backfill consisting of tamped  $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch sized gravel. This gravel backfill zone should be a minimum of 12 inches wide and should extend from slightly below the drainpipe up to approximately two-thirds of wall height. The entire gravel section should be wrapped in a filter cloth such as Mirafi 140 NS or similar to prevent contamination with fines. Alternatively, walls can be drained using geo-composite panel drains that connect to a gravel sub-drain at the heel of the wall. In addition, the wall should be properly moisture proofed per the project architect. See the Retaining Wall Drain Details (Figure 5 in Appendix A).

Foundation and Slab Concrete - The results of the corrosion tests indicate negligible levels of sulfates and chlorides within the sample tested. However, due to the coastal location, it is recommended that the concrete used for foundation elements contain Type V cement. The concrete should be mixed and placed in accordance with ACI specifications. Water should not be added to the concrete at the site, as this can reduce the mix and lead to increased porosity and shrinkage cracking.



Proper curing techniques and a reduction in mixing water can help reduce cracking and concrete permeability. In order to further reduce shrinkage cracking and slab permeability, consideration should be given to using a concrete mix that possesses a maximum water-cement ratio of 0.5.

It should be noted that TCI does not consult in the field of corrosion engineering. Thus, the client project architect and project engineer should evaluate the level of corrosion protection required for the project and seek consultation from a qualified professional, as warranted.

Appurtenances - Other site appurtenances such as planter walls, site walls, etc., can be constructed on continuous footings. Footings for such appurtenances should be a minimum of 18 inches deep, 12 inches wide, and minimally reinforced with four No. 4 bars, two top, and two bottom. The bearing capacity for such appurtenances is 1,500 psf.

## **7.8 Trench Backfill**

Trench excavations for utility lines should be properly backfilled and compacted. Utilities should be properly bedded and backfilled with clean sand or approved granular soil to a depth of at least 1 foot over the pipe. This backfill should be uniformly watered and compacted to a firm condition for vertical and lateral pipe support. The remainder of the backfill may be typical on-site soil or low-expansive import placed near optimum moisture content in lifts not exceeding 8 inches in thickness and mechanically compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction.

## **7.9 Pavement**

The following pavement sections are provided for the new pavements associated with the proposed improvements. Subgrade preparation should be conducted immediately prior to placement of the pavement section. As a minimum, the upper 12 inches of subgrade in the proposed pavement area should be removed and properly re-compacted to 95 percent relative compaction and moisture-conditioned to at least 2 percent over the optimum moisture content (per ASTM D-1557).

It is assumed that the proposed driveway will receive light vehicle traffic, etc. The following pavement sections are recommended based on an assumed R-value of 5 and in accordance with the Caltrans Highway Design Manual and the Flexible Pavement Structural Section Design Guide for California Cities and Counties (3rd edition). Concrete pavement sections were determined utilizing the Design of Concrete Pavement for City Streets by Portland Cement Association.



Assumed Traffic Index	Assumed R-Value	Asphalt Concrete	Aggregate Base (Class II)
Asphalt Pavement Section - Driveway			
5.0	5	3.0 inches	10.0 inches
Concrete Pavement Section - Driveway			
5.0	5	6.0 inches	4.0 inches

Final pavement designs should be determined based on testing of the soils exposed at the completion of the finished grading.

Concrete should be reinforced at a minimum with No. 4 rebar at 18 inches on center, each way, placed at the midpoint of the section. Additionally, control joints should be saw-cut a minimum of 2.5 inches deep longitudinally at 10-foot maximum spacing, and transversely at 10-foot maximum spacing. The concrete should be placed in conformance with ACI standards and have a minimum modulus of rupture of 500 psi.

Aggregate base should conform to the specifications for crushed aggregate base, crushed miscellaneous base, or processed miscellaneous base as defined in Section 200-2 of the "Greenbook." Aggregate base should be compacted to at least 95 percent of maximum dry density based on ASTM D-1557 guidelines. Asphalt concrete should conform to "Greenbook" specifications. Asphalt concrete should be compacted to at least 95 percent based on the Hveem unit weight.

#### **7.10 Site Drainage**

Drainage should be designed to direct surface water away from structures and on to an approved disposal area. A minimum gradient of 2 percent should be maintained for earth areas, with drainage directed towards approved collection facilities. In order to reduce saturation of the building foundation soils, positive drainage should be maintained within an away gradient of at least 5 percent for a minimum distance of 10 feet from foundations. Where property line constraints prohibit this distance, a 5 percent gradient to an approved drainage diversion (i.e., area drains or swales) should be provided. Impervious surfaces within 10 feet of the building foundation should be sloped a minimum of 2 percent away from the building. Drainage patterns approved after grading should be maintained throughout the life of the development. It is also recommended that roof gutters be installed with downspouts tied into the tightlined area drain system.



### **7.11 Storm Water Infiltration / Percolation BMPs**

The existing site configuration consists of undocumented fill soils associated with initial site development, which mantles the site. Site-specific sub-surface exploration encountered existing conditions with fill soils in excess of 6 feet in thickness. Areas with even greater depths of undocumented fill are anticipated to exist on-site. Site infiltration would likely induce settlement and/or volume change within the existing undocumented fill; as such, the site would be considered a no-filtration site.

As is always the case, site infiltration near proposed improvements (structures and appurtenances) would negatively impact potential settlement and/or heave of the supporting fill and underlying native soils. Due to these potential negative impacts, the site is not considered feasible for infiltration. A Feasibility Condition Letter is provided within Appendix F.

### **7.12 Plan Review and Geotechnical Observation**

When the grading and foundation plans are completed, they should be reviewed by TCI for compliance with the recommendations herein. Observation by TCI, or another company's geotechnical representative is essential during grading and/or construction to confirm conditions anticipated by the preliminary investigation, adjust designs to actual field conditions, and determine that grading is conducted in general accordance with our recommendations. In addition, all foundation excavations should be reviewed for conformance with the plans prior to the placement of forms, reinforcement, or concrete. Observation, testing, and engineering consulting services are provided by our firm and should be budgeted within the cost of development.

## **8.0 CLOSURE**

### **8.1 Limits of Investigation**

Our investigation was performed using the skill and degree of care ordinarily exercised, under similar circumstances, by reputable soils engineers and engineering geologists practicing in this or similar localities. No warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the conclusions and professional advice in this report. This report is prepared for the sole use of our client and may not be assigned to others without the written consent of the client and TCI.



The samples taken and used for testing, and the observations made, are believed representative of the site conditions; however, soil and geologic conditions can vary significantly between test excavations and surface exposures. As in most projects, conditions revealed by construction excavations may vary with the preliminary findings. If this occurs, the geotechnical engineer should evaluate the changed conditions and adjust recommendations and designs, as necessary.

This report is issued with the understanding that it is the responsibility of the owner or of their representative to ensure that the information and recommendations contained herein are brought to the attention of the project architect and engineer. Appropriate recommendations should be incorporated into the structural plans and the necessary steps taken to see that the contractor and subcontractors carry out such recommendations in the field.

The findings of this report are valid as of the present date. However, the conditions can change with the passage of time, whether they are due to natural processes or the works of man. In addition, changes in applicable or appropriate standards may occur from legislation or the broadening of knowledge. Accordingly, the findings of this report may be invalidated wholly or partially by changes outside of our control. This report is subject to review and should be updated after a period of 3 years.




**\* \* \* TerraPacific Consultants, Inc. \* \* \***



## **APPENDIX A**

### **Figures**


LOCATION:  
4033-4039 Lamont Street,  
San Diego, CA



REFERENCE: Google Maps



REFERENCE:  
Preliminary Grading Plan. Sheet C-2, Original Date, Sept. 7, 2020  
prepared by Christensen Engineering & Surveying



LEGEND

B-3

⊕


Approximate location of boring by TerraPacific Consultants, Inc.

Af

(Qop<sub>6</sub>)

Artificial fill

Quaternary-aged Old Paralic Deposits, Unit 6 (bracketed where buried)




Compiled by  
Michael P. Kennedy and Siang S. Tan  
2008  
**San Diego Quadrangle**

1. U.S. Geological Survey, Department of Earth Sciences, University of California, Riverside


Description of Map Units

**Qop6** Old paralic deposits, Unit 6 (late to middle Pleistocene)—Mostly poorly sorted, moderately permeable, reddish-brown, interfingering strandline, beach, estuarine and colluvial deposits composed of siltstone, sandstone and conglomerate. These deposits rest on the 22-23 m Nestor terrace (Fig. 3)






## ROCK & FABRIC ALTERNATIVE



## PANEL DRAIN ALTERNATIVE



### NOTES:

- 1) Perforated pipe should outlet through to a solid pipe at maximum 25 foot centers to a free gravity outfall. Perforated pipe and outlet pipe should have a fall of at least 1%.
- 2) Filter fabric should consist of Mirafi 140N or similar approved fabric. Filter fabric should be overlapped at least 6-inches.
- 3) Geocomposite panel drain should consist of Miradrain 6000, Mirafi G100N, J-Drain 400, or approved similar product.
- 4) Drain installation should be observed by the geotechnical consultant prior to backfilling.

NOT TO SCALE



## **APPENDIX B**

### **References**

## REFERENCES



- 1) American Society of Civil Engineers, Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures, ASCE Standard 7-05, 2006.
- 2) American Society for Testing and Materials, Annual Books of ASTM Standards, Section 4, Construction, Volume 04.08 Soil and Rock (I): D 420 – D 4914, West Conshohocken, PA, 2008.
- 3) Bing or Google, 2020, Site Location Map for 4033 Lamont Street, San Diego, CA 92109.
- 4) Blake, T.F., EQFAULT, EQSEARCH, FRISK: Computer Programs for Estimation of Peak Horizontal Acceleration from Southern California Historic Earthquakes, 2000.
- 5) Bowles, Joseph E., 1982, Foundation Analysis and Design, Third Edition.
- 6) City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study, 2008, Sheet 25.
- 7) California Building Standards Commission, California Building Code, 2019 Edition.
- 8) California Department of Conservation, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act with Index to Earthquake Fault Zones Maps, Special Publication 42, California Geological Survey, Interim Revision 2007.
- 9) California Geological Survey, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, Special Publication 117, 2008.
- 10) California Geological Survey, Probabilistic Seismic Hazards Mapping Ground Motion Page, California Geological Survey website.
- 11) Christensen Engineering and Surveying, Site Plan for 4033 Lamont Street, San Diego, California 92109, dated April 2, 2020, Preliminary Grading Plan, dated September 7, 2020.
- 12) Coduto, Donald P., 2001, Foundation Design Principals and Practice, Second Edition.
- 13) Golba Architecture, Site Plan, NEST at Crown Point Shores, Sheet A0.0, undated.
- 14) Harden, D., California Geology, 1997.
- 15) Jennings, C.W., 1994, Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas, California Division of Mines and Geology, Map No. 6, Scale 1:750,000.
- 16) Kennedy, Michael P. and Peterson, G.L., 2001 Re-Print, Geology of San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, California Department of Conservatory Division of Mines and Geology, Bulletin 200.

## REFERENCES



- 17) Kennedy, M.P. and Tan, S.S., 2008, Geologic Map of the San Diego 30' by 60' Quadrangle, California, California Geological Survey, Regional Geologic Map Series, 1:100,000 Scale, Map No. 3, San Diego Quadrangle.
- 18) Krier, Robert, July 6, 2005, Wave Warning, Tsunami Risk on San Diego Coast Could Be Higher Than Previously Thought, San Diego Union Tribune Article.
- 19) Leyendecker, Frankel, and Rukstales, Earthquake Ground Motion Parameters Version 5.0.9a, dated November 13, 2009.
- 20) Norris, Robert M. and Webb, Robert W., 1976, Geology of California, John Wiley & Sons.
- 21) Structural Engineers Association of California, Seismic Design Maps, 2020.
- 22) Treiman, J.A., The Rose Canyon Fault Zone, Southern California, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, DMG open-file report 93-02, 1993.
- 23) United States Geological Survey, California-Nevada Active Faults Index Map, <http://quake.wr.usgs.gov/info/faultmaps/index.html>.
- 24) United States Geological Survey, Earthquake Hazards Program, Seismic Hazards Maps and Data, <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards>.
- 25) United States Geological Survey, Earthquake Hazards Program, 2010 Fault Activity Map of California, <http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/FAM/faultactivitymap.html>.
- 26) Wesnousky, S.G., 1986, Earthquakes, Quaternary Faults and Seismic Hazard in California, Journal of Geophysical Research, Vol. 91, No. B12, pp. 2587-2631.



## **APPENDIX C**

### **Subsurface Excavation Logs**

## Subsurface Boring Log

Boring No: B-1

**Project No:** 20-056

**Project Name:** Lamont Units

**Location:** 4033 Lamont Street

**Sample Method:** Modified California Sampler

**Instrumentation:** None installed

**Elevation:** F.S.

**Date:** 6/5/20

**Logged By:** O. Brambila

**Drilling Company:** Native Drilling

**Driller:** Gabriel

**Drill Rig Type:** Tripod

**Hammer Wt. & Drop:** 140 lbs. for 30"

Depth (ft)	Lithology	DESCRIPTION & REMARKS	USCS	Sample Type	Blow Counts (6", 12", 18")	Dry Density (pcf)	Moisture (%)
0		FILL: From 0.0', Silty sand, red brown, moist, loose, few roots in upper foot		Bulk	--	--	--
				Ring	3/5/8	--	--
5		From 4.5', Sandy clay, gray brown to orange brown, moist to very moist, soft to firm		Ring	6/9/11	--	--
		From 5.3', Silty sand, orange brown to yellow brown, moist, loose to medium dense		Bulk	--	--	--
		NATIVE (Old Paralic Deposits, Unit 6): From 6.2', Silty sandstone, light orange, moist, medium dense, slightly weathered					
		From 7.5', Sandstone, light yellow brown to orange brown, slightly moist, dense, fine to medium grained					
10				Ring	8/13/18	--	--
		From 12.0', Sandstone, orange brown, slightly moist, dense, with gravel, medium to coarse gravel, difficult auger through gravelly zone					
				Ring	17/16/20/23	--	--
		From 14.0', Sandstone, light tan, slightly moist, dense					
15							

**Total Depth:** 15.0'

**Water:** No

**Caving:** No

**Hole Diameter:** 6"

**Boring**

**B-1**

## Subsurface Boring Log

Boring No: B-2

<b>Project No:</b> 20-056	<b>Date:</b> 6/5/20
<b>Project Name:</b> Lamont Units	<b>Logged By:</b> O. Brambila
<b>Location:</b> 4033 Lamont	<b>Drilling Company:</b> Native Drilling
<b>Sample Method:</b> Modified California Sampler	<b>Driller:</b> Gabriel
<b>Instrumentation:</b> None installed	<b>Drill Rig Type:</b> Tripod
<b>Elevation:</b> F.S.	<b>Hammer Wt. &amp; Drop:</b> 140 lbs. for 30"

Depth (ft)	Lithology	DESCRIPTION & REMARKS	USCS	Sample Type	Blow Counts (6", 12", 18")	Dry Density (pcf)	Moisture (%)
0		FILL: From 0.0', Silty sand, medium brown, dry, loose to medium dense					
5		NATIVE (Old Paralic Deposits, Unit 6): From 5.0', Silty sandstone, red brown, moist, medium dense to dense, slightly weathered, trace of clay		Ring / Bulk	11/15/16	--	--
		@ 8.0', Becomes very dense					
10		From 11.0', Silty sandstone, red brown, moist, very dense, some gravel		Ring	7/11/28	--	--
15							

<b>Total Depth:</b> 11.5'	<b>Boring</b>
<b>Water:</b> No	<b>B-2</b>
<b>Caving:</b> No	
<b>Hole Diameter:</b> --	Page 1 of 1



## Subsurface Boring Log

Boring No: B-3

**Project No:** 20-056

**Project Name:** Lamont Units

**Location:** 4033 Lamont

**Sample Method:** Modified California Sampler

**Instrumentation:** None installed

**Elevation:** F.S.

**Date:** 6/5/20

**Logged By:** O. Brambila

**Drilling Company:** Native Drilling

**Driller:** Gabriel

**Drill Rig Type:** Tripod

**Hammer Wt. & Drop:** 140 lbs. for 30"

Depth (ft)	Lithology	DESCRIPTION & REMARKS	USCS	Sample Type	Blow Counts (6", 12", 18")	Dry Density (pcf)	Moisture (%)
0		FILL: From 0.0', Clayey sand, red brown, very moist, loose, abundant roots in upper 2'-3"					
5		NATIVE (Old Paralac Deposits, Unit 6): From 5.1', Silty sandstone, red brown to orange brown, moist, dense, friable		Ring	5/6/10	--	--
10		From 9.0', Sandstone, light tan, moist, dense, friable		Ring	9/15/28	--	--
15							

**Total Depth:** 12.5'

**Water:** No

**Caving:** No

**Hole Diameter:** 6"

**Boring**

**B-3**

Page 1 of 1





## **APPENDIX D**

### **Laboratory Test Results**



**DIRECT SHEAR TEST**  
Laboratory Report

File Name: Lamont St  
File No.: 20-056  
Date: 6/11/2020  
Technician: JMS



Sample No.& Location:	B-1 @ 0-5'			
Soil Description:	Medium Brown Silty Sand w/ Clay			
Sample Type:	Intact			
Specimen Preparation:	Inundated			

	Peak	Ultimate
Friction Angle $\Phi'$ (deg)	37	37
Cohesion $C'$ (psf)	160	85

# COMPACTION TEST

**ASTM D 1557  
Modified Proctor**

Project Name: Lamont St.  
Project No. : 20-056  
Boring No.: B-1 @ 0-5'  
Technician: JMS  
Date: 6/11/2020

Visual Sample Description: Red Brown Silty Sand w/Clay


**X** **Manual Ram**

*Ram Weight 10 LBS Drop 18 inches*

	TEST NO.	1	2	3	4	5	6
<b>A</b>	Wt. Comp. Soil + Mold (gm.)	3871.00	3928.00	3883.00	3932.00		
<b>B</b>	Wt. of Mold (gm.)	1794.00	1794.00	1794.00	1794.00		
<b>C</b>	Net Wt. of Soil (gm.)	<b>A - B</b>	2077.00	2134.00	2089.00	2138.00	
<b>D</b>	Wet Wt. of Soil + Cont. (gm.)		1746.5	1773.0	1545.9	1575.6	
<b>E</b>	Dry Wt. of Soil + Cont. (gm.)		1634.7	1646.6	1403.4	1454.5	
<b>F</b>	Wt. of Container (gm.)		193.8	301.6	187.9	301.3	
<b>G</b>	Moisture Content (%)	$[(D-F)-(E-F))/(E-F)] \times 100$	7.8	9.4	11.7	10.5	
<b>H</b>	Wet Density (pcf)	$C \times 29.76 / 453.6$	136.3	140.0	137.1	140.3	
<b>I</b>	Dry Density (pcf)	$H / (1 + G/100)$	126.5	128.0	122.7	126.9	

Maximum Dry Density (pcf) **128.0**

**9.5**



## PROCEDURE USED

### Procedure A

Soil Passing No. 4 (4.75 mm) Sieve  
Mold : 4 in. (101.6 mm) diameter  
Layers : 5 (Five)  
Blows per layer : 25 (twenty-five)  
May be used if No.4 retained < 25%

\*Remove excess soil and dr on rammer between lifts



## **APPENDIX E**

### **Summary of Active Faults**

20-056.OUT

```
*****
*                               *
*   E Q F A U L T             *
*                               *
*   Version 3.00               *
*                               *
*****
```

DETERMINISTIC ESTIMATION OF  
PEAK ACCELERATION FROM DIGITIZED FAULTS

JOB NUMBER: 20-056

DATE: 06-24-2020

JOB NAME: Lamont Units

CALCULATION NAME: 20-056

FAULT-DATA-FILE NAME: C:\Program Files\EQFAULT1\CDMGFLTE\_new.dat

SITE COORDINATES:

SITE LATITUDE: 32.7943

SITE LONGITUDE: 117.2330

SEARCH RADIUS: 62.4 mi

ATTENUATION RELATION: 14) Campbell & Bozorgnia (1997 Rev.) - Alluvium

UNCERTAINTY (M=Median, S=Sigma): M Number of Sigmas: 0.0

DISTANCE MEASURE: cdist

SCOND: 0

Basement Depth: 5.00 km Campbell SSR: 0 Campbell SHR: 0

COMPUTE PEAK HORIZONTAL ACCELERATION

FAULT-DATA FILE USED: C:\Program Files\EQFAULT1\CDMGFLTE\_new.dat

MINIMUM DEPTH VALUE (km): 3.0

-----  
EQFAULT SUMMARY  
-----

-----  
DETERMINISTIC SITE PARAMETERS  
-----

Page 1

ABBREVIATED FAULT NAME	APPROXIMATE DISTANCE mi (km)	ESTIMATED MAX. EARTHQUAKE EVENT		
		MAXIMUM EARTHQUAKE MAG. (Mw)	PEAK SITE ACCEL. g	EST. SITE INTENSITY MOD. MERC.
ROSE CANYON	1.3( 2.1)	7.2	0.510	X
CORONADO BANK	12.0( 19.3)	7.6	0.343	IX
NEWPORT-INGLEWOOD (offshore)	27.5( 44.3)	7.1	0.111	VII
ELSINORE-JULIAN	39.9( 64.2)	7.1	0.070	VI
ELSINORE-TEMECULA	42.3( 68.0)	6.8	0.050	VI
EARTHQUAKE VALLEY	46.4( 74.7)	6.5	0.034	V
ELSINORE-COYOTE MOUNTAIN	52.0( 83.7)	6.8	0.038	V
PALOS VERDES	53.1( 85.5)	7.1	0.049	VI
ELSINORE-GLEN IVY	59.0( 95.0)	6.8	0.033	V
SAN JACINTO-ANZA	62.1( 100.0)	7.2	0.043	VI
SAN JACINTO-COYOTE CREEK	62.2( 100.1)	6.8	0.030	V

\*\*\*\*\*


-END OF SEARCH- 11 FAULTS FOUND WITHIN THE SPECIFIED SEARCH RADIUS.

THE ROSE CANYON FAULT IS CLOSEST TO THE SITE.  
IT IS ABOUT 1.3 MILES (2.1 km) AWAY.

LARGEST MAXIMUM-EARTHQUAKE SITE ACCELERATION: 0.5102 g

# CALIFORNIA FAULT MAP

Lamont Units





## **APPENDIX F**

### **Infiltration Feasibility Condition Letter**



Mr. Tim Golba  
Golba Architecture Inc.  
1940 Garnet Avenue, Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92109

September 22, 2020  
File No. 20-056

Subject: **Infiltration Feasibility Condition Letter**  
NEST at Crown Point Shores  
4033 Lamont Street  
San Diego, California

References: 1) "Geotechnical Investigation, NEST at Crown Point Shores, 4033 Lamont Street, San Diego, California," by TerraPacific Consultants, Inc., dated September 22, 2020.  
2) "Storm Water Standards," City of San Diego, dated October 2018.  
3) "Preliminary Grading Plan, 4033 Lamont Street, San Diego, CA," by Christensen Engineering and Survey, dated September 7, 2020.

Dear Mr. Golba:

The following updated letter provides our opinions regarding site infiltration for the proposed development at the subject project. For simplicity, we are addressing each bullet item as indicated in Section C.1.1, in the October 2018 edition of the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards BMP Design Manual.

- A preliminary geotechnical investigation was conducted by our firm during the initial design phase of the project; this investigation report is referenced above.
- The geotechnical investigation revealed site topography is gently generally flat, with an approximate elevation of 30' msl. Site stratigraphy consists of poorly consolidated undocumented fill soil mantling the site. Native paralic deposits underlie the fill soils. Based on the site-specific exploration, which included numerous borings, existing undocumented fill soils in excess of 6 feet in thickness, were encountered. Localized areas of existing undocumented fill soils of in excess of 6-foot thickness are also expected to underlie the site.
- The site is currently developed with residential structures and other appurtenances; undocumented fill soils from initial site development blanket the site.
- The current design footprint is consistent with the initial concept design due to the limited lot size and dimensions. The proposed development will consist of multi-family structures over an on-grade parking garage, which will utilize the entire lot. Retaining walls near the property lines will accommodate the proposed grade changes.



- Due to the limited lot size and proposed improvement footprint, which utilizes the entire lot, partial or full infiltration is not feasible, as adequate setbacks cannot be established.
- The physical impairment associated with the limited lot size and proposed improvement footprint prevents full/partial infiltration.
- The existing site configuration consists of undocumented fill soils blanketing the site. Undocumented fill soils with depths in excess of 6 feet were encountered during our site-specific investigation, including in numerous borings. These soils are not considered suitable for support of the proposed improvements (structures and appurtenances). Proposed cut areas near property lines will require retaining walls to accommodate the grade changes. As is always the case, infiltration can induce soil settlement and volume change that would adversely impact the proposed improvements which utilize the entire lot footprint.
- The site design BMP requirements appear to be adequately addressed in the overall design by the project civil engineer. The referenced Grading Plan, attached within this letter, was utilized as a base map for the Geotechnical Plan, Figure 2.
- Based on our referenced site-specific geotechnical investigation, infiltration is not considered feasible from a geotechnical standpoint, due to the negative impacts on proposed improvements (structures and appurtenances) that would result from infiltration and associated soil volume changes.
- The Geotechnical Plan, Figure 2, and Preliminary Grading Plan, depict the site design and are provided in the attachment within this letter.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Respectfully submitted,  
**TerraPacific Consultants, Inc.**

Cristopher C. O'Hern, CEG 2397  
Senior Engineering Geologist



Octavio Brambila, PE 70633  
Project Engineer






**ATTACHMENT**

**Geotechnical Plan**

REFERENCE:  
Preliminary Grading Plan. Sheet C-2, Original Date, Sept. 7, 2020  
prepared by Christensen Engineering & Surveying



### LEGEND

**B-3** 

Approximate location of boring by TerraPacific Consultants, Inc.

Af

Artificial fill

(Qop<sub>6</sub>)

Quaternary-aged Old Paralic Deposits, Unit 6 (bracketed where buried)

↑

0 10 20  
APPROX. SCALE IN FEET



## **APPENDIX G**

### **Standard Grading Guidelines**

# **STANDARD GUIDELINES FOR GRADING PROJECTS**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
GENERAL.....	G-1
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS.....	G-1
OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES .....	G-4
SITE PREPARATION.....	G-4
SITE PROTECTION .....	G-5
EXCAVATIONS.....	G-6
Unsuitable Materials .....	G-6
Cut Slopes.....	G-6
Pad Areas.....	G-6
COMPACTED FILL .....	G-7
Placement .....	G-7
Moisture .....	G-8
Fill Material .....	G-8
Fill Slopes .....	G-10
Off-Site Fill .....	G-11
DRAINAGE.....	G-11
STAKING .....	G-11
SLOPE MAINTENANCE .....	G-12
Landscape Plants.....	G-12
Irrigation.....	G-12
Maintenance .....	G-12
Repairs .....	G-12
TRENCH BACKFILL .....	G-13
STATUS OF GRADING.....	G-13

## **GENERAL**

The guidelines contained herein and the standard details attached hereto represent this firm's standard recommendations for grading and other associated operations on construction projects. These guidelines should be considered a portion of the project specifications.

All plates attached hereto shall be considered as part of these guidelines.

The Contractor should not vary from these guidelines without prior recommendation by the Geotechnical Consultant and the approval of the Client or his authorized representative. Recommendation by the Geotechnical Consultant and/or Client should not be considered to preclude requirements for approval by the controlling agency prior to the execution of any changes.

These Standard Grading Guidelines and Standard Details may be modified and/or superseded by recommendations contained in the text of the preliminary geotechnical report and/or subsequent reports.

If disputes arise out of the interpretation of these grading guidelines or standard details, the Geotechnical Consultant shall provide the governing interpretation.

## **DEFINITIONS OF TERMS**

**ALLUVIUM** - Unconsolidated soil deposits resulting from flow of water, including sediments deposited in river beds, canyons, flood plains, lakes, fans and estuaries.

**AS-GRADED (AS-BUILT)** - The surface and subsurface conditions at completion of grading.

**BACKCUT** - A temporary construction slope at the rear of earth retaining structures such as buttresses, shear keys, stabilization fills or retaining walls.

**BACKDRAIN** - Generally a pipe and gravel or similar drainage system placed behind earth retaining structures such buttresses, stabilization fills, and retaining walls.

**BEDROCK** - Relatively undisturbed formational rock, more or less solid, either at the surface or beneath superficial deposits of soil.

**BENCH** - A relatively level step and near vertical rise excavated into sloping ground on which fill is to be placed.

**BORROW (Import)** - Any fill material hauled to the project site from off-site areas.

**BUTTRESS FILL** - A fill mass, the configuration of which is designed by engineering calculations to retain slope conditions containing adverse geologic features. A buttress is generally specified by minimum key width and depth and by maximum backcut angle. A buttress normally contains a back-drainage system.

**CIVIL ENGINEER** - The Registered Civil Engineer or consulting firm responsible for preparation of the grading plans, surveying and verifying as-graded topographic conditions.

**CLIENT** - The Developer or his authorized representative who is chiefly in charge of the project. He shall have the responsibility of reviewing the findings and recommendations made by the Geotechnical Consultant and shall authorize the Contractor and/or other consultants to perform work and/or provide services.

**COLLUVIUM** - Generally loose deposits usually found near the base of slopes and brought there chiefly by gravity through slow continuous downhill creep (also see Slope Wash).

**COMPACTION** - Densification of man-placed fill by mechanical means.

**CONTRACTOR** - A person or company under contract or otherwise retained by the Client to perform demolition, grading and other site improvements.

**DEBRIS** - All products of clearing, grubbing, demolition, contaminated soil materials unsuitable for reuse as compacted fill and/or any other material so designated by the Geotechnical Consultant.

**ENGINEERING GEOLOGIST** - A licensed Engineering Geologist who applies scientific methods, engineering and geologic principles and professional experience to the acquisition, interpretation and use of knowledge of materials of the earth's crust for the evaluation of engineering problems. Geotechnical Engineering encompasses many of the engineering aspects of soil mechanics, rock mechanics, geology, geophysics, hydrology and related sciences.

**ENGINEERED FILL** - A fill of which the Geotechnical Consultant or his representative, during grading, has made sufficient tests to enable him to conclude that the fill has been placed in substantial compliance with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Consultant and the governing agency requirements.

**EROSION** - The wearing away of the ground surface as a result of the movement of wind and/or water.

**EXCAVATION** - The mechanical removal of earth materials.

**EXISTING GRADE** - The ground surface configuration prior to grading.

**FILL** - Any deposits of soil, rock, soil-rock blends or other similar materials placed by man.

**FINISH GRADE** - The ground surface configuration at which time the surface elevations conform to the approved plan.

**GEOFABRIC** - Any engineering textile utilized in geotechnical applications including subgrade stabilization and filtering.

**GEOLOGIST** - A representative of the Geotechnical Consultant educated and trained in the field of geology.

**GEOTECHNICAL CONSULTANT** - The Geotechnical Engineering and Engineering Geology consulting firm retained to provide technical services for the project. For the purpose of these specifications, observations by the Geotechnical Consultant include observations by the Soil Engineer, Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist and those performed by persons employed by and responsible to the Geotechnical Consultants.

**GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEER** - A licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Civil Engineer who applies scientific methods, engineering principles and professional experience to the acquisition, interpretation and use of knowledge of materials of the earth's crust for the evaluation of engineering problems. Geotechnical Engineering encompasses many of the engineering aspects of soil mechanics, rock mechanics, geology, geophysics, hydrology and related sciences.

**GRADING** - Any operation consisting of excavation, filling or combinations thereof and associated operations.

**LANDSLIDE DEBRIS** - Material, generally porous and of low density, produced from instability of natural or man-made slopes.

**MAXIMUM DENSITY** - Standard laboratory test for maximum dry unit weight. Unless otherwise specified, the maximum dry unit weight shall be determined in accordance with ASTM Method of Test D 1557-09.

**OPTIMUM MOISTURE** - Soil moisture content at the test maximum density.

**RELATIVE COMPACTION** - The degree of compaction (expressed as a percentage) of dry unit weight of a material as compared to the maximum dry unit weight of the material.

**ROUGH GRADE** - The ground surface configuration at which time the surface elevations approximately conform to the approved plan.

**SITE** - The particular parcel of land where grading is being performed.

**SHEAR KEY** - Similar to buttress, however, it is generally constructed by excavating a slot within a natural slope in order to stabilize the upper portion of the slope without grading encroaching into the lower portion of the slope.

**SLOPE** - An inclined ground surface the steepness of which is generally specified as a ratio of horizontal:vertical (e.g., 2:1).

**SLOPE WASH** - Soil and/or rock material that has been transported down a slope by action of gravity assisted by runoff water not confined by channels (also see Colluvium).

**SOIL** - Naturally occurring deposits of sand, silt, clay, etc., or combinations thereof.

**SOIL ENGINEER** - Licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Civil Engineer experienced in soil mechanics (also see Geotechnical Engineer).

**STABILIZATION FILL** - A fill mass, the configuration of which is typically related to slope height and is specified by the standards of practice for enhancing the stability of locally adverse conditions. A stabilization fill is normally specified by minimum key width and depth and by maximum backcut angle. A stabilization fill may or may not have a back drainage system specified.

**SUBDRAIN** - Generally a pipe and gravel or similar drainage system placed beneath a fill in the alignment of canyons or former drainage channels.

**SLOUGH** - Loose, non-compacted fill material generated during grading operations.

**TAILINGS** - Non-engineered fill which accumulates on or adjacent to equipment haul-roads.

**TERRACE** - Relatively level step constructed in the face of graded slope surface for drainage control and maintenance purposes.

**TOPSOIL** - The presumable fertile upper zone of soil which is usually darker in color and loose.

**WINDROW** - A string of large rocks buried within engineered fill in accordance with guidelines set forth by the Geotechnical Consultant.

## **OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES**

The Geotechnical Consultant should provide observation and testing services and should make evaluations in order to advise the Client on geotechnical matters. The Geotechnical Consultant should report his findings and recommendations to the Client or his authorized representative.

The client should be chiefly responsible for all aspects of the project. He or his authorized representative has the responsibility of reviewing the findings and recommendations of the Geotechnical Consultant. He shall authorize or cause to have authorized the Contractor and/or other consultants to perform work and/or provide services. During grading the Client or his authorized representative should remain on-site or should remain reasonably accessible to all concerned parties in order to make decisions necessary to maintain the flow of the project.

The Contractor should be responsible for the safety of the project and satisfactory completion of all grading and other associated operations on construction projects, including but not limited to, earthwork in accordance with the project plans, specifications and controlling agency requirements. During grading, the Contractor or his authorized representative should remain on-site. Overnight and on days off, the Contractor should remain accessible.

## **SITE PREPARATION**

The Client, prior to any site preparation or grading, should arrange and attend a meeting among the Grading Contractor, the Design Engineer, the Geotechnical Consultant, representatives of the appropriate governing authorities as well as any other concerned parties. All parties should be given at least 48 hours notice.

Clearing and grubbing should consist of the removal of vegetation such as brush, grass, woods, stumps, trees, roots of trees and otherwise deleterious natural materials from the areas to be graded. Clearing and grubbing should extend to the outside of all proposed excavation and fill areas.

Demolition should include removal of buildings, structures, foundations, reservoirs, utilities (including underground pipelines, septic tanks, leach fields, seepage pits, cisterns, mining shafts, tunnels, etc.) and other man-made surface and subsurface improvements from the areas to be graded. Demolition of utilities should include proper capping and/or re-routing pipelines at the project perimeter and cutoff and capping of wells in accordance with the requirements of the governing authorities and the recommendations of the Geotechnical Consultant at the time of demolition.

Trees, plants or man-made improvements not planned to be removed or demolished should be protected by the Contractor from damage or injury.

Debris generated during clearing, grubbing and/or demolition operations should be wasted from areas to be graded and disposed off-site. Clearing, grubbing and demolition operations should be performed under the observation of the Geotechnical Consultant.

The Client or Contractor should obtain the required approvals from the controlling authorities for the project prior, during and/or after demolition, site preparation and removals, etc. The appropriate approvals should be obtained prior to proceeding with grading operations.

## **SITE PROTECTION**

Protection of the site during the period of grading should be the responsibility of the Contractor. Unless other provisions are made in writing and agreed upon among the concerned parties, completion of a portion of the project should not be considered to preclude that portion or adjacent areas from the requirements for site protection until such time as the entire project is complete as identified by the Geotechnical Consultant, the Client and the regulating agencies.

The Contractor should be responsible for the stability of all temporary excavations. Recommendations by the Geotechnical Consultant pertaining to temporary excavations (e.g., backcuts) are made in consideration of stability of the completed project and, therefore, should not be considered to preclude the responsibilities of the Contractor. Recommendations by the Geotechnical Consultant should not be considered to preclude more restrictive requirements by the regulating agencies.

Precautions should be taken during the performance of site clearing, excavations and grading to protect the work site from flooding, ponding, or inundation by poor or improper surface drainage. Temporary provisions should be made during the rainy season to adequately direct surface drainage away from and off the work site. Where low areas can not be avoided, pumps should be kept on hand to continually remove water during periods of rainfall.

During periods of rainfall, plastic sheeting should be kept reasonably accessible to prevent unprotected slopes from becoming saturated. Where necessary during periods of rainfall, the Contractor should install check dams, desilting basins, riprap, sand bags or other devices or methods necessary to control erosion and provide safe conditions.

During periods of rainfall, the Geotechnical Consultant should be kept informed by the Contractor as to the nature of remedial or preventative work being performed (e.g., pumping, placement of sandbags or plastic sheeting, other labor, dozing, etc.).

Following periods of rainfall, the Contractor should contact the Geotechnical Consultant and arrange a walk-over of the site in order to visually assess rain related damage. The Geotechnical Consultant may also recommend excavations and testing in order to aid in his assessments. At the request of the Geotechnical Consultant, the Contractor shall make excavations in order to evaluate the extent of rain related damage.

Rain related damage should be considered to include, but may not be limited to, erosion, silting, saturation, swelling, structural distress and other adverse conditions identified by the Geotechnical Consultant. Soil adversely affected should be classified as Unsuitable Materials and should be subject to over-excavation and replacement with compacted fill or other remedial grading as recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant.

Relatively level areas, where saturated soils and/or erosion gullies exist to depths of greater than 1-foot, should be over-excavated to unaffected, competent material. Where less than 1-foot in depth, unsuitable materials may be processed in-place to achieve near optimum moisture conditions, then thoroughly recompact in accordance with the applicable specifications. If the desired results are not achieved, the affected materials should be over-excavated, then replaced in accordance with the applicable specifications.

In slope areas, where saturated soil and/or erosion gullies exist to depths of greater than 1 foot, they should be over-excavated and replaced as compacted fill in accordance with the applicable specifications. Where affected materials exist to depths of 1 foot or less below proposed finished grade, remedial grading by moisture conditioning in-place, followed by thorough recompaction in accordance with the applicable grading guidelines herein may be attempted. If the desired results are not achieved, all affected materials should be over-excavated and replaced as compacted fill in accordance with the slope repair recommendations herein. As field conditions dictate, other slope repair procedures may be recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant.

## **EXCAVATIONS**

### **Unsuitable Materials**

Materials which are unsuitable should be excavated under observation and recommendations of the Geotechnical Consultant. Unsuitable materials include, but may not be limited to, dry, loose, soft, wet, organic compressible natural soils and fractured, weathered, soft bedrock and non-engineered or otherwise deleterious fill materials.

Material identified by the Geotechnical Consultant as unsatisfactory due to its moisture conditions should be over-excavated, watered or dried, as needed, and thoroughly blended to a uniform near optimum moisture condition (per Moisture guidelines presented herein) prior to placement as compacted fill.

### **Cut Slopes**

Unless otherwise recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant and approved by the regulating agencies, permanent cut slopes should not be steeper than 2:1 (horizontal:vertical).

If excavations for cut slopes expose loose, cohesionless, significantly fractured or otherwise unsuitable material, over-excavation and replacement of the unsuitable materials with a compacted stabilization fill should be accomplished as recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant. Unless otherwise specified by the Geotechnical Consultant, stabilization fill construction should conform to the requirements of the Standard Details.

The Geotechnical Consultant should review cut slopes during excavation. The Geotechnical Consultant should be notified by the contractor prior to beginning slope excavations.

If, during the course of grading, adverse or potentially adverse geotechnical conditions are encountered which were not anticipated in the preliminary report, the Geotechnical Consultant should explore, analyze and make recommendations to treat these problems.

When cut slopes are made in the direction of the prevailing drainage, a non-erodible diversion swale (brow ditch) should be provided at the top-of-cut.

### **Pad Areas**

All lot pad areas, including side yard terraces, above stabilization fills or buttresses should be over-excavated to provide for a minimum of 3-feet (refer to Standard Details) of compacted fill over the entire pad area. Pad areas with both fill and cut materials exposed and pad areas containing both very shallow (less than 3-feet) and deeper fill should be over-excavated to provide for a uniform compacted fill blanket with a minimum of 3-feet in thickness (refer to Standard Details).

Cut areas exposing significantly varying material types should also be over-excavated to provide for at least a 3-foot thick compacted fill blanket. Geotechnical conditions may require greater depth of over-excavation. The actual depth should be delineated by the Geotechnical Consultant during grading.

For pad areas created above cut or natural slopes, positive drainage should be established away from the top-of-slope. This may be accomplished utilizing a berm and/or an appropriate pad gradient. A gradient in soil areas away from the top-of-slopes of 2 percent or greater is recommended.

### **COMPACTED FILL**

All fill materials should be compacted as specified below or by other methods specifically recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant. Unless otherwise specified, the minimum degree of compaction (relative compaction) should be 90 percent of the laboratory maximum density.

#### **Placement**

Prior to placement of compacted fill, the Contractor should request a review by the Geotechnical Consultant of the exposed ground surface. Unless otherwise recommended, the exposed ground surface should then be scarified (6-inches minimum), watered or dried as needed, thoroughly blended to achieve near optimum moisture conditions, then thoroughly compacted to a minimum of 90 percent of the maximum density. The review by the Geotechnical Consultant should not be considered to preclude requirements of inspection and approval by the governing agency.

Compacted fill should be placed in thin horizontal lifts not exceeding 8-inches in loose thickness prior to compaction. Each lift should be watered or dried as needed, thoroughly blended to achieve near optimum moisture conditions then thoroughly compacted by mechanical methods to a minimum of 90 percent of laboratory maximum dry density. Each lift should be treated in a like manner until the desired finished grades are achieved.

The Contractor should have suitable and sufficient mechanical compaction equipment and watering apparatus on the job site to handle the amount of fill being placed in consideration of moisture retention properties of the materials. If necessary, excavation equipment should be "shut down" temporarily in order to permit proper compaction of fills. Earth moving equipment should only be considered a supplement and not substituted for conventional compaction equipment.

When placing fill in horizontal lifts adjacent to areas sloping steeper than 5:1 (horizontal:vertical), horizontal keys and vertical benches should be excavated into the adjacent slope area. Keying and benching should be sufficient to provide at least 6-foot wide benches and minimum of 4-feet of vertical bench height within the firm natural ground, firm bedrock or engineered compacted fill. No compacted fill should be placed in an area subsequent to keying and benching until the area has been reviewed by the Geotechnical Consultant.

Material generated by the benching operation should be moved sufficiently away from the bench area to allow for the recommended review of the horizontal bench prior to placement of fill. Typical keying and benching details have been included within the accompanying Standard Details.

Within a single fill area where grading procedures dictate two or more separate fills, temporary slopes (false slopes) may be created. When placing fill adjacent to a false slope, benching should be conducted in the same manner as above described. At least a 3-foot vertical bench should be established within the firm core of adjacent approved compacted fill prior to placement of additional fill. Benching should proceed in at least 3-foot vertical increments until the desired finished grades are achieved.

Fill should be tested for compliance with the recommended relative compaction and moisture conditions. Field density testing should conform to ASTM Method of Test D 1556-07, and/or D 6938-10. Tests should be provided for about every 2 vertical feet or 1,000 cubic yards of fill placed. Actual test intervals may vary as field conditions dictate. Fill found not to be in conformance with the grading recommendations should be removed or otherwise handled as recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant.

The Contractor should assist the Geotechnical Consultant and/or his representative by digging test pits for removal determinations and/or for testing compacted fill.

As recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant, the Contractor should "shut down" or remove grading equipment from an area being tested.

The Geotechnical Consultant should maintain a plan with estimated locations of field tests. Unless the client provides for actual surveying of test locations, the estimated locations by the Geotechnical Consultant should only be considered rough estimates and should not be utilized for the purpose of preparing cross sections showing test locations or in any case for the purpose of after-the-fact evaluating of the sequence of fill placement.

### **Moisture**

For field testing purposes, "near optimum" moisture will vary with material type and other factors including compaction procedures. "Near optimum" may be specifically recommended in Preliminary Investigation Reports and/or may be evaluated during grading.

Prior to placement of additional compacted fill following an overnight or other grading delay, the exposed surface or previously compacted fill should be processed by scarification, watered or dried as needed, thoroughly blended to near-optimum moisture conditions, then recompacted to a minimum of 90 percent of laboratory maximum dry density. Where wet or other dry or other unsuitable materials exist to depths of greater than 1 foot, the unsuitable materials should be over-excavated.

Following a period of flooding, rainfall or overwatering by other means, no additional fill should be placed until damage assessments have been made and remedial grading performed as described herein.

### **Fill Material**

Excavated on-site materials which are acceptable to the Geotechnical Consultant may be utilized as compacted fill, provided trash, vegetation and other deleterious materials are removed prior to placement.

Where import materials are required for use on-site, the Geotechnical Consultant should be notified at least 72 hours in advance of importing, in order to sample and test materials from proposed borrow sites. No import materials should be delivered for use on-site without prior sampling and testing by Geotechnical Consultant.

Where oversized rock or similar irreducible material is generated during grading, it is recommended, where practical, to waste such material off-site or on-site in areas designated as "nonstructural rock disposal areas". Rock placed in disposal areas should be placed with sufficient fines to fill voids. The rock should be compacted in lifts to an unyielding condition. The disposal area should be covered with at least 3 feet of compacted fill which is free of oversized material. The upper 3 feet should be placed in accordance with the guidelines for compacted fill herein.

Rocks 8 inches in maximum dimension and smaller may be utilized within the compacted fill, provided they are placed in such a manner that nesting of the rock is avoided. Fill should be placed and thoroughly compacted over and around all rock. The amount of rock should not exceed 40 percent by dry weight passing the  $\frac{3}{4}$ -inch sieve size. The 12-inch and 40 percent recommendations herein may vary as field conditions dictate.

During the course of grading operations, rocks or similar irreducible materials greater than 8-inches maximum dimension (oversized material) may be generated. These rocks should not be placed within the compacted fill unless placed as recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant.

Where rocks or similar irreducible materials of greater than 8 inches but less than 4 feet of maximum dimension are generated during grading, or otherwise desired to be placed within an engineered fill, special handling in accordance with the accompanying Standard Details is recommended. Rocks greater than 4 feet should be broken down or disposed off-site. Rocks up to 4 feet maximum dimension should be placed below the upper 10 feet of any fill and should not be closer than 20-feet to any slope face. These recommendations could vary as locations of improvements dictate. Where practical, oversized material should not be placed below areas where structures or deep utilities are proposed.

Oversized material should be placed in windrows on a clean, over-excavated or unyielding compacted fill or firm natural ground surface. Select native or imported granular soil (S.E. 30 or higher) should be placed and thoroughly flooded over and around all windrowed rock, such that voids are filled. Windrows of oversized material should be staggered so that successive strata of oversized material are not in the same vertical plane.

It may be possible to dispose of individual larger rock as field conditions dictate and as recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant at the time of placement. Material that is considered unsuitable by the Geotechnical Consultant should not be utilized in the compacted fill.

During grading operations, placing and mixing the materials from the cut and/or borrow areas may result in soil mixtures which possess unique physical properties. Testing may be required of samples obtained directly from the fill areas in order to verify conformance with the specifications. Processing of these additional samples may take two or more working days. The Contractor may elect to move the operation to other areas within the project, or may continue placing compacted fill pending laboratory and field test results. Should he elect the second alternative, fill placed is done so at the Contractor's risk.

Any fill placed in areas not previously reviewed and evaluated by the Geotechnical Consultant, and/or in other areas, without prior notification to the Geotechnical Consultant may require removal and recompaction at the Contractor's expense. Determination of over-excavations should be made upon review of field conditions by the Geotechnical Consultant.

## **Fill Slopes**

Unless otherwise recommended by the Geotechnical Consultant and approved by the regulating agencies, permanent fill slopes should not be steeper than 2:1 (horizontal to vertical).

Except as specifically recommended otherwise or as otherwise provided for in these grading guidelines (Reference Fill Materials), compacted fill slopes should be overbuilt and cut back to grade, exposing the firm, compacted fill inner core. The actual amount of overbuilding may vary as field conditions dictate. If the desired results are not achieved, the existing slopes should be over-excavated and reconstructed under the guidelines of the Geotechnical Consultant. The degree of overbuilding shall be increased until the desired compacted slope surface condition is achieved. Care should be taken by the Contractor to provide thorough mechanical compaction to the outer edge of the overbuilt slope surface.

Although no construction procedure produces a slope free from risk of future movement, overfilling and cutting back of slope to a compacted inner core is, given no other constraints, the most desirable procedure. Other constraints, however, must often be considered. These constraints may include property line situations, access, the critical nature of the development and cost. Where such constraints are identified, slope face compaction may be attempted by conventional construction procedures including back rolling techniques upon specific recommendation by the Geotechnical Consultant.

As a second-best alternative for slopes of 2:1 (horizontal to vertical) or flatter, slope construction may be attempted as outlined herein. Fill placement should proceed in thin lifts, (i.e., 6 to 8-inch loose thickness). Each lift should be moisture conditioned and thoroughly compacted. The desired moisture condition should be maintained and/or reestablished, where necessary, during the period between successive lifts. Selected lifts should be tested to ascertain that desired compaction is being achieved. Care should be taken to extend compactive effort to the outer edge of the slope. Each lift should extend horizontally to the desired finished slope surface or more as needed to ultimately establish desired grades. Grade during construction should not be allowed to roll off at the edge of the slope. It may be helpful to elevate slightly the outer edge of the slope.

Slough resulting from the placement of individual lifts should not be allowed to drift down over previous lifts. At intervals not exceeding 4 feet in vertical slope height or the capability of available equipment, whichever is less, fill slopes should be thoroughly backrolled utilizing a conventional sheeps foot-type roller. Care should be taken to maintain the desired moisture conditions and/or reestablishing same as needed prior to backrolling. Upon achieving final grade, the slopes should again be moisture conditioned and thoroughly backrolled. The use of a side-boom roller will probably be necessary and vibratory methods are strongly recommended. Without delay, so as to avoid (if possible) further moisture conditioning, the slopes should then be grid-rolled to achieve a relatively smooth surface and uniformly compact condition.

In order to monitor slope construction procedures, moisture and density tests will be taken at regular intervals. Failure to achieve the desired results will likely result in a recommendation by the Geotechnical Consultant to over-excavate the slope surfaces followed by reconstruction of the slopes utilizing overfilling and cutting back procedures and/or further attempt at the conventional backrolling approach. Other recommendations may also be

provided which would be commensurate with field conditions.

Where placement of fill above a natural slope or above a cut slope is proposed, the fill slope configuration as presented in the accompanying Standard Details should be adopted.

For pad areas above fill slopes, positive drainage should be established away from the top-of-slope. This may be accomplished utilizing a berm and pad gradients of at least 2 percent in soil areas.

### **Off-Site Fill**

Off-site fill should be treated in the same manner as recommended in these specifications for site preparation, excavation, drains, compaction, etc.

Off-site canyon fill should be placed in preparation for future additional fill, as shown in the accompanying Standard Details.

Off-site fill subdrains temporarily terminated (up canyon) should be surveyed for future relocation and connection.

## **DRAINAGE**

Canyon subdrain systems specified by the Geotechnical Consultant should be installed in accordance with the Standard Details.

Typical subdrains for compacted fill buttresses, slope stabilization or sidehill masses, should be installed in accordance with the specifications of the accompanying Standard Details.

Roof, pad and slope drainage should be directed away from slopes and areas of structures to suitable disposal areas via non-erodible devices (i.e., gutters, downspouts, concrete swales).

For drainage over soil areas immediately away from structures (i.e., within 4 feet), a minimum of 4 percent gradient should be maintained. Pad drainage of at least 2 percent should be maintained over soil areas. Pad drainage may be reduced to at least 1 percent for projects where no slopes exist, either natural or man-made, or greater than 10-feet in height and where no slopes are planned, either natural or man-made, steeper than 2:1 (horizontal to vertical slope ratio).

Drainage patterns established at the time of fine grading should be maintained throughout the life of the project. Property owners should be made aware that altering drainage patterns can be detrimental to slope stability and foundation performance.

## **STAKING**

In all fill areas, the fill should be compacted prior to the placement of the stakes. This particularly is important on fill slopes. Slope stakes should not be placed until the slope is thoroughly compacted (backrolled). If stakes must be placed prior to the completion of compaction procedures, it must be recognized that they will be removed and/or demolished at such time as compaction procedures resume.

In order to allow for remedial grading operations, which could include over-excavations or slope stabilization, appropriate staking offsets should be provided. For finished slope and stabilization backcut areas, we recommend at least a 10-foot setback from proposed toes and tops-of-cut.

## **SLOPE MAINTENANCE**

### **Landscape Plants**

In order to enhance surficial slope stability, slope planting should be accomplished at the completion of grading. Slope planting should consist of deep-rooting vegetation requiring little watering. Plants native to the southern California area and plants relative to native plants are generally desirable. Plants native to other semi-arid and arid areas may also be appropriate. A Landscape Architect would be the best party to consult regarding actual types of plants and planting configuration.

### **Irrigation**

Irrigation pipes should be anchored to slope faces, not placed in trenches excavated into slope faces.

Slope irrigation should be minimized. If automatic timing devices are utilized on irrigation systems, provisions should be made for interrupting normal irrigation during periods of rainfall.

Though not a requirement, consideration should be given to the installation of near-surface moisture monitoring control devices. Such devices can aid in the maintenance of relatively uniform and reasonably constant moisture conditions.

Property owners should be made aware that overwatering of slopes is detrimental to slope stability.

### **Maintenance**

Periodic inspections of landscaped slope areas should be planned and appropriate measures should be taken to control weeds and enhance growth of the landscape plants. Some areas may require occasional replanting and/or reseeding.

Terrace drains and down drains should be periodically inspected and maintained free of debris. Damage to drainage improvements should be repaired immediately.

Property owners should be made aware that burrowing animals can be detrimental to slope stability. A preventative program should be established to control burrowing animals.

As a precautionary measure, plastic sheeting should be readily available, or kept on hand, to protect all slope areas from saturation by periods of heavy or prolonged rainfall. This measure is strongly recommended, beginning with the period of time prior to landscape planting.

### **Repairs**

If slope failures occur, the Geotechnical Consultant should be contacted for a field review of site conditions and development of recommendations for evaluation and repair.

If slope failures occur as a result of exposure to periods of heavy rainfall, the failure area and currently unaffected areas should be covered with plastic sheeting to protect against additional saturation.

In the accompanying Standard Details, appropriate repair procedures are illustrated for

superficial slope failures (i.e., occurring typically within the outer 1 foot to 3 feet of a slope face).

### **TRENCH BACKFILL**

Utility trench backfill should, unless otherwise recommended, be compacted by mechanical means. Unless otherwise recommended, the degree of compaction should be a minimum of 90 percent of the laboratory maximum density.

Backfill of exterior and interior trenches extending below a 1:1 projection from the outer edge of foundations should be mechanically compacted to a minimum of 90 percent of the laboratory maximum density.

In cases where clean granular materials are proposed for use in lieu of native materials or where flooding or jetting is proposed, the procedures should be considered subject to review by the Geotechnical Consultant.


Clean Granular backfill and/or bedding are not recommended in slope areas unless provisions are made for a drainage system to mitigate the potential build-up of seepage forces.

### **STATUS OF GRADING**

Prior of proceeding with any grading operation, the Geotechnical Consultant should be notified at least two working days in advance in order to schedule the necessary observation and testing services.

Prior to any significant expansion or cut back in the grading operation, the Geotechnical Consultant should be provided with adequate notice (i.e., two days) in order to make appropriate adjustments in observation and testing services.


Following completion of grading operations and/or between phases of a grading operation, the Geotechnical Consultant should be provided with at least two working days notice in advance of commencement of additional grading operations.



## TYPICAL STABILIZATION FILL DETAIL


NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE 1



TYPICAL BUTTRESS FILL DETAIL


NOT TO SCALE



## TYPICAL SHEAR KEY DETAIL

NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE 3




## DAYLIGHT SHEAR KEY DETAIL


NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE 4

**BENCHING FILL OVER NATURAL**




**BENCHING FILL OVER CUT**




**BENCHING FOR COMPACTED FILL DETAIL**

NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE 5



### DETAIL A-A



\* Filter rock to meet following specifications or approved equal.


Sieve	% Passing
1"	100
3/4"	90-100
3/8"	40-100
No.4	25-40
No.30	5-15
No.50	0-7
No.200	0-3

### \*\* APPROVED PIPE TYPE

Schedule 40 polyvinyl chloride (P.V.C.) or approved equal.  
Min. crush strength 1000 PSI.

## TYPICAL BACKDRAIN DETAIL

NOT TO SCALE




\* Filter rock to meet following specifications or approved equal.

Sieve	% Passing
1"	100
3/4"	90-100
3/8"	40-100
No.4	25-40
No.30	5-15
No.50	0-7
No.200	0-3

\*\* Approved pipe type:

Schedule 40 polyvinyl chloride (P.V.C.) or approved equal.  
Min. crush strength 1000 PSI.

BACKDRAIN DETAIL (GEOFABRIC)



\* Filter rock to meet following specifications or approved equal.

<u>Sieve</u>	<u>% Passing</u>
1"	100
3/4"	90-100
3/8"	40-100
No.4	25-40
No.30	5-15
No.50	0-7
No.200	0-3

\*\* APPROVED PIPE TYPE


Schedule 40 polyvinyl chloride (P.V.C.) or approved equal.  
Min. crush strength 1000 PSI.

Pipe diameter to meet the following criteria. Subject to field review based on actual geotechnical conditions encountered during grading.

<u>Length of Run</u>	<u>Pipe Diameter</u>
Upper 500'	4"
Next 1000'	6"
>1500'	8"

## TYPICAL CANYON SUBDRAIN DETAIL

NOT TO SCALE



\* Drainage material to meet following specifications or approved equal.

<u>Sieve</u>	<u>% Passing</u>
1 1/2"	88-100
1"	5-40
3/4"	0-17
3/8"	0-7
No.200	0-3


ADD MINIMUM 4" DIAMETER APPROVED PERFORATED PIPE WHEN GRADIENT IS LESS THAN 2%

APPROVED PIPE TO BE SCHEDULE 40 POLY-VINYL-CHLORIDE (P.V.C.) OR APPROVED EQUAL. MINIMUM CRUSH STRENGTH 1000 psi.

## GEOFABRIC SUBDRAIN

NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE 9




WHERE NATURAL SLOPE GRADIENT IS 5:1 OR LESS, BENCHING IS NOT NECESSARY. HOWEVER, FILL IS NOT TO BE PLACED ON COMPRESSIBLE OR UNSUITABLE MATERIAL.

## FILL SLOPE ABOVE NATURAL GROUND DETAIL

NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE 10




NOTE:  
CUT SLOPE PORTION SHALL BE MADE  
PRIOR TO PLACEMENT OF FILL


## FILL SLOPE ABOVE CUT SLOPE DETAIL

NOT TO SCALE

CUT LOT



CUT/FILL LOT (TRANSITION)




TRANSITION LOT DETAIL


NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE 12


# BUILDING



## TYPICAL WINDROW DETAIL (EDGE VIEW)



## (PROFILE VIEW)



## ROCK DISPOSAL DETAIL

NOT TO SCALE

FIGURE 13