From: Lance A. Roberts [mailto:Lance.Roberts@respec.com]
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 12:19 PM
To: Lacock Fletcher
Subject: Chapel Valley Water Tank

## Fletcher -

I spoke with you on the phone about a month ago about the proposed water tank for Chapel Valley. I see that this item is on the agenda for the December 5 meeting. When you and I spoke, you mentioned the requirement of a "neighborhood" meeting that Mr. Davis and the Chapel Valley Water Board should hold. Was this meeting required before the items to be presented on December 5 to the Planning Commission? If so, no such meeting has been held and we have not seen any sort of proposed plan view of the tank.

I am not opposed to another water tank and understand the need to increase fire flows. However, I am extremely opposed to the height of the proposed tank. The tank would be nearly (or over) 5 stories tall and there is no way that this could be hidden by the trees. A shorter tank, located further up the hill, is a better option. For reference, my address is 4915 Copperhill Court.

Please let me know if this neighborhood meeting was supposed to be held.

Thank you!
Lance A. Roberts, Ph.D., P.E.
Vice President - Mining \& Energy Division
RESPEC Consulting \& Services - Established 1969
Mining \& Energy, Water \& Natural Resources, Information Technologies
P.O. Box 725, Rapid City, SD 57709-0725

Phone: 605.394.6511|Cell: 605.393.7085
www.respec.com
Innovation|Collaboration|Inspiration

From: George Rankin [mailto:ggr1011@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2013 12:07 PM
To: Lacock Fletcher
Subject: Chapel Valley Water Tank
Good Morning Mr. Lacock

I am sending you this message because of our concerns of the proposed water storage tank to be located within close proximity to our house at 4914 Copperhill Ct. in Chapel Valley. To be brief we find the proposal completely unacceptable as it is now.

It was our understanding two years ago that if and when a storage tank was built it would be 35 feet tall and tucked back in the trees away from our neighborhood, that additional vegetation would be established and that it would be virtually unnoticeable. Now we are hearing that the tank will be 53 feet high and would be much closer to the houses in the area. A structure of that size on the hill above our houses would dominate the Copperhill area and give the entire neighborhood a "industrial" look and feel. In addition over the past year the trees on that hill have been thinned to the point that you can now see between the ones remaining so there is little left to hide a steel tank.

We have lived in Chapel Valley since 1986 and in our house since 1990, Chapel Valley is a unique residential area that is defined by the trees and the views. I have talked with real estate people and having been involved in real estate I can assure you what the effect of a 53 foot water tank dominating the view to the West would do to the value of the houses in the Copperhill area, it would be devastating.

We do agree that in the event of a fire a water reservoir would be needed but I'm sure that the tank could be redesigned, moved farther up the hill away from the houses where it would be unnoticed.

Respectively,
George \& Gloria Rankin

From: Tom Blue [mailto:bluetnt@rushmore.com]
Sent: Monday, December 02, 2013 1:46 PM
To: Lacock Fletcher
Subject: Fw: tank height
Fletcher,
As recently as this September, the Chapel Lane Water Board represented that the water tank would be 34 feet tall (see emails below to me from the President of the Water Board).

I am adamantly opposed to what is now apparently a proposed 57 foot tall tank about 100 yards out my dining room window. It will look like a missile sitting on a launch pad and will absolutely destroy my property value.

The Water Company told me that another site would work just fine further up the hill and would provide for a much shorter tank of 34 foot. That is an alternative that is reasonable. A 57 foot tall tank is not.

Sincerely,
Tom Blue
4901 Copperhill Drive
From: Dennis Decker
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2013 7:42 AM
To: Business Emails
Subject: Re: tank height
Will give you a call. I made a mistake about the tank height, it is 34 not 42 . Too much going on. Brandon will start on the tank area and then dig in the pipe after that is finished. The road area will be the last to be completed. He has to dig up the road bed whether we gravel it or not. Talk to you later. DD ----- Original Message -----
From: Business Emails
To: Dennis Decker
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2013 9:41 PM
Subject: Re: tank height
Give me a call sometime later this week; let's go walk up there and get an idea of where it would be visible and where it wouldn't - higher up the hill might be less visible. The paperwork you read to me earlier said 30 feet diameter and 34 feet high - doesn't matter since it will be delayed until next spring but it might help if we take a look since it hasn't been built yet. I talked to someone again at the city last week after you and I last talked and he was going to see whether we needed to do anything on a road or not. So, Brandon may not have to do any work on a road - don't say anything to him or anyone else yet on it until I hear back. Tom

```
From: Dennis Decker
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2013 7:11 PM
To: Blue, Tom
Subject: tank height
```

The plans indicated what I told you for a height of 42 ft was corrrect, but when I asked Ron Davis he said that was wrong and contacted the tank company and found that they had fortunately not started to build the tank yet. Ron and Bob went to the tank site last Friday and determined that if we would have left the
height at 42' we would have had to move it up the hill at lease another 20 ft to make it the right elevation with the current tank. It would have been much more visible and would have required a lot of changes to the plans. The tank company was using their standard plan for the tank that would hold 185,00 gallons. That was what we were asking for, but the elevation of the top was not high enough.
Therefore the board decided to delay the delivery of the tank until next spring and do all the site prep, including burying the pipe to Copper Hill this fall. Brandon will start work in about a week on the site. There will not be hardly any dirt to work with from the site construction and the board agreed that we would finish the installation in the spring before we address any other issues with homeowners being able to see the tank. Dennis

From: Oxner, Sgt. Matt [mailto:Matt.Oxner@state.sd.us]
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 12:16 PM
To: cpweb
Subject: Water Tower in Chapel Valley

I am writing this letter in hopes to STOP the 57 FOOT WATER TOWER that is being placed near my property in Chapel Valley. This is the first notice that I have received on this tower and have been told that the city can put a smaller tower of 34 feet back up the hill further that would not affect the property values of the residences that live on or near Copperhill Drive and Court.

It appears to me that it is common sense as to install the smaller tank versus a 57 Foot tank on top of a hill? I am not sure what motives the city or planners have with the larger tank and plan on fighting this if needed. I will attempt to attend the meeting on the $5^{\text {th }}$ but with my job it is tough to be able to attend such meetings as I would think would be the case as to most professionals whom many live in my neighborhood.

Thanks for your consideration and I would hope we can come to a common sense agreement on this issue.




```
******SA/mon**
```
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