



# Pikes Peak Reservoir and Pump Station Project

## Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary

Date: January 24, 2017

Time: 6:30 – 7:30 PM

Location: Bellevue City Hall, 1E-121 (First Floor)

### Attendees

Community: Jennifer Duncan (Lake Washington Saddle Club), Suzanne Kagen (Lake Washington Saddle Club), Jim Erckmann (Bridle Trails Park Foundation), Alice Prince (Bridle Trails Community Club), Jay Bergevin (community member), Steve Brand (Washington State Parks), Richard Benson (Washington State Parks), Kelly Losse (community member)

Project team: Jay Hummel (Project Manager), Regan Sidie (Design Services Manager), Tom Lindberg (Consultant), John Chaney (Consultant), Ashley Bagley (Consultant)

### Summary

#### Introduction/Community Advisory Group's Priorities and Topics of Interest

Jay Hummel welcomed everyone to the second Community Advisory Group meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves. Once introductions were over, Jay restated the project need: the existing reservoir and pump station are not up to current seismic and operating standards and are nearing the end of their useful lives. Jay reviewed the topics of interest that the advisory group provided at the first meeting:

- Concerned about overall impacts to the park:
  - Prefer no tree removal
  - Prefer to keep fence in same location
  - Prefer to keep the footprint inside the existing fence
  - Concerned about increasing the height and/or diameter of the reservoir
- Construction impacts:
  - Timing, schedule, and duration
  - Noise
  - Access
  - Heavy equipment and potential impact to trails
  - Staging area size and location
- Prefer construction vehicles and equipment would access the site from the south end of the park (vs. the north)
- Concern about homeowner impacts
- More info and coordination with AT&T tower is needed
- Want it to be aesthetically appealing

Other updates Jay informed the members about include:

- The City took their questions from the first meeting and created a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document, which will be added to the project website in early 2017.
- A link has been added to the website to allow people to directly sign-up for project emails.

Jay proposed the City would send the advisory group members email text with an update on the project and a hyperlink to the email sign-up. Jay also encouraged the advisory group members to inform him if they would like the City to come and provide an update at one of their organization's regular meetings.

### **Draft Technical Evaluation Update**

Transitioning the discussion over to the technical update, Jay informed the advisory group that the technical team has been working through the first phase of evaluations and will be working to finalize draft alternatives in the next few months. The feedback and input so far from the advisory group will help shape those alternatives. Tom Lindberg reminded everyone that the reservoir will need to be enlarged from 1.0 million gallons to 1.25 million gallons, which is based on the needs within the neighborhoods directly served by the Pikes Peak Reservoir. Jay mentioned that due to the increase in storage volume, replacement of the reservoir is required; a rehabilitation of the existing structure is not feasible. Jay added that the projected lifespan for a replacement is about 75-100 years (vs. about 50 years for a rehabilitation). This would mean less overall impacts to the Bridle Trails community in the future.

Jay informed the advisory group that the team has made progress evaluating two replacement options so far:

- Reservoir and pump station on-site: The feasibility of this option is being evaluated since the volume of the new reservoir and footprint of the new pump station are larger than the existing facilities, and the evaluation is based on the existing 118'x117' easement area and a limited increase in reservoir height. The initial thoughts are to try and not move the fence location within the easement area to make room for the replaced reservoir.
- Reservoir on-site, pump station off-site: Due to space limitations within the existing easement, the pump station may need to be removed from the existing site and replaced at a different and larger site.

Based on the first option, Jay displayed a draft conceptual plan view showing what the current site would look like replacing both facilities within the existing easement. The draft plan view was for display purposes only and was not a depiction of a final alternative.

Jay and Tom explained that the size of the pump station building will need to be larger to meet current safety and operating standards. With a larger pump station footprint while keeping the reservoir diameter the same, this creates spatial issues within the easement area. Furthermore, Jay and Tom informed the advisory group that there are many different aspects to consider in the evaluation process (material type, social impacts, cost, schedule, etc.). In response, many members had questions pertaining to:

- Reservoir material type options → Concrete, pre-stressed concrete, steel
- Retaining wall material type options for a steel reservoir → Natural (stone) or industrial (concrete) material

- Buffer zone and retaining wall limits → Ten-foot-wide access path around the reservoir and a five-foot-tall retaining wall (preliminary dimensions).
- Process for selecting reservoir and pump station alternatives → Alternatives will be determined and scored using a Triple Bottom Line analysis based on factors related to cost (economic), environmental and social impacts.
- Potential construction impacts → Minimize or avoid removal of trees within easement area where possible (mitigation is an option), and minimize or avoid impacts to trails (e.g. access, condition; mitigation is an option).
- Shape of the reservoir → Square or rectangular reservoirs are an option since they could fit better in tight locations versus a circular reservoir. However, circular reservoirs are the most common and provide the best function (e.g. water tight) and longevity.
- Reservoir floor and roof elevation → It is possible to evaluate lowering the floor elevation of the new reservoir to minimize the overall height, but lowering the floor may have other impacts that would need to be evaluated, such as the feasibility of lowering the drain line.

Overall responses from the advisory group members were:

- Try to limit the increase in reservoir height
- Construction access should come from the south (easement access area)

### **Project Site Tour Date Selection**

Jay reminded everyone that the City would like to host a site visit in the next couple of weeks to walk the site and answer questions. Jay noted that he would send out a Doodle poll so people can share their availability with the project team. Once a date is determined, Jay will email the advisory group the details.

### **Next Steps**

Jay thanked everyone for sharing and wanted to discuss next steps before the meeting adjourned. Jay noted the next advisory group meeting will be in approximately another month and that a Doodle poll would be emailed out to gauge everyone's availability. The proposed agenda for the next meeting would be to present the latest efforts being made on evaluation of several alternatives. Lastly, Jay thanked everyone for coming and told them he would follow-up via email.