Regular Board Meeting - February 27, 2019
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2. Related Agenda Items
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AGENDA

Regular Meeting
Governing Board of Sweetwater Authority
Wednesday, February 27, 2019 – 3:30 p.m.

- Call Meeting to Order and Roll Call
- Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag
  Director Preciado
- Opportunity for Public Comment
  Opportunity for members of the public to address the Board (Government Code Section 54954.6)
- Chair's Presentation
  Comments from the Public Regarding Agency Staff and Agency Recognition in the Press

ACTION CALENDAR AGENDA
The following items on the Action Agenda call for discussion and action by the Board. All items are placed on the Agenda so that the Board may discuss and take action on the item if the Board is so inclined, including items listed for information.

1. Items to be Added, Withdrawn, or Reordered on the Agenda

2. Approval of Minutes
   A. Special Meeting of February 7, 2019
   B. Regular Meeting of February 13, 2019

Consent Calendar Items
Items to be acted upon without discussion, unless a request is made by a member of the Board, the Staff, or the Public to discuss a particular item, including items listed for information. All consent calendar items are approved by a single motion.

3. Approval of Demands and Warrants

4. Consideration to Award a Contract for Heavy Equipment Replacement (Operations Committee Meeting of 2/20/19, Item 4. B.)
   Recommendation: Award a contract in the amount of $121,920.32 to RDO Equipment Company, Lakeside, CA.

A Public Water Agency
Serving National City, Chula Vista and Surrounding Areas
5. Request to Approve Easement Quitclaim - 237 Rogan Road, Chula Vista (Operations Committee Meeting of 2/20/19, Item 4. C.)
   **Recommendation:** Approve the quitclaim request, with the Owner paying all costs associated with processing the quitclaim.

6. Consideration to Award a Contract for Desktop Computer (PC) Purchase (Finance and Personnel Committee Meeting of 2/20/19, Item 4. B.)
   **Recommendation:** Declare the bid from Red River Technology, LLC nonresponsive; and award a contract in the amount of $125,434 to CDW Government LLC, Vernon Hills, IL.

7. One-time Adjustment to Customer Water Bill (Finance and Personnel Committee Meeting of 2/20/19, Item 4. C.)
   **Recommendation:** Deny an adjustment and grant an extended payment plan to pay $37,583.48 over a twelve-month period.

8. Consideration to Approve Contract Amendment No. 5 to GEI Consultants, Inc., for Condition Assessment of North and South Spillways of Sweetwater Dam (Finance and Personnel Committee Meeting of 2/20/19, Item 4. D.)
   **Recommendation:** Approve Contract Amendment No. 5 to GEI Consultants, Inc. in the amount of $169,244.

9. Consideration of Changes to Director's Per Diem Fees (Finance and Personnel Committee Meeting of 2/20/19, Item 4. E.)
   **Recommendation:** No action is recommended.

10. Review of Board Policies and Procedures (501 through 511) (Finance and Personnel Committee Meeting of 2/20/19, Item 4. F.)
    **Recommendation:** Approve the recommended changes as presented.

**Action and Discussion Items**

11. Ridgeway Apartments Project by Blue Centurion Homes, Development Project Update (Operations Committee Meeting of 2/20/19, item 4. A)
    **Recommendation:** Direct staff to evaluate remaining life of the existing pipeline; assign a value, and provide as a credit to Blue Centurion Homes.

12. Old Business
    Consideration to Adopt Resolution 19-04 of the Governing Board of Sweetwater Authority Rescinding Resolution 96-03, Re-establishing the Regular Meeting Date and Time of the Governing Board, and Authorizing Amendments to Policy 601 of the Policies & Procedures for the Governing Board

13. New Business
    A. Consideration to Approve Chair's Recommendation to Appoint Steve Castaneda as the Director Representative and José Cerda as the Alternate to the Association of California Water Agencies - Joint Powers Insurance Authority (ACWA/JPIA)
B. Request to concur in nomination to the ACWA/JPIA Executive Committee and possible adoption of resolution
   • Paul E. Dorey, Vista Irrigation District
   • Andre Morris, Santa Rosa Regional Resources Authority

14. Approval of Directors’ Attendance at Meetings and Future Agenda Items
   A. Per diem approval for Director Martinez’ participation in the San Diego County Water Authority Citizens Water Academy – March 7, March 13, and March 23, 2019
   B. Per diem approval for Directors who wish to attend the California Water Policy Conference, San Diego, CA – April 4-5, 2019

REPORTS AND INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
The following Agenda items are placed on the Agenda to allow the persons designated to provide information to the Board and the Public. There is no action called for in these items. The Board may engage in discussion on any report upon which specific subject matter is identified on the Agenda, but may not take any action other than to place the matter on a future Agenda.

15. FY 2019-20 Budget Calendar (Information Item) (Finance and Personnel Committee Meeting of 2/20/19, Item 4. A.)

16. Committee Minutes

17. January 2019 Financial Reports

18. Management Report
   A. Report of Assistant General Manager
   B. Report of General Manager

19. Report of Sweetwater Authority Director to the Water Conservation Garden Authority

20. Report of the South Bay Irrigation District Representative and the City of National City Representative to the San Diego County Water Authority
    Report by representatives for the purposes of briefing the Board on items of interest and importance that appear on the previous or future San Diego County Water Authority agendas and to receive direction from the Sweetwater Authority Governing Board in representing its interests at the San Diego County Water Authority.

21. Reports by Directors on Events Attended
    Reports and discussion relating to events attended by the Directors.
    Council of Water Utilities Meeting – February 19, 2019

22. Directors’ Comments
    Directors’ comments are comments by Directors concerning Authority business that may be of interest to the Board. Directors’ comments are placed on the Agenda to enable individual Board members to
CLOSED SESSION
At any time during the regular session, the Governing Board may adjourn to closed session to consider litigation, personnel matters, or to discuss with legal counsel matters within the attorney-client privilege. Government Code Section 54954.5.

A. Potential Threat to Public Services and Facilities, pursuant to Government Code Section 54957
   Consultation with: Paula de Sousa Mills, Legal Counsel
   Special Agent J. K. Goettsche, Federal Bureau of Investigations
   Intelligence Analyst A. Pettigrew, Federal Bureau of Investigations

B. Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9 (d)(1):

23. 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.

PUBLIC COMMENT PROCEDURES
Members of the general public may address the Board regarding items not appearing on the posted agenda, which are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Governing Board. Speakers are asked to state name, address, and topic, and to observe a time limit of three (3) minutes each. Public comment on a single topic is limited to twenty (20) minutes. Anyone desiring to address the Governing Board regarding an item listed on the agenda is asked to fill out a speaker’s slip and present it to the Board Chair or the Secretary. Request to Speak forms are available at the Speaker’s podium and at www.sweetwater.org/speakerform.
TO: Governing Board
FROM: Tish Berge, General Manager
DATE: February 22, 2019
SUBJECT: Comments from the Public Regarding Agency Staff and Agency Recognition in the Press

SUMMARY
The Authority has a long tradition of sharing comments from the public and articles about the Authority in the press with the Governing Board. This allows the Board to monitor a primary goal area of the Authority: to provide high quality customer service. Employees strive to provide this high quality customer service by being understanding, supportive, and responsive to customers' needs.

While negative comments regarding customer service are rare, when they are received, they are handled by Management as personnel related issues.

POLICY
Strategic Plan Goal #4 Customer Service: Provide high quality customer service.

CONCLUSION
This is an information item only.

Attachments: Comments from the Public
Articles about the Authority in the Press
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To: Tish Berg, General Manager, Sweetwater Authority  
From: Center for Water Studies at Cuyamaca College  
Re: Thank You  
Date: January 24, 2019

Dear Tish,

On behalf of the Center for Water Studies at Cuyamaca College, we wanted to express our deepest appreciation and admiration to you for serving as a panelist for General Manager’s Forum at our Women in Water Symposium on January 17, 2019. When planning an event such as this, it is imperative to gain the participation of experts in the field. Your willingness, passion, and commitment to share your valuable time and expertise in the water wastewater industry proved to be pinnacle to the success of this event. We were fortunate to have you among your exceptional peers, representing different paths and journeys to success in this industry.

From the overwhelming feedback concerning the event, participants have raved about your session as the highlight of the event. Direct quotes from Women in Water participants include:

“All the speakers were wonderful.”
“Great panel and inspirational presentations.”
“Great speakers, career development information.”
“Enjoyed all the speakers and the opportunity to talk with the other women working for water agencies in different field[s].”

The Women in Water Symposium was not intended to be a single event, but one of the catalysts to the network of support already occurring among such exceptional women in the water wastewater industry. The Center of Water Studies remains committed to support these crucial activities in between annual events.

We hope that you will want to be involved in our Women in Water Symposium next year. We will send you a call-for-presenters form as we get closer to next year’s planning. We were pleased to have your participation in this outstanding gathering of industry professionals, and we thank you for your valuable contribution.

Center for Water Studies Team

RECEIVED
JAN 28 2019
Sweetwater Authority
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To: Sue Mosburg, Program Manager, Sweetwater Authority  
CA/NV AWWA Water Loss Control Committee Chair, Director, AWWA  

From: Center for Water Studies at Cuyamaca College  
Re: Thank You  
Date: January 24, 2019  

Dear Sue:  

On behalf of the Center for Water Studies at Cuyamaca College, we wanted to express our deepest appreciation and admiration to you for serving as both a Women in Water Committee member and presenter for Building Your Leadership Skills at our Women in Water Symposium on January 17, 2019. When planning an event such as this, it is imperative to gain the participation of experts in the field. Your willingness, passion, and commitment to share your valuable time and expertise in the water wastewater industry proved to be pinnacle to the success of this event. We were fortunate to have you among your exceptional peers, representing different paths and journeys to success in this industry.

From the overwhelming feedback concerning the event, participants have raved about your session as the highlight of the event. Direct quotes from Women in Water participants include:

"All the speakers were wonderful."
"Great panel and inspirational presentations."
"Great speakers, career development information."
"Enjoyed all the speakers and the opportunity to talk with the other women working for water agencies in different field[s]."

The Women in Water Symposium was not intended to be a single event, but one of the catalysts to the network of support already occurring among such exceptional women in the water wastewater industry. The Center of Water Studies remains committed to support these crucial activities in between annual events.

We hope that you will want to be involved in our Women in Water Symposium next year. We will send you a call-for-presenters form as we get closer to next year’s planning. We were pleased to have your participation in this outstanding gathering of industry professionals, and we thank you for your valuable contribution.

Center for Water Studies Team

900 Rancho San Diego Parkway. El Cajon. CA.92019 619-660-4000 www.cuyamaca.edu
Please see the staff "shout out" from our friends at Chula Vista High School District Hydro Station handle on Twitter below.

The transformation of our future home has started! Today decals were added to entrance doors and a step & repeat banner was delivered for students, staff, & guests to take photos with! Thanks, @SweetwaterAuth Plant Maintenance Supervisor, Davis Doane for your support! #HSLearns
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Water District Board Members Give Themselves Insurance

The Union-Tribune’s editorial board came out against a South Bay water district board that voted to give itself health insurance.

"Board members with local water agencies — often politicians or politically connected people — don't always bring a lot of relevant expertise to the job," the paper opined, after it reported that Sweetwater Authority in Chula Vista voted 6-1 to expand already-existing health insurance coverage to dependents. "They generally meet no more than a few times a month, basically to bless staff recommendations."

Board member Josie Calderon-Scott, who voted against the benefit expansion, noted her and her fellow board members don't work full time — "not even part time," she said, according to the paper.

But Sweetwater isn't alone, several other local water districts offer some sort of health benefits to board members. According to an analysis by Sweetwater, the others are: Carlsbad, Helix, Lakeside, Olivenhain, Otay, Padre Dam, Rincon del Diablo, Santa Fe Irrigation District, Vallecitos, Vista, Yuima and the Leucadia Wastewater District.

The Morning Report was written by Ry Rivard and Andrew Keatts, and edited by Sara Libby.
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A water main broke and flooded a section of Chula Vista roads Saturday morning, according to the Chula Vista Police Department.

The flooding occurred near the intersection of Palomar Street and Bay Boulevard, police said.

CVPD received a call about the incident at around 6:30 a.m.

Water was rushing over the streets and sidewalks, even flowing down to the nearby railroad tracks.

The water has since been shut off. Businesses in the area have been affected.

Police could be seen blocking parts of the roads in the area.

CVPD and the Sweetwater Authority are responding.
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CALIFORNIA NATIVE PLANT SOCIETY
San Diego Chapter Newsletter

CHAPTER MEETING
Casa del Prado Room 101
Balboa Park
February 19, 2019

Schedule
6:30 pm – Natives for Novices
7:00 pm – Refreshments, browsing, & socializing.
7:30 pm - Announcements
7:45 pm – Main Presentation.

Chapter meetings are free and open to the public.

Natives for Novices:
Native Plant Propagation Basics
by Amy Huey

Amy Huey teaches Plant Propagation in the Cuyamaca College Ornamental Horticulture Program. She works for Sweetwater Authority as a Watershed Caretaker. She has served as a volunteer with CNPS-SD for over ten years having served on the Plant Sale Committee, Propagation Committee, and as the Seed and Bulb Sale team leader.

Main Presentation:
Inspect and Manage – A Regional, Collaborative Approach to Monitoring Rare Plant Species in San Diego County
by Jessie Vinje

In 2016, 2017, and 2018, the Conservation Biology Institute (CBI) and AECOM coordinated and implemented the San Diego Management and Monitoring Program (SDMMP) Management Strategic Plan (MSP) Inspect and Manage (IMG) regional rare plant monitoring protocol for 30 rare plant species on conserved lands in western San Diego County. SDMMP, in collaboration with the City of San Diego, CBI, and The Nature Conservancy, developed the threats-based monitoring protocol based on existing rare plant and habitat assessment protocols. The 2016 - 2018 monitoring effort involved greater than 50 entities, including federal and state wildlife agencies, local jurisdictions, non-profit land conservancies, private landowners, military, and volunteer organizations. They trained agency staff and volunteers through workshops and site visits, assisted land managers with monitoring, and monitored ‘orphan’ populations.

They monitored a total of 235, 205, and 227 rare plant occurrences in 2016, 2017 and 2018 respectively. For each occurrence, they collected data on species status, habitat attributes, and threats. Monitoring as many occurrences of a species within the same year using the same method improved their understanding of species status, threats, and management priorities. High priority occurrences will be eligible for regional management funding.

Jessie Vinje is a botanist with Conservation Biology Institute. She has over 20 years professional experience in field biology, botany and land management throughout California with a strong background in coastal and desert ecology, and natural resource management and restoration. She specializes in the flora of central and southern California coast and coastal ranges, western and central Mojave Desert, and central and southern Sierra Nevada Mountains where she has surveyed for and located more than 120 threatened, endangered, or sensitive plant species. She is a member of the San Diego Rare Plant Oversight Committee and the San Diego County Weed Management Area steering committee.

San Diego thornmint (Acanthomintha ilicifolia)
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To the newly elected and reelected SWEETWATER AUTHORITY BOARD MEMBERS. At
the December 12 Sweetwater Authority (Authority) Governing Board meeting,
STEVE CASTANEDA and HECTOR MARTINEZ were sworn into four-year terms as directors.
At the same meeting, the Authority's Governing Board appointed Castaneda as Board Chair and Jose
Preciado as Vice Chair for 2019-2020 term.

Castaneda was reelected to Division 1 and has served on the Authority's Board since
2014. Martinez is the newly-elected Director in Division 4. He replaces former Director
Teresa "Terry" Thomas, who retired from the Board after serving for 12 years.

The Authority's board is composed of seven members; five directors are elected by division by the citizens of the South Bay Irrigation District, and two directors are appointed by the Mayor of National City, subject to City Council confirmation.

Sweetwater Authority, a joint powers public agency, provides public water service to approximately 189,000 people residing in National City and the South Bay Irrigation District (which includes portions of Chula Vista and most of Bonita).
'The Great Flood of 1916': Could history repeat itself at the Sweetwater Dam?

Posted: 3:14 PM, Feb 21, 2019
Updated: 10:55 AM, Feb 22, 2019
By: Jermaine Ong

(KGTV) - The heavy rainfall of early 2019 has been a welcome sight for many in San Diego County hoping for an improvement in California's drought conditions.

However, with that rainfall comes some concern about the structural integrity of county dams and the potential for catastrophic flooding on par with a devastating event that happened over 100 years ago in the South Bay.

For over 100 years, the Sweetwater Dam has kept water in the Sweetwater Reservoir away from the city of Bonita. It has held back the reservoir, which supplies water to homes and businesses in Bonita, Chula Vista and National City, since 1888.

When construction was finished, the Sweetwater Dam was 90 feet tall. It was then considered the tallest masonry arch dam in the U.S., according to the American Society of Civil Engineers.
Nearly 30 years after it was erected, the dam was tested, with devastating results.

In January 1916, heavy rainfall across the county led to an overflow at the Sweetwater Dam - an event referred to by the South Bay Historical Society as “The Great Flood of 1916.”

The flooding killed eight people, and it sparked numerous changes to the dam, particularly to its size.

The concrete Sweetwater Dam now stands at 112 feet tall with a reservoir capacity of 28,079 acre-feet.

SAFETY CONCERNS?

In 2016, an official with California’s Department of Water Resources’ Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) told 10News that the Sweetwater Dam was unsafe and could potentially be a threat to anyone downstream. The official said the dam would not be able to withstand a flood similar to the 1916 flood.

The Sweetwater Authority, which oversees the dam, said at the time that it would begin the process of upgrading the structure by 2018.

In a response to this story and to clarify the official’s statements made in the 2016 story, Sweetwater Authority officials said: “To clarify, the state official said the Sweetwater Dam could not safely accommodate a flood event that would result in the water level overtopping the existing parapet walls of Sweetwater Dam. A flood substantially larger than the 1916 flood would be required to overtop the existing dam because it was fortified and increased in height after the 1916 flood. The recurrence interval for a storm to cause overtopping of the existing parapet walls is approximately 5,500 years. In the fall of 2016, Sweetwater Authority’s Governing Board approved the reallocation of reserve funds to fully fund the improvements to Sweetwater Dam and the South Dike to accommodate the Probable Maximum Flood. The Probable Maximum Flood is a worst-case flood event that is approximately three times the flow rate experienced in the 1916 flood.”

Chris Orrock with the Department of Water Resources said the Sweetwater Dam was last evaluated by the state in 2018, with a report explaining their assessment released to the public on Sept. 1, 2018.

Sweetwater Authority officials said the last on-site DSOD inspection was conducted on May 15, 2018.

According to the state’s 2018 evaluation, Sweetwater Dam is in “Fair” condition but was given a downstream hazard rating of “extremely high.”
A Fair rating is defined as "no existing dam safety deficiencies are recognized," while the state says an extremely high downstream hazard rating means the dam is "expected to cause considerable loss of human life or would result in an inundation area with a population of 1,000 or more" if the reservoir was full and a full collapse or breach occurred.

Orrock said the Sweetwater Authority submitted an application to the state to make additional improvements to the facility. The Authority has conducted their own evaluation of the dam, but Orrock told 10News that the state asked them to reevaluate and provide more information.

The state, Orrock said, has been requesting reevaluations at dams throughout the state since the February 2017 Oroville Dam crisis.

According to Orrock, the state has been working with Sweetwater Authority to make sure that the work they do "is to the highest quality necessary, knowing what we know after recent events."

The Sweetwater Authority confirmed that they are working with the DSOD “to perform all necessary inspections and maintenance and to design and construct improvements necessary to allow the Sweetwater Dam to accommodate a worst-case flood event.”

MANAGING WATER IN THE RESERVOIR

With rain seemingly falling at a record pace, the Sweetwater Authority said they conduct controlled water transfers to and from nearby reservoirs to manage any rain-related events. Officials said the measures allow for the Sweetwater Reservoir to maintain a safe water storage level that allows for no potential for overflow.

Authority officials said the Sweetwater Reservoir is "only about one-fourth full as a result of the multi-year drought." As of Feb. 20, 2019, there is only 7,270 acre-feet of water stored at the reservoir, which only accounts for just under 26 percent of the reservoir’s total capacity, officials said.

Sweetwater Authority officials said the Sweetwater Dam "is designed so water can flow through its spillways when the water level exceeds the maximum storage capacity, without compromising structural integrity and safety."

Water overflowing from the dam’s spillways "does not constitute a cause for concern," officials said.
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The Governing Board of Sweetwater Authority held a Regular meeting on Thursday, February 7, 2019, at the Sweetwater Authority Administrative Office, 505 Garrett Avenue, Chula Vista, California. Chair Castaneda called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

- Roll Call
  Directors Present: *Josie Calderon-Scott (left the meeting at 6:10 p.m.), *Jerry Cano (4:08 p.m.), Steve Castaneda, José F. Cerda, Hector Martinez, Jose Preciado, and Alejandra Sotelo-Solis
  Directors Absent: None
  Management, General Manager Tish Berge, Assistant General Manager Jennifer Sabine, Legal Counsel Paula de Sousa Mills, and Board Secretary Ligia Perez. Staff members: Administrative Assistant Michael Garcia.

- Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

- Opportunity for Public Comment (Government Code Section 54954.3)
  There were no members from the public.

**ACTION CALENDAR AGENDA**

- Workshop on Work Plan Development
  General Manager Berge provided an overview of the Annual Work Plan (Note: Director Cano entered the meeting at 4:08 p.m.). The Board had general discussion and provided direction on citizen and customer engagement, the Authority's purchasing policy (Note: Director Sotelo-Solis left the meeting at 5:02 p.m. and reentered the meeting at 5:04 p.m.); labor relations; maximizing assets (Note: Director Cerda left the meeting at 5:41 p.m. and reentered the meeting at 5:42 p.m.) (Note: Director Martinez left the meeting at 5:42 p.m. and reentered the meeting at 5:43 p.m.); evaluating the usage of Automated Meter Reading/Automated Meter Intelligence; recreation at the Authority's reservoirs; the Governing Board's meeting days and times; and governance. Ms. Berge informed the Board that the direction provided would be incorporated into the Strategic Plan Work Plan and be presented to the Board at a future meeting, and that Management would request additional clarification and prioritization as needed. (Note: Director Calderon-Scott left the meeting at 6:10 p.m.)

  No action was required from the Governing Board.

- Directors' Comments
  Director Preciado thanked staff for their engagement.

  Director Cano asked the Directors if they have attended the Local Government
Commission Yosemite Policymakers Conference and if they would share their experience with him.

- **Adjournment**
  
  With no further business before the Board, Chair Castaneda adjourned the meeting at 6:12 p.m.

______________________________
Steve Castaneda, Chair

Attest:

______________________________
Ligia Perez, Board Secretary
The Governing Board of Sweetwater Authority held a Regular meeting on Wednesday, February 13, 2019, at the Sweetwater Authority Administrative Office, 505 Garrett Avenue, Chula Vista, California. Chair Castaneda called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

- **Roll Call**  
  Directors Present: Josie Calderon-Scott, Jerry Cano, Steve Castaneda, José F. Cerda, Hector Martinez, *Jose Preciado (6:05 p.m.), and *Alejandra Sotelo-Solis (6:03 p.m.)  
  Directors Absent: None  
  Management, Staff and Others Present: General Manager Tish Berge, Assistant General Manager Jennifer Sabine, Legal Counsel Paula de Sousa Mills, and Board Secretary Ligia Perez. Others present: Mike Sampsel

- **Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag**

- **Opportunity for Public Comment** (Government Code Section 54954.3)  
  Mike Sampsel spoke to increases in employee salaries compared to increases in cost of living, inflation, and cost of water for the ten-year period 2006-2015.

  (Note: Director Sotelo-Solis entered the meeting at 6:03 p.m.)  
  (Note: Director Preciado entered the meeting at 6:05 p.m.)

- **Chair’s Presentation**  
  There was none.

**ACTION CALENDAR AGENDA**

1. **Items to be Added, Withdrawn, or Reordered on the Agenda**  
   There were none.

2. **Approval of Minutes - Regular Meeting of January 23, 2019**  
   Director Sotelo-Solis made a motion, seconded by Director Cano, that the Governing Board approve the minutes of the January 23, 2019 Regular meeting. The motion carried unanimously.

**Consent Calendar Items**

   Director Preciado made a motion, seconded by Director Cano, that the Governing Board approve the consent calendar. Director Castaneda recused himself from consideration of warrant numbers 150457, 150500, and 150534 due to his contract with Sempra Energy, parent company of SDG&E, which Director Castaneda disclosed on
the record. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Demands and Warrants – Check numbers 150425 through 150545 and electronic fund transfers 25937 through 26188

4. Hydrostation Memorandum of Understanding between Sweetwater Authority and Chula Vista Elementary School District (Communications Committee meeting of 1/30/19, Item 4. B) 
   Recommendation: Enter into the Hydrostation Memorandum of Understanding with Chula Vista Elementary School District

Action and Discussion Items

5. New Business
   A. Employee Engagement Survey Results
      General Manager Berge presented the results of the annual employee engagement survey.

   B. Board Ambassador Pilot Program
      Director Preciado made a motion, seconded by Chair Castaneda, to grant the Communications Committee Chair the opportunity to attend and evaluate events and meetings not currently pre-approved per Policy 511 and report back to the Board, using talking points that are relevant to water and prepared by the General Manager; and with the Authority paying any applicable attendance/registration fee, but no per diem. The motion carried unanimously.

   C. Discussion on Board Meeting Days and Times
      Mike Sampsel commented on meeting times.
      Director Preciado made a motion, seconded by Chair Castaneda, approving to initiate the process to move the meeting time for the second Board meeting of the month to 6:00 p.m. The motion carried, with Director Calderon-Scott opposing.

(Note: Director Martinez left the meeting at 7:40 p.m.)

6. Approval of Directors' Attendance at Meetings and Future Agenda Items
   A. Council of Water Utilities Meeting, San Diego County - Hotel Karlan San Diego – Tuesday, February 19, 2019

   B. California Special Districts Association - San Diego Chapter Quarterly Meeting – Wednesday, February 20, 2019

   C. Per diem approval for Directors who wish to attend the Local Government Commission's Annual Yosemite Leadership and Policy Conference – March 14-17, 2019

      Director Preciado made a motion, seconded by Director Cano, that the Governing Board approve per diem for Director's attendance at the Local Government Commission's
Annual Yosemite Leadership and Policy Conference - March 14-17, 2019. The motion carried unanimously, with Director Martinez absent.

(Note: Director Martinez reentered the meeting at 7:42 p.m.)

REPORTS AND INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

7. Committee Minutes

8. Report of Legal Counsel
   There was none.

9. Management Report
   A. Report of Assistant General Manager
      Ms. Sabine stated that the Quarterly Capital Project Update has been provided in the agenda packet.
   B. Report of General Manager
      Ms. Berge shared news of a recent meeting with ABM Utilities to review potential efficiency related to AMI/AMR technology; another meeting has been scheduled with ABM Utilities at no cost to the Authority; and Ms. Berge will be volunteering in local elementary schools as part of Junior Achievement Day in South Bay.

10. Reports by Directors on Events Attended
    There were none.

11. Directors' Comments
    Director Sotelo-Solis asked what the Authority does to recognize and engage the public. General Manager Berge replied that the Authority administrates contests that recognize students for their artwork and citizens for their landscaping. Director Sotelo-Solis also shared that the City of National City selected their fifth councilmember, Dr. Gonzalo Quintero.

    Director Cerda commented on the water main break near Main Street in January; the Authority received commendation from Chula Vista Councilmember Jill Galvez for its quick resolve.

CLOSED SESSION

At 7:46 p.m., the Board convened to meet in closed session with legal counsel for:

- A. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation – Significant exposure to Litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9 (d)(2): Two Potential Cases

There was no need for a closed session on item B., Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9 (d)(1); United States, et al. ex rel John Hendrix v. J-M Manufacturing Company Inc., and Formosa Plastics Corporation, U.S.A., case No. ED CV06-00055-GW.
There were no minutes taken, and the session was not audio-recorded. At 9:00 p.m., Chair Castaneda declared the meeting to be in open session. No reportable action was taken by the Governing Board.

22. Adjournment

With no further business before the Board, Chair Castaneda adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

______________________________
Steve Castaneda, Chair

Attest:

______________________________
Ligia Perez, Board Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warrant Number</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Payable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150546-</td>
<td>$2,815.33</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150550</td>
<td>31.32</td>
<td>Hector M. Martinez</td>
<td>Reimbursement - expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150552</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>Josephine L. Calderon-Scott</td>
<td>Reimbursement - expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150553</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150554</td>
<td>20,597.51</td>
<td>John Hancock USA</td>
<td>Employer's contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150555</td>
<td>709.00</td>
<td>Lincoln National Life Insurance Co.</td>
<td>Employees' contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150556</td>
<td>2,654.62</td>
<td>Nationwide Retirement Solutions, Inc.</td>
<td>Employees' contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150557</td>
<td>274.62</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150558</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>California Aquatics</td>
<td>Monthly fountain service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150559-</td>
<td>1,025.00</td>
<td>City of National City - Finance Department</td>
<td>Facility deposit and rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150560</td>
<td>372.00</td>
<td>Coastal Chlorination and Backflow</td>
<td>Chlorination service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150562</td>
<td>437.33</td>
<td>Copy Link Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly copier maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150563</td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
<td>Cox Communications, Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly cable services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150564</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>CSDA, San Diego Chapter</td>
<td>Reservation - Directors Castaneda, Cerda, Martinez, Preciado, Sotelo-Solis, and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150565</td>
<td>7,672.15</td>
<td>Domino Solar, LTD</td>
<td>Solar electricity service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150566</td>
<td>28,103.21</td>
<td>Enterprise Automation, Inc.</td>
<td>SCADA - capital and expense projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150567</td>
<td>813.75</td>
<td>Fit To Work, Inc.</td>
<td>Comprehensive ergonomic evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150568</td>
<td>83.35</td>
<td>Golden State Overnight</td>
<td>Delivery services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150569</td>
<td>6,622.02</td>
<td>Hawthorne Machinery Co.</td>
<td>Equipment rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150570</td>
<td>2,539.00</td>
<td>Hudson Safe<em>T</em>Lite Rentals</td>
<td>Traffic control plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150571</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>Manager Tools LLC</td>
<td>Staff training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150572</td>
<td>10,098.54</td>
<td>Pacific Pipeline Supply</td>
<td>Inventory supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150573</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>PARS - Public Agency Retirement Services</td>
<td>Monthly trust administrator service fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150574</td>
<td>9,787.50</td>
<td>Powerland Equipment, Inc.</td>
<td>Equipment rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150575</td>
<td>2,865.79</td>
<td>Republic Services, Inc.</td>
<td>Waste collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150576</td>
<td>10,593.20</td>
<td>San Diego Concrete Cutting Co.</td>
<td>Trench concrete saw cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150577</td>
<td>690.00</td>
<td>San Diego County Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>Splash Lab - Olivewood Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150578</td>
<td>223,561.94</td>
<td>San Diego Gas &amp; Electric</td>
<td>Gas and electric service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150579</td>
<td>346.40</td>
<td>Sectran Security, Inc.</td>
<td>Monthly armored car service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150580</td>
<td>854.00</td>
<td>Separation Processes, Inc.</td>
<td>Operation support services - Desal Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150581</td>
<td>1,511.00</td>
<td>Sharp Rees-Steady Medical Group</td>
<td>Regulatory medical exams and tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150582</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>Professional certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150583</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
<td>SVPR Communications</td>
<td>Community outreach consulting services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150584</td>
<td>3,832.50</td>
<td>Timberline Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td>SCADA - capital and expense projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150585</td>
<td>37.22</td>
<td>United Parcel Service</td>
<td>Delivery services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction ID</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150586</td>
<td>$210.29</td>
<td>USA Blue Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150587</td>
<td>241.75</td>
<td>VWR International, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150588</td>
<td>20,587.35</td>
<td>West Coast Sand &amp; Gravel, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150589</td>
<td>524.99</td>
<td>Antonio Blas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150590</td>
<td>331.75</td>
<td>Daisy Iriemedio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150591</td>
<td>200.55</td>
<td>Sema Construction, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150592</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>Stevens Real Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150593</td>
<td>156.12</td>
<td>Wakeland Housing and Development Co</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150594</td>
<td>3,321.66</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150595</td>
<td>38,381.60</td>
<td>ABC Construction Company, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150596</td>
<td>109.69</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150597</td>
<td>1,952.00</td>
<td>Brenntag Pacific, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150598</td>
<td>71.55</td>
<td>Calolympic Glove &amp; Safety Company, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150600</td>
<td>768.42</td>
<td>City of National City - Finance Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150601</td>
<td>1,258.00</td>
<td>City of San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150602</td>
<td>48,963.08</td>
<td>City of San Diego City Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150603</td>
<td>207.00</td>
<td>Clay Clifton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150604</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>CSDA, San Diego Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150605</td>
<td>86,178.53</td>
<td>Enterprise Automation, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150606</td>
<td>15,143.83</td>
<td>Enterprise FM Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150607</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td>Firemaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150608</td>
<td>1,520.00</td>
<td>Friends of the Water Conservation Garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150609</td>
<td>712.92</td>
<td>Global Power Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150610</td>
<td>2,016.00</td>
<td>Hanson Aggregates, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150611</td>
<td>8,054.00</td>
<td>Hudson Safe<em>T</em>Lite Rentals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150612</td>
<td>4,735.00</td>
<td>Merkel &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150613</td>
<td>10,383.75</td>
<td>PACE, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150614</td>
<td>2,953.65</td>
<td>Pacific Pipeline Supply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150615</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>Prизм Janitorial Services, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150616</td>
<td>1,640.00</td>
<td>San Diego County Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150617</td>
<td>6,473.07</td>
<td>San Diego Gas &amp; Electric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150618</td>
<td>54,762.16</td>
<td>Timberline Engineering, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150619</td>
<td>64,438.13</td>
<td>Tyler Technologies, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150620</td>
<td>2,466.00</td>
<td>V&amp;A Consulting Engineers, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150621</td>
<td>15,901.82</td>
<td>West Coast Sand &amp; Gravel, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150622</td>
<td>1,722.32</td>
<td>Western Water Works Supply Co., Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150623</td>
<td>1,086.86</td>
<td>KD 31st LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150624</td>
<td>1,683.63</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Electronic Transfer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26189</td>
<td>$299,972.41</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26368</td>
<td>89.90</td>
<td>Steven Castaneda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26369</td>
<td>757.84</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26370</td>
<td>286.00</td>
<td>City Employees Association (CEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26371</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>SWA Confidential Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26372</td>
<td>3,218.89</td>
<td>SWA Employees Committee (SAEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26373</td>
<td>439.00</td>
<td>SWA Association (SARA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26374</td>
<td>19,360.11</td>
<td>CalPERS 457 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26375</td>
<td>72,717.83</td>
<td>CalPERS Retirement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26376</td>
<td>20,725.57</td>
<td>EDD State of California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26377</td>
<td>121,087.84</td>
<td>Internal Revenue Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26378</td>
<td>1,773.10</td>
<td>WageWorks, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26379</td>
<td>958,463.19</td>
<td>San Diego County Water Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26380</td>
<td>1,332.92</td>
<td>WageWorks, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26381</td>
<td>143.85</td>
<td>Boot World, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26382</td>
<td>540.00</td>
<td>California Commercial Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26383</td>
<td>121.00</td>
<td>Clinical Laboratory of San Bernardo, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26384</td>
<td>184.34</td>
<td>Corodata Media Storage, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26385</td>
<td>555.48</td>
<td>Corodata Records Management, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26386</td>
<td>2,304.79</td>
<td>Diamond Environmental Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26387</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>Door-Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26388</td>
<td>264.81</td>
<td>Evoqua Water Technologies LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26389</td>
<td>10,378.50</td>
<td>Hach Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26390</td>
<td>14,435.61</td>
<td>Hidden Valley Pump Systems, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26391</td>
<td>808.31</td>
<td>Idexx Laboratories, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26392</td>
<td>84.05</td>
<td>Jupin Graphics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26393</td>
<td>1,554.93</td>
<td>Myriad Industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26394</td>
<td>1,088.00</td>
<td>OfficeTeam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26395</td>
<td>101.14</td>
<td>Onesource Distributors LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26396</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>Pacific Safety Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26397</td>
<td>464.22</td>
<td>Prudential Overall Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26398</td>
<td>1,668.81</td>
<td>The SOCO Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26399</td>
<td>1,881.70</td>
<td>Thermo Electron North America LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26400</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>Juan J. Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26401</td>
<td>1,197.99</td>
<td>Airgas USA, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26402</td>
<td>582.37</td>
<td>Benny D. WynnDham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26403</td>
<td>133.09</td>
<td>Boot World, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26404</td>
<td>$227.50</td>
<td>California Commercial Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26405</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>Clinical Laboratory of San Bernardino, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26406</td>
<td>1,464.00</td>
<td>Eurofins Eaton Analytical, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26407</td>
<td>5,750.95</td>
<td>Idexx Laboratories, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26408</td>
<td>5,546.36</td>
<td>JCI Jones Chemicals, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26409</td>
<td>278.71</td>
<td>Microbiologics, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26410</td>
<td>336.30</td>
<td>ProBuild Company LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26411</td>
<td>87.80</td>
<td>Strategy 7 Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26412</td>
<td>281.69</td>
<td>The SOCO Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26413</td>
<td>291,661.74</td>
<td>Payroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$2,590,742.84  Warrant Disbursements**
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 Deere 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
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
  - 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.
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August 28, 2018
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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 loads 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]
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.
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
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TO:        Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)
FROM:     Management
DATE:     February 15, 2019
SUBJECT:  Consideration to Award a Contract for Desktop Computer (PC) Purchase

SUMMARY
The Purchasing Section issued a Request for Quote (RFQ) to three (3) suppliers regarding a contract to purchase one hundred fifty (150) Desktop Computers. The purchased computers will fully replace all machines in use across the Authority originally purchased between 2011 and 2013. Industry standard for replacement of computers is between three (3) and five (5) years.

The RFQ was posted on the Authority’s website in an effort to reach additional suppliers. Three (3) bid proposals were received. The second lowest bid submitted by Red River Technology LLC is deemed nonresponsive as they did not meet the required specifications for physical delivery of a sealed bid document by the required bid deadline.

The summary of the responsive bid proposals is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplier</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDW Government LLC</td>
<td>$125,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utile ITServices Inc.</td>
<td>$134,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lowest, responsive, and responsible bidder is CDW Government LLC. The Authority has purchased other PCs and equipment from CDW Government LLC and has no concerns with its ability to deliver the required materials on time.

FISCAL IMPACT
The contract cost is estimated to be $125,434, with funding included in the FY 2018-19 Operating Expense Budget.
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POLICY
The Authority's Procurement Policy requires that the Finance and Personnel Committee and Governing Board approve all equipment purchases in excess of $50,000.

Strategic Plan Objective SR9: Cost-effectively maintain facilities and infrastructure to optimize their useful life and performance.

ALTERNATIVES
1) Declare the bid from Red River Technology LLC as nonresponsive; and award a contract in an amount not-to-exceed $125,434 to CDW Government LLC, Vernon Hills, IL, for the purchase of 150 desktop computers.

2) Reject all bids and direct staff to conduct another RFQ.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Governing Board declare the bid from Red River Technology LLC as nonresponsive; and award a contract in an amount not-to-exceed $125,434, to CDW Government LLC, Vernon Hills, IL, for the purchase of 150 desktop computers.
TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)  
FROM: Management  
DATE: February 15, 2019  
SUBJECT: One-Time Adjustment to Customer Water Bill

**SUMMARY**

| Soapy Joe's Bonita Inc.  
3048 Bonita Road, Bonita | HCF | Commodity Amount |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Bill Under Review for Adjustment (a)</td>
<td>7,715</td>
<td>$37,576.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Bi-Monthly Water Bill (prior 12 months)</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>$6,976.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Average Water Use at Wholesale Rate</td>
<td>7,715 - 1,118 = 6598</td>
<td>$19,794.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Total Amount Due (b)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>26,770.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of One-Time Adjustment (a-b)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,806.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY/STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE**

It is the Board’s policy to set rules for adjusting customer’s water bills so as not to profit by a customer’s misfortune. Under this policy, the General Manager is authorized to approve adjustments up to $1,500; adjustments in excess of $1,500 shall be approved by the Board. In addition, all one-time adjustments are provided without a specific reason.

**ALTERNATIVES**

1. Approve the one-time adjustment to Soapy Joe’s Bonita Inc.’s account in the amount of $10,806.60.

2. Grant Soapy Joe’s Bonita Inc. an extended payment plan to pay the balance of $37,583.48 over a twelve month period with no adjustment.

3. Deny the request.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve a one-time adjustment in the amount of $10,806.60 to the account of Soapy Joe’s Bonita Inc.
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TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)  
FROM: Management  
DATE: February 15, 2019  
SUBJECT: Consideration to Approve Contract Amendment No. 5 to GEi Consultants, Inc., for Condition Assessment of North and South Spillways of Sweetwater Dam

SUMMARY
The Authority is contracted with GEi Consultants, Inc. (GEi) to assist the Authority with bid and construction phase support and construction management services for the Sweetwater Dam and South Dike Improvements Project (Project). Final design plans and specifications for the Project were electronically submitted to the California Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) for review and approval on May 4, 2018. On August 1, 2018, DSOD responded with comments on both the plans and specifications. The Authority and GEi made the necessary revisions to the plans and specifications and resubmitted them to DSOD for review and approval on October 22, 2018.

On December 3, 2018, DSOD informed the Authority that all previous DSOD comments were satisfactorily addressed; however, DSOD now had new requirements that were not previously discussed. Under these new requirements, the Authority must perform a condition assessment of the North and South Spillways to further evaluate the concrete lining, drainage system, foundation materials, and geologic conditions adjacent to and underneath the spillways. Even though both spillways have been evaluated before, this new requirement by DSOD is a result of the major incident that occurred at Oroville Dam, where significant damage and erosion of the Service and Emergency Spillways occurred. As a result of the Oroville incident, former Governor Jerry Brown issued a plan to bolster DSOD's Dam Safety Program, ordering detailed evaluations of dam appurtenant structures, such as spillways. DSOD is expediting evaluations for dams with high and extremely high hazard classifications as it relates to downstream inundation and damages, in case of dam failure. DSOD has classified Sweetwater Dam and its appurtenant structures as extremely high hazard.

The Authority received a proposal from GEi on January 2, 2019, to perform the additional condition assessment of the spillways, for an amount not-to-exceed $125,734. The proposed scope of work was forwarded by email to DSOD on the same day to obtain DSOD approval before proceeding with the actions necessary to authorize GEi to perform the work. DSOD approved the proposed scope of work by email on
January 7, 2019, but recommended that the non-destructive testing methods described in the optional Task 5 of GEi's original proposal be included in the scope of work. The Authority immediately requested a revised proposal from GEi that includes a cost for the non-destructive testing methods.

The revised GEi proposal was received on January 17, 2019 for an amount not-to-exceed $169,244. Authority staff concurs with DSOD’s recommendation because including them will provide a more comprehensive assessment of both spillways. The non-destructive testing methods, now included in Task 2 of the revised GEi proposal, would be able to detect any structural deficiencies and potential void space underneath the concrete lining of both spillways that might not be able to be detected by the visual inspection methods described in Task 2 of the proposal.

The following table provides a summary of project design activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 2018</td>
<td>Final design plans and specification submitted to DSOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 2018</td>
<td>DSOD responded with comments on both the plans and specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22, 2018</td>
<td>Authority and GEI made the necessary revisions to the plans and specifications and resubmitted them to DSOD for review and approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 2018</td>
<td>DSOD informed the Authority of new requirements for additional condition assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2, 2019</td>
<td>Authority received a proposal from GEI for the additional required work; proposal was forwarded to DSOD for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7, 2019</td>
<td>DSOD approved scope of work, but made additional recommendation to include non-destructive testing methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 2019</td>
<td>GEI sent revised proposal with additional scope of work for non-destructive testing methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FISCAL IMPACT
The $169,244 cost associated with the condition assessment of the North and South Spillways results in an increase to the contract with GEI from $219,580 to $388,824. Funds for this project are budgeted in the Sweetwater Dam PMF Project Reserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Contract: GEI Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>$219,580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Scope of Work</td>
<td>169,244.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contract Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$388,824.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance of Sweetwater Dam PMF Project Reserve</td>
<td>$6,340,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: funds previously allocated from Sweetwater Dam PMF Project Reserve</td>
<td>(219,580.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: additional funds allocated from Sweetwater Dam PMF Project Reserve</td>
<td>(169,244.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance of Project Reserve</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,951,476</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 SR5: Address Division of Safety of Dams and maintenance requirements to accommodate the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) for Sweetwater Dam and stairs replacement at Loveland Dam
  - 002.00 Prepare design, environmental document, advertise bids, and construction Sweetwater Dam PMF and South Spillway Improvements (bond funded)

ALTERNATIVES
1. Approve contract Amendment No. 5 with GEI Consultants, Inc., Carlsbad, CA, for the scope of work relating to a condition assessment of the North and South Spillways of Sweetwater Dam (including non-destructive testing), in an amount not-to-exceed $169,244.

2. Reject DSOD's recommendation and approve the original GEI proposal received on January 2, 2019 for an amount not-to-exceed $125,734, with the understanding that it does not include DSOD's recommendation for non-destructive testing.
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RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Governing Board approve Contract Amendment No. 5 with
GEI Consultants, Inc., Carlsbad, CA, for the scope of work relating to a condition
assessment of the North and South Spillways of Sweetwater Dam, in an amount not-to-
exceed $169,244.

ATTACHMENT
Proposal from GEI
January 15, 2019
P1804968

Erick Del Bosque, P.E.
Engineering Manager
Sweetwater Authority
505 Garrett Ave.
Chula Vista, CA 91910

Re: Proposal for Condition Assessment of South and North Spillways of Sweetwater Dam

Dear Mr. Del Bosque:

This letter is a proposal by GEI Consultants, Inc. (GEI) to perform a comprehensive condition assessment of the south spillway and north (siphon) spillway of Sweetwater Dam owned by Sweetwater Authority (Authority). This condition assessment was requested to be performed by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), Division of Safety of Dams (DSOD) in their December 5, 2018 email to the Authority. DSOD's request is a result of recent major incidents at Oroville Dam which led to significant damage to its service and emergency spillways.

Scope of Work

Our proposed scope of work is based on specialized experience gained over the past 18 months performing more than 30 comprehensive spillway condition assessments for dams in California in response to DSOD’s requests.

Our proposed scope of work consists of the following tasks:

- Task 1 – Review Existing Information
- Task 2 – Field Inspection
- Task 3 – Evaluation and Report
- Task 4 – Project Management and Meeting
- Task 5 – Optional Services

Task 1 – Review Existing Information

Prior to performing our field inspection, GEI will review existing drawings, reports, and repair records of the spillways previously provided to us by the Authority. We request
that the Authority provide any other relevant documents related to the spillway condition assessment, especially any additional records of previous repairs and maintenance, construction documents, and history of spills. GEI will also obtain PDF copies of all DSOD files on Sweetwater Dam. This PDF copy of DSOD files will be provided to the Authority. We will perform a thorough review of information pertaining to the geology, design and construction, hydrology and hydraulics, instrumentation, and historical performance of the spillways.

Task 2 – Field Inspection

Visual Inspection

Prior to conducting the field inspection of the spillways, GEI will prepare a brief work plan for review by the Authority and ultimate submission to DSOD for approval. GEI will also prepare a project-specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) for performance of the field work.

The visual inspection will be performed by a three-party team of GEI professionals that will include an engineering geologist and two civil/geotechnical engineers who are experienced in spillway and dam inspections and identification of geologic hazards.

The discharge chute of the south spillway and the six barrels of the siphon spillway will require rope access to perform detailed inspections. In addition, the six barrels of the siphon spillway are permit-required confined spaces. GEI will engage Rescue Solutions as a subcontractor to address rope access logistics and confined space entry concerns. GEI has teamed with Rescue Solutions on several other spillway inspection projects to provide similar services. Rescue Solutions will assist GEI by providing:

- Rope access set-up and operation to support the inspection
- Rescue support as needed for any on-rope or medical emergency
- Confined space rescue stand-by crew(s) for permit required entries

Precautions such as air monitoring will be employed while inspecting the siphons and will be detailed in the HASP. We anticipate that the field inspection will require up to five working days to complete. This is mainly due to the complexities associated with rope access to the south spillway chute and six barrels of the siphon spillway.

GEI will visually inspect the condition of the existing spillways including the concrete and any exposed bedrock foundation conditions. The inspection will include performing qualitative soundings along the spillways by striking the concrete surfaces with a rock hammer and noting any hollow delaminated concrete, or “drummy” zones that may indicate voids beneath the concrete. The conditions of each concrete panel will be tabulated and mapped, noting items such as: cracks and concrete defects; joint conditions and joint offsets; tilt, bulging, or warping of walls and slab panels; spalling and delamination of concrete; exposed aggregate and/or reinforcing steel; previous
repairs and the condition and type of existing repairs; and observable portions of any drainage systems.

Geologic inspections of the materials adjacent to the spillways will be performed. The inspection will include: mapping and characterization of discontinuities such as joints, shear zones, and bedding; qualitative evaluation of rock hardness and degree of weathering; characterization of soils; and any evidence of undermining of the spillway or head cutting erosion at the ends of spillway chutes.

A photographic record of observed conditions will be maintained during the inspection and will be included in the report.

Non-Destructive Testing

At the request of the DSOD, we have included non-destructive testing (NDT) in this first phase of the inspection. We plan to perform the NDT at the same time as the visual inspection described above to take advantage of Rescue Solutions mobilization to the site to provide rope access and rescue team support. The NDT will be performed by a two-party team of GEI professionals.

Equipment will be brought to the site to perform NDT using the following techniques: Impulse Response Spectrum (ASTM C-1740), Ground Penetrating Radar (ASTM D-6432), and Impact Echo (ASTM C-1383). The locations where various test techniques will be performed will be based on access constraints, design details shown on existing drawings, and informed by the visual inspection data. NDT will be performed in the south spillway (relatively flat upper portion and steep downstream chute) and siphon spillway (discharge chambers and runout section). The relatively thick concrete in the siphons and steep to overhanging geometry will limit the number of NDT methods that can be employed in the siphon chambers. The likely focus of the NDT work within the siphon chambers will be to confirm rebar spacing and typical concrete cover over the rebar with respect to the design drawings. We plan to perform this type of testing on the floor and lower portions of the walls of at least one siphon chamber.

Where practical, multiple testing techniques will be used to help corroborate the test results. We plan to drill a few (4 to 6) small diameter (3/4-inch) holes through concrete slabs (and possibly walls) to corroborate slab thickness data obtained from the NDT, and also to corroborate NDT data that may indicate the presence of voids below slabs. These small holes will be backfilled with a two-component, polymer-modified, Portland cement-based, fast-setting, non-sag mortar such as SikaTop 123 Plus (or similar).

We have budgeted to perform four days of NDT at the site, likely two days at each spillway. If time allows (and results warrant) we will expand the NDT work to include an additional siphon chamber.
Assumptions

We have assumed that the field inspection will be performed at a time when the reservoir is below the upstream access location for the siphon spillway and that the spillways are free of water, debris, moss or other vegetation. GEI will work with the Authority to identify any site-specific hazards and address those concerns as appropriate.

Task 3 – Evaluation and Report

Potential failure modes of each spillway will be identified. Design details will be compared to the state of practice for modern spillway designs. This comparison and our expertise and understanding of spillway failure modes will be used along with results of the field inspection to evaluate the adequacy of the spillways. This evaluation will consider planned improvements to the south spillway, as documented in reports, plan drawings, and specifications previously submitted to the Authority by GEI, and subsequently reviewed by DSOD.

A condition assessment report will be prepared covering both the south spillway and siphon spillway. The report will document and describe the condition of the spillways and identify any areas of concern such as defects, areas requiring repair, potential risk reduction measures, and other significant observations from the field inspection. The report will include a summary of historical performance of the spillways, and conclusions and recommendations. Recommendations may include the need for further exploration and/or field testing.

Electronic copies of the draft report in MS Word and PDF formats will be provided to the Authority for review and comment. GEI will incorporate Authority comments on the draft report into the final report. GEI will provide hard copies of the final report, as well as electronic files in MS Word and PDF.

The final report will be submitted to DSOD by the Authority for their review and comment.

Task 4 – Project Management and Meeting

GEI will maintain close communication with the Authority throughout the course of the work and provide updates on progress, schedule, and budget on a monthly basis along with our invoices. GEI will plan for and participate in one meeting with the Authority to discuss the results of the condition assessment work.

Task 5 – Optional Services

At this time, GEI is not proposing additional tasks be performed as part of the spillway condition assessment. However, the condition assessment described above may
indicate the need to perform a second phase of field investigation, involving destructive testing. Examples of destructive testing may include:

- **Concrete Coring** – Concrete coring would involve obtaining samples of spillway concrete for use in laboratory testing to further characterize the properties of the concrete.

- **Borings** – Borings would involve mobilization of a drilling rig to obtain samples of soil and/or rock to further characterize the properties of these materials at depth below the spillway.

Optional services could also include more detailed geologic investigation (geologic field mapping) and/or unmanned aerial video survey (drone survey) for further documentation of spillway and geologic conditions. If additional investigations are judged to be warranted, or required by DSOD, GEI will develop a scope of work and fee estimate for performing the additional work for review by the Authority.

We have assumed that the results of the spillway condition assessment will not require the need to modify the existing final design plans and specifications for the Sweetwater Dam and South Dike Improvements Project, which includes improvements to the south spillway. If modification of these plans and specifications are warranted, GEI will develop a scope of work and fee estimate to make any necessary changes for review by the Authority.

**Fee Estimate**

Our fee estimate for performing the scope of work described above for Tasks 1 to 4 is $169,244 as summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>GEI Labor &amp; Expenses $</th>
<th>Rescue Solutions (Subcontractor) $</th>
<th>Total $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Review Existing Information</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Field Inspection</td>
<td>76,598</td>
<td>26,750</td>
<td>103,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Evaluation and Report</td>
<td>48,876</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Project Management and Meeting</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>142,494</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>169,244</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A detailed breakdown of the fee estimate is contained in Attachment A. A proposal from Rescue Solutions for performance of their portion of the work is contained in Attachment B. Rescue Solutions billing will be based on a July 2017 Standard Expense Sheet contained in their proposal.
GEI will not exceed the authorized budget unless written approval to do so is received from the Authority.

**Schedule**

We anticipate that a work plan for the field inspection can be submitted to the Authority for review within three weeks of receiving notice to proceed. The field inspection would be scheduled following DSOD review and approval of the work plan. GEI will coordinate with the Authority for performance of the field inspection, assumed to be in March or April 2019. We anticipate that a draft report of the spillway condition assessment can be submitted to the Authority within three months of completion of the field inspection.

Please contact me at 760-795-1972 or tkeller@geiconsultants.com if you have any questions regarding this proposal.

Sincerely,

GEI CONSULTANTS, INC.

Thomas O. Keller, P.E., G.E.
Project Manager, Vice President

David A. Gutierrez, P.E., G.E.
Vice President
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## ATTACHMENT A

**Condition Assessment of South Spillway and North Spillway**  
**Sweetwater Dam**  
GEI Consultants, Inc. Fee Estimate  
Sweetwater Authority  
01/15/2019

### Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Labor Hours</th>
<th>Total Labor Hours</th>
<th>Labor Cost</th>
<th>Direct Expenses</th>
<th>Sub-contractor (Note 1)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review Existing Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Information Review (Note 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 16 4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0 0 16 16 0 0 0 0 0 36</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct Field Inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Health &amp; Safety Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td>$1,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Work Plan</td>
<td>2 8 4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$3,036</td>
<td>$3,036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Base Maps, Field Sheets</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,284</td>
<td>$1,284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Geologic Mapping</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,712</td>
<td>$1,712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Visual Inspection (Note 3)</td>
<td>120 60</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>$34,200</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$26,750</td>
<td>$69,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Non-Destructive Testing (Note 4)</td>
<td>2 112</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$21,566</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$26,066</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2 2 143 116 0 68 0 0 0 0 331</td>
<td>$83,148</td>
<td>$13,450</td>
<td>$26,750</td>
<td>$169,348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluations and Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Draft Report</td>
<td>24 4 24 6 24</td>
<td>24 16 6 194</td>
<td>$39,256</td>
<td>$39,256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Final Report</td>
<td>4 2 4 8 4 2 4 48</td>
<td>$9,570</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$9,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>28 6 120 32 0 28 0 0 18 10 242</td>
<td>$48,826</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$48,876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Project Management and Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Meetings and Project Management</td>
<td>16 12 2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$7,520</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$8,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>16 0 12 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 30</td>
<td>$7,520</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46 8 291 186 0 100 0 0 18 10 639</td>
<td>$126,494</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$26,750</td>
<td>$169,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Rescue Solutions for rope access set-up and operation, rescue support for on-rope or medical emergency, and confined space rescue crew.
2. Direct expense of $2,000 is estimated cost for making copies of all DSOD files related to Sweetwater Dam.
3. GEI inspection crew of three GEI personnel certified for rope access, on site for up to five days.
4. GEI inspection crew of two NOT specialized GEI personnel certified for rope access, on site for up to four days.
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ATTACHMENT B

January 14, 2019

GEI Consultants

ATT: Chris Slack
Via Email:
Cslack@geiconsultants.com

Dear Sir:

Regarding Rope Access and Rescue Stand-By Services for Spillway inspection at Sweetwater Dam Spillway.
Services are as follows:

LOCATION
Sweetwater Dam Spillway

SCHEDULE
TBD 2019

JOB SCOPE
Provide rope access set-up and operation as needed to support inspection of spillway.
Provide Rescue support as needed for any on-rope or medical emergency.
Provide Confined Space Rescue Stand-By crew(s) for permit required entries.

SERVICE INCLUDES
1 Rescue Module
  - Ropes and Hardware for anchoring and rigging retrieval lines
  - Multi-pod, Sked/Stokes Litter
  - SCBA/Supplied Air, Hard line Communication, Radios
  - Air monitoring and Ventilation fan

3 Rescue Technicians
  - Certified for Confined Space Rescue
  - CPR/EMS First responder, Fire Department Personal
QUOTATION

ESTIMATED 5 Days 1 Team M-F 12HR $17,750.00
Additional Rescue Tech (@ 1,400 12HR day) 5 Days M-F $7,000.00
ESTIMATED 1 MOVE IN $2,000.00

NOT TO EXCEED Total $26,750.00

Includes
Crew, Module, Hotel, per diem, vehicle
8 hr. min
Cancellation with less than 16 hours notice will be charged
An 8 hour day.
Sat is overtime and Sun is double time

Changes or delays to the agreed upon schedule will result in additional crew charges in accord with the attached Rescue Solutions Standard Expense Sheet as of July 2017.

Please contact Ron at 707-391-5881 should you have any questions. Thank you for the opportunity to quote.

Sincerely,

ERICA FRANKLIN

Rescue Solutions
Office 707-670-0272
20250 S HWY 101
Hopland, CA 95449
RescueSolutions.net
STANDARD EXPENSE SHEET
As of July 2017

SERVICE INCLUDES
1 Rescue Module
- Ropes and Hardware for anchoring and rigging retrieval/rescue systems
- Multipod (tri-pod), Sked/Stokes Litter
- SCBA/Supplied Air, Hard line Communication, Radios
- Air monitoring and Ventilation fan for rescue personnel

2 Rescue Technicians
- Confined Space Rescue Trained
- Swift-Water Rescue Trained (As required)
- CPR/EMS First responder, Fire Department Personal

Rescue Crew Rate with Rescue Gear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8 Hr Day:</th>
<th>10 Hr Day:</th>
<th>12 Hr Day:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truck/Gear</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Techs</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Overtime</td>
<td></td>
<td>+$600 Overtime</td>
<td>+$1,200 Overtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>$2,350.00</td>
<td>$2,950.00</td>
<td>$3,550.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are our standard rates for Rescue Stand-by:
Technician Labor Rate __________ $100.00/Hour /Technician 1-8hr
Overtime Labor Rate __________ $150.00/Hour /Technician 9-12hr
Overtime Labor Rate __________ $200.00/Hour /Technician 13-24hr
Saturday Labor Rate __________ $150.00/Hour /Technician 1-8hr
Saturday Labor Rate __________ $200.00/Hour /Technician 9-24hr
Sunday Labor Rate __________ $200.00/Hour /Technician 1-24hr
Rescue Gear __________ $700.00/Day
Truck __________ $50.00/Day
Mobilization (In/Out) __________ $400.00 per move in/out (Per Quote)
*These items are broken down here for informational purposes only; these prices are factored into the above technician rate and may be subject to change.

Hotel__________________________ $150.00/Day/Technician or cost**
Per Diem______________________ $50.00/Day/Technician**
Travel________________________ $75.00/hour/Technician (to and from job site)
Mobilization__________________ Per Quotation; $1.00 per Mile
Demobilization__________________ Per Quotation; $1.00 per Mile

*These items are additional if needed for work requested.

Daily Job Site Mileage___________ Per Quotation; $1.25/Mile
Air Fare_______________________ Cost
Freight________________________ Cost
Rental Vehicle__________________ Cost

*Should worked requested require the use of our rescue boat:

Rescue Boat____________________ $500 a day
17.5’ 10 person Zodiac W/40hp
Rescue Boat____________________ $250 a day
14’ White Water Raft
TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)
FROM: Management
DATE: February 15, 2019
SUBJECT: Consideration of Changes to Director's Fees

SUMMARY
Members of the Governing Board (Board) of the Authority receive per diem, also referred to as "Director’s Fees", for occasions that constitute the performance of official duties, in an amount that is established by the Board in accordance with state law and for the actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of such official duties.

Presently, Director’s Fees in the amount of $150 per day, as established by the Board in accordance with the Water Code Sections 20200-20207, shall be paid for attendance at the following:

A. Regular, Special, or Adjourned meetings of the Board.
B. Board Committee, Interagency Committees/Boards, and Ad Hoc Committee meetings.
C. Meetings of other organizations, where such attendance constitutes the performance of a Director's official duties, as provided for by Policy 511; however, Directors shall not receive Director’s Fees for travel days immediately preceding and/or following the day on which a conference or meeting is held.
D. Designated functions at the direction of the Board by motion, either prior to the function or at the next regular Board meeting following the function.
E. Chairperson’s attendance at Board agenda preparation meetings with Management and the General Manager’s performance evaluation by the Chairperson, or Vice Chairperson’s attendance at such meetings and performance evaluations in the event the Chairperson is unable to attend.

Per Water Code Section 20202, the increase in the amount of compensation which may be received by members of the governing board of a water district may not exceed 5 percent for each calendar year following the operative date of the last adjustment. Additionally, a director cannot receive compensation for more than a total of 10 (ten) days in any calendar month.
As of the last increase effective on July 23, 2001, the maximum increase the Board can entertain at this point is $135, which would bring the per diem to $285 ($150 + $135 = $285). Should the Board elect to increase the per diem to $285, the effective date would need to be on or after July 23, 2019. Should the Board elect to increase the per diem to an amount less than $285, then the effective date could be July 1, 2019, per Policy 510. For reference, staff conducted a survey of water agencies and their associated Director's Fees in San Diego County, which is attached.

FISCAL IMPACT
Any approved changes would be reflected in the proposed FY 2019-20 Budget.

POLICY/STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE
Policy 510, Per Diem and Reimbursement, states that Director's Fees will be reviewed annually in either January or February, and any changes approved will be effective July 1 of the same year.

ALTERNATIVES
1) Consider adjustment to Director's Fees, as directed by the Board, and direct staff to schedule a public hearing.

2) Do not approve changes to the Director's Fees.

RECOMMENDATION
Staff defers to the Governing Board for direction.

ATTACHMENT:
Survey of San Diego Water Agency Per Diem Fees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>Jan 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad MWD</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern MWD</td>
<td>$223.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsinore Valley MWD</td>
<td>$221.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encina Wastewater Authority</td>
<td>$206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallbrook PUD</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helix Water District</td>
<td>$225.00 effective April 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeside Water District</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucadia Wastewater</td>
<td>$190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivenhain MWD</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otay Water District</td>
<td>$145.00 effective July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padre Dam MWD</td>
<td>$137.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow MWD</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramona MWD</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho California Water District</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Del Diablo MWD</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDCWA Directors/Officers</td>
<td>$150/$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Dieguito Water District</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Irrigation District</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Irrigation District</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallecitos Water District</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Center MWD</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Irrigation District</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuima MWD</td>
<td>$206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>Jan 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Carlsbad MWD</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fallbrook PUD</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ramona MWD</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. San Dieguito Water District</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. South Bay Irrigation District</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Valley Center MWD</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lakeside Water District</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Padre Dam MWD</td>
<td>$137.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Otay Water District</td>
<td>$145.00 effective July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Olivenhain MWD</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rainbow MWD</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Santa Fe Irrigation District</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SDCWA Directors/Officers</td>
<td>$150/$180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rincon Del Diablo MWD</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Leucadia Wastewater</td>
<td>$190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rancho California Water District</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Vallecitos Water District</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Vista Irrigation District</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encina Wastewater Authority</td>
<td>$206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Yuima MWD</td>
<td>$206.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elsinore Valley MWD</td>
<td>$221.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Eastern MWD</td>
<td>$223.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Helix Water District</td>
<td>$225.00 effective April 15, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)
FROM: Management
DATE: February 15, 2019
SUBJECT: Review of Board Policies and Procedures (501 through 511)

SUMMARY
Annually, the Board reviews and updates all of its Policies and Procedures to ensure that they are relevant, accurately reflect current and/or preferred practice, and include all legal requirements. Management will present the policies to the Board in batches so that the Board can carefully deliberate the recommended changes and provide any additional feedback.

Management reviewed each policy and submitted proposed changes to legal counsel for concurrence, as well as any additional legal updates. These recommended changes are now presented to the Board for consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>ADDITIONS/MODIFICATIONS/COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>501, 508, and 509</td>
<td>No recommended changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Recommended changes: Clarify to align with mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Recommended changes: Clarify that periodic review of the existing policies and procedures will be initiated by the General Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Recommended changes: Clarify that these procedures are intended to assist in the governance of the Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Recommended changes: Change term of office to one year as suggested by Director Preciado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Recommended changes: Clarify governance of behavior as a member of the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Recommended changes: Clarify that a serial meeting may occur if an individual contacts the members of the legislative body prior to a formal meeting; standing Committee appointments shall be made annually; and minutes of Standing Committees shall be made available to the Board as part of publicly available agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Recommended changes: Clarify definition of a quorum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memo to: Governing Board (Finance and Personnel Committee)
Subject: Review of Board Policies and Procedures (501 through 511)
February 15, 2019
Page 2 of 2

| 511 | Recommended changes: Community outreach functions shall be approved by the Board as agendized actions. |

**FISCAL IMPACT**
Fiscal impact is limited to cost incurred for legal counsel review.

**POLICY**
The Governing Board has approved periodic reviews of its Policies and Procedures.

**ALTERNATIVES**
1) Approve the recommended changes to the attached policies as presented.
2) Direct staff to make revisions to the recommended changes.

**RECOMMENDATION**
Management recommends that the Governing Board approve the recommended changes to Policies 501 through 511 as presented.

Attachments: Board Policy 501
Board Policy 502 (Revised)
Board Policy 503 (Revised)
Board Policy 504 (Revised)
Board Policy 505 (Revised)
Board Policy 506 (Revised)
Board Policy 507 (Revised)
Board Policy 508
Board Policy 509
Board Policy 510 (Revised)
Board Policy 511 (Revised)
POLICY 501 – OFFICIAL SEAL

POLICY

The Governing Board of Sweetwater Authority has adopted a design that shall constitute the official seal of Sweetwater Authority.

PROCEDURE

The following design shall constitute the official seal of Sweetwater Authority.

The seal is comprised of two concentric circles. The diameter of the seal is 1-5/8” with the outer perimeter of the circle encompassed with a braided rope design. The distance between the outer and inner circle is ¼” containing the words "SWEETWATER AUTHORITY" inscribed around the top of the inside circle and "CALIFORNIA" inscribed around the bottom. In the center of the single-lined circle, which is 1” in diameter, the word "ORGANIZED" is inscribed around the top inner portion of the circle, with the words "FEB. 3, 1972" inscribed around the bottom inner portion. The very center of this circle also contains a symbol that resembles a small propeller.
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POLICY 502 – PURPOSE OF BOARD POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

POLICY

It is the intent of the Governing Board (Board) of Sweetwater Authority (Authority) to use sound management practices and maintain a Policies and Procedures Manual. It shall contain a comprehensive listing of the Board’s current policies and procedures, constituting the rules and regulations enacted by the Board from time to time.

PROCEDURE

The Policies and Procedures Manual shall serve as a resource for the Directors, staff, Management, and members of the public in determining the manner in which matters of Authority business are to be conducted.

If any policy or portion of a policy contained within the Policies and Procedures Manual is in conflict with rules, regulations, or legislation having authority over the Authority, said rules, regulations or legislation shall prevail.
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POLICY 503 – ADOPTION/AMENDMENT OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

POLICY

To establish guidelines to adopt or amend policies and procedures in the Policies and Procedures Manual of the Governing Board (Board) of Sweetwater Authority (Authority).

PROCEDURE

Consideration by the Board to adopt a new policy or procedure or to amend an existing policy or procedure may be initiated by a Director or by the General Manager. The proposed adoption or amendment is initiated by submitting a written draft of the proposed adoption or amendment to each Director and the General Manager through the Authority's office and requesting that the item be included for consideration on the agenda of the appropriate Committee or on the agenda of a Regular Meeting of the Board.

Periodic review of the existing policies and procedures will be initiated by the General Manager.

Adoption of a new policy or procedure or amendment of an existing policy or procedure shall be accomplished at a Regular Meeting of the Board and shall require an affirmative majority vote of the Board.

Before considering adopting or amending any policy or procedure, Directors shall have the opportunity to review the proposed adoption or amendment prior to the meeting at which consideration for adoption or amendment is to be given.

Copies of the proposed policy or procedure adoption or amendment shall be included in the agenda information packet for any meeting of consideration. Pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act, the agenda information packets with said copies shall be made available to each Director for review at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to any meeting of consideration.
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POLICY 504 – CODE OF ETHICS

POLICY

The Governing Board (Board) of Sweetwater Authority (Authority) is committed to providing excellence in legislative leadership that results in the provision of the highest quality industry-leading services to its constituents and to comply with all applicable state laws including AB 1234 approved in 2006.

PROCEDURE

Directors who consistently ignore or violate these procedures may be subject to censure by the Board or removal from representing the Board at any activities where they might be designated by the Board as a representative of the Authority. In order to assist in the governance of the behavior between and among members of the Board and staff, the following will be observed:

A. The dignity, style, values, and opinions of each Director shall be respected.

B. Responsiveness and attentive listening in communication are encouraged.

C. The needs of the Authority’s constituents should be the priority of the Board. When a Director believes he/she may have a conflict of interest, the Director may consult legal counsel to assist the Director in making a determination if one exists or not. If the Director determines that there is a conflict of interest or an appearance of a conflict of interest with respect to any official action that he or she needs to take as a Director, then the Director is responsible for disclosing such conflict and recusing himself or herself in accordance with applicable law and regulations.

D. The primary responsibility of the Board is the formulation and evaluation of policy and making financial decisions. Routine matters concerning the operational aspects of the Authority are to be delegated to professional staff members of the Authority, the General Manager.

E. Directors should commit themselves to emphasizing the focused, relevant, thoughtful, positive contributions to the discussion and collaborative analytical process, avoiding double talk, hidden agendas, gossip, backbiting, and other negative forms of interaction.

F. Directors should commit themselves to focusing on issues and not personalities or other prejudices. The presentation of the opinions of others should be encouraged. Cliques and voting blocks based on personalities rather than issues should be avoided.
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POLICIES & PROCEDURES
FOR THE GOVERNING BOARD

CODE OF ETHICS
Policy 504

G. Differing viewpoints are healthy in the decision-making process. Individuals have the right to disagree with ideas and opinions in a courteous manner, without being disagreeable. Once the Board takes action, Directors should commit to supporting said action and should not create barriers to the implementation of said action.

H. Directors should develop a working relationship with the General Manager wherein current issues, concerns, and Authority projects can be discussed comfortably and openly. In seeking clarification on informational items, Directors should approach the General Manager or Assistant General Manager to obtain information needed to supplement, upgrade, or enhance their knowledge to improve legislative decision-making.

I. When approached by in-handling complaints from residents and property owners of the Authority with complaints, said complaints should be referred directly to the General Manager.

J. When considering in-handling items related to safety, concerns for safety or hazards should be reported to the General Manager or Assistant General Manager.

K. In seeking clarification for policy-related concerns, especially those involving personnel, legal action, land acquisition and development, finances, and programming, said concerns should be referred directly to the General Manager or legal counsel.

L. When approached by Authority personnel concerning specific Authority policy, Directors should direct the Authority personnel to the General Manager. Directors may directly consult with the General Manager or legal counsel.

M. The work of the Authority is a team effort. All individuals should work together in the collaborative process, assisting each other in conducting the affairs of the Authority.

N. When responding to constituent requests and concerns, Directors should be courteous, responding to individuals in a positive manner and routing their questions through appropriate channels, such as customer service, the General Manager, or legal counsel and to responsible management personnel.

O. Directors should function as a part of the whole. Issues should be brought to the attention of the Board as a whole, rather than to individual members selectively.

P. Directors are responsible for monitoring the Authority’s progress in attaining the goals and objectives, while pursuing its mission, as identified in the annual Strategic Plan.

Q. When approached by vendors or contractors concerning the availability of work or
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contracts at the Authority, such inquiries should be referred to the General Manager or Assistant General Manager.

Directors who consistently ignore or violate these procedures may be subject to censure by the Board or removal from representing the Board at any activities where they might be designated by the Board as a representative of the Authority.
POLICIES & PROCEDURES
FOR THE GOVERNING BOARD

BOARD CHAIRPERSON AND
VICE CHAIRPERSON

Policy 505

POLICY 505 - BOARD CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON

POLICY

The appointed Chairperson shall preside as Chair at all meetings of the Governing Board (Board) of Sweetwater Authority and perform such other duties as are specified by the Board. In the absence of the Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson shall serve as Chair over all meetings of the Board.

PROCEDURE

The Governing Board shall hold an annual organizational meeting at its last regular meeting in December. The Board shall elect one of its members as Chairperson and another member as Vice Chairperson. The Chairperson's term of office shall be two (2) years and until his/her successor takes office. The Chairperson's authority is granted by the full Board and the Chairperson:

- Represents the full Board in any public announcements, and
- Should speak on behalf of the Board only in support of the decisions of the full Board.

The Chairperson shall have the same rights as the other members of the Board in voting, introducing motions, resolutions and ordinances, and any discussion of questions that follow said actions. The Chairperson customarily has primary contact with the General Manager.

The Vice Chairperson's term of office shall be two (2) years and until his/her successor takes office. The Vice Chairperson shall perform all the duties of the Chair in the absence of the Chairperson or in the event of the Chairperson's inability to perform such duties and such other duties as are specified by the Board. If the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Board are both absent, the remaining members present shall select one of themselves to act as Chairperson of the meeting.

As the presiding officer, the Chairperson must keep the meeting discussions aimed at agenda issues and move the Board along toward decisions.

The duties and responsibilities of the Chairperson include the following:

A. Preside over Board meetings.
B. Ensure that orders and resolutions of the Board are carried out.
C. Coordinate the work of officers of the Board and committees.
D. Call special meetings as the need arises.
E. Act as official spokesperson for the Board, unless authority is delegated.
F. Perform all other functions required by the office of Chairperson.
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POLICY 506 – MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BOARD

POLICY

To provide guidelines to members of the Governing Board (Board), who are the unit of authority for Sweetwater Authority (Authority). Apart from their normal function as a part of this unit, Directors have no individual authority. Staff does not report to any one Director, but rather to the Board, which may direct staff by formal action or by a concurrence of the majority. As individuals, Directors may not commit the Authority to any policy, act, or expenditure. Individual Board members, except as authorized by the Board, shall have no power to act for the Authority, or the Board, or to direct Authority staff. The Board Chairperson has the authority to act on behalf of the Board on both routine and unusual matters, which may, depending on the nature of the matter, be subject to ratification by the Board.

PROCEDURE

The Board shall be comprised of seven (7) members, five (5) of whom are members of the Board of Directors of South Bay Irrigation District and two (2) of whom shall be appointed by the Mayor of National City, subject to confirmation by the City Council of National City. They shall be electors of National City at the time of assuming such offices and at all times during their terms of office. They shall serve four (4) year terms. Any vacancy that occurs among the National City members of the Board shall be filled by appointment by the Mayor of National City, subject to confirmation by the City Council of National City. In order to assist in the governance of behavior as a member of the Board, the following will be observed:

A. Directors shall act as a part of the body that represents and acts for the community as a whole and should not represent any fractional segment of the community, but are, rather, a part of the body that represents and acts for the community as a whole.

B. Directors shall thoroughly prepare themselves to discuss agenda items at meetings of the Board. Information may be requested from, or exchanged with, the General Manager or Assistant General Manager before meetings. For matters that are to be considered under closed session, information may be requested from, or exchanged with, legal counsel. Information that is exchanged before meetings shall be distributed to Directors so that, through the General Manager, and all Directors will receive all information being distributed. Copies of public information exchanged before meetings shall be available at the meeting for members of the public in attendance, and shall also be provided to anyone not present upon their request.

C. Directors shall at all times conduct themselves with courtesy to each other, to staff, and to members of the audience present at Board meetings.

Reviewed and Reapproved on 6/23/18
D. Directors shall defer to the Chairperson for conduct of meetings of the Board, but shall be free to question and discuss items on the agenda. All comments should be brief and confined to the matter being discussed by the Board.

E. Directors may request for inclusion into minutes brief comments pertinent to an agenda item only at the meeting that item is discussed (including, if desired, a position on abstention or dissenting vote).

F. Directors shall abstain from participating in consideration on any item involving a personal or financial conflict of interest. Unless such a conflict of interest exists, however, Directors should not abstain from the Board’s decision-making responsibilities.

G. Directors shall channel requests for substantive information and/or research through the General Manager. Requests by individual Directors that entail substantial effort or cost for substantive information and/or research from Authority staff will be channeled through the General Manager and through the Board if the request entails substantial effort or cost. Individual Board members shall not act independently to direct staff in the performance of their duties, or to provide or compile data, information, or reports.

H. Directors shall not exchange information about projects, personnel, or any other business matter with employees of the Authority outside of normal channels, without the knowledge of the General Manager.
POLICY 507 – COMMITTEES OF THE GOVERNING BOARD AND INTERAGENCY COMMITTEES

POLICY

Except as otherwise provided in this Policy, the Chairperson of the Governing Board (Board) shall appoint members to established Standing Committees of the Authority, Interagency Committees/Boards, and Ad Hoc Committees as necessary. The Chairperson may also appoint the Chairpersons for said Committees/Boards or have the option to assign that task to said Committees.

PROCEDURE

A Standing Committee of Sweetwater Authority (Authority) is a legislative body subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act (Brown Act), which is defined as any Standing Committee that has “continuing subject matter jurisdiction” or a meeting schedule fixed by ordinance, resolution, or formal action.

Unauthorized serial meetings occur when there is a “meeting of the minds” of a quorum of the legislative body outside of a formal meeting. This may occur if member “A” contacts member “B,” who contacts member “C” and so on, until a quorum has been involved.

A serial meeting may occur if an individual staff member or other person contacts the members of the legislative body to brief them prior to a formal meeting and, in the process, reveals their respective views to one another or asks the members to commit to or decide on a proposed action. Serial meetings are “secret meetings” that deprive the public of an opportunity to contribute to the decision-making process.

In contrast, the distribution of a memo does not constitute a meeting. A unilateral communication to a legislative body, such as an information or advisory memo, does not violate the Brown Act.

The Standing Committees of the Board are:

A. Finance and Personnel Committee
B. Operations Committee
C. Consultant Selection Committee (meets on an as-needed basis)
D. Communications Committee (meets on an as-needed basis)

Interagency Committees/Boards are:

A. Association of California Water Agencies/Joint Powers Insurance Authority
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A. (appointment made by the Board Chair or Board)
B. Chula Vista Interagency Water Task Force
C. Water Conservation Garden Joint Powers Authority Board

Ad Hoc Committees are to be appointed by the Chairperson, if necessary.

The creation and duties of the Ad Hoc Committees shall be outlined at the time determined by the Chairperson or by the direction of the Board. Members of the Ad Hoc Committee shall be appointed by the Chair. The Committee shall be considered dissolved when the Chairperson of the Board determines the need no longer exists.

The Chairperson shall appoint and publicly announce the members of the Standing Committees for the ensuing year no later than the Board's second regular meeting in JanuaryFebruary 1 of each year.

The Board's Standing Committees may be assigned to review (a) the Authority's functions, activities, or operations pertaining to their designated concerns, or (b) those of another Standing Committee, when necessary, if the timeliness of Board action is a consideration in such a review. Any recommendations resulting from review by a Committee should be submitted to the Board via a written or oral report.

If a member of a Committee is unable to attend a scheduled meeting, the meeting may take place with only two members of the Committee in attendance. Committee meetings will not be conducted by the use of teleconferencing provided for in Government Code Section 54953 unless the Director's absence is excused because of health or personal emergency and is notified to the Board Secretary and is then approved by the Chairperson of the Board or Committee or by the Chair of the Committee if the Board Chair is not available.

All meetings of Standing Committees shall conform to all open meeting laws (e.g., "Brown Act") that pertain to regular meetings of the Board.

Meeting minutes of Standing Committees shall be prepared and made available to the Board as part of a publicly available agenda.
POLICY 508 – OTHER APPOINTED OFFICERS

POLICY

To establish a procedure to serve as a guide to appoint other officers of the Governing Board (Board) and to establish guidelines and clarification of responsibilities.

PROCEDURE

The General Manager shall be appointed by the Board. The General Manager shall be the Chief Executive Officer responsible directly to the Board. The General Manager shall have charge of, handle, and have access to, the property of Sweetwater Authority (Authority). The General Manager shall plan, direct, coordinate and administer the activities of the Authority, subject to and within the policy determinations of the Board, and perform such other duties as are specified by the Board.

The Assistant General Manager shall serve as the General Manager in the General Manager’s absence.

Pursuant to Section 2 (D) (3) of the Joint Powers Agreement for the Authority, the Secretary of the Authority shall be appointed by the Board and shall serve at the pleasure of the Board. The Secretary may, but need not, be a member of the Board. The Secretary shall be responsible for the minutes and other records of the proceedings of the Board and shall perform such other duties as are specified by the Board.

Pursuant to Section 2 (D) (4) of the Joint Powers Agreement for the Authority, the Treasurer of the Authority shall be the Treasurer of South Bay Irrigation District, appointed by the Board, and serving ex-officio as Treasurer of the Authority. The Treasurer shall also perform such other duties as are specified by the Board.

The positions of General Manager and Secretary shall be appointed by the Board. The Board may seek and choose to concur with the General Manager’s recommendation or may choose to select a replacement based on an internal search, an external search, or both.
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POLICY 509 – ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS

POLICY

Members of the Governing Board (Board) shall attend the full session of all Regular and Special meetings of the Board unless there is a good cause for absence. As a courtesy, any Board member who believes he/she will be absent from any meeting should notify the Board Secretary of such absence. In the event a Director plans to be absent for a period of time (vacation, illness, etc.) that would cause him/her to be absent for a Special meeting, a "Waiver of Personal Notice of Special Meeting" should be completed, signed, and filed with the Secretary in accordance with Government Code Section 54956.

PROCEDURE

In accordance with Government Code Section 1770, a vacancy shall occur if any member ceases to discharge the duty of his/her office due to the happening of certain events before expiration of the term, including but not limited to:

A. His/her absence from the state without the permission required by law beyond the period allowed by law.

B. His/her ceasing to discharge the duties of his/her office for the period of three (3) consecutive months, except when prevented by sickness or when absent from the state with the permission required by law.

In addition, pursuant to Government Code Section 1062, no state or municipal officer shall be absent himself or herself from the state for more than sixty (60) days, unless either:

A. Upon business of the state or the municipality

B. With the consent of the Legislature or the Governing Body of the municipality

Failure to attend the full session of all Board meetings for three (3) consecutive months is not an automatic disqualification from office; however, it would be evidence of the absent Director's ceasing to discharge the duties of his/her office and of a misuse of public resources if the Director receives Director's Fees and attends only partial meetings. (Penal Code § 424) If no reasonable explanation or excuse for the absence is provided, the office shall be considered vacant. In addition, failure to attend meetings while absent from the state for more than sixty (60) days without the consent of the Board shall create a vacancy.
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POLICY 510 – PER DIEM AND REIMBURSEMENT

POLICY

Members of the Governing Board (Board) shall receive per diem, specified herein as "Director’s Fees," for occasions that constitute the performance of official duties, in an amount that is established by the Board in accordance with state law and for the actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of such official duties. The Per Diem and Reimbursement policy set forth herein shall be read in conjunction with Policy 511 for Training, Education, and Community Outreach.

PROCEDURE

Director’s Fees in the amount of $150 per day, as established by the Board in accordance with the Water Code Sections 20200-20207, shall be paid for attendance at the following:

A. Regular, Special, or Adjourned meetings of the Board.
B. Board Committee, Interagency Committees/Boards, and Ad Hoc Committee meetings.
C. Meetings of other organizations, where such attendance constitutes the performance of a Director's official duties, as provided for by Policy 511; however, Directors shall not receive Director’s Fees for travel days immediately preceding and/or following the day on which a conference or meeting is held.
D. Designated functions at the direction of the Board by motion, either prior to the function or at the next regular Board meeting following the function.
E. Chairperson’s attendance at Board agenda preparation meetings with Management and the General Manager’s performance evaluation by the Chairperson, or Vice Chairperson’s attendance at such meetings and performance evaluations in the event the Chairperson is unable to attend.

Director’s Fees will be reviewed annually in either January or February, and any changes approved will be effective July 1 of the same year.

Directors will not receive a Director's Fee or payment of actual and necessary expenses for attendance at: a) more than one authorized event per day or b) meetings of other organizations as provided for by Policy 511, unless the Board approves such attendance either prior to the function or at the next regular Board meeting following the function. Total per diem, or Director's Fees, shall not exceed ten (10) days in any calendar month.

Directors who attend meetings of organizations other than Authority Board or Committee meetings by the use of teleconferencing or the Internet (i.e., online) shall not receive a Director’s Fee unless:

1) the Director is unable to attend in person because of health or personal emergency,
or

2) the Director chooses not to attend in order to save the Authority the expense of travel to the meeting, the Director’s Fee is approved in accordance with Policy 511, and teleconferencing/online participation is approved in advance by the Board, or

3) the Director is participating in a legally required training function with an approved vendor of the State of California provided the Director submits a certificate of completion.

4) the meeting is only available by teleconferencing or Internet and the Director’s Fee is approved in accordance with Policy 511, or

5) the Director is an appointed Authority representative to an organization and that organization’s meeting is available by teleconferencing or the Internet.

At the end of each month, Directors are to submit to the Board Secretary a signed "Director’s Monthly Per Diem and Mileage Reimbursement" form documenting the meetings attended during the month and the corresponding mileage to be reimbursed, if any.

Water Code Section 20202 provides that a water district may increase the amount of compensation which may be received by members of the Board above the amount of one hundred dollars ($100) per day, so long as the increase does not exceed an amount equal to five percent (5%) for each calendar year following the operative date\(^1\) of the last adjustment of compensation. -Section 20202 authorizes compensation for no more than a total of ten (10) days in any calendar month.

The Authority will pay actual and necessary expenses of Directors incurred in the performance of official duties within San Diego County as contemplated by Policy 511, including registration, tuition, meals, incidental expenses, tips and gratuities, and each mile actually traveled by a Director in his or her private automobile for attendance of any Director specifically designated or approved by the Board to attend an event within San Diego County. Reimbursement per mile to be equal to the standard rate in effect for business miles deduction by the United States Internal Revenue Service, as such rate is established from time to time.

A Director will receive reimbursement for each mile actually traveled in his or her private automobile while attending meetings outside of San Diego County when acting under orders of the Board, provided such mileage compensation does not exceed economy class airfare plus normal cost for transportation to and from the airport at the point of departure and the airport at the destination. Reimbursement per mile to be equal to the standard rate in effect for business miles deduction by the United States Internal Revenue Service, as such rate is established from time to time.

If a Director chooses to travel in his or her private automobile rather than by scheduled airline, while attending meetings outside of San Diego County when acting under orders of the Board, and the distance traveled requires more than eight (8)-hours driving, mileage,

---

\(^{1}\) Resolution 01-09 was adopted on May 23, 2001 approving an adjustment in compensation and establishing the per diem at $150, effective July 23, 2001.

Reviewed and Reapproved on

92
overnight lodging and three (3) meals will be reimbursed to the Director, provided that such reimbursement does not exceed the cost of economy class airfare plus normal cost for transportation to and from the airport at the point of departure and the airport at the destination.

If two (2) or more Directors travel in the same car, the Director driving will receive full mileage reimbursement, provided that said mileage does not exceed the cost of economy class airfare plus normal cost for transportation to and from the airport at the point of departure and the airport at the destination for all the Directors who traveled in the same car.

Directors should travel together whenever feasible, but not in a number that would constitute a quorum of the Board, (three (3) maximum—see Policy 542) and economically beneficial, and register sufficiently in advance, when possible, to obtain discounted tuition and registration expenses.

In no event shall a Director receive from the Authority compensation for out-of-town travel expenses, including, but not limited to, airfare, car rental when appropriate, lodging, registration, meals, incidental expenses, or miles traveled in his or her private automobile, unless such out-of-town travel is preapproved by order of the Board. Directors are encouraged, whenever feasible, to provide a fifteen (15) day advanced notice for air travel to the Board Secretary. The cost of alcoholic beverages will not be paid by the Authority.

Frequent flyer miles accumulated by Directors for airfare paid for, or reimbursed, by the Authority, should be redeemed for discounts on future airfare paid for, or reimbursed, by the Authority, and may not be redeemed for personal use. If any Director requires special travel accommodations due to a disability or health-related reasons, the Authority will pay all costs associated with those special accommodations.

Actual and necessary expenses for accommodations and meals incurred by Directors while attending meetings outside of San Diego County when acting under orders of the Board will be reimbursed as provided in this Policy. Reimbursement shall be permitted for travel expenses, including accommodations and meals, incurred on the day immediately preceding or immediately following an approved meeting or conference held outside of San Diego County when travel on the actual day of the meeting or conference is infeasible. Except as otherwise provided herein, the maximum reimbursement for lodging costs shall be two hundred twenty-five dollars ($225) per day including taxes. However, if the lodging is in connection with a conference or organized educational activity conducted in compliance with this Policy, the Authority will pay lodging costs which do not exceed the maximum group rate published by the conference or activity sponsor, provided that the lodging at the group rate is available to the Director at the time of booking. If the group rate is not available, the Authority will pay for comparable lodging at an amount not-to-exceed the maximum group rate published by the conference or activity sponsor. The maximum reimbursement for meals (breakfast, lunch, and dinner) not included in conference registration shall be seventy-five dollars ($75) per day.
Reimbursement for all tips and gratuities shall be limited to a maximum of twenty percent (20%) of the underlying costs. Tips and gratuities for services with no underlying costs (such as concierge, bellhop, or wheelchair assistance) shall be at a maximum of $5 per service and $20 per day. Directors requesting reimbursement for amounts exceeding the maximum limits shall require Board ratification prior to payment to a Director. Upon the request of a Board member, the Board may authorize actual and necessary expenses for accommodations and meals which exceed the policy limits.

Directors shall use government and group rates offered by a provider of transportation or lodging services or travel and lodging, when available.

The Board Secretary may arrange for certain group travel including prepaying the fares, fees, tips, and gratuities. There shall be no reimbursement for fares, fees, tips, or gratuities paid by Directors if these were prepaid by the Authority.

Actual and necessary expenses for meals incurred by Directors while attending meetings within San Diego County, and meetings outside San Diego County which do not involve lodging, when acting under orders of the Board, will be reimbursed. The maximum reimbursement for said meals not included in conference registration shall be seventy-five dollars ($75) per day.

For conferences and events for which costs and expenses are prepaid by the Authority, Directors unable to attend the conference or event due to illness or scheduling conflict will notify the Board Secretary as soon as possible to ensure credit or reimbursement of costs from the conference or event sponsor. If reimbursement is not possible, the Board Secretary shall contact other Directors to determine if they can attend. The Board Secretary will also inquire through the General Manager if staff members can attend.

Within thirty (30) days following an event which constitutes the performance of official duties as designated in Policy 511, and for which the payment of actual and necessary expenses has been approved, any Director attending must submit a signed "Director's Expense Reimbursement Form," together with valid itemized receipts, to the Board Secretary and return any excess funds advanced for attendance of the event. Eligible expenses for which receipts are not available will be reimbursed with an explanation included in the expense report for accounting backup. If actual and necessary expenses incurred by a Director attending exceed the amount of any advance, the Authority will reimburse the Director for excess expenses within ten (10) days of receipt of the expense report.

The Board Secretary shall produce and distribute a quarterly report containing the Governing Board's Expenses. The reports shall be presented to the Board no later than the second meeting of in January, April, July, and October.
POLICY 511 - TRAINING, EDUCATION, AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH

POLICY

The Governing Board (Board) finds that it is beneficial to Sweetwater Authority (Authority) for the Board to increase its knowledge of matters within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Board. To this end, members of the Board are encouraged to attend educational conferences and professional meetings concerning matters within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Board and which activities constitute the performance of official duties. To the maximum extent feasible and practical, Directors attending such conferences and/or meetings will attend for the time frame that they are registered and engage with staff and the public. The Training, Education and Conferences policy set forth herein shall be read in conjunction with Policy 510 for Per Diem and Reimbursement.

PROCEDURE

There is no limit as to the number of Directors attending a particular conference or seminar when it is apparent that their attendance is beneficial to the Authority. To promote such Board development and excellence, the Authority reimburses actual and necessary expenses incurred on behalf of the Authority in the performance of official duties, such as travel, tuition, lodging, meals, incidental expenses, and each mile actually traveled by a Director in his or her private automobile as a result of training, educational courses, participation with professional organizations, and attendance at conferences, in accordance with Policy 510. In no event shall a Director receive from the Authority such compensation for out-of-town travel expenses, unless when such out-of-town travel is pre-approved by order of the Board. The cost of alcoholic beverages will not be paid by the Authority. Reimbursement shall be permitted for travel expenses, including accommodations and meals, incurred on the day immediately preceding or immediately following an approved meeting or conference held outside of San Diego County when travel on the actual day of the meeting or conference is infeasible as provided in Policy 510; however, Directors shall not be entitled to Director's Fees for such travel day(s).

The Board Secretary is responsible for making arrangements for Directors to attend conferences and to record and calculate the per diem or "Director's Fees" as set forth in more detail in Policy 510. The Director's Fees for attendance at approved events and the procedure for reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of official duties are set forth in Policy 510.

Attendance by Directors at meetings, seminars, workshops and conferences (other than those that are already pre-approved as designated events which constitute the performance of official duties) shall be approved by the Board prior to payment of Director's Fees or incurring any reimbursable actual and necessary expenses. A Director shall not attend a conference or training event (other than those that are already pre-approved as designated
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events which constitute the performance of official duties) that does not cover matters within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Board.

Upon returning from meetings, seminars, workshops, conferences, and other occasions which constitute the performance of official duties for which Directors receive Director’s Fees and the actual and necessary expenses are reimbursed by the Authority, in accordance with Policy 510, Directors shall either prepare a written report for distribution to the Board, or make a verbal report at the next regular Board meeting following the event. Said written or verbal report shall detail the information that may be of benefit to the Authority that was presented at the meeting, seminar, workshop, conference, or other occasion which constitutes the performance of official duties. Materials from the meetings, seminars, workshops, conferences, and other occasions which constitute the performance of official duties may be delivered to the Authority’s office to be included in the Authority’s library for the future use of other Directors and staff.

Directors who have signed up for an event, and subsequently cannot attend, shall contact the Board Secretary as soon as possible to ensure credit or reimbursement of costs from the conference or event sponsor. If reimbursement is not possible, the Board Secretary shall contact other Directors to determine if they can attend. The Board Secretary will also inquire through the General Manager if staff members can attend.

Directors’ attendance at board and membership meetings of the following associations has been pre-approved as occasions that constitute the performance of official duties:

A. Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA)
B. Association of California Water Agencies – Joint Powers Insurance Authority (ACWA/JPIA)
C. CalDesal
D. California Special Districts Association (CSDA) both state and San Diego Chapter
E. Council of Water Utilities
F. Ethics Training in accordance with AB1234 (bi-annual)
G. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
H. National Water Resources Association (NWRA) and Municipal Caucus
I. San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA)
J. Sexual Harassment Avoidance Training in accordance with AB1825 (bi-annual)
K. Urban Water Institute
L. Water Education Foundation
M. Western Coalition of Arid States (WESTCAS)

Directors’ attendance at educational or legally required training functions of the following organizations shall be approved by the Board as agendized actions:

N. Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA)
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O. Association of California Water Agencies – Joint Power Insurance Authority (ACWA/JPIA)
P. Best Best & Krieger (BBK) Legal Updates
Q. California Special Districts Association (CSDA) both state and San Diego Chapter
R. Council of Water Utilities (COWU)
S. Local Government Commission
T. National Water Resources Association (NWRA) and Municipal Caucus
U. San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA)
V. Sweetwater Authority Leader Tours
W. Urban Water Institute (UWI)
X. Water Education Foundation (WEF)
Y. Western Coalition of Arid States (WESTCAS)

Directors' attendance at community outreach functions shall be approved by the Board as agendized actions.

Y.___

Directors' attendance at the following community outreach events is preapproved:

A. Bonitafest
B. Chula Vista Lemon Festival
C. National City Automobile Heritage Day
D. National City Mariachi Festival and Competition
E. Bonita Chili Cook-Off and Fair
F. HarborFest Chula Vista

The six five (55) outreach events shall be staffed by Directors and Authority staff. The water tanker will be provided at these events, if requested by the event organizers. Directors may receive per diem for up to five (5) of the six five (55) events. The General Manager is authorized as part of his/her regular duties, and as budgeted, to direct other outreach activities of the Authority.

Attendance at events organized by agencies and/or entities other than the Authority involving tours of, or visits to, local water reclamation, major projects related to water quality and distribution, or other engineering projects during construction or after completion of the project may also be occasions which constitute the performance of official duties, so long as attendance is approved by the Board as agendized action, either prior to the visit or at
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the next regular Board meeting following the visit. Directors may be compensated for attendance and travel for the purpose of visiting such projects as approved by the Board. Completion of legally required training functions may be conducted online with an approved vendor of the State of California provided the Director submits a certificate of completion.

The compensation paid to Board members of the Authority for sitting on the Board or acting under its orders shall be as approved by Resolution of the Board and set forth in Policy 510.
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 flow rate 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 2,083 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 in 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
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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>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>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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 that 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.

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).

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 Description</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 Description</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</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>
Blue Centurion, Ridgeway Apartments

Quarter Section 108

PROJECT SITE

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

VICINITY MAP
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Attachment 3: Ridgeway Apartments
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RESOLUTION 19-04

A RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE SWEETWATER AUTHORITY ("AUTHORITY") RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 96-03, RE-ESTABLISHING THE REGULAR MEETING DATE AND TIME OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND AUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS TO POLICY 601 OF THE POLICIES & PROCEDURES FOR THE GOVERNING BOARD

WHEREAS, the Governing Board has held its regular monthly meetings on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month at 6:00 p.m. and 3:30 p.m., respectively, pursuant to Resolution No. 96-03; and

WHEREAS, the Governing Board seeks to change the time of its second regular monthly meeting to the time specified in this Resolution, below; and

WHEREAS, Water Code Section 21378 provides that the Governing Board may change its meeting date by Resolution entered upon its minutes; and

WHEREAS, Policy 601 of the Policies & Procedures for the Governing Board provides that the "date, time, and place of regular Board Meetings can be reconsidered by the Board and adopted by Resolution, when the Board deems it necessary."

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Governing Board approves the following:

Section 1. Commencing in the month of March 2019, the regular meetings of the Governing Board of the Authority shall be held on the second and fourth Wednesday of each month at 6:00 p.m. in the Board Room of the District offices located at 505 Garrett Avenue, Chula Vista, CA 91910.

Section 2. The Secretary of the District is hereby directed to publish this Resolution once a week for two successive weeks in a newspaper published in San Diego County.

Section 3. Resolution No. 96-03, which established the prior regular meeting schedule of the Governing Board, is hereby rescinded.

Section 4. The Secretary of the District is hereby directed to make a ministerial revision to Policy 601 of the Policies & Procedures for the Governing Board of the Authority deleting the time of the Regular Meetings of the Board stated as follows: "the fourth Wednesday of each calendar month at 3:30 pm" and replacing said time with the following: "held on the second and fourth Wednesday of each calendar month at 6:00 p.m."

Section 5. This Resolution shall be effective upon completion of publication as provided in Section 2 above.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Governing Board at a regular meeting held on the 27th day of February, 2019, by the following vote to wit:

AYES: __________________________

NOES: __________________________

ABSENT: ________________________

ABSTAIN: ________________________

Steve Castaneda, Chair

ATTEST:

Ligia Perez, Board Secretary
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An excerpt from the JPIA Agreement:

"Article 7 - Board of Directors"

(a) The Authority shall be governed by the Board of Directors which is hereby established and which shall be composed of one representative from each Member, who shall be a Member director selected by the governing board of that Member. Each Member, in addition to appointing its member of the Board, shall appoint at least one alternate who shall be an officer, member of the governing board, or employee of that Member. The alternate appointed by a Member shall have the authority to attend and participate in any meeting of the Board when the regular member for whom he or she is an alternate is absent from said meeting.

(b) Each Director or alternate of the Board shall serve until a successor is appointed. Each Director or alternate shall serve at the pleasure of the Member by which he or she has been appointed.

(c) Each Director representing a Member, or his or her alternate, shall have one vote.

Please have your agency’s Board of Directors designate a JPIA Director Representative and Alternate Representative.

Member Agency: __________________________________________________________

JPIA Director Representative: _____________________________________________
Must be a member of the agency’s board of directors.

Preferred mailing address: _______________________________________________

E-mail address: _________________________________________________________

Phone number: _________________________________________________________

Assuming office date: __________________________

JPIA Alternate Representative: ____________________________________________

Preferred mailing address: ______________________________________________

E-mail address: _________________________________________________________

Phone number: _________________________________________________________

Please mail form to: Attn: Bobbette Wells, ACWA/JPIA, PO Box 619082, Roseville, CA 95661-9082

or FAX to: (916) 774-7040
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February 7, 2019

ACWA/JPIA Member Agencies

Re: Nomination of Paul E. Dorey to the ACWA/JPIA Executive Committee

Dear General Manager:

The Vista Irrigation District (VID) has nominated Board member Paul E. Dorey to serve on the ACWA/JPIA Executive Committee. Elections will take place at the JPIA Board of Directors meeting on May 8, 2017 at the Spring ACWA Conference in Monterey, California.

Paul has served as VID’s representative to the JPIA Board of Directors for 12 years, and he has been a member of the JPIA Liability Subcommittee for 9 years. We hope your organization will concur with this nomination.

As a member of ACWA/JPIA, Vista Irrigation District requests that your Board submit a resolution of support concurring with the nomination of Paul Dorey to serve on the ACWA/JPIA Executive Committee, and vote for him at the election. As you can see from the attached background information regarding Paul Dorey, he is well qualified for this position. All concurring nominations must reach the JPIA office to the attention of Sylvia Robinson at P.O. Box 619082, Roseville, CA 95661-9082 by 4:30 p.m. on Friday, March 22, 2019. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Brett Hodgkiss
General Manager

Attachments:
- Statement of candidacy for Paul E. Dorey
- Vista Irrigation District nominating resolution
- Sample concurring resolution
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Paul E. Dorey

Statement of Candidacy

I have served on the ACWA/JPIA Board of Directors since 2007. During the last nine years, I have had the privilege of serving on the Liability Committee of the JPIA. The Liability Committee has successfully kept its focus on providing member agencies with the most comprehensive, affordable and reliable liability insurance possible. Our Committee has recommended significant reductions in the premiums paid by member agencies while also increasing the insurance coverages provided.

I was elected to the Vista Irrigation District Board of Directors in 2006. The District provides water service to over 135,000 residents in northern San Diego County. I served on the Board of Directors of the Groundwater Resources Association of California, and I currently serve on the San Luis Rey Watershed Council and the Southern California Water Coalition. My wife Nancy and I have lived in Vista since 1971, where we raised our two daughters.

My forty-six years of public service, first in the United States Marine Corps and then in the water industry, have given me the necessary experience and background to serve as a member of the JPIA Executive Committee. This experience has helped me recognize the importance of safety and risk management and the value of developing appropriate policies and procedures, as well as establishing conservative fiscal controls.

As a member of the JPIA’s Executive Committee, I will perform my duties and make decisions to guide the organization to most efficiently benefit its member agencies. I will take my responsibility seriously and serve as a very useful and productive member of the Executive Committee. I value your trust and will honor it if elected to the Executive Committee.

Thank you for your support. If you have any questions about my candidacy, feel free to contact me at (760) 208-5263 or Paul.Dorey@vidwater.org.
RESOLUTION NO. 19-08

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE VISTA IRRIGATION DISTRICT
NOMINATING PAUL E. DOREY TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES JOINT POWERS INSURANCE AUTHORITY ("ACWA/JPIA")

WHEREAS, Vista Irrigation District is a member district of the ACWA/JPIA that participates in all four of its Programs: Liability, Property, Workers' Compensation, and Employee Benefits; and

WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the ACWA/JPIA provide that in order for a nomination to be made to ACWA/JPIA’s Executive Committee, the member district must place into nomination its member of the ACWA/JPIA Board of Directors for such open position;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Vista Irrigation District that its member of the ACWA/JPIA Board of Directors, Paul E. Dorey, be nominated as a candidate for the Executive Committee for the election to be held on May 6, 2019.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the ACWA/JPIA staff is hereby requested, upon receipt of the formal concurrence of three other member districts, to effect such nomination.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the District Secretary is hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the ACWA/JPIA at P.O. Box 619082, Roseville, CA 95661-9082, forthwith.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the following roll call vote of the Board of Directors for the Vista Irrigation District this 6th day of February 2019.

AYES: Directors Miller, Vásquez, Dorey, Sanchez, and MacKenzie
NOS: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

ATTEST:

Jo MacKenzie, President

Lisa R. Soto, Secretary
Board of Directors
VISTA IRRIGATION DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. ________

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE

(NAME OF MEMBER DISTRICT)

CONCURRENCE IN NOMINATION TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES
JOINT POWERS INSURANCE AUTHORITY ("ACWA JPIA")

WHEREAS, this district is a member district of the ACWA JPIA; and

WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the ACWA JPIA provide that in order for a nomination to be made to ACWA JPIA's Executive Committee, three member districts must concur with the nominating district, and

WHEREAS, another ACWA JPIA member district, the (NAME OF NOMINATING DISTRICT) has requested that this district concur in its nomination of its member of the ACWA JPIA Board of Directors to the Executive Committee of the ACWA JPIA;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the (NAME OF MEMBER DISTRICT) that this district concur with the nomination of (NAME OF NOMINEE) of (NAME OF NOMINATING DISTRICT) to the Executive Committee of the ACWA JPIA.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the District Secretary is hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the ACWA JPIA at P.O. Box 619082, Roseville, CA 95661-9082, forthwith.

ADOPTED this (DATE) day of (MONTH), 2019.

(SIGNATURE)
Board President

ATTEST:

(SIGNATURE)
Secretary
ACWA/JPIA Member Agencies

RE: Nomination of Andrew Morris to the ACWA/JPIA California Water Insurance Fund
(An ACWA JPIA Captive Insurance Company)

Dear General Manager:

There are two positions to be filled on JPIA’s newly formed captive insurance company board, the California Water Insurance Fund.

The election will be held during the JPIA’s Board of Directors’ meeting on May 6, 2019, at the spring conference in Monterey. For the initial term, these two positions will be filled for three years each. Thereafter, they will be two-year terms.

The Santa Rosa Regional Resources Authority (SRRRA) has nominated Board Member Andy Morris to serve on the ACWA/JPIA California Water Insurance Fund Board. Andy currently serves as Chair for SRRRA which was formed in 2015 for the operation, maintenance, and administration of the Santa Rosa Water Reclamation Facilities.

As a member of ACWA/JPIA, SRRRA requests that your Board submit a resolution of support concurring with the nomination of Andy Morris to serve on the ACWA/JPIA California Water Insurance Fund Board, and vote for him at the election. Attached information explains how he is very qualified for this role.

All concurring nominations (resolutions) must reach the JPIA office to the attention of Sylvia Robinson at P.O. Box 619082, Roseville, CA 95661-9082 by 4:30 p.m. on Friday, March 22, 2019. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you for your consideration. We appreciate your support.

Sincerely,
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Andrew Morris

Statement of Candidacy

I was elected to the Board of Directors of the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD) in 2010. EVMWD provides water and sewer service to over 100,000 customers, throughout its 96 square mile service area. I am member of several committees on behalf of EVMWD, including the Water Planning Committee, which focuses on securing infrastructure and natural resources to decrease the dependency on imported water, and to provide safe and reliable water supply.

I am also currently serving as Chair for The Santa Rosa Regional Resources Joint Power Authority which was formed in 2015 for the operation, maintenance, and administration of the Santa Rosa Water Reclamation Facilities. SRRRA provides sewer services to portions of southern and western Riverside County. I have been involved in the creation and establishment of the SRRRA from inception and believe I can utilize my knowledge and experience to be a productive member of the ACWA JPIA’s California Insurance Fund (an ACWA JPIA Captive Insurance Company).

I’m a graduate of California State University Fullerton, with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in History. I have owned and operated the Andrew Morris Insurance Agency in Wildomar for over 27 years specializing in Property and Casualty, Life and Health. I’m confident that I have the necessary experience and knowledge to recognize the importance of risk management, asset management and having proper coverages and precautions in place.

I am asking for your support and I’m appreciative of your trust and concurrence in my nomination to be a member of ACWA JPIA’s California Insurance Fund.
RESOLUTION NO. _______

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE

(NAME OF MEMBER DISTRICT)

CONCURRING IN NOMINATION TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA WATER AGENCIES

JOINT POWERS INSURANCE AUTHORITY ("ACWA JPIA")

WHEREAS, this district is a member district of the ACWA JPIA; and

WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the ACWA JPIA provide that in order for a
nomination to be made to ACWA JPIA's Executive Committee, three member
districts must concur with the nominating district, and

WHEREAS, another ACWA JPIA member district, the (NAME OF NOMINATING
DISTRICT) has requested that this district concur in its nomination of its
member of the ACWA JPIA Board of Directors to the Executive Committee of the
ACWA JPIA;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the

(NAME OF MEMBER DISTRICT) that this district concur with the nomination of

(NAME OF NOMINEE) of (NAME OF NOMINATING DISTRICT) to the Executive
Committee of the ACWA JPIA.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the District Secretary is hereby directed
to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the ACWA JPIA at
P.O. Box 619082, Roseville, CA 95661-9082, forthwith.

ADOPTED this (DATE) day of (MONTH), 2019.

(SIGNATURE)
Board President

ATTEST:

(SIGNATURE)
Secretary
RESOLUTION 19-05

RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF SWEETWATER AUTHORITY
CONCURRING IN THE NOMINATION OF (NAME OF NOMINEE)
TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
WATER AGENCIES JOINT POWERS INSURANCE AUTHORITY ("ACWA/JPIA")

WHEREAS, Sweetwater Authority is a member district of the ACWA/JPIA; and

WHEREAS, the Bylaws of the ACWA/JPIA provide that in order for a nomination
to be made to ACWA/JPIA's Executive Committee, three member districts must concur
with the nominating district; and

WHEREAS, another ACWA/JPIA member district, the (Name of Nominating
District), has requested that this district concur in its nomination of its member of the
ACWA/JPIA Board of Directors to the Executive Committee of the ACWA/JPIA.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Governing Board of Sweetwater
Authority that this district concurs with the nomination of (Name of Nominee) of (Name
of Nominating District) to the Executive Committee of the ACWA/JPIA.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the District Secretary is hereby directed to
transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the ACWA/JPIA at P.O .Box 619082,
Roseville, California 95661-9082, forthwith.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the Governing Board of
Sweetwater Authority held on the 27th day of February 2019, by the following vote to
wit.

AYES: ____________________________
NOES: ____________________________
ABSENT: __________________________
ABSTAIN: __________________________

_______________________________
Steve Castaneda, Chair

ATTEST: __________________________
_______________________________
Ligia Perez, Board Secretary
California Water Policy Conference

April 4 & 5, 2019
Courtyard by Marriott at Liberty Station, San Diego

Our 28th Year

The California Water Policy Conference Planning Committee is developing a stimulating conference agenda that will take the leading water issues of the day head-on and bring all participants into the heart of the debate and problem-solving.

Our highlighted speakers include

_Opening Keynote, Thursday, April 4_

**Joaquin Esquivel**  Board Member, California State Water Resources Control Board

Board Member Esquivel will open the conference with a tone of optimism and problem solving as he shares his thoughts on the pressing water policy issues facing California. Joaquin Esquivel was appointed to the State Water Resources Control Board by Governor Jerry Brown in March 2017. Previously, he served as Assistant Secretary for federal water policy at the California Natural Resources Agency in the Governor’s Washington, D.C. office, where he facilitated the development of policy priorities between the agency, the
Governor’s Office, the California Congressional delegation, and federal stakeholder agencies. He was born and raised in California’s Coachella Valley.

*Lunch Speaker, Thursday, April 4*

**Mark Arax** *Author*

Mark Arax will be discussing his newest book, The Dreamt Land: Chasing Water and Dust Across California. Mark is from a family of Central Valley farmers, a writer with deep ties to the land who has watched the battles over water intensify even as California lurches from drought to flood and back again. In The Dreamt Land, he travels the state to explore the one-of-a-kind distribution system, built in the 1940s, ’50s and ’60s, that is straining to keep up with California's relentless growth.

*Opening Keynote, Friday, April 5*

**Brenda Burman**, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation

Brenda Burman has 25 years of experience working on western issues, with an emphasis on water and natural resources. She previously served in the Department of the Interior as Reclamation's Deputy Commissioner for External and Intergovernmental Affairs and as Interior's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water and Science.

See more speaker details here . . .

**Who are we**

Now in its 28th year, the California Water Policy Conference is the premier event in the State that brings together leaders from the agricultural, urban water and environmental communities to discuss the current policy issues impacting California’s water. Every year over 300 participants from around the State attend this conference to network with their colleagues, listen to perspectives they may have not heard before and learn about new programs and ideas.

The conference agenda is put together by a diverse planning committee that strives to identify the most current topics and best speakers to offer insight and debate with the goal being to educate, enlighten and inform our attendees. We hope you will join us at this year’s conference.

Please feel free to connect with us either by sending an email to info@CAwaterPolicy.org or talking with us at 858-272-6804.

**Who Should Attend**

- Officials and staff at all levels of government
- Water agency officials and staff
- Business, Agricultural and environmental leaders
- Academics and students

http://www.cawaterpolicy.org/
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Board Meeting</th>
<th>Present to Finance Committee &amp; Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **February 7**  
  FY 2019-20 Strategic Plan Work Plan Workshop

- **March 20**  
  Review of Board input from February 7 Workshop

- **March 27**  
  Review Draft FY 2019-20 Five-year Financial Plan (including table of assumptions) and Draft Strategic Plan Work Plan

- **April 17**  
  Review Draft FY 2019-20 Five-year Financial Plan (including table of assumptions) and Draft Strategic Plan Work Plan

- **April 24**  
  Review Draft FY 2019-20 Five-year Financial Plan (including table of assumptions) and Draft Strategic Plan Work Plan

- **May TBD**  
  **DRAFT:** FY 2019-20 Budget and Strategic Plan Work Plan  
  (draft budget includes operating, capital, reserves and revenue details)

- **May 15**  
  Follow-up Board meeting as needed from budget or work plan input from prior meetings

- **May 22**  
  Follow-up Board meeting as needed from budget or work plan input from prior meetings

- **June 12**  
  **FINAL:** FY 2019-20 Operating, Capital, Reserve Budget and Five-year Projection; and FY 2019-20 Strategic Plan Work Plan

- **July 12**  
  Annual Consumer Price Index released by Bureau of Labor Statistics for establishing the January 1, 2020 rate change
OPERATIONS COMMITTEE
MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, February 20, 2019

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. Present were Director Alejandra Sotelo-Solis, Director Hector Martinez, and *Director Josie Calderon-Scott (10:07 a.m.). Director Sotelo-Solis was selected to serve as Chair of the Operations Committee. Staff members present: General Manager Tish Berge, Assistant General Manager Jennifer Sabine, Interim Director of Water Quality Justin Brazil, Director of Engineering Ron Mosher, Director of Distribution Greg Snyder, Director of Finance Rich Stevenson, and Engineering Manager Luis Valdez. Others present: Isaac Calderon, Abraham Edid, and Dylan Hinkle of Blue Centurion Homes, Andrew Oven of Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc., and Steve Leyton of Protection Design & Consulting.

2. ITEMS TO BE ADDED, WITHDRAWN, OR REORDERED IN THE AGENDA
(Government Code Section 54956.5)
Director Martinez requested that agenda item number 4. E., "Ridgeway Apartments Project by Blue Centurion Homes" be reordered to item 4. A., and reorder all subsequent agenda items.

3. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
(Government Code Section 54954.3)
There were no comments from the public.

4. ACTION AGENDA
   A. Ridgeway Apartments Project by Blue Centurion Homes, Development Project Update (Information Item):
   (Note: Director Calderon-Scott entered the meeting at 10:07 p.m.)

   General Manager Berge indicated this item was placed on the agenda by Director Martinez and that this item had first been brought to Management’s attention by former Director Morrison in August 2018.

   Director Calderon-Scott clarified that she had received a call from the developer and referred the request to Chair Castaneda. Director Martinez stated that Chair Castaneda asked him to investigate the issues.

   Ms. Berge provided a brief overview of the project history, including the impact of fire flow on water facility improvements, and the revision of the fire flow requirement from the City of National City Fire Department.

   Mr. Edid stated that they are not asking for an exemption from any of the Authority’s requirements; rather, they believe staff is misinterpreting the existing policies. Mr. Edid then provided a summary of the proposed project. Mr. Leyton of Protection Design & Consulting, a
fire sprinkler consultant to Blue Centurion Homes, described the building features that allowed the National City Fire Department to change the fire flow requirement to 1,000 gpm. Mr. Edid stated that the Authority’s pipeline velocity limitation of 10 feet per second (fps) and the fire flow requirement of 1,000 gpm are not linked, and that this is the primary point of disagreement between Blue Centurion Homes and Authority staff.

Director of Engineering Mosher explained that the fire department is concerned about fire flow capability, residual pressure during fire flow conditions, and duration of fire flow to ensure a fire can be extinguished. These requirements are stated in the National City Fire Department fire flow letter to be 1,000 gpm at 20 psi residual pressure for a duration of two hours. Mr. Mosher explained that these requirements translate into impacts to the water distribution system in terms of velocity of the water during fire flow conditions, residual pressure, and storage tank sizing to provide the volume of water needed to meet the two-hour duration. He explained that these evaluation criteria have been used by the Authority since the 1980’s, and that the 10 fps velocity criteria is supported by industry standards.

Engineering Manager Valdez explained that the velocity of the water flowing in the pipelines, regardless of whether the cause is peak day demand in the system or fire flow conditions, can have a substantial impact on the water distribution system through the creation of transient pressures as a result of quickly stopping the water, creating what is commonly referred to as a water hammer. Mr. Valdez explained that the 10 fps velocity can generate a pressure spike that either nearly reaches or exceeds the pressure class of the asbestos cement pipe in Ridgeway Drive.

Director Calderon-Scott asked if there had been any discussion with Blue Centurion Homes regarding a reimbursement agreement. Mr. Mosher replied that a reimbursement agreement had been discussed, but that discussion had occurred prior to the reduction in the fire flow requirement by the National City Fire Department. Mr. Mosher explained how the reimbursement agreement would be implemented in light of the new scope of work required to accommodate the proposed development, which consists of installing about 430 feet of 8-inch water main to replace the existing 6-inch asbestos cement main in Ridgeway Drive.

Director Martinez stated that he agrees with Mr. Edid that there is some ambiguity regarding the impact of the velocity criteria and suggested that the developer go back to the National City Fire Department for authorization to use two fire hydrants to meet the required fire flow. Mr. Edid and his team (Mr. Leyton and Mr. Oven of Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.) replied it would not be a fruitful exercise as the National City Fire Department will only consider the proposed fire hydrant to be constructed at the project site as the source of supply for fire-fighting purposes needed to complete the fire-fighting activities that are not addressed by the fire sprinkler systems in the buildings.

Director Martinez suggested that the Authority look at this project and others for ways to facilitate projects by considering when the Authority would have replaced this particular pipeline in Ridgeway Drive, based on the analyses performed for and documented in the Water Distribution System Master Plan. This could then be used to establish a credit to the
developer for the value of the existing water main that had been “used” by the Authority versus the value “lost” by replacing it before its time. In effect, determine the depreciated value of the pipeline and apply that as a credit to the developer’s cost of installing the required new 8-inch water main to support the needs of the proposed development by Blue Centurion Homes.

The Operations Committee recommends that the Governing Board direct staff to evaluate the remaining life of the existing water main in Ridgeway Drive; determine the depreciated value of the pipe; and offer that value as a credit to the cost of installing the new water main needed to support the proposed development.

B. Consideration to Award a Contract for Heavy Equipment Replacement:
Director of Distribution Snyder provided an overview of the item.

The Operations Committee 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.

C. Request to Approve Easement Quitclaim – 237 Rogan Road, Chula Vista:
General Manager Berge provided an overview of the item.

The Operations Committee 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.

D. Overview of Fiscal Impact – Expense vs. Capital (Information Item):
General Manager Berge provided an overview of two different types of fiscal impacts as provided in memos to the Board: (1) Expense items, or (2) Capital items. She then explained the difference in reporting of these items, as provided to the Committee in their agenda packet.

Director Calderon-Scott stated she would like the fiscal impact to show how the requested funds line up to the available funds as presented in the Budget for all requests, including requests for items or services funded through the Expense portion of the Budget.

The Operations Committee members agreed that the example the memos provided for the fiscal impact of Capital projects offers the Board the detail needed to understand how the fiscal impact is presented. The Committee and had no recommendation for changes to how fiscal impacts are presented in memos to the Board.

No action is required by the Governing Board.
E. Facility and Capital Project Tours (No Enclosure):

The Operations Committee members indicated that they are interested in facility and project tours as part of future Operations Committee meetings.

No action is required by the Governing Board.

5. CLOSED SESSION

There was none.

6. NEXT MEETING

The next regularly scheduled Operations Committee meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 20, 2019 at 10:00 a.m.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:44 a.m.
1. **CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

   The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Present were Chair Preciado, Director Jerry Cano, and Director Jose Cerda. Staff members present: General Manager Tish Berge, Assistant General Manager Jennifer Sabine, Director of Engineering Ron Mosher, Director of Finance Rich Stevenson, and Director of Administrative Services Dina Yorba.

2. **ITEMS TO BE ADDED, WITHDRAWN, OR REORDERED ON THE AGENDA**
   
   (Government Code Section 54956.5)
   
   There were none.

3. **OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**
   
   (Government Code Section 54954.3)
   
   There were no members from the public present.

4. **ACTION AGENDA**

   A. **FY 2019-20 Budget Calendar (Information Item)**

   Director of Finance Stevenson provided an overview of the budget calendar and stated that an overview of the FY 2019-20 Financial Plan will be provided at the April 24, 2019 Board meeting, and a full draft FY 2019-20 Budget presented at a workshop in May 2019. The final budget will be presented at the June 12, 2019 Board meeting for approval.

   Chair Preciado asked Mr. Stevenson for elaboration on the parameters used in developing the financial plan. Mr. Stevenson stated that the financial plan would incorporate an estimated increase based on the Bureau of Labor Statistic's Consumer Price Index for San Diego released in July 2019, as allowed for in the five-year rate plan adopted by the Board in August 2018. Chair Preciado added that the adopted five-year rate plan also allows the Authority to build a rate stabilization fund based on certain wholesale water purchase costs and the water rates associated with those costs.

   No action is required by the Governing Board

   B. **Consideration to Award a Contract for Desktop Computer (PC) Purchase**

   Director of Finance Stevenson provided an overview of this agenda item.

   Director Cerda asked if a better price could be achieved through direct negotiations with the computer manufacturer. Mr. Stevenson replied that the third party distributor of the computers contracts for much larger volumes with the manufacturer than the Authority would on its own; thus, the distributor would receive a much lower price and pass that price on to the final customer. In addition, the computer manufacturers rely on the distributors to provide a layer of customer service that the manufacturers prefer.
Chair Preciado asked why the Red River Technology LLC bid was rejected. Mr. Stevenson replied that they submitted the proposal incorrectly; in addition, their bid was only the second lowest, and therefore, Red River Technology LLC would not have been awarded the contract.

The Finance and Personnel Committee recommends that the Governing Board declare the bid from Red River Technology LLC as nonresponsive; and award a contract in an amount not-to-exceed $125,434, to CDW Government LLC, Vernon Hills, IL, for the purchase of 150 desktop computers.

C. One-time Adjustment to Customer Water Bill

Director of Administrative Service Yorba provided an overview of this agenda item.

Chair Preciado asked if Authority staff takes steps to notify the customer of a leak. Ms. Yorba replied that staff evaluates customer’s water use as the meters are read; and when larger than normal volumes are recorded, then staff will contact the customer.

Director Cano asked for a description of the one-time adjustment approval process. Ms. Yorba provided an explanation of the process.

Director Cerda and Director Cano both stated that they felt the customer should pay the water bill in full.

The Finance and Personnel Committee recommends that the Governing Board deny an adjustment to Soapy Joe’s Bonita Inc., and grant an extended payment plan to pay the balance of $37,583.48 over a twelve month period.

D. Consideration to Approve Contract Amendment No. 5 to GEI Consultants, Inc., for Condition Assessment of North and South Spillways of Sweetwater Dam

Director of Engineering Mosher provided an overview of this agenda item and stated that the contract amendment will result in the final stages of the planning and design process for the reserve funded project.

The Finance and Personnel Committee recommends that the Governing Board approve Contract Amendment No. 5 with GEI Consultants, Inc., Carlsbad, CA, for the scope of work relating to a condition assessment of the North and South Spillways of Sweetwater Dam, in an amount not-to-exceed $169,244.

E. Consideration of Changes to Director’s Fees

General Manager Berge provided an overview of this agenda item.

Chair Preciado opined that no changes in fees are needed at this time.

The Finance and Personnel Committee recommends no action at this time.
F. Review of Board Policies and Procedures (501 through 511)

General Manager Berge presented this agenda item and discussed the proposed changes with the Committee.

The Finance and Personnel Committee recommends that the Governing Board approve the recommended changes to Policies 501 through 511 as presented.

5. CLOSED SESSION

There was none.

6. NEXT MEETING

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Finance and Personnel Committee will be held on Wednesday, March 20, 2019 at 4:00 p.m.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.
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Sweetwater Authority  
Treasurer's Report as of January 31, 2019  
Cash, Demand Deposits and Investment Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>Account Name</th>
<th>Yield to Maturity</th>
<th>Current Yield</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Policy Limits</th>
<th>Cost Basis</th>
<th>Book Value</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union Bank Demand Deposit - Checking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,412,296.34</td>
<td>1,397,833.20</td>
<td>1,397,833.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7,050.00</td>
<td>7,050.00</td>
<td>7,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$50 M</td>
<td>19,286,188.11</td>
<td>19,286,188.11</td>
<td>19,286,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) - Water Revenue Bond 2017A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>$50 M</td>
<td>20,871,565.75</td>
<td>20,871,565.75</td>
<td>20,879,413.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Money Market</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackrock T-Fund Inst #60 01/31/19</td>
<td>2016 Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>522.41</td>
<td>522.41</td>
<td>522.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackrock T-Fund Inst #60 01/31/19</td>
<td>2017 Debt Service Fund</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificates of Deposit</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ally Bank 09/16/19</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>247,915.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMW Bank North America 09/16/19</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>247,912.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everbank 09/16/19</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>248,172.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Town Bank and Trust 09/23/20</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>244,267.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everbank USA 09/23/20</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>244,350.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Service Certificates of Deposit</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDARS 07/09/20</td>
<td>Pacific Commerce Bank</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
<td>526,225.91</td>
<td>526,225.91</td>
<td>526,225.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal National Mortgage Assn 02/19/19</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>2,026,240.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,999,320.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Home Loan Banks 09/28/20</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>2,004,820.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,997,660.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Home Loan Banks 10/01/20</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>1,997,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,003,540.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Farm Credit Bank 04/05/21</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>1,988,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Farm Credit Bank 10/19/21</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>699,712.10</td>
<td>695,000.00</td>
<td>702,857.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treasury Securities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note 08/31/20</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1,995,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,965,400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note 08/31/20</td>
<td>Investment Trust</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>1,985,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,988,360.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Demand Deposits and Investment Portfolio</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56,051,620.82</td>
<td>56,036,385.38</td>
<td>55,996,307.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All investments have been made in accordance with Sweetwater Authority's Annual Statement of Investment Policy. This report provides documentation that Sweetwater Authority has sufficient funds to meet the next 180 days cash obligations. Funds invested in accordance with the Bond Covenant are excluded from Investment Policy limits.

Average Weighted Yield = 2.270%  
Weighted Average Days to Maturity = 139

Rich Stevenson, Treasurer
This page intentionally left blank.
# Sweetwater Authority
## Treasurer’s Report as of January 31, 2019
### Accounting of Receipts, Disbursements and Fund Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td>$2,593,734.85</td>
<td>$53,394,752.66</td>
<td>$55,988,487.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Receipts</td>
<td>4,565,311.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,565,311.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Deposits</td>
<td>11,821.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,821.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Fees</td>
<td>8,040.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing Revenue</td>
<td>1,079.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,079.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>541.44</td>
<td>237,521.62</td>
<td>238,063.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Reimbursement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Receivables</td>
<td>85,193.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,193.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Receipts</td>
<td>199,584.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>199,584.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Receipts</strong></td>
<td>$4,871,570.73</td>
<td>$1,237,521.62</td>
<td>$6,109,092.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Warrants</td>
<td>$(2,163,416.40)</td>
<td>$(2,163,416.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>(1,583,328.45)</td>
<td>(1,583,328.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Purchase</td>
<td>(1,299,214.39)</td>
<td>(1,299,214.39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>(1,000,000.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,000,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Disbursements</strong></td>
<td>$(6,045,959.24)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$(6,045,959.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Cash Balance</strong></td>
<td>$1,419,346.34</td>
<td>$54,632,274.28</td>
<td>$56,051,620.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>$89,494.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>89,494.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Warrants</td>
<td>(103,958.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(103,958.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted Ending Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td>$1,404,883.20</td>
<td>$54,632,274.28</td>
<td>$56,037,157.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reserve Fund Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior Year Ending June 30, 2018</th>
<th>Year - to - Date Adjustments</th>
<th>Year - to - Date January 31, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Revenue Bond 2017A</td>
<td>$21,435,000.00</td>
<td>$(1,005,000.00)</td>
<td>$20,430,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Reserves Set By Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Del Lago</td>
<td>$182,200.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$182,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>1,198,771.09</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1,198,771.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate Stabilization Reserve</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBID Transfer Funds (pending)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>703,611.42</td>
<td>703,611.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetwater Dam PMF Project</td>
<td>8,181,071.58</td>
<td>(51,403.48)</td>
<td>8,129,668.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fund (carryover)</td>
<td>2,256,500.00</td>
<td>(479,484.82)</td>
<td>1,777,115.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Fund (bond funds)</td>
<td>883,088.53</td>
<td>313,393.86</td>
<td>1,196,482.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Special Reserves</strong></td>
<td>$13,701,731.20</td>
<td>$486,116.98</td>
<td>$14,187,848.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Fund</td>
<td>$17,693,730.44</td>
<td>$3,725,578.86</td>
<td>$21,419,309.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Reserve Balance</strong></td>
<td>$52,830,461.64</td>
<td>$3,206,695.84</td>
<td>$56,037,157.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Water Use Budget vs Actual
**Fiscal Year 2018-19**

- **Total YTD**
  - **Budget**: 10,609 AF
  - **Actual**: 10,498 AF
  - Variance: (1.0%)

### Water Use by Customer Class in Acre Feet
**Fiscal Year-to-date January 31, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Class</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Over (Under) Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4,062</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>(262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>2,217</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Meters</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Authority</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Water Sales AF</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,498</strong></td>
<td><strong>(111)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sweetwater Authority
### Fiscal Year 2018-19
#### Budget Summary as of January 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD % Over/Under</th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
<th>% Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Sales-Residential</strong></td>
<td>2,660,848</td>
<td>21,957,297</td>
<td>21,742,265</td>
<td>0.99 %</td>
<td>37,943,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,943,900</td>
<td>15,986,603</td>
<td>42.13 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Sales-Commercial</strong></td>
<td>875,547</td>
<td>6,788,517</td>
<td>6,348,688</td>
<td>6.92 %</td>
<td>11,057,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,057,500</td>
<td>4,268,983</td>
<td>38.61 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Sales-Industrial</strong></td>
<td>13,798</td>
<td>128,624</td>
<td>150,355</td>
<td>(14.45) %</td>
<td>263,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>263,100</td>
<td>134,476</td>
<td>51.11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Sales-Miscellaneous</strong></td>
<td>7,938</td>
<td>108,787</td>
<td>59,896</td>
<td>81.63 %</td>
<td>101,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>101,100</td>
<td>(7,687)</td>
<td>(7.60) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Sales-Private Fire Prot</strong></td>
<td>47,210</td>
<td>245,971</td>
<td>221,670</td>
<td>10.96 %</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>134,029</td>
<td>35.27 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Sales-Public Authorities</strong></td>
<td>176,883</td>
<td>2,764,626</td>
<td>2,496,170</td>
<td>10.75 %</td>
<td>4,296,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,296,100</td>
<td>1,531,474</td>
<td>35.65 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconnection Fees</strong></td>
<td>42,765</td>
<td>309,379</td>
<td>262,500</td>
<td>17.86 %</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>140,621</td>
<td>31.25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity Fees</strong></td>
<td>8,040</td>
<td>279,140</td>
<td>282,920</td>
<td>(1.34) %</td>
<td>485,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>485,000</td>
<td>205,860</td>
<td>42.45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Leases</strong></td>
<td>40,274</td>
<td>279,140</td>
<td>282,920</td>
<td>(1.34) %</td>
<td>485,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>485,000</td>
<td>205,860</td>
<td>42.45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td>238,617</td>
<td>735,101</td>
<td>262,500</td>
<td>180.04 %</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>(285,101)</td>
<td>(63.63) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Revenues</strong></td>
<td>300,318</td>
<td>1,615,692</td>
<td>723,220</td>
<td>123.40 %</td>
<td>1,239,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,239,800</td>
<td>(375,892)</td>
<td>(30.32) %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td>4,412,239</td>
<td>35,186,534</td>
<td>32,795,364</td>
<td>7.29 %</td>
<td>57,086,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,086,500</td>
<td>21,899,966</td>
<td>38.36 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration &amp; General</strong></td>
<td>953,052</td>
<td>7,059,600</td>
<td>7,381,324</td>
<td>(4.36) %</td>
<td>13,069,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,961,112</td>
<td>5,901,512</td>
<td>45.53 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Service</strong></td>
<td>152,955</td>
<td>1,141,683</td>
<td>1,180,536</td>
<td>(3.29) %</td>
<td>2,024,100</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,034,100</td>
<td>892,417</td>
<td>43.87 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td>99,181</td>
<td>971,758</td>
<td>1,150,848</td>
<td>(15.56) %</td>
<td>1,843,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,843,700</td>
<td>871,942</td>
<td>47.29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td>1,211,800</td>
<td>9,756,529</td>
<td>9,953,945</td>
<td>(1.98) %</td>
<td>17,955,000</td>
<td>(443,000)</td>
<td>17,012,000</td>
<td>7,305,471</td>
<td>42.82 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution</strong></td>
<td>309,223</td>
<td>2,179,927</td>
<td>2,587,582</td>
<td>(15.75) %</td>
<td>4,303,300</td>
<td>88,088</td>
<td>4,391,388</td>
<td>2,211,461</td>
<td>50.36 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Systems</strong></td>
<td>96,565</td>
<td>766,748</td>
<td>893,061</td>
<td>(14.14) %</td>
<td>1,539,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,539,300</td>
<td>772,552</td>
<td>50.19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Quality</strong></td>
<td>689,201</td>
<td>5,067,160</td>
<td>5,344,159</td>
<td>(5.18) %</td>
<td>8,975,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,975,400</td>
<td>3,908,240</td>
<td>43.54 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>3,511,978</td>
<td>26,943,406</td>
<td>28,491,455</td>
<td>(5.43) %</td>
<td>49,260,000</td>
<td>(453,000)</td>
<td>48,807,000</td>
<td>21,863,594</td>
<td>44.80 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Service</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>679,291</td>
<td>679,300</td>
<td>0.00 %</td>
<td>3,913,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,913,600</td>
<td>3,234,309</td>
<td>82.64 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Contingency</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution</strong></td>
<td>114,645</td>
<td>714,827</td>
<td>1,749,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,749,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,749,700</td>
<td>1,034,873</td>
<td>59.15 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering</strong></td>
<td>190,480</td>
<td>2,502,536</td>
<td>19,074,800</td>
<td>797,000</td>
<td>19,871,800</td>
<td>17,369,264</td>
<td>17,369,264</td>
<td>126,381</td>
<td>72.42 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Systems</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48,119</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>74,500</td>
<td>174,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>174,500</td>
<td>126,381</td>
<td>72.42 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Quality</strong></td>
<td>8,033</td>
<td>92,776</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>257,224</td>
<td>73.49 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Capital Investments</strong></td>
<td>313,157</td>
<td>3,358,258</td>
<td>21,524,500</td>
<td>621,500</td>
<td>22,146,000</td>
<td>18,787,742</td>
<td>18,787,742</td>
<td>84.84 %</td>
<td>84.84 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital-Grant Reimbursements</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Investments</strong></td>
<td>313,157</td>
<td>3,358,258</td>
<td>21,524,500</td>
<td>621,500</td>
<td>22,146,000</td>
<td>18,787,742</td>
<td>18,787,742</td>
<td>84.84 %</td>
<td>84.84 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sweetwater Authority
### Fiscal Year 2018-19
#### Budget Summary as of January 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current Month Actual</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>YTD Budget</th>
<th>YTD % Over/Under</th>
<th>Annual Budget Contingency</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
<th>% Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Water</td>
<td>574,054</td>
<td>5,677,443</td>
<td>5,813,040</td>
<td>(2.33)%</td>
<td>9,667,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,667,000</td>
<td>41.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDCWA Charges</td>
<td>477,042</td>
<td>3,119,697</td>
<td>2,921,985</td>
<td>6.77%</td>
<td>5,312,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,312,700</td>
<td>41.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased Water - URDS Pumpback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Purchase</strong></td>
<td>1,051,096</td>
<td>8,797,140</td>
<td>8,735,025</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>14,979,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,979,700</td>
<td>41.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>265,793</td>
<td>1,942,025</td>
<td>1,832,720</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
<td>2,956,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,956,000</td>
<td>34.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>41,252</td>
<td>405,654</td>
<td>354,950</td>
<td>14.28%</td>
<td>572,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>572,500</td>
<td>29.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>14,163</td>
<td>108,862</td>
<td>104,842</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
<td>169,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>169,100</td>
<td>35.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power, Chemicals &amp; Fuel</strong></td>
<td>321,209</td>
<td>2,456,541</td>
<td>2,292,512</td>
<td>7.15%</td>
<td>3,697,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,697,600</td>
<td>33.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; General</td>
<td>129,733</td>
<td>1,022,703</td>
<td>1,179,157</td>
<td>(13.27)%</td>
<td>2,043,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,043,600</td>
<td>49.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>110,427</td>
<td>845,704</td>
<td>929,026</td>
<td>(8.97)%</td>
<td>1,610,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,610,100</td>
<td>47.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services</td>
<td>60,479</td>
<td>456,018</td>
<td>452,658</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>784,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>784,500</td>
<td>41.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>111,981</td>
<td>776,975</td>
<td>829,435</td>
<td>(6.32)%</td>
<td>1,437,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,437,500</td>
<td>45.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>183,966</td>
<td>1,454,327</td>
<td>1,547,397</td>
<td>(6.01)%</td>
<td>2,681,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,681,800</td>
<td>45.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>55,239</td>
<td>416,360</td>
<td>444,116</td>
<td>(6.25)%</td>
<td>769,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>769,700</td>
<td>45.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>239,439</td>
<td>1,864,252</td>
<td>1,907,849</td>
<td>(2.29)%</td>
<td>3,306,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,306,500</td>
<td>43.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Salaries</strong></td>
<td>891,264</td>
<td>6,836,339</td>
<td>7,289,638</td>
<td>(6.22)%</td>
<td>12,633,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,633,700</td>
<td>45.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Salaries</td>
<td>26,237</td>
<td>251,247</td>
<td>340,890</td>
<td>(26.30)%</td>
<td>590,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>590,800</td>
<td>57.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salaries</strong></td>
<td>917,501</td>
<td>7,087,586</td>
<td>7,630,528</td>
<td>(7.12)%</td>
<td>13,224,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,224,500</td>
<td>46.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Benefits                        | 787,078              | 5,625,477  | 5,792,608  | (2.89)%          | 10,197,500                 | -               | 10,197,500      | 44.83%      |

| General Operating Expenses      | 461,332              | 3,227,908  | 4,381,672  | (26.33)%         | 7,751,500                  | (453,000)       | 7,298,500       | 55.77%      |
| **Operating Expenses**          | 3,511,978            | 26,943,406 | 28,491,455 | (5.43)%          | 49,260,000                 | (453,000)       | 48,807,000      | 44.80%      |
MANAGEMENT MONTHLY REPORT
ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE DASHBOARD (FOR THE MONTH ENDING JANUARY 31, 2019)

**Rainfall/Runoff**
- Loveland Reservoir
  - Rainfall: 2.34" FYTD: 7.12"
  - Annual Average: 15.28"
- Sweetwater Reservoir
  - Rainfall: 2.28" FYTD: 7.77"
  - Annual Average: 11.33"

**Water Storage**
- Loveland Reservoir Capacity: 25,387 AF
- Sweetwater Reservoir Capacity: 28,079 AF

**Total Monthly Production**
- 1219.9 AF

**Water Production and Cost**
- Perdue Plant Daily Production MGD
  - Average: 3.2
  - Max (1/7/19): 6.5
  - Min (1/19/19): 0

**Cost to Treat Water per AF (Variable Costs)**
- January 2018:
  - Perdue Plant: $108
  - Desal Facility: $336
  - NC Wells: $145

**Financial**
- Fiscal Year-to-Date Water Sales
  - Acre Feet
    - Actual: 10,498
    - Budget: 10,743
  - $ (millions)
    - Actual: $31.7
    - Budget: $32.1

**Administrative**
- No. of Funded Positions: 133
- No. of Positions Filled: 123
- No. of Vacancies: 10
- No. of Recruitments: 8
- No. of Website Visitors: 12,311
- No. of Safety Achievements Issued: 7
- Hours of Training: 201.75
  - Total Attendees: 270

**Customer Service**
- Month: 203
  - FYTD: 1,452
  - Prior FYTD: 1,577
- Delinquent Accounts
- Credit Card Transactions: 6,804
  - FYTD: 45,508
  - Prior FYTD: 40,996
- High Bill Investigations: 25
  - FYTD: 212
  - Prior FYTD: 213
- Walk-in Customer Assistance: 3,609
  - FYTD: 23,384
  - Prior FYTD: 23,017
- Water Efficiency Outreach: 1
  - FYTD: 32
  - Prior FYTD: 46
- Taste and Odor Complaints: 0
  - FYTD: 4
  - Prior FYTD: 14
- New Accounts: 306
  - FYTD: 2,679
  - Prior FYTD: 2,685

**Watershed Runoff**
- (Loveland)
  - January 2018: 238.6 AF
- (Sweetwater)
  - January 2018: 173.2 AF

**Water Loss**
- Cause:
  - Natural Pipe Aging: 0 Incidents/Type FYTD: 0
  - Hit by Contractor: 1 Incidents/Type FYTD: 3
  - Tree Root/Settlement: 0 Incidents/Type FYTD: 3
  - Fittings, Gaskets, etc.: 0 Incidents/Type FYTD: 1
  - Trench Settlement: 1 Incidents/Type FYTD: 5

**Water Efficiency Outreach**
- January 2017: 40,996
  - FYTD: 23,017
  - Prior FYTD: 23,017

**Loveland Reservoir**
- Rainfall: 2.34" FYTD: 7.12"
  - Annual Average: 15.28"
  - Last Month: 53% Full

**Sweetwater Reservoir**
- Rainfall: 2.28" FYTD: 7.77"
  - Annual Average: 11.33"
  - Last Month: 14% Full

**Watershed Runoff**
- (Loveland)
  - January 2018: 238.6 AF
- (Sweetwater)
  - January 2018: 173.2 AF

**Loveland Reservoir Capacity**
- 25,387 AF

**Sweetwater Reservoir Capacity**
- 28,079 AF

**Loveland Reservoir**
- Rainfall: 2.34" FYTD: 7.12"
  - Annual Average: 15.28"

**Sweetwater Reservoir**
- Rainfall: 2.28" FYTD: 7.77"
  - Annual Average: 11.33"
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Date Requested</th>
<th>Requestor and Request</th>
<th>Action by Staff/Schedule</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>01/03/18</td>
<td>Director Preciado – Requested staff investigate providing Board members with WIFI while at the offices.</td>
<td>Staff will review Internet access for the Board members as part of the upcoming Information System (IS) Master Plan. The Plan will also take into account how Board member use of public agency provided Internet is subject to the Public Records Act.</td>
<td>TBD IS Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>01/09/19</td>
<td>Board – Deferred discussion of the reservoir emergency storage policy to the Operations Committee.</td>
<td>Management added this item to the February 20, 2019, will add this to the March 2019 or future Operations Committee Agenda.</td>
<td>02/05/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>01/17/19</td>
<td>Director Martinez – Asked Management to look into whether health coverage costs change after an employee or Board member are eligible for Medicare (i.e., turn 65)</td>
<td>Management researched the request. The cost for active employees and Board members is the same, regardless of age, including past 65.</td>
<td>01/31/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>01/17/19</td>
<td>Director Martinez – Asked Management to research the quality of sand at Loveland and Sweetwater reservoirs.</td>
<td>Management is researching information already available that is responsive to this request.</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>01/17/19</td>
<td>Director Martinez – Asked Management to research his concern about the accuracy of the Venturi meters and reporting of water produced at Perdue Treatment Plant.</td>
<td>Management provided the information to Director Martinez via a voicemail message. Due to the desalination facility coming online, the treatment plant is now acting as a “peaker” plant with much lower flow than previously. As such, the single meter at the clearwell inlet is not as accurate at low flows. To ensure accuracy of reporting, the summation of the filter effluent meters is now used to measure production.</td>
<td>01/25/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>01/17/19</td>
<td>Director Martinez – Asked Management to research his concern about over-reporting of water loss reporting to the State.</td>
<td>Management researched the concern, which was rectified in 2018.</td>
<td>02/01/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>01/23/19</td>
<td>Director Preciado – Asked Management to add discussion of meeting days and times to the agenda for the Strategic Plan Workplan Workshop.</td>
<td>Management added this item.</td>
<td>02/05/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>01/23/19</td>
<td>Director Calderon-Scott – Asked Management to clarify how fiscal impact information is provided in memos to the Board.</td>
<td>Management added this item to the Operations Committee agenda.</td>
<td>01/23/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LOG OF BOARD REQUESTS

**February 21, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Date Requested</th>
<th>Requestor and Request</th>
<th>Action by Staff/Schedule</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>02/07/19</td>
<td>Director Martinez – Asked Management to place the Blue Centurion Project at Ridgeway Drive on the next Operations Committee agenda.</td>
<td>Management added this item.</td>
<td>02/07/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>02/10/19</td>
<td>Director Martinez – Asked Management if there's any sand mining interest at Sweetwater and Loveland by the current sand mining company in the Sweetwater River middle basin.</td>
<td>Management responded that staff had met with this developer and to their knowledge, they have not expressed interest in sand at the reservoirs.</td>
<td>02/11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>02/11/19</td>
<td>Director Martinez – Asked Management about permits for work performed on First Ave south of F St.</td>
<td>Management responded that Authority did have the necessary permits, including for traffic control.</td>
<td>02/11/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>02/20/19</td>
<td>Director Martinez – Asked Management two questions on the Blue Centurion Project at Ridgeway Drive: 1) What is the velocity with a 1,000 gpm fire flow with an average day demand, and 2) What is the velocity with 1,000 gpm and zero demand?</td>
<td>Management is researching the level of effort necessary to respond to this request and whether it needs to be channeled through the Board in accordance with Policy 506.</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Number sequencing is not in order as those tasks completed are removed from this list. New tasks are assigned a new number.*
Captain William Dale (Bud) Pocklington, USN (Ret). May 29, 1932- February 22, 2019

Captain William D. (Bud) Pocklington USN (Ret) former Commanding Officer of HC-1, passed away on February 22, 2019 at Sharp Memorial Hospital, San Diego California. Born in Lake County, Ill, the fourth son of seven boys of William and Hilda Pocklington. Bud set the example for the rest of the family by being the first high school, and college graduate in the family. Graduating from Zion High School, Bud was encouraged to enlist in the Navy by his High School Football Coach the Commanding officer in the Navy Air Reserve Squadron at NAS Great Lakes Ill. While in college he was an Aviation Storekeeper Petty Officer in the Naval Reserve. He received his Bachelor of Arts Degree in Business Economics from Whitworth College in 1955. After being commissioned an Ensign in December 1956, and awaiting orders to Flight Training he was assigned as Air Intelligence Officer at Los Alamitos, Long Beach, California. Bud received his wings in November 1959 at Corpus Christi, Texas.

His first squadron, Airborne Early Warning Barrier Squadron Pacific, (AEWBARRONPAC), Midway Island Bud was trained in the Lockheed EC 121 Super Constellation (Willy Victors). At tours completions Bud requested assignment to Helicopters and at HT-8 he was qualified in Helicopters, April 19, 1961. During his first tour in HS-4 where he made two Western Pacific deployments aboard anti-submarine carrier USS YORKTOWN, and flew the HSS-1N, the first helicopter equipped for night instrument operational anti-submarine warfare. During his tours at NAS Ream Field, Bud’s other military assignments include the following squadrons HS-10, also HS-2, and HS-4, flying the H3 A/D/F.

In March of 1967 he reported to the United States Military Assistance Command Vietnam, Saigon, where he was assigned to Plans and Special Projects in the Joint Operation Division, Combat Operation Center in country for 12 months 1967/68 during the TET offensive. This is where he was exposed to Agent Orange which would effect him 45 years later and end his life.

After completion of the Senior War College at New Port R.I. Bud returned to NAS Ream Field and HC-1 completing his XO/CO tour, Command, which also included the last at SEA recovery with Navy Seals and a H3 aircraft, on February 8, 1974 came to an end. This also was the first time an Apollo splashdown was not broadcast live by television and world news.

Completing his tour at HC-1 and assigned to Naval Air Systems command, he worked the new development of the V-22 OSPREY. A mulita-mission til-rotor aircraft with both Vertical take off and Landing (VTOL), and Short takeoff and Landing (STOL) capabilities. Sea duty required Bud to return to DESRON staff duty in San Diego, CA. This tour of duty and his next one involved the Lamps Surface commands in ASW/Combat for support for all Pacific commands, as the senior Aviator at Commander Naval Surface Forces. Captain Pocklington has earned the Bronze Star Medal, Air Medal, Combat Action Ribbon, Navy Unite Commendation Medal, Meritorious Unite Commendation Medal, in addition to various campaign and service awards.

Bud completed 30 years of service and retired from Commander Naval Air Forces Pacific in 1986. He soon was elected to public office, just 30 days after retirement. As a Board Director on the South Bay Irrigation District and conjunction with the Sweetwater Authority a local Water Board in South Bay, San Diego County. His experience and service to his community saw him being re-elected 6 more times completed 28 years service to his community. Other Boards he served on during this time was Local Formation Commission (LAFCO), San Diego County Water Authority, and the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.
In 2014 Bud was diagnosed with health issues due to being exposed to Agent Orange and was given an option to have a Left Ventricular Assist Device (LVAD) operation which included an electrical pump of 1.3 lbs placed in side his body and made part of his heart and blood circulate which is used in heart transplant recipients. On January 29, 2014 after a 9 hour operation completing the procedure and lived somewhat a comfortable life until 2019 when his heart became weaker and could not keep him alive and passed away at Sharp, Memorial where he had the LVAD put in place five years earlier.

Services will be held at Miramar National Cemetery in San Diego, California, on March 7, 2019 at 11:00 AM. Bud is survived by his wife of 57 years Bess, two sons, William and David, and two Grand daughters Ashley and Taylor and 4 great grand children. In lieu of flowers please make a gift donation to the Wounded Warriors Project.
Agenda Item No. 11
Attachment 3: Ridgeway Apartments
Correspondence
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.

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.
PAY TO THE ORDER OF: Sweetwater Authority

Three Hundred and 00/100 DOLLARS

Sweetwater Authority
505 Garrett Ave
Chula Vista, CA 91910

MEMO

Dexter Wilson Engineering
Sweetwater Authority

General Account

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

CA Bank & Trust - Gen

300.00
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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 project’s 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
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.
From: jmettler@sweetwater.org [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 7:56 AM
To: Andrew Oven <Andrew Oven>
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 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: Sendtlt 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
619-409-0755

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.
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
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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Andrew Oven
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
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
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
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.

Secured by Accellion
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From: Andrew Oven  
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.

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2017 12:40 PM  
To: Andrew Oven  
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  
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
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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

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

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.
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
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.
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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

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.
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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: jmettler@sweetwater.org
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2017 7:56 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.
To: Andrew Oven

Subject: SendIt New Account Invitation

imetller@sweetwater.org has invited you to use SendIt

Message from imettller@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 imettller@sweetwater.org to send a new invitation e-mail.
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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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

Andrew,

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.

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,
From: Andrew Oven [mailto: • • • •]
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
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
From: Andrew Oven [mailto: • • • •
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: • • • •]
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.
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
Redact Cell
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org
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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
ateieda@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 via “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 <ateieda@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
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
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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:•••]
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
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>
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.

From: Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@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 <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.
From: Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org>
Sent: Monday, April 23, 2018 4:49 PM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Subject: FW: 2604 Ridgeway Parcel C - Hydrant Flow Test Request

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

From: Valdez, Luis
Sent: Wednesday, April 18, 2018 8:51 AM
To: 'Andrew Oven'
Cc: Mettler, Jason; Tejeda, Arturo
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Parcel C - Hydrant Flow Test Request

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

From: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Sent: Tuesday, April 17, 2018 2:49 PM
To: Valdez, Luis
Cc: Mettler, Jason; Tejeda, Arturo
Subject: RE: 2604 Ridgeway Parcel C - Hydrant Flow Test Request

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

From: Valdez, Luis <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 8:09 AM
To: Andrew Oven <Redact>
Cc: Mettler, Jason <imettler@sweetwater.org>; Tejeda, Arturo <atejeda@sweetwater.org>
Subject: [Blacklisted Sender] RE: 2604 Ridgeway Parcel C - Hydrant Flow Test Request

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 Redact | 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
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
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Hello Dylan,

As mentioned 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
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

From: MEscobarEckRedact [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2018 1:17 PM
To: Josie Flores Clark <JClark@nationalcityca.gov>
Cc: Ron Morrison <RMorrison@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Ridgeway documents
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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 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: MEscobar-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
From: MEscobarEcl, 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: MEscobarEcl, 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: MEscobarEcl, 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
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

Redact
Redact
Mettler, Jason

From: Mettler, Jason
Sent: Thursday, August 09, 2018 8:55 AM
To: Mosher, Ron; Valdez, Luis
Subject: RE: Ridgeway documents
Attachments: 2602 Ridgeway Drive-Suggested Response-jdm.docx

Hello Luis,

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

Thanks,
Jason

Mosher, Ron

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

Berge, Tish

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

Ron Morrison [mailto:RMorrison@nationalcityca.gov]

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 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 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
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: MEscobarEckRedact
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.

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

From: Josie Flores Clark <JClark@nationalcityca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 12:04 PM
To: MEscobarEckRedact
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: MEscobarEckRedact
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.
Jeannette Temple
Senior Land Use Consultant
Atlantis Group Land Use Consultants
www.AtlantisSD.com

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

Regards, Marcela

From: Jeannette Temple
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2018 10:03 AM
To: Marcela Escobar-Eck
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
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 [Redact].

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 [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
From: Marcela Escobar-Eck
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: Marcela Escobar-Eck @ 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: Marcela Escobar-Eck
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’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

[Redact]

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
PRIVATE WATER SYSTEM ANALYSIS
FOR THE
RIDGEWAY PARCEL C PROJECT
IN THE CITY OF NATIONAL CITY

December 27, 2017
PRIVATE WATER SYSTEM ANALYSIS
FOR THE
RIDGEWAY PARCEL C PROJECT
IN THE CITY OF NATIONAL CITY

December 27, 2017

Prepared by:
Dexter Wilson Engineering, Inc.
2234 Faraday Avenue
Carlsbad, CA 92008
(760) 438-4422

Job No. 1501-008
December 27, 2017

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
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.
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
Jeff Lundstrom, P.E.
December 27, 2017
Ridgeway Parcel C

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>Fixtures</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLOTHES WASHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUNDRY SINK</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUB/SHOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITCHEN SINK</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISHWASHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVATORY</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER CLOSET (1.6 GPF)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSE BIBB</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EACH ADDTL HB</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building A # of Units</th>
<th>WFUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building B # of Units</th>
<th>WFUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>196.9</td>
<td>716.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Bkflw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120 Bkflw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>172.8</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>282.8</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>297.8</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

MINOR LOSS TABLES AND MANUFACTURER'S LITERATURE FOR A REDUCED PRESSURE PRINCIPLE DETECTOR CHECK ASSEMBLY BACKFLOW PREVENTER
**APPLICATION**

Designed for installation on potable water lines in fire protection systems to protect against both backslipphonage 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
- Elastomers: EPDM (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>DIMENSION (approximate)</th>
<th>WEIGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B LESS GATE VALVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in.</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37 5/8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

(Patent No. 5,913,331)
FLOW CHARACTERISTICS

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

FLOW RATES (l/s)

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

FLOW RATES (l/s)

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.

PROTECTIVE ENCLOSURE

OUTDOOR INSTALLATION

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.

INDOOR INSTALLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipe size</th>
<th>5 ft/sec</th>
<th>7.5 ft/sec</th>
<th>10 ft/sec</th>
<th>15 ft/sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2&quot;</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>2339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&quot;</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>3887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>2644</td>
<td>3625</td>
<td>5288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILKINS a Zurn Company, 1747 Commerce Way, Paso Robles, CA 93446 Phone: 805-238-7100 Fax: 805-238-5766

In Canada: ZURN INDUSTRIES LIMITED, 3544 Nashua Dr., Mississauga, Ontario L4V 1L2 Phone: 905-405-3272 Fax: 905-405-1232

Product Support Help Line: 877-BACKFLOW (877-222-5356) • Website: http://www.zurn.com
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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 1</td>
<td>717.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>173.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>283.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>8 11</td>
<td>298.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JUNCTION NUMBER | DEMAND | ELEVATION | CONNECTING PIPES
1               | .00     | 132.00     | 100 120
2               | .00     | 132.00     | 120 124
5               | .00     | 134.00     | 124 127
8               | .00     | 135.00     | 127 130
11              | .00     | 127.00     | 130

OUTPUT SELECTION: ALL RESULTS ARE OUTPUT EACH PERIOD

THIS SYSTEM HAS 5PIPES 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>HL/1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>8 11</td>
<td>.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     | 240.00     | 132.00    | 46.80
2               | .00     | 240.00     | 132.00    | 46.80
5               | .00     | 240.00     | 134.00    | 45.93
8               | .00     | 240.00     | 135.00    | 45.50
11              | .00     | 240.00     | 127.00    | 48.97
Ridgeway Parcel C in National City
Sweetwater Authority Water Service
Fire Flow Analysis

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 = 0.00000

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

<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>HL/1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 1</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 2</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>81.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2 5</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 8</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>27.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>8 11</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>15.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUNCTION NUMBER</th>
<th>DEMAND</th>
<th>GRAGE 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>178.35</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>NODE NOS.</th>
<th>FLOWRATE</th>
<th>HEAD LOSS</th>
<th>PUMP HEAD</th>
<th>MINOR LOSS</th>
<th>VELOCITY HL/1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>5.85 11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td>13.17 81.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>2 5</td>
<td>2063.00</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>8.43 27.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>6.13 15.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>8 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>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>563.00</td>
<td>190.60</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>24.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1500.00</td>
<td>186.31</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>22.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>186.31</td>
<td>127.00</td>
<td>25.70</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 = .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.

Abraham Edid
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
This page intentionally left blank.
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
Cell: [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,
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

[Redact]

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9285 Activity Fid 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
Call: Redact
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 Edid [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 Edid
Cell: [Redact]
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
This page intentionally left blank.
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 <nmoshen@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 Edid [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 Edid
Cell: Redact
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92128
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

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92128

www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
This page intentionally left blank.
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
Cell: [Redact]
Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 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
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.
# BID OPENING SIGN-IN SHEET

**PROJECT NAME: PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION FOR 2018-2019 PIPELINE REPLACEMENT PROGRAM**

**BUDGET PROJECT NO. 20194009 through 20194015**

**DATE: 09/11/18**  **TIME: 3:30 PM**

**LOCATION: RICHARD A. REYNOLDS DESALINATION FACILITY, 3066 N. SECOND AVENUE, CHULA VISTA, CA 91910**

<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>7550 Opportunity Rd Suite A San Diego, CA 92108</td>
<td>619-291-1495</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kelly@palmengineering.com">Kelly@palmengineering.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esteban Cloud</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>1635 Federal Blvd San Diego</td>
<td>619-483-4111</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sarah@baliconstruction.com">Sarah@baliconstruction.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Hallby</td>
<td>Cell-Crete</td>
<td>550 Upper 405 Exposition Dr 619-905-9185</td>
<td>619-4-616-079</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Bob@cellcrete.com">Bob@cellcrete.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buzz Birney</td>
<td>Cass Arrieta</td>
<td>1105 S. Marshall Ave, El Cajon, CA 92021 619 570 0929</td>
<td>619-820-7429</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbirney@casarrieta.com">bbirney@casarrieta.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll Caza</td>
<td>Buetech Pipeline</td>
<td>102 51100 St Encinitas CA 92024</td>
<td>619 634 3822</td>
<td><a href="mailto:buddy@buetechpipeline.com">buddy@buetechpipeline.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Young</td>
<td>EJCJON Grading</td>
<td>P.O. Box 967 Lakeside CA 619 561-9980</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Randy@EJCJON.com">Randy@EJCJON.com</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Randy@EJCJON.com">Randy@EJCJON.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lynes</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>P.O. Box 967 Lakeside CA 619 561-9980</td>
<td>619-561-9980</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Steve@Sweetwater.com">Steve@Sweetwater.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Tajoela</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>525 Gueit Ave, CV 91910</td>
<td>619-404-6758</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Allen@Sweetwater.com">Allen@Sweetwater.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco J Matiyo</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>525 Gueit Ave, CV 91910</td>
<td>619-404-6755</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Francisco@Sweetwater.com">Francisco@Sweetwater.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Metzker</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>525 Gueit Ave, CV 91910</td>
<td>619-404-6755</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jason@Sweetwater.com">Jason@Sweetwater.com</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 Cell
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.
<Bid Attendance Sheet.pdf>
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

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,

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
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
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Arturo,

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

Bill

From: Bill Lundstrom
To: Tejeda, Arturo
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason; Montijo, Jay; Dylan Hinkle
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements
Date: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 8:42:21 AM
Attachments: L209-03 BMP SHT-05.pdf

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
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason; Montijo, Jay
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

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,
From: Bill Lundstrom
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
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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
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
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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

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

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

From: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 1:31 PM
To: Bill Lundstrom <Redact> 
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, the will process SWRCB approval.

Thank you,

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

From: Bill Lundstrom [mailto:Redact]
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
Bill Lundstrom

To: Arturo Tejeda

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

Arturo Tejeda
Senior Engineer Technician
Sweetwater Authority

From: Arturo "Art" Tejeda

Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

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
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
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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

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,

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
? Call out 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
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.

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
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:Redact]
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; Montijo, Jay
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
Cc: Abraham Edid; Jeff Lundstrom; Mettler, Jason; Montijo, Jay
Subject: RE: Ridgeway waterline improvements

Arturo,

It looks 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
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
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
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 Activity 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 lineal 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

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

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
9285 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

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
9285 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 addressing 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.
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

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) 409-6751, or lvaldez@sweetwater.org.

Sincerely,

SWEETWATER AUTHORITY

Ron R. Mosher  
Director of Engineering

RRM:LV:vn
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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
October 18, 2018

To: Sweetwater Authority (SWA)
   Attn: Ron Mosher – Director of Engineering
  mailto: rmosher@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,

[Signature]

Abraham Edid

[Contact Information]

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 (Design Standard)</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>Value in Table B105.1(2) at the required fire-flow rate</td>
<td>Duration in Table B105.1(2) at the required fire-flow rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-3,600</td>
<td>Section 903.3.1.3 of the California Fire Code or Section 313.3 of the California Residential Code</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,601 and greater</td>
<td>Section 903.3.1.3 of the California Fire Code or Section 313.3 of the California Residential Code</td>
<td>½, value in Table B105.1(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For SI: 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>FIRE-FLOW CALCULATION AREA (square feet)</th>
<th>FIRE-FLOW (gallons per minute)</th>
<th>FLOW DURATION (hours)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type IA and IIB*</td>
<td>Type IIA and IIA*</td>
<td>Type IV and V-A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-22,700</td>
<td>0-12,700</td>
<td>0-8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,701-30,200</td>
<td>12,701-17,000</td>
<td>8,201-10,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,201-38,700</td>
<td>17,001-21,800</td>
<td>10,901-12,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38,701-48,300</td>
<td>21,801-26,200</td>
<td>12,901-17,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48,301-59,900</td>
<td>24,201-33,200</td>
<td>17,501-21,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59,001-70,900</td>
<td>33,201-39,700</td>
<td>21,301-25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,901-83,700</td>
<td>39,701-47,100</td>
<td>26,101-30,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97,701-112,700</td>
<td>54,901-63,400</td>
<td>35,201-40,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112,701-128,700</td>
<td>63,401-72,400</td>
<td>40,601-46,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128,701-145,900</td>
<td>72,401-82,100</td>
<td>46,401-52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145,901-164,200</td>
<td>82,101-92,400</td>
<td>52,501-59,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164,201-183,400</td>
<td>92,401-103,100</td>
<td>59,101-66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183,401-203,700</td>
<td>103,101-114,600</td>
<td>66,001-73,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203,701-225,200</td>
<td>114,601-126,700</td>
<td>73,301-81,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225,201-247,700</td>
<td>126,701-139,400</td>
<td>81,101-89,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247,701-271,200</td>
<td>139,401-152,600</td>
<td>89,201-97,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271,201-295,900</td>
<td>152,601-166,500</td>
<td>97,701-106,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295,901-Greater</td>
<td>166,501-Greater</td>
<td>106,501-115,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>115,801-125,500</td>
<td>83,701-90,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>125,501-135,500</td>
<td>90,601-97,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>135,501-145,800</td>
<td>97,901-106,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>145,801-156,700</td>
<td>106,801-113,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>156,701-167,900</td>
<td>113,201-121,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>167,901-179,400</td>
<td>121,301-129,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>179,401-191,400</td>
<td>129,601-138,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>191,401-Greater</td>
<td>138,301-Greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For SI: 1 square foot = 0.0929 m², 1 gallon per minute = 3.785 L/min, 1 pound per square inch = 6.895 kPa.

a. Types of construction are based on the California Building Code.

b. Measured at 20 psi residual pressure.

---
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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

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

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9285 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
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

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
9285 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com

Begin forwarded message:

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
9285 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
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
9285 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
www.BlueCenturionHomes.com
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 R. Mosher
Director of Engineering

(619) 409-6750 Direct Line

(619) 425-7469 Fax

Rmosher@sweetwater.org
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 <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
9285 Activity Rd Suite 112
San Diego CA 92126
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; Valdez, Luis
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 PDT
To: Ron Mosher <Rmosher@sweetwater.org>
Cc: Tish Berge <lberge@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
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)
1,325pm flows through the 6” at over 15fps

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

From: Abraham Edid [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 Edid

On Oct 30, 2018, at 2:50 PM, Mosher, Ron <mosher@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 [mailto: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 92128
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

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

Blue Centurion Homes LLC
9265 Activity Rd Suite 112
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@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
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.
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

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

From: Abraham Edid <mailto:••••>  
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 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
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
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 Edid
Cell: [Redact]
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

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
This page intentionally left blank.
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
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: Mettler, Jason [mailto:jmettler@sweetwater.org]
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 11:34 AM
To: Robert Hernandez <RHernandez@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
From: Robert Hernandez [mailto:RHernandez@nationalcityca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2018 8:47 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: RE: Installation of NFPA Fire Protection Tank System at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950

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) 336-4652
r hernandez@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: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 9:04 AM
To: Robert Hernandez <RHernandez@nationalcityca.gov>
Subject: RE: Installation of NFPA Fire Protection Tank System at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950

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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Robert Hernandez [mailto:RHernandez@nationalcityca.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 05, 2018 9:50 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Subject: Fwd: Installation of NFPA Fire Protection Tank System at 2604 Ridgeway Drive, National City CA 91950

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

-------- Original message ----------
From: Abraham Edid [Redact]
Date: 11/2/18 11:10 AM (GMT-08:00)
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
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
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). Fire more information please go to the City's website: www.nationalcityca.gov

<copier@nationalcityca.gov_20181129_175635.pdf>
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

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,

Robert Hernandez  
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshall
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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

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,

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: 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
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.
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  

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  
9265 Activity Road, Suite 112  
San Diego, CA 92126
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Flow Required: 1,000 GPM
Flow Available: 843 GPM
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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
Valdez, Luis

From: Valdez, Luis
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2018 9:42 AM
To: Mosher, Ron
Cc: Mettler, Jason
Subject: Talking Points for Ridgeway Apartments Project

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 $550,00.
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. Introduces dynamic thrust forces at bends.
4. 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”.
Transient Pressure on Instantaneous Valve Closure
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 Gwynne Avenue.”

Thank you.

Abraham Edid
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

<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 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 [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
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
To: [Redact]
Cc: [Redact]
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 <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>, Dylan Hinkle <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
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  
Redact 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 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.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abraham Edid [mailto: Redact]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 10:07 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Andrew Oven; Valdez, Luis; Dylan Hinkle; Tejeda, Arturo
Subject: Fwd: Ridgeway Apartments - 2504 Ridgeway Drive APN: 564-040-07-00

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.
This page intentionally left blank.
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
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  
Redact Cell  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org

<Ltr - Fire Flow - 12-11-18.pdf>
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

---

From: Abraham Edid [mailto:Redact]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 10:07 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Andrew Oven; Valdez, Luis; Dylan Hinkle; Tejeda, Arturo
Subject: Fwd: Ridgeway Apartments - 2604 Ridgeway Drive APN: 564-040-07-00

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:
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
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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

<Ltr - Fire Flow - 12-11-18.pdf>
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

From: Abraham Edid [mailto: Redact]
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2019 10:41 AM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Andrew Oven; Valdez, Luis; Dylan Hinkle; Tejeda, Arturo; Berge, Tish
Subject: JASON - YOU ARE WRONG!

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)
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 10:07 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Andrew Oven; 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 10 fps.

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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org

From: Abraham Edid
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
jmettler@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

Luis Valdez
Engineering Manager
619-409-6751
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

From: Abraham Edid [mailto: • • • •]
Sent: Monday, January 07, 2019 10:07 PM
To: Mettler, Jason
Cc: Andrew Oven; Valdez, Luis; Dylan Hinkle; 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 <lvaldez@sweetwater.org>, 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 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  
jmettler@sweetwater.org  
www.sweetwater.org

---

From: Abraham Edid  
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
jmettler@sweetwater.org
www.sweetwater.org
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RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD

HIGH DENSITY PARCELS

Google Earth
48-UNIT MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT

12 units (1 Building) Bldg A - 10,678 sf residential

36 units (6 Buildings) Bldg B - 4,536 sf residential / 1,500 sf garage

Project Address
2604 Ridgway Dr National City, CA 91950

APN: 564-040-07-00

Building Type V-A
MATERIAL SCHEDULE
1. Roof - Concrete Tile
2. Fascia - 2X Resawn Wood
3. Wall - Stucco
4. Trim - 2X Stucco Over
5. Railing - Metal
6. Decorative Outlookers
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,

Robert Hernandez
Battalion Chief / Fire Marshal
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

Luis Valdez, P.E.  
Engineering Manager

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  
9265 Activity Road, Suite 112  
San Diego, CA 92126
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
made between the two methods to assure facilities are properly planned to accommodate the demands of the year 2030.

New water facilities will be sized based upon the results of a combination of these methods and upon completion of a Hydraulic Network Analysis. The Hydraulic Network Analysis and constraints required to be used during this process are specified in Section VIII.

In planning, the replacement of facilities, pipelines, and/or mains shall be sized to accommodate domestic peak hourly demands, plus fire demands.

**VIII. HYDRAULIC NETWORK ANALYSIS**

Node demands for a Hydraulic Network Analysis should be developed using both the "Water Duty" and "Population" methods. Both methods have built-in variables and change constantly. Therefore, a cross-check of both methods can produce a more accurate insight into demands.

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.

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.

**IX. FLOW TESTING**

A. **Water Conservation:** During a water alert stage, as determined by the Authority, fire hydrants may be flow tested only after all other avenues of design have been exhausted.
FYI...

20 psi residual provides 1,210 gpm (includes new demands for subject development)
1,325 pm flows through the 6” at over 15fps

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@swa.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”.

1
### 6" - Extrapolated* Calculations Fire Hydrant Flow (per Sweetwater Authority Memorandum Data from January 4, 2017)

#### 6" PIPE - RIDGEWAY-C WATER CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residual Pressure, psi</th>
<th>Available Flow, GPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,501.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1,409.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1,312.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1,260.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1,207.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1,152.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1,095.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1,035.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>972.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>905.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>834.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>757.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>673.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>578.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>468.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>330.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSI</th>
<th>GPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Approx. Calculations
CONNECTIONS TO WATER AND SEWER SERVICES

Sweetwater Authority
6" Water Main

TYPICAL HOME OWNER
CONNECTIONS TO WATER AND SEWER
NEIGHBORHOOD FIRE FLOW REQUIREMENTS

1,000 GPM
20 PSI
2 HOURS

* For non-sprinklered homes
KEY FACTS:

- The existing 6" water line on Ridgeway Drive exceeds the required fire flow conditions and has been recognized by Sweetwater Staff.

- There is no need to replace any pipe and add additional costs to anyone involved.

- The fire flow requirement for our project is the same as for the rest of neighborhood.

- Our project is not changing or affecting the current conditions at Ridgeway Drive.

- Our project is not impacting the existing system or putting any burden into it any more than the existing properties.