

Log #	Received From	Comment/Question	Staff/Consultant Response
1	Councilmember Weinberg	<p>I noticed that the proposed new line would be 24 inches in diameter. That’s the same diameter as the original line that was installed in 1956, when the population on the island was about 11,000 people. I have 4 questions about this topic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Let’s think 100 years in the future. While it’s impossible to predict exactly how populous the community will be in 100 years, I think we can safely assume that it will be considerably more populous than it is today. Do we expect a 24-inch line to be sufficient to serve the community’s needs in the year 2124? b. From an engineering standpoint, would it be physically viable for the City to install a pipe along the proposed new route which is larger than 24 inches, or does the size of the pipe segments preceding and following it necessitate its staying at 24 inches? c. From a long-term planning standpoint, is it feasible to install a larger line in the new segment in anticipation of the preceding and following segments eventually being widened as well when they reach their end-of-useful-life? d. <i>From a risk mitigation standpoint, would installing a larger line enable us to “fall back” to 24 inches should a future break similar to what happened on April 3rd occur in the new pipe, necessitating the</i> 	<p>At this stage of planning, we are still in the preliminary assessment phase. Additional planning and design details, including the pipe size, will be evaluated once the project enters the formal design phase.</p> <p><u>Additional information below:</u> Staff collaborated with our engineers and water modeling consultant to analyze the new water transmission line, focusing on the best pipe size to meet current demands and projected population growth. The analysis evaluated 24-inch, 30-inch, and 36-inch diameter pipes, concluding that a 24-inch diameter pipe will meet the community's water needs for the next 50+ years.</p> <p>Water is delivered to the City’s reservoir tanks through a pressure difference between the Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) supply source and the reservoir. With the existing pressure from SPU, a 24-inch pipe will provide adequate water flow. Upsizing to 30-inch or 36-inch pipes does not significantly enhance water delivery under the available pressures.</p> <p>Additionally, water quality is an important consideration; larger pipes may lead to slower flow velocities, which could adversely affect water quality, particularly during seasons of reduced demand.</p> <p>From an engineering perspective, installing a larger pipe along the existing alignment is feasible.</p>

		<p><i>installation of another diameter-reducing structural liner?</i></p>	<p>However, each increase in pipe size raises concerns about fitting the pipe within the existing right-of-way, making construction more challenging.</p> <p>In regards to liners, a larger pipe diameter could potentially allow for a larger liner to be installed. However, it is important to note that a primary driver for this new pipe alignment is to allow for future access and conventional repairs and maintenance to occur, perhaps reducing the need for a future liner.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Councilmember Weinberg</p>	<p>Regarding the pipes between Shorewood and the end of Reach 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are all the current pipes made up of Asbestos Concrete? b. Do these pipes also fall in the 97.5% / 2.5% split of responsibility between CoMI and SPU when it comes to costs of operations, maintenance, modernization/replacement? c. Would the transfer of ownership, maintenance, and modernization responsibilities for these pipes from SPU to CoMI result in a net reduction in SPU’s long-term operations, maintenance, and capital costs and a corresponding net increase to those of the City of MI? d. If so, is this transfer of recurring cost one of the primary topics of the proposed discussion 	<p>The Shorewood transmission, highlighted in green on AB6530x1, runs from the SPU meter (where Reach 3 connects with Reach 4) to the Shorewood Complex. This line is primarily comprised of 10-inch Asbestos Concrete (AC) pipe.</p> <p>This section of pipe is private and does not fall into the cost split between the City and SPU.</p> <p>Should the City move forward with the transfer of ownership, the preferred option for connecting Shorewood to the City distribution system involves the installation of two new master meters at SE 36th Street on 88th and 90th Avenues SE. This option would take the private AC transmission line out of service.</p> <p>Yes, the transfer of ownership from SPU to the City would reduce the long-term capital and operational costs to SPU and transfer them to the City, however this is a subject of a future contract negotiation.</p>

		<p>with SPU about amending our Wholesale Service Contract?</p> <p>e. Has SPU given the CoMI any indication of whether or when it was planning to replace and modernize these pipes (between Shorewood and Reach 3)</p>	<p>SPU has not indicated what the timing was/would be as it relates to the replacement of the private lines. This question, as well as the history (age, condition, break history, water quality, etc.) would be part of the information gathering process prior to contract negotiations.</p>
3	Councilmember Weinberg	<p>How many water main breaks have we had year-to-date in 2024?</p> <p>If memory serves, I believe we had 15 in '23 and 12 in '22.</p>	<p>Water main breaks per year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2024 YTD (4) • 2023 (15) • 2022 (13)
4	Councilmember Reynolds	<p>With the 30” supply line taken out of commission in Mercer Slough, it looks like our 24” lines are being fed solely by a 16” supply line through the slough area. Is that true? If so, how does the math math? Is the 16” line just at much higher pressure to feed enough water to fill the 24” line?</p>	<p>With the 30-inch supply line out of commission in Mercer Slough, the City’s water supply now relies on the 16-inch line thru the Mercer Slough and attached to the I90 bridge.</p> <p>The City’s contract with Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) requires maintaining a minimum pressure at the Boat Ramp, which is downstream of the 16”.</p> <p>Currently, SPU’s transmission line across the lake can provide adequate pressure to meet the contract requirements at the Boat Ramp.</p> <p>Hydraulically, the 16-inch supply line does cause a significant pressure drop in the SPU system; however, SPU can still deliver the contracted pressures at the Boat Ramp.</p>
5	Councilmember Reynolds	<p>It appears that both a 16 and a 20 inch line go across the water. Are they both underwater or is one suspended from the bridge?</p>	<p>The 16-inch line is suspended under the bridge and the 20-inch line crosses under the water, along the lake floor.</p>

6	Councilmember Reynolds	Does the 16” line remain completely separate from the 20” line until it fills our backup line? Or do they merge near the boat launch and then re split.	The 16-inch and 20-inch lines merge at the Boat Ramp. There is an isolation valve between the lines that belongs to Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) which only SPU can operate.
7	Councilmember Reynolds	If we wanted a 30” line to create additional capacity to fund higher future demands, would it be possible without creating water quality issues? Would it be pointless because the lines across the lake are too small?	See answer to question #1 above.
8	Councilmember Reynolds	<i>What role does Shorewood have in the decision making? If we vote to connect them directly to MI instead of remaining a SPU customer, is it a done deal? Or do they need to vote separately?</i>	Shorewood will be informed of the discussion, but the contract negotiation will occur between the City and SPU.