
From: Joe Kirchofer <Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2018 11:37 AM
To: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Susan Yogi
Subject: FW: updated construction phasing Balboa Res
Attachments: FigX_Proposed Construction Phasing_sy.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

From: Susan Yogi [<mailto:SYogi@esassoc.com>]
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2018 11:50 AM
To: Joel Roos <joelr@pudco.com>; Brian Schuster <BSchuster@esassoc.com>
Cc: Joe Kirchofer <Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com>; Nora Collins <Nora_Collins@avalonbay.com>
Subject: RE: updated construction phasing Balboa Res

Thanks Joel!

- The construction equipment quantities look identical between the two options. Wouldn't there need to be an increase in construction equipment quantity and/or longer operational hours for the vertical construction to maintain the same schedule? Our notes show that we will go with the default average of 8 hrs/day for construction equipment operation for the 1,100 unit option. Perhaps your contractor can weigh in on whether there's an assumption for a % increase in magnitude for the equipment and/or operational hours for the 1,550 option?
- Our understanding is that since the 1,550 option would *not* include a below-grade public parking garage as proposed under the 1,100 option, less excavation would be required. The spreadsheet still shows 57,000 CY of off haul for the 1,550 unit option. Wouldn't there be less off haul under the higher density option?
- The spreadsheet shows that Blocks J, K, L, M, N would be constructed in Phase 2 for the 1,550 option. The geographic areas of Blocks K, L, M, and N areas are part of Phase 1 under the 1,100 option (see attached – it's based on the old block numbering but you'll see what I mean). Is there a reason Blocks K through N can't be assumed as part of Phase 1? If there are differences in the phasing schemes, then our source/receptor modeling for the 1,100 option would not be accurate for the 1,550 option.

The point is to capture differences in the construction schedule and/or intensity for the project options in the analysis. We want to make sure this is all correct before Brian's team gets started.

From: Joel Roos <joelr@pudco.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 21, 2018 1:28 PM
To: Susan Yogi <SYogi@esassoc.com>; Brian Schuster <BSchuster@esassoc.com>
Cc: 'Joe Kirchofer (Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com)' <Joe_Kirchofer@avalonbay.com>; Nora_Collins@avalonbay.com
Subject: updated construction phasing Balboa Res

Susan and Brian,

This construction schedule now includes a tab for 1548 units.

It should be noted that the City Variant does not add up to the 1550...it adds up to 1548.

The paving has now been calculated and the recycling plant has been input. Note, we are showing 3 months of operations on the recycling plant whereas AB believes that it is closer to 7 weeks. We erred on the conservative side.

Please also note, with regard to the 1550 variant, we have not made any adjustments to the parking count, except for the alignment of the Townhouses 1:1.

Best,

Joel

NOTICE: This message, including any attachments, is proprietary to AvalonBay Communities, Inc., intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information designated as internal use, confidential, and/or attorney-client privileged work product doctrine information. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this message are prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please destroy it and notify the sender immediately.