



L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: 585354 **Title:** MPF 5550 Oberlin Dr, Ste A
Project Mgr: Cac, Cherlyn (619) 236-6327 ccac@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/20/2018	Deemed Complete on 04/20/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Planning Review	Cycle Distributed: 04/20/2018	
Reviewer: Goossens, Kyle (619) 446-5475 kgoossens@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/04/2018	
	Started: 05/04/2018	
Hours of Review: 1.00	Review Due: 05/04/2018	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Completed: 05/04/2018	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2018	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/22/2018 from 05/09/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Conditions.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Planning Review on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 14 outstanding review issues with LDR-Planning Review (14 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Planning Review performed 110 reviews, 89.1% were on-time, and 41.5% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

First Review

Separation Requirements

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	City staff is also expecting the public to identify conflicts throughout the processing of the use permit. The 1000 ft distance is measured in accordance with Section 113.0225. [Information Item - No Response Required] (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	Major Issue: Baby Genius located at 5820 Oberlin Drive appears to be a minor oriented facility. Is this a minor-oriented facility? If it is not, then what is your rationale for it not being a minor-oriented facility? If City staff determines that minor oriented facilities exist denial of the application will be recommended. Please also update your spreadsheet to include this business. (From Cycle 2)

Corrections

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	The general notes at the top of sheet 1 states that distribution will occur. Please provide an explanation of the type of distribution that will occur. Please provide a description of each area within the MPF. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	26	Please provide the hours of operation (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	28	Please provide the SF of the building. It appears as if there is another portion to the structure. Please show on site plan (From Cycle 2)

Draft Conditions

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34	Please keep in mind as the review process continues, additional draft conditions may arise. (From Cycle 2)
<input type="checkbox"/>	48	All operations, including equipment and storage, shall be conducted indoors within a secured structure. Greenhouses are prohibited. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	49	Lighting shall be provided to illuminate the immediate surrounding area of the facility, including parking lots and adjoining sidewalks. Lighting shall be hooded or oriented so as to deflect light away from adjacent properties (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	50	Security shall include operable cameras, alarms, and a security guard. The security guard shall be licensed by the State of California and be present on the premises during business hours. The security guard shall only be engaged in activities related to providing security for the facility, except on an incidental basis. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	51	The name and emergency contact phone number of an operator or manager shall be posted outside the marijuana production facility in a location visible to the public from the public right-of-way in character size at least two inches in height. The permittee shall provide this contact information to the San Diego Police Department. The operator or manager shall also be available 24 hours a day to address public nuisance complaints and interact with local, state, and federal law enforcement authorities. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	52	Other than the contact information, a marijuana production facility shall limit signage on the exterior of the property visible from the public right-of-way to the address. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	53	A permit shall be obtained as required pursuant to Chapter 4, Article 2, Division 15 (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	54	A Conditional Use Permit for a marijuana production facility shall expire no later than five (5) years from the date of issuance (New Issue)

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Planning Review' review, please call Kyle Goossens at (619) 446-5475. Project Nbr: 585354 / Cycle: 6





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	55	An extension of time for a Conditional Use Permit granted to a marijuana production facility shall comply with the requirements of section 126.0111 with the following exceptions The extension shall be for a maximum of five (5) years (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	56	A decision on an application for an extension of time shall be made in accordance with Process Two. Appeals of a decision to approve an extension of time shall be made to the Planning Commission (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	57	The separation requirements in Section 141.0504(a) shall not be considered in making the findings required in Section 126.0111(g) when a specified use in Section 141.1004(a) has located within the required distance after the approval date of the initial Conditional Use Permit. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	58	A change in zoning after the approval date of the initial Conditional Use Permit shall not be considered in making the findings required in Section 126.0111(g) (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	59	The sale of marijuana and marijuana products shall only be conducted by a marijuana outlet in accordance with Section 141.0504. A marijuana production facility is prohibited from providing marijuana and marijuana products to any person other than another marijuana production facility, a testing lab, or a marijuana outlet. (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	60	The marijuana production facility, adjacent public sidewalks, and areas under the control of the marijuana production facility shall be maintained free of litter and graffiti at all times (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	61	The marijuana production facility shall provide daily removal of trash, litter, and debris. Graffiti shall be removed from the premises within 24 hours. (New Issue)

Second Review

Community Plan

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	45	Demonstrate how project conforms with Development Criteria #4 of the Mira Mesa Community Plan: All new industrial development shall provide bicycle lockers and shower facilities for employees, and where feasible, bikeways that provide a linkage to the City bikeway system. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	46	Demonstrate how project conforms with Development Criteria #5 of the Mira Mesa Community Plan: Signs shall be posted indicating the availability of bicycle parking facilities (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	47	Demonstrate how project conforms with Development Criteria #6 of the Mira Mesa Community Plan: All outdoor storage areas, refuse collection areas, and loading areas should be located in interior side or rear yards only and should be screened with a similar material and color as the primary building. (From Cycle 5)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/20/2018	Deemed Complete on 04/20/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Environmental	Cycle Distributed: 04/20/2018	
Reviewer: Tracy, Christopher (619) 446-5381 CRTracy@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/26/2018	
	Started: 05/07/2018	
Hours of Review: 4.00	Review Due: 05/22/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/21/2018	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2018	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/22/2018 from 05/09/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Environmental on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month LDR-Environmental performed 124 reviews, 76.6% were on-time, and 32.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

📁 Cycle 2 Review - 1-25-18

📁 XIS

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	The Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Land Development Review Division has reviewed the submittal of the above referenced project and has determined that the project will be placed in Extended Initial Study (XIS) status due to the following issues: (From Cycle 2)

📁 ENERGY

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that potentially significant energy implications of a project be considered to the extent relevant and applicable to the proposed project. The environmental review must address the estimated energy use for the project and assess whether the project would generate a demand for energy (electricity and/or natural gas) that would exceed the planned capacity of energy suppliers. Please describe any proposed measures included as part of the project directed at conserving energy and reducing energy consumption. (From Cycle 2)

📁 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	The MPF use was added to the Land Development Code after preparation and adoption of the Climate Action plan, therefore, MPFs were not included in the land use assumptions used in the Climate Action Plan. The project requires a Greenhouse Gas Emissions analysis to determine if the project would result in an equivalent or less GHG-intensive project when compared to the existing use. (From Cycle 2)

📁 GEOTRACKER

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	In reviewing Geotracker database, the project site is adjacent to hazardous clean-up site to the west of the property: APPLIED MICRO CIRCUITS CORP. (71002689) CLEANUP STATUS: CLEANUP STATUS INACTIVE - NEEDS EVALUATION EAS will coordinate with City LEA staff to determine if further evaluation of this issue area. (From Cycle 2)

📁 NEXT REVIEW

<u>Issue</u>		
<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Please provide a written response to all issue areas. (From Cycle 2)

📁 Cycle 5 Review - 4-11-18

📁 MARIJUANA PRODUCTION FACILITY

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

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Environmental' review, please call Christopher Tracy at (619) 446-5381. Project Nbr: 585354 / Cycle: 6





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	Please scan/attach the "Section 2.0" Project Description to the plan set with the next submittal package as it will become the basis for an Exhibit "A" (From Cycle 5)

ENERGY

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	Inclusive of the response the total energy needs is anticipated to be 2,901,644 kWh per year, Please provide a comparison to current usage in order determine level of significance. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	23	Please provide the energy saving measures as described in the response kWh per year. (From Cycle 5)

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	25	The GHG Analysis updates were communicated with Sapphos Engineering by phone discussion on 4/4/18, 4/5/18 with respect to the submitted Greenhouse Gas Emissions Study 3/21/18: (From Cycle 5) [Recommended]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	26	Please revise the baseline assumption scaling from a fast food restaurant w/ drive thru equate to the proposed use does not seem as a realist comparison. Please update the equivalency selection to a variety comparable land uses/sizes that would be sited in that location. (From Cycle 5)

CAP CONSISTENCY CHECKLIST UPDA

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	28	Under Step 1, please add description of how the MPF is now consistent with the land use/zoning. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	29	Step 2 "CAP Strategies Consistency" Appears would appear to be "Yes" (Energy Saving Measures) or "N/A". Please provide a response in each box and update. Also provide/describe any voluntary measures as it relates to energy saving measures that would be implemented per Issue 23. (From Cycle 5)

TRANSPORTATION

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27	Comments are pending from LDR-Transportation within this review cycle. EAS cannot make a CEQA determination until all issues are addressed with this reviewer. (From Cycle 5)

LAND USE

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	30	Corrections were provided by LDR-Planning within this review cycle and remain uncleared from Cycle 2. EAS cannot make a CEQA determination until all issues are addressed with this review dicipline. (From Cycle 5)

ENGINEERING

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	31	Corrections were provided by LDR-Engineering within this review cycle and remain uncleared from Cycle 2. EAS cannot make a CEQA determination until all issues are addressed with this review dicipline. (From Cycle 5)

NEXT REVIEW

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	32	Please provide a written response to all issue areas. (From Cycle 5)

Cycle 6 Review - 5-9-18

GHG/ENERGY/WATER

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	34	EAS evaluated the "Marijuana Production Facility Greenhouse Gas Emissions Study, Project Number: 585354, Project Address: 5550 Oberlin Drive, Suite A, April 9, 2018, Sapphos Environmental, Inc." and accepts the findings and conclusions contained within the study. EAS has no further comments. (New Issue)

TRANSPORTATION

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





L64A-003A

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

35 Corrections were provided by LDR-Transportation after EAS reviewed the project under Cycle 5.

With respect to this cycle (Cycle 7), comments are pending from LDR-Transportation within this review cycle. EAS cannot make a CEQA determination until all issues are addressed with this reviewer. (New Issue)

HEALTH & SAFETY

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

36 EAS received the DS-165 (Hazardous Materials Reporting Form) (from Cycle 5). EAS is working with Qualified City Staff to develop a permit condition to ensure that all hazardous materials, as identified on the form, are stored in compliance with applicable regulations. The condition will be implemented at the time of building permit. (New Issue)

CEQA

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

37 EAS cannot make a CEQA determination as of yet. The issues identified in any other discipline review comments must be addressed before an environmental determination can be made on this project. A determination of Categorical Exemption (CE), Negative Declaration (ND), Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be made based on the information provided in any subsequent submittals. (New Issue)

Cycle 6 Review - Part II - 5-2

TRANSPORTATION

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

38 All remaining Transportation Development issue have been addressed from the first review of Cycle 6 and prior cycle, as such, EAS can make an environmental determination. (New Issue)

CEQA DETERMINATION

Issue

Cleared? Num Issue Text

39 All issues have been cleared; EAS can determine that the project would be exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Pursuant to LDC Section 128.0207 (a) EAS will post a Notice of Right to Appeal (NORA) Environmental Determination for ten working days. The environmental determination will become final upon expiration of NORA if an appeal is not filed. (New Issue)

40 Since your project has been determined to be Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); a Notice of Exemption (NOE) will be filed with the County Clerk after all appeal periods have been exhausted. The County requires a \$50 documentary handling fee to file a CEQA NOE. Prior to scheduling your project for a hearing a check payable to the "San Diego County Clerk" in the amount of \$50 must be forwarded to the Project Manager. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/20/2018	Deemed Complete on 04/20/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Engineering Review	Cycle Distributed: 04/20/2018	
Reviewer: Vera, Karen (619) 541-4348 Kvera@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/25/2018	
	Started: 04/30/2018	
Hours of Review: 1.50	Review Due: 05/04/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 04/30/2018	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2018	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/22/2018 from 05/09/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Engineering Review on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 3 outstanding review issues with LDR-Engineering Review (1 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Engineering Review performed 112 reviews, 88.4% were on-time, and 31.1% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

📁 1st Review - 12/28/2017

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The Engineering Review Section has reviewed the subject development and have the following comments that need to be addressed prior to a Public Hearing. Upon resubmittal, we will complete our review of the Conditional Use Permit Plans. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	The applicant did not complete the Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist correctly. The correct response to Part A, Item No. 2 is YES, Item No. 3 is UNMARKED, Item No. 4 is UNMARKED, Final Item is "A WPCP IS REQUIRED". The Correct response to Part B, Item No. 4 is MARKED. The Correct response to Part C, Item No. 1 is NO, Item No. 2 is NO, Item No. 3 is YES. Revise the remaining form accordingly, this project is not subject to permanent storm water BMP requirements. Submit a revised checklist on the next submittal. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Revise Site Plan: Clearly show/call out what will be in the parkway area. Please note: Anything other than standard lawn in the ROW will require an Encroachment Maintenance Removal Agreement (EMRA). (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Development Permit Conditions will be determined on the next submittal when all requested information is provided. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Please provide a written response to all comments whether you agree or not and in case of disagreement, express your reasoning. (From Cycle 2)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	Additional comments may be recommended pending further review of any redesign of this project. These comments are not exclusive. Should you have any questions or comments, please call Karen Vera at 619 446-5331. (From Cycle 2)

📁 2nd Review - 04/02/2018

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	Regarding previous cycle issue #15. It looks like there are 2 backflow preventers adjacent to the property on Oberlin Drive. One to the back of the parkway, and one behind the water meter. Only one is called out on plans, please call out the second. Please clarify if second backflow preventer is in the public ROW. If so, an EMRA will be required. (From Cycle 5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	Regarding previous comment. If existing backflow preventer needs to be upgraded it should be relocated to private property. Please clarify on plans. (From Cycle 5)

📁 Conditions

For questions regarding the 'LDR-Engineering Review' review, please call Karen Vera at (619) 541-4348. Project Nbr: 585354 / Cycle: 6





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the Owner/Permittee shall assure, by permit and bond, the construction of a current City Standard driveway, adjacent to the site on Oberlin Drive, satisfactory to the City Engineer. (From Cycle 5)
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	Prior to the issuance of any construction permit the Owner/Permittee shall submit a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP). The WPCP shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in Part 2 Construction BMP Standards Chapter 4 of the City's Storm Water Standards. (From Cycle 5)
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	Prior to issuance of any engineering permits, the Owner/Permittee shall obtain Encroachment and Maintenance Removal Agreement (EMRA) for all existing and proposed improvements of any kind, including utilities, landscaping, and electrical conduits to be installed within the Oberlin Drive Public- Right-of-Way. (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/20/2018	Deemed Complete on 04/20/2018
Reviewing Discipline: LDR-Transportation Dev	Cycle Distributed: 04/20/2018	
Reviewer: Inerowicz, Michal (619) 446-5002 Minerowicz@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/24/2018	
	Started: 05/09/2018	
Hours of Review: 3.00	Review Due: 05/21/2018	
Next Review Method: Conditions	Completed: 05/15/2018	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2018	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/22/2018 from 05/09/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Conditions.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for LDR-Transportation Dev on this project as: Conditions.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 1 outstanding review issues with LDR-Transportation Dev (5 of which are new issues).
- . Last month LDR-Transportation Dev performed 73 reviews, 68.5% were on-time, and 27.7% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

2 ND REVIEW 04/11/2018

PARKING

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	Please use a rate of 2.5/1KSF instead of 2.1/1KSF. Under existing permit a minimum of 57 parking spaces is to be maintained on site. Please do not compare required parking for single use (proposed use in Suite A) against parking provided for the entire site. Show parking required and provided for the entire site for all uses. Suite B (11,175SF) @ 2.5/KSF + Suite A (11,224SF) @ 2.5/KSF = 56 spaces. Parking required 56 / provided 57 spaces (From Cycle 5)

LOADING AREA

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	Please dimension the concrete pad located at the north-east corner of the parking lot where the loading operations will take place. Project is required to provide a loading area per SDMC section 142.1010 which is a minimum length of 35 feet and a minimum width of 12 feet (From Cycle 5)

3rd review 5/9/2018

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	Please fill out "Marijuana Production Facility Parking & Trip Generation" fillable pdf sent via email (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	23	Please delete word "Building" from sheet A-1.1 top right corner "Building Required Parking" (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	24	Please delete word "IS" in Engineering Note "The ROW is has been..." Sheet A1-1 bottom center (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	25	Please remove parking calculation from Sheet A-3 (New Issue)
<input type="checkbox"/>	26	The automobile, motorcycle and bicycle parking spaces must be constructed in accordance with the requirements of the SDMC. All on-site parking stalls and aisle widths shall be in compliance with requirements of the City's Land Development Code and shall not be converted and/or utilized for any other purpose, unless otherwise authorized in writing authorized by the appropriate City decision maker in accordance with the SDMC (New Issue)





L64A-003A

Review Information

Cycle Type: 6 Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Submitted: 04/20/2018	Deemed Complete on 04/20/2018
Reviewing Discipline: Community Planning Group	Cycle Distributed: 04/20/2018	
Reviewer: Cac, Cherlyn (619) 236-6327 ccac@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 05/02/2018	
	Started: 05/02/2018	
Hours of Review: 0.30	Review Due: 05/04/2018	
Next Review Method: Submitted (Multi-Discipline)	Completed: 05/02/2018	COMPLETED ON TIME
	Closed: 05/22/2018	

- . The review due date was changed to 05/22/2018 from 05/09/2018 per agreement with customer.
- . The reviewer has indicated they want to review this project again. Reason chosen by the reviewer: Partial Response to Cmnts/Regs.
- . We request a 4th complete submittal for Community Planning Group on this project as: Submitted (Multi-Discipline).
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Your project still has 2 outstanding review issues with Community Planning Group (1 of which are new issues).
- . Last month Community Planning Group performed 74 reviews, 60.8% were on-time, and 37.8% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

Review

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	3	Please contact the Chair for the Mira Mesa Community Planning Group, Jeffry Stevens at mmcp.g.chair@gmail.com to make arrangements to present your project for review at their next available meeting. This Community Planning Group is officially recognized by the City as a representative of the community. (From Cycle 5)
<input type="checkbox"/>	4	5/2/18 If you have already obtained a recommendation from the community planning group, please submit a copy of the recommendation and/or minutes from the meeting which includes the vote count. (New Issue)

