



City of Seattle
Seattle Public Utilities

Friends of Seward Park
November 2, 2013
Henderson N CSO Reduction Project Public Meeting
Meeting notes and responses

SPU provided a brief presentation of the project revisions since last SPU spoke with the Friends of Seward Park. The presentation included an update on the project schedule and status. The completion of the environmental process was a major milestone that was completed in October 2013. There was also a design change which increased storage volume in Seward Park. The increase in storage did not significantly revise the footprint and will save the project approximately ten (10) million dollars. The intent of the presentation was to gather input on the proposed surface restoration design. SPU and Parks are refining the design concepts presented at the meeting.

The following are the questions and comments SPU received from attendees organized by topic. Closed bullets are the comments or questions SPU heard. Open bullets with a "R-" are SPU responses.

Surface Restoration

- There is concern about the number of above ground features and how wide the 15' access way on the east side of the tanks is.
- Don't like wide access lane.
- Don't like excessive impervious surface area.
- Concerned with the quality of tennis court if replaced. The Tennis courts have never been good condition in Seward Park – if SPU is going to have to replace them make them good quality.
- The landscape will be designed to make the area softer and friendlier –
 - R – Parks agrees that the site needs to be softer and is working with SPU to reduce impervious surfaces on site.

General Response – SPU and Parks are working to reduce the amount of impervious area on site. At this time the impervious area between the two courts and at either end of the two courts cannot be reduced. We are looking at reducing the width of the access lane and changing the material on the east side of the tennis courts to something that is more pervious than concrete.

Design Change

- Do not like the increase in size of the tank at Seward Park.
 - R-The increase in the tank size saves rate payers approximately \$10m in project cost. The design change also stores sewage in the basin that generates the sewage.
- The Friends wanted to know what Park's view on the design change and impacts to the Park.
 - R-Parks does not have an opinion one way or the other one the design change. Parks is working with SPU on the surface restoration. It is Parks general belief that

Ray Hoffman, Director
Seattle Public Utilities
700 5th Avenue, Suite 4900
PO Box 34018
Seattle, WA 98124-4018

Tel (206) 684-5851
Fax (206) 684-4631
TDD (206) 233-7241
ray.hoffman@seattle.gov

<http://www.seattle.gov/util>

An equal employment opportunity, affirmative action employer. Accommodations for people with disabilities provided on request.

the surface restoration aspects are not at 60% and have a ways to go to get to that design level.

- Were the design changes at Martha Washington Park in response to a potential lawsuit?
 - The design changes in Martha Washington Park were not in response to a lawsuit. They were based on trying to reduce the overall project costs while meeting the requirements of the federal decree. SPU is unaware of any potential lawsuits or threats of a lawsuit from the community adjacent to Martha Washington Park.

Overall Project

- There was a question as to whether dynamite would be used by the project
 - R- No dynamite will be used by the project.
- This is a necessary environmental project and there is a concern about the NIMBY attitude by some. We are all responsible for the impact of combined sewer overflows to Lake Washington. Is the project robust enough to address flows over a long time period? Are the surfaces around the tank permeable?
 - R- The project is in response to a federal consent decree to reduce combined sewer overflows per the Clean Water Act.
 - R- The project is designed to accommodate future flows and conditions and is robust enough to accommodate future changes in the neighborhood. The project has reviewed current and forecasted zoning, density and new development requirements for the basin. The proposed facility is being designed to meet the anticipated flow levels for several decades resulting from redevelopment in the basin as well as precipitation changes due to climate change.
 - R- The surfaces around the tank are still being developed. Due to the depth of the tank it is believed that permeable surfaces would not be feasible over the top of the tank (such as between the two tennis courts).
- There is a belief that everything would be back to normal after the project was completed.
 - R- Once the project is completed the Park will be restored to its current uses; tennis, parking, shoreline and southern grass area. In addition, the shoreline will be enhanced with improvements such as the removal of invasive plants and reconstruction of the shoreline bulkhead. It will not be the exactly the same, however, the normal or existing recreational uses will be restored and in some cases improved.
- Is a tank required?
 - R- Short answer, yes. A storage facility was the outcome of the preliminary options analysis that was completed several years ago. This was further refined during that analysis to a tank in the Park.
- The Friends of Seward Park would like to see the tank and tree removal at both sites staked out.
 - R- The tree removal at the tennis court site will be marked in the field and the four corners of the tank will be staked in the first quarter of 2014.

Construction

- There was a question on construction staging and where that will be located.
 - R-SPU has hired the Contractor who is assisting with design. The Contractor is not intending to use the south parking lot site for staging as shown in the EIS documents. They are planning on using the area north of the tennis court site between the Park entry, the toe of the slope and Juneau Street. Parks has preliminary identified trees to be protected in the staging area.
- What happens to hauled material? Could it be used in the parking lot?

- R-Excavated material will be hauled to approved offsite locations. It is anticipated that the excavated material will not be suitable for filling or use in the parking lot area.
- Has a route been chosen for truck traffic? There is a concern with the existing condition of Orcas Street and that it might sustain damage from truck traffic.
 - R- No route has been selected for truck traffic at this time.

Noise levels

- Noise is a concern as well.
- Can SPU provide an example of what the noise would sound like?
 - R-The information below is from the operational noise study completed in September 2013. The study looked at and analyzed noise at specific locations within the park and along the western park property line. The specific locations can be found in Figure 2-1 in the RFEIS. Operational noise associated with the facility would be created by the odor control system.
 - Tennis courts site (RFEIS Table 2-4)
 Daytime there are two locations which experience an increase in noise. This is at the odor control exhaust and air intake vents. The noise level in these locations is predicted to increase from 37 dBA to 54 dBA during the daytime. The predicted daytime level of noise would be equivalent to light auto traffic from 50' away, see table below. The odor control intake and exhaust vents have been specifically located west of the tennis court parking lot so that this predicted increase in noise will not impact the recreational experience of any park users. The project will not increase noise at the west park property line with the neighbors during the daytime. Night time there is no perceptible increase in noise at the property line on the west side of the Park and there are no park users to be impacted by the noise associated with the vents.
 - Parking lot site (RFEIS Table 2-5)
 Daytime there is one location that is predicted to experience a 5 dBA increase. This is located at the odor control exhaust and intake vents and would increase from 46 dBA to 51dBA during the daytime. Night time there is no perceptible increase in noise at the property line on the west side of the Park and there are no park users to be impacted by the noise associated with the vents.
 - Sound Levels and Human Response (RFEIS Table 2-1)

Sound Source	dBA	Response Descriptor
Carrier deck jet operation	140	
	130	Painfully loud Limit amplified speech
Jet takeoff (200 feet) Auto horn (3 feet)	120	
Riveting machine	110	Maximum vocal effort
Jet takeoff (2,000 feet) Shout (0.5 foot)	100	
New York subway station Heavy truck (50 feet)	90	Very annoying Hearing damage (8-hour
Pneumatic drill (50 feet)	80	Annoying

Freight train (50 feet) Freeway traffic (50 feet)	70	Telephone use difficult
Air conditioning unit (20)	60	Intrusive
Light auto traffic (50 feet)	50	Quiet
Living room Bedroom	40	
Library Soft whisper (15 feet)	30	Very quiet
Broadcasting studio	20	
	10	Just audible
	0	Threshold of hearing

Source: Adapted from Council on Environmental Quality 1970

- Is there an existing example of venting that people could visit?
 - R- There are no similar examples of this type of venting in Seattle. The City is building these facilities to reduce impacts to the neighbors and users of the Park. This has not been done in the past, so there are no examples in the City, sorry. We are still trying to find a similar site at another local agency but have not been successful to date.
- A better demonstration of comparative noise levels impacts might be found on you-tube.
 - R- SPU is trying to find a short video or other information which would provide examples of the sound levels associated with the project and daytime park noise level.
- Did the noise impact come up during public meetings on site choice? Has there been research into how to reduce noise pollution?
 - R- Operational or on-going facility noise did not come up during the earlier Public Meetings. Construction noise was discussed. Operational noise associated with the facility would be created by the odor control system. SPU has conducted research in the summer of 2013 to evaluate design options, locate, and select equipment types to minimize noise pollution for park users and neighbors.

Public Input - All comments received are stated below

- Would like more public input.
- There is a lack of ability for community input on the design of the surface features. Currently Parks Preview meets with SPU and there is no chance for public input.
 - R- The current outreach effort is in an attempt to engage the public and receive input on the project. A public open house will be held at the Audubon Center 11/13/13. Additional meetings will be held in the spring of 2014
- A recommendation was made to have stakeholders, including the Friends of Seward Park, participate in the design process. There was another comment made about a concern about not being able to provide input on landscape design. The commenter would like a committee put together of citizen stakeholders who can provide input on design and plant palette work.
 - SPU has determined at this time that starting a new process, such as the Public Advisory Committee, would not be efficient for the project schedule given the time remaining in the schedule and regulatory requirements associated with the schedule. SPU would like to provide a means for stakeholders to provide input on the landscape design of the project. That is part of the current outreach effort in early November. SPU is also proposing to include 2-3 people from the Friends of Seward Park in 90% design workshops around April 2014. The final design plans are due in

June 2014. In addition, SPU would like to meet with the Friends of Seward Park at a regularly scheduled meeting in the March/ April time frame to provide a project status update and receive any comments on the project.

The project team has received the 60% plans comments from the Friends of Seward Park and is working to respond to all comments on the 60% plans. We will provide responses back to the comments received from FoSP.

- The EIS process was too formalized and there was no acknowledgement of comments. This meeting is more helpful with an open dialogue.
- There is concern that Parks planning and development is an internal process which is not responsive to public input.
- The Friends of Seward Park would like to be involved in the vegetation plan for the Shoreline.
 - R-SPU will attempt to include the Friends of Seward Park through additional meetings like this one, comment response to design milestones and at the next set of design workshops.
- There have been five (5) public meetings. There is a belief that the community has not been brought along in the project process.
 - R- SPU agrees that there was a significant gap in which we did not reach out the community over the last 9 to 12 months. We are going to try to reach out more often on a 4-6 month time frame.
- Previously it felt like SPU and Parks did not want to listen to comments. One of the concerns in taking comments is that a response should also be provided.
 - SPU acknowledges that we can improve our process and will respond to comments from this point forward. Debbie Harris, SPU, apologizes for being so late in getting these comments and comment responses back to the Friends of Seward Park.
- The Friends would like SPU to come back after the Friends have received responses to their comments and questions.
 - R- SPU will work with the Friends to schedule attendance at a meeting in the spring of 2014.
- The community has a lot of concerns about the Parks Preview process.

General Response: SPU is working to provide opportunities for public input on the design prior to and after key milestones. The public outreach in the late October early November 2013 was to gain comments and input on the 60% design level. We are planning additional outreach in the spring of 2014 to follow up on the 60% formal design milestone and to gain additional input prior to the final design milestone.

Site Selection

- There were several questions on whether the parking lot site was still an option and why the tennis court is the preferred site.
 - Both Parks and SPU prefer and are recommending the tennis court site and are moving forward with that site design. It is anticipated that the City Council will vote on the preferred site in early 2014.
 - There have been numerous public meetings during the preliminary environmental process to determine the type of facility to reduce combined sewer overflows and where the treatment should be sited. Through this process a storage treatment was preferred by the community. In reviewing the costs and impacts it was determined that storage within Seward Park would be the preferred location. The tennis court is preferred because it keeps the expansion of utilities into the Park to a minimum, the short term construction impacts to Park operations and events are reduced, the long term impacts to the park and park events are reduced, and the above ground features are less obtrusive at the tennis court site. The tennis court site also offers a

- location for the odor control vents that will minimize impacts to park users while not increasing noise levels outside of the property line.
- Believe that the tennis court site is a poor choice. Wants to know from a long term perspective why the tennis court site was selected.
 - R- Long term both SPU and Parks would like the least amount of utilities as possible in the park and would like to keep those utilities confined to an outside boundary of the Park. Installing the tank under the parking lot site would significantly expand the utility presence within the Park and would reduce future options for use of the Park at the parking lot site. In reviewing the maintenance requirements for the storage tank it was determined that the first two years access to the tank hatches would be required at least once per month and possibly more. After the first two years the access for maintenance would be reduced to approximately 7 times per year occurring mainly during the rainy season, October through April. This maintenance at the tennis court site would allow the tennis courts to remain open. At the parking lot site a portion of the parking lot would be closed and inaccessible during this maintenance.
 - There was a question on the long term impacts of the two sites.
 - R- The long term impacts are addressed in the EIS.
 - Believe that the parking lot site is a better location than the tennis courts site. There is 30% more parking in the parking lot site plus there is additional parking available in the upper parking lots. The people in this room could be utilized to improve the project aesthetics. The south parking lot site can be designed to not impact the public and potentially increase parking in this location in the long term. The project team is incorrectly representing the impacts for the south parking lot site.
 - R- SPU disagrees with this comment for the reasons listed above.
 - Why would SPU take the risk of a lawsuit and damage by choosing the tennis court site?
 - R- Parks and SPU believe that the tennis court site is the best location for the CSO reduction project for reasons provided above. There are risks, positives, and negatives for each site reviewed in the EIS. Risk was reviewed in selecting a preferred site.
 - There is a perception that SPU was ambivalent to the site location per Andrew Lee of SPU.
 - R- This is untrue. SPU and Parks believe the tennis court site is the best location for the reasons described in the previous bullets.

Adjacent property/ neighbor comments:

- Dan Kinerk wants to speak directly with Michael Shiosaki, Parks Department.
 - R-This message was passed to Michael. SPU understands that Dan was able to talk with Michael in late December 2013
- Parks desire for access to the south side of the tennis courts does not take into consideration the adjacent neighbors. Would Parks consider building a fence along the property line?
 - Parks does not build fences along the property lines. The intent is that the park is open and available to all.
- Did Parks and SPU take into account the impacts to Homeowners?
 - Homeowners were taken into account in the analysis of the two sites. The odor control facility has been included in the project to treat both the existing and new facility. No formal odor complaints have been received from the public although in public meetings SPU has heard about odors in the vicinity of the project. The proposed facility will reduce odors in the vicinity of the existing tank which does not currently have an odor treatment facility. The equipment for the proposed odor control system, vent locations, and operations plan were chosen to reduce noise to park users and to the neighbors. Where possible all of the new equipment has been

placed below ground rather than in an above ground structure. The surface restoration will consist of putting back the same park facilities that exist currently in the tennis court location with an improved shoreline, improved parking, and ADA access to the tennis courts.

- There was a question on whether SPU has insurance if the homes are damaged.
 - R-Damage to the homes would be the responsibility of the Contractor. Pre- and post-construction condition assessments will be completed to determine if construction caused any damage. The Contractor is required to have both insurance and to be bonded.
- The impacts to neighbors is much more than the two year construction project, it is the life of the tank. Was that considered?
 - R- Yes it was considered, we believe that the recommended site is the best solution for Parks, park users, SPU, and the neighbors.
- Why does the project accept the possibility of risk to the structures/homes uphill from the tank as acceptable? When there is no risk of this problem if the south parking lot site is chosen? The south parking lot is also in need of environmental upgrades.
 - R- The risk to the homes and utilities up slope of the tennis court site was considered and has been studied during the design process. We do not believe there is a significant risk of damage to the homes or utilities. The South Parking Lot site also includes risks and a steep slope adjacent to the site which appears to be sliding in its current condition.

Summary Response:

SPU and Parks are working to respond to questions and comments received. We are modifying the design as we can to incorporate response to public comments that we have received. In addition to the above comments and questions, the project team has also received the 60% design comments from the Friends of Seward Park. The project team would like to meet again with the Friends of Seward Park in the March or April time frame. In addition we would like to coordinate with the Friends of Seward Park in order to include a few members in the 90% review workshops that will be held in the April time frame.

Please contact Debbie Harris, 206-733-9050 with any questions on these notes or the project.