



## Washington Park Reservoir Improvements Project Community Sounding Board Meeting #2 Summary *DRAFT*

**August 6, 2013**

**6:00 to 8:00 pm**

**First United Methodist Church  
1838 SW Jefferson – Room 202**

### **CSB Members Present**

Eric Nagle – *Arlington Heights NA*  
Bill Welch – *Northwest District Association*  
Terri Davis – *Portland Parks & Recreation*  
Nicolas Clark – *Neighbors West Northwest*  
Chris Kent – *Goose Hollow NA*  
Annie Mahoney – *Historic Group Representative*

### **CSB Members Absent**

Charlie Clark – *Northwest Heights NA*  
Dave Malcolm – *Sylvan-Highlands NA*  
Patty Gardner – *Pearl District NA*

### **Staff & Public Present**

Teresa Elliott, *Portland Water Bureau*  
Tim Hall, *Portland Water Bureau*  
Tom Carter, *Portland Water Bureau*  
Jerry Moore, *Portland Water Bureau*  
Marie Del Toro, *Portland Water Bureau*  
Alan Peck, *AECOM*  
Carmen Nale, *AECOM*  
Marilee Hanks, *AECOM*  
Jeanne Lawson, *JLA Public Involvement*  
Sam Beresky, *JLA Public Involvement*  
Jamie Harvie, *JLA Public Involvement*  
Kathryn Notson, *Resident*  
Dee White, *Resident*  
Wayne Wirta, *Resident/NWDA*

## **Welcome and Introductions**

Community Sounding Board (CSB) members, staff and members of the public introduced themselves. **Annie Mahoney** noted that she attends as an individual, rather than as a representative of a group. **Jeanne Lawson** said members serve as a sounding board of individuals who are familiar with the issues in their area or field of expertise.

**Jeanne Lawson** reviewed what had happened at the previous meeting and reviewed the agenda for this meeting. She reminded the group of their charge.

**Teresa Elliott** talked about replanting at Bull Run. It has been frequently replanted over the years; they are unsure of the most recent date – possibly 1993, which was the last time there was any logging within the watershed.

**Teresa Elliott** talked about the Portland Water Bureau's (PWB) coordination with Portland Parks and Recreation (PPR). First, Terri Davis represents PPR on the CSB. Also, PWB and PPR are having a series of meetings in order to share technical information, coordinate projects, and continue to update PPR as stakeholders. There have been three such meetings to date, including a meeting with the joint directors of both bureaus and a meeting with the Japanese Gardens. The Commissioners in charge have also been briefed.

**Sam Beresky** reviewed changes to the protocol document. It was noted that the wording "2/3 majority of members present" needed to be updated at one additional place in the document. This change will be made prior to the next meeting.

**Jeanne Lawson** asked whether any CSB members would suggest changes to the meeting #1 summary; no one had any changes. She said that future meeting summaries would be sent for review prior to meetings, and asked members to review them and bring any changes to the following meeting.

**Jeanne Lawson** said that the project team will encourage the sounding board members to bring up any information/feedback they receive from constituents between meetings. Jeanne asked whether any CSB members have information they would like to share. **Eric Nagle** said that the Arlington Heights Neighborhood Association Board's main perspective is that no significant change in use should happen at Reservoir 3 site until there is a Washington Park Master Plan. He specified that a reflecting pool would probably not be a significant change in use but, for example, a wading pool could be.

#### *Questions and Discussion*

- **Eric Nagle** asked whether the City Council has the final decision on design. **Teresa Elliott** replied that the project requires a historic review, which means the land use decision must go before City Council for approval. Therefore, the City Council will be the final decision-maker.
- **Bill Welch** asked which of the people present at the meeting will vote on CSB recommendations. **Jeanne Lawson** replied that only those listed as CSB "members" on the contact list are those whose opinions will be represented.
- **Annie Mahoney** asked whether a Washington Park Master Plan will be done. **Terri Davis** said that PPR plan to do one, but it would probably not be initiated until 2015, which does not fit with the timeframe for the reservoir update.
- **Nicolas Clark** asked whether the Landmarks Commission has provided any guidelines. Marilee Hanks said the project team had briefed the Landmarks Commission on July 22; there is no formal feedback at this point. The next meeting with the Landmarks Commission will be a design review towards end of September.

## **Open House and Outreach Review**

**Sam Beresky** briefed the group on the in-person and virtual open houses, as well as the outreach done prior to and during these events. Sam said that many attendees came to express opposition to the project and other Portland Water Bureau projects. Of those that provided feedback on this project, many issues and opportunities that were identified mirrored that of the CSB and stakeholder interviews. Sam reviewed the

issues/opportunities “wordles” and said these would be updated to reflect the open house input. A complete open house summary will be posted to the website.

**Jeanne Lawson** said the project team has learned that open houses are not going to be the most effective way of reaching out to the neighbors and park users. **Eric Nagle** suggested setting up a display at the kiosk by Reservoir 3. **Nicolas Clark** offered to distribute flyers for future outreach efforts.

#### *Questions and Discussion*

- **Bill Welch** asked how the issues/opportunities “wordles” are prioritized. **Jeanne Lawson** explained that the size is based on how frequently that issue was brought up during stakeholder interviews and the first CSB meeting. The color and arrangement are random. Wordles are a useful tool for visually weighting issues and opportunities.

## **Draft Goals and Objectives**

### **Purpose and Need**

**Jeanne Lawson** reviewed the project’s purpose and needs, as well as the intent of the current visible features process.

Purpose – The project purpose is the fundamental reason why the project is being done. The Washington Park Reservoir Improvements Project’s purpose is to:

- Meet modern public health practices and standards.
- Make the water system more reliable and resilient.
- Create new facilities that can serve Portland for the next 100 years.

Needs – The project needs are the drivers behind the project. The project needs were a main focus of the first CSB meeting. The project needs are:

- Aging: Reservoirs were designed for 100 years, and are now 140 years old
- Seismic: Reservoirs were not designed to withstand earthquakes
- Landslide area: Has been affecting both reservoirs
- Federal health and safety regulations: Require covering the drinking water supply

Intent – The focus of the current process is to ensure the visible features of the reservoir improvements project respect the park and the historic character of the existing features, and reflect the values of the community it serves.

### **Goals and Objectives**

**Jeanne Lawson** said the goals and objectives are intended to capture the sentiments of the community and legislation, and will be developed into more specific evaluation criteria by the project team. Goals and objectives often conflict with one another; it must then be decided how to balance them.

**Jeanne Lawson** reviewed the draft goals and objectives. She asked for feedback from sounding board members.

### ***Be Good Stewards of Public Funds discussion:***

**Chris Kent** said that the stewardship aspect is very important and the goals and objectives were well stated. He did not recommend any changes.

**Bill Welch** said that “minimizing the total cost of the project” objective seems to limit all other options; particularly because it is listed as the first and foremost goal. **Jeanne Lawson** said that the goals and objectives are not necessarily intended to be in order of importance, though the project team did put cost first since it had been the issue heard most often.

**Eric Nagle** agreed with Bill; he said he is troubled by the word minimize. He noted that the historical features process immediately requires more than the minimum cost. He suggested a similar message could be conveyed without using the word “minimize.”

**Nicolas Clark** said that it is unclear who the “community” is. He recommended the word “communities.” **Terri Davis** recommended “community of stakeholders”.

**Nicolas Clark** said the word “benefits” is very vague. **Jeanne Lawson** said that different stakeholders have indicated various and conflicting things to be benefits; that’s why it is worded this way.

**Jeanne Lawson** said that the project team would work on the wording of this section and bring back a revision to the next meeting.

***Respect Historic Resources discussion:***

**Annie Mahoney** noted that the historic structures report would be helpful in defining what constitutes historic structures and features. **Jeanne Lawson** said that goals and objectives are intended to be vague so they do not specify outcomes – this is why specific features are not identified.

There were no changes to the historic structures goals and objectives.

***Be a Good Neighbor discussion:***

**Eric Nagle** said that the current wording captures the goals and objectives well.

There were no changes to the good neighbor goals and objectives.

***Enhance Park Experience discussion:***

**Bill Welch** said it would be nice to be able to see the historic resources, and that selective vegetation removal may support this. **Jeanne Lawson** asked whether the “enhance views into and from the area” objective captures this. Bill replied that it does.

There were no changes to the enhance park experience goals and objectives.

***Support Sustainability discussion:***

**Annie Mahoney** and **Eric Nagle** recommended adding wording regarding education of sustainability and water conservation. **Bill Welch** said an overriding goal of the PWB should be education about water conservation. **Annie Mahoney** noted this is not currently covered in these objectives – they currently are more about maintenance rather than education.

**Jeanne Lawson** said that the project team would work on the wording of this section to focus on encouraging sustainable actions among the public. The project team will bring back a revision to the next meeting.

*Questions and Comments*

- **Chris Kent** wanted to know what the budget for the visual features part of the project will be.

- **Nicolas Clark** said that less demolition during the project means less reconstruction. This is good for the costs and for historic resources. **Jeanne Lawson** replied that most visible features of the reservoirs must be torn down in order to do the project.
- **Bill Welch** said the current reservoirs seem creature-sterile; would be nice to change this. **Terri Davis** said that wildlife is there; three bucks were recently seen. The trick is to allow them to exist separately while making it feel like they are there.
- **Bill Welch** and **Eric Nagle** asked for a tour of the reservoirs to better understand the project and historic structures. **Jeanne Lawson** replied that a tour would be arranged for CSB members before the next meeting.
- Opportunities for education
  - **Annie Mahoney** recommended an educational approach to support the “honoring historic function of reservoirs” objective.
  - **Eric Nagle** recommended explaining how the reservoirs work/what they do.
  - Several members recommended education around water conservation and sustainability.

## Project Constraints and Opportunities

**Marilee Hanks** presented the project constraints and opportunities (PowerPoint).

### Design Process

The design process will be shaped by inputs, both from the goals and objectives, and the design and program requirements.

### Historic Preservation

The reservoirs are within a historic district; this will have a major influence on the design.

The project team has considered examples of other approaches to the challenge of burying a historic reservoir, including Cal Anderson Park in Seattle and Garfield Park in Indianapolis.

As operating facility, the reservoirs have had to be maintained and changed over time. The current update is a continuation of this process. It is impossible to separate the visual features from the function of the water system.

### Design Parameters

The major design parameters include historic features, the landslide, surface elevation and water volume.

Landslide – Engineers have recommended not encroaching into the landslide. This means the project cannot bury any deeper than the bottom of the current reservoirs. Also, a 10-foot buffer is recommended to separate the new reservoir from the landslide. The landslide is moving approximately  $\frac{1}{4}$  inch per year, so this should accommodate movement for the next 100 years.

Surface Elevation – There would be consequences to keeping the surface elevation similar to how it looks today. If this project were to keep the current surface elevation, overall water volume would go down (because they must fill some area for the landslide and are unable to excavate deeper to accommodate). If the current water volume were to be maintained, then any water feature must be higher than today. The surface elevation is important to the overall water system because any changes to Reservoir 3's water volume will affect other reservoirs in the system.

Capacity – Current capacity is 25 MG; PWB has asked the design team to maintain a capacity of 23 MG within the system. Maintaining capacity is tied to community resiliency; they want to have at least 2.4 days’ supply in reserves. Reservoir 3 is significant part of current west side storage.

### **Character and Activities**

The range of activities considered in the designs will be based on feedback from stakeholder interviews, the CSB members, public comments and coordination with PPR.

### **Next Steps**

The design team will consider the goals and objectives as well as feedback from the public in order to develop concepts.

### *Questions and Comments*

- Capacity
  - **Bill Welch** asked whether the project must maintain the same water capacity. **Jeanne Lawson** said the PWB believes they need to maintain the same capacity, however they would like to hear what the sounding board thinks.
  - **Eric Nagle** said that maintaining current storage to extent possible is essential. The City’s primary job is to provide a secure water supply and that is more important than anything else.
  - **Nicolas Clark** asked whether they have already lost capacity since Reservoir 4 has been offline. **Teresa Elliott** said that Reservoir 4 was originally built for the industrial area down by the riverside and is not needed today. PWB currently only use it during current high demand periods or when working on Reservoir 3.
- **Bill Welch** asked whether the reservoir footprints will shrink considerably for protection from the landslide. **Marilee Hanks** replied that they would.
- **Bill Welch** asked whether it would be cheaper to develop a new reservoir somewhere else. **Teresa Elliott** said that there are no city-owned properties of the necessary size and elevation; they would have to condemn private properties. **Jeanne Lawson** said this would also disrupt the gravity-fed system which flows from one reservoir to another.
- **Eric Nagle** asked how much higher a water feature would need to be than the current water level. **Alan Peck** said that the top of the reservoir cap would be close to the height of the parapet. They are considering 18 inches deep for reflecting pool.
- **Annie Mahoney** said that any water feature should not impact on historic features. The design should focus on the historic context of the reservoirs. Having some surface water would be appropriate, but perhaps not to the same extent as current.
- **Nicolas Clark** asked how this will affect maintenance. **Alan Peck** said that maintenance access will be part of the visual features design.
- **Eric Nagle** asked whether the reservoir cap needs to be flat or sloped. **Alan Peck** said it needs to be slightly sloped; it can’t be too steep because water surface is flat. Cascades are a possibility for allowing changes to elevation.
- **Nicolas Clark** asked whether reservoirs in the system could be cut off from one another. **Jerry Moore** replied that the system is designed to flow from one to another.
- **Nicolas Clark** suggested moving SW Washington Way and putting the new underground reservoir where the road currently runs to the east of the reservoir. **Jeanne Lawson** said that the design team is currently working within the PWB

property lines, but it is an interesting suggestion because users do not see the distinction between PWB, PPR and private property – they see an overall site.

## **Public Comment**

**Kathryn Notson** asked whether PWB has any plans to upgrade Mayfair or Sam Jackson 2 reservoirs. **Teresa Elliott** said she is not aware of any plans. **Jerry Moore** said that these reservoirs only have so much property; they are hemmed in, so there is only so much room to increase capacity. There is not anywhere near as much capacity as Reservoir 3.

## **Wrap-up**

Next meeting is Tuesday, August 20<sup>th</sup>. The design team will share initial design ideas. Updated goals and objectives will be shared.

A tour of the reservoirs will be organized before the next meeting.

After the next meeting, the project team will be ready to meet with neighborhood associations. CSB members will follow up with their organizations about this. **Bill Welch** said the NWBA does not need a presentation.

**Jeanne Lawson** adjourned the meeting.