



Pure Water North City Phase 1 Construction Projects
Clairemont Working Group Meeting #4 Summary

Clairemont Emmanuel Baptist Church
Monday, August 20, 2018, 4:30 p.m. - 8 p.m.

This document is not intended to capture verbatim comments from the meeting or function as meeting minutes. It is a summary of the questions posed by the Working Group members and the answers provided by City staff and consultants. The questions and answers are unattributed.

Working Group Members Present

Jeff Baughn, Resident
David Curtis, Resident
Michael Dwyer, Resident
Ed Elliott, Resident
Connor Munson, Brady Engineering
Morteza Rahimi, Clairemont Town Council

Working Group Members Absent

Stephanie Fullerton, Diocese of San Diego
Kelly Johnson, Clairemont Town Square
Michael Lambert, Coldwell Banker Residential Brokerage
Jonathan Layton, Resident/UTC Aerospace Systems

Project Team Members Present

Megan Drummy, Katz & Associates
Dylan Grise, Katz & Associates
John Helminski, City of San Diego
Natalia Hentschel, Katz & Associates
Steve Lindsay, City of San Diego
Joe Long, AECOM
Sean McCarty, Consultant, City of San Diego
Alan Shapiro, AECOM

Other Attendees

Daniel Manley, Council District 6
Marc Schaefer, Council District 2

Public Members Present

Tom Crane
Dennis La Salle, LaSalle Solutions
Suzanne Persell, LaSalle Solutions

Welcome and Introduction

John Helminski welcomed the WG members to the fourth meeting and asked if there were any questions they would like addressed related to the construction topics discussed during Meeting 3. Natalia Hentschel began by introducing the staff and WG members and reviewed the meeting agenda. She informed WG members that two future meetings will be held on dates and locations to be determined later.

WG members received packets of materials for their binders containing the handouts for this meeting including the agenda, recommendations matrix, Meeting 3 summary and Meeting 2 summary revisions.

To view project and meeting materials, including new binder contents, visit the Pure Water San Diego website at www.purewatersd.org/Phase1.

Follow Up Questions

The following are comments or questions from the WG members:

WG Member: Is there an issue with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) holding up the contracts?

Project Team: The NEPA process is a couple of months behind the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process and is necessary since this project will be receiving federal funding. We anticipate having a final approval of that document by the end of August 2018.

WG Member: Is it true that the Clairemont pipeline project will have the greatest schedule slip?

Project Team: I had previously stated that it would have the greatest amount of 'float', which is a scheduling term for flexibility. That means it has the longest available schedule to complete the work even though the work will not take that whole time.

WG Member: There was concern that the insertion of oxygen into the pipeline might be corrosive to the sewage line once it turns into sulfuric acid. Will there be a chemist involved?

Project Team: The University City WG had requested we have a chemist attend their fourth meeting to answer questions that they had and we have the chemist involved in the project coming to speak with that group directly. You will be able to access his responses to those questions as part of the University City WG Meeting 4 summary through the Phase One section of the Pure Water website.

WG Member: Will there be HAZMAT controls while working on the three intersections in Clairemont that have gas stations located at them?

Project Team: The contractor will submit a community safety plan to the City and we will go through that with our staff from environmental services. The construction crews will have certified personnel on-site that have been HAZMAT trained and will be responsible for following all HAZMAT procedures.

WG Member: Will the major intersections in Clairemont be closed during their scheduled night work?

Project Team: Typically, when we go through any intersection, we maintain at least one lane of open traffic for access.

Construction Topics Recommendations Matrix

N. Hentschel introduced the status matrix containing recommendations from the WG related to the construction topics discussed during the first three working group meetings and the status of their feasibility review. The status matrix will be made available for review on the project website along with the matrices for each of the other three working groups. The project team presented the WG suggestions that were captured and the status of their response to each.

The following are comments and questions from the WG members during the presentation of the status matrix, grouped by construction topic:

WG Member: Will absent members still be receiving the emails and correspondence for the next series of WGs?

Project Team: Yes, all of the members will be included in future WG correspondence and invited to participate in the meetings.

Multiple Disruptions and Project Coordination

No questions or comments on this construction topic.

Street Restoration

WG Member: We recommend the PUD attempts to bump Clairemont up in the list of beautification efforts with the responsible City departments to compensate the community for the construction impacts.

Project Team: Thank you for your comment.

WG Member: Who is responsible for the long-term conditions of the road; specifically, once the roadway has been restored and there is settling that occurs, is there a plan for upkeep?

Project Team: There are latent construction defects that the contractor is responsible for correcting for ten years after construction. The City can go after a contractor to make those repairs in that time and if they refused to come fix the roadways, the City would take them to court.

WG Member: Once the construction has been completed and the streets are back to normal, is there a moratorium that prevents future work in the immediate area?

Project Team: There is a regulation called the Street Preservation Ordinance. The ordinance requires a three-year moratorium for when there has been a slurry seal, and a five-year for an overlay. There are waivers that can be applied for, but they must go through an approval process by the City Engineer, which is stringent and typically difficult to obtain. Two examples we see most often are to either provide service to an individual lot that may need utility services hooked up where they had not previously been and the other is emergency

services where utility services may fail or be unreliable without the installation of new materials.

WG Member: I suggest that the language used to describe the resurfacing efforts listed on page 13 of the PowerPoint we were given in the first meeting be changed. The term “curb-to-curb” may not be clear for the general public that reads this information but has not had the opportunity to hear the exact definition at these meetings.

Project Team: Thank you for your comment. We will take that under consideration.

Air Quality and Noise

No questions or comments were made about this construction topic.

Staging Areas and Parking

No questions or comments were made about this construction topic.

Environmental Monitoring

No questions or comments were made about this construction topic.

Traffic Control and Signage

WG Member: Can you place additional signage to caution vehicles and reduce driving speeds in areas that bicycle lane striping will be removed during construction?

Project Team: We have included in our construction specifications to use signage in those affected areas to help ensure bicyclist safety.

WG Member: What will the speed limit be in lanes shared with bicycles during construction; can we reduce the speed limit to accommodate the shared bike lane for the solo lanes that will be closed?

Project Team: The construction zone speed limit maximum is set at 35 MPH and we can post additional signage alerting drivers of the presence of bicyclists that would normally be in their own lane. We will also review the speeds in affected areas and determine a safe speed for vehicles, bicyclists and construction workers.

WG Member: Since the construction staging areas will decrease the number of available street parking spaces, is it possible to utilize some of the red-curb areas for temporary parking?

Project Team: There are safety restrictions that limit what we can use as parking areas. These include areas that aren't the proper size to accommodate parking, fire hydrant access and line of sight for traffic coming off side streets into busy thoroughfares. In some cases, there are curbs that have been illegally painted red by businesses or residents for any number of reasons. There is a hotline that you can call at any time if you think there is a red curb where there shouldn't be, but we will verify the accuracy of the red curb placement at the time of construction.

WG Member: We suggest not doing construction on more than one major intersection at a time to avoid back-ups.

Project Team: The work being done on the major intersections will more than likely be done at night to avoid major traffic delays. We have to be reasonable when doing construction in areas that are highly utilized by commuters.

Special Stakeholder Access Needs

No questions or comments were made about this construction topic.

Outreach, Communication and Notifications

WG Member: Is it possible to get a prospectively timed schedule in the immediate construction areas so commuters can see how long they can expect construction in any given area?

Project Team: It would be difficult to convey the information being requested in a way that would inform the drivers without taking their attention off the road and construction area. We have addressed several ways to communicate the construction schedule to the community through our outreach efforts (in the provided matrix) that would not require risking safety for information.

WG Member: A good location for a message board with construction information would be at an intersection where people are already stopped and have a moment to safely review the signage.

Project Team: Thank you for your comment. We will include this in the recommendations matrix.

WG Member: Will you be utilizing flagmen in the construction zones?

Project Team: There will be flagmen available when they are needed; however, these flagmen will be individuals that have other roles during construction (excavator operators, laborers, foreman) and will not be solely in the flagman role. These workers will be called on to flag in situations like when large trucks or excavators are arriving or departing from the worksite but will resume their normal work positions after that.

WG Member: Can we extend the outreach perimeter past the recommended area so we can get the information to residents and businesses outside the immediate construction area, maybe as a water bill insert?

Project Team: Feedback we have received has shown water bill inserts to be ineffective. Another issue is that the water bills only get distributed every two months and residents living in apartment complexes typically don't even receive a water bill from the Public Utilities Department, rather, they receive a usage bill from their property management. Our approach to outreach is multi-pronged. There is no one way that works for any community, and each community is different. We are using these groups to figure out the best way to inform as many people as possible in your community. There are several ways we plan on ensuring that the necessary information is distributed and available in the construction outreach plan based off the recommendations you have provided to us.

WG Member: I suggest having some type of informational flier that is about the size of a postcard that we could bring to community meetings. We could have meeting attendees take a small pile and distribute them to friends and neighbors in the community that were unable to attend.

Project Team: Thank you for your comment. We will add this to the recommendations matrix.

WG Member: Residents that live on the side streets adjacent to the construction zone are going to feel the impacts of the construction since the main roads will not have street parking and people will be forced to use those side streets as their temporary parking spots.

Project Team: At the end of the work day, the parking that has been closed off during daytime construction will be opened back up for residents. There will be some equipment and vehicle staging in some of the work areas, but we don't anticipate large sections of parking to be taken up after the scheduled working hours.

WG Member: Can we utilize outreach methods like radio shows to get the construction information out to residents that are outside of the construction outreach area that may frequent the construction zones?

Project Team: We are not allowed to reach out to the media directly; that would be a request that we would have to be submitted to the Mayor's office.

[Work Restrictions and Construction Phasing](#)

No questions or comments were made on this construction topic.

[Working Days and Hours](#)

No questions or comments were made on this construction topic.

[Construction Monitoring](#)

WG Member: Can we expand the WG's efforts to include more individuals in the construction update process?

Project Team: We can continue this WG and expand with a format that allows residents to discuss the local construction impacts and commit to that throughout our construction outreach efforts to increase the dialogue and hear concerns.

[Public Comment](#)

No public comments were made at the meeting.

[Next Steps](#)

N. Hentschel closed the meeting by reminding WG members that the information from this meeting will be sent electronically to the WG members. As updates are made to the status matrix, email notifications will be distributed to the WG with an updated matrix document, and the document will be posted to the website. She reminded the WG that there will be two additional meetings with dates to be determined as the next steps are finalized.