



# Pikes Peak Reservoir and Pump Station Project

## Community Advisory Group Meeting Summary

Date: December 7, 2016

Time: 6 - 7 PM

Location: Bellevue City Hall, 1E-118 (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)

Project team: Jay Hummel (Project Manager), Regan Sidie (Design Services Manager), Michael May (Public Information Officer), John Chaney (Consultant), Ashley Bagley (Consultant)

### Summary

#### Introduction/Community Advisory Group's Role and Objectives

Jay Hummel welcomed everyone to the first Community Advisory Group Meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves. Once introductions were over, Jay reviewed the meeting agenda and discussed the group's purpose: to create a collaborative and transparent evaluation process for the Pikes Peak Reservoir and Pump Station Project. Jay stated that the City hopes to meet with the advisory group about once a month, when they have information to share. In addition, the City is looking to the advisory group to provide high level input about community concerns, issues that the City may not be aware of, and areas that need further exploration. Jay clarified that the City will retain the final decision authority, but will be incorporating community feedback into the options evaluated and ultimately the final solution.

#### Project History

Jay transitioned the discussion over to Regan Sidie to explain the project's history. Regan began by informing the group that the City, through a utility easement with Washington State Parks, owns, operates, and maintains the Pikes Peak Reservoir and Pump Station facilities, which were constructed in 1968.

The existing reservoir facility is not up to current seismic standards, is nearing the end of its useful life, and does not have sufficient storage for the surrounding areas that it serves. The pump station also is nearing the end of its useful life and is one of the City's higher priority pump stations for replacement.

The Pikes Peak area water system serves several residential neighborhoods roughly bounded by I-405, SR-520, 140th Avenue NE, Bridle Trails State Park, and the City of Kirkland to the north. Due to the hilly terrain, the area is split into three pressure zones (Pikes Peak 550, 600 and 670). Each number refers to the elevation above sea level.

Water is supplied to the area directly from Tolt Eastside Supply Line (TESSL). At certain times of the year, the TESSL water pressure is high enough to feed all three pressure zones. Whenever the supply pressure drops, Bellevue's local pump stations take over to move water and maintain pressure.

Pikes Peak area water storage is provided by the Pikes Peak Reservoir. Water levels in the reservoir provide gravity pressure to the 550 Zone. When TESSL pressure is low, water is pumped to the Pikes Peak Reservoir from the Cherry Crest Pump Station, and pressure in the 600 and 670 zones is maintained by the Pikes Peak Pump Station and another pump station on NE 40th Street near 140th Avenue NE.

More recently, in 2012, the City of Bellevue started work to find a solution for the increasing water storage needs for Downtown Bellevue and the Bel-Red area. A result of that work was a determination that the Pikes Peak site was not needed to provide the additional storage. The current project focus is on issues with the aging facilities and local water storage for the Pikes Peak area. The City has changed its overall approach to the project from both a technical standpoint and how they will engage the public. Moving forward, the City is being mindful of the community's interests and appreciates the advisory group's participation.

### **Project Status and Schedule**

Jay explained to the advisory group that a storage analysis was done as part of the City's 2016 Water System Plan update and identified a need for a quarter million gallons of additional capacity to meet firefighting needs for the service area of the reservoir.

The existing one million-gallon steel reservoir is 85 feet in diameter and 24 feet tall (side wall height). The new (or rehabilitated) reservoir will need to hold 1.25 million gallons and will be either slightly larger in diameter with the same height, slightly taller in height, or a combination of the two dimensions.

Jay clarified that this project is different from this site's previous consideration as a candidate for a larger reservoir. That project was intended to provide storage to a greater service area than the immediate vicinity of the existing reservoir, which meant needing a much larger reservoir. Based on a review of existing storage capabilities, that issue has been addressed by other means.

In addition, if the reservoir is determined to be replaced, the City will evaluate material options such as steel versus concrete. Potential aesthetic measures will be part of these evaluations as the project progresses.

In terms of the preliminary project schedule, the review and evaluation process is projected to be completed by fall 2017. However, depending on the information the City gathers from the evaluation process and the community input received, that process could potentially take longer. If all goes as planned, construction on the reservoir and pump station is anticipated to begin in spring 2019 and will last about a year and a half.

### Open Discussion/Topics of Interest

The City turned the discussion over to the advisory group to ask questions and provide comments. (Note: Some of the answers to the questions asked during the meeting have been refined here):

- **Question:** Will the reservoir need to be enlarged?  
**Answer:** Yes, by 250,000 gallons. The existing one million-gallon steel reservoir is 85 feet in diameter and 24 feet tall (side wall height). The new (or rehabilitated) reservoir will hold 1.25 million-gallons and will be either slightly larger in diameter with the same height, slightly taller in height, or a combination of the two dimensions. We will share that information at a later date as we develop potential alternatives.
- **Question:** What is the existing footprint? What about the utility easement area? Does the City plan to stay within the footprint?  
**Answer:** The fence essentially bounds the main utility easement area, which is a 117' x 118' square, plus a site access easement area between NE 39th St and the site, which all add up to the "existing footprint." There is a portion of the utility easement area outside the main fenced area, but it is too early to determine if that will need to be utilized.
- **Question:** Is rehabilitation an option?  
**Answer:** Yes, it is an option, but it is more complicated to rehabilitate an older steel structure and enlarge it at the same time (e.g. it can ultimately create more pressure on the structure). We are currently in the evaluation stage of this work and will keep the Community Advisory Group and interested community members informed when we know if rehabilitation or replacement is the best option moving forward. Rehabilitation of the reservoir would mean a relatively shorter life span. If the reservoir is rebuilt, it would last approximately 100 years.
- **Question:** If the reservoir was possibly nine feet wider or taller, what would the City have to do? Would it be totally rebuilt?  
**Answer:** Yes, it would need to be rebuilt if it were made wider, possibly not if it were made just taller. There are many options depending on the material type that is used - concrete reservoirs can also be built partially underground.
- **Question:** Who is the property expert at State Parks? Any idea if the current utility easement agreement can change?  
**Answer:** The project team is not sure of who the property expert is at State Parks, but the utility easement was revised about two years ago, and is on a set payment schedule for the next 12 years or so.
- **Question:** What types of heavy equipment would need to be used during potential future construction? This could impact the trails.  
**Answer:** The heaviest equipment would probably be a concrete truck and/or other large heavy equipment. More information won't be known about specific construction activities and equipment, and the extent of any impacts on trails, until a final design is complete.

- **Question:** If the reservoir was under construction, would there still be water services to homes?  
**Answer:** Yes, the City will modify our system operation to maintain service during construction.
- **Question:** Will the rehabilitation or replacement look like the existing reservoir?  
**Answer:** If the reservoir is rebuilt using steel, it will look very similar (i.e. exterior painted surface). If it is constructed using concrete, it could take on a different look and shape (although a round reservoir is the most common and most efficient shape), and the exterior wall texture could change. We have not determined exactly what the reservoir would look like. We will be looking to the advisory group for feedback and input on that. However, the pump station needs to be replaced; rehabilitation is not an option since it is not up to current codes.
- **Question:** Will the community have a say on the appearance?  
**Answer:** Yes. There are many factors to consider in choosing the appearance (e.g. surface texture, color, partially buried, etc.) and the City would like to get the advisory group's opinion.
- **Question:** What will the life cycle be if the reservoir is rehabilitated?  
**Answer:** Rehabilitation of the reservoir would mean a shorter life span, possibly 40-50 years. If the reservoir is rebuilt, the anticipated life cycle is approximately 100 years.

#### **Topics of Interest shared by the advisory group**

- Concerned about any overall impacts to the park:
  - Prefer no tree removal
  - Prefer to keep fence in same location
  - Keep the footprint inside the existing fence
  - Worried about increasing the height 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

#### **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 occur sometime in January 2017 and that a Doodle poll would be emailed out to gauge everyone's availability. In addition, he mentioned that the project team

is interested in taking the advisory group out for a project site visit sometime in early 2017. Lastly, Jay thanked everyone for coming and told them he would follow-up via email.