From:	DeMott, David
То:	Freitag, Mark; Baker, Bruce; Westminster Clerk
Cc:	<u>City Council; Erb, Kodi</u>
Subject:	RE: Reasons I will vote against appealing the condemnation valuation
Date:	Friday, February 10, 2023 1:15:14 PM
Attachments:	image001.png
	image002.png

## Clerk Fitch,

These answers are more information off of the piece I asked to be added to minutes for the last meeting. Can we have this additional information added to public comment for record to add value and insight to the conversation on water plant for the public.

## Manager Freitag,

WE have <u>https://www.cityofwestminster.us/water</u> lots of information on the water topic. I think it would be great to have some of the QAs updated to reflect some of the concerns raised by public and how the plan does or does not speak to them.

Thank you,

Dave DeMott Westminster City Councillor 303-881-2728 www.CityofWestminster.us

Find answers to many issues or log a request @ <u>https://www.cityofwestminster.us/Residents/CityServices/ServiceRequests</u>

Get engaged with your city @

https://www.westyconnect.us/

NOTE: As a public entity, the City of Westminster is governed by the Colorado Open Records Act. Accordingly, this email and any attachments may be subject to inspection and/or copying by members of the public.

From: Freitag, Mark <mfreitag@cityofwestminster.us>

Sent: Friday, February 10, 2023 9:52 AM

To: Baker, Bruce <bbaker@cityofwestminster.us>

**Cc:** City Council <CityCouncil@CityofWestminster.us>; Erb, Kodi <kerb@CityofWestminster.us> **Subject:** FW: Reasons I will vote against appealing the condemnation valuation

Councillor Baker,

The staff team provided the following information in response to your questions.

1. CDM was under contract to complete design work for the larger water treatment plant that was proposed with Water 2025. Their work was stopped in order to do a reevaluation of the

project and to look at specific options that had been identified as potential alternatives. They did not spend significant effort on re-evaluating the Jacob's study as they were primarily focused on developing more in-depth evaluation of the four identified alternatives; however, they did agree with the thoroughly vetted process and results of the Jacobs study. Specific to the Westcliffe open space area, there are a few factors that make it a less desirable location. The first is that it is designated as actively used open space amenity for the community. It is also immediately adjacent to single family residential homes. Construction in particular but also ongoing operations of the facility would be impactful to these existing homes. Access to the property is challenging. Heavy trucking traffic would have to be routed through the residential neighborhood to the south - which would include semi-truck deliveries of hazardous chemicals. Alternatively, a substantial bridge could be built across Big Dry Creek with access through the hotel/commercial area. A bridge of this size would be relatively expensive. It is also a safety concern. Having the access to the treatment plant be across a bridge and water way represents a major potential issue in a flooding event. In either case, at a minimum a secondary access through the neighborhood would be required. Impacts to the adjacent neighborhood along with access concerns make this a less desirable location.

2. At the beginning of the re-evaluation there was substantial interest in understanding what the current condition at Semper was. This was a legitimate question to fully understand appropriate next steps for the water plant. The result of that evaluation concluded that rehabilitating Semper will not result in a similar condition or life expectancy as building a new treatment plant. Portions of Semper are beyond their useful life and rehabilitation will not extend the life of the plant to 50 years. That said, portions of Semper were identified as having remaining life if certain rehabilitations are completed. The proposed project at Westminster Blvd, includes the rehabilitation of those parts of the plant that have remaining value. This allows the City to maximize remaining life at Semper and also construct a plant sufficient to cover the failing portions of Semper with more resilient infrastructure.

I trust this information is helpful.

## R/Mark

From: Baker, Bruce <<u>bbaker@cityofwestminster.us</u>>
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2023 1:03 PM
To: Erb, Kodi <<u>kerb@CityofWestminster.us</u>>; City Council <<u>CityCouncil@CityofWestminster.us</u>>
Cc: Freitag, Mark <<u>mfreitag@cityofwestminster.us</u>>
Subject: Re: Reasons I will vote against appealing the condemnation valuation

## Manager Freitag,

Can you answer/clarify my questions below in regards to the responses to MPT's requests.

 It is my understanding that Feb 2022 when our Interim Manager requested the Water 2025 reassessment, as per the information in the Feb 28, Pre/post meeting, Item 1. he amended the contract with CDM Smith for Final design services for water 2025, which stopped work at about 30%. He then contracted with CDM Smith for \$750,000 reassessment. At that time, March 2022 to study recieved, did CDM Smith reassess the site selection done by Jacobs. If they did, <u>what was the reason for not re-considering</u> <u>the Westcliffe Park</u>?

2. During our Jan 23, 2023 discussion, I specifically asked Ms Bleiker if Semper would last 50 years. She brought up regulatory concerns, so I more precisely asked if Semper would mechanically last 50 years. At time mark beginning 47:30 Ms Bleiker stated that all four alternatives were planned to last more than 50 years. In the response to MTP you flatly say Semper will not last 50 years. Why was Semper ever proposed as an equal alternative among the 4 choices?

<u>Thanks,</u>

<u>Bruce Baker</u>