Operations Committee - Wednesday, February 20, 2019

1. Agenda Packet

   Documents:

   190220 AGENDA PACKET_WEB.PDF
1. **CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL.**

2. **ITEMS TO BE ADDED, WITHDRAWN, OR REORDERED IN THE AGENDA.**

3. **PUBLIC COMMENT.**
   Opportunity for members of the public to address the Committee. (Government Code Section 54954.3).

4. **ACTION AGENDA.**
   The following items on the Action Agenda call for discussion and action by the Committee. All items are placed on the Agenda so that the Committee may discuss and take action on the item if the Committee is so inclined, including items listed for information.
   
   A. Consideration to Award a Contract for Heavy Equipment Replacement
   B. Request to Approve Easement Quitclaim – 237 Rogan Road, Chula Vista
   C. Overview of Fiscal Impact – Expense vs. Capital (Information Item)
   D. Facility and Capital Project Tours (No Enclosure)
   E. Ridgeway Apartments Project by Blue Centurion Homes, Development Project Update (Information Item)

5. **CLOSED SESSION.**
   At any time during the regular session, the Committee may adjourn to closed session to discuss real property matters within the attorney-client privilege, subject to the appropriate disclosures. (Government Code Section 54956.8).

6. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** Wednesday, March 20, 2019 at 10:00 a.m.

7. **ADJOURNMENT.**
   This agenda was posted at least seventy-two (72) hours before the meeting in a location freely accessible to the Public on the exterior bulletin board at the main entrance to the Authority’s office and it is also posted on the Authority’s website at www.sweetwater.org. No action may be taken on any item not appearing on the posted agenda, except as provided by California Government Code Section 54954.2. Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the members of the Sweetwater Authority Governing Board regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the Authority Administration Office, located at 505 Garrett Avenue, Chula Vista, CA 91910, during normal business hours. Upon request, this agenda will be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with disabilities, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Any person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should direct such request to the Board Secretary at (619) 409-6703 at least forty-eight (48) hours before the meeting, if possible.

To e-subscribe to receive meeting agendas and other pertinent information, please visit www.sweetwater.org.
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TO: Governing Board (Operations Committee)
FROM: Management
DATE: February 15, 2019
SUBJECT: Consideration to Award a Contract for Heavy Equipment Replacement

SUMMARY
The FY 2018-19 Budget includes the purchase of one (1) backhoe loader. Staff utilized Sourcewell (formerly National Joint Powers Alliance) to obtain quotes from companies for a backhoe loader. Sourcewell offers competitively solicited cooperative contracts by combining the purchasing power of 50,000 government, education, and nonprofit organizations. This approach simplifies the procurement process as Sourcewell has previously conducted the bidding. Utilizing the contracts Sourcewell provides, each dealership offers equal pricing when comparing equivalent units. The lowest bid was from RDO Equipment Company. The quote included credit for the trade-in value for the existing backhoe that is being replaced.

The Authority has standardized its fleet in order to benefit from increased maintenance efficiencies, reduced operating cost, and streamlining the specification and bid process. The standardized manufacturer of rubber tire loaders (backhoes) is John Deere. RDO Equipment Company is the local John Deere dealer, and the Authority has utilized RDO Equipment Company in the past with no concerns.

After reviewing the specifications and quote, staff recommends proceeding with a direct purchase with a trade-in allowance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dealership</th>
<th>Equipment Description</th>
<th>Total Purchase Price with Trade-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDO Equipment Company</td>
<td>John Deer 410L</td>
<td>$121,920.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT
The FY 2018-19 Budget includes funding to purchase one (1) backhoe loader.

- Budgeted Amount: $149,000.00
- Less Purchase: <121,920.32>
- Balance: $27,079.68
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POLICY
The Authority’s Procurement Policy requires that the Governing Board approve all equipment purchases in excess of $50,000.

Strategic Plan Goal 2, System and Water Supply Reliability: Achieve an uninterrupted, long-term water supply through investment, maintenance and innovation
  • Objective SR4: Maintain and replace fleet vehicles and equipment in accordance with manufacturers’ recognized standards and practices, and the Authority’s Fleet Maintenance and Replacement Program

Strategic Plan Goal 7, Environmental Stewardship: Provide core services while maintaining a balanced approach to human and environmental needs
  • Objective ES4: Comply with Heavy Equipment Replacement policies from the regulatory agencies
    o 001.00: Replace eight pieces of heavy equipment beginning in FY 2012-2013 and ending in FY 2024-2025 to meet requirements of CARB (approximately one replacement every other year)

ALTERNATIVES
1. Award a contract in the amount of $121,920.32 to RDO Equipment Company, Lakeside, CA, for the purchase of one (1) John Deere 410L Backhoe Loader with attachments.

2. Reject the quote and provide direction to staff.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Governing Board award a contract in the amount of $121,920.32 to RDO Equipment Company, Lakeside, CA, for the purchase of one (1) John Deere 410L Backhoe Loader with attachments.

ATTACHMENT
Standardizing Sweetwater Authority Automotive and Heavy Equipment Fleets
TO: Management
FROM: Tristan Hayman, Interim Director of Distribution
DATE: Tuesday, August 28, 2018
SUBJECT: Standardizing Sweetwater Authority Automotive and Heavy Equipment Fleets

SUMMARY
The Sweetwater Authority (Authority) automotive and equipment fleets are comprised of over 100 diverse vehicles and equipment types that are specifically designed to carry out the unique functions they are required to perform. In addition to this the technological evolution, even within the same make and model of vehicle over several years, can incur numerous variations even in a small fleet. The Authority has for many years minimized the variety of vehicle and equipment manufacturers within its fleet, but has not formally approved standardizing the fleet. Standardizing with one make of chassis, body, equipment, and major components can greatly reduce the degree of fleet diversity and many of the problems it brings. This memorandum seeks to share the benefits of standardizing and obtain management’s approval.

Obvious benefits and savings from standardizing a fleet accrue from:

Improved Maintenance Efficiency:
The complexity of vehicle and equipment systems is increasing with the addition of electronic sensors and controls, new emissions technology, and smart safety devices. This steep learning curve for fleet maintenance technicians can be reduced by limiting the variety of new systems. Proficiency in the maintenance garage is largely a function of solid training and experience. A standardized fleet can expect quicker repairs and fewer mistakes, all other factors being equal.

Fewer Diagnostic and Specialty Tools:
Test equipment and software updates or subscriptions can be an expensive, recurring cost. To a lesser extent, so can unique hand tools. Standardized fleets generally realize budgetary savings since they avoid multiple specialized diagnostic equipment and specialty tools.

Fewer Parts and Bulk Fluid Inventory:
The more variety within a fleet, the more spare parts and bulk fluid types you must stock. Standardization will reduce costs from the reduced value of parts required to be kept in inventory.

Faster Specification and Bid Evaluation:
Once segments of a fleet are standardized, the workload for each new purchase is significantly less difficult and time consuming.
Increased Operational Efficiency and Safety:
Vehicle and equipment operators become accustomed to the controls, displays, and “feel” of a unit. Standardizing allows operators greater flexibility in making driver assignments without loss of productivity or the increased liability of drivers switching between dissimilar units. They also learn the capabilities of a given unit (e.g., how full a dump truck looks when at its maximum rated payload for a given material, or how many scoops of what size material a wheel loader takes to hit the critical fill point).

The table below indicates the service type of vehicle and equipment and the proposed standardized manufacturer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small/Medium Pickup Trucks</td>
<td>Ford Motor Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Utility Vehicles and Sedans</td>
<td>Ford Motor Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Trucks (4CY – 10 CY)</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Trucks</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum Excavator Trucks</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber Tired Loaders (Backhoes)</td>
<td>John Deere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front End Loaders</td>
<td>John Deere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skid Steers</td>
<td>John Deere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Tractors</td>
<td>John Deere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Equipment Trailers</td>
<td>Zieman Manufacturing Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approve staff’s request to standardize Sweetwater Authority’s automotive and equipment fleets.

Submitted by: Tristan Hayman, Interim Director of Distribution

Reviewed by: Jennifer Sabine, Assistant General Manager

Approved by: Tish Berge, General Manager
STANDARDIZATION OF SPECIFICATION FORM

Item Requested:
Sweetwater Authority Automotive and Heavy Equipment Fleet

Vendor or Manufacturer:
Various – See associated memorandum

Which definition of the ‘Sole Source’ policy does this request meet?
☒ Is compatible with or matches existing equipment/components
☒ Is most reliable, cost efficient, and/or feasible for the Authority
☒ Provides safety benefits or complies with safety standards

Justification and Explanation:
Please see memorandum “Standardizing Sweetwater Authority Automotive and Equipment Fleets dated August 28, 2018.

Requesting Department: Distribution Department Date: 8/28/2018

Department Head Signature: [Signature]

Management Signature: [Signature]

"Exhibit 14 to the Procurement Policy"
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TO:       Governing Board (Operations Committee)
FROM:     Management
DATE:     February 15, 2019
SUBJECT:  Request to Approve Easement Quitclaim – 237 Rogan Road, Chula Vista

SUMMARY
Nathan Wallace, the Owner of the parcel at 237 Rogan Road, Chula Vista (A.P.N. 569-090-19-00), is planning to subdivide the subject parcel. Before subdividing, Mr. Wallace is requesting the quitclaim of a Sweetwater Authority (Authority) defined easement granted to the San Diego Land and Town Company. Approval of this easement quitclaim request would remove the Authority’s encumbrance on the property.

The San Diego Land and Town Company easement, which covers a portion of the parcel, was recorded in 1888. Staff has researched Authority facility maps and found that there is no existing plan for future water facilities on this parcel requiring the need for the easement. Currently, there is one (1) two-inch water service with a one-inch water meter serving the parcel.

FISCAL IMPACT
There is no fiscal impact. All costs for processing the quitclaim are the responsibility of the requestor.

POLICY/STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE
It is the Authority’s practice to quitclaim easements if it is determined that there is no potential use of the easement, there is no future extension of the system to service the parcel, and the easement has no value. In evaluating quitclaim requests, a recommendation to quitclaim will generally be made if the following criteria are met:

1. There is not a current or projected need for the easement.
2. There is no requirement to purchase an alternative easement for the retired facility or for a new facility.
3. There is no other property that is dependent on the easement proposed for quitclaim for water service now or in the future.

The easement requested to be quitclaimed meets the above criteria.

Strategic Plan Goal 2, System Reliability: Achieve an uninterrupted, long-term water supply through investment, maintenance, and innovation.
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- Objective SR10: Maintain the Authority's easements throughout the service area to ensure access and minimize negative impacts to water system facilities.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the quitclaim request of the San Diego Land and Town Company easement, with the Owner paying all costs associated with processing the quitclaim.

2. Reject the quitclaim request

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve the quitclaim request of the San Diego Land and Town Company easement, with the Owner paying all costs associated with processing the quitclaim.

ATTACHMENT

Location Map
Request to Approve Easement Quitclaim

237 Rogan Road, Chula Vista
Quarter Section 124

APN: 569-090-19-00

SWA EASEMENT 3-SW-3
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TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)
FROM: Management
DATE: October 11, 2012
SUBJECT: Extension of Sole-Source Contract for On-Call Cathodic Protection Consultant

SUMMARY

Section 6 of Sweetwater Authority’s (Authority) Procurement Policy and Procedures allows for sole-source selection of on-call professional consultants when there is a need for a specific expertise and/or for the purpose of retaining such consultant for a specific project area to maintain continuity (e.g., the Sweetwater/Loveland Dam, Geotechnical, Environmental, Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System [SCADA], Auditors, and Bond Counsel). Staff considers cathodic protection system (CPS) analysis and design to be an essential specialized service, and is recommending a contract extension for V&A Consultant Engineers, Inc. (V&A), the Authority’s current CPS on-call consultant.

V&A was selected for this work by the Board in 2003 when the company was named DEC Consulting Engineers (DEC). DEC was bought by V&A in 2007. V&A has completed numerous CPS annual monitoring surveys, focused feasibility studies and designs on-time and under budget for the Authority.

Currently, V&A is working on the annual CPS survey and the steel pipeline assessment for freeway crossings. They have recently completed studies on the feasibility of repairing key CPSs for the Authority.

Because of V&A’s quality of work, specific expertise, knowledge of the distribution system’s extensive CPS, and to maintain continuity with on-going projects, a five-year extension of the current contract is recommended.

FISCAL IMPACT

The CPS projects and studies to be completed by the on-call professional consultants are addressed and approved each fiscal year in the budget process.
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POLICY

The Governing Board must approve sole-source selection of an on-call, professional consultant with specific expertise and/or purpose of retaining such consultant for specific project areas.

ALTERNATIVES

Do not approve the sole-source selection of the on-call cathodic protection consultant, and require a competitive selection process to re-select a new consultant for the work.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve a five-year, sole-source contract with V&A Consultant Engineers, Inc., Oakland, CA, as the on-call consultant for the Authority’s cathodic protection system.

Submitted by: __________________________________________
Ron R. Mosher, Director of Engineering

Reviewed by: __________________________________________
Jennifer H. Sabine, Assistant General Manager

Approved by: __________________________________________
James L. Smyth, General Manager
TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)
FROM: Management
DATE: June 14, 2012
SUBJECT: Recommendation to Award Contracts for Construction Fill Material and Trucking Services

SUMMARY

The Purchasing Section recently issued a Request for Quote (RFQ) to thirteen vendors for construction fill material and trucking services. An advertisement was placed in the San Diego Union-Tribune newspaper and the RFQ was posted on the Authority’s website in an effort to reach other potential vendors. A minimum quantity was not guaranteed; however, an estimated usage and billable hours were provided on the Bidder’s Response Form for the sole purpose of comparing offers. Estimated usage and hours may be increased or decreased to meet the Authority’s requirements during the period of performance.

Three proposals were received in response to the RFQ (see attached bid tabulation). The Distribution Department and the Purchasing Section reviewed the bid tabulation in order to determine the lowest responsible and responsive bidder for each item.

The award recommendations by vendor are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Estimated Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Materials, Inc.</td>
<td>Decomposed Granite (DG)</td>
<td>$40,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Materials, Inc.</td>
<td>DG, Pre-Moistened</td>
<td>28,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Rock &amp; Sand, Inc.</td>
<td>Crushed Aggregate Base</td>
<td>18,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Rock &amp; Sand, Inc.</td>
<td>1-inch Minus Rock</td>
<td>1,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Rock &amp; Sand, Inc.</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>1,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Rock &amp; Sand, Inc.</td>
<td>Cold Mix</td>
<td>147,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast Rock &amp; Sand, Inc.</td>
<td>Trucking Services</td>
<td>35,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$273,404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FISCAL IMPACT

The combined contract cost is estimated to be $273,404 with funding divided between Capital and Expense projects. These costs are included in the proposed 2012–2013 fiscal year budget.

POLICY

All purchases greater than $50,000 require approval by the Governing Board.

ALTERNATIVES

There are no reasonable alternatives.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board award contracts for construction fill material and trucking services, as follows: $68,886 to Mountain Materials, Inc., Lakeside, CA, ($40,110 for Decomposed Granite, and $28,776 for Pre-Moistened Decomposed Granite), and $204,518 to West Coast Rock & Sand, Inc., Lakeside, CA, ($18,980 for Crushed Aggregate Base; $1,376 for 1-inch Minus Rock; $1,092 for Sand; $147,870 for Cold Mix; and $35,200 for Trucking Services).

Attachment: Bid Tabulation

Submitted by: __________________________
William Olson, Director of Distribution

Approved by: __________________________
James L. Smyth, General Manager
TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)

FROM: Management

DATE: April 26, 2012

SUBJECT: Award of Annual Contracts for Water Treatment Chemicals

SUMMARY

The Purchasing Section recently issued a Request for Quotes (RFQ) to 24 suppliers for water treatment chemicals to be used in the operation of the Perdue Plant, Desal Facility, and National City Wells. The RFQ was also posted on the Authority’s website in an effort to reach other potential vendors. The RFQ stated that the contract would be awarded by individual item(s) through annual contracts. A minimum quantity was not guaranteed; although, an estimated usage was provided for each item to assist in calculating the total bid price. The vendors were made aware that the quantities provided were estimates only and may increase or decrease to meet the Authority’s requirements during the contract period.

There were 18 proposals received in response to the RFQ. The quotes reflected on this tabulation are shown as unit costs only (e.g., pounds per gallon of chemical) with the estimated total cost per vendor/chemical shown below. Water Quality and Purchasing Section staff reviewed the bid tabulations in order to determine the lowest, responsive bidder for each item. The award recommendations by vendor are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>Estimated Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brenntag Pacific, Inc.</td>
<td>Sodium Hypochlorite 12.5%</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Water Technologies</td>
<td>Ferric Chloride 43%</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Brothers Chemical Co.</td>
<td>Aqua Ammonia 19.0%</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Dioxide Inc.</td>
<td>Sodium Chlorite 31%</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCI Jones Chemicals, Inc</td>
<td>Ton Cylinders of Chlorine</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemira Water Solutions, Inc.</td>
<td>Ferrous Chloride</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olin Chlor Alkali Products</td>
<td>Sodium Hydroxide 50%</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polydyne, Inc.</td>
<td>Cationic Polymer</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher Company of CA</td>
<td>Activated Carbon Powder</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thatcher Company of CA</td>
<td>Aluminum Sulfate 45-55%</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univar USA, Inc.</td>
<td>Ammonium Sulfate</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FISCAL IMPACT

The combined contract cost is estimated to be $997,500, with funding included in Water Quality’s FY 2012-13 Operating Expense budget.

POLICY

All purchases greater than $50,000 require approval by the Governing Board.

ALTERNATIVES

There are no reasonable alternatives.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board award contracts for water treatment chemicals as follows: $50,000 to Brenntag Pacific, Inc., Santa Fe Springs, CA, for Sodium Hypochlorite 12.5%; $110,000 to California Water Technologies, Santa Fe Springs, CA, for Ferric Chloride 43%; $51,000 to Hill Brothers Chemical Co., Brea, CA, for Aqua Ammonia 19%; $260,000 to International Dioxide, Inc., North Kingstown, RI, for Sodium Chlorite 31%; $56,000 to JCI Jones Chemical, Inc., Torrance, CA, for Chlorine; $80,000 to Kemira Water Solutions, Inc., Lawrence, KS, for Ferrous Chloride; $190,000 to Olin Chlor Alkali Products, Tracy, CA, for Sodium Hydroxide 50%; $162,000 to Polydyne, Inc., Riceboro, GA, for Cationic Polymer; $15,500 to Thatcher Company of CA, Downey, CA, ($15,000 for Activated Carbon Powder and $500 for Aluminum Sulfate), and $8,000 to Univar USA, Inc., Kent, WA, for Ammonium Sulfate.

Submitted by:  
Scott McClelland, Director of Water Quality

Reviewed by:  
Jennifer H. Sabine, Assistant General Manager

Approved by:  
James L. Smyth, General Manager
TO:  Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)

FROM:  Management

DATE:  March 29, 2012

SUBJECT:  Renew Contract with TRM Inc. for Maximo Enterprise Asset Management System

SUMMARY

Staff is recommending a three-year contract extension for Total Resource Management Inc. (TRM), in order to maintain continuity for the integration of the Maximo Enterprise Asset Management System (Maximo) with the pending IBM system replacement. The current contract with TRM expires on September 30, 2012.

The Board selected TRM in 2007 for the Maximo project implementation, and approved a two-year contract extension in 2010. TRM is currently upgrading the Maximo system to the most current version, and is also working closely with CH2M Hill on the IBM system replacement to determine how to best integrate Maximo with the proposed Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system that will replace the IBM system.

Because of TRM’s quality of work, specific expertise, and knowledge of the Authority’s current Maximo system, and to maintain continuity with the proposed ERP system, a three-year contract extension is recommended. This will allow TRM to complete the current Maximo software upgrade, and to continue to assist the Authority in integrating Maximo with the proposed ERP program.

FISCAL IMPACT

| Existing Contract Amount | $180,000 |
| Proposed FY 2012-13 Contract | $72,000 |
| Proposed FY 2013-14 Contract | $75,000 |
| Proposed FY 2014-15 Contract | $75,000 |
POLICY

Allows for a contract extension with a consultant that was previously selected and approved by the Board to maintain continuity subject to Board review and approval.

ALTERNATIVE

Complete a competitive selection process to re-select a consultant for the Maximo work.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve a three-year contract extension in the amounts of $72,000 for FY 2012-13, $75,000 for FY 2013-14, and $75,000 for FY 2014-15 with Total Resources Management Inc., Alexandria, Virginia, to continue the implementation of the Maximo Enterprise Asset Management System.

Submitted by:  
George Silva, Director of Information Systems

Reviewed by:  
Jennifer H. Sabine, Assistant General Manager

Approved by:  
Jim Smyth, General Manager
TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)
FROM: Management
DATE: January 27, 2012
SUBJECT: Award of Contract to Purchase Fuel

SUMMARY

The Purchasing Section participated as part of a cooperative procurement Request for Proposal (RFP 10015195-12-Z) issued by the City of San Diego to establish a requirement contract for various types of unleaded and diesel fuel.

The City of San Diego and 20 other public agencies throughout the County of San Diego (see attachment) combined efforts in order to seek additional potential price discounts based on an economy of scale.

Two hundred and eighty six potential proposers were sent a notice regarding the RFP through Demand Star (the City’s electronic procurement platform). Twenty four potential proposers downloaded a copy of the RFP documents. The Request for Proposal was advertised in the San Diego Daily Transcript on July 29, 2011 and was broadcast through Demand Star website on July 30, 2011. Three proposals were received.

A comprehensive review of the proposals submitted in response to the RFP was completed. The evaluation was conducted based upon the criteria specified in the RFP. Proposers were assigned an overall final ranking based on the RFP evaluation criteria.

In order to establish a verifiable fuel price per gallon, the RFP utilized a benchmark index. The benchmark index is based on data provided by the Oil Price Information Service (OPIS) “Unbranded Low Rack” for San Diego. The Unbranded Low Rack is a snapshot of the lowest supplier posting in the OPIS rack market. The benchmark index is based on the date of fuel delivery.

The RFP required contractors to propose a Market Differential for the OPIS Rack market for each given delivery item listed in the RFP. The Market Differential is a four-digit decimal numerical value that is added to the benchmark index for the price of a given fuel product.
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The Market Differential includes all cost and profit components determined by the contractor, excluding any applicable taxes.

A total estimated contract price was calculated by modifying the Benchmark Index (described above) by the Market Differential entered by the contractor for each delivery location, and multiplying the resulting price per gallon by the estimated quantity of fuel to determine the estimated cost for each delivery location. The sum of the estimated costs for all locations determined the total estimated contract price.

The lowest total estimated contract price of the proposal that met the requirements of this RFP received the maximum assigned points to this category as set forth in the evaluation criteria specified in the RFP. The other Price Schedule proposals were scored based on how much higher their total estimated contract prices compare with the lowest total estimated contract price.

Upon conclusion of the review and evaluation, it was determined that The SoCo Group’s proposal represented the best overall value, considering the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

Based on Estimated Yearly Usage and the Calculated Price per Gallon:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Fuel</th>
<th>Estimated Yearly Usage (gallons)</th>
<th>Calculated Price per Gallon</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Regular unleaded</td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>$2.7948</td>
<td>$124,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Diesel No. 2</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>3.1697</td>
<td>55,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Diesel No. 2</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>$3.2997</td>
<td>3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Yearly Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$183,799</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The yearly contract cost is estimated to be $183,799, with funding provided in the 2011-2012 Fiscal Year budget and proposed 2012-2013 Fiscal Year budget.
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POLICY

All purchases greater than $50,000 require approval by the Governing Board.

The Purchasing Section may utilize cooperative bidding/”piggyback” contracting to utilize contracts awarded by the United States of America, any state, municipality, or public agency, when it is in the Authority’s best interest to do so.

ALTERNATIVES

There are no reasonable alternatives.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board award a one-year contract, with the option to extend for four additional one-year periods, to The SoCo Group, Carlsbad, CA for the purchase of unleaded and diesel fuel.

Attachment: Participating Agencies (20)

Submitted by: ______________________________
Bill Olson, Director of Distribution

Reviewed by: ______________________________
Jennifer Smith, Assistant General Manager

Approved by: ______________________________
James L. Smyth, General Manager
TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)

FROM: Management

DATE: October 11, 2012

SUBJECT: 2012-13 Vehicle Replacement Program – Award of Contracts for Five Vehicles

SUMMARY

The 2012-2013 fiscal year budget includes the purchase of five vehicles for replacement for various departments. The Purchasing Section issued a Request for Quote (RFQ) to twenty-three (23) dealerships. Also, an advertisement was placed in The San Diego Union-Tribune and the RFQ was posted on the Authority’s website in an effort to reach additional dealerships. Nine proposals were received in response to the RFQ (see attached summary).

For Bid Items No. 1 and 2, the Authority requested pricing for an unleaded fuel Ford Fusion or Chevrolet equivalent, with optional pricing for a hybrid Ford Fusion or Chevrolet equivalent. A bid was received from City Chevrolet with pricing for a Chevrolet Malibu hybrid sedan. During the review process, it was discovered that the Chevrolet Malibu hybrid sedan had an estimated miles per gallon (MPG) of 25 city and 37 highway. The Ford Fusion hybrid sedan has an estimated MPG of 47 city and 47 highway. Therefore, the bid submitted by City Chevrolet is considered non-responsive as the MPG with the Chevrolet Malibu hybrid sedan would not be equivalent to the Ford Fusion hybrid sedan.

The summary of the lowest, responsive, and responsible bidders are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dealership</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Vehicle Description</th>
<th>Price ((^{\text{1)}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica Ford, Santa Monica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2013 Ford Fusion Hybrid Sedan</td>
<td>$27,221.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds Buick Inc., Covina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2013 GMC Sierra Pickup Truck</td>
<td>22,000.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunRoad Auto LLC, San Diego</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2013 Ford F250, HD Utility Truck</td>
<td>29,856.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunRoad Auto LLC, San Diego</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2013 Ford F750 Flatbed Truck</td>
<td>77,760.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SunRoad Auto LLC, San Diego</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2013 Ford F650 Utility Crew Truck</td>
<td>$103,393.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{\text{1)}}\) Tax included
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**FISCAL IMPACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$432,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Vehicle Purchase</td>
<td>&lt;260,233.19&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Off-Road Utility Vehicle</td>
<td>&lt;13,915.91&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Vehicles Carried Over and Purchased</td>
<td>&lt;52,999.19&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Other Cost (Vehicle Outfitting)</td>
<td>&lt;6,000.00&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>$98,851.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Vehicle was bid separately and requisitioned by staff per the Authority's Procurement Policy and Procedures
(2) Vehicles carried over from FY 2011-12 Budget
(3) Emergency lights, utility boxes, computer stands, and striping

**POLICY**

The Procurement Policy requires that the Finance and Personnel Committee and Governing Board approval is required for all equipment purchases in excess of $50,000.

**ALTERNATIVES**

For Bid Item No. 1, the Authority could choose not to purchase a hybrid sedan and award the bid to Raceway Ford for the purchase of a regular, unleaded sedan at the cost of $19,812.06. No other alternatives are recommended.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Governing Board declare the bid from City Chevrolet for the Chevrolet Malibu ECO as non-responsive and award the following contracts for the total purchase of five vehicles as a part of the 2012-13 Vehicle Replacement Program:
- $27,221.96 to Santa Monica Ford, San Monica, CA (one vehicle);
- $22,000.53 to Reynolds Buick Inc., Covina, CA (one vehicle);
- $211,010.70 SunRoad Auto LLC, San Diego, CA (three vehicles).

Attachment: Summary

Submitted by: William Olson, Director of Distribution

Reviewed by: Jennifer H. Sabine, Assistant General Manager

Approved by: James L. Smyth, General Manager
TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)

FROM: Management

DATE: August 9, 2012

SUBJECT: Award of Contract for the 2012-13 Design Survey and Construction Staking Services

SUMMARY

The 2012-13 Fiscal Year Budget includes a project to provide design survey and construction staking services for Engineering Designs and the Pipeline Replacement Program scheduled for construction for the current and next fiscal year. Specifically, twelve projects require survey for design, and eleven projects require staking of the completed designs for construction purposes.

Requests for Proposal were sent to four qualified consulting firms who expressed interest in the project. On July 30, 2012, one proposal was submitted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Design Surveys</th>
<th>Construction Staking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berggren &amp; Associates</td>
<td>$53,492</td>
<td>$20,528</td>
<td>$74,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDS Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimley-Horn and Associates</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Engineering Company</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff has worked with Berggren & Associates in the past, and has found its work to be of good quality.

FISCAL IMPACT

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>$77,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Contract Amount</td>
<td>74,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>$2,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Budget reflects survey work only from three Capital projects: $50,000 Engineering Design Program; $15,000 Pipeline Replacement Program (Engineering); and $12,000 Pipeline Replacement Program (Distribution)
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POLICY

The Authority’s Procurement Policy requires soliciting proposals from a minimum of three prospective consultants qualified to perform the services in question. Also, for professional service contracts greater than $50,000, the Consultant Selection Committee would convene to interview and select the most qualified consultant with Board approval. Since only one proposal was received, and the fact that this type of professional service is routine in nature, staff is recommending that the Consultant Selection Committee not be convened.

ALTERNATIVES

There are no reasonable alternatives.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board award a contract in an amount not-to-exceed $74,020 to Berggren & Associates, San Diego, CA, for the 2012-13 Design Survey and Construction Staking Services.

Submitted by: __________________________
Ron R. Mosher, Director of Engineering

Approved by: __________________________
James L. Smyth, General Manager
TO: Governing Board (Operations Committee)
FROM: Management
DATE: November 1, 2012
SUBJECT: Recommendation to Award a Contract for the Cross-Connection Office Rehabilitation

SUMMARY

The 2012-13 fiscal year budget includes a project to rehabilitate office space in the Meter Shop at the Authority’s Operations Center that is being utilized by Cross-Connection staff. This project involves combining two separate office spaces for use by the Cross-Connection staff, installing adequate heating, ventilation and air-conditioning, as well as updating all windows, doors and walls to building standards. Currently, one of the existing office spaces is utilized by Cross-Connection staff and the other is used on a temporary basis by Human Resources (HR). When completed, the new office space will be occupied exclusively by Cross-Connection staff, thereby displacing HR staff. Since there are no other available spaces at this location for HR to use on a temporary basis, it was determined during the design that it would be prudent to add one additional adjoining office space to be used primarily by HR staff, although it can also be used by other departments on a temporary basis. Note that this concept is being utilized at the Water Quality location, and has been beneficial for staff at both of these locations to access HR staff in-lieu of traveling to the Administration building where HR is permanently located.

Bid documents were obtained by three contractors and, on October 9, 2012, two bids were submitted to the Authority:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>BASE BID AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lingol Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$34,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telliard Construction</td>
<td>$44,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lingol Construction, Inc. (Lingol) submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid. Lingol has worked for the Authority in the past and staff has been satisfied with their ability to complete the scope of work on time and within budget.

Staff and Management reviewed the bid from Lingol and have determined that the Cross-Connection Office Rehabilitation, with the change in scope of adding the new HR Office, is an appropriate investment of Authority funds, and will seek additional funds from the Governing Board to complete the project.
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FISCAL IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Proposed Contract Amount</td>
<td>&lt;34,550 &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Office Furniture Allowance*</td>
<td>&lt;4,000  &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>&lt; $13,550 &gt;</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Office Furniture allowance reduced from FY 2012-13 budget estimate

The project cost results in a deficit amount of $13,550, which would require funding from the Capital Contingency fund.

POLICY

The project is less than $50,000, which does not require Board approval. Since the project scope of work has been modified, and the project requires additional funding, project approval is now required by the Governing Board.

ALTERNATIVES

Defer construction of the additional HR office space until 2013-14 fiscal year budget process. The cost is not known at this time; however, it is projected to be higher than the current cost in this bid.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board award a contract in the amount of $34,550 to Lingol Construction, Inc., San Diego, CA, for the Cross-Connection Office Rehabilitation with the new HR Office. Staff further recommends that the Governing Board authorize a transfer of $13,550 from the Capital Contingency Fund to fund the project. The current balance of the Capital Contingency Fund is $374,200.

Submitted by:

Ron R. Mosher, Director of Engineering

Reviewed by:

Jennifer H. Sabine, Assistant General Manager

Approved by:

James L. Smyth, General Manager
TO:          Governing Board (Operations Committee)
FROM:       Management
DATE:        November 1, 2012
SUBJECT:     Recommendation to Award a Contract for Pipeline Replacements in the City of Chula Vista

SUMMARY

The 2012-13 fiscal year budget includes four separate projects under the Pipeline Replacement Program, as summarized below:

1. Hilltop Drive; Quintard to Main Street, Chula Vista          4,414 LF of 12-inch PVC
2. Hilltop Drive; Barrett Avenue to Naples Street, Chula Vista    691 LF of 12-inch PVC
3. Donahoe Street; Hilltop Drive to Cuyamaca Avenue, Chula Vista 1,131 LF of 12-inch PVC
4. Easement; between Rachael Avenue and Thelma Way, National City 160 LF of 6-inch PVC

Staff determined the most appropriate action was to group the three projects in the City of Chula Vista together (projects 1-3 above) into a single bid package, and to implement the project in National City separately (project 4 above) via a separate bid in the near future.

Bid documents for the three projects in the City of Chula Vista were obtained by eleven contractors and, on October 23, 2012, eight bids were submitted to the Authority:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>BID AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC Valley Engineering Inc.</td>
<td>$1,251,976.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arietta Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,362,999.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon Grading &amp; Engineering Inc.</td>
<td>$1,511,039.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRFCO, Inc.</td>
<td>$1,588,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Construction Company Inc.</td>
<td>$1,618,144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basile Construction Inc.</td>
<td>$1,645,323.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtech Pipeline Inc.</td>
<td>$1,715,151.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schilling Paradise Corporation</td>
<td>$1,724,915.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SC Valley Engineering Inc. (SC Valley) submitted the lowest responsive and responsible bid. SC Valley has not worked for the Authority in the past, but staff contacted references provided in the bid form and found they have worked well with other public agencies.
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FISCAL IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$2,138,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Proposed Contract Amount</td>
<td>&lt;1,251,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Easement/Thelma Way*</td>
<td>&lt;235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less SWA Engineering and Inspection Labor</td>
<td>&lt;166,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Survey Consultant</td>
<td>&lt;15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 470,024</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* To be bid separately

POLICY

The Authority’s Purchasing Policy requires the Operations Committee and Governing Board approval to award public work contracts in excess of $50,000.

ALTERNATIVES

Reject all bids and rebid.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board award a contract in the amount of $1,251,976 to SC Valley Engineering Inc., El Cajon, CA, for Pipeline Replacements in the City of Chula Vista.

Submitted by: Ron R. Mosher, Director of Engineering

Reviewed by: Jennifer H. Sabine, Assistant General Manager

Approved by: James L. Smyth, General Manager
TO: Governing Board (Operations Committee)
FROM: Management
DATE: August 30, 2012
SUBJECT: Recommendation to Award a Contract for the Trench Pavement for 2012-2013 Pipeline Replacement Program

SUMMARY
The 2012-2013 fiscal year budget includes the need for a private contractor to conduct pavement repairs for various projects. These projects include pavement repairs for six pipeline replacements performed by the Authority’s Distribution Department, as well as pavement reconstruction and overlay work at the Operations Center, the Administration Office, and two booster sites within the Authority’s service area.

Bid documents were obtained by eight paving contractors, and on August 28, 2012, five bids were submitted to the Authority:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>BID AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAL General Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>$298,767.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koch-Armstrong General Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>$318,494.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Paving, Inc.</td>
<td>$328,008.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Construction Company, Inc.</td>
<td>$339,327.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTA Engineering &amp; Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>$365,475.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAL General Engineering, Inc. (PAL) submitted the lowest bid. Upon further review of PAL’s bid, staff discovered that the required Bidder Information and Experience Form (Section 00430) was not completed. Specifically, this form requires bidders to list current projects in Part B and to list projects completed within the last three years in Part C. The document submitted with PAL’s bid did not address the requirements of Part B, and only partially addressed the requirements of Part C in that the most recent project listed was completed in October 2010. Legal Counsel was contacted to review this bid for an opinion and concurred with staff’s assessment that the bid was non-responsive. PAL was provided written notice of these deficiencies and as of the writing of this memo, no response has been received from PAL.

The next lowest bid, from Koch-Armstrong General Engineering, Inc. (Koch-Armstrong), was reviewed in detail and was determined to be both responsive and responsible. Koch-Armstrong has previously worked for the Authority on trench pavement contracts. Staff has been satisfied with Koch-Armstrong’s ability to complete the scope of work on time and within budget.
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FISCAL IMPACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$446,300*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Proposed Contract Amount</td>
<td>&lt;318,494 &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Bonita Road Paving</td>
<td>&lt;58,300 &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less East 12th St. (FY 2011-12 Carryover)***</td>
<td>&lt;47,900 &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Projected Authority Inspection Use</td>
<td>&lt;24,600 &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,994 &gt;</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Budget includes $401,300 from the Pipeline Trench Pavement project, B.P. 20134001–20134007, which includes $58,300 for Bonita Road and a FY 2011-12 carryover amount of $47,900 for East 12th Street; and $45,000 from Pavement Maintenance, B.P. 20134011.

** Pipeline project located on Bonita Road from Glen Abbey Boulevard to Randy Lane was deemed by the Distribution Department to be a high priority project; therefore, paving for the project has been assigned to the Authority’s Time-and-Materials pave contractor because it was determined that temporary pave would not be safe waiting for this contractor to complete this award process given the high volume of traffic on Bonita Road.

***PAL General Engineering, Inc., the Trench Pavement contractor for FY 2011-12, completed this work in FY 2012-13 as a carryover project because the pipeline construction was not completed until late June 2012, resulting in the need to start the paving work after the start of the new fiscal year.

POLICY

The Authority’s Purchasing Policy requires the Operations Committee and Governing Board approval to award public work contracts in excess of $50,000.

ALTERNATIVES

Reject all bids and rebid.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Governing Board reject the low bid from PAL General Engineering, Inc. as non-responsive, and to award a contract to the next lowest bidder in the amount of $318,494 to Koch-Armstrong General Engineering, Inc., Lakeside, CA, for the Trench Pavement for 2012-2013 Pipeline Replacement Program. Staff further recommends that the Governing Board authorize a transfer of $3,000 from the Capital Contingency Fund to fund the project. The current balance of the Capital Contingency Fund is $485,000.

Submitted by: __________________________________________
Ron R. Mosher, Director of Engineering

Approved by: __________________________________________
James L. Smyth, General Manager
TO:        Governing Board (Operations Committee)
FROM:     Management
DATE:     February 15, 2019
SUBJECT:  Ridgeway Apartments Project by Blue Centurion Homes, Development Project Update

SUMMARY
This item was placed on the Operations Committee agenda at the request of Director Martinez.

Blue Centurion Homes (Developer) is proposing a multi-housing development project on a 2.2 acre parcel located at 2602 Ridgeway Drive in the City of National City. The location of the project is presented on the attached project vicinity map. The project proposes to construct 48 housing units through the construction of seven detached two-story housing structures.

The 2.2 acre parcel is located within the Authority’s O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone and is currently served by a 1-inch domestic water service lateral. The water service lateral served the former single family residence that has since been demolished in preparation for the current development project. As part of the proposed project, new water connections will be required to meet the demand requirements for a larger domestic water service, and a new fire service lateral. Based on the present project configuration, the proposed sizes for the domestic and fire service laterals are 2-inches and 6-inches, respectively.

The earliest coordination in connection with the proposed development project was in September 2015, at which time the Authority provided the Developer with general development project information (e.g., fees, new service requirements, etc.). The attached table provides a summary of customer service calls or meetings provided to this Developer.

In the ongoing review of the proposed development project and related activities, there have been two issues of disagreement between the Authority and the Developer: 1) the pressure zone to which the project is required to connect and 2) the fire flow requirement and the associated need for a water main upgrade to meet velocity criteria.
Pressure Zone Service

As shown on the attached vicinity map, the proposed project is located on a parcel within the Authority’s O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone and fronts right-of-way within that zone. The Authority’s Rates and Rules require that water service to the parcel be provided from the water main serving the parcel on Ridgeway Drive, similar to the service provided to the neighboring parcels. However, the Developer has proposed water supply alternatives that involve connecting to the neighboring Gravity System, located approximately 320 feet west of the subject parcel. The alternatives proposed by the Developer include running a public or private pipeline to supply fire protection only from the Gravity System while keeping domestic service on the O.D. Arnold System.

None of the proposed alternatives meet the established criteria of serving the parcel from its dedicated pressure zone, which is a pressure zone best management practice to maintain clear pressure zone boundaries and avoid water service to parcels from alternating pressure zones. The Developer has also proposed a pressure zone boundary adjustment; however, this would not address the issue of having inconsistent pressure zone service on Ridgeway Drive (i.e., alternating service to water laterals from different pressure zones). While anomalies of this type can be found in the existing distribution system close to pressure zone boundaries, these are examples of undesirable remnants of a water distribution system acquired from a private water company. The Authority’s approach for new water system improvements, whether Authority or developer projects, is to adhere as much as possible to clearly defined pressure zone boundaries and provide water service from corresponding pressure zones.

Fire Flow Requirement

For purposes of fire flow availability, the Authority defers the establishment of fire flow and pressure criteria to the appropriate fire jurisdiction. For this project, the fire flow and pressure criteria are established by the City of National City Fire Department (Fire Department).

In its initial coordination activity regarding fire flow, the Authority performed a fire flow analysis at the Developer’s request in April 2017. The Authority reported that the available fire flow for the project under existing conditions is 843 gallons per minute (gpm). In its analysis, the Authority calculates the available flow until either a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi is reached, or maximum flow velocity of 10 feet per second is reached. In the case of the above fire flow analysis, the flowrate of 843 gpm was limited by a maximum velocity of 10 feet per second across the 6-inch AC water main that serves the parcel.

Subsequent to the initial fire flow analysis, there were a series of evolving fire flow requirements as reported by the Developer and communicated by the Fire Department.
directly to the Authority. In a water system analysis performed by the Developer’s consultant in December 2017, it was reported that the proposed construction type and building area would require a fire flow of 2,063 gpm, taking into account the use of an approved fire sprinkler system. In April 2018, the Developer reported that the Fire Department’s fire flow requirement would be 2,250 gpm, requiring the developer to upgrade over 2,000 feet of water main upgrade to 12-inches in order to meet the Authority’s maximum flow velocity criteria. Independent verification by the Authority determined that the actual length of upgrade is 1,600 feet to meet the above requirement. In September 2018, the Authority received the first fire flow requirement letter from the Fire Department indicating a fire flow requirement of 2,000 gpm, which requires upgrading 1,600 feet of water main to 12-inches (as cited above), to meet the Authority’s maximum velocity criteria.

Based on discussions between the Developer and the Fire Department, the Fire Department reduced the fire flow requirement to 1,000 gpm and communicated this revision to the Authority in the form of a revised fire flow requirement letter. Based on the revised fire flow criteria, the Authority communicated to the Developer that the water main extension required to meet velocity criteria was reduced to 430 feet, and the required pipeline diameter was reduced to 8-inches. During the course of communicating the Authority’s updated water main extension requirement to the Developer, the Developer objected to the Authority’s maximum velocity criteria. The basis of the criteria is discussed below.

Fire Flow Velocity Criteria

The application of a maximum flow velocity criteria has a technical, historical, and policy basis, as further explained below.

**Technical –** From a technical standpoint, the limitation of flow velocities mitigates risk to the distribution system, including the following:

- Introduction of transient pressures (e.g., water hammer), which could cause the pipeline to rupture,
- Potential damage to internal piping components such as valve seats, and
- Scouring of the distribution system which at a minimum may result in excessive sediment uplift and deposition, thus affecting water quality.

Of these risk factors, the potential for transient pressures is of particular concern as it can be very significant depending on a variety of factors including valve closure speed, which the Authority does not control in the event of a fire.

The Authority’s goal is to provide adequate water pressure and flow for both service and fire protection. It is not the Authority’s approach to limit the operation of fire hydrants in the event of fire events, but rather, to design new water systems to provide
unimpeded operation for fire-fighting purposes while mitigating known risk factors as much as possible. Note that the intermittent nature of fire flows would not mitigate the risk of transient pressure development, as the full potential for pressure surge still exists once the velocity is initiated.

**Historical** – Additional guidance to the application of a maximum velocity criteria is obtained from the Authority’s historical application of maximum velocity criteria in its seven most recent water distribution system master plans dating back to 1989. In the plans, it is established that the maximum velocity criteria for distribution mains shall be 10 feet per second under maximum day demand conditions plus fire flow. There is additional guidance provided in the Authority’s Design Standards regarding the maximum flow velocity of 10 feet per second, an item that is in dispute by the Developer.

**Policy Basis** – Beyond the Authority’s internal documentation, additional reference with respect to maximum velocity is provided by the following:

**San Diego Water Agencies Design Standards** – These standards provide a uniform set of design guidelines for use among its six original signatory agencies, of which Sweetwater Authority is a part. Section 4.1 of the guidelines provides criteria for water planning and includes a distribution pipeline velocity limitation of 10 feet per second under maximum day plus fire flow condition.

**American Waterworks Association Manual of Practice M22** – This manual pertains to the sizing of water service lines and meters. While this standard pertains to service lines and not water mains, it offers guidance with respect to velocities for the purpose of avoiding transient pressure. As cited in the manual, “In addition to sizing the service line to provide adequate pressure, the size should also be selected to prevent water hammer. Velocities greater than 10 feet per second should be avoided even if the service line can provide adequate pressure at these high velocities.”

**American Waterworks Association Standard C401, Selection of Asbestos-Cement Pressure Pipe, 4-in through 16-in, for Water Distribution Systems** – This AC pipe standard provides guidance for the protection of the water distribution system under fire flow conditions, in the following excerpt from Section 4.6.3: “Surge pressures in a distribution system can be of considerable magnitude, particularly when fire hydrants are rapidly opened or closed. The magnitude of this surge is difficult to determine and depends on the speed at which the fire hydrant is opened or closed. Design criteria for asbestos-cement pressure pipe for water distribution systems incorporate a safety factor of 4 in the operating or pressure class of the pipe to allow for an unknown amount of surge pressure that will occur in the system.” The legacy AC pipe manufacturers (i.e., Certainteed, Johns Manville) which supplied the majority of the AC pipe in the Authority’s system, manufactured pipe to a hydrostatic pressure factor of 3.5 times the
pressure class, or 350 psi to 525 psi for Class 100 and Class 150 AC pipe. It is noted that record keeping from old AC lines acquired from the Authority’s predecessor water system is not always sufficient to establish the pressure class of AC pipes. Considering the theoretical transient pressure rise potential on the 6-inch main fronting the project is on the order of 480 psi, one can assume a total pressure of 500 psi by adding an assumed 20 psi residual pressure under fire flow condition. This is noted to either closely approach or exceed the hydrostatic test pressure of the AC main, assuming Class 100 or Class 150 pipe, respectively. For flows exceeding 10 feet per second, a proportional rise in potential transient pressure would result. It is also noted that AC pipe condition assessment by the Authority in 2012 and 2014 included hydrostatic pressure testing of actual pipe samples taken from the distribution system. Those results indicated burst pressures ranging from 240 psi to 841 psi, highlighting the highly variable conditions and strength in installed AC pipe within the distribution system.

FISCAL IMPACT

There are no significant fiscal impacts to the Authority in connection to this project, as new facilities required to provide water service to a development are to be installed at the expense of the developer requesting service.

POLICY/STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE

Strategic Plan Goal 2, System and Water Supply Reliability: Achieve an uninterrupted, long-term water supply through investment, maintenance, and innovation.

- Objective SR7: Review proposed development plans and install necessary infrastructure to ensure the facilities meet the required demand, achieve code compliance, avoid cross-connection, and have minimal-to-zero financial impacts to the Authority’s ratepayers.

CONCLUSION

This report is presented for informational purposes only.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Summary of Project Activities
Attachment 2: Ridgeway Apartments Project Vicinity Map
Attachment 3: Ridgeway Apartments Correspondence
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**Blue Centurion – Ridgeway Apartments**  
**Summary of Project Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2, 2015</td>
<td>Sent an Email to Dylan Hinkle of Blue Centurion Homes, providing information regarding Sweetwater Authority’s capacity fees, facility maps, and new service processing information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 28, 2016</td>
<td>Mr. Hinkle came into the Authority office to request a hydraulic analysis and to pay the $200 fee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
<td>The Authority performed a hydraulic analysis at fire hydrant location adjacent to the project site. Delivered analysis results to Mr. Hinkle via email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 25, 2017</td>
<td>Mr. Hinkle came into the office with San Diego County Agency Clearance form requesting the Authority’s signature, and provided a set of building plans. He was provided information about Authority procedures and requirements for submission and proposed construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15, 2017</td>
<td>Processed Design Requirement Letter requesting $2,500 deposit for engineering review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4, 2017</td>
<td>Andrew Oven from Dexter Wilson sent an email to Authority staff requesting hydraulic analysis for the site. He was provided the test results of the previous analysis performed on January 4, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2017</td>
<td>Mr. Oven indicated he no longer needed the analysis requested on December 4th and requested the check be returned. Andrew further indicated the project may require a 12-inch water main upgrade from Van Ness (east of Granger to the site) and said he would continue to investigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2017</td>
<td>Sent Bill Lundstrom of Lundstrom Engineering the Authority’s facility information via email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 3, 2018</td>
<td>Received email from Mr. Hinkle indicating that he has not received a Design Requirement Letter. A scanned copy of the letter was sent to him via email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5, 2018</td>
<td>Received an email from Mr. Hinkle stating he sent the check today and asked if the Authority needs a copy of the plans. He was informed that plans showing water facilities are required, as well as fire protection plans and calculations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 8, 2018</td>
<td>Responded to email from Mr. Hinkle requesting plans that show all proposed water facilities and existing utilities at the site. He was sent a Sendit account activation link to allow him to send plans through upload link.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 2018</td>
<td>Plans submitted by Mr. Hinkle via Sendit. Placed plans into file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11, 2018</td>
<td>$2,500 deposit check received - processed payment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15, 2018</td>
<td>Received and filed signed Design Requirement Letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2018</td>
<td>Mailed Design Review Letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2018</td>
<td>Received two sets of plans showing a 12-inch water main extension from Gravity Zone into the O.D. Arnold System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2018</td>
<td>Conducted internal review of plans submitted on March 21st. Mailed a Design Review Letter to Mr. Hinkle indicating the Authority will not accept a main extension from the Gravity Zone to the O.D. Arnold Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2, 2018</td>
<td>Spoke to Mr. Lundstrom regarding March 23rd response letter rejecting the proposed 12-inch main extension. Explained that a 400-ft long water main for fire service, with minimal demand, will pose stagnation issues, and that parcels must be served from water mains in the pressure zone that they front. It was recommended that he contact Mr. Oven (project engineer) to determine water main upgrade requirements from the O.D. Arnold System. Mr. Lundstrom asked for a response via email so he can inform the client.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3, 2018</td>
<td>Received phone call from Mr. Oven regarding the Design Review Letter not allowing the water main extension from the Gravity Zone to provide fire service to the project parcel. It was explained that the Authority requires a parcel to be served from the water main and zone where it is located, and that the Authority does not want a 400-ft water main to provide fire service, as it may pose stagnation issues. Mr. Oven indicated he would evaluate an extension from O.D. Arnold Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 25, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Oven contacted the Authority with an inquiry regarding the reported static pressures in the April 23, 2018 fire flow analysis on Van Ness Ave. He was provided explanation in an email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Oven communicated in an email that a fire flow of 2,250 gpm is required for the project and requested two alternatives to obtain water: 1. Serve the project from the Gravity Zone with a new water main. 2. Serve the project with a remote fire service (i.e., across parcels) from Gravity Zone. Mr. Oven was informed that the Authority could not accept the proposed alternatives. He understood and said he would inform the owner, and most likely, the owner would be calling to request consideration for alternative two. It was recommended that the owner send a written request, but also offered the Authority’s availability for a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Hinkle submitted plans showing a 12-inch fire service lateral connected to the 30-inch main in Euclid, then east through three parcels, then onto public right-of-way (on Ridgeway Drive), and into the subject property. Placed plans in file and held internal discussion regarding the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 05, 2018</td>
<td>Mailed a Design Review Letter to Mr. Hinkle in response to the new proposal, indicating the Authority’s non-acceptance of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Oven requested a meeting with his design team and the Authority to discuss the design for a water main upgrade. A meeting was scheduled for July 18, 2018 at 9:00am with Mr. Oven and Jeff Lundstrom of Lundstrom Engineering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18, 2018</td>
<td>Authority staff Jason Mettler and Arturo Tejeda met with Mr. Oven, Mr. Hinkle, and Mr. Lundstrom. Mr. Lundstrom asked why the Authority would not allow their proposal of tapping the 30-inch main from Euclid, have a private line enter private property, go out into public right-of-way, and then back into private property to serve the project. Mr. Mettler reiterated the previous reasons provided, and also discussed the option previously recommended by Mr. Oven for a water main upgrade from Van Ness. The developer’s team said they do not want to do that. Mr. Lundstrom said they have San Diego County approval to have a private water line encroaching in the right-of-way. Mr. Mettler indicated that water could be provided by the 30-inch main in Euclid if the four parcels leading up to the subject site were consolidated. Mr. Lundstrom also asked about paying for all fees up front so domestic water could be provided, (off the existing 6-inch AC) and a Building Permit be acquired, so they could continue to construct during water main plan development. Mr. Mettler explained the reasons why that is not an option. Mr. Lundstrom mentioned the site is being graded with an approved grading plan. Mr. Mettler replied that the Authority should be notified following any material change to the parcel, including ownership change, permit issuance, lot adjustment, etc. Following the meeting, Mr. Mettler instructed Mr. Tejeda to request the approved grading plans from Mr. Hinkle, and request the site comply with backflow prevention requirements, due to the ongoing grading. After the meeting, Mr. Tejeda emailed Mr. Hinkle requesting grading plans and copied the Authority’s Cross Connection staff. He explained to Mr. Hinkle that the water service must be in compliance with cross connections since it is being used for grading to the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19, 2018</td>
<td>Wes Curing (developer’s contractor) called and indicated he was instructed to ask the Authority if they could recommend an engineer or firm to design the proposed pipeline. He was informed the Authority cannot make a recommendation. He said he was originally contracted to install the new water facilities, but due to the changes he is not proceeding. Luis Valdez informed him the owner is required to provide the plans, and how they plan to proceed with the work (i.e., by contractor or the Authority). Mr. Curing said they are building right now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25, 2018</td>
<td>Sal, from Saleni Engineering called and asked about available water pressure. A pressure of 78 psi was provided. Sal was informed the site has not obtained water for the project and it was explained current flow availability for fire flow (843 gpm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 8, 2018</td>
<td>Received a forwarded email from from Tish Berge, originally sent from Marcela Escobar-Eck of Atlantis SD to Josie Flores-Clark and Ron Morrison, with inquiries related to the project. Staff assisted with the preparation of a response to the email. A response was provided in an email by Ms. Berge on August 9, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 28, 2018</td>
<td>Ron Mosher, Jennifer Sabine, and Tish Berge met with Abraham Edid of Blue Centurion Homes, who presented an alternative to provide water to the site. After the meeting, Mr. Edid emailed a copy of Dexter Wilson’s “Private Water System Analysis for the Ridgeway Parcel C Project in the City of National City”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 28, 2018</td>
<td>Responded to a phone call from Mark Steve, property owner at 2628 Ridgeway Drive which is two properties east of project site. He inquired about fire flow requirements for multi-family construction on his property. He also inquired about a potential water main upgrade from the Blue Centurion parcel and how cost sharing would work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 29, 2018</td>
<td>Bill Lundstrom called about plan review fees for a different project on a parcel west of the subject project, at the corner of Euclid and Ridgeway, which could benefit from the water main extension in question under the current project. He was provided standard plan review information included in the typical Design Requirement Letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 4, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Mosher emailed Mr. Edid a response to the proposal and analysis presented at the August 28th meeting, providing two viable options to serve the project from the O.D. Arnold System (requiring main extension), or from the Gravity Zone if parcels were consolidated. Mr. Edid replied they would proceed with the original request (i.e. water main extension in O.D. Arnold System).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Mosher emailed Mr. Edid to set up a meeting between the developer's team and the Authority on Tuesday, September 11th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Edid, Mr. Lundstrom, and Mr. Oven came into the office to discuss the project. Authority staff present were Mr. Mosher, Ms. Sabine, Mr. Valdez, and Mr. Mettler. The developer’s team said they understand the need for the water main upgrade and would provide plans in three weeks. Mr. Edid asked if a temporary service could be provided to allow them to construct for 1-2 years. This option was denied by the Authority, with explanation. Other discussion topics included the previous design alternatives, setting up temporary service, and reimbursement agreements. In conclusion, the developer is to work on a design of a water main extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Edid sent an email requesting contractors who could perform pipeline work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 2018</td>
<td>Responded to Mr. Edid with a list of bid attendees on a recent pipeline project, which included contractors who bid on the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 2018</td>
<td>Received a request via email from Jim Belt for water main information on Ridgeway to Van Ness. Emailed information to him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20, 2018</td>
<td>Received Fire Flow Requirement letter from National City Fire Department indicating a fire flow of 2,000 gpm is required to serve the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20, 2018</td>
<td>Reviewed conceptual sketch on water main extension design from Bill Lundstrom, upon his request. Comments were provided via email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 21, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Curing called and mentioned he received the contractor listing for the Authority’s recent pipeline replacement projects. He said he obtained cost estimates from two of the contractors. He inquired about Burtech and he was informed they are currently working for the Authority. He also inquired about other contractors on the list, Authority construction crews, and about the Authority’s developer agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2018</td>
<td>The Authority was copied on an email from NCFD Battalion Chief Robert Hernandez instructing Mr. Hinkle to contact the Authority in regards to the use of a fire pump to be used in conjunction with a fire service from the Gravity Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2018</td>
<td>Mailed Fire Flow Requirement letter with sketches to Mr. Hinkle, copied NCFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2018</td>
<td>Received a letter from Mr. Edid to Ms. Berge with the developer’s current proposal to provide service for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Mosher replied to Mr. Edid’s letter to Tish Berge dated October 5, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Mosher received a letter from Mr. Edid in response to Mr. Mosher’s letter dated October 12, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18, 2018</td>
<td>Kevin and Mary Coniff, owners of property at 2560 Ridgeway Drive called to inquire about water requirements for site development, and what implications a water main upgrade from the Ridgeway project would have on the development of their parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 31, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Edid requested a meeting with Ms. Berge, Ms. Sabine, and Mr. Mosher to discuss a fire protection proposal they discussed with the NCFD. On November 5, 2018, a meeting with Mr. Mosher and Mr. Valdez was confirmed for November 9, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Mosher and Mr. Valdez met with Mr. Edid, Mr. Oven, and Isaac of Blue Centurion to discuss Mr. Edid’s latest proposal for the project. Mr. Edid explained that NCFD reduced their fire flow requirement to 1,000 gpm. Based on a lower fire flow requirement, they requested the Authority waive its maximum velocity requirement to provide a fire flow of 1,000 gpm, given the residual pressure requirement would be met. After extensive discussion, the Authority did not agree to waive the velocity requirement. Mr. Edid also presented another option to provide fire storage tanks to make up the difference between the available and required flow. Mr. Mosher and Mr. Valdez further indicated that there is no current purpose in considering alternatives to deliver 1,000 gpm, because the current requirement from NCDF is 2,000 gpm. Mr. Edid indicated he would have NCFD provide the Authority a revised fire flow letter indicating 1,000 gpm is required; this was the single action item of the meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Valdez sent Mr. Edid an e-mail to memorialize the meeting of November 9th and to indicate that the Authority will not take further action on his fire flow proposals until the Authority receives a revised fire flow requirement letter from the NCFD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20, 2018</td>
<td>Received email from NCFD Battalion Chief Hernandez with an invitation to attend a meeting on November 27, 2018 with the City and the applicant (Blue Centurion) to discuss the Ridgeway Project. The meeting invitation was accepted by the Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 27, 2018</td>
<td>Attended meeting with Chief Hernandez, the City’s plan review consultant (EsGil), and the developer’s team. The City's consultant and Chief Hernandez indicated that based on the latest project configuration and current Fire Code, it appears that the fire flow requirement may be reduced to 1,000 gpm. Chief Hernandez indicated he would formalize this reduction by re-issuing a fire flow requirement letter. The reduced fire flow requirement still exceeds the maximum velocity through the existing water main. There was significant commentary and objection from the developer regarding the Authority’s enforcement of its velocity criteria. The Authority reiterated its position regarding the maximum allowed velocity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 30, 2018</td>
<td>Received a revised Fire Flow Requirement Letter from NCFD, indicating a requirement of 1,000 gpm. The Authority contacted Mr. Oven to inform him of the revised requirement and of the reduced pipeline extension (approx. 420 feet) and reduced diameter (8-inches).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 2018</td>
<td>Contacted Mr. Hinkle to inform him of the revised fire flow requirement and reduced scope of the water main extension. He recommended the Authority work with Mr. Oven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4, 2018</td>
<td>Authority staff spoke to Mr. Hinkle and Mr. Edid at the Developer’s Forum and informed them of the reduced fire flow of 1,000 gpm. They directed the Authority contact Mr. Oven to work through the revised design. Staff called Mr. Oven and left a voice mail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2018</td>
<td>The Authority contacted Mr. Oven to discuss project revisions in light of new fire flow requirement. He indicated he has instructions not to move forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11, 2018</td>
<td>Mailed revised fire flow availability letter to Mr. Hinkle, with copy to NCFD, indicating fire flow is not available because of the velocity constraint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11, 2018</td>
<td>Sent email to Mr. Oven with an attached copy of the revised fire flow requirement letter and a summary of the reduced project scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 14, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Edid emailed and asked for specific reference from Rates and Rules, and other Authority policies that support the Authority’s conclusion that the project must construct an 8-inch line from the project to Gwynne Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 17, 2018</td>
<td>Replied to Mr. Edid via email and provided the information as requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2018</td>
<td>Mr. Edid emailed with a continuing request to provide policy documentation that specifies why the project is to install 420 feet of water main extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 12, 2019</td>
<td>Mr. Valdez sent Mr. Edid an email responding to his December 18th emails continuing the explanation for the basis of the project requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2019</td>
<td>Mr. Edid replied to January 12th email disputing the Authority’s requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 21, 2019</td>
<td>Mr. Valdez replied to Mr. Edid to reiterate the Authority’s final position on the requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31, 2019</td>
<td>Mr. Edid emailed Mr. Valdez and Mr. Mettler continuing with his objection to the requirement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VICTINITY MAP

Blue Centurion, Ridgeway Apartments

Quarter Section 108

REQUIRED WATER MAIN UPGRADE TO MINIMUM 8-INCHES, 430 FEET

PROJECT SITE

PROJECT SITE
Mettler, Jason

From: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: SendIt New Account Invitation
Attachments: 4830_001.pdf; Check 2623.pdf

Jason,

This email is to request that Sweetwater Authority conduct a computer model fire hydrant flow test for the fire hydrant described below.

The fire flow to be tested is 2,750 gpm.

Attached is a map showing the fire hydrant location requested. The test hydrant is east of Euclid Avenue and on the north side of Ridgeway Drive at the intersection.

The fire flow test fee of $300 is being sent to your attention via US Mail in the form of a check made out to Sweetwater Authority. A copy of the check is included in the email as assurance that the check was mailed.

I would appreciate anything you can do to provide this fire flow information as quickly as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

Redact

From: jmettler@sweetwater.org [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 7:56 AM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Subject: SendIt New Account Invitation

jmettler@sweetwater.org has invited you to use SendIt

Message from jmettler@sweetwater.org:

Please use this application to transfer large files to Sweetwater Authority.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
619-409-6755

New Account Invitation:
To accept this invitation and register for your SendIt account, please click on this link:
Redact

The invitation link is only valid for 168 hours. Beyond this timeframe, please ask jmettler@sweetwater.org to send a new invitation e-mail.
PAY TO THE ORDER OF: Sweetwater Authority

Three Hundred and 00/100

$ **300.00

DOLLARS

Sweetwater Authority
505 Garrett Ave
Chula Vista, CA 91910

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE

DEXTHER WILSON ENGINEERING

Sweetwater Authority

CALIFORNIA BANK & TRUST

GENERAL ACCOUNT

2623

12/1/2017

Fire Flow Test for the Ridgeway Parcel C Project
Job Number 1501-008

CA Bank & Trust- Gen

300.00
Hello Andrew,

Upon receiving this email, I took a look at our archives and discovered a hydraulic analysis was performed at this location earlier this year. See attached.

2,750 gpm is not available from the fire hydrant, which is supplied by a 6-inch AC water main (one direction), within the O.D. Arnold pressure zone system (HGL 327). There is a 30” WS main in the projects vicinity, but it’s our Gravity zone (HGL of 255).

Please let me know if I should move forward with the test as requested below.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

Jason,

This email is to request that Sweetwater Authority conduct a computer model fire hydrant flow test for the fire hydrant described below.

The fire flow to be tested is 2,750 gpm.

Attached is a map showing the fire hydrant location requested. The test hydrant is east of Euclid Avenue and on the north side of Ridgeway Drive at the intersection.

The fire flow test fee of $300 is being sent to your attention via US Mail in the form of a check made out to Sweetwater Authority. A copy of the check is included in the email as assurance that the check was mailed.

I would appreciate anything you can do to provide this fire flow information as quickly as possible. Thank you for your assistance.
From: jmettler@sweetwater.org
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 7:56 AM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Subject: SendIt New Account Invitation

jmettler@sweetwater.org has invited you to use SendIt

Message from jmettler@sweetwater.org:

Please use this application to transfer large files to Sweetwater Authority.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
619-409-6755

New Account Invitation:
To accept this invitation and register for your SendIt account, please click on this link:
Redact

The invitation link is only valid for 168 hours. Beyond this timeframe, please ask jmettler@sweetwater.org to send a new invitation e-mail.
Mettler, Jason

From: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 9:16 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Valdez, Luis
Subject: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Jason,

Thank you for sending the January 4, 2017 fire flow analysis. I do not know why the client did not provide this information to me.

Please do not proceed with another analysis at this time.

However, what would be especially helpful to me based on the results of the January 2017 flow test would be a map showing existing water main sizes for the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone. Piping for the Gravity Zone could be useful, however, available pressure from the Gravity Zone is low (upper 40s psi). But, if we could connect to a 30” pipe it may give us good fire flow to the site.

Please call me to discuss further if necessary and send me some maps as soon as you can.

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Cc: Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>
Subject: RE: Sendlt New Account Invitation

Hello Andrew,

Upon receiving this email, I took a look at our archives and discovered a hydraulic analysis was performed at this location earlier this year. See attached.

2,750 gpm is not available from the fire hydrant, which is supplied by a 6-inch AC water main (one direction), within the O.D. Arnold pressure zone system (HGL 327). There is a 30” WS main in the projects vicinity, but it’s our Gravity zone (HGL of 255).

Please let me know if I should move forward with the test as requested below.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: SendIt New Account Invitation

Jason,

This email is to request that Sweetwater Authority conduct a computer model fire hydrant flow test for the fire hydrant described below.

The fire flow to be tested is 2,750 gpm.

Attached is a map showing the fire hydrant location requested. The test hydrant is east of Euclid Avenue and on the north side of Ridgeway Drive at the intersection.

The fire flow test fee of $300 is being sent to your attention via US Mail in the form of a check made out to Sweetwater Authority. A copy of the check is included in the email as assurance that the check was mailed.

I would appreciate anything you can do to provide this fire flow information as quickly as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

From: jmettler@sweetwater.org [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 7:56 AM
To: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Subject: SendIt New Account Invitation

jmettler@sweetwater.org has invited you to use SendIt

Message from jmettler@sweetwater.org:

Please use this application to transfer large files to Sweetwater Authority.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
619-409-6755

New Account Invitation:
To accept this invitation and register for your SendIt account, please click on this link:

The invitation link is only valid for 168 hours. Beyond this timeframe, please ask jmettler@sweetwater.org to send a new invitation e-mail.
Mettler, Jason

From: Andrew Oven \[Redact\]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 12:03 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Jason,

Thank you for the two base maps. Could I bother you for Map 107 as well? It appears that there is a 12” O.D. Arnold System water main extending north in Van Ness Avenue; is this the main source of water to this area of the O.D. Arnold System which feeds Granger Avenue, Fenton Place and Ridgeway Drive?

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 10:48 AM
To: Andrew Oven \[Redact\]
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Andrew,

Please see the attached maps showing Sweetwater Authority’s distribution system. Also note the HGL for our Gravity Zone can vary between 250-255.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
\[Redact\] Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 9:16 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Valdez, Luis
Subject: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Jason,

Thank you for sending the January 4, 2017 fire flow analysis. I do not know why the client did not provide this information to me.

Please do not proceed with another analysis at this time.
However, what would be especially helpful to me based on the results of the January 2017 flow test would be a map showing existing water main sizes for the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone. Piping for the Gravity Zone could be useful, however, available pressure from the Gravity Zone is low (upper 40s psi). But, if we could connect to a 30" pipe it may give us good fire flow to the site.

Please call me to discuss further if necessary and send me some maps as soon as you can.

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

---

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:mettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Cc: Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>
Subject: RE: SendIt New Account Invitation

Hello Andrew,

Upon receiving this email, I took a look at our archives and discovered a hydraulic analysis was performed at this location earlier this year. See attached.

2,750 gpm is not available from the fire hydrant, which is supplied by a 6-inch AC water main (one direction), within the O.D. Arnold pressure zone system (HGL 327). There is a 30" WS main in the projects vicinity, but it's our Gravity zone (HGL of 255).

Please let me know if I should move forward with the test as requested below.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

---

From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: SendIt New Account Invitation

Jason,

This email is to request that Sweetwater Authority conduct a computer model fire hydrant flow test for the fire hydrant described below.

The fire flow to be tested is 2,750 gpm.
Attached is a map showing the fire hydrant location requested. The test hydrant is east of Euclid Avenue and on the north side of Ridgeway Drive at the intersection.

The fire flow test fee of $300 is being sent to your attention via US Mail in the form of a check made out to Sweetwater Authority. A copy of the check is included in the email as assurance that the check was mailed.

I would appreciate anything you can do to provide this fire flow information as quickly as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

From: jmettler@sweetwater.org [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 7:56 AM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Subject: SendIt New Account Invitation

jmettler@sweetwater.org has invited you to use SendIt

.model

Message from jmettler@sweetwater.org:

Please use this application to transfer large files to Sweetwater Authority.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
619-409-6755

New Account Invitation:
To accept this invitation and register for your SendIt account, please click on this link: Redact

The invitation link is only valid for 168 hours. Beyond this timeframe, please ask jmettler@sweetwater.org to send a new invitation e-mail.

Secured by Accellion
Mettler, Jason

From: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 1:43 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Jason,

Thank you. I will look at using the Gravity Zone with a connection to the 30" line in Euclid. If that does not work we may have to go back to the 12" line in Van Ness.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

[Redact]

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 12:40 PM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Hello Andrew,

See the attached Map 107 as requested. Yes, Granger and Van Ness are the only source of water to this area.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
[Redact] Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 12:03 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Jason,

Thank you for the two base maps. Could I bother you for Map 107 as well? It appears that there is a 12" O.D. Arnold System water main extending north in Van Ness Avenue; is this the main source of water to this area of the O.D. Arnold System which feeds Granger Avenue, Fenton Place and Ridgeway Drive?

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 10:48 AM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Andrew,

Please see the attached maps showing Sweetwater Authority's distribution system. Also note the HGL for our Gravity Zone can vary between 250-255.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 9:16 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Valdez, Luis
Subject: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Jason,

Thank you for sending the January 4, 2017 fire flow analysis. I do not know why the client did not provide this information to me.

Please do not proceed with another analysis at this time.

However, what would be especially helpful to me based on the results of the January 2017 flow test would be a map showing existing water main sizes for the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone. Piping for the Gravity Zone could be useful, however, available pressure from the Gravity Zone is low (upper 40s psi). But, if we could connect to a 30" pipe it may give us good fire flow to the site.

Please call me to discuss further if necessary and send me some maps as soon as you can.

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Cc: Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>
Subject: RE: Sendilt New Account Invitation
Hello Andrew,

Upon receiving this email, I took a look at our archives and discovered a hydraulic analysis was performed at this location earlier this year. See attached.

2,750 gpm is not available from the fire hydrant, which is supplied by a 6-inch AC water main (one direction), within the O.D. Arnold pressure zone system (HGL 327). There is a 30” WS main in the projects vicinity, but it’s our Gravity zone (HGL of 255).

Please let me know if I should move forward with the test as requested below.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven [mailto: Redact]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: SendIt New Account Invitation

Jason,

This email is to request that Sweetwater Authority conduct a computer model fire hydrant flow test for the fire hydrant described below.

The fire flow to be tested is 2,750 gpm.

Attached is a map showing the fire hydrant location requested. The test hydrant is east of Euclid Avenue and on the north side of Ridgeway Drive at the intersection.

The fire flow test fee of $300 is being sent to your attention via US Mail in the form of a check made out to Sweetwater Authority. A copy of the check is included in the email as assurance that the check was mailed.

I would appreciate anything you can do to provide this fire flow information as quickly as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
Redact

From: jmettler@sweetwater.org [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 7:56 AM
To: Andrew Oven [mailto: Redact]
Subject: SendIt New Account Invitation
Message from jmettler@sweetwater.org:

Please use this application to transfer large files to Sweetwater Authority.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
619-408-8755

New Account Invitation:
To accept this invitation and register for your SendIt account, please click on this link: [Link]

The invitation link is only valid for 168 hours. Beyond this timeframe, please ask jmettler@sweetwater.org to send a new invitation e-mail.
Andrew,

Please see the attached maps showing Sweetwater Authority’s distribution system. Also note the HGL for our Gravity Zone can vary between 250-255.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Dirct
Redact  Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 9:16 AM  
To: Mettler, Jason  
Cc: Valdez, Luis  
Subject: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Jason,

Thank you for sending the January 4, 2017 fire flow analysis. I do not know why the client did not provide this information to me.

Please do not proceed with another analysis at this time.

However, what would be especially helpful to me based on the results of the January 2017 flow test would be a map showing existing water main sizes for the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone. Piping for the Gravity Zone could be useful, however, available pressure from the Gravity Zone is low (upper 40s psi). But, if we could connect to a 30” pipe it may give us good fire flow to the site.

Please call me to discuss further if necessary and send me some maps as soon as you can.

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
Redact

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]  
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 12:15 PM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Cc: Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>
Subject: RE: SendIt New Account Invitation

Hello Andrew,

Upon receiving this email, I took a look at our archives and discovered a hydraulic analysis was performed at this location earlier this year. See attached.

2,750 gpm is not available from the fire hydrant, which is supplied by a 6-inch AC water main (one direction), within the O.D. Arnold pressure zone system (HGL 327). There is a 30" WS main in the projects vicinity, but it's our Gravity zone (HGL of 255).

Please let me know if I should move forward with the test as requested below.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven <mailto:Redact>
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: SendIt New Account Invitation

Jason,

This email is to request that Sweetwater Authority conduct a computer model fire hydrant flow test for the fire hydrant described below.

The fire flow to be tested is 2,750 gpm.

Attached is a map showing the fire hydrant location requested. The test hydrant is east of Euclid Avenue and on the north side of Ridgeway Drive at the intersection.

The fire flow test fee of $300 is being sent to your attention via US Mail in the form of a check made out to Sweetwater Authority. A copy of the check is included in the email as assurance that the check was mailed.

I would appreciate anything you can do to provide this fire flow information as quickly as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

Andrew Owen, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
Redact

From: jmettler@sweetwater.org <mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org>
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 7:56 AM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Subject: SendIt New Account Invitation

jemetter@sweetwater.org has invited you to use SendIt

Message from jemetter@sweetwater.org:

Please use this application to transfer large files to Sweetwater Authority.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
619-409-6755

New Account Invitation:
To accept this invitation and register for your SendIt account, please click on this link:
Redact

The invitation link is only valid for 168 hours. Beyond this timeframe, please ask jemetter@sweetwater.org to send a new invitation e-mail.
Hello Andrew,

See the attached Map 107 as requested. Yes, Granger and Van Ness are the only source of water to this area.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact [Redact] Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 12:03 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Jason,

Thank you for the two base maps. Could I bother you for Map 107 as well? It appears that there is a 12” O.D. Arnold System water main extending north in Van Ness Avenue; is this the main source of water to this area of the O.D. Arnold System which feeds Granger Avenue, Fenton Place and Ridgeway Drive?

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
Redact

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 10:48 AM
To: Andrew Oven [Redact]
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Andrew,

Please see the attached maps showing Sweetwater Authority’s distribution system. Also note the HGL for our Gravity Zone can vary between 250-255.

Thank you,
Jason Mettler  
Engineering Technician Supervisor  
Sweetwater Authority  
(619) 409-6755 Direct  
Redact Cell  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 9:16 AM  
To: Mettler, Jason  
Cc: Valdez, Luis  
Subject: 2604 Ridgeway Drive Parcel C

Jason,

Thank you for sending the January 4, 2017 fire flow analysis. I do not know why the client did not provide this information to me.

Please do not proceed with another analysis at this time.

However, what would be especially helpful to me based on the results of the January 2017 flow test would be a map showing existing water main sizes for the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone. Piping for the Gravity Zone could be useful, however, available pressure from the Gravity Zone is low (upper 40s psi). But, if we could connect to a 30” pipe it may give us good fire flow to the site.

Please call me to discuss further if necessary and send me some maps as soon as you can.

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.  
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.  
Redact

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]  
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 12:15 PM  
To: Andrew Oven  
Cc: Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>  
Subject: RE: Sendit New Account Invitation

Hello Andrew,

Upon receiving this email, I took a look at our archives and discovered a hydraulic analysis was performed at this location earlier this year. See attached.

2,750 gpm is not available from the fire hydrant, which is supplied by a 6-inch AC water main (one direction), within the O.D. Arnold pressure zone system (HGL 327). There is a 30” WS main in the projects vicinity, but it’s our Gravity zone (HGL of 255).

Please let me know if I should move forward with the test as requested below.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: SendIt New Account Invitation

Jason,

This email is to request that Sweetwater Authority conduct a computer model fire hydrant flow test for the fire hydrant described below.

The fire flow to be tested is 2,750 gpm.

Attached is a map showing the fire hydrant location requested. The test hydrant is east of Euclid Avenue and on the north side of Ridgeway Drive at the intersection.

The fire flow test fee of $300 is being sent to your attention via US Mail in the form of a check made out to Sweetwater Authority. A copy of the check is included in the email as assurance that the check was mailed.

I would appreciate anything you can do to provide this fire flow information as quickly as possible. Thank you for your assistance.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

From: jmettler@sweetwater.org [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 7:56 AM
To: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Subject: Sendit New Account invitation

jmettler@sweetwater.org has invited you to use SendIt

Message from jmettler@sweetwater.org:

Please use this application to transfer large files to Sweetwater Authority.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
619-409-6755

New Account Invitation:
To accept this invitation and register for your SendIt account, please click on this link: [Redact]
The invitation link is only valid for 188 hours. Beyond this timeframe, please ask jmettler@sweetwater.org to send a new invitation e-mail.
Jason,

Thank you for returning the check for $300.

At this point in the project planning we will propose that the fire protection system be connected to a new 12” Gravity Zone water line to be extended from the 30” pipe in Euclid Avenue. The domestic service will be off of the existing 6” OD Arnold Zone water line in Ridgeway Drive. Thank you for your assistance in understanding the water system in this area.

Merry Christmas.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
2234 Faraday Avenue
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Hello Dylan,

Attached is a copy of the Design Requirement letter that was sent on November 15, 2017. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

Hi Arturo,

We never received a letter or a request for payment. Can you please double check that it was sent and re send it?
Can you send via email?

thank you

Dylan

On Oct 25, 2017, at 4:44 PM, Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Dylan,

Thank you again for submitting the preliminary plans for the subject project. As per our conversation I have attached an information brochure to help familiarize you with Sweetwater Authority’s (Authority) process for requesting and or upgrading water service(s). Also, the Authority will send out to the property owner a Design Requirement letter with a request for $2,500.00 deposit for engineering plan check, review, and project processing. The letter also contains a section where and authorized agent for
the project can be designated by the ownership. That portion can be submitted with the requested deposit. Please anticipate the letter within the next week or so.

Thank you,

Arturo "Art" Tejeda | Senior Engineer Technician |
Direct 619.409.6758 | atejeda@sweetwater.org
P.O. Box 2328, Chula Vista, CA 91912-2328

<New Water Service Brochure.pdf>
Hello Dylan,

Please see the attached Hydraulic Analysis and sketch as requested.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org
Hello Dylan,

I did receive the plans submitted via "SendIt". I have not receive a check yet. Please ensure that the check submitted for Engineering plan check and review is accompanied with page 4 of the Design Requirement Letter dated November 15, 2017 (copy attached) filled out and signed.

Please contact me with any questions.

Thank you,

Arturo "Art" Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Dylan Hinkle [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 4:56 PM
To: Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason; Bill Lundstrom
Subject: Re: Ridgway Apartments - 2602 Ridgway Drive, National City

Hi Arturo,

please confirm that you received the information vie “send it” along with the check.

Just want to make sure we keep things going on our end for the project.

thank you

Dylan

> On Jan 9, 2018, at 5:02 PM, Dylan Hinkle <Redact> wrote:
> >
> > thank you. I just received it.
> >
> >> On Jan 9, 2018, at 4:49 PM, Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org> wrote:
> >>
Hello Dylan,

I just resent the "Sendlt" Account Invitation.

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Dylan Hinkle
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 4:41 PM
To: Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason
Subject: Re: Ridgway Apartments - 2602 Ridgway Drive, National City

Hi Arturo.

We did not receive the “send” email. Please confirm it was sent to my address. The civil will have plans sent ASAP

thank you

Dylan

On Jan 8, 2018, at 9:22 AM, Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Dylan,

As stated in the Design Requirement Letter, the Authority cannot conduct any design review until the letter is returned to the Authority signed by the Applicant and Items 1, 2, and 3 have been submitted. The Authority did receive the onsite plans on 10-25-2017, but those plans do not show the proposed water improvements, indicating the location of proposed water facilities and all existing utilities. Please submit all applicable plans (civil, landscape, fire protection) electronically for the Authority's review.

You will receive a request called "Sendlt New Account Invitation." "Sendlt" is a secure file sharing program that is approved by the Authority IS Department. Click on the link to accept the invitation and register for your Sendlt account (it is free). When you click on the link, it will direct you to create a password. This registration will allow you to use "Sendlt" as required to submit items to the Authority. This gives unlimited access to submit large files to the Authority.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority  
Direct 619.409.6758  
atejeda@sweetwater.org  

-----Original Message-----  
From: Dylan Hinkle [mailto:Redact]  
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2018 11:55 AM  
To: Tejeda, Arturo  
Cc: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason  
Subject: Re: Ridgway Apartments - 2602 Ridgway Drive, National City  

Arturo,  

We sent the check today. Do you still need copies of the plans? I thought that’s what we did the day I dropped them off for you to scan.  

Also we do not have a fire sprinkler company set up for provide the fire department with plans. Are you able to move forward without this for now?  

Please let me know what else is needed to keep things moving on your end.  

Thank you  
Dylan  

On Jan 3, 2018, at 1:46 PM, Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org> wrote:  

<ltr - Design Requirement - 11-15-17 - signed.pdf>
Tejeda, Arturo

From: Tejeda, Arturo
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 5:08 PM
To: 'Dylan Hinkle'
Cc: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason; Bill Lundstrom
Subject: RE: Ridgway Apartments - 2602 Ridgway Drive, National City

Hello Dylan,

I did receive the plans submitted via "SendIt". I have not receive a check yet. Please ensure that the check submitted for Engineering plan check and review is accompanied with page 4 of the Design Requirement Letter dated November 15, 2017 (copy attached) filled out and signed.

Please contact me with any questions.

Thank you,

Arturo "Art" Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Dylan Hinkle [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 4:56 PM
To: Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason; Bill Lundstrom
Subject: Re: Ridgway Apartments - 2602 Ridgway Drive, National City

Hi Arturo,

please confirm that you received the information vie "send it" along with the check.

Just want to make sure we keep things going on our end for the project.

thank you

Dylan

> On Jan 9, 2018, at 5:02 PM, Dylan Hinkle <Redact> wrote:
> 
> thank you. I just received it.
> 
> >> On Jan 9, 2018, at 4:49 PM, Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org> wrote:
>>
>> Hello Dylan,
>>
>> I just resent the "SendIt" Account Invitation.
>>
>> Thank you,
>>
>> Arturo “Art” Tejeda
>> Senior Engineer Technician
>> Sweetwater Authority
>> Direct 619.409.6758
>> atejeda@sweetwater.org
>>
>>-----Original Message-----
>> From: Dylan Hinkle [mailto:Redact]
>> Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 4:41 PM
>> To: Tejeda, Arturo
>> Cc: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason
>> Subject: Re: Ridgway Apartments - 2602 Ridgway Drive, National City
>>
>> Hi Arturo,
>>
>> We did not receive the “send” email. Please confirm it was sent to my address. The civil will have plans sent ASAP
>>
>> thank you
>>
>> Dylan
>>
>> On Jan 8, 2018, at 9:22 AM, Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org> wrote:
>>
>> Hello Dylan,
>>
>> As stated in the Design Requirement Letter, the Authority cannot conduct any design review until the letter is returned to the Authority signed by the Applicant and Items 1, 2, and 3 have been submitted. The Authority did receive the onsite plans on 10-25-2017, but those plans do not show the proposed water improvements, indicating the location of proposed water facilities and all existing utilities. Please submit all applicable plans (civil, landscape, fire protection) electronically for the Authority's review.
>>
>> You will receive a request called "SendIt New Account Invitation." "SendIt" is a secure file sharing program that is approved by the Authority IS Department. Click on the link to accept the invitation and register for your SendIt account (it is free). When you click on the link, it will direct you to create a password. This registration will allow you to use "SendIt" as required to submit items to the Authority. This gives unlimited access to submit large files to the Authority.
>>
>> Please feel free to contact me with any questions.
>>
>> Thank you,
>>
>> Arturo “Art” Tejeda
>> Senior Engineer Technician
We sent the check today. Do you still need copies of the plans? I thought that’s what we did the day I dropped them off for you to scan.

Also we do not have a fire sprinkler company set up for provide the fire department with plans. Are you able to move forward without this for now?

Please let me know what else is needed to keep things moving on your end.

Thank you

Dylan

On Jan 3, 2018, at 1:46 PM, Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org> wrote:

<ltr - Design Requirement - 11-15-17 - signed.pdf>
Valdez, Luis

From: Andrew Oven <[Redact]>
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 8:47 AM
To: Valdez, Luis
Cc: Tejeda, Arturo
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Parcel C - Hydrant Flow Test Request

Luis,

Thank you for the explanation. That is sufficient.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
[Redact]

From: Valdez, Luis <valdez@sweetwater.org>
Sent: Wednesday, April 25, 2018 8:38 AM
To: Andrew Oven <[Redact]>
Cc: Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org>
Subject: [Blacklisted Sender] RE: 2604 Ridgeway Parcel C - Hydrant Flow Test Request

Hi Andrew,

I’m jumping in to try and answer your inquiry. Please note that average day and max day conditions are analyzed in two separate simulations. The short answer to your question is that the static pressure is taken at the same point in time within each of the simulations (they are both extended period simulations, not static). At the specific point in time in which the static pressure is measured, the pumps supplying this pressure zone happen to be OFF in the average day simulation, and they happen to be ON in the max day simulation, hence the higher static pressure in the max day simulation. The status of the pumps is strictly in response to the demand conditions. I hope this answers the question. If you need more detail, please feel free to call me.

Thank you,

-Luis

From: Andrew Oven <[mailto:Redact]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2018 10:53 AM
To: Tejeda, Arturo
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Parcel C - Hydrant Flow Test Request

Arturo,

Can you double check the pressure under Average Day? It is noted as 60.1 psi, but this is lower than the Maximum Day static which is 65 psi.

Thank you.
Hello Andrew,

Attached are the results to the hydraulic analysis you requested. Please feel free to contact Jason Mettler at jmettler@sweetwater.org with any questions regarding the results.

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

---

Hi Andrew,

This is to confirm we received the fee for the requested fire flow test on April 16. We should get this back to you within a week, so say by next Tuesday. While we normally have a faster turnaround than the stated 5-10 working days, we are understaffed this week.

-Luis

---

Luis,

Please confirm that you have received the $300 fee for the hydrant flow test and provide me with an expected timeline for the flow test results.

Thank you.
Hello Mr. Oven,

This is to acknowledge I received your email. We will stand by for the fee and process your request upon receipt. Thank you.

Luis Valdez, P.E.
Engineering Manager
Sweetwater Authority
505 Garrett Avenue, Chula Vista, CA 91910
O 619.409.6751 | C [Redacted] | F 619.425.7469
lvaldez@sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 3:13 PM
To: Valdez, Luis
Cc: Mettler, Jason
Subject: 2604 Ridgeway Parcel C - Hydrant Flow Test Request

Luis,

I am requesting a new fire hydrant flow test report from Sweetwater Authority. The attached map shows the fire hydrant at which I am requesting flow and pressure data. Note that this requested location is different than what I included in my April 5, 2018, email to Jason Mettler.

A check for $300 has been cut and sent to your attention; you should receive it by the end of this week. Please proceed with the flow test report as soon as you can after confirming receipt of the fee.

If you have any questions about this request, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
2234 Faraday Avenue
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Redact
Jason,

Welcome back from your time off. I spoke with Luis Valdez last week after receiving the new hydrant flow analysis on Van Ness Avenue at 20th Street and sharing with him the results and some proposed alternatives for going forward. Let me summarize the results and give you a chance to get settled and catch up with Luis on this topic.

First, the National City Fire Department set a fire flow requirement for the Parcel C Apartments of 2,250 gpm.

To get this fire flow from the OD Arnold Zone the project would need to install a 12-inch water main in Ridgeway Drive east to Granger Avenue, north to Leonard Street, and east to Van Ness Avenue. Total length is 2,400 feet of 12-inch pipe. The project cannot support such a cost.

One alternative is to extend a 12-inch main off of Euclid (as per the drawings which were submitted) but also include the domestic service to Parcel C so that the new 12-inch Gravity Zone pipe would not be stagnant.

Another alternative is to install a fire service on Euclid off of the 30-inch main and after the backflow preventer which would be on Euclid extend a private fire service line to Parcel C and work out with the County of San Diego that private pipe alignment and permit.

We are open to other ideas.

After you have had a chance to review this, please call to discuss further.

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
2234 Faraday Avenue
Carlsbad, CA 92008
Hello Dylan,

As mention in our meeting earlier today, Sweetwater Authority (Authority) does not have the approved Grading Plans to the site. Please submit those plans to the Authority as soon as you can. This will allow the Authority’s Cross Connections Section to review and ensure that the site complies with backflow/cross connection prevention since the existing water service is currently being used for the grading to the site. If you have any questions regarding what is required for backflow prevention during the grading process, please feel free to contact either Rick DeLeon or Mike Hussmann, both of whom are included in this email.

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

Thank you Arturo.

Dylan

On Jun 25, 2018, at 8:51 AM, Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Dylan,

The plans were received. Sweetwater Authority will get back with a response as soon as possible.

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
Excellent thank you. Please confirm when received.
Dylan

On Thu, Jun 21, 2018 at 5:14 PM Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Dylan,

I will not be here tomorrow. You can submit the plans electronically (preferred method). I can send you a link to submit the plans electronically.

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Dylan Hinkle [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2018 4:14 PM
To: Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Bill Lundstrom
Subject: 2604 ridgeway National City. C water line

Arturo,

Our civil engineer has been working with the county for our water line and the county has agreed to our method for our 12” fire water supply. I will be bringing down the plans for a submittal tomorrow to you. If there is anything that you need with this submittal besides the plans please let us know. Please confirm if you will be there tomorrow mid day.

I have copied our engineer on the email.

thank you
Luis and Jason,

Can you help me develop a response to this email, please?

Thanks,
Ron

Hi Ron,

Please see below for the e-mail I mentioned this morning. Please review the information and let me know your thoughts.

Thank you, Tish

Tish Berge
General Manager
Sweetwater Authority
619.420.1413

Josie:
I have also received the following information that may be helpful:

To:  Marcela Escobar-Eck and Jeannette Temple
Atlantic Group
Below is a summary describing the existing water line and options available to resolve the fire flow requirements for our development at 2504 Ridgeway Drive in National City, California:

EXISTING 6" WATER LINE:
• An existing 6" water main in Ridgeway Drive is used for both domestic water usage and fire protection. This line will
be used to service our development for domestic use.

- The 6” line has available pressure of approximately 90 psi which is adequate pressure for domestic service, for both our development and the community.
- The 6” line has existing fire flow capability of 843 gallons per minute (GPM) based on Sweetwater Authority memorandum.
- Our development requires 2,250 (GPM) based on the National City Fire Department letter received on April 26, 2018. Therefore, the existing 6” line cannot deliver the required fire flow.

OPTIONS TO PROVIDE FIRE FLOW:

In order to resolve the fire flow requirement, there are several options and approaches to accomplish our goal.

Below are three alternatives along with their pros and cons:

Option 1: Upgrade the existing 6” water line mentioned above to a 12” water line. In order to accomplish this, we need about 2,000 feet of new 12” pipe in Ridgeway Drive and Granger Ave. This option is extraordinarily expensive as it requires opening and cutting the street and disturbing neighbors for a long period of time.

Option 2: Public Main Extension - Euclid Ave is located down the street from our development. An existing 30” water main exists on Euclid which provides sufficient flow to meet the project fire flow requirements. To accomplish this option, we need extend a 12” water main from Euclid to the project (about 400 ft) providing a public line.

Option 3: Fire Service - Extend a 12” fire service main from Euclid to Parcel A (we own). Connect a private fire line from Parcel A to Parcel C via Ridgeway Drive. This fire line will provide the required pressure and fire flow to meet the requirements for our development. The design for this private main extension is in the process of being approved by the County. It is important to note that Sweetwater Authority will not incur in any installation or maintenance costs for this private line.

Note for Option 3: During our discussions with Sweetwater Authority staff, we were led to believe that if the private main extension was authorized and accepted by the County, Sweetwater Authority would approve the implementation of this design.

We are asking Sweetwater Authority to allow us to proceed with Option 3 mentioned above. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me directly at [Redact].

Best regards,
Abraham Edd, President
Blue Centurion Homes, LLC

Note: Technical assistance to write this letter provided by Andrew Oven from Dexter Wilson Engineering Inc

Thanks again for your assistance,
Marcela

---

From: M. Escobar-Eck [Redact]
Sent: Monday, August 6, 2018 1:07 PM
To: 'Josie Flores Clark' <jclark@nationalcityca.gov>
Cc: 'Ron Morrison' <rmorrison@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway documents

Josie:

I am wondering I the Mayor made any progress on our issue with the Water district. Please let me know when you can. Thank you.

--Marcela

Marcela Escobar-Eck
Principal/CEO
Atlantis Group Land Use Planning

www.AtlantisSd.com

Redact
Redact
Redact
Redact
Redact
Thank you Josie.

Josie Flores-Clark
Executive Assistant to Mayor Ron Morrison
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
(619) 336-4236

Josie:
Yesterday on the phone the Mayor requested some additional information. Attached are two documents.

The first is the set of drawings that were accepted by the County staff for an encroachment of the private water line. The second letter is from the National City Fire Department which indicates that the reduced requirement meets the Fire Safety needs because the homes are sprinklered.

Please let me know if there is anything else I can provide. Again, thank you so much for your help and guidance.

Regards, Marcela

Marcela Escobar-Eck
Principal/CEO
Atlantis Group Land Use Planning

www.AtlantisSd.com

From: Jeannette Temple
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 10:03 AM
To: MEscobarCek
Subject: Ridgeway documents

Marcela,
This is the County approved drawing that was approved as a private line encroaching in the PROW, and the Fire Dept, Providing the reduced fire pressure and flow required. The design complies with the Fire requirements.

Jeannette Temple
Senior Land Use Consultant
Atlantis Group Land Use Consultants
www.AtlantisSD.com
Hello Luis,

I drafted a project background, and a suggested response. Please take a look and comment.

Thanks,
Jason

From: Mosher, Ron
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2018 3:15 PM
To: Valdez, Luis; Mettler, Jason
Subject: FW: Ridgeway documents

Luis and Jason,

Can you help me develop a response to this email, please?

Thanks,
Ron

From: Berge, Tish
Sent: Wednesday, August 08, 2018 3:03 PM
To: Mosher, Ron
Cc: Sabine, Jennifer
Subject: FW: Ridgeway documents

Hi Ron,
Please see below for the e-mail I mentioned this morning. Please review the information and let me know your thoughts.
Thank you, Tish

Tish Berge
General Manager
Sweetwater Authority
619.420.1413

From: Ron Morrison [mailto:RMorrison@nationalcityca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 07, 2018 5:57 PM
To: Berge, Tish
Subject: FW: Ridgeway documents
Josie:
I have also received the following information that may be helpful:

To: Marcela Escobar-Eck and Jeannette Temple
Atlantis Group

Below is a summary describing the existing water line and options available to resolve the fire flow requirements for our development at 2604 Ridgeway Drive in National City, California:

EXISTING 6" WATER LINE:
- An existing 6" water line in Ridgeway Drive is used for both domestic water usage and fire protection. This line will be used to service our development for domestic use.
- The 6" line has available pressure of approximately 90 psi which is adequate pressure for domestic service, for both our development and the community.
- The 6" line has existing fire flow capability of 843 gallons per minute (GPM) based on Sweetwater Authority memorandum.

- **Our development requires 2,250 (GPM)** based on the National City Fire Department letter received on April 26, 2018. Therefore, the existing 6" line cannot deliver the required fire flow.

OPTIONS TO PROVIDE FIRE FLOW:

In order to resolve the fire flow requirement, there are several options and approaches to accomplish our goal. Below are three alternatives along with their pros and cons:

**Option 1:** Upgrade the existing 6" water line mentioned above to a 12" water line. In order to accomplish this, we need about 2,000 feet of new 12" pipe in Ridgeway Drive and Granger Ave. This option is extraordinarily expensive as it requires opening and cutting the street and disturbing neighbors for a long period of time.

**Option 2:** Public Main Extension - Euclid Ave is located down the street from our development. An existing 30" water main exists on Euclid which provides sufficient flow to meet the project fire flow requirements. To accomplish this option, we need extend a 12" water main from Euclid to the project (about 400 ft) providing a public line.

**Option 3:** Fire Service - Extend a 12" fire service main from Euclid to Parcel A (we own). Connect a private fire line from Parcel A to Parcel C via Ridgeway Drive. This fire line will provide the required pressure and fire flow to meet the requirements for our development. The design for this private main extension is in the process of being approved by the County. It is important to note that Sweetwater Authority will not incur in any installation or maintenance costs for this private line. Note for Option 3: During our discussions with Sweetwater Authority staff, we were led to believe that if the private main extension was authorized and accepted by the County, Sweetwater Authority would approve the implementation of this design.

We are asking Sweetwater Authority to allow us to proceed with Option 3 mentioned above. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me directly...

Best regards,
Abraham Edid, President
Blue Centurion Homes, LLC

Note: Technical assistance to write this letter provided by Andrew Oven from Dexter Wilson Engineering Inc.

Thanks again for your assistance,

Marcela

---

Josie:
I am wondering if the Mayor made any progress on our issue with the Water district. Please let me know when you can. Thank you.

--Marcela

Marcela Escobar-Eck
Principal/CEO
Atlantis Group Land Use Planning

www.AtlantisSd.com

From: MEscobarEck@Redact
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 3:39 PM
To: 'Josie Flores Clark' <JClark@nationalcityca.gov>
Cc: Ron Morrison <RMorrison@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway documents

Thank you Josie.

From: Josie Flores Clark <JClark@nationalcityca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 12:04 PM
To: MEscobarEck@Redact
Cc: Ron Morrison <RMorrison@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway documents

I will make sure the Mayor receives this.

Josie Flores-Clark
Executive Assistant to Mayor Ron Morrison
1243 National City Blvd.,
National City, CA 91950
(619) 336-4236

From: MEscobarEck@Redact
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 10:19 AM
To: Josie Flores Clark <JClark@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: FW: Ridgeway documents

Josie:
Yesterday on the phone the Mayor requested some additional information. Attached are two documents.

The first is the set of drawings that were accepted by the County staff for an encroachment of the private water line. The second letter is from the National City Fire Department which indicates that the reduced requirement meets the Fire Safety needs because the homes are sprinklered.

Please let me know if there is anything else I can provide. Again, thank you so much for your help and guidance.
Regards, Marcela

Marcela Escobar-Eck
Principal/CEO
Atlantis Group Land Use Planning

www.AtlantisSd.com

From: Jeannette Temple
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 10:03 AM
To: MEscobarEck@Redact
Subject: Ridgeway documents

Marcela,
This is the County approved drawing that was approved as a private line encroaching in the PROW, and the Fire Dept,
Providing the reduced fire pressure and flow required. The design complies with the Fire requirements.

Jeannette Temple
Senior Land Use Consultant
Atlantis Group Land Use Consultants
www.AtlantisSD.com
Dear Marcela Escobar-Eck,

Mayor Morrison shared your concerns with me and Sweetwater Authority (Authority) researched and reviewed the project’s history. We have reviewed your requests against our governing Rates & Rules, which are put into place to protect the water system and ensure effective operations. Upon review, however, the Authority cannot provide water service to the site as requested under Option No. 3 in your email below.

The Authority has previously reviewed the design concept under Option No. 3 and has found that it is not in accordance with several of the Authority’s Rates and Rules, specifically Section I.B.-Standards, and Section II.H.-Separate Meter for Each Parcel. Option No. 3 would also not be in accordance with the Authority’s Standard Specification for Construction of Water Facilities, Drawing 15-A, and the Authority’s Design Standards, Section 1.H.-Services. In addition, the Authority cannot serve a single parcel from two separate parcels and two separate pressure zones as proposed under Option 3. The design also proposes to place a section of the private fire service lateral within public right-of-way, as an encroachment, within the Authority’s jurisdiction, which negatively impacts the Authority’s ability to maintain its distribution system. Future serviceability, parcel ownership, cross connection and public notifications required by state law must be considered, as well as the ability to establish accounts for customer service. Therefore, neither Options No. 2 nor 3 can be considered as viable options to provide water service to the project.

In 2016, Mr. Hinkle came into the Authority’s offices and requested a hydraulic analysis for the hydrant located on the north east corner of Ridgeway Drive and Euclid Avenue. Test results indicated an available fire flow of 843 gallons per minute (gpm). The Authority has requested approved plans and a fire flow letter since the fall of 2017 and has indicated on all its design review letters that only 843 gpm fire flow is available to serve the site. To date, no approved plans have been submitted, and no fire flow letter from the City of National City has been provided to the Authority. The Authority was recently informed by Mr. Hinkle that onsite work has commenced. Please note that this action violates the Authority’s Rates and Rules Section II. B. Connection to Water System, Paragraph 4, and is not in accordance with the Design Requirement letter that was acknowledged by the owner.

The Authority remains consistent in our response on this project; specifically, the only viable option to provide water to meet the project water demands, in accordance to the Authority’s Rates and Rules, Design Standards, and Standard Specifications for Construction of Water Facilities, is Option No.1, as communicated to Mr. Hinkle since the fall of 2017.

Respectfully,

Tish Berge
General Manager
Sweetwater Authority
619.420.1413
Cc: Ron Morrison <RMorrison@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway documents

Josie:
I have also received the following information that may be helpful-
To: Marcela Escobar-Eck and Jeannette Temple
Atlantis Group
Below is a summary describing the existing water line and options available to resolve the fire flow requirements for our development at 2604 Ridgeway Drive in National City, California:
EXISTING 6” WATER LINE:
• An existing 6” water main in Ridgeway Drive is used for both domestic water usage and fire protection. This line will be used to service our development for domestic use.
• The 6” line has available pressure of approximately 90 psi which is adequate pressure for domestic service, for both our development and the community.
• The 6” line has existing fire flow capability of 843 gallons per minute (GPM) based on Sweetwater Authority memorandum.
• Our development requires 2,250 (GPM) based on the National City Fire Department letter received on April 26, 2018. Therefore, the existing 6” line cannot deliver the required fire flow.
OPTIONS TO PROVIDE FIRE FLOW:
In order to resolve the fire flow requirement, there are several options and approaches to accomplish our goal. Below are three alternatives along with their pros and cons:
Option 1: Upgrade the existing 6” water line mentioned above to a 12” water line. In order to accomplish this, we need about 2,000 feet of new 12” pipe in Ridgeway Drive and Granger Ave. This option is extraordinarily expensive as it requires opening and cutting the street and disturbing neighbors for a long period of time.
Option 2: Public Main Extension - Euclid Ave is located down the street from our development. An existing 30” water main exists on Euclid which provides sufficient flow to meet the project fire flow requirements. To accomplish this option, we need extend a 12” water main from Euclid to the project (about 400 ft) providing a public line.
Option 3: Fire Service - Extend a 12” fire service main from Euclid to Parcel A (we own). Connect a private fire line from Parcel A to Parcel C via Ridgeway Drive. This fire line will provide the required pressure and fire flow to meet the requirements for our development. The design for this private main extension is in the process of being approved by the County. It is important to note that Sweetwater Authority will not incur in any installation or maintenance costs for this private line.
Note for Option 3: During our discussions with Sweetwater Authority staff, we were led to believe that if the private main extension was authorized and accepted by the County, Sweetwater Authority would approve the implementation of this design.
We are asking Sweetwater Authority to allow us to proceed with Option 3 mentioned above. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me directly at [Redacted].
Best regards,
Abraham Edid, President
Blue Centurion Homes, LLC
Note: Technical assistance to write this letter provided by Andrew Oven from Dexter Wilson Engineering Inc
Thanks again for your assistance,
Marcela

From: MEscobarEck [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, August 6, 2018 1:07 PM
To: 'Josie Flores Clark' <JClark@nationalcityca.gov>
Cc: 'Ron Morrison' <RMorrison@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway documents

Josie:

I am wondering I the Mayor made any progress on our issue with the Water district. Please let me know when you can. Thank you.

--Marcela
From: MEscobarEck
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 3:39 PM
To: 'Josie Flores Clark' <jclark@nationalcityca.gov>
Cc: Ron Morrison <Rmorrison@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway documents

Thank you Josie.

From: Josie Flores Clark <jclark@nationalcityca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 12:04 PM
To: MEscobarEck@Redact
Cc: Ron Morrison <Rmorrison@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway documents

I will make sure the Mayor receives this.

Josie Flores-Clark
Executive Assistant to Mayor Ron Morrison
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
(619) 336-4236

From: MEscobarEck
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 10:19 AM
To: Josie Flores Clark <jclark@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: FW: Ridgeway documents

Josie:
Yesterday on the phone the Mayor requested some additional information. Attached are two documents.

The first is the set of drawings that were accepted by the County staff for an encroachment of the private water line. The second letter is from the National City Fire Department which indicates that the reduced requirement meets the Fire Safety needs because the homes are sprinklered.

Please let me know if there is anything else I can provide. Again, thank you so much for your help and guidance.

Regards, Marcela

Marcela Escobar-Eck
Principal/CEO
From: Jeannette Temple
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 10:03 AM
To: MEscobarEck
Subject: Ridgeway documents

Marcela,
This is the County approved drawing that was approved as a private line encroaching in the PROW, and the Fire Dept, Providing the reduced fire pressure and flow required. The design complies with the Fire requirements.

Jeannette Temple
Senior Land Use Consultant
Atlantis Group Land Use Consultants
www.AtlantisSD.com
Hi Ron,

It was nice meeting you, Tish and Jennifer this morning. As promised, attached below is copy of the original analysis and proposal made by Andrew Oven at Dexter Wilson Engineering (cc’ed here) for our site at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950. Please keep in mind that this proposal was originally designed with a private line in mind that meets the requirements for water flow and pressure. Also, we are happy to make adjustments as needed.

I thank you for taking the time to evaluate again our case and Andrew will be happy to assist and answer any questions you may have and can be reached at [Redact]. As mentioned in the meeting, I hope there are some alternative compliance options we can explore and find common ground to make this project a success for all.

Please advise when you’ve had a chance to review and I’ll be happy to coordinate a conference call.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Eldrid
Cell: [Redact]
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
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Lundstrom Engineering and Surveying, Inc.
5333 Mission Center Road, Suite 115
San Diego, CA 92108

Attention: Jeff Lundstrom, P.E., Project Manager

Subject: Private Water System Analysis for the Ridgeway Parcel C Project in the City of National City

Introduction

The Ridgeway Parcel C project is located in the southeast portion of the City of National City. It is situated on the south side of Ridgeway Drive east of the 805 Freeway. The Ridgeway Parcel C project is a few hundred feet east of Euclid Avenue. See Figure 1 for the location of the project.

The Ridgeway Parcel C project is proposing to develop a total of 48 multi-family residential apartment units within a group of seven buildings. Finished floor elevations for the building range from 126.7 feet to 135.7 feet.

The Ridgeway Parcel C project will receive water service from the Sweetwater Authority and is located within the 327 O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone. The purpose of this letter report is to present the sizing and configuration of the private domestic water system and the private fire protection system to provide service to the Ridgeway Parcel C project.
Private Water System Design Criteria

Water service within the Ridgeway Parcel C project will consist of two separate systems; one will be for private domestic water service and the other will be for private fire protection service. The domestic water system is sized in accordance with the California Plumbing Code 2016.

The fire protection component of the water system is designed based on the required fire flow for the project as stipulated by the Chula Vista Fire Department. The Fire Department typically determines the required fire flow based on the largest building fire area, type of construction, and fire sprinkler system. Then, using Table B105.1 in the Fire Code, the necessary fire flow a duration is determined.

The private fire protection system is designed to provide a minimum residual pressure greater than 20 psi at any location within the private fire protection water system under a fire flow demand.

Existing Water System

The Ridgeway Parcel C project is within the City of National City and will obtain water service from the Sweetwater Authority's public water system. The nearest existing public water line in the vicinity of the Ridgeway Parcel C project is a 6-inch water line in Ridgeway Drive along the project frontage. There is also an existing 30-inch public water line in Euclid Avenue to the west of the project.

Water Service Overview

Water service to the Ridgeway Parcel C project will be provided from two different pressure zones. Domestic water service will be obtained by connecting to the existing 6-inch 372 O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone water line in Ridgeway Drive. The range of pad elevations on the project, 126.7 feet to 135.7 feet, results in expected maximum static pressures at the
street to be between 102 psi and 106 psi when connected to the existing 6-inch water line in Ridgeway Drive.

The Ridgeway Parcel C project private domestic water system will consist of installing two 2-inch domestic service laterals from the existing 6-inch water line in Ridgeway Drive and setting two 2-inch domestic meters and reduced pressure principle backflow preventers near the entrance to the project. The two 2-inch meter assemblies will be manifolded together after the backflow preventers.

Fire protection service will be obtained by extending a new 12-inch public water line from Euclid Avenue along Ridgeway Drive to the project frontage. As will be discussed later in this report, the existing 6-inch O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone water line cannot deliver sufficient fire flow for this project. Therefore, a new water main must be extended from the existing 30-inch transmission main in Euclid Avenue to provide fire flow to the project.

The private fire protection system will consist of one 12-inch fire service lateral extending off of the new 12-inch public water line in Ridgeway Drive. An 8-inch reduced pressure principle detector check assembly will be installed at the project boundary. Internal to the project there will be 10-inch private fire protection piping to provide service to the two onsite private fire hydrants.

Fire sprinkler water lines and laterals, which are expected to be connected to the private domestic water system and will supply the building fire sprinkler system, shall be sized by the fire sprinkler system designer employed for the Ridgeway Parcel C project and are outside the scope of work for this report. Underground lateral supplies for sprinkler systems are recommended to be a minimum of 4-inches in diameter for each residential building.

**Available Hydraulic Grade Line**

The available hydraulic grade line (HGL) in the vicinity of the Ridgeway Parcel C project was estimated based on the pressure zone to which each private water system will be connected. The critical hydraulic grade line needed for analysis is for the fire flow
Jeff Lundstrom, P.E.
December 27, 2017
Ridgeway Parcel C

Calculation. Since the fire service line will be connected to the existing 30-inch Gravity Zone transmission main, the available hydraulic grade line is more certain than in a local distribution main.

PRIVATE DOMESTIC WATER SYSTEM

The Ridgeway Parcel C project’s private domestic water system will consist of two 2-inch domestic water meters connected to the existing 6-inch public water line in Ridgeway Drive. Each of the two 2-inch domestic water meters will have a 2-inch diameter service lateral connection and will be followed by a 2-inch reduced pressure principle backflow preventer. The domestic water system after the meter will be a private system and the responsibility of the project association. Internal to the project, each building will be connected to the private domestic water main by a single building supply line. The sizing of the project’s master water meter and private domestic water system distribution piping is presented in the following sections.

**Master Water Meter Sizing.** A master domestic water meter will provide service to the Ridgeway Parcel C project. The master meter size was determined based on the total number of fixture units that will be served by the meter. Irrigation internal to the project will be supplied by a separate irrigation meter.

The Ridgeway Parcel C project architectural plans were used to determine the total Water Fixture Units for the project. Then, using the maximum operating capacity meter flow rates provided by Sweetwater Authority, the appropriate size of the master meter is determined. Appendix A provides a copy of the Sweetwater Authority’s design criteria for domestic water meters.

Water Fixture Units are determined for each dwelling unit proposed within the Ridgeway Parcel C project. For each dwelling unit type, the Water Fixture Unit (WFU) count was determined based upon the number of water-using fixtures and its associated WFU value as set forth in the California Plumbing Code 2016.
The architectural plans were used to determine the total WFUs for the Ridgeway Parcel C project. Appendix B has a copy of the pertinent architectural floor plan sheets, a summary table calculating the total Water Fixture Units, and Chart A-103.1(1) converting WFUs to maximum flow.

The total WFUs for the Ridgeway Parcel C project is 955. Using Chart A-103.1(1) in the California Plumbing Code 2016, 955 WFUs equates to a peak flow of 200 gpm. Therefore, to adhere to Sweetwater Authority's meter sizing guidelines, two 2-inch meters are recommended for the Ridgeway Parcel C project. The allowable capacity of a 2-inch domestic meter is 160 gpm; thus, two 2-inch meters will provide 320 gpm capacity. Each 2-inch meter will be followed by a 2-inch reduced pressure principle backflow preventer.

Domestic Water System Pipe Sizing. The private domestic water system distribution piping for the Ridgeway Parcel C project has been sized in accordance with the Uniform Plumbing Code and the Installation Standard for PVC Cold Water Building Supply and Yard Piping (IAPMO IS 8-2006). The Installation Standard requires that the maximum pipeline velocity be limited to eight feet per second (8 fps). To comply with this requirement, the maximum flowrate and WFUs for different pipe sizes was calculated based on Chart A-103.1(1) from the California Plumbing Code 2016. The WFUs per pipe size summarized in Table 1 below are used to size the piping within the Ridgeway Parcel C project by determining the total number of WFUs that any line would serve.
Jeff Lundstrom, P.E.
December 27, 2017
Ridgeway Parcel C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Water Fixture Units</th>
<th>Minimum System Pipe Size¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 14</td>
<td>¼-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 29</td>
<td>1-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 53</td>
<td>1 ¼-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 – 106</td>
<td>1 ¾-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 – 270</td>
<td>2-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271 – 500</td>
<td>2 ¼-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 – 780</td>
<td>3-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>781 – 1,920</td>
<td>4-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,921 – 3,575</td>
<td>5-inch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,576 – 6,175</td>
<td>6-inch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Based on velocity of 5 fps

Figure 2 presents a graphic of the recommended private domestic water system for the Ridgeway Parcel C project. Building supply piping is to be sized to match the plumbing plans for the size of the domestic water entering the single building.

The domestic water line sizes shown on Figure 2 are the minimum recommended pipe sizes that comply with the California Plumbing Code 2016 and will supply adequate flow and pressure within the Ridgeway Parcel C project. The line sizes may be increased for uniformity or ease of construction.

The expected residual pressure at the domestic base of the riser for the Ridgeway Parcel C project buildings is around 82 psi. This available pressure takes into account the available HGL under a maximum day demand condition, the pressure losses through the proposed public water piping, and estimated pressure loss through the domestic water meters and backflow preventers. Onsite building supply piping losses are not taken into account for this estimate.

Individual pressure regulators will be needed at each building supply to regulate internal building pressure to below 80 psi in accordance with the California Plumbing Code.
PRIVATE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM PIPE SIZING

All fire hydrants within the Ridgeway Parcel C project will be connected to a private fire protection water system which will be independent of any other water system. The private fire protection system for Ridgeway Parcel C will be connected to the new 12-inch public water line in Ridgeway Drive.

The fire flow for the Ridgeway Parcel C was estimated using the largest building square footage and type of construction. For Type V-B construction and a building size of 10,678 square feet, the fire flow requirement is 2,750 gpm. With 20 percent reduction for using an approved fire sprinkler system, the resulting fire flow is 2,063 gpm.

Sweetwater Authority had prepared a fire flow test in January 2017 for the 6-inch O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone water line in Ridgeway Drive. A copy is provided in Appendix C. The results indicated a maximum possible fire flow of 843 gpm. Since this flow is insufficient for the Ridgeway Parcel C project, an alternative means of providing fire flow was conceived. The approach is to connect to the existing 30-inch Gravity Zone transmission line in Euclid and extend a new public water line in Ridgeway Drive to the project entrance. Hydraulic calculations were done to confirm that this will provide the required flow and pressure and to determine what pipe size is necessary to construct in Ridgeway Drive.

The private fire protection system was sized based on the required fire flow for the project and taking into consideration the proposed piping configuration. In order to establish the required fire protection system pipe sizing, a water system computer model was generated for the project’s fire protection system piping. Fire flow scenarios were modeled which provided data upon which the recommended pipe sizing is based.

Model Development. Analysis using the KYPIPE computer software program developed by the University of Kentucky determined residual pressures throughout the fire protection system. This computer software utilizes the Hazen-Williams equation for determining headloss in pipes. The Hazen-Williams “C” value used for all pipe sizes in our analysis is 120.
Fitting and Valve Losses. To simulate minor losses through pipe fittings and valves, equivalent lengths of piping were added to the straight pipe lengths and included in the hydraulic model. Appendix D provides the equivalent length reference table utilized for the determination of minor losses within the computer modeling analysis.

Backflow Assembly Losses. The pressure losses through the reduced pressure principle detector check assembly devices were modeled as minor losses using a "k" value large enough to result in the expected pressure loss through these devices. Appendix E presents a candidate reduced pressure principle detector check assembly backflow preventer device. The manufacturer's literature includes charts which show pressure loss through the backflow preventer as a function of flow. These charts were used to approximate the pressure losses which were reflected in the computer modeling and show up as minor losses calculated in feet.

Hydraulic Grade Line Available. The private fire protection system was modeled with an estimated hydraulic grade line in the 30-inch Gravity Zone transmission line west of the project site of 240 feet. This hydraulic grade line was estimated based on the hydraulic grade line for the Gravity Zone which is 255 feet.

The private fire protection system has been designed to provide a minimum residual pressure greater than 20 psi under a fire flow scenario within the Ridgeway Parcel C project.

Fire Protection System Analysis. Appendix F presents the computer modeling results for the private fire protection system. Exhibit A shows the Node and Pipe Diagram for the private fire protection system model. The fire flow requirement of 2,063 gpm was modeled at two adjacent fire hydrant locations with a flow of 563 gpm at the first hydrant and 1,500 gpm at the furthest hydrant.

The recommendation is to construct a new 12-inch water main from Fourth Avenue in H Street to the east end of the Ridgeway Parcel C project. This larger water main will enable the fire flow requirement for the Ridgeway Parcel C project to be met with greater than 20 psi residual.
With the proposed 12-inch public water main improvement in Ridgeway Drive from Euclid Avenue to the project site, the fire flow requirement is being met with greater than 20 psi residual pressure at all locations within the project. Minimum residual pressures are greater than 20 psi under all fire flow scenarios.

The private fire protection system will be connected at the project entrance to the new 12-inch Gravity Zone public water line in Ridgeway Drive as shown in Figure 3. This connection includes a 12-inch lateral and an 8-inch reduced pressure principle detector check assembly in accordance with Sweetwater Authority standards and the City of National City backflow prevention requirements.

The City of Chula Vista Fire Department requirements for fire hydrants, fire hydrant locations, fire department connection (FDC) locations, post indicator valves (PIV), and other standard details can be found at:


Fire Sprinkler Systems

As of the preparation date for this report, fire sprinkler flow and pressure requirements were not known. Therefore, fire sprinkler lateral pipe sizes cannot be determined.

While it is typical to connect the building fire sprinkler laterals to the private fire protection system, in the case of the Ridgeway Parcel C project, this approach needs to be evaluated prior to proceeding. The private fire protection system is connected to the 255 HGL Gravity Zone because the existing 6-inch O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone piping in Ridgeway Drive does not have the hydraulic capability to provide adequate fire flow for the project. However, the Gravity Zone will provide at best 51 psi static pressure in the street, and after the backflow preventer the available pressure for a fire sprinkler lateral is expected to be less than 40 psi.
FIGURE 3
PROPOSED PRIVATE FIRE SYSTEM
RIDGEWAY PARCEL C

NOTE:
FIRE SPRINKLER LATERALS ARE RECOMMENDED TO BE CONNECTED TO THE DOMESTIC WATER SYSTEM IN ORDER TO HAVE ADEQUATE SERVICE PRESSURE.

LEGEND
- PROJECT BOUNDARY
- EXISTING PUBLIC WATER
- PROPOSED PUBLIC WATER
- PROPOSED PRIVATE FIRE
- PROPOSED BACKFLOW
- PROPOSED FIRE HYDRANT

SCALE: 1" = 80' FEET
On the domestic system, available pressure will be around 80 psi. Therefore, it is worthwhile considering connecting the fire sprinkler systems to the domestic water system. Among other considerations, this approach will require additional backflow preventers at each building connection. Further analysis of these alternatives is necessary to be performed by the fire sprinkler designer once the required flows and pressures are known.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The following recommendations and conclusions are presented based upon the private water system analyses performed for the Ridgeway Parcel C project.

1. Water service to the project will be provided by the Sweetwater Authority public water system.

2. The existing Sweetwater Authority public water system does front the proposed project with an existing 6-inch water line. This line is adequate to provide domestic service to the project.

3. Finished floor elevations within the project range from approximately 126.7 to 135.7 feet resulting in a range of maximum static water pressures in the street of 102 to 106 psi.

4. Domestic service and fire protection to the project shall be supplied by two independent private water systems.

5. Private domestic service for the Ridgeway Parcel C project will be supplied by two 2-inch domestic water meters.

6. Each 2-inch domestic meter will be followed by a 2-inch reduced pressure principle backflow preventer.
7. Figure 2 presented in this report provides the recommended distribution pipe sizes for the private domestic water system.

8. The existing 6-inch water line in Ridgeway Drive has insufficient capacity to deliver fire flow requirements for the project. A new 12-inch Gravity Zone water line will have to be constructed from the existing 30-inch Gravity Zone transmission water line in Euclid Avenue to the project boundary along Ridgeway Drive. The length of this 12-inch public water main is approximately 500 linear feet.

9. The construction of a new 12-inch Gravity Zone pipeline in Ridgeway Drive makes available to the project site the estimated fire flow of 2,063 gpm.

10. Private fire protection service for the Ridgeway Parcel C project will be supplied by a 12-inch lateral connection to the new 12-inch public water main. Internal to the project the private fire protection system will consist of 10-inch piping.

11. The 12-inch private fire protection system connection to the public main shall include an 8-inch reduced pressure principle detector check assembly backflow preventer in accordance with Sweetwater Authority standards and the City of National City backflow prevention requirements.

12. Figure 3 provides a layout of the Ridgeway Parcel C project showing the recommended private fire protection system pipeline sizes throughout the project.

13. Underground lateral supplies for sprinkler systems shall be a minimum of 6-inches for commercial properties and a minimum of 4-inches for residential properties. The fire protection system service laterals, the fire service backflow preventers, the private fire protection system piping, and the fire sprinkler system riser to each building are recommended to be 4” diameter. This sizing is to be confirmed by the building fire sprinkler system designer.

14. Fire sprinkler water lines and laterals which will supply the buildings shall be sized by the fire sprinkler designer employed for the Ridgeway Parcel C project and are not included in the scope of this report. Underground lateral supplies for sprinkler
systems are recommended to be a minimum of 4-inches for residential properties. The fire sprinkler laterals may need to be connected to the private domestic water system to have sufficient pressure to operate.

15. The public water system shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the guidelines, standards, and approved materials of the Sweetwater Authority.

16. This report presents the sizing and a general schematic layout of the proposed private domestic and private fire protection water systems. The design engineer for these systems should incorporate valves, fittings, and appurtenances as needed for proper installation and long-term operation of the private water systems.

17. If PVC pipe is used for the private water lines within the project, we recommend pipes 4-inch through 12-inch diameter to be AWWA C900, DR-14 (Class 305) for private fire protection system piping, and AWWA C900, DR-18 (Class 235) for private domestic system piping. Pipes smaller than 4-inch in diameter should be solvent welded Schedule 40 PVC; as an alternative, copper piping may be used. The 12-inch public water main improvement in Ridgeway Drive is recommended to be 12-inch PVC per AWWA C900 DR-18.

Thank you for the opportunity to assist you with the water system planning for this project. If you have any questions regarding the information presented in this report, please do not hesitate to call.

Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

Andrew Oven, P.E.

AO:ps

Attachments
APPENDIX A

SWEETWATER AUTHORITY
DOMESTIC METER CAPACITIES
XI. DOMESTIC METER SIZING

Most manufacturers of water meters rate the flow capacities of their domestic water meters at forty (40) psi water pressure. The following are general rated flow capacities for the meter sizes shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meter Size (inches)</th>
<th>Rated Capacity (gpm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1/2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the Authority’s system is designed to provide a reasonable supply of water to each consumer, the Authority shall determine the water meter size that will meet the needs of both the consumer and the Authority.

The Uniform Plumbing Code (UPC) and Manual 22 of the AWWA both provide a listing of demands needed for various types of plumbing fixtures. By applying the demands determined from the fixture unit count, a demand for the meter can be determined.

In some cases, it may not be desirable to anticipate that all domestic needs may be available at one time, such as during a peak water use period. In this situation, the use of irrigation systems may be required during an off peak period if the needs of all consumers within a pressure zone are to be met.

The meter sizing requirement for the various structures within the Authority’s service area will be determined by the Authority’s Director of Engineering.

XII. LANDSCAPING

All Authority facilities, except water mains and appurtenances, shall be landscaped with plants, trees, or ground cover that will enhance the structure, and provide a pleasing environmental appearance to the public.
APPENDIX B

WATER FIXTURE UNIT COUNTS
AND ARCHITECTURAL FLOOR PLANS
Water Fixture
The basis for the Water Fixture Units is "Private" per the 2016 California Plumbing Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Floor Plan Unit 1</th>
<th>Floor Plan Unit 2</th>
<th>Floor Plan Unit 3</th>
<th>Floor Plan Unit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FIXTURE TOTAL</td>
<td>FIXTURE TOTAL</td>
<td>FIXTURE TOTAL</td>
<td>FIXTURE TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QUANTITY UNITS FIXTURE EACH</td>
<td>QUANTITY UNITS FIXTURE EACH</td>
<td>QUANTITY UNITS FIXTURE EACH</td>
<td>QUANTITY UNITS FIXTURE EACH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOTHES WASHER</td>
<td>1 4 14</td>
<td>1 4 14</td>
<td>1 4 14</td>
<td>1 4 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUNDRY SINK</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUB/SHOWER</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOWER</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITCHEN SINK</td>
<td>1 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>1 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>1 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>1 1.5 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISHWASHER</td>
<td>1 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>1 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>1 1.5 1.5</td>
<td>1 1.5 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVATORY</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>2 1 2</td>
<td>3 1 3</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER CLOSET (1.6 GPF)</td>
<td>1 2.5 2.5</td>
<td>2 2.5 5</td>
<td>2 2.5 5</td>
<td>2.5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSE BIBB</td>
<td>2.5 0</td>
<td>2.5 0</td>
<td>2.5 0</td>
<td>2.5 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACH ADDTL HB</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building A # of Units WFUs
Plan 1 2 29
Plan 2 6 132
Plan 3 4 92
Total 12 253

Building B # of Units WFUs
Plan 1 2 20
Plan 2 4 68
Plan 3 0 0
Total 6 117

Building # of Bldgs WFUs
A 1 253
B 6 702

TOTAL 955
955 WFUs equates to 200 gpm
For SI units: 1 gallon per minute = 0.06 L/s
APPENDIX C

SWEETWATER AUTHORITY
FLOW TEST FROM JANUARY 4, 2017
TO: BLUE CENTURION HOMES, LLC  
FROM: JASON METTLER  
SUBJECT: 2604 RIDGEWAY DRIVE, NATIONAL CITY  
DATE: JANUARY 4, 2017  
CC: ARTURO TEJEDA, LUIS VALDEZ

As requested, I used a computer program to model the demands for the Sweetwater Authority distribution system and the results are as follows:

- Static Maximum Day 93.6 psi
- 250 GPM 87.6 psi
- 500 GPM 77.1 psi
- 750 GPM 66.2 psi
- 843 GPM 59.4 psi (Maximum Flow)
- 1,000 GPM - Not available since the water flow velocity exceeds 10 feet per second.

In all cases, the demand was applied to a node at the 6" AC water main connection point for an existing fire hydrant located at the north east corner of Euclid Avenue and Ridgeway Drive, National City. The model was set for maximum day water system demands with a four-hour fire flow starting at 9:00 a.m., with all test results shown at 1:00 p.m. Please see the attached sketch showing the test node location.
2604 Ridgeway Drive - Hydraulic Analysis

843 GPM maximum flow demand to a node at the existing 6" water main connection point for an existing fire hydrant located on the north east corner of Euclid Avenue and Ridgeway Drive, National City. The model was set for maximum day water system demands with a four-hour fire flow starting at 9:00 a.m., with test results shown at 1:00 p.m.
APPENDIX D

MINOR LOSS EQUIVALENT LENGTH DATA
FOR HYDRAULIC COMPUTER MODELING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe No.</th>
<th>Gate Valve, Open</th>
<th>Check Valve</th>
<th>Standard tee, Branch</th>
<th>Standard tee, Through</th>
<th>90° Elbow, std.</th>
<th>45° Elbow</th>
<th>Pipe Length (ft)</th>
<th>Pipe Size, in</th>
<th>Equivalent Length of Additional Pipe Elements</th>
<th>Total Length (ft)</th>
<th>Pipe No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>196.9</td>
<td>716.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Bkflw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120 Bkflw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>172.8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>282.8</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>297.8</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{artic\_eng\_1501008\_2017-12-05 Ridgeway Parcel C Minor Loss Equivalent Lengths.xlsx / 10'' Equivalent Length}
APPENDIX E

MINOR LOSS TABLES AND MANUFACTURER'S LITERATURE FOR A REDUCED PRESSURE PRINCIPLE DETECTOR CHECK ASSEMBLY BACKFLOW PREVENTER
WILKINS®
Reduced Pressure Detector Assembly

SPECIFICATION SUBMITTAL SHEET

APPLICATION
Designed for installation on potable water lines in fire protection systems to protect against both backspigotage and backpressure of contaminated water into the potable water supply. The Model 375DA shall provide protection where a potential health hazard exists. Incorporates metered by-pass to detect leaks and unauthorized water use.

STANDARDS COMPLIANCE
(Unless otherwise noted, applies to sizes 2 1/2’ thru 10’)
- ASSE® Listed 1047 (2 1/2’ thru 8’)
- UL® Classified
- AWWA Compliant C550
- CSA® Certified (4’ & 6’)
- C-UL® Classified
- FM® Approved
- NYC MEA 218-01-M Vol 3
- Approved by the Foundation for Cross Connection Control and Hydraulic Research at the University of Southern California

MATERIALS
Main valve body Ductile Iron ASTM A 536 Grade 4
Access covers Ductile Iron ASTM A 536 Grade 4
Coatings FDA Approved fusion epoxy finish
Internals Stainless steel, 300 Series
Fasteners NORYL™, NSF Listed
Elastomers Stainless Steel, 300 Series
Elastomers EPDM (FDA approved)
Polymers Buna Nitrile (FDA approved)
Springs Stainless steel, 300 series
Sensing line Stainless steel, braided hose

DIMENSIONS & WEIGHTS (do not include pkg.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODEL 375DA SIZE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in.</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>in.</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>15 7/8</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>7 1/4</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>15 7/8</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>7 1/4</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37 5/8</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>19 1/2</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>44 3/4</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>23 1/2</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>60 3/4</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>37 3/4</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>83 3/4</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>37 3/4</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attention: Model 375DA (flange body) and Model 375DA (grooved body) have different lay lengths.

Relief Valve discharge port:
- 2 1/2” - 6” - 2.75 sq. in.
- 8” - 10” - 3.69 sq. in.

(Material No. 5,913,331)
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WILKINS a Zurn Company, 1747 Commercet Way, Peso Robles, CA 93448 Phone: 805-236-7100 Fax: 805-236-5766
In Canada: ZURN INDUSTRIES LIMITED, 3544 Nashua Dr., Mississauga, Ontario L4V 1L2 Phone: 905-405-8272 Fax: 905-405-1292
Product Support Help Line: 877-BACKFLO/W (877-222-3566) - Website: http://www.zurn.com
FLOW CHARACTERISTICS

MODEL 375DA 2 1/2", 3" & 4" (STANDARD & METRIC)

FLOW RATES (l/s)

FLOW RATES (GPM)

MODEL 375DA 6", 8" & 10" (STANDARD & METRIC)

FLOW RATES (l/s)

FLOW RATES (GPM)

TYPICAL INSTALLATION

Local codes shall govern installation requirements. To be installed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and the latest edition of the Uniform Plumbing Code. Unless otherwise specified, the assembly shall be mounted at a minimum of 12" (305mm) and a maximum of 30" (762mm) above adequate drains with sufficient side clearance for testing and maintenance. The installation shall be made so that no part of the unit can be submerged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity thru Schedule 40 Pipe (GPM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipe size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIFICATIONS

The Reduced Pressure Detector Backflow Prevention Assembly shall be ASSE® Listed 1047 and supplied with full port OS & Y gate valves. The main body and access cover shall be epoxy coated ductile iron (ASTM A 536 Grade 4), the seat ring and check valve shall be NORYL™, the stem shall be stainless steel (ASTM A 276) and the seat disc elastomers shall be EPDM. The checks and the relief valve shall be accessible for maintenance without removing the device from the line. The Reduced Pressure Detector Backflow Prevention Assembly shall be a WILKINS Model 375DA.
APPENDIX F

COMPUTER RUNS

PRIVATE FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEM ANALYSIS

NODE AND PIPE DIAGRAM REFERENCE:

Exhibit A

CONDITIONS MODELED:

1. Fire flow of 2,063 gpm; 1,500 gpm at Node 11 and 563 gpm at Node 8.

2. Fire flow of 2,063 gpm; 1,500 gpm at Node 8 and 563 gpm at Node 5.
FLOWRATE IS EXpressed In GPM AND PRESSURE IN PSIG

A SUMMARY OF THE ORIGINAL DATA FOLLOWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPE NO.</th>
<th>NODE NOS.</th>
<th>LENGTH (FEET)</th>
<th>DIAMETER (INCHES)</th>
<th>ROUGHNESS</th>
<th>MINOR LOSS K</th>
<th>FIXED GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>717.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>298.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNCTION NUMBER</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>CONNECTING PIPES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>100 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>120 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>124 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>127 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>127.00</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OUTPUT SELECTION: ALL RESULTS ARE OUTPUT EACH PERIOD

THIS SYSTEM HAS 5 PIPES WITH 5 JUNCTIONS, 0 LOOPS AND 1 FGNS

Ridgeway Parcel C in the County of San Diego
Fire Flow of 2063 gpm from the Sweetwater Authority System
Connect to 30 inch Gravity Zone line in Euclid Avenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPE NO.</th>
<th>NODE NOS.</th>
<th>FLOWRATE</th>
<th>HEAD LOSS</th>
<th>PUMP HEAD</th>
<th>MINOR LOSS</th>
<th>VELOCITY</th>
<th>VELOCITY HL/1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNCTION NUMBER</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>GRADE LINE</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>PRESSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>46.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>46.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>45.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>45.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>127.00</td>
<td>48.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE NET SYSTEM DEMAND = 0.00

SUMMARY OF INFLOWS(+) AND OUTFLOWS(−) FROM FIXED GRADE NODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPE NUMBER</th>
<th>FLOWRATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE NET FLOW INTO THE SYSTEM FROM FIXED GRADE NODES = 0.00
THE NET FLOW OUT OF THE SYSTEM INTO FIXED GRADE NODES = 0.00

A SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS SPECIFIED FOR THE NEXT SIMULATION FOLLOWS

THE FOLLOWING SPECIFIC DEMAND CHANGES ARE MADE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNCTION NUMBER</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>563.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE RESULTS ARE OBTAINED AFTER 2 TRIALS WITH AN ACCURACY = 0.0000

Ridgeway Parcel C
Fire Flow of 2063 gpm split between Nodes 8 and 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPE NO.</th>
<th>NODE NO.</th>
<th>FLOWRATE</th>
<th>HEAD LOSS</th>
<th>PUMP HEAD</th>
<th>MINOR LOSS</th>
<th>VELOCITY</th>
<th>H/L/1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>2063.60</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>81.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>8 11</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNCTION NUMBER</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>GRADE LINE</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>PRESSURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>231.94</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>43.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>195.33</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>27.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>190.60</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>24.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>563.00</td>
<td>182.86</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>20.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>176.35</td>
<td>127.00</td>
<td>22.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE NET SYSTEM DEMAND = 2063.00

SUMMARY OF INFLOWS(+) AND OUTFLOWS(−) FROM FIXED GRADE NODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPE NUMBER</th>
<th>FLOWRATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE NET FLOW INTO THE SYSTEM FROM FIXED GRADE NODES = 2063.00
THE NET FLOW OUT OF THE SYSTEM INTO FIXED GRADE NODES = 0.00
A SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS SPECIFIED FOR THE NEXT SIMULATION FOLLOWS

THE FOLLOWING SPECIFIC DEMAND CHANGES ARE MADE:
JUNCTION NUMBER DEMAND
  5       563.00
  8       1500.00

THE RESULTS ARE OBTAINED AFTER 2 TRIALS WITH AN ACCURACY = .00000

Ridgeway Parcel C
Fire Flow of 2063 gpm split between Nodes 5 and 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPE NO.</th>
<th>NOOR NOS.</th>
<th>FLOWRATE</th>
<th>HEAD LOSS</th>
<th>PUMP HEAD</th>
<th>MINOR LOSS</th>
<th>VELOCITY</th>
<th>HL/1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>31.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>27.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>15.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JUNCTION NUMBER DEMAND GRADE LINE ELEVATION PRESSURE
  1        .00      231.94  132.00    43.32
  2        .00      195.33  132.00    27.44
  5        563.00   190.60  134.00    24.53
  8        1500.00  186.31  135.00    22.24
  11       .00      188.31  127.00    25.70

THE NET SYSTEM DEMAND = 2063.00

SUMMARY OF INFLOWS(+) AND OUTFLOWS(-) FROM FIXED GRADE NODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPE NUMBER</th>
<th>FLOWRATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE NET FLOW INTO THE SYSTEM FROM FIXED GRADE NODES = 2063.00
THE NET FLOW OUT OF THE SYSTEM INTO FIXED GRADE NODES = .00
Ron,

I am pleased to meet you via email. Do let me know if you have any questions about the technical study that I prepared for 2604 Ridgeway Drive or any alternate approach to providing service to the proposed project. I am available by phone or email.

Thank you.

Andrew Oven, P.E.
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.

Hi Ron,

It was nice meeting you, Tish and Jennifer this morning. As promised, attached below is copy of the original analysis and proposal made by Andrew Oven at Dexter Wilson Engineering (cc'd here) for our site at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950. Please keep in mind that this proposal was originally designed with a private line in mind that meets the requirements for water flow and pressure. Also, we are happy to make adjustments as needed.

I thank you for taking the time to evaluate again our case and Andrew will be happy to assist and answer any questions you may have and can be reached at [Redact]. As mentioned in the meeting, I hope there are some alternative compliance options we can explore and find common ground to make this project a success for all.

Please advise when you've had a chance to review and I'll be happy to coordinate a conference call.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: [Redact]
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Tish and Jennifer,

Here is a suggested response to Mr. Edid for your review and consideration.

Thanks,
Ron

Hello Mr. Edid:

Thank you for sending the water supply analysis and proposal. I appreciate the effort that has been expended to find a creative solution to the fire protection issue for your proposed development project at 2604 Ridgeway Drive. However, as I mentioned in our meeting, the hydraulics are simply a function of hydraulic grade line, terrain, and water main size. Unfortunately, the only one of these components that can be changed is the water main size.

In our meeting, there seemed to be some confusion regarding the ability to modify the zone boundary based on parcel ownership. Sweetwater Authority's Rates and Rules guide us to review proposed developments by evaluating the water supply at the public right-of-way frontage to the parcel. In your case, the parcel with the proposed development fronts Ridgeway Drive (and only Ridgeway Drive). As such, we must look to the water facilities in Ridgeway Drive to evaluate the water supply capabilities based on domestic and fire protection requirements. There has been ample documentation that the water main in Ridgeway Drive is in the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone and that it only has a capacity of 843 gpm for fire protection. This is inadequate for your proposed development. If your parcel were to also front Euclid Avenue, we could look to the water facilities in that street for service to your proposed development. For example, if you or your company owned all of the parcels between 2604 Ridgeway Drive and Euclid Avenue and the parcels were consolidated into a single parcel that fronts Euclid Avenue, we could consider the water main in Euclid Avenue as an option. I believe this parcel consolidation aspect has not been clearly communicated and, for that, I apologize.

I understand that you already own some of the parcels between 2604 Ridgeway Drive and Euclid Avenue. If the parcels with the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) were consolidated into a single parcel, service to the newly created parcel could be evaluated based on the frontage to Euclid Avenue:

- APN 564-040-07-00 (the proposed development parcel)
- APN 564-040-05-00
- APN 564-040-04-00
- APN 564-040-02-00
- APN 564-040-23-00

If the parcel consolidation is not feasible, the only remaining option is to construct the new water main in Ridgeway Drive as communicated in previous correspondence from the Authority.

Thank you,
Hi Ron,

It was nice meeting you, Tish and Jennifer this morning. As promised, attached below is copy of the original analysis and proposal made by Andrew Oven at Dexter Wilson Engineering (cc’d here) for our site at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950. Please keep in mind that this proposal was originally designed with a private line in mind that meets the requirements for water flow and pressure. Also, we are happy to make adjustments as needed.

I thank you for taking the time to evaluate again our case and Andrew will be happy to assist and answer any questions you may have and can be reached at [Redact]. As mentioned in the meeting, I hope there are some alternative compliance options we can explore and find common ground to make this project a success for all.

Please advise when you’ve had a chance to review and I’ll be happy to coordinate a conference call.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Call: [Redact]
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Hello Mr. Edid:

Thank you for sending the water supply analysis and proposal for your development project at 2604 Ridgeway Drive. Per your request, I have reviewed this document with the understanding that it was developed based on separate supplies from two of Sweetwater Authority’s (Authority) pressure zones; one for domestic service and the other for fire protection. As stated in our August 28, 2018 meeting, this water supply proposal is neither allowed nor desired. In addition, as I mentioned in our meeting, the hydraulics are simply a function of hydraulic grade line, terrain, and water main size. Unfortunately, the only one of these components that can be changed is the water main size.

In our meeting, you requested that the Authority identify some alternative compliance option(s). The Authority’s Rates and Rules guide us to review proposed developments by evaluating the water supply at the public right-of-way frontage to the parcel. In your case, the parcel with the proposed development fronts Ridgeway Drive (and only Ridgeway Drive). As such, we must look to the water facilities in Ridgeway Drive to evaluate the water supply capabilities based on domestic and fire protection requirements. There has been ample documentation that the water main in Ridgeway Drive is in the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone and that it only has a capacity of 843 gpm for fire protection. This is inadequate for your proposed development. If your parcel were to also front Euclid Avenue, we could look to the water facilities in that street for service to your proposed development. For example, if you or your company owned all of the parcels between 2604 Ridgeway Drive and Euclid Avenue and the parcels were consolidated into a single parcel that fronts Euclid Avenue, we could consider the water main in Euclid Avenue as an option.

I understand that you already own some of the parcels between 2604 Ridgeway Drive and Euclid Avenue. If the parcels with the following Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APN) were consolidated into a single parcel, service to the newly created parcel could be evaluated based on the frontage to Euclid Avenue:

- APN 564-040-07-00 (the proposed development parcel)
- APN 564-040-05-00
- APN 564-040-04-00
- APN 564-040-02-00
- APN 564-040-23-00

Please understand that if this option were to be implemented, the entire newly created parcel would be at the hydraulic grade line associated with the Gravity Pressure Zone. If the parcel consolidation is not feasible, the only remaining option is to construct the new water main in Ridgeway Drive as communicated in previous correspondence from the Authority.

Thank you,
Ron R. Mosher  
Director of Engineering  
Sweetwater Authority  

(619) 403-6750 Direct Line  
(619) 425-7469 Fax  
Rmosher@sweetwater.org

---

From: Abraham Eid [mailto:Redact]  
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2018 12:24 PM  
To: Mosher, Ron  
Cc: Berge, Tish; Andrew Oven  
Subject: Follow-up regarding Fire Line for 2604 Ridgeway Drive Development Project

Hi Ron,

It was nice meeting you, Tish and Jennifer this morning. As promised, attached below is copy of the original analysis and proposal made by Andrew Oven at Dexter Wilson Engineering (cc’d here) for our site at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950. Please keep in mind that this proposal was originally designed with a private line in mind that meets the requirements for water flow and pressure. Also, we are happy to make adjustments as needed.

I thank you for taking the time to evaluate again our case and Andrew will be happy to assist and answer any questions you may have and can be reached at Redact As mentioned in the meeting, I hope there are some alternative compliance options we can explore and find common ground to make this project a success for all.

Please advise when you’ve had a chance to review and I’ll be happy to coordinate a conference call.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Eid  
Cell: Redact  
Blue Centurion Homes LLC  
9266 Activity Rd Suite 112  
San Diego CA 92126  
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Hi Ron,

Thank you for your reply and I appreciate your help in trying to help us out with our situation. I have reviewed your email below and will gather the team and start the submittal work as originally requested. I will keep in touch and will contact you if I have further questions.

Thank you again for your help.

Abraham Edid
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com

On Sep 4, 2018, at 11:03 AM, Mosher, Ron <rmosher@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Mr. Edid:

Thank you for sending the water supply analysis and proposal for your development project at 2604 Ridgeway Drive. Per your request, I have reviewed this document with the understanding that it was developed based on separate supplies from two of Sweetwater Authority's (Authority) pressure zones; one for domestic service and the other for fire protection. As stated in our August 28, 2018 meeting, this water supply proposal is neither allowed nor desired. In addition, as I mentioned in our meeting, the hydraulics are simply a function of hydraulic grade line, terrain, and water main size. Unfortunately, the only one of these components that can be changed is the water main size.

In our meeting, you requested that the Authority identify some alternative compliance option(s). The Authority's Rates and Rules guide us to review proposed developments by evaluating the water supply at the public right-of-way frontage to the parcel. In your case, the parcel with the proposed development fronts Ridgeway Drive (and only Ridgeway Drive). As such, we must look to the water facilities in Ridgeway Drive to evaluate the water supply capabilities based on domestic and fire protection requirements. There has been ample documentation that the water main in Ridgeway Drive is in the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone and that it only has a capacity of 843 gpm for fire protection. This is inadequate for your proposed development. If your parcel were
to also front Euclid Avenue, we could look to the water facilities in that street for service to your proposed development. For example, if you or your company owned all of the parcels between 2604 Ridgeway Drive and Euclid Avenue and the parcels were consolidated into a single parcel that fronts Euclid Avenue, we could consider the water main in Euclid Avenue as an option.

I understand that you already own some of the parcels between 2604 Ridgeway Drive and Euclid Avenue. If the parcels with the following Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) were consolidated into a single parcel, service to the newly created parcel could be evaluated based on the frontage to Euclid Avenue:

- APN 564-040-07-00 (the proposed development parcel)
- APN 564-040-05-00
- APN 564-040-04-00
- APN 564-040-02-00
- APN 564-040-23-00

Please understand that if this option were to be implemented, the entire newly created parcel would be at the hydraulic grade line associated with the Gravity Pressure Zone. If the parcel consolidation is not feasible, the only remaining option is to construct the new water main in Ridgeway Drive as communicated in previous correspondence from the Authority.

Thank you,

Ron R. Mosher
Director of Engineering
Sweetwater Authority

(619) 409-6750 Direct Line
(619) 425-7469 Fax
Rmosher@sweetwater.org

---

**From:** Abraham Feld [mailto:Redact]
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 28, 2018 12:24 PM
**To:** Mosher, Ron
**Cc:** Berge, Tish; Andrew Oven
**Subject:** Follow-up regarding Fire Line for 2604 Ridgeway Drive Development Project

Hi Ron,

It was nice meeting you, Tish and Jennifer this morning. As promised, attached below is copy of the original analysis and proposal made by Andrew Oven at Dexter Wilson Engineering (cc'd here) for our site at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950. Please keep in mind that this proposal was originally designed with a private line in mind that meets the requirements for water flow
and pressure. Also, we are happy to make adjustments as needed.

I thank you for taking the time to evaluate again our case and Andrew will be happy to assist and answer any questions you may have and can be reached at [REDACTED]. As mentioned in the meeting, I hope there are some alternative compliance options we can explore and find common ground to make this project a success for all.

Please advise when you’ve had a chance to review and I’ll be happy to coordinate a conference call.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: [REDACTED]
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BluCenturionHomes.com
Hi Ron,

I would like to meet with you to go over a few items that I want your opinion and clarification. As you know, we have two 48-unit developments (separated by one neighboring parcel). Since we are going to be investing a lot of resources to extend the fire water line on Ridgeway, I want to understand how the parcel next to Euclid will be affected by the work done at 2604 Ridgeway Dr.

Please advise your availability and I will schedule myself.

Thank you for your time.

Abraham Edid

On Sep 4, 2018, at 11:03 AM, Mosher, Ron <rmother@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Mr. Edid:

Thank you for sending the water supply analysis and proposal for your development project at 2604 Ridgeway Drive. Per your request, I have reviewed this document with the understanding that it was developed based on separate supplies from two of Sweetwater Authority’s (Authority) pressure zones; one for domestic service and the other for fire protection. As stated in our August 28, 2018 meeting, this water supply proposal is neither allowed nor desired. In addition, as I mentioned in our meeting, the hydraulics are simply a function of hydraulic grade line, terrain, and water main size. Unfortunately, the only one of these components that can be changed is the water main size.

In our meeting, you requested that the Authority identify some alternative compliance option(s). The Authority’s Rates and Rules guide us to review proposed developments by evaluating the water supply at the public right-of-way frontage to the parcel. In your case, the parcel with the proposed development fronts Ridgeway Drive (and only Ridgeway Drive). As such, we must look to the water facilities in Ridgeway Drive to evaluate the water supply capabilities based on domestic and fire protection requirements. There has been ample documentation that the water main in Ridgeway Drive is in the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone and that it only has a capacity of 843 gpm for fire protection. This is inadequate for your proposed development. If your parcel were to also front Euclid Avenue, we could look to the water facilities in that street for service to your proposed development. For example, if you or your company owned all of the parcels between 2504 Ridgeway Drive and Euclid Avenue and the parcels were consolidated into a single parcel that fronts Euclid Avenue, we could consider the water main in Euclid Avenue as an option.
I understand that you already own some of the parcels between 2604 Ridgeway Drive and Euclid Avenue. If the parcels with the following Assessor’s Parcel Numbers (APN) were consolidated into a single parcel, service to the newly created parcel could be evaluated based on the frontage to Euclid Avenue:

- APN 564-040-07-00 (the proposed development parcel)
- APN 564-040-05-00
- APN 564-040-04-00
- APN 564-040-02-00
- APN 564-040-23-00

Please understand that if this option were to be implemented, the entire newly created parcel would be at the hydraulic grade line associated with the Gravity Pressure Zone. If the parcel consolidation is not feasible, the only remaining option is to construct the new water main in Ridgeway Drive as communicated in previous correspondence from the Authority.

Thank you,

Ron R. Mosher
Director of Engineering
Sweetwater Authority

(519) 499-4750 Direct Line
(519) 425-7469 Fax
Rmosher@sweetwater.org

---

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2018 12:24 PM
To: Mosher, Ron
Cc: Berge, Tish; Andrew Owen
Subject: Follow-up regarding Fire Line for 2604 Ridgeway Drive Development Project

Hi Ron,

It was nice meeting you, Tish and Jennifer this morning. As promised, attached below is copy of the original analysis and proposal made by Andrew Owen at Dexter Wilson Engineering (cc’d here) for our site at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950. Please keep in mind that this proposal was originally designed with a private line in mind that meets the requirements for water flow and pressure. Also, we are happy to make adjustments as needed.

I thank you for taking the time to evaluate again our case and Andrew will be happy to assist and answer any questions you may have and can be reached at Redact. As mentioned in the meeting, I hope there are some alternative
compliance options we can explore and find common ground to make this project a success for all.

Please advise when you’ve had a chance to review and I’ll be happy to coordinate a conference call.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Hi Ron, Luis and Jason,

I want to thank you for meeting with me and the team today. It is much clearer to me the scope of work and areas we need to work on. I will coordinate the team to start the submittal process and hopefully have an application to you in the next few weeks.

I appreciate your help and look forward to working with you in the future. Feel free to contact me anytime.

Best regards,

Abraham Edid

Cell: Redacted

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Hi Luis and Jason,

I would appreciate if you can provide me a few of the qualified contractors you mentioned on our meeting last week. I want to meet with a couple of them this week and explain the scope of what will be required.

Thank you and have a good week.

Abraham Edid

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
8265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Good morning Abraham,

Please see the Pipeline Construction for 2018-19 Project bid attendance sheet, attached, showing contractors who recently bid on the work for Sweetwater Authority.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Cell
jmettler@swwater.org
www.swwater.org

Hi Luis and Jason,

I would appreciate if you can provide me a few of the qualified contractors you mentioned on our meeting last week. I want to meet with a couple of them this week and explain the scope of what will be required.

Thank you and have a good week.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Duffy</td>
<td>Palm Engineering</td>
<td>7530 Opportunity Rd Suite A San Diego CA</td>
<td>619-291-1495</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Richard.duffy@palamengineering.com">Richard.duffy@palamengineering.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteban Carlo</td>
<td>Piperin Corp.</td>
<td>510 Venture St Escondido CA 92029</td>
<td>760-305-7253</td>
<td><a href="mailto:esteban@piperin.com">esteban@piperin.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Cabana</td>
<td>Bali Construction Inc</td>
<td>6015 Federal Blvd San Diego</td>
<td>619-436-4619</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sarah@bali.com">Sarah@bali.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Halkin</td>
<td>Cell-Crete</td>
<td>530 Upper St Escondido CA 92029</td>
<td>619-995-5783</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RobH@cellcrete.com">RobH@cellcrete.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buzz Birney</td>
<td>Cass Arieta</td>
<td>1105 N. Marshall Ave El Cajon CA</td>
<td>619-590-0729</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbirney@cassarieta.com">bbirney@cassarieta.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Carson</td>
<td>BucTech Pipeline</td>
<td>1025 Second St Encinitas CA 92024</td>
<td>760-634-2822</td>
<td><a href="mailto:buddy@bucotechpipeline.com">buddy@bucotechpipeline.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Young</td>
<td>El Cajon Grading</td>
<td>P.O.Box 967 Lakeside CA</td>
<td>619-562-9030</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Randy@ElCajongrading.com">Randy@ElCajongrading.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lynes</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-392-1964</td>
<td><a href="mailto:slynes@Sweetwater.org">slynes@Sweetwater.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo Tojeda</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>535 Granada Ave, CV 91910</td>
<td>619-409-6758</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atojeda@Sweetwater.org">atojeda@Sweetwater.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco J Martinez</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>619-409-6758</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmartinez@Sweetwater.org">jmartinez@Sweetwater.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Mattler</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>55 Granada Ave, CV 91910</td>
<td>619-409-6758</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmartinez@Sweetwater.org">jmartinez@Sweetwater.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you Jason. I will review and advise if I have any questions.

Have a good day.

Abraham

On Sep 17, 2018, at 7:40 AM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Good morning Abraham,

Please see the Pipeline Construction for 2018-19 Project bid attendance sheet, attached, showing contractors who recently bid on the work for Sweetwater Authority.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Coef!
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

Hi Luis and Jason,

I would appreciate if you can provide me a few of the qualified contractors you mentioned on our meeting last week. I want to meet with a couple of them this week and explain the scope of what will be required.

Thank you and have a good week.
Hi Arturo,

Can I get as-built/record drawings for the existing water main per the attached exhibit? We are assembling the 12” water main improvements.

Thank you,
Jim Belt
Lundstrom Engineering & Surveying, Inc.
5333 Mission Center Road, Suite 115
San Diego, CA 92108
Gentlemen,

We are working on the design for the waterline right now and we'd like to get some clear direction on the layout so that we can get it all done correctly the first time. This is a very rough sketch, but we didn't want to add the details if you don't like the direction we are going. Please let me know what your thoughts are. Thank you.

Bill Lundstrom

LUNDSTROM ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING
5333 Mission Center Road, Ste. 115
San Diego, CA 92108
Hello Jason,

I may have given you the incorrect information on the Ridgeway project (Dylan Hinkle). I have include the most recent/current fire flow letters to date. I scanned the two (identical) letters for each property.

Take care,

Robert Hernandez  
National City Fire Department  
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal / Fire Investigator  
1243 National City Blvd.  
National City, CA 91950  
Ph: (619) 336-4550  Fax: (619) 336-4652  
rhernandez@nationalcityca.gov

Business hours for the City of National City are 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Thursday (closed on Fridays). For more information please go to the City's website: www.nationalcityca.gov
Hello Bill,

Thank you for the rough sketch. Comments are as follows:

- The proposed and existing water mains must maintain at least 5 feet of separation
- Show the connections (tie-ins) of the new water main to the existing water mains
- Callout all water services to be reconnected to new water main
- Identify existing sewer and gas laterals
- Show existing water valves
- Show all valves for new water main.
- Identify the starting and ending points for the new water main

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct: 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

---

Bill Lundstrom

LUNDSTROM ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING
5333 Mission Center Road, Ste. 115
San Diego, CA 92108
Arturo,

It doesn’t look like we will have a separation of 10’ from the sewer and the proposed water line as well as 5’ separation from the existing waterline and the proposed waterline. Assuming that you won’t want to put the new waterline under the existing curb, where would you propose we put it? Can we keep 10’ from the sewer and make the water separation only 4’?

Bill

From: Tejeda, Arturo [mailto:jeda@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 8:02 PM
To: Bill Lundstrom
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason; Montijo, Jay
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Hello Bill,

Thank you for the rough sketch. Comments are as follows:

- The proposed and existing water mains must maintain at least 5 feet of separation
- Show the connections (tie-ins) of the new water main to the existing water mains
- Callout all water services to be reconnected to new water main
- Identify existing sewer and gas laterals
- Show existing water valves
- Show all valves for new water main.
- Identify the starting and ending points for the new water main

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org
From: Bill Lundstrom [mailto:Bill.Lundstrom@lundstrom.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 11:48 AM
To: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason; Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Abraham Eid; Jeff Lundstrom
Subject: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Gentlemen,

We are working on the design for the waterline right now and we'd like to get some clear direction on the layout so that we can get it all done correctly the first time. This is a very rough sketch, but we didn't want to add the details if you don't like the direction we are going. Please let me know what your thoughts are. Thank you.

Bill Lundstrom

LUNDSTROM ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING
5333 Mission Center Road, Ste. 115
San Diego, CA 92108
Arturo,

Have you discussed what we should be doing on the separation for the waterline?

Bill

From: Bill Lundstrom
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2018 4:32 PM
To: 'Tejeda, Arturo' <ateljeda@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org>; Montijo, Jay <jmontijo@sweetwater.org>

Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Arturo,

It doesn’t look like we will have a separation of 10’ from the sewer and the proposed water line as well as 5’ separation from the existing waterline and the proposed waterline. Assuming that you won’t want to put the new waterline under the existing curb, where would you propose we put it? Can we keep 10’ from the sewer and make the water separation only 4’?

Bill

From: Tejeda, Arturo [mailto:ateldela@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Bill Lundstrom <ateldela@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org>; Montijo, Jay <jmontijo@sweetwater.org>

Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Hello Bill,

Thank you for the rough sketch. Comments are as follows:

- The proposed and existing water mains must maintain at least 5 feet of separation
- Show the connections (tie-ins) of the new water main to the existing water mains
- Callout all water services to be reconnected to new water main
- Identify existing sewer and gas laterals
- Show existing water valves
- Show all valves for new water main.
- Identify the starting and ending points for the new water main

Thank you,
Arturo "Art" Tejeda  
Senior Engineer Technician  
Sweetwater Authority  
Direct 619-409-6758  
atejeda@sweetwater.org

From: Bill Lundstrom [mailto:Redact]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 11:48 AM  
To: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason; Tejeda, Arturo  
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom  
Subject: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Gentlemen,

We are working on the design for the waterline right now and we'd like to get some clear direction on the layout so that we can get it all done correctly the first time. This is a very rough sketch, but we didn't want to add the details if you don't like the direction we are going. Please let me know what your thoughts are. Thank you.

Bill Lundstrom

LUNDSTROM ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING
5333 Mission Center Road, Ste. 115
San Diego, CA 92108
Hello Dylan,

Please consult with Sweetwater Authority on your fire pump proposal. From my understanding, SWA does not allow for the mixing/split of zones.

Respectfully,

Robert Hernandez
National City Fire Department
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal / Fire Investigator
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
Ph: (619) 336-4550  Fax: (619) 336-4652
rhenandez@nationalcityca.gov

Business hours for the City of National City are 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Thursday (closed on Fridays). For more information please go to the City's website: website: www.nationalcityca.gov
Garcia, Michael

From: Mettler, Jason
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 1:31 PM
To: 'Bill Lundstrom'; Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Montijo, Jay; Dylan Hinkle
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Good afternoon Bill,

Arturo is currently out on PTO so I’ll be happy to answer your question during his absence. The proposed pipeline can be placed to maintain 8.5 feet of water and sewer pipeline separation. Once the plans are finalized and approved by the Authority, we will process SWRCB approval.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Bill Lundstrom
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 8:42 AM
To: Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason; Montijo, Jay; Dylan Hinkle
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Arturo,

Have you discussed what we should be doing on the separation for the waterline?

Bill

From: Bill Lundstrom
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2018 4:32 PM
To: 'Tejeda, Arturo' <atejeda@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org>; Montijo, Jay <jmontijo@sweetwater.org>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Arturo,

It doesn’t look like we will have a separation of 10’ from the sewer and the proposed water line as well as 5’ separation from the existing waterline and the proposed waterline. Assuming that you won’t want to put the new waterline under the existing curb, where would you propose we put it? Can we keep 10’ from the sewer and make the water separation only 4’?

Bill
From: Tejeda, Arturo [mailto:atejeda@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Bill Lundstrom <Redact>
Cc: Abraham Edid <Redact> Jeff Lundstrom <Redact> Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org>; Montijo, Jay <jmontijo@sweetwater.org>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Hello Bill,

Thank you for the rough sketch. Comments are as follows:

1. The proposed and existing water mains must maintain at least 5 feet of separation
2. Show the connections (tie-ins) of the new water main to the existing water mains
3. Callout all water services to be reconnected to new water main
4. Identify existing sewer and gas laterals
5. Show existing water valves
6. Show all valves for new water main.
7. Identify the starting and ending points for the new water main

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

From: Bill Lundstrom [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 11:48 AM
To: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason; Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom
Subject: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Gentlemen,

We are working on the design for the waterline right now and we’d like to get some clear direction on the layout so that we can get it all done correctly the first time. This is a very rough sketch, but we didn’t want to add the details if you don’t like the direction we are going. Please let me know what your thoughts are. Thank you.

Bill Lundstrom
LUNDSTROM ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING
5333 Mission Center Road, Ste. 115
San Diego, CA 92108
Thanks Jason. We will place the water separations at 5' and the sewer/water at 8.5'. We'll continue preparing our plan for your review.

Bill

Arturo is currently out on PTO so I'll be happy to answer your question during his absence. The proposed pipeline can be placed to maintain 8.5 feet of water and sewer pipeline separation. Once the plans are finalized and approved by the Authority, the will process SWRCB approval.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
[Redact] Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Arturo,

It doesn't look like we will have a separation of 10' from the sewer and the proposed water line as well as 5' separation from the existing waterline and the proposed waterline. Assuming that you won't want to put the new waterline under the existing curb, where would you propose we put it? Can we keep 10' from the sewer and make the water separation only 4'?

Bill

From: Tejeda, Arturo [mailto:atejeda@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Bill Lundstrom <Redact>
Cc: Abraham Edid <Redact> Jeff Lundstrom
Redact Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org>; Montijo, Jay <jmontijo@sweetwater.org>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Hello Bill,

Thank you for the rough sketch. Comments are as follows:

- The proposed and existing water mains must maintain at least 5 feet of separation
- Show the connections (tie-ins) of the new water main to the existing water mains
- Callout all water services to be reconnected to new water main
- Identify existing sewer and gas laterals
- Show existing water valves
- Show all valves for new water main
- Identify the starting and ending points for the new water main

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

From: Bill Lundstrom [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 11:48 AM
To: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason; Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom
Subject: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Gentlemen,

We are working on the design for the waterline right now and we'd like to get some clear direction on the layout so that we can get it all done correctly the first time. This is a very rough sketch, but we didn't want to add the details if you don't like the direction we are going. Please let me know what your thoughts are. Thank you.

Bill Lundstrom

LUNDSTROM ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING
5333 Mission Center Road, Ste. 115
San Diego, CA 92108
Hello Bill,

I just noticed the sheet contains a profile grid that is not approved by the Authority (we cannot see it using portable laptops). Please use the profile grid as shown in the attached drawing and example.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

Bill

Thanks Jason. We will place the water separations at 5' and the sewer/water at 8.5'. We'll continue preparing our plan for your review.

Bill

Good afternoon Bill,

Arturo is currently out on PTO so I'll be happy to answer your question during his absence. The proposed pipeline can be placed to maintain 8.5 feet of water and sewer pipeline separation. Once the plans are finalized and approved by the Authority, the will process SWRCB approval.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Arturo,

Have you discussed what we should be doing on the separation for the waterline?

Bill

Arturo,

It doesn’t look like we will have a separation of 10’ from the sewer and the proposed water line as well as 5’ separation from the existing waterline and the proposed waterline. Assuming that you won’t want to put the new waterline under the existing curb, where would you propose we put it? Can we keep 10’ from the sewer and make the water separation only 4’?

Bill

Hello Bill,

Thank you for the rough sketch. Comments are as follows:

? The proposed and existing water mains must maintain at least 5 feet of separation
Show the connections (tie-ins) of the new water main to the existing water mains
Callout all water services to be reconnected to new water main
Identify existing sewer and gas laterals
Show existing water valves
Show all valves for new water main.
Identify the starting and ending points for the new water main

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct: 619.409.6758
atejeda@sweetwater.org

From: Bill Lundstrom [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 11:48 AM
To: Montjo, Jay; Mettler, Jason; Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom
Subject: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Gentlemen,
We are working on the design for the waterline right now and we’d like to get some clear direction on the layout so that we can get it all done correctly the first time. This is a very rough sketch, but we didn’t want to add the details if you don’t like the direction we are going. Please let me know what your thoughts are. Thank you.

Bill Lundstrom
LUNDSTROM ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING
5333 Mission Center Road, Ste. 115
San Diego, CA 92108
Thanks Jason. We will modify our plan accordingly. We were using the plan that was just approved (H Street Waterline, Urbana) as the go by. Sorry for the confusion on the plans.

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 1:44 PM  
To: Bill Lundstrom <Redact> Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org>  
Cc: Abraham Edid <Redact> Jeff Lundstrom <Redact> Montijo, Jay <jmontijo@sweetwater.org>; Dylan Hinkle <Redact>  
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements  
Hello Bill,

I just noticed the sheet contains a profile grid that is not approved by the Authority (we cannot see it using portable laptops). Please use the profile grid as shown in the attached drawing and example.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler  
Engineering Technician Supervisor  
Sweetwater Authority  
(619) 409-6755 Direct  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org

From: Bill Lundstrom [mailto:Bill.Lundstrom@sweetwater.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 1:34 PM  
To: Mettler, Jason; Tejeda, Arturo  
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Montijo, Jay; Dylan Hinkle  
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements  
Thanks Jason. We will place the water separations at 5' and the sewer/water at 8.5'. We'll continue preparing our plan for your review.

Bill

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 1:31 PM  
To: Bill Lundstrom <Redact> Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org>  
Cc: Abraham Edid <Redact> Jeff Lundstrom <Redact> Montijo, Jay <jmontijo@sweetwater.org>; Dylan Hinkle <Redact>  
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements  

Good afternoon Bill,

Arturo is currently out on PTO so I'll be happy to answer your question during his absence. The proposed pipeline can be placed to maintain 8.5 feet of water and sewer pipeline separation. Once the plans are finalized and approved by the Authority, the will process SWRCB approval.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

---

From: Bill Lundstrom [mailto:Bill.Lundstrom@Sweetwater.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 8:42 AM
To: Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason; Montijo, Jay; Dylan Hinkle
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Arturo,

Have you discussed what we should be doing on the separation for the waterline?

Bill

---

From: Bill Lundstrom
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2018 4:32 PM
To: 'Tejeda, Arturo' <atejeda@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org>; Montijo, Jay <jmontijo@sweetwater.org>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Arturo,

It doesn't look like we will have a separation of 10’ from the sewer and the proposed water line as well as 5’ separation from the existing waterline and the proposed waterline. Assuming that you won’t want to put the new waterline under the existing curb, where would you propose we put it? Can we keep 10’ from the sewer and make the water separation only 4’?

Bill

---

From: Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 6:02 PM
To: Bill Lundstrom
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org>; Montijo, Jay <jmontijo@sweetwater.org>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Hello Bill,

Thank you for the rough sketch. Comments are as follows:

- The proposed and existing water mains must maintain at least 5 feet of separation
- Show the connections (tie-ins) of the new water main to the existing water mains
- Callout all water services to be reconnected to new water main
- Identify existing sewer and gas laterals
- Show existing water valves
- Show all valves for new water main
- Identify the starting and ending points for the new water main

Thank you,

Arturo “Art” Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority
Direct 619.409.6758
atxjeda@sweetwater.org

From: Bill Lundstrom  
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 11:48 AM  
To: Montijo, Jay; Mettler, Jason; Tejeda, Arturo  
Cc: Abraham Edic; Jeff Lundstrom  
Subject: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Gentlemen,

We are working on the design for the waterline right now and we’d like to get some clear direction on the layout so that we can get it all done correctly the first time. This is a very rough sketch, but we didn’t want to add the details if you don’t like the direction we are going. Please let me know what your thoughts are. Thank you.

Bill Lundstrom

LUNDSTROM ENGINEERING AND SURVEYING
5333 Mission Center Road, Ste. 115
San Diego, CA 92108
Hi Mrs. Berge,

Attached is a proposal detailing a feasible design for your consideration. Please review the documents and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you and have a good weekend.

Abraham Edid
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Acticity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
October 5, 2018

To: Sweetwater Authority (SWA)
   Attn: Tish Berge -- General Manager
   mailto:tberge@sweetwater.org
   505 Garrett Avenue
   Chula Vista, CA 91910
   Phone Number: 619-420-1413

Ref: Multifamily Development at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950

Dear Mrs. Berge,

As you are aware we are working with our consultants to find a solution for the high-density parcels (which we are calling A, B, C, D, E and F) located on Ridgeway Drive. We realize these parcels are an anomaly in the general plan and we are presenting a comprehensive water line design alternative that adapts to this unique situation. Also, the size of these parcels is unique as they permit a larger number of units on each lot.

As you know, San Diego is in a housing crisis and every month we hear in the media how jurisdictions and municipalities are talking about helping developers build more housing. We want to work together with SWA to bring development into this unique area and entice future development affecting thousands of people.

According to the latest Sweetwater Authority decision, we are being required to build a new 12" water line that extends 1,900 linear feet to the east. Furthermore, we are being required to reconnect water service to over 60 parcels, all intersections in our path as well as fire hydrants. Because of the scope of SWA’s resolution, it is hard to estimate the amount of surprises to encounter on this endeavor. We have received preliminary quotes and we estimate $1,500,000 of cost which do not include permits, fees, bonds, supervision, insurance, design fees, consultants, etc. This requirement will kill our project and will deter any future development of the high-density parcels that surround our project.

Our team has worked very hard on finding an alternative, and attached below is a description of it:

Feasible Design and Future Improvement Plan:

- **High Density Anomaly:** These high-density parcels are currently an anomaly in the general plan and require a different consideration to provide utilities to the site.

- **New 12" Line for High-Density Parcels:** Install a 12" water line starting at the 30" main line from Euclid and run it up to Ridgeway C. Cap this new line for future extension by
development for parcels D, E, and F (only other high density lots on Ridgeway Drive) that would benefit from the 12” when future development is desired.

- **Parcel Connections to 12” Line**: When a high-density parcel is approved for development by the County it will have 2 taps to the 12” line (one for domestic use, and one for fire use).

- **Booster Pumps**: Each high-density developer would be required to install private water booster pump(s) on their project. We have met with engineers and vendors that have provided economical solutions. The backflow device would be installed per SWA requirements.

- **Keep Existing 6” Service**: Parcel B, B1, D, E, and F would be kept on the existing 6” line on the O.D. Arnold Zone until a development is approved. If the owner(s) want to develop high-density, they would only need to connect to the new 12” line and include a similar setup as described above.

- **Administrative Boundary Adjustments**: One of SWA’s concerns is having 2 water lines running on the same street. However, there is precedent of parallel water lines running through different pressure zones (see one example attached from SWA quarter section 107 map). As properties are developed, an administrative adjustment of pressure zone boundary would be made.

I believe Sweetwater Authority is asking us to solve a community problem and requiring us to pay more than our fair share. This letter describes a sensible solution for all high-density parcels and allow development to flourish. I ask you to please review the information provided and take positive action and work together. I would appreciate a written response by October 15, 2018 and will be happy to meet with you and your team to discuss further.

Best regards,

Abraham Edid
Cell: [Redact]
mailto: [Redact]

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlucenturionHomes.com
Mr. Edid,
Thank you for your correspondence. I have forwarded it to the Engineering Department for consideration.

Tish Berge
General Manager
Sweetwater Authority
619-420-1413

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Friday, October 05, 2018 2:50 PM
To: Berge, Tish
Subject: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Hi Mrs. Berge,

Attached is a proposal detailing a feasible design for your consideration. Please review the documents and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you and have a good weekend.

Abraham Edid

Redact

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Thank you for your prompt response. Have a good weekend.

Abraham

On Oct 5, 2018, at 3:33 PM, Berge, Tish <tberge@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,
Thank you for your correspondence. I have forwarded it to the Engineering Department for consideration.

Tish Berge
General Manager
Sweetwater Authority
619-420-1413

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Friday, October 05, 2018 2:50 PM
To: Berge, Tish
Subject: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Hi Mrs. Berge,

Attached is a proposal detailing a feasible design for your consideration. Please review the documents and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you and have a good weekend.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92128
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Good afternoon Mr. Edid,

Please see the attached letter regarding the Multi-family development at 2604 Ridgeway Drive.

Thank you.

Vanessa Nieves
Engineering Office Assistant II
Sweetwater Authority
505 Garrett Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91910
Ph. (619) 409-6747
Mr. Abraham Edid  
Blue Centurion Homes, LLC  
9265 Activity Road, Suite 112  
San Diego, CA 92126

Subject: Multi-family Development at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City  
SWA File: (Dev) Ridgeway Apartments

Dear Mr. Edid:

Sweetwater Authority is in receipt of your letter dated October 5, 2018, regarding your current proposal to provide water service for the multifamily development project at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, in National City, and surrounding parcels. The Authority appreciates the additional information you have provided and commends your efforts to continue to explore options for providing water service to your project and future potential development projects in its vicinity.

In responding to your request to review the current proposal, the Authority would like to restate the basis of the direction it has taken over the course of months of communications with your project team and in its submittal reviews. From the earliest stages of this process, the Authority has applied a consistent set of criteria to evaluate the feasibility of multiple project variations. These criteria include the following:

- Proposed development plans shall meet required demands, achieve code compliance, avoid cross-connections, and have minimal to zero financial impacts to the Authority’s rate payers.
- Water facilities shall satisfy the City of National City’s fire flow requirements, subject to the Authority’s pressure and flow velocity criteria.
- Water service to a parcel shall be provided from a single pressure zone.
- The creation of pressure zone islands will not be allowed.
- Low flow or dead-end pipelines (e.g., without demand) will be minimized.
- Installation of all public water facilities shall be in the public right-of-way.
- Installation of private water facilities (e.g., fire protection pipelines) parallel to public water facilities will not be allowed in the public right-of-way.

In addressing the current proposal presented in your letter, the Authority shall respond by addressing each item, one by one, applying the same set of criteria.

A Public Water Agency  
Serving National City, Chula Vista and Surrounding Areas
Mr. Abraham Edid  
Re: Multi-family Development at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City —  
Ridgeway Apartments  
October 12, 2018  
Page 2 of 3

**High Density Anomaly:** From the Authority's and a water supply perspective, the parcels are not differentiated from other multi-family parcels within the service area. The incidence of parcels zoned for multi-family residential use adjacent to single family residential use is prevalent throughout the Authority's service area. At times, buildout of the intended land use requires infrastructure improvements including water. The Authority's approach to deliver water to these parcels is through the application of its typical criteria as presented above.

**New 12-inch Line for High-Density Parcels:** Under the proposal, Parcels B and B1 will remain in service through their connection to the existing 6-inch main in the O.D. Arnold pressure zone, resulting in a pressure zone island, which will not be allowed.

**Parcel Connections to 12-inch Line:** While it is understood that service for domestic and fire protection is to be provided by the proposed 12-inch main from Euclid Avenue, the proposal does not resolve the above concern regarding pressure zone islands. At the outset of the proposed plan, Parcels B and B1 will immediately be a pressure zone island. In addition, there is no guarantee for either the timing or sequencing for multi-family development on Parcels D, E, and F. This proposal leaves open the possibility that the creation of additional pressure zone islands may be the only way to serve Parcels D, E, and F, depending on the sequence of their development. This condition will not be allowed.

**Booster Pumps:** It is noted that booster pumps may be required to provide satisfactory pressure to the subject parcels, if fed from the Authority's Gravity pressure zone.

**Keep Existing 6-inch [Water Main] Service:** As noted above, implementation of the proposed plan immediately results in the creation of a pressure zone island on Parcels B and B1. Further, there is no guarantee on the timing or sequencing of development on the other parcels, potentially resulting in circumstances whereby water supply for future development may only be provided through the creation of additional pressure zone islands. This condition will not be allowed.

**Administrative Boundary Adjustments:** It is stated that one of the Authority's concerns is "having 2 water lines running on the same street". Please note that it is not the presence of two water mains on the street that has been the source of objection. With respect to the specific two-main arrangement proposed by this project, the Authority's concerns are reiterated below.

- Water service to a parcel shall be provided from a single pressure zone. There have been previous proposals to feed the subject parcels from both
Mr. Abraham Edid  
Re: Multi-family Development at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City –  
Ridgeway Apartments  
October 12, 2018  
Page 3 of 3

water mains. The current proposal partially addresses this concern by proposing connections to the 12-inch main from Euclid Avenue, as each parcel is developed. However, it results in pressure zone islands whereby adjacent parcels alternate in service from one pressure zone to another.

- Low flow or dead-end pipelines will be minimized. This criterion is not met unless installation of a new 12-inch main also includes the transfer of services to impose domestic demands on the new main, and the existing 6-inch main is abandoned.

The pressure zone boundary example presented is not a precedent for the above condition which the Authority seeks to avoid. The highlighted part of the system shows the boundary between two pressure zones, each defined by continuous and unbroken areas. All parcels are supplied water by the continuous pressure zone in which they lie. Note that no parcel is fed from two pressure zones and there are no pressure zone islands.

The Authority looks forward to continuing to work with you and your team to provide water service in a way that satisfies all parties' requirements and concerns. If we can be of further assistance, please contact Mr. Luis Valdez, Engineering Manager, at (619) 408-6751, or lvaldez@sweetwater.org.

Sincerely,

SWEETWATER AUTHORITY

Ron R. Mosher
Director of Engineering

RRM:LV:vn
Hi Mr. Mosher,

I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I’ve reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: [Redact]
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9266 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
October 18, 2018

To:  Sweetwater Authority (SWA)
     Attn: Ron Mosher -- Director of Engineering
     mailto: mosher@sweetwater.org
     505 Garrett Avenue
     Chula Vista, CA 91910
     Phone Number: 619-420-1413

Ref:  Multifamily Development at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950

Dear Mr. Mosher,

I have received your letter dated Oct-12-2018, and I want to address important issues and ask for some clarifications:

Pressure Zone Islands:
Your letter states that the “creation of pressure zone islands will not be allowed.” After reading all the Sweetwater Rates and Rules I cannot find any section that describes what you mentioned in your letter. I would appreciate if you can provide me a copy Sweetwater Authority’s code where this concept is defined.

In the common language and knowledge, generally accepted definitions of Island and Peninsula are:

“Island - a piece of land surrounded by water on all four sides.” For our case what you describe as an island, it would be a parcel surrounded by OD Arnold pressure zone on all 4 sides of the lot.

“Peninsula - a piece of land surrounded by water on the three sides but connected to the mainland on the fourth.” For our case, our parcel C is connected to the OD Arnold pressure zone on the north side and to the Gravity pressure zone on the south side of the lot. Therefore, parcel C becomes a peninsula connected to the Gravity pressure zone and not an island.

I have reviewed the Sweetwater Authority Rates and Rules, Design Standards, Water Distribution System Master Plan, Standard Specifications for Construction of Water Facilities and other documents from Sweetwater Authority and have not found a single mention of the “island pressure zone” concept.

Regardless of this fact, our proposal does not create any pressure zone island but rather a peninsula concept on the southern portion for lots A thru E connected to Gravity Pressure Zone. Peninsulas are commonly found among Sweetwater Authority boundaries. For instance, our own parcel A at 2542 Ridgeway Dr. National City, CA 91950 (see attached maps from Quarter Section 108) is located within the Gravity Pressure Zone. The green boundary lines clearly show the parcel as a peninsula. This is just one example of what we propose for our project on Ridgeway C. As mentioned, the southern portions of parcels A thru E border the Gravity Pressure Zone boundary line and therefore they should be considered a peninsula.
Fire Flow Requirements:

Your letter states that “Water facilities shall satisfy the City of National City’s fire flow requirements”. On your email dated Sep-04-2018, you mention that “there has been ample documentation that the water main in Ridgeway Drive is in the O.D. Arnold Pressure Zone and that it only has a capacity of 843 gpm for fire protection.”

According to the California Fire Code, residential properties without fire sprinkler systems require a minimum fire flow of 1,000 gpm (see attached table information). Since the existing 6” line is not up to California Fire Code it creates enormous risk to the community. Not only to the houses connected to this 6” water pipe, but also exposes Sweetwater Authority to a potential class action suit by neighbors whose lives are at risk because of the shortage of fire flow in case their houses are involved in a fire.

It seems to me that Sweetwater Authority is taking advantage of this opportunity and requiring us to make improvements at no cost to them. As stated in your letter, our development should have “minimal to zero financial impacts to the Authority’s rate payers” but it surely seems that we are being taken advantage of. My previous letter addressed our concern of being asked to pay more than our fair share and I did not receive any comment on this matter. The scope of work you are requiring us is directly impacting the feasibility of any development of these parcels and hindering Sweetwater to acquire more customers.

Water Lines Crossing Pressure Zone Boundaries:

You have informed us that Sweetwater Authority does not allow water to be supplied from lines in different pressures zones. Attached below is Quarter Section 107 of your map demonstrating several examples where this is not the case. Water lines (and parallel lines) are running within a specific pressure zone but feed parcels located in a different pressure zone (please see highlighted examples in green color). This is another example of supposed requirements that are not consistent with Sweetwater Authority’s policy.

Our company has presented Sweetwater Authority with a practical alternative to solve real issues affecting our community. I ask you to review the attached information that complements the feasibility of our proposal to connect to the Euclid 30” water line. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards,

Abraham Edid

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
### APPENDIX B

#### TABLE B105.1(1)
**REQUIRED FIRE-FLOW FOR ONE- AND TWO-FAMILY DWELLINGS, GROUP R-3 AND R-4 BUILDINGS AND TOWNHOUSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire-Flow Calculation Area (square feet)</th>
<th>Automatic Sprinkler System (California Standards)</th>
<th>Minimum Fire-Flow (gallons per minute)</th>
<th>Flow Duration (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3,600</td>
<td>No automatic sprinkler system</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,601 and greater</td>
<td>No automatic sprinkler system</td>
<td>Values in Table B105.1(2)</td>
<td>Duration in Table B105.1(2) at the required fire-flow rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3,600</td>
<td>Section 930.3.1.3 of the California Fire Code</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,601 and greater</td>
<td>Section 930.3.1.3 of the California Fire Code</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} ) value in Table B105.1(3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For SF: 1 square foot = 0.0929 m², 1 gallon per minute = 3.785 L/min.

#### TABLE B105.1(2)
**REFERENCE TABLE FOR TABLES B105.1(1) AND B105.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type IA and ID*</th>
<th>Type IA and ID*</th>
<th>Type IV and V*</th>
<th>Type VI and VIB*</th>
<th>Type V-D*</th>
<th>Fire-Flow (gallons per minute)*</th>
<th>Flow Duration (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-22,700</td>
<td>0-12,700</td>
<td>0-5,300</td>
<td>0-3,600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,701-30,200</td>
<td>12,701-17,000</td>
<td>8,200-10,900</td>
<td>5,900-7,900</td>
<td>3,600-4,900</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,201-48,300</td>
<td>17,001-28,800</td>
<td>10,500-12,900</td>
<td>7,900-9,800</td>
<td>4,800-5,900</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48,301-95,900</td>
<td>24,201-38,300</td>
<td>17,401-21,200</td>
<td>12,500-15,400</td>
<td>7,700-9,600</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95,901-96,300</td>
<td>33,201-39,700</td>
<td>21,301-25,500</td>
<td>15,401-18,400</td>
<td>9,401-11,300</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,001-83,700</td>
<td>39,701-47,100</td>
<td>25,501-30,100</td>
<td>18,401-21,800</td>
<td>11,301-13,400</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97,701-112,700</td>
<td>54,901-61,400</td>
<td>35,201-40,600</td>
<td>24,901-29,300</td>
<td>15,501-18,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112,701-128,700</td>
<td>61,401-72,400</td>
<td>40,601-46,400</td>
<td>29,301-33,500</td>
<td>18,001-20,600</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128,701-145,900</td>
<td>72,401-82,100</td>
<td>46,401-52,500</td>
<td>33,501-37,900</td>
<td>20,601-23,300</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145,901-164,200</td>
<td>82,101-92,400</td>
<td>52,501-59,100</td>
<td>37,901-42,700</td>
<td>23,301-26,300</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164,201-183,400</td>
<td>92,401-103,100</td>
<td>59,101-66,000</td>
<td>42,701-47,700</td>
<td>28,301-29,800</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183,401-203,700</td>
<td>103,101-114,600</td>
<td>66,001-73,900</td>
<td>47,701-55,000</td>
<td>29,301-32,600</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203,701-225,200</td>
<td>114,601-126,700</td>
<td>73,901-81,400</td>
<td>55,001-58,600</td>
<td>32,601-35,600</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225,201-247,700</td>
<td>126,701-139,400</td>
<td>81,401-88,200</td>
<td>58,601-65,400</td>
<td>35,601-39,600</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247,701-271,200</td>
<td>139,401-152,600</td>
<td>88,201-97,700</td>
<td>65,401-70,600</td>
<td>39,601-43,400</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271,201-295,900</td>
<td>152,601-165,500</td>
<td>97,701-106,500</td>
<td>70,601-77,000</td>
<td>43,401-47,400</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295,901-Greater</td>
<td>165,501-Greater</td>
<td>106,501-115,800</td>
<td>77,001-83,700</td>
<td>47,401-51,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>115,801-125,500</td>
<td>83,701-90,800</td>
<td>51,501-55,700</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>125,501-135,500</td>
<td>90,801-97,900</td>
<td>55,701-60,200</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>135,501-145,800</td>
<td>97,901-106,800</td>
<td>60,201-64,800</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>145,801-156,700</td>
<td>106,801-113,200</td>
<td>64,801-69,500</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>156,701-167,900</td>
<td>113,201-121,300</td>
<td>69,501-74,600</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>167,901-179,400</td>
<td>121,301-129,600</td>
<td>74,601-79,800</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>179,401-181,400</td>
<td>129,601-138,300</td>
<td>79,801-85,100</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>181,401-Greater</td>
<td>138,301-Greater</td>
<td>85,101-Greater</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For SF: 1 square foot = 0.0929 m², 1 gallon per minute = 3.785 L/min.

*a. Types of construction are based on the California Building Code.

*b. Measured at 20 psi residual pressure.*
FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENT

Quarter Section: 108
Fire District: National City
Flow Required: 2,000 GPM
Flow Available: 843 GPM
Pressure Zone: O.D. Arnold PZ

Legend
- Project Site
* Fire Hydrant
- Pressure Zone Boundary

Subject Site

Scale: 1" = 800'
Date: October 1, 2018
Hi Mr. Mosher,

I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I've reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid

Blue Centurion Homes LLC,
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Mr. Mosher,

I want to follow-up with you regarding the letter I emailed last week. I have not received a response from you regarding the ideas and concerns I presented. As you know, time is of the essence and I would appreciate your prompt response to my correspondence.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact
Blue Centurion Homes LLC.  
8265 Activity Rd Suite 112  
San Diego CA 92126  
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid <Redact>  
Subject: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive  
Date: October 18, 2018 at 10:18:43 AM PDT  
To: Ron Mosher <Rmosher@sweetwater.org>  
Cc: Tish Berge <tberge@sweetwater.org>, Luis Valdez <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>, "Nieves, Vanessa" <vnieves@sweetwater.org>

Hi Mr. Mosher,

I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I’ve reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact
Blue Centurion Homes LLC.  
8265 Activity Rd Suite 112  
San Diego CA 92126  
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Mr. Ecid,

Thank you for the email below and for the voicemail this morning. We are reviewing the matter internally and will also discuss the matter with our legal counsel, and a response will be forthcoming. Thank you for your patience.

With regards,

Ron R. Mosher
Director of Engineering

(619) 409-6750 Direct Line
(619) 425-7469 Fax
Rmosher@sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2018 10:23 AM
To: Mosher, Ron
Cc: Berge, Tish; Valdez, Luis; Nieves, Vanessa
Subject: Fwd: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Mr. Mosher,

I want to follow-up with you regarding the letter I emailed last week. I have not received a response from you regarding the ideas and concerns I presented. As you know, time is of the essence and I would appreciate your prompt response to my correspondence.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Subject: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive
Date: October 18, 2018 at 10:18:43 AM PDT
Hi Mr. Mosher,

I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I’ve reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.
Mr Mosher,

Thank you for your reply. When do you expect to have an answer? Please advise.

Thank you.

Abraham

On Tue, Oct 30, 2018 at 2:50 PM Mosher, Ron <rmosher@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,

Thank you for the email below and for the voicemail this morning. We are reviewing the matter internally and will also discuss the matter with our legal counsel, and a response will be forthcoming. Thank you for your patience.

With regards,

Ron P. Mosher
Director of Engineering

(619) 409-6750 Direct Line

(619) 425-7469 Fax

rmosher@sweetwater.org
**Sent:** Friday, October 26, 2018 10:23 AM

**To:** Mosher, Ron

**Cc:** Berge, Tish; Valdez, Luis; Nieves, Vanessa

**Subject:** Fwd: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Mr. Mosher,

I want to follow-up with you regarding the letter I emailed last week. I have not received a response from you regarding the ideas and concerns I presented. As you know, time is of the essence and I would appreciate your prompt response to my correspondence.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid

**Cell:** [Redact]

**Blue Centurion Homes LLC**

9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126

[www.BlueCenturionHomes.com](http://www.BlueCenturionHomes.com)

---

**Begin forwarded message:**

**From:** Abraham Edid <[Redact]>

**Subject:** Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

**Date:** October 18, 2018 at 10:18:43 AM PDT

**To:** Ron Mosher <rmosher@sweetwater.org>

**Cc:** Tish Berge <tberge@sweetwater.org>, Luis Valdez <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>, "Nieves, Vanessa" <vnieves@sweetwater.org>

Hi Mr. Mosher,

I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I’ve reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid

**Cell:** [Redact]

**Blue Centurion Homes LLC**

9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126

[www.BlueCenturionHomes.com](http://www.BlueCenturionHomes.com)
Dear Mrs. Berge and Mr. Mosher,

Yesterday our team met with the National City Fire Chief Mr. Robert Hernandez and discussed the fire flow requirements for our development. We believe we have found a simple solution that I would like to present to you in person. Please advise if you are available to meet this Friday morning Nov-02-18 around 9am.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Abraham Edid

On Oct 30, 2018, at 2:50 PM, Mosher, Ron <rmosher@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,

Thank you for the email below and for the voicemail this morning. We are reviewing the matter internally and will also discuss the matter with our legal counsel, and a response will be forthcoming. Thank you for your patience.

With regards,

Ron R. Mosher
Director of Engineering

(619) 409-6750 Direct Line
(619) 425-7469 Fax
Rmosher@sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2018 10:23 AM
To: Mosher, Ron
Cc: Berge, Tish; Vaidez, Luis; Nieves, Vanessa
Subject: Fw: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Mr. Mosher,

I want to follow-up with you regarding the letter I emailed last week. I have not received a response from you regarding the ideas and concerns I presented. As you know, time is of the essence and I would appreciate your prompt response to my correspondence.
Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid <Redact>
Subject: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive
Date: October 18, 2018 at 10:18:43 AM PDT
To: Ron Mosher <Rmosher@sweetwater.org>, Tish Berge <tberge@sweetwater.org>, Luis Valdez <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>, "Nieves, Vanessa" <vnieves@sweetwater.org>

Hi Mr. Mosher,

I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I’ve reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Quick update. Jason left Robert Hernandez (National City Fire Chief) a couple voicemail messages, with no response yet. Given NC's dark Fridays, we may not hear from him today. What we do know is that Robert called Jason prior to his meeting with Mr. Edid and shared that the types of design revisions Mr. Edid's team is proposing would reduce the fire flow requirement to around 1750 gallons per minute. The existing main can provide 880 gallons per minute. As soon as we hear back we will report.

-Luis
FYI...

20 psi residual provides 1,210 gpm (includes new demands for subject development)
1,325 gpm flows through the 6” at over 15 fps

As stated, current fire flow demand for the site remains at 2,050 gpm.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org
Hello Mr. Edid,

I’m getting back to you regarding your request for a meeting. At this point, the earliest we can schedule a meeting is Friday. Tish has deferred this matter to staff, so the meeting will be with Ron Mosher and other staff members. Please let me know if Friday works for you. As an alternative, you are free to submit your proposal along with other pending submittals for the Authority’s review.

Thank You,

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-6751

Dear Mrs. Berge and Mr. Mosher,

Yesterday our team met with the National City Fire Chief Mr. Robert Hernandez and discussed the fire flow requirements for our development. We believe we have found a simple solution that I would like to present to you in person. Please advise if you are available to meet this Friday morning Nov-02-18 around 9am.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Abraham Edid

On Oct 30, 2018, at 2:50 PM, Mosher, Ron <rmosher@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,

Thank you for the email below and for the voicemail this morning. We are reviewing
the matter internally and will also discuss the matter with our legal counsel, and a response will be forthcoming. Thank you for your patience.

With regards,

Ron R. Mosher
Director of Engineering

(619) 409-6750 Direct Line
(619) 425-7469 Fax
Rmosher@sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2018 10:23 AM
To: Mosher, Ron
Cc: Berge, Tish; Valdez, Luis; Nieves, Vanessa
Subject: Fwd: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Mr. Mosher,

I want to follow-up with you regarding the letter I emailed last week. I have not received a response from you regarding the ideas and concerns I presented. As you know, time is of the essence and I would appreciate your prompt response to my correspondence.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid <Redact>
Subject: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive
Date: October 18, 2018 at 10:18:43 AM PDT
To: Ron Mosher <Rmosher@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Tish Berge <tberge@sweetwater.org>, Luis Valdez <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>, "Nieves, Vanessa" <vnieves@sweetwater.org>

Hi Mr. Mosher,
I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I’ve reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edd
Call: Redact
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Hi Mr. Valdez,

Thank you for your email and Friday works for us. Please advise the time so we can schedule ourselves.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham

On Nov 5, 2018, at 9:50 AM, Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Mr. Edid,

I'm getting back to you regarding your request for a meeting. At this point, the earliest we can schedule a meeting is Friday. Tish has deferred this matter to staff, so the meeting will be with Ron Mosher and other staff members. Please let me know if Friday works for you. As an alternative, you are free to submit your proposal along with other pending submittals for the Authority's review.

Thank You,

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-6751

See attached images.
Hernandez and discussed the fire flow requirements for our development. We believe we have found a simple solution that I would like to present to you in person. Please advise if you are available to meet this Friday morning Nov-02-18 around 9am.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Abraham Edid

On Oct 30, 2018, at 2:50 PM, Mosher, Ron <rmosher@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,

Thank you for the email below and for the voicemail this morning. We are reviewing the matter internally and will also discuss the matter with our legal counsel, and a response will be forthcoming. Thank you for your patience.

With regards,

Ron R. Mosher
Director of Engineering

(619) 409-6750 Direct Line
(619) 425-7469 Fax
rmosher@sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Reclued]
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2018 10:23 AM
To: Mosher, Ron
Cc: Berge, Tish; Valdez, Luis; Nieves, Vanessa
Subject: Fwd: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Mr. Mosher,

I want to follow-up with you regarding the letter I emailed last week. I have not received a response from you regarding the ideas and concerns I presented. As you know, time is of the essence and I would appreciate your prompt response to my correspondence.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact
Blue Conturion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid
To: Ron Mosher <Rmosher@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Tish Berge <tberge@sweetwater.org>, Luis Valdez <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>, "Nieves, Vanessa" <vnieves@sweetwater.org>

Hi Mr. Mosher,

I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I’ve reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
3265 Acacia Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92125
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Mr. Edid,

We are available to meet with you on Friday at 10:00 a.m. Please confirm if this works. Thank you.

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-6751

Hi Mr. Valdez,

Thank you for your email and Friday works for us. Please advise the time so we can schedule ourselves.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham

On Nov 5, 2018, at 9:50 AM, Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Mr. Edid,

I’m getting back to you regarding your request for a meeting. At this point, the earliest we can schedule a meeting is Friday. Tish has deferred this matter to staff, so the meeting will be with Ron Mosher and other staff members. Please let me know if Friday works for you. As an alternative, you are free to submit your proposal along with other pending submittals for the Authority’s review.
Thank You,

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-6751

Dear Mrs. Berge and Mr. Mosher,

Yesterday our team met with the National City Fire Chief Mr. Robert Hernandez and discussed the fire flow requirements for our development. We believe we have found a simple solution that I would like to present to you in person. Please advise if you are available to meet this Friday morning Nov-02-18 around 9am.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Abraham Edid

On Oct 30, 2018, at 2:50 PM, Mosher, Ron <rmosher@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,

Thank you for the email below and for the voicemail this morning. We are reviewing the matter internally and will also discuss the matter with our legal counsel, and a response will be forthcoming. Thank you for your patience.

With regards,

Ron R. Mosher
Director of Engineering

(619) 409-6750 Direct Line
Mr. Mosher,

I want to follow-up with you regarding the letter I emailed last week. I have not received a response from you regarding the ideas and concerns I presented. As you know, time is of the essence and I would appreciate your prompt response to my correspondence.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid

Subject: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Date: October 18, 2018 at 10:18:43 AM PDT

To: Ron Mosher <Rmosher@sweeterwater.org>
Cc: Tish Berge <tberge@sweeterwater.org>, Luis Valdez <lvaldez@sweeterwater.org>, "Nieves, Vanessa" <vnieves@sweeterwater.org>

Hi Mr. Mosher,

I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I’ve reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Hi Mr. Valdez,

Confirmed for Friday at 10am.

Thank you.

Abraham

On Nov 6, 2018, at 9:13 AM, Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,

We are available to meet with you on Friday at 10:00 a.m. Please confirm if this works.
Thank you.

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-6751

Hi Mr. Valdez,

Thank you for your email and Friday works for us. Please advise the time so we can schedule ourselves.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham
On Nov 5, 2018, at 9:50 AM, Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Mr. Eidid,

I’m getting back to you regarding your request for a meeting. At this point, the earliest we can schedule a meeting is Friday. Tish has deferred this matter to staff, so the meeting will be with Ron Mosher and other staff members. Please let me know if Friday works for you. As an alternative, you are free to submit your proposal along with other pending submittals for the Authority’s review.

Thank You,

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-6751

From: Abraham Eidid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 5:08 PM
To: Mosher, Ron
Cc: Berge, Tish; Sabine, Jennifer; Valdez, Luis
Subject: Re: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Dear Mrs. Berge and Mr. Mosher,

Yesterday our team met with the National City Fire Chief Mr. Robert Hernandez and discussed the fire flow requirements for our development. We believe we have found a simple solution that I would like to present to you in person. Please advise if you are available to meet this Friday morning Nov-02-18 around 9am.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Abraham Eidid

On Oct 30, 2018, at 2:50 PM, Mosher, Ron <rmosher@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Eidid,
Thank you for the email below and for the voicemail this morning. We are reviewing the matter internally and will also discuss the matter with our legal counsel, and a response will be forthcoming. Thank you for your patience.

With regards,

Ron R. Mosher
Director of Engineering

(619) 409-6750 Direct Line
(619) 425-7469 Fax
Rmosher@sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid
To: Mosher, Ron
Cc: Berge, Tish; Valdez, Luis; Nieves, Vanessa
Subject: Fwd: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive

Mr. Mosher,

I want to follow-up with you regarding the letter I emailed last week. I have not received a response from you regarding the ideas and concerns I presented. As you know, time is of the essence and I would appreciate your prompt response to my correspondence.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid
Subject: Design Proposal for High-Density Parcels at Ridgeway Drive
Date: October 18, 2018 at 10:18:43 AM
Hi Mr. Mosher,

I received your response letter dated October 12, 2018. I've reviewed the different topics you discuss, and attached below are some of my comments. Please review and let me know your thoughts. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edd

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Hello Everyone,

Thank you for the documents provided. I will get back to you on questions I may have as soon as possible. It is important to note, that no final decisions have been made by the National City Fire Department on the subject in review.

Respectfully,

Robert Hernandez
National City Fire Department
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal / Fire Investigator
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
Ph: (619) 336-4550 Fax: (619) 336-4652
rhernandez@nationalcityca.gov

Business hours for the City of National City are 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Thursday (closed on Fridays). For more information please go to the City's website: website:

www.nationalcityca.gov

From: Abraham Eddi <mailto:Redact:>
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2018 11:09 AM
To: Robert Hernandez <R.Hernandez@nationalcityca.gov>
Cc: Dylan Hinkle <Redact:>, Isaac Calderon (<isaac@vnagroup.us>)
Subject: Installation of NFPA Fire Protection Tank System at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950

Dear Chief Hernandez,

It was a pleasure meeting with you this past Tuesday. As discussed in our meeting, I am submitting to you this proposal to install an NFPA Fire Protection Tank System at our multifamily development mentioned above. I would appreciate it if you can please review the attached documents and let me know if you have any questions.
Thank you and have a good day.
Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126

www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Hello Mr. Edid,

The purpose of this email is to circle back with you and memorialize our meeting of November 9, 2018, during which we discussed topics presented in your letter dated October 18, 2018 and your new proposal to provide fire flow for the subject project based on a reduced fire protection requirement from the National City Fire Department. As we discussed, Sweetwater Authority (Authority) will take further action on this matter when a revised fire protection requirement is provided to the Authority by the National City Fire Department.

Thank you,

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-6751
Hello Gentleman,

Thank you for your time today. I hope you did not mind me interrupting dialogue. I felt this was a point that was already made between the parties. I will continue to keep you posted on the outcome. I’m sure you will do the same.

Respectfully,

Robert Hernandez
National City Fire Department
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal / Fire Investigator
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
Ph: (619) 336-4550 Fax: (619) 336-4652
rherandez@nationalcityca.gov

Business hours for the City of National City are 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Thursday (closed on Fridays). For more information please go to the City’s website: website: www.nationalcityca.gov

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 11:34 AM
To: Robert Hernandez <rherandez@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Installation of NFPA Fire Protection Tank System at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950

Hello Robert,

Yes, Ron Mosher, Director of Engineering, Luis Valdez, Engineering Manager, and I are planning to attend the meeting to continue to support the Authority’s position.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Hello Jason,

I will be setting up a meeting with the applicant from the Ridgeway project for November 27, 2018 @ 1000. The meeting will be here at City Hall located at 1243 National City Boulevard 1st floor. Please let me know if you would like to attend.

Have a great holiday weekend!

Robert Hernandez
National City Fire Department
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal / Fire Investigator
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
Ph: (619) 336-4550 Fax: (619) 336-4552
rhernandez@nationalcityca.gov

Business hours for the City of National City are 7:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Thursday (closed on Fridays). For more information please go to the City’s website: website: www.nationalcityca.gov

---

Hello Robert,

Mr. Edid and his team came into our office on Friday and informed the Authority that NCFD approved a 1,000 gpm fire flow and the use of a tank to supplement the fire flow shortfall for the two-hour duration would be acceptable. Further, using a supplemental fire flow source would be very complicated due to the need for a NFPA approved fire pump, not to mention the ongoing operation and maintenance requirements.

Please note, in accordance to SD County Part Four: Development Regulations -Section 4838, the water tank cannot exceed 15 feet in height and 12 feet in diameter…”. The maximum tank size allowed is not sufficient to cover the gpm shortfall. In addition, Mr. Edid’s team asked the Authority to remove its maximum 10 fps water velocity criteria. The Authority cannot remove its velocity limitation and must adhere to its Standards.
Thank you,

Jason Mettler  
Engineering Technician Supervisor  
Sweetwater Authority  
(619) 409-6755 Direct  
Redact Cell  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org

--------- Original message ---------

From: Abraham Edid <Redact>
Date: 11/2/18 11:10 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: Robert Hernandez <RHernandez@nationalcity.ca.gov>
Cc: Dylan Hinkle <Redact>
Isaac Calderon <isaacz@vngroup.us>
Subject: Installation of NFPA Fire Protection Tank System at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950

Dear Chief Hernandez,

It was a pleasure meeting with you this past Tuesday. As discussed in our meeting, I am submitting to you this proposal to install an NFPA Fire Protection Tank System at our multifamily development mentioned above. I would appreciate it if you can please review the attached documents and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you and have a good day.

Abraham Edid
Cell: Redact

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
Dear Mr. Hernandez,

Thank you for your letter and I will follow-up with the team from Sweetwater Authority.

Have a good night.

Abraham

On Nov 29, 2018, at 5:14 PM, Robert Hernandez <RHernandez@nationalcityca.gov> wrote:

Hello Mr. Edid,

Please find a scanned copy of your current flow letter as requested. Two originals with wet signature area available here at National City Fire Administration, which may be retrieved at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Robert Hernandez
National City Fire Department
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal / Fire Investigator
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
Ph: (619) 336-4550  Fax: (619) 336-4652
r hernandez@nationalcityca.gov

<image001.png>

Business hours for the City of National City are 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Thursday (closed on Fridays). For more information please go to the City’s website: www.nationalcityca.gov

<copier@nationalcityca.gov_20181129_175635.pdf>
Hello Mr. Eid,

Please find a scanned copy of your current flow letter as requested. Two originals with wet signature area available here at National City Fire Administration, which may be retrieved at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Robert Hernandez

National City Fire Department
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal / Fire Investigator
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
Ph: (619) 336-4550  Fax: (619) 336-4652
rhernandez@nationalcityca.gov

Business hours for the City of National City are 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Thursday (closed on Fridays). For more information please go to the City’s website: website: www.nationalcityca.gov
November 29, 2018

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd. Suite 112
San Diego, CA 92126

RE: Fire Flow Requirements APN# 564-040-07-00

Mr. Hinkle,

The fire flow requirements for the proposed project located at 2604 Ridgeway Drive in the County of Lincoln Acres will be as follows.

For the structure APN# 564-040-07-00, the required fire flow shall be 1,000 gallons per minute for duration of 2 hours measured at 20 psi residual pressure. The structure will be of type VA construction.

This fire flow may change, depending on accrual size, construction, plans submittal configuration, access and placement of structures on the property and the relationship to other structures.

The provided information is good for 6 months from the above date.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Robert Hernandez
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal

National City Fire Department
1243 National City Boulevard, National City, CA 91950-4301
Hello Mr. Edid,

Please find a scanned copy of your current flow letter as requested. Two originals with wet signature area available here at National City Fire Administration, which may be retrieved at your convenience.

Respectfully,

Robert Hernandez
National City Fire Department
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal / Fire Investigator
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
Ph: (619) 336-4550 Fax: (619) 336-4652
rhhernandez@nationalcityca.gov

Business hours for the City of National City are 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Thursday (closed on Fridays). For more information please go to the City’s website: website: www.nationalcityca.gov
November 29, 2018

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd. Suite 112
San Diego, CA 92126

RE: Fire Flow Requirements APN# 564-040-07-00

Mr. Hinkle,

The fire flow requirements for the proposed project located at 2604 Ridgeway Drive in the County of Lincoln Acres will be as follows.

For the structure APN# 564-040-07-00, the required fire flow shall be 1,000 gallons per minute for duration of 2 hours measured at 20 psi residual pressure. The structure will be of type VA construction.

This fire flow may change, depending on accrual size, construction, plans submittal configuration, access and placement of structures on the property and the relationship to other structures.

The provided information is good for 6 months from the above date.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Hernandez
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal
Dear Mr. Hernandez,

Thank you for your letter and I will follow-up with the team from Sweetwater Authority.

Have a good night.

Abraham

---

On Nov 29, 2018, at 5:14 PM, Robert Hernandez <RHernandez@nationalcityca.gov> wrote:

Hello Mr. Edid,
Please find a scanned copy of your current flow letter as requested. Two originals with wet signature area available here at National City Fire Administration, which may be retrieved at your convenience
Respectfully,
Robert Hernandez
National City Fire Department
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal / Fire Investigator
1243 National City Blvd.
National City, CA 91950
Ph: (619) 336-4550  Fax: (619) 336-4652
rhernandez@nationalcityca.gov
<image001.png>

Business hours for the City of National City are 7:00 am to 6:00 pm, Monday through Thursday (closed on Fridays). For more information please go to the City’s website:
website: www.nationalcityca.gov

<copier@nationalcityca.gov_20181129_175635.pdf>
Hello Andrew,

On November 30, 2018, Sweetwater Authority received a National City Fire Department (NCFD) Fire Flow Requirement letter, dated November 29, 2018, for the subject project. The required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met (see attached fire flow letter).

In response to the letter, the Authority re-analyzed its distribution system to confirm that obtaining flow requires the installation of approximately 420 LF of 8” PVC water main on Ridgeway Drive, from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.

One of the earlier NCFD fire flow letters received by the Authority required 2,000 gpm and that demand would have required the developer to upgrade and install approximately 1,550 LF of 12” PVC water main at an estimated cost of $550,000. Based on the revised requirements, the upgrade of 420 feet of 8” PVC main is estimated to cost $140,000.

I informed Abraham and Dylan that the Authority received the revised fire flow letter and it significantly reduced the scope of work that was originally required to obtain higher fire flow demands. They both asked me to contact you so we could continue to work together with the goal to obtain water for the subject project.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler  
Engineering Technician Supervisor  
Sweetwater Authority  
(619) 409-6755 Direct  
Cell  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org
December 11, 2018

Mr. Dylan Hinkle
Blue Centurion Homes, LLC
9265 Activity Road, Suite 112
San Diego, CA 92126

Subject: Fire Flow Availability—Revised
A.P.N. 564-040-07-00
2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City
SWA File: (Dev) Ridgeway Apartments

Dear Mr. Hinkle:

The following is in response to the updated Fire Flow Requirement Letter from the National City Fire Department (Fire Department) dated November 29, 2018, regarding the subject property. A fire flow of 1,000 gallons per minute (gpm) at a residual pressure of 20 pounds per square inch (psi) for a two-hour duration, as required by the Fire Department, is not available to serve the above-referenced project.

Sweetwater Authority (Authority) records indicate that there is a 1-inch water service lateral with a 5/8-inch meter serving the site. Per the Authority's Rates and Rules, fire protection systems for Commercial, Industrial, Government and Multi-Family Residential sites shall be exclusively dedicated to fire protection purposes.

The Owner shall submit to the Authority approved building plans and fire sprinkler plans with design calculations. Upon review, the Authority will confirm the water facilities required to serve the parcel and will determine any applicable San Diego County Water Authority and Sweetwater Authority capacity fees. The Owner will further be responsible for costs associated with any water facility improvements required for the subject property.

Mr. Rick DeLeon, of the Authority’s Cross-Connection Control Department, will contact the Owner regarding the type of backflow prevention device required for the existing water service.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Arturo Tejeda at (619) 409-6758, or atejeda@sweetwater.org.

A Public Water Agency
Serving National City, Chula Vista and Surrounding Areas
Mr. Dylan Hinkle
Re: Fire Flow Availability—Revised — Ridgeway Apartments, 2604 Ridgeway Drive,
National City
December 11, 2018
Page 2 of 2

Sincerely,

SWEETWATER AUTHORITY

[Signature]

Luis Valdez, P.E.
Engineering Manager

LV:ART:vn

enclosures: Fire Flow Requirement Sketch 1 and 2

cc: Mr. Rick DeLeon, Sweetwater Authority

Mr. Robert Hernandez
Battalion Chief/Fire Marshal
National City Fire Department
1243 National City Boulevard
National City, CA 91950

Mr. Abraham Edid
Blue Centurion Homes, LLC
9285 Activity Road, Suite 112
San Diego, CA 92126
FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENT

Quarter Section: 108
Fire District: National City
Flow Required: 1,000 GPM
Flow Available: 843 GPM
Pressure Zone: O.D. Arnold PZ

Legend
- Project Site
+ Fire Hydrant
- Pressure Zone Boundary

Subject Site
Hi Jason,

Please provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support the Sweetwater Authority’s conclusion that the Ridgeway Parcel C project must construct an 8” line “...from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.”

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 11, 2018, at 5:32 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Andrew,

On November 30, 2018, Sweetwater Authority received a National City Fire Department (NCFD) Fire Flow Requirement letter, dated November 29, 2018, for the subject project. The required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met (see attached fire flow letter).

In response to the letter, the Authority re-analyzed its distribution system to confirm that obtaining flow requires the installation of approximately 420 LF of 8” PVC water main on Ridgeway Drive, from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.

One of the earlier NCFD fire flow letters received by the Authority required 2,000 gpm and that demand would have required the developer to upgrade and install approximately 1,550 LF of 12” PVC water main at an estimated cost of $550,000. Based on the revised requirements, the upgrade of 420 feet of 8” PVC main is estimated to cost $140,000.

I informed Abraham and Dylan that the Authority received the revised fire flow letter and it significantly reduced the scope of work that was originally required to obtain higher fire flow demands. They both asked me to contact you so we could continue to work together with the goal to obtain water for the subject project.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org
History of Fire Flow Requirements

1. Fire flow analysis performed and delivered to developer on 1/4/17. The analysis cited the velocity limited flow of 843 gpm through a 6-in water main.
2. Developer's hydraulic report dated 12/27/17 cites a fire flow requirement of 2,750 gpm, with a reduction to 2,063 gpm allowed by the use of fire sprinklers.
3. On 4/30/18, the developer communicated that the fire flow requirement would be 2,250 gpm, requiring a water main upgrade of 2,250 feet.
4. The above fire flow will actually require a 1,550-ft water main upgrade to 12-inches and approximately 45 service reconnections. Estimated cost is $550,000.
5. Fire flow requirement from NC received on 9/19/18, setting a requirement of 2,000 gpm. This requires the upgrade cited above.
6. Revised Fire Flow requirement from NC received on 11/29/18, setting a requirement of 1,000 gpm. This requires a 420-ft water main upgrade to 8-inches and 12 service reconnections. Estimated cost is $140,000.
7. A 2,250-ft water main upgrade is not required under any scenario, even under the 2,750 gpm fire flow requirement.

Fire Flow Pressures

1. Without the maximum velocity constraint, the available fire flow based on 20 psi residual is approximately 1,075 gpm. Note that the 20 psi residual pressure is reached at a location slightly west of the project site which is higher in elevation. This fire flow is lower than the extrapolated value the developer has been using when citing that approximately 1,300 gpm is available.

Maximum Velocity Constraint

1. Protects internal piping components such as valve seats, which can be vulnerable to damage by high flow velocities.
2. Creates potential for transient pressures which can lead to pipe failure, or in the event of negative transients, can result in backflow contamination. Note the Authority does not control hydrant valve operation during fire flow event. See chart below for an illustration of the potential magnitude of transient pressures resulting from instant valve closure for various pipe materials and flow velocities.
3. It introduces dynamic thrust forces at bends.
4. It provides for a safety factor in the design of water facilities.
5. Note that the maximum velocity criteria is applied by other water agencies. The San Diego Water Agencies Design Standards limit velocity to 10 fps under “maximum day plus fire flow condition.”
Good afternoon Abraham,

As stated in the email below, the required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met.

Sweetwater Authority’s Design Standards limit pipeline velocities to 10 feet per second, and require a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi under fire demand. The pipeline velocity and pressure criteria are consistent with other water agencies in San Diego County.

An analysis of fire flows under the new fire flow criteria confirms that pipe velocity between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue exceeds 10 feet per second, and therefore does not meet the maximum velocity criteria. In order to mitigate this, installation of an 8-inch pipeline is required between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue. It is the Authority’s standard practice to measure the distance from the midpoint of the parcel.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

Hi Jason,

Please provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support the Sweetwater Authority’s conclusion that the Ridgeway Parcel C project must construct an 8” line “...from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynne Avenue.”

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 11, 2018, at 5:32 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Andrew,
On November 30, 2018, Sweetwater Authority received a National City Fire Department (NCFD) Fire Flow Requirement letter, dated November 29, 2018, for the subject project. The required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met (see attached fire flow letter).

In response to the letter, the Authority re-analyzed its distribution system to confirm that obtaining flow requires the installation of approximately 420 LF of 8” PVC water main on Ridgeway Drive, from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.

One of the earlier NCFD fire flow letters received by the Authority required 2,000 gpm and that demand would have required the developer to upgrade and install approximately 1,550 LF of 12” PVC water main at an estimated cost of $550,000. Based on the revised requirements, the upgrade of 420 feet of 8” PVC main is estimated to cost $140,000.

I informed Abraham and Dylan that the Authority received the revised fire flow letter and it significantly reduced the scope of work that was originally required to obtain higher fire flow demands. They both asked me to contact you so we could continue to work together with the goal to obtain water for the subject project.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 499-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmnettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

<Ltr - Fire Flow - 12-11-18.pdf>
Hi Jason,

It is clear you are either not understanding my question or evading it. Your “standard practice” may not be applicable or is inappropriate in our particular case. The following facts are applicable in our case:

1. Our fire flow requirement is 1,000 gpm at 20 psi for 2 hours (per Fire Marshal Letter dated Nov-29-2018)

2. The existing 6” line on Ridgeway Drive can deliver over 1,300 gpm above 20 psi, therefore has sufficient capability to deliver our fire flow requirement.

3. Per California Fire Code, the fire flow requirement of 1,000 gpm is the same for all of my existing neighbors. We should not be treated any different than the rest of the community.

4. Sweetwater Authority limits pipeline velocity to 10 feet per second (fps).

5. There is an existing neighborhood deficiency from Gwynn to the west end of Ridgeway Drive, and I believe my responsibility is to upgrade my frontage.

6. In order to do so, I have offered to replace the pipeline in the frontage of my parcel to an 8” line. By doing so, the pipeline velocity in our frontage will meet the requirement of less than 10fps.

I have asked you to provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support your requirement of building 420 linear feet from the midpoint of our parcel to Gwynn Avenue. You have responded this is “standard practice” without actually providing any written documentation and support I requested. “Standard practices” are highly subjective and in our case should be supported by written rules, regulations and guidelines.

Again, I ask you to please provide me with the proper references and policy documents that specify why we are liable for replacing 420 linear feet of pipeline. Lastly, please advise why by implementing my proposal above you believe I am not fulfilling my obligation and meeting Sweetwater’s requirements.

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 17, 2018, at 3:26 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmetller@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Abraham,
As stated in the email below, the required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met.

Sweetwater Authority’s Design Standards limit pipeline velocities to 10 feet per second, and require a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi under fire demand. The pipeline velocity and pressure criteria are consistent with other water agencies in San Diego County.

An analysis of fire flows under the new fire flow criteria confirms that pipe velocity between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue exceeds 10 feet per second, and therefore does not meet the maximum velocity criteria. In order to mitigate this, installation of an 8-inch pipeline is required between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue. It is the Authority’s standard practice to measure the distance from the midpoint of the parcel.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2018 10:03 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Andrew Owen; Valdez, Luis; Dylan Hinkle
Subject: Re: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive APN: 564-040-07-00

Hi Jason,

Please provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support the Sweetwater Authority’s conclusion that the Ridgeway Parcel C project must construct an 8” line “...from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.”

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 11, 2018, at 5:32 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Andrew,

On November 30, 2018, Sweetwater Authority received a National City Fire Department (NCFD) Fire Flow Requirement letter, dated November 29, 2018, for the subject project. The required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met (see attached fire flow letter).
In response to the letter, the Authority re-analyzed its distribution system to confirm that obtaining flow requires the installation of approximately 420 LF of 8" PVC water main on Ridgeway Drive, from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.

One of the earlier NCFD fire flow letters received by the Authority required 2,000 gpm and that demand would have required the developer to upgrade and install approximately 1,550 LF of 12" PVC water main at an estimated cost of $550,000. Based on the revised requirements, the upgrade of 420 feet of 8" PVC main is estimated to cost $140,000.

I informed Abraham and Dylan that the Authority received the revised fire flow letter and it significantly reduced the scope of work that was originally required to obtain higher fire flow demands. They both asked me to contact you so we could continue to work together with the goal to obtain water for the subject project.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

<Ltr - Fire Flow - 12-11-18.pdf>
Hi Jason,

I sent the email below 3 weeks ago and have not received a response from you. Please advise when I should expect your reply.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Abraham Edid.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid <Redacted>
Subject: Re: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive APN: 564-040-07-00
Date: December 18, 2018 at 6:14:03 PM PST
To: Jason Mettler <jmettler@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Andrew Oven <Redacted>, Luis Valdez <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>, Dylan Hinkle <Redacted>, "Tejeda, Arturo" <alejeda@sweetwater.org>

Hi Jason,

It is clear you are either not understanding my question or evading it. Your “standard practice” may not be applicable or is inappropriate in our particular case. The following facts are applicable in our case:

1. Our fire flow requirement is 1,000 gpm at 20 psi for 2 hours (per Fire Marshal Letter dated Nov-29-2018)

2. The existing 6" line on Ridgeway Drive can deliver over 1,300 gpm above 20 psi, therefore has sufficient capability to deliver our fire flow requirement.

3. Per California Fire Code, the fire flow requirement of 1,000 gpm is the same for all of my existing neighbors. We should not be treated any different than the rest of the community.

4. Sweetwater Authority limits pipeline velocity to 10 feet per second (fps).

5. There is an existing neighborhood deficiency from Gwynn to the west end of Ridgeway Drive, and I believe my responsibility is to upgrade my frontage.
6. In order to do so, I have offered to replace the pipeline in the frontage of my parcel to an 8" line. By doing so, the pipeline velocity in our frontage will meet the requirement of less than the 10fps.

I have asked you to provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support your requirement of building 420 lineal feet from the midpoint of our parcel to Gwynn Avenue. You have responded this is “standard practice” without actually providing any written documentation and support I requested. “Standard practices” are highly subjective and in our case should be supported by written rules, regulations and guidelines.

Again, I ask you to please provide me with the proper references and policy documents that specify why we are liable for replacing 420 lineal feet of pipeline. Lastly, please advise why by implementing my proposal above you believe I am not fulfilling my obligation and meeting Sweetwater’s requirements.

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 17, 2018, at 3:26 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Abraham,

As stated in the email below, the required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met.

Sweetwater Authority’s Design Standards limit pipeline velocities to 10 feet per second, and require a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi under fire demand. The pipeline velocity and pressure criteria are consistent with other water agencies in San Diego County.

An analysis of fire flows under the new fire flow criteria confirms that pipe velocity between Parcel C and Gwynn Avenue exceeds 10 feet per second, and therefore does not meet the maximum velocity criteria. In order to mitigate this, installation of an 8-inch pipeline is required between Parcel C and Gwynn Avenue. It is the Authority’s standard practice to measure the distance from the midpoint of the parcel.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 499-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org
Hi Jason,

Please provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support the Sweetwater Authority’s conclusion that the Ridgeway Parcel C project must construct an 8” line “...from the midpoint of the developer's subject property to Gwynn Avenue.”

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 11, 2018, at 5:32 PM, Mettler, Jason <jemetller@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Andrew,

On November 30, 2018, Sweetwater Authority received a National City Fire Department (NCFD) Fire Flow Requirement letter, dated November 29, 2018, for the subject project. The required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it's not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met (see attached fire flow letter).

In response to the letter, the Authority re-analyzed its distribution system to confirm that obtaining flow requires the installation of approximately 420 LF of 8” PVC water main on Ridgeway Drive, from the midpoint of the developer's subject property to Gwynn Avenue.

One of the earlier NCFD fire flow letters received by the Authority required 2,000 gpm and that demand would have required the developer to upgrade and install approximately 1,550 LF of 12” PVC water main at an estimated cost of $550,000. Based on the revised requirements, the upgrade of 420 feet of 8” PVC main is estimated to cost $140,000.

I informed Abraham and Dylan that the Authority received the revised fire flow letter and it significantly reduced the scope of work that was originally required to obtain higher fire flow demands. They both asked me to contact you so we could continue to work together with the goal to obtain water for the subject project.
Thank you,

Jason Mettler  
Engineering Technician Supervisor  
Sweetwater Authority  
(619) 409-6755 Direct  
Redact [Redacted] Cell  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org

<Ltr - Fire Flow - 12-11-18.pdf>
Mr. Edid,

As has been pointed out on several occasions, you are being requested to comply with the Authority’s design standards, specifically Section VIII as it relates to maximum allowed flow velocity. Being that the required fireflow causes an exceedence of 10 fps across 420 feet of pipeline, the subject project is required to upgrade that segment of pipe to meet the velocity criteria. The cost of the pipeline upgrade required to support the subject project is to be borne by the developer. This is consistent with the Authority’s Rates and Rules, Sections 1.1 and 1.3 which stipulate that the cost of new facilities required to provide water service to a development be installed at the expense of the developer requesting service, and the Authority’s Strategic Plan Objective SR-2, which supports the above by directing staff to install development infrastructure at minimal-to-zero financial impacts to the Authority’s ratepayers. This is the Authority’s final direction in its review of the current project proposal.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

---

Hi Jason,

I sent the email below 3 weeks ago and have not received a response from you. Please advise when I should expect your reply.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Abraham Edid.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 10:07 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Andrew Ovez; Valdez, Luis; Dylan Hinkle; Tejeda, Arturo
Subject: Fwd: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive APN: 564-040-07-00
Hi Jason,

It is clear you are either not understanding my question or evading it. Your “standard practice” may not be applicable or is inappropriate in our particular case. The following facts are applicable in our case:

1. Our fire flow requirement is 1,000 gpm at 20 psi for 2 hours (per Fire Marshal Letter dated Nov-29-2018)

2. The existing 6” line on Ridgeway Drive can deliver over 1,300 gpm above 20 psi, therefore has sufficient capability to deliver our fire flow requirement.

3. Per California Fire Code, the fire flow requirement of 1,000 gpm is the same for all of my existing neighbors. We should not be treated any different than the rest of the community.

4. Sweetwater Authority limits pipeline velocity to 10 feet per second (fps).

5. There is an existing neighborhood deficiency from Gwynn to the west end of Ridgeway Drive, and I believe my responsibility is to upgrade my frontage.

6. In order to do so, I have offered to replace the pipeline in the frontage of my parcel to an 8” line. By doing so, the pipeline velocity in our frontage will meet the requirement of less than the 10fps.

I have asked you to provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support your requirement of building 420 lineal feet from the midpoint of our parcel to Gwynn Avenue. You have responded this is “standard practice” without actually providing any written documentation and support I requested. “Standard practices” are highly subjective and in our case should be supported by written rules, regulations and guidelines.

Again, I ask you to please provide me with the proper references and policy documents that specify why we are liable for replacing 420 lineal feet of pipeline. Lastly, please advise why by implementing my proposal above you believe I am not fulfilling my obligation and meeting Sweetwater’s requirements.

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 17, 2018, at 3:26 PM, Mettler, Jason
<jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Abraham,

As stated in the email below, the required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met.

Sweetwater Authority’s Design Standards limit pipeline velocities to 10 feet per second, and require a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi under fire demand. The pipeline velocity and pressure criteria are consistent with other water agencies in San Diego County.

An analysis of fire flows under the new fire flow criteria confirms that pipe velocity between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue exceeds 10 feet per second, and therefore does not meet the maximum velocity criteria. In order to mitigate this, installation of an 8-inch pipeline is required between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue. It is the Authority’s standard practice to measure the distance from the midpoint of the parcel.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
[Redact] Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

Hi Jason,

Please provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support the Sweetwater Authority’s conclusion that the Ridgeway Parcel C project must construct an 8” line “...from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.”

Thank you,

Abraham Edid

On Dec 11, 2018, at 5:32 PM, Mettler, Jason
<jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:
Hello Andrew,

On November 30, 2018, Sweetwater Authority received a National City Fire Department (NCFD) Fire Flow Requirement letter, dated November 29, 2018, for the subject project. The required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it's not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met (see attached fire flow letter).

In response to the letter, the Authority re-analyzed its distribution system to confirm that obtaining flow requires the installation of approximately 420 LF of 8" PVC water main on Ridgeway Drive, from the midpoint of the developer's subject property to Gwynn Avenue.

One of the earlier NCFD fire flow letters received by the Authority required 2,000 gpm and that demand would have required the developer to upgrade and install approximately 1,550 LF of 12" PVC water main at an estimated cost of $550,000. Based on the revised requirements, the upgrade of 420 feet of 8" PVC main is estimated to cost $140,000.

I informed Abraham and Dylan that the Authority received the revised fire flow letter and it significantly reduced the scope of work that was originally required to obtain higher fire flow demands. They both asked me to contact you so we could continue to work together with the goal to obtain water for the subject project.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Re: 616-2000-C1 Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

<Letter - Fire Flow - 12-11-18.pdf>
Jason,

Let's first analyze in detail Section VIII of Authority's design standards:

Section VIII have 3 paragraphs:

**Paragraph 1:** Node demands for Hydraulic Networks Analysis should be developed....

**Paragraph 2:** An average day and maximum day analysis should be performed. Water pressure should indicate the nodes will have a minimum of forty (40) psi of water pressure during maximum day conditions. The maximum velocity allowed on pipelines is ten (10) feet per second.

**Paragraph 3:** After the average day and maximum day runs have been completed, then runs with selected fire demands can be made to assure fire demands can be met. At the selected fire demand point, water pressure shall not be less than twenty (20) psi under the fire demand condition.

IMPORTANT NOTE: Paragraph 2 and 3 are not related or dependent to each other as they address different concepts (Paragraph 2 talks about domestic water use, and Paragraph 3 addresses fire)

Translating of Section VIII to my project:

**Paragraph 1:** Node demands for Hydraulic Networks Analysis should be developed....

**Paragraph 2:**
We ran AVERAGE DAY AND MAXIMUM DAY ANALYSIS and the results are:
- Water pressure is ABOVE 40psi
- VELOCITY IS BELOW 10 fps
**Therefore, WE COMPLY with Section VIII Paragraph 2**

**Paragraph 3:**
We ran FIRE DEMAND ANALYSIS and the results are:
- Fire flow exceeds the required 1,000 gpm (per Fire Chief Letter requirements)
- Water pressure is above the 20 psi requirement
**Therefore, WE COMPLY with Section VIII Paragraph 3**

As you can see, based on the TEXT OF SWEETWATER AUTHORITY DESIGN STANDARDS Section VIII the fire demand is not restricted by velocity. Therefore, your comment that "the required fireflow causes an exceedance of 10 fps" does not apply!

Only if you can prove in writing that Section VIII limits the FIRE DEMANDS to 10 fps, I WILL ACCEPT YOUR ARGUMENTS. Otherwise, you need to follow the text of the Sweetwater Authority Design Standards and stop pushing us to upgrade the pipe segment
based on your improper interpretations. The existing 6” pipeline meets and exceeds my projects domestic and fire flow requirements.

Abraham Edid

On Jan 12, 2019, at 9:20 AM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,

As has been pointed out on several occasions, you are being requested to comply with the Authority’s design standards, specifically Section VIII as it relates to maximum allowed flow velocity. Being that the required fireflow causes an exceedance of 10 fps across 420 feet of pipeline, the subject project is required to upgrade that segment of pipe to meet the velocity criteria. The cost of the pipeline upgrade required to support the subject project is to be borne by the developer. This is consistent with the Authority’s Rates and Rules, Sections 1.1 and 1.3 which stipulate that the cost of new facilities required to provide water service to a development be installed at the expense of the developer requesting service, and the Authority’s Strategic Plan Objective SR-2, which supports the above by directing staff to install development infrastructure at minimal-to-zero financial impacts to the Authority’s ratepayers. This is the Authority’s final direction in its review of the current project proposal.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

Hi Jason,

I sent the email below 3 weeks ago and have not received a response from you. Please advise when I should expect your reply.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Abraham Edid.
From: Abraham Edid

Subject: Re: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive
APN: 564-040-07-00
Date: December 18, 2018 at 6:14:03 PM PST
To: Jason Mettler <jmettler@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Andrew Oven <Redact>, Redact Valdez <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>, Dylan Hinkle <Redact>, "Tejeda, Arturo" <atejeda@sweetwater.org>

Hi Jason,

It is clear you are either not understanding my question or evading it. Your “standard practice” may not be applicable or is inappropriate in our particular case. The following facts are applicable in our case:

1. Our fire flow requirement is 1,000 gpm at 20 psi for 2 hours (per Fire Marshal Letter dated Nov-29-2018)

2. The existing 6” line on Ridgeway Drive can deliver over 1,300 gpm above 20 psi, therefore has sufficient capability to deliver our fire flow requirement.

3. Per California Fire Code, the fire flow requirement of 1,000 gpm is the same for all of my existing neighbors. We should not be treated any different than the rest of the community.

4. Sweetwater Authority limits pipeline velocity to 10 feet per second (fps).

5. There is an existing neighborhood deficiency from Gwynn to the west end of Ridgeway Drive, and I believe my responsibility is to upgrade my frontage.

6. In order to do so, I have offered to replace the pipeline in the frontage of my parcel to an 8” line. By doing so, the pipeline velocity in our frontage will meet the requirement of less than the 10fps.

I have asked you to provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support your requirement of building 420 lineal feet from the midpoint of our parcel to Gwynn Avenue. You have responded this is “standard practice” without actually providing any written documentation and support I requested. “Standard practices” are highly subjective and in our case should be supported by written rules, regulations and guidelines.
Again, I ask you to please provide me with the proper references and policy documents that specify why we are liable for replacing 420 lineal feet of pipeline. Lastly, please advise why by implementing my proposal above you believe I am not fulfilling my obligation and meeting Sweetwater’s requirements.

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 17, 2018, at 3:26 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Abraham,

As stated in the email below, the required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met.

Sweetwater Authority’s Design Standards limit pipeline velocities to 10 feet per second, and require a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi under fire demand. The pipeline velocity and pressure criteria are consistent with other water agencies in San Diego County.

An analysis of fire flows under the new fire flow criteria confirms that pipe velocity between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue exceeds 10 feet per second, and therefore does not meet the maximum velocity criteria. In order to mitigate this, installation of an 8-inch pipeline is required between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue. It is the Authority’s standard practice to measure the distance from the midpoint of the parcel.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
[Redact] Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid <[Redact]>
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2018 10:03 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Andrew Oven; Valdez, Luis; Dylan Hinke
Subject: Re: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive
APN: 564-040-07-00
Hi Jason,

Please provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support the Sweetwater Authority’s conclusion that the Ridgeway Parcel C project must construct an 8” line “...from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.”

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 11, 2018, at 5:32 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Andrew,

On November 30, 2018, Sweetwater Authority received a National City Fire Department (NCFD) Fire Flow Requirement letter, dated November 29, 2018, for the subject project. The required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met (see attached fire flow letter).

In response to the letter, the Authority re-analyzed its distribution system to confirm that obtaining flow requires the installation of approximately 420 LF of 8” PVC water main on Ridgeway Drive, from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.

One of the earlier NCFD fire flow letters received by the Authority required 2,000 gpm and that demand would have required the developer to upgrade and install approximately 1,550 LF of 12” PVC water main at an estimated cost of $350,000. Based on the revised requirements, the upgrade of 420 feet of 8” PVC main is estimated to cost $140,000.

I informed Abraham and Dylan that the Authority received the revised fire flow letter and it significantly reduced the scope of work that was originally required to obtain higher fire flow demands. They both asked me to contact you so we could continue to work together with the goal to obtain water for the
subject project.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler  
Engineering Technician Supervisor  
Sweetwater Authority  
(619) 409-6755 Direct  
Redact Cell  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org

<Ltr - Fire Flow - 12-11-18.pdf>
Abraham,

The sentence referencing the maximum allowed velocity stands on its own and its scope is not limited by its placement within Section VIII of the Design Standards. As indicated in our previous email response on this subject (included in the thread below), this is the Authority's final direction in its review of your project.

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-0751

Jason,

Let's first analyze in detail Section VIII of Authority's design standards:

Section VIII have 3 paragraphs:

Paragraph 1: Node demands for Hydraulic Networks Analysis should be developed....

Paragraph 2: An average day and maximum day analysis should be performed. Water pressure should indicate the nodes will have a minimum of forty (40) psi of water pressure during maximum day conditions. The maximum velocity allowed on pipelines is ten (10) feet per second.

Paragraph 3: After the average day and maximum day runs have been completed, then runs with selected fire demands can be made to assure fire demands can be met. At the selected fire demand point, water pressure shall not be less than twenty (20) psi under the fire demand condition.
IMPORTANT NOTE: Paragraph 2 and 3 are not related or dependent to each other as they address different concepts (Paragraph 2 talks about domestic water use, and Paragraph 3 addresses fire)

Translating of Section VIII to my project:

**Paragraph 1:** Node demands for Hydraulic Networks Analysis should be developed. ...

**Paragraph 2:**
We ran AVERAGE DAY AND MAXIMUM DAY ANALYSIS and the results are:
- Water pressure is ABOVE 40psi
- VELOCITY IS BELOW 10 fps

**Therefore, WE COMPLY with Section VIII Paragraph 2**

**Paragraph 3:**
We ran FIRE DEMAND ANALYSIS and the results are:
- Fire flow exceeds the required 1,000 gpm (per Fire Chief Letter requirements)
- Water pressure is above the 20 psi requirement

**Therefore, WE COMPLY with Section VIII Paragraph 3**

As you can see, based on the TEXT OF SWEETWATER AUTHORITY DESIGN STANDARDS Section VIII the fire demand is not restricted by velocity. Therefore, your comment that “the required fireflow causes an exceedance of 10 fps” does not apply.

Only if you can prove in writing that Section VIII limits the FIRE DEMANDS to 10 fps, I WILL ACCEPT YOUR ARGUMENTS. Otherwise, you need to follow the text of the Sweetwater Authority Design Standards and stop pushing us to upgrade the pipe segment based on your improper interpretations. The existing 6” pipeline meets and exceeds my projects domestic and fire flow requirements.

Abraham Edid

On Jan 12, 2019, at 9:20 AM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,

As has been pointed out on several occasions, you are being requested to comply with the Authority’s design standards, specifically Section VIII as it relates to maximum allowed flow velocity. Being that the required fireflow causes an exceedance of 10 fps across 420 feet of pipeline, the subject project is required to upgrade that segment of pipe to meet the velocity criteria. The cost of the pipeline upgrade required to support the subject project is to be borne by the developer. This is consistent with the Authority’s Rates and Rules, Sections 1.1 and 1.3 which stipulate that the cost of new facilities required to provide water service to a development be installed at the expense of the developer requesting service, and the Authority’s Strategic Plan Objective SR-2, which supports the above by directing staff to install development infrastructure at minimal-to-zero financial impacts to the Authority’s ratepayers. This is the Authority’s final direction in its review of the current project proposal.
Hi Jason,

I sent the email below 3 weeks ago and have not received a response from you. Please advise when I should expect your reply.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Abraham Edid.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid <mailto:Redact>

Subject: Re: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive APN: 564-040-07-00

Date: December 18, 2018 at 6:14:03 PM PST

Hi Jason,

It is clear you are either not understanding my question or evading it. Your "standard practice" may not be applicable or is inappropriate in our particular case. The following facts are applicable in our case:

1. Our fire flow requirement is 1,000 gpm at 20 psi for 2 hours (per Fire Marshal Letter dated Nov-29-2018)

2. The existing 6" line on Ridgeway Drive can deliver over 1,300
gpm above 20 psi, therefore has sufficient capability to deliver our fire flow requirement.

3. Per California Fire Code, the fire flow requirement of 1,000 gpm is the same for all of my existing neighbors. We should not be treated any different than the rest of the community.

4. Sweetwater Authority limits pipeline velocity to 10 feet per second (fps).

5. There is an existing neighborhood deficiency from Gwym to the west end of Ridgeway Drive, and I believe my responsibility is to upgrade my frontage.

6. In order to do so, I have offered to replace the pipeline in the frontage of my parcel to an 8” line. By doing so, the pipeline velocity in our frontage will meet the requirement of less than the 10fps.

   I have asked you to provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support your requirement of building 420 lineal feet from the midpoint of our parcel to Gwynn Avenue. You have responded this is “standard practice” without actually providing any written documentation and support I requested. “Standard practices” are highly subjective and in our case should be supported by written rules, regulations and guidelines.

   Again, I ask you to please provide me with the proper references and policy documents that specify why we are liable for replacing 420 lineal feet of pipeline. Lastly, please advise why by implementing my proposal above you believe I am not fulfilling my obligation and meeting Sweetwater’s requirements.

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 17, 2018, at 3:26 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Abraham,

As stated in the email below, the required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met.

Sweetwater Authority’s Design Standards limit pipeline velocities to 10 feet per second, and require a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi under fire demand. The pipeline velocity and pressure criteria are consistent with other water
agencies in San Diego County.

An analysis of fire flows under the new fire flow criteria confirms that pipe velocity between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue exceeds 10 feet per second, and therefore does not meet the maximum velocity criteria. In order to mitigate this, installation of an 8-inch pipeline is required between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue. It is the Authority’s standard practice to measure the distance from the midpoint of the parcel.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler  
Engineering Technician Supervisor  
Sweetwater Authority  
(619) 469-6755 Direct  
Redact Cell  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid  
mailto: Redact  
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2018 10:03 AM  
To: Mettler, Jason  
Cc: Andrew Oven; Valdez, Luis; Dylan Hinkle  
Subject: Re: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive  
APN: 564-040-07-00

Hi Jason,

Please provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support the Sweetwater Authority’s conclusion that the Ridgeway Parcel C project must construct an 8” line “...from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.”

Thank you,

Abraham Edid

On Dec 11, 2018, at 5:32 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Andrew,

On November 30, 2018, Sweetwater Authority received a National City Fire Department (NCFD) Fire Flow Requirement letter, dated November 29, 2018, for the subject project.
The required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it's not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met (see attached fire flow letter).

In response to the letter, the Authority re-analyzed its distribution system to confirm that obtaining flow requires the installation of approximately 420 LF of 8” PVC water main on Ridgeway Drive, from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.

One of the earlier NCFD fire flow letters received by the Authority required 2,000 gpm and that demand would have required the developer to upgrade and install approximately 1,550 LF of 12” PVC water main at an estimated cost of $550,000. Based on the revised requirements, the upgrade of 420 feet of 8” PVC main is estimated to cost $140,000.

I informed Abraham and Dylan that the Authority received the revised fire flow letter and it significantly reduced the scope of work that was originally required to obtain higher fire flow demands. They both asked me to contact you so we could continue to work together with the goal to obtain water for the subject project.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jamettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

<Ltr - Fire Flow - 12-11-18.pdf>
Luis,

You need to be aware of your responsibility by trying to manipulate the Sweetwater Design Standards, and place your own interpretations where they do not belong. In your email you are stating that the velocity criteria in section VIII "stands on its own and its scope is not limited by its placement." This is the most absurd statement I’ve heard in my life!

The Sweetwater Design Standards were written by someone more intelligent than you and me. It is obvious that whoever wrote the standards, understood the fact that fire demand cannot be limited by velocity. That is why, the 3rd paragraph of Section VIII is written as follows:

"After the average day and maximum day runs have been completed, then runs with selected fire demands can be made to assure fire demands can be met. At the selected fire demand point, water pressure shall not be less than twenty (20) psi under the fire demand condition."

The beginning of the 3rd paragraph “After the average day and maximum day runs have been completed, then runs with selected fire demands” separates it from the analysis described in the 2nd paragraph which limit the water velocity only to average day and maximum day. The context of Section VIII needs to be followed as it is written, and you do not have any right and authority to modify it.

Abraham Edid

On Jan 21, 2019, at 4:16 PM, Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Abraham,

The sentence referencing the maximum allowed velocity stands on its own and its scope is not limited by its placement within Section VIII of the Design Standards. As indicated in our previous email response on this subject (included in the thread below), this is the Authority’s final direction in its review of your project.

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-6751
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Let's first analyze in detail Section VIII of Authority's design standards:

Section VIII have 3 paragraphs:

**Paragraph 1:** Node demands for Hydraulic Networks Analysis should be developed....

**Paragraph 2:** An average day and maximum day analysis should be performed. Water pressure should indicate the nodes will have a minimum of forty (40) psi of water pressure during maximum day conditions. The maximum velocity allowed on pipelines is ten (10) feet per second.

**Paragraph 3:** After the average day and maximum day runs have been completed, then runs with selected fire demands can be made to assure fire demands can be met. At the selected fire demand point, water pressure shall not be less than twenty (20) psi under the fire demand condition.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** Paragraph 2 and 3 are not related or dependent to each other as they address different concepts (Paragraph 2 talks about domestic water use, and Paragraph 3 addresses fire)

Translating of Section VIII to my project:

**Paragraph 1:** Node demands for Hydraulic Networks Analysis should be developed....

**Paragraph 2:**
We ran AVERAGE DAY AND MAXIMUM DAY ANALYSIS and the results are:

- Water pressure is ABOVE 40psi
- VELOCITY IS BELOW 10 fps

**Therefore, WE COMPLY with Section VIII Paragraph 2**

**Paragraph 3:**
We ran FIRE DEMAND ANALYSIS and the results are:

- Fire flow exceeds the required 1,000 gpm (per Fire Chief Letter requirements)
- Water pressure is above the 20 psi requirement

**Therefore, WE COMPLY with Section VIII Paragraph 3**
As you can see, based on the TEXT OF SWEETWATER AUTHORITY DESIGN STANDARDS Section VIII the fire demand is not restricted by velocity. Therefore, your comment that “the required fireflow causes an exceedance of 10 fps” does not apply.

Only if you can prove in writing that Section VIII limits the FIRE DEMANDS to 10 fps, I WILL ACCEPT YOUR ARGUMENTS. Otherwise, you need to follow the text of the Sweetwater Authority Design Standards and stop pushing us to upgrade the pipe segment based on your improper interpretations. The existing 6” pipeline meets and exceeds my project’s domestic and fire flow requirements.

Abraham Edid

On Jan 12, 2019, at 9:20 AM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Mr. Edid,

As has been pointed out on several occasions, you are being requested to comply with the Authority’s design standards, specifically Section VIII as it relates to maximum allowed flow velocity. Being that the required fireflow causes an exceedance of 10 fps across 420 feet of pipeline, the subject project is required to upgrade that segment of pipe to meet the velocity criteria. The cost of the pipeline upgrade required to support the subject project is to be borne by the developer. This is consistent with the Authority’s Rates and Rules, Sections 1.1 and 1.3 which stipulate that the cost of new facilities required to provide water service to a development be installed at the expense of the developer requesting service, and the Authority’s Strategic Plan Objective SR-2, which supports the above by directing staff to install development infrastructure at minimal-to-zero financial impacts to the Authority’s ratepayers. This is the Authority’s final direction in its review of the current project proposal.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 10:07 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Andrew Owen Valdez, Luis; Dylan Hlindhe; Tejeda, Arturo
Subject: Fwd: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive APN: 564-040-
Hi Jason,

I sent the email below 3 weeks ago and have not received a response from you. Please advise when I should expect your reply.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Abraham Edid.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid
Subject: Re: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive APN: 564-040-07-00
Date: December 18, 2018 at 6:14:03 PM PST
To: Jason Mettler <jmettler@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Andrew Oven, Luis Valdez, Dylan Hinkle, "Tejeda, Arturo" <atejeda@sweetwater.org>

Hi Jason,

It is clear you are either not understanding my question or evading it. Your “standard practice” may not be applicable or is inappropriate in our particular case. The following facts are applicable in our case:

1. Our fire flow requirement is 1,000 gpm at 20 psi for 2 hours (per Fire Marshal Letter dated Nov-29-2018)

2. The existing 6” line on Ridgeway Drive can deliver over 1,300 gpm above 20 psi, therefore has sufficient capability to deliver our fire flow requirement.

3. Per California Fire Code, the fire flow requirement of 1,000 gpm is the same for all of my existing neighbors. We should not be treated any different than the rest of the community.

4. Sweetwater Authority limits pipeline velocity to 10 feet per second (fps).

5. There is an existing neighborhood deficiency from Gwynn to the west end of Ridgeway Drive, and I believe
my responsibility is to upgrade my frontage.

6. In order to do so, I have offered to replace the pipeline in the frontage of my parcel to an 8" line. By doing so, the pipeline velocity in our frontage will meet the requirement of less than the 10fps.

I have asked you to provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support your requirement of building 420 lineal feet from the midpoint of our parcel to Gwynne Avenue. You have responded this is “standard practice” without actually providing any written documentation and support I requested. “Standard practices” are highly subjective and in our case should be supported by written rules, regulations and guidelines.

Again, I ask you to please provide me with the proper references and policy documents that specify why we are liable for replacing 420 lineal feet of pipeline. Lastly, please advise why by implementing my proposal above you believe I am not fulfilling my obligation and meeting Sweetwater’s requirements.

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 17, 2018, at 3:26 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Good afternoon Abraham,

As stated in the email below, the required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met.

Sweetwater Authority’s Design Standards limit pipeline velocities to 10 feet per second, and require a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi under fire demand. The pipeline velocity and pressure criteria are consistent with other water agencies in San Diego County.

An analysis of fire flows under the new fire flow criteria confirms that pipe velocity between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue exceeds 10 feet per second, and therefore does not meet the maximum velocity criteria. In order to mitigate this, installation of an 8-inch pipeline
is required between Parcel C and Gwynne Avenue. It is the Authority’s standard practice to measure the distance from the midpoint of the parcel.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler
Engineering Technician Supervisor
Sweetwater Authority
(619) 409-6755 Direct
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

Hi Jason,

Please provide specific references to your written Rates and Rules and/or other Authority policy documents to support the Sweetwater Authority’s conclusion that the Ridgeway Parcel C project must construct an 8” line “…from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.”

Thank you.

Abraham Edid

On Dec 11, 2018, at 5:32 PM, Mettler, Jason <jmettler@sweetwater.org> wrote:

Hello Andrew,

On November 30, 2018, Sweetwater Authority received a National City Fire Department (NCFD) Fire Flow Requirement letter, dated November 29, 2018, for the subject project. The
required flow for the subject project is now 1,000 gpm, but it’s not available, as the maximum velocity criteria is not met (see attached fire flow letter).

In response to the letter, the Authority re-analyzed its distribution system to confirm that obtaining flow requires the installation of approximately 420 LF of 8” PVC water main on Ridgeway Drive, from the midpoint of the developer’s subject property to Gwynn Avenue.

One of the earlier NCIFD fire flow letters received by the Authority required 2,000 gpm and that demand would have required the developer to upgrade and install approximately 1,550 LF of 12” PVC water main at an estimated cost of $550,000. Based on the revised requirements, the upgrade of 420 feet of 8” PVC main is estimated to cost $140,000.

I informed Abraham and Dylan that the Authority received the revised fire flow letter and it significantly reduced the scope of work that was originally required to obtain higher fire flow demands. They both asked me to contact you so we could continue to work together with the goal to obtain water for the subject project.

Thank you,

Jason Mettler  
Engineering Technician  
Supervisor  
Sweetwater Authority  
(619) 409-6755 Direct  
7000000 Cell  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org