

CHAPTER 9

County Coordination Meeting



The District convened a meeting with the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District (CCCFPD) and other County staff on June 7, 2012, to review the potential improvements presented and evaluated in Chapters 7 and 8 of this report, receive input on these potential improvements from several County departments, and identify feasible improvements that would increase the safety of the Walnut Creek Channel and Drop Structure 2. A copy of the PowerPoint presentation from that meeting is provided in Appendix 9A. This chapter includes the following sections:

- Attendance at the Meeting
- Summary of the Meeting
- Recommended Improvements

9.1 ATTENDANCE AT THE MEETING

The meeting was attended by the following individuals:

- Tim Jensen, Senior Civil Engineer, CCCFCWCD
- Michelle Parella, Administrative Services Assistant II, CCCFCWCD
- Mike Carlson, Supervising Civil Engineer, CCCFCWCD
- Paul Detjens, Senior Civil Engineer, CCCFCWCD
- Carl Roner, Associate Civil Engineer, CCCFCWCD
- Anthony Medina, Assistant Field Operations Manager, CCCFCWCD
- Mike Giles, Assistant Field Operations Manager, CCCFCWCD
- Carrie Ricci, Customer Service Coordinator, Contra Costa County Public Works
- Betsy Burkhart, Public Information Officer, Contra Costa County
- Brent Boling, CCCFPD
- John LeFevre, Swiftwater Rescue, CCCFPD
- Andy Steffen, Battalion Chief, CCCFPD
- Doug Moore, Engineering Manager, West Yost Associates

9.2 SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

A summary of the meeting is presented below:

- Tim Jensen opened the meeting and provided a brief introduction and background for the project.
- Doug Moore gave the presentation included in Appendix 9A, including noting that the thermal imaging and tension diagonals appeared to be the most promising potential improvements.

- The CCCFPD already has portable thermal imaging cameras, but have not had success with thermal imaging because a person's body temperature drops quickly when exposed to cold water like the flow in the Walnut Creek Channel.
- The CCCFPD expressed concern that even with a tension diagonal, it would be very difficult to catch and rescue a victim caught in the supercritical flow.
- At this time the discussion shifted to identifying what facilities would be helpful to CCCFPD staff for rescuing a victim trapped in the Walnut Creek Channel. The facilities identified are described in the following section.

9.3 RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS

The following facilities would be the most helpful for CCCFPD staff to effectively rescue a victim trapped in the Walnut Creek Channel. Two sets of improvements would be constructed, including a primary set where the initial rescue attempt would be made and a secondary/redundant set farther downstream. One of the sites could be just upstream of the Bancroft Road Bridge on property owned by the CCCFCWCD. The location of the second site is not yet known. The exact location of the recommended improvements would be determined in the field by CCCFPD staff. The recommended improvements are described below:

- An 8-foot wide access gate through the existing fencing along the top of the channel banks (double 4-foot gates would probably be better than a single 8-foot wide gate).
- Strong anchor points located 15 to 20 feet back from the channel top. The rescuers would be connected to the anchor points with ropes to prevent them from falling into the channel.
- A high point attachment (basically a structure with a horizontal bar 6 to 8 feet above the ground). The high point attachment would be used to attach webbing or rope in order to provide the leverage necessary to lift someone (rescuer or victim) over the channel wall and onto the channel bank.

The CCCFPD will use these improvements to implement rope and/or net based rescues. The Rescue staff will develop the specific rescue procedures when the improvements have been constructed and will refine the procedures through simulations and practice and training rescue operations.

A cost estimate for these recommended improvements is provided in Table 9-1. The costs do not include acquisition of land at either site. As shown, the total cost is estimated to be \$38,000. If land for the second site is needed, the cost would increase. These costs estimates are approximate and should be refined when the location of the second site is determined and the field layout of the improvements has been developed.

Table 9-1. CCCFPD Requested Improvements Cost Estimate

| Item No. | Item Description | Unit of Measure | Estimated Quantity | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------|
| 1 | Gates (double 4-foot gates) | Each | 2 | \$1,000 | \$2,000 |
| 2 | Strong Anchor Points | Each | 2 | \$1,000 | \$2,000 |
| 3 | High Point Attachment | Each | 2 | \$1,000 | \$2,000 |
| 4 | Extra Anchor Points | Each | 6 | \$200 | \$1,200 |
| 5 | All Weather Access Road to Undetermined Site | Feet | 300 | \$50 | \$15,000 |
| 6 | Clear Trees and vegetation | Lump Sum | 2 | \$2,000 | \$4,000 |
| 7 | Incidentals at 10 percent | Lump Sum | 1 | \$2,000 | \$2,000 |
| 8 | Mobilization and Demobilization at 5 Percent | Lump Sum | 1 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 |
| Subtotal 1 (rounded) | | | | | \$29,000 |
| Estimating Contingency (10%) | | | | | \$2,900 |
| Subtotal 2 (rounded) | | | | | \$30,000 |
| Construction Contingency (10%) | | | | | \$2,900 |
| Total Estimated Construction Cost (rounded) | | | | | \$30,000 |
| Design, Bidding, and Engineering Services during Construction Costs (5%) | | | | | \$1,500 |
| City Costs (including Admin., Plan Check, etc.) (5%) | | | | | \$1,500 |
| Construction Management (8%) | | | | | \$2,400 |
| Environmental Documentation and Permitting Costs (2%) | | | | | \$600 |
| Project Contingency (5%) | | | | | \$1,500 |
| Total Estimated Capital Cost (rounded) | | | | | \$38,000 |
| Based on Engineering News Record 20-Cities Average Construction Cost Index of 9267 (March 2012) | | | | | |