



**Geotechnical • Geologic • Coastal • Environmental**

5741 Palmer Way • Carlsbad, California 92010 • (760) 438-3155 • FAX (760) 931-0915 • [www.geosoilsinc.com](http://www.geosoilsinc.com)

July 7, 2020

W.O. 7882-A-SC

**Mr. Mark Tuszynski**  
c/o **Alan Austin & Associates**  
7724 Girard Avenue, Second Floor  
La Jolla, California 92037

Subject: Response to City Review, closed December 12, 2018, Project No:  
611654/Cycle 2, for 5692 Dolphin Place, La Jolla, California 92037

Dear Mr. Austin:

In accordance with your request and the Client's authorization, GeoSoils, Inc. (GSI) is hereby responding to the subject City review. The scope of our services has included, a review of the selected documents in the Appendix, a review of the referenced "Cycle Issues" by the City (see the Appendix), analysis of data, and preparation of this review response. This response should be reviewed in conjunction with our update report for the site (see the Appendix).

### **GSI REVIEW RESPONSE**

For convenience, the reviewers comments that are pertinent are repeated below in *italics*, followed by GSI's response.

#### **Review Comment No. 1:**

*The project site is located within geologic hazards zones 47 and 53 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Geologic Hazards Maps, Zone 47 is characterized by coastal bluffs, generally stable, favorable geologic structure, minor or no erosion, no landslides. Zone 53 is characterized by level or sloping terrain with unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk. (New Issue)*

#### **Response No. 1:**

Acknowledged.

#### **Review Comment No. 2:**

*Storm Water Requirements for the proposed conceptual development will be evaluated by LDR-Engineering review. Priority Development Projects (PDPs) may require an investigation of storm water infiltration feasibility in accordance with the Storm Water Standards (including*

*Appendix C and D). Check with your LDR-Engineering reviewer for requirements. LDR-Engineering may determine that LDR-Geology review of a storm water infiltration evaluation is required. (New Issue)*

Response No. 2:

Acknowledged.

Review Comment No. 4:

*The referenced geotechnical report is over three years old and was prepared by a geotechnical firm that is no longer in business. (New Issue)*

Response No. 4:

Acknowledged. A current geotechnical report is provided under separate cover.

Review Comment No. 5:

*An update geotechnical investigation report that addresses the geologic conditions at the site and the issues that follow must be submitted for review. The geotechnical report must be prepared in accordance with the City's "Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports," <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/development-services/pdf/industry/geoguidelines.pdf>. (New Issue)*

Response No. 5:

Acknowledged. An update geotechnical investigation report is provided under separate cover.

Review Comment No. 6:

*Edge of Bluff:*

*Provide a current determination of the bluff edge in accordance with the methods described in the Coastal Bluffs and Beaches Guidelines. <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/development-services/pdf/industry/landdevmanual/ldmcoastal.pdf>. (New Issue)*

Response No. 6:

Acknowledged. A current determination of the bluff edge is provided under separate cover in the update geotechnical report.

Review Comment No. 7:

*Provide an accurate and precise topographic map of the ground surface of the property and beyond to aid in establishing the location of the coastal beach, coastal bluff face, and coastal bluff edge as defined in the City's Coastal Bluffs and Beaches Guidelines. Consideration should be given to providing elevation contours with an interval no greater than 2-feet. (New Issue)*

Response No. 7:

GSI respectfully disagrees with the reviewer, in that the beach and bluff are armored and virtually no erosion has occurred since the issuance of the aforementioned older geotechnical report. To that end, GSI has electronically merged the current topographic map of the pad near street grade with the older topographic map of the bluff top, bluff, and beach for use in our analyses.

Review Comment No. 8:

*Indicate the bluff edge on the topographic map, the site plan, and site sections. The geotechnical consultant must provide three geologic cross sections through the lot, including the bluff edge. The cross-sections must match the site plan and include all geologic information. Show the existing gunite faced bluff, rock revetment, 25 foot and 40 foot coastal bluff edge setbacks and 1.5 factor of safety line on the site plan and sections. (New Issue)*

Response No. 8:

Acknowledged. The requested information is included in the update geotechnical report, under separate cover.

Review Comment No. 9:

*Geologic units including fill soils and proposed lot improvements must be shown and labeled. Fill distribution and thickness should be based on subsurface investigation by the geotechnical consultant. (New Issue)*

Response No. 9:

Acknowledged. The requested information is included in the update geotechnical report, provided under separate cover.

Review Comment No. 10:

*Bluff Recession:*

*Please provide an average bluff recession rate in feet per year and the resulting feet of bluff recession in 75 years. Please provide photographic copies or high density scans of historic photographs used in the analysis (.jpg or .tif format) as well as copies of any other documents used. Please indicate the points measured as part of the analysis. (New Issue)*

Response No. 10:

An average bluff recession rate and photographs are provided in the update geotechnical report, under separate cover.

Review Comment No. 11:

*A site-specific rate must be determined for the site by using historical data, such as historic aerial photographs. If the rate exceeds 25 feet in 75 years, please provide a bluff edge setback suitable to preclude erosion of the bluff affecting the lot improvements for the specified period of time (76 years). (New Issue)*

Response No. 11:

The requested information is provided in the update geotechnical report, under separate cover.

Review Comment No. 12:

*Please provide an analysis of the potential effects on bluff stability of rising sea levels and of the potential effects of past and projected El Nino events on bluff stability, using latest scientific information. The report must also provide an analysis of whether this section of coastline is under a process of retreat. (New Issue)*

Response No. 12:

Acknowledged. The requested information is provided in the update geotechnical report, under separate cover.

Review Comment No. 13:

*Please address rising sea levels with respect to "California Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance, Interpretive Guidelines for Addressing Sea Level Rise in Local Coastal Programs and Coastal Development Permits," adopted August 12, 2015 (available at: [https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/slr/guidance/August2015/0\\_Fulll\\_Adopted\\_Sea\\_Level\\_Rise\\_Policy\\_Guidance.pdf](https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/assets/slr/guidance/August2015/0_Fulll_Adopted_Sea_Level_Rise_Policy_Guidance.pdf)). (New Issue)*

Response No. 13:

Acknowledged. The requested information is provided in the update geotechnical report, under separate cover.

Review Comment No. 14:

*Provide slope stability analysis for each geologic cross section, The consultant must demonstrate and conclude that the site will have factors of safety of 1.5 or greater with respect to gross and surficial bluff stability at the completion of the project. (New Issue)*

Response No. 14:

Acknowledged. The requested information is provided in the update geotechnical report, under separate cover.

Review Comment No. 15:

*Construction Impacts: The geotechnical consultant must comment whether or not the proposed scope of work as recommended will measurably destabilize neighboring properties or induce the settlement of adjacent structures. (New Issue)*

Response No. 15:

The proposed scope of work, as recommended, will not measurably destabilize neighboring properties or induce the settlement of adjacent structures.

Review Comment No. 16:

*Submit original quality prints and digital copies (on CD/DVD/or USB data storage device) of the referenced and requested geotechnical reports for our review and for our records. (New Issue)*

Response No. 16:

Acknowledged. GSI will provide the requested documents and storage device to the project architect for his submittal to the City.

The opportunity to be of service is sincerely appreciated. If you should have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Respectfully submitted,

**GeoSoils, Inc.**



John P. Franklin  
Engineering Geologist, CEG 1340



David W. Skelly  
Civil Engineer, RCE 47857



JPF/DWS/mn

Attachments: Appendix - Selected References

Distribution: (3) Addressee (wet signed and pdf)

## APPENDIX

### SELECTED REFERENCES

Benumof, B.T. and Griggs, G.B., 1999. The dependence of seacliff erosion rates on material properties and physical processes: San Diego County, California *in* Shore & Beach, Journal of the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, Volume 67, No. 4, pp. 29-41.

California Coastal Records Project, 2013, photo no. 201312387.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2010, photo no. 201003941.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2008, photo no. 200804629.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2006, photo no. 200604482.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2004, photo no. 200407777.

\_\_\_\_\_, 2002, photo no. 9485.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1989, photo no. 8920123.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1987, photo no. 8701243.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1979, photo no. 7955069.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1972, photo no. 7241078.

City of San Diego, Development Services Department, 2020, 9044 LJ Shore Ln Emergency, Cycle Type: 1 submitted (multi-Discipline), project nbr: 660175/Cycle: 1, closed: March 5.

EDR, 2020, The EDR Aerial Photo Decade Package, 500-scale aerial photos, 2016, 2012, 2009, 2005, 1994, 1990, 1987, 1985, 1979, 1970, 1966, 1964, 1953, 1949, 1928, various flights.

Emery, K.O., and Kuhn, G.G., 1982, Sea cliffs: their processes, profiles, and classification: Geological Society of America Bulletin, v. 93, no 7.

\_\_\_\_\_, 1980, Erosion of rock shores at La Jolla, California, *in* Marine Geology, v. 37.

GeoSoils, Inc., 2020, Update Geotechnical Evaluation, Proposed Residential Addition, 5692 Dolphin Pl., La Jolla, California 92037, Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 357-421-01-00, W.O. 7882-A-SC, dated July 3.

- Hapke, C.J. and, Reid, D.; 2007, National Assessment of Shoreline Change Part 4: Historical Coastal Cliff Retreat Along the California Coast: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2007-1133.
- Hapke, C.J.; Reid, D.; Richmond, B.M.; Ruggiero, P.; and List, J.; 2006, National assessment of shoreline change part 3: historical shoreline change and associated coastal land loss along sandy shorelines of the California coast: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2006-1219.
- Kennedy, M.P., 1973, Sea-cliff erosion at Sunset Cliffs, San Diego, in California Geology, v. 26, February.
- Kennedy, M.P., and Tan, SS., 2008, Geologic map of the San Diego 30' by 60' quadrangle, California, Map no. 3, scale 1:100,000, California Geologic Survey and U.S. Geologic Survey.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 2005, Geologic map of the San Diego 30' by 60' quadrangle, California, regional geologic map series, scale 1:100,000, California Geologic Survey and United States Geological Survey, [www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/rgm/preliminary\\_geologic\\_maps.htm](http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/rgm/preliminary_geologic_maps.htm)
- Woodward-Clyde Consultants, 1989, Geologic evaluation - coastal bluff property at 205 - 205-½ Bird Rock Avenue, La Jolla, California, project no. 8951020D-COS1, dated March 17.