



NORTH HENDERSON CSO REDUCTION PROJECT COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2

**December 14, 2010
6:00-8:00 p.m.**

**Rainier Community Center
4600 38th Avenue S, Seattle**

OVERVIEW

Combined sewer overflows (CSOs) happen when pipes that carry both sewage and stormwater overflow into our waterways during heavy rain. Seattle Public Utilities is working to control CSOs throughout Seattle to protect property, human health and the environment and to comply with state and federal regulations.

Combined sewer overflows (CSOs) happen up to 17 times year in the North Henderson basins, on average. In 2009, the outfalls in North Henderson overflowed 27 times, pouring 8.5 million gallons of combined sewage and stormwater into Lake Washington. The overflows happened after as little as one-half inch of rain.

The North Henderson Project will reduce the amount of untreated sewage and polluted stormwater that is overflowing into Lake Washington combined sewer overflow outfalls near Seward Park (CSO Outfall #44) and Martha Washington Park (CSO Outfall #45).

EVENT DESCRIPTION

On Tuesday, December 14, 2010 from 6:00 - 8:00 p.m., SPU hosted the second of three community workshops to inform the planning and site selection phase of the project. Approximately 30 people attended. The purpose of the workshop was to provide participants with the opportunity to:

- Learn about site-specific CSO reduction alternatives
- Provide feedback on the alternatives
- Confirm evaluation criteria (i.e. community values and concerns)
- Weight the relative importance of evaluation criteria

SPU will use the community input generated at the workshop to identify a shortlist of alternatives that reflect community preferences.

Public Notification

SPU advertised the workshop through a variety of methods including the North Henderson project website, a postcard announcement mailed to approximately 1,700 households in the North Henderson basins and to about 100 people representing organizations that have reserved facilities in Seward Park over the last three years, a posting on the City's online public outreach and engagement calendar, a meeting advertisement in the Rainier Valley Post, two messages to the North Henderson listserv, phone calls to community organizations in the project area, and by delivering meeting flyers to gathering places throughout the project area, including community centers, libraries, Synagogues and post offices.

Format

At the beginning of the workshop, participants signed in as they arrived and SPU staff informed them of the workshop purpose and agenda. Each participant received an agenda, project fact sheet and a comment form. After signing in, SPU staff encouraged participants to review display boards with information describing what a combined sewer overflow is, how SPU is addressing CSOs throughout Seattle, specific information about the North Henderson basins, boards describing each alternative, a recap of what we heard at workshop 1 and a project timeline highlighting upcoming public involvement opportunities.

Trish Rhay, SPU Drainage and Wastewater Systems Management Division Director, gave a brief introductory presentation to explain the CSO program purpose, the need for the North Henderson basins project, and to provide a recap of workshop 1. She also introduced the evaluation criteria SPU staff developed in response to community input provided to date.

Andrew Lee, SPU CSO Reduction Program Manager, described the site-specific CSO reduction alternatives that SPU is considering and responded to participant questions:

- **Distributed Storage** – Construct two underground storage tanks to hold approximately 2.4 million gallons (Basin 44) and 200,000 gallons (Basin 45). The alternative would require one location in both Basin 44 and Basin 45 and could be built under a park, street, or private property.
- **Tunnel Storage** – Construct a tunnel to hold 2.6 million gallons in a tunnel underneath private property between Seward Park and Martha Washington Park.

- **Conveyance and Storage** – Send flows through a pipeline from Basin 44 to Basin 45 to be stored in a 2.6 million gallon underground tank near Martha Washington Park.
- **Complete Separation** – All properties would need to disconnect roof and foundation drains from their existing side sewer and install new separated stormwater pipelines from their properties to convey inflow to the stormwater main in the street. All properties would need to repair or replace side sewers that allow infiltration of groundwater and the city would need to repair or replace any mainlines that contribute to infiltration. The City would also need to extend stormwater mains on streets where there currently are none. This alternative requires full participation from all property owners in order to reduce volumes to the regulatory standard. This alternative also involves significant repaving of all streets in the neighborhoods.

Following the presentations, participants broke into small groups to confirm the community values criteria, and discuss the benefits and concerns for each alternative. The small group session was designed to assure participant’s individual values were incorporated in the criteria and gather feedback and answer questions on each alternative. A representative of the technical team facilitated the group discussion and responded to participant questions. A scribe documented comments and questions on easel pads.

At the conclusion of the meeting, participants were given stickers and asked to vote for their three highest priority criteria (existing and new criteria).

COMMENT SUMMARY

The following highlights feedback from workshop participants in regard to the evaluation criteria and CSO alternatives. Participants provided feedback about the criteria and the benefits and concerns for each option in small breakout groups.

Overall Themes

- Cost information is a top concern. Participants requested a transparent cost analysis of each alternative to accurately evaluate the options.
- There is concern for potential impacts to private property.
- Preserve park character and avoid impacts to Seward Park and Martha Washington Park facilities.
- The project should provide a benefit to the community and improve the neighborhood character.

Evaluation Criteria

As part of the small group discussions, participants were asked to identify their top community values criteria from workshop 1 (developed by SPU staff to reflect community input received to date) and add new criteria as necessary. At the end of the workshop, participants used stickers to rank their top three preferred criteria. The following table summarizes the results of this exercise. The numbers indicate the number of participants who voted for each criterion.

Evaluation Criteria	Your Priority
<i>Limit disproportionate impacts to individual property owners</i>	11
<i>Preserve current use of park and character of park design</i>	10
Minimize impact to Martha Washington Park	7
<i>Create an environmental benefit or limit environmental impact</i>	4
Increase open space	3
Provide flexibility for future water quality projects	2
Manage stormwater on site (on every individual property	2
Maintain access to homes	2
Minimize cost	2
Avoid tunneling- too risky	2
Limit short term construction impacts	1
Long term vs. short term impacts to rate payer	1
Preserve Olmsted Heritage	1
Minimize visual impact	1
Minimize impacts to Lake Washington Blvd	1
Project should improve character and design of park	1
<i>Limit impact from operation and maintenance (noise, traffic, duration and frequency of maintenance and operation, scale of equipment)</i>	1

The following criteria did not receive any votes but were included in the existing criteria or emerged during the small group discussions:

- Provides comprehensive solution to all environmental needs (i.e. stormwater and CSO)
- Improves neighborhood, not just minimize impacts
- Magnitude of impacts short term and long term
- Cost
- Noise and odor
- Minimize traffic disruption

- Minimize damage/maximize compensation to private properties
- Tree preservation
- Provides best option for stormwater treatment

** Criteria in italics are the criteria developed by SPU based on community input provided to date*

Feedback on CSO Options

The following captures participant comments providing during the small group breakout sessions and in written comment forms. A total of six comment forms were submitted as of December 21, 2010.

Distributed Storage

There was mixed support for the Distributed Storage options. While some participants noted benefits including cost, shared impacts and mitigation opportunities, others expressed concern for impacts to parks.

- *This seems like a reasonable alternative to share the impacts and keep the storage near each basin. Also most reasonable cost.*
- *Extremely concerned about impact on parks, trees and the urban forest.*
- *Very concerned about turning parks into facilities by constructing large permanent storage tanks...*
- *If these are going to be two tanks the only sensible place for the large tank in Basin 44 is under the parking lot. Those poplar trees are not native and not particularly attractive. Small tank should be in Martha Washington Park.*
- *Invest cost and best distribution on construction and distribution to our parks.*

Tunnel Storage

The majority of the comments addressed the negative and unknown impacts of the Tunnel Storage option. A few participants were in favor of this alternative and cited fewer impacts to trees, less intrusion to the neighborhood and traffic upon completion.

- *This option makes no sense cost-wise, risk-wise, or impact-wise given that the entrance area alone is as big a footprint as a storage tank.*
- *Too many unknowns around tunnel construction.*
- *Seems much less impactful on parks, trees and the urban forest.*
- *Neighborhood disturbance during construction.*
- *Less intrusive (when complete).*

Conveyance and Storage

There was also mixed support for the Conveyance and Storage alternative. Impacts to Martha Washington Park remained the most common concern. Those in favor of Conveyance and Storage indicated a preference for CSO storage in a park facility to prevent impacting private property.

- *This solution is most objectionable in that it would turn Martha Washington into a facility and no longer a park.*
- *Would be better to divide storage rather than having a large storage facility at Martha Washington Park.*
- *This is one of the best two alternatives. There is a good place for the pump station and Martha Washington Park is a prime location for the single large tank. Probably the most sensible choice.*
- *Better to locate in park than on private property.*
- *Too much impact to Martha Washington Park. Unfair to transfer stormwater from one basin to negatively affect another.*

Complete Separation

Several participants noted positive environmental benefits of the Complete Separation option, including capturing pollutants and returning cleaner water to Lake Washington, while avoiding impacts to parks. Others expressed concern about the likelihood of achieving the 100 percent resident participation this alternative requires and argued that it could be an invasive and costly solution.

- *Capturing more pollutants.*
- *Eliminates storage tank.*
- *Returning water to lake clean.*
- *This is costly, invasive and unappealing. 100% participation is required but very likely impossible.*
- *I strongly support complete separation. This allows the most flexibility and allows sewage to be treated appropriately and stormwater to be addressed suitably. It also maintains our parks as parks, not facilities.*

Other Comments

Participants provided additional comments and questions during the presentation and during the break-out sessions. The following comments and questions are organized by topic.

- Avoid impacts to private property
 - *Parks can be resorted – private property cannot.*
 - *What are the implications of repairing private property infrastructure at public cost?*
 - *Why wasn't there more information presented at workshop 1 about private property impacts?*
 - *High density of low income populations in the project area. Low income residents are vulnerable to condemnation. This is unfair.*
- Consider a comprehensive solution to address current and future stormwater issues
 - *If in 5 years, SPU has to treat stormwater, what will the cost be to reassess the situation?*
 - *Does complete storage prepare SPU for the next phase of stormwater treatment.*
 - *Deal with all environmental needs – stormwater issues and consider a comprehensive solution.*
- Project should benefit parks and improve neighborhood character
 - *Each park could benefit from the project.*
 - *Project should improve character and design of park.*
 - *Don't just minimize the impact but bring benefits to community.*
 - *Create a best practice model.*