

Four Mile Run Stream Removal Project

Meeting at Mayor's Office

February 22, 2019

Meeting Summary

Meeting Purpose: Update on PWSA Stream Removal project and coordination with the Autonomous Vehicle Road project

Attendees:

Alex Sciulli (AS), Jake Pawlak (JP), and Brandon Vatter (BV), PWSA

Dan Gillman, Mayor's Chief of Staff

Don Smith, RIDC representative

Sam Reiman, Grant Oliphant, Rob Steffany, Heinz Endowments/Almono Partners representatives

Andrew McElwane

Tim McNulty, CMU representatives

RK Mellon representative

Rebecca Flora (RF), Katrina Flora, ReMake group representatives

Karina Ricks (KR), DOMI

Summary

1. AS reviewed the attached PWSA slide presentation on the stream removal project status. AS provided a reminder of the key takeaways from the last group meeting on 1-25-19 (slides 3 & 4). AS provided an update on overall project status (slides 5 – 9) and the risk assessment performed to-date (slides 10-11). AS indicated a Value Engineering scope is being developed by PWSA to have the core project reviewed over the next 8 -10 weeks to address the various identified risks and project components. The VE will be performed by the MBaker firm and Brian Marengo (Jacobs).
2. AS indicated the core project is complex, challenging and expensive. The core project currently exceeds the typical costs for CSO reduction but with the connecting neighborhood projects the overall project becomes cost-effective and can be below the PWSA target of \$0.75 per gallon of CSO reduced.
3. AS indicated the core project by itself doesn't stop the flooding. The upland projects are needed to mitigate flooding. The core project could reduce CSO but would not address the flooding or other goals by itself. AS indicated he was at first skeptical of the project, but now understands PWSA has an outstanding project that could be a model for other sewersheds. The VE is needed now to review the project assumptions, design parameters and costs.
4. AS reviewed the core project schedule and noted the design completion will be pushed back to November – December 2019 with construction still starting in Spring 2020. This

Four Mile Run Stream Removal Project

Meeting at Mayor's Office

2-22-19 Meeting Summary

schedule assumes the risks identified, such as DEP and railroad permits, geotechnical, etc. are properly mitigated.

5. AS noted the core project is being designed to manage the first 1.5 inches of rainfall runoff. AS noted in 2018, there were 10 3-day periods that had greater than 1.5 inches of rain so the design criteria would have been exceeded. AS noted this is one reason why its very important to confirm these assumptions now and another benefit of the VE.

6. Mr. Gilman noted the public has trouble understanding flooding reduction versus elimination and have an expectation that this project will eliminate their current flooding. Mr. Gilman noted the messaging on this issue needs to be improved by PWSA to better penetrate the public. Mr. Gilman wondered instead of a 25-year storm, which is what current development designs for, should we be designing for a larger storm event.

7. AS indicated people are going to expect with the project dollars spent that they won't have flooding. AS noted more cost-effective options may be to change the floodplain and purchase the affected properties.

8. RF indicated the storm events are changing and other cities are dealing with this issue across the globe. RF noted this is another reason why the VE is so important to be conducted now.

9. AS indicated more consistent messaging is needed. Mr. Gilman indicated he was concerned with the meetings in 4 Mile Run that have occurred so far and that the messaging wasn't clear enough on the flooding issue. Mr. Gilman noted we need to be blunt and speak in basic english with the flooding messaging. RF indicated we need a communications plan in layman's terms.

10. Representatives from Heinz asked if early warning sensors could be used to warn of flooding. JP indicated that Panther Hollow Lake is currently outfitted with sensors to draw down in between rain events and store more water during rain events.

11. Representatives from Heinz asked if the VE would identify early construction opportunities, potential project delays, additional funding needed.

12. AS indicated the possible outcomes of the VE would be: 1) Project is on the right path, 2) Project needs to be tweaked, for example, higher design criteria, more cost necessary, perform work in phases, 3) need more work and planning in the upland neighborhoods to manage the stormwater, and 4) No project – but don't want to think about that outcome.

13. AS indicated he was comfortable that we have a project. We may need to make adjustments along the way, but worth the risk.

14. RF asked what DOMI's schedule was for the roadway. KR noted the mobility trail could be precluded in the run (Junction Hollow). KR indicated she didn't know the exact schedule

Four Mile Run Stream Removal Project

Meeting at Mayor's Office

2-22-19 Meeting Summary

and DOMI was still evaluating alternatives. AS indicated we could potentially advance the design criteria for the road and stream channel at the same time to benefit schedule.

15. Mr. Gilman then asked, "what have we been doing for the last 2 years?" Mr. Gilman asked, "Did PWSA's engineers not design something right?" He indicated he is not worried about the 8 -10 weeks for the VE review, but is worried about why the project is 3 years behind what was promised to the community.

16. AS indicated he can't speak for what PWSA did over the last 2 years. AS indicated we are doing everything we can to advance the project and make it successful.

17. RF noted we need the team needs to look at messaging and other parallel options for the transportation network to the Hazelwood green site and the stream channel.

18. Representative from Heinz noted the worst-case scenario is we don't have a way to get CMU and others to the Hazelwood green site. KR noted DOMI can have MBaker look at other alternatives for current and future traffic loads. KR noted the mobility trail can't support future traffic loads so additional transportation alternatives would be needed for future traffic loads. Mr. Gilman asked if these alternatives could also include Swineburn street if the landslide was fixed. KR indicated DOMI is putting Swineburn landslide design out for proposals next week.

19. Dan Smith indicated let's get an imperfect connector road there now and more perfect long-term solution implemented later. Dan noted Boundary street is there now which used to be a public road. Could that street be used for limited access now while longer term solutions are being developed. Discussion ensued about the advantages and disadvantages of such an approach.

20. RF indicated we need to consider a fast track approach and where can we double up to gain efficiencies. RF then outlined **5 Action Items** as a result of this meeting:

- a. **VE review and analysis of 30% design** (8-10 weeks for analysis, plus review & report-out time) – Alex S (lead)
- b. **Alternatives analysis for connection to Oakland** - use existing DOMI contract with MBaker to conduct this work concurrently – Karina (lead)
- c. **Communications plan development** – begin work to assess needs, key messages and potential firms – Jake P is lead to initiate and work with other stakeholders from the meeting.
- d. **Fast track** – look for ways to overlap 4mile stream design with connector design & construction to create a strong collaborative effort – Karina/Alex (w/Rebecca)
- e. **Operations Plan** – develop the interim (2-5 year) organizational and business model: Metro 21 - Karen Lightman (lead)

Four Mile Run Stream Removal Project

Meeting at Mayor's Office

2-22-19 Meeting Summary

21. Next meeting tentatively scheduled for March 15th 8:30 AM. **This meeting has subsequently changed to April 5th, 8:30 AM.**